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ABSTRACT

The purpose of this thesis was to identify applicant’s reactions to the use of video interviewing in the selection process. Video interviewing is a fairly new technology that employers are using to conduct interviews over the internet with webcams. It can be conducted in a live or non-live environment. This study specifically focuses on the use of non-live video interviewing in the selection process. The survey was sent to 463 job candidates who recently conducted a video interview and 73 of those who responded had conducted a non-live video interview. Applicant reactions to video interviewing were studied specifically in the areas of experience with webcams, ability to communicate information about themselves over the webcam, level of position applying to, travel constraints, procedural fairness, and overall favorability of video interviewing in the selection process. A strong relationship was found between travel constraints and procedural fairness; ability to communicate information and overall favorability of video interviewing as a selection tool; and procedural fairness and overall favorability.
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Chapter 1

Background and Statement of the Research Problem

Background

As technology is increasingly used in all facets of business, it is really not surprising to find its growth in the human resource field. Human resource professionals are using technology in their selection systems because technology is fast, flexible, and cost effective (Jones et al., 2002). One of the technological changes that human resources have used in the selection process involves the use of video. It has become more common for employers to use videos to interview candidates especially when job candidates are unable to travel for interviews. Videos have also been used by businesses in an effort to save time and money. Instead of a face-to-face interview, managers can conduct the interview over video cameras, webcams, or other related video technology. Videoconferencing is the most common use of video in the interview process. However, one of the newer technologies for this process is called video interviewing.

Video interviewing and videoconferencing have some similar features but they also have several very important differences. Videoconferencing is streamed in real time so it is a “live” interview. It occurs between two locations that simultaneously connect as well as interact in a two-way video and audio transmission. Similar to a face-to-face interview, interviewers have the ability to specialize questions to the interviewee. It also allows the interviewer(s) and the interviewee to meet in a mock face-to-face setting where information is exchanged by both parties. However, some information (e.g., eye contact, the handshake, and other body cues) may be restricted or missing due to technological barriers.

Video interviewing, or virtual interviewing as it is also known, can occur in either a live or non-live environment (Luman, 2009). Live environments use two-way video and audio
communication so they are similar to videoconferencing but they use different technology (webcams and personal computers) to conduct the interview. This study will focus on video interviewing in non-live environments. Non-live environments only stream audio and video one-way. During a non-live video interview, the interviewee has no interaction with an interviewer. Some see this as a disadvantage because these types of interviews do not permit face-to-face contact (Heneman & Judge, 2009). The candidate is only able to give information to the employer because video interviewing is asynchronous. The interview takes place at one point in time and it is reviewed by interviewer(s) at another point in time since the video interview is recorded. The purpose of video interviewing is to narrow the applicant pool down even further by screening out applicants who are a mismatch or unqualified for the position so it usually replaces one of the first steps of the selection process.

Typically, video interviewing in a non-live environment replaces telephone interviews (initial assessments) and video interviewing in a live environment replaces the first round face-to-face interview in the selection process. Even though employers typically use non-live video interviewing to replace the telephone interview, they may also use it to replace other interviews, such as face-to-face, during the selection process. Some organizations have been using video interviewing to replace phone interviews by eliminating face-to-face interviews and shortening the interview process. For example, since organizations are able to have multiple interviewers review the video interview and they are able to watch the video interview over and over again, they don’t need as many interviews in the selection process. Employers are able to cut interviews out of their selection process so the overall length of the selection process has been shortened. Employers have also been replacing videoconferences with video interviewing due to a savings
in cost. Video interviews do not require the expensive videoconferencing technology that can cause candidates to have to drive to special locations to conduct a videoconference interview.

Employers have been using video interviewing mainly for the benefits stated above. First, since the interview is recorded, employers can watch the video interview as many times as they want or they feel necessary in order for them to make an informed decision about which candidates should move on in the selection process. If there is a specific question that the interviewer feels is really important, they can listen to that question as many times as they want in order to pick the best candidate. Second, video interviewing allows employers the ability to have multiple managers view the interviews. Instead of just having one manager conduct a telephone interview, employers are able to have multiple managers review the interviews because they don’t have to present for the actual interview. They can review the videos at their convenience. By allowing several managers to review the interviews, organizations are able to receive feedback on the job candidate from a few sources. Video interviewing has a lot of benefits for employers but applicants reactions to the use of video interviewing are unknown.

**Statement of the Problem**

Research in this area is important for a variety of reasons. First of all, very little is known about using communication media to conduct interviews (Chapman et al., 2003). There is some research on communication media, such as telephones and computers, but the research on video (webcams) is lagging far behind. Research has not kept pace with the increased usage of video (Iddekinge et al., 2006), especially research on actual applicant reactions (Bauer et al., 2006). Exploratory research still needs to be conducted in this area in order to fully understand the affect of using video technology during interviews. Validity and applicant reactions to the lack of
face-to-face contact are unknown. These reactions may create a limitation on the use of video interviewing (Heneman & Judge, 2009). Employers assume that technology can replace face-to-face interviews without any consequences but this may not be true. It is unclear “how applicants will react to these relatively impersonal methods” (Heneman & Judge, 2009, p. 393).

Studies using actual job applicants have also been lagging. Research on the use of videos in the selection process has been conducted in laboratory settings but participants have relatively little at stake and most settings are on campuses where students may be more familiar with technology. Additionally, real applicants may have different reactions due to their career and job choices (Truxillo et al., 2002). The actual theories that relate to applicant’s reactions (e.g., organizational justice) also need to be examined more using real applicants during an actual selection process (Ployhart & Ryan, 1997).

This study will also help to determine if applicants perceive video interviewing as an effective communication medium for interviewing. Applicants may feel that they are unable to fully convey themselves during the interview since they are not used to the characteristics of the video communication medium. Applicants, who feel that they cannot convey the same things in a video interview that they can convey in a face-to-face interview, may perceive that there is a barrier to communication with video interviewing. If applicants feel that their message is not understood by the receiver, they may perceive the organization negatively for using video technology.

Research also needs to be conducted on video interviewing to determine how the applicants react to video interviewing as a selection tool. Studying applicant reactions is a growing field of interest because of the lack of research in this area (Bauer et al., 2004). In the past, research has focused more on organizational reasons or the manager’s reaction the selection
tool (Hausknecht et al., 2004). Currently, there is no research on the applicant’s reaction to video interviewing so it’s important to find out how applicants perceive the use of video interviewing in the selection process. “If applicants perceive the selection process as unfair or unreasonable, they may develop negative attitudes about the organization and withdraw from the selection process before they have an opportunity to become better informed about the job and organization” (Smither et al., 1996, p. 299). Applicant’s reactions to the selection process are valuable to organizations because of the effects that perceptions can have in the organization when applicants become employees (Hausknecht et al., 2004).

These are just a few of the reasons why research, especially exploratory research in this area is so important. There are a range of questions that need to be answered in order to begin to understand applicants’ reactions and the effectiveness of using video interviewing as a selection tool. Organizations need to understand the affect that video interviewing has on applicants due to the multitude of effects (positive or negative) that their reactions and perceptions may have on an organization. Applicant’s who react negatively may not only withdrawal early from the selection process but the negative reaction towards the organization might carry over into the applicant’s employment with the organization if they are chosen from the selection process. Employers need to understand how applicants are reacting to the selection process in their organization.

My main research question for this study is: What reactions do job candidates have to video interviewing as a selection tool? I will start by looking at whether job applicants favor the use of video interviewing in the selection process. I will look at the relationship that procedural fairness and a candidates’ ability to communicate information have on this variable. I will then look at job candidates’ reactions to video interviewing as a fair selection tool. Specifically how the level of the job position that the candidate is applying to and the candidates travel constraints
may affect their fairness perceptions. Finally, this study looks at applicant’s reactions to video interviewing as an effective communication tool for communicating knowledge, skills, and abilities; interest in the job or organization; and anything else that applicants feel that the organization needs to know about them in order to make a decision. In this area, I will specifically analyze the relationship that experience with webcams and related technology have on the applicant’s ability to communicate information over the video interview.
Chapter 2

Literature Review and Hypotheses

Video Interviewing

Since video interviewing is a new technology, it is important to fully understand the video interviewing process and how it is different from a traditional interview. I will begin by explaining video interviewing more in depth. Then I will discuss how a non-live video interview is conducted and how it is used in the selection process. Finally, I will look at previous research in this area and related areas. I will begin the literature review by looking at overall favorability of video interviewing in relation to procedural fairness and ability to communicate information. I will end this section by discussing other factors that may affect procedural fairness and ability to communicate information during the video interview.

Non-live video interviewing is being used at the beginning of the selection process during the initial assessment. The initial assessment is important because it is “often the applicant’s first personal contact with the organization and its staffing system” (Heneman & Judge, 2009, p. 391). Similar to a traditional interview, individuals apply to an organization in order to be entered into an applicant pool for a specific position. Employers then review job applicants to see if they have the qualifications necessary for the position. After qualifications are reviewed, employers decide who will move on to the next step in the selection process and who will be rejected. Initial assessments are conducted by organizations in order to minimize costs by reducing the number of people in the selection process (Heneman & Judge, 2009). Most employers begin the selection process by interviewing candidates over the telephone but the first step depends on the specific selection process that each organization has in place.
For this study, I will be interviewing job candidates who conducted a video interview through a company called HireVue. The video interviewing process that I will describe below may be different depending on the organization providing the video interviewing system. Video interviewing only requires three components to conduct an interview: computer access, broadband Internet, and webcams (Luman, 2009). During a video interview at HireVue, candidates have a certain timeframe, 48 hours, to go online and take the interview. Candidates logon to the HireVue website during that timeframe to begin the video interviewing process. Candidates are given instructions prior to the interview to make sure that there webcams are

### Table 2.1: Sample of Questions Commonly Asked During a Video Interview

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personal</th>
<th>Experience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tell me about yourself. What are your hobbies?</td>
<td>What job-related skills have you developed?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Why did you choose to interview with our organization?</td>
<td>Did you work while going to school? In what positions?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Describe your ideal job. What can you offer us?</td>
<td>What did you learn from these work experiences?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What do you consider to be your greatest strengths? Weaknesses?</td>
<td>What did you enjoy most about your last employment? Least?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have you ever had any failures? What did you learn from them?</td>
<td>Have you ever quit a job? Why?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Of which three accomplishments are you most proud? Who are your role models? Why?</td>
<td>Give an example of a situation in which you worked under deadline pressure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How does your college education or work experience relate to this job?</td>
<td>Give an example of a situation in which you provided a solution to an employer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Why should we hire you rather than another candidate?</td>
<td>Have you ever done any volunteer work? What kind?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What do you know about our organization (products or services)?</td>
<td>How do you think a former supervisor would describe your work?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Career Goals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Why did you choose your major?</td>
<td>Do you prefer to work under supervision or on your own?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Why did you choose to attend your college or university?</td>
<td>What kind of boss do you prefer?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you think you received a good education? In what ways?</td>
<td>Would you be successful working with a team?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In which campus activities did you participate?</td>
<td>Do you prefer large or small organizations? Why?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Which classes in your major did you like best? Least? Why?</td>
<td>How do you feel about working in a structured environment?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Which elective classes did you like best? Least? Why?</td>
<td>Are you able to work on several assignments at once?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If you were to start over, what would you change about your education?</td>
<td>How do you feel about the possibility of relocating?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do your grades accurately reflect your ability?</td>
<td>Are you willing to work flextime?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: [http://www.hirevue.com/content/common-employer-questions](http://www.hirevue.com/content/common-employer-questions)
properly setup (e.g., volume working and picture clear). Once the interview starts, a question will appear on the candidates screen for 30 seconds. Candidates then have up to three minutes to respond to that question. After the first question is answered, they move on to the next one and they go through the same process of seeing the question and then responding. Examples of questions that candidates may be asked during a video interview are given in Table 2.1.

Each candidate for a particular position receives the same set of questions so questions are not specialized to the interviewee. A structured set of questions allow the interviewers to easily compare candidates since each candidate is responding to the exact same questions. In HireVue’s system, interviewers can view videos either by candidate or sequentially by each question (HireVue, n.d.). Viewing candidates by question allows employers to easily compare each candidate’s responses since they can view one after the other.

After the video portion, candidates may have to answer true/false, multiple-choice, multiple selection, short answer, or essay questions that require typed responses. Once the candidate is done, interviewers are notified by email that they can logon to the website and evaluate the interview at their convenience. If the organization uses Taleo’s Talent Management system for their online applications, employers can actually access the videos through Taleo. The candidate’s application, resume, and video interview are all located in one program. Although video interviewing is mainly for giving information, applicants may also receive information from the employer if they have a video introduction or closing video for the applicants to watch.

**Video Interviewing in the Selection Process**

Technology has reduced the average time to hire for employers (Ensher et al., 2002). The number of applicants for an open position has significantly increased with e-recruiting. Advertising an open position on the internet through job boards and company websites has
significantly increased the applicant pool for organizations. Video interviewing can help employers reduce the time to hire by decreasing the amount of time for the initial assessment. Once the most qualified candidates are chosen from the applicant pool, all applicants can submit their video interviews to the company in the same timeframe. Instead of organizations scheduling telephone interviews over a period of weeks or even months, the interviews can be recorded and reviewed in less than two weeks. For example, African Development Bank Group (AfDB) screened 150 candidates from 49 countries in 10 days (HireVue, n.d.).

Technology has given human resources access to global markets by enabling employers to find candidates from all over the globe. Employers are no longer constrained by geography during the selection process (Ensher et al., 2002). They can go beyond the local applicant pool to find the best possible candidate but this can become costly for employers. Video interviewing gives companies the ability to interview candidates without having to spend hundreds or thousands of dollars to fly someone in from across the country or half way around the world. For example, Rio Tinto Mining Group had a cost savings of 77.2% by using HireVue’s video interviewing system to interview candidates from all over North America (HireVue, n.d.). Companies can interview all of the qualified candidates for a reasonable price and candidates do not have to waste time traveling. Even though video interviewing typically replaces phone interviews, they are also eliminating face-to-face interviews from the selection process due to the previously mentioned reasons.

Video interviewing also allows the interview to be completed at any time so scheduling conflicts due to time zones are eliminated. It is difficult for managers to schedule interviews with applicants who are located all over the world because of a difference in time zones. If a manager in the U.S. is trying to interview someone in India, either the U.S. manager or the applicants in
India would have to be awake during their night in order to conduct the interview. Video interviewing allows applicants to conduct interviews during their own time so issues that may arise with time zone differences are eliminated. This makes it very convenient for both employers and job candidates.

Organizations using technology in the selection process may save money but there may be other costs associated with using technology. Technology has first-level and second-level effects on organizations and the people using them. First-level effects are the direct cost savings realized through technology. The first-level effects for video interviewing are the planned savings in cost (e.g. travel fees) or increases in productivity (e.g. managers can view interviews at their convenience) that are a result of the use of technology. Second-level effects are the unintended social impacts from the use of technology (Straus et al., 2001). Social impacts can include a variety of factors including how technology affects the company culture or how the applicants perceive the technology. This study will look at some of the second-level effects that video interviewing has on job candidates.

This study focuses on some of the second-level effects that may affect a candidates overall favorability of video interviewing in the selection process. In the rest of this chapter, I will describe how job candidates overall favorability of video interviewing may be impacted by their perception of procedural fairness and ability to communicate information through the webcam during the video interview. I will then look at how travel constraints and the level of job position a candidate is applying to may impact their perception of procedural fairness. I will end this chapter by looking at the impact that experience with webcams and related technology may have on the ability to communicate information during the video interview.
**Overall Favorability of Video Interviewing as a Selection Tool**

Applicant reaction is a term that refers to research that examines “attitudes, affect, or cognitions an individual might have about the hiring process” (Hausknecht et al., 2004, p. 640). Research on applicant reactions in the selection process has focused mainly on how applicants perceive and react to face-to-face interviews (Ployhart, 2006). Applicant reactions to video interviewing may be much different than reactions to a face-to-face interview. For example, some applicants have increased nervousness when they are videotaped so they may be more nervous during a video interview (Iddekinge et al., 2006). Applicant reactions may change over time as candidates gain experience with the technology (Straus et al., 2001) or they may change depending on the stage of the selection process that the technology is used in (Hausknecht et al., 2004).

In the selection process, it is important for applicants to react positively to the selection tools that an organization chooses. Job candidates who are satisfied with the selection tools will view the process favorably so they will have positive intentions toward the organization. Candidates who favor the selection process will recommend the organization to others, accept a job offer if one is made, and if they are rejected for the position, they will reapply to the organization (Ployhart & Ryan, 1997). Candidates who do not like the selection process will tell others about their “bad” experience, not recommend the organization to others, and have other negative reactions to the process. This can potentially be harmful to an organization so it is important for candidates to favor the selection process. Two areas that may affect a candidate’s reaction to the selection process are procedural fairness and ability to communicate information.

**Procedural Fairness**
Applicants’ reactions to the fairness of a selection tool can have a large impact on an organization. “Feelings of unfairness can lead to negative outcomes such as decreased reapplication, decreased recommendations, and lower job attraction” (Bauer et al., 2006, p. 616). An applicant’s reaction to a selection tool can directly influence their attitudes and behaviors that occur during and after hiring (Hausknecht et al., 2004: Gilliland, 1994). If a process is viewed as unfair, an applicant’s attitude and behavior will be negatively affected once they join the organization. Martin and Nagao (1999) find that applicants judge interview procedures as unfair if they violate an individual’s expectations of a fair interview and this feeling of fairness was independent of the interview outcome (Martin & Nagao, 1989). So whether or not an applicant receives the position is not as important as the process that is used to determine which individual is selected for a position.

Organizational justice is the theory that is used most often to examine how a person’s perception of fairness motivates them to do certain behaviors in work-related contexts (Ployhart & Ryan, 1997). Organizational justice is important in organizations because it leads to favorable outcomes within the organization such as employees who more committed, more trusting, and more satisfied with their jobs and the organization (Kim, 2009). Organizational justice is comprised of four facets of justice but only one, procedural justice, is relevant to this study (Hausknecht et al., 2004).

Procedural justice is concerned with the fairness of procedures used by an organization to make a decision (Gilliland, 1994; Bauer et al., 2004). In this case, it is concerned with the fairness that organizations used to make their decision on who to hire. Procedural justice is composed of four dimensions: “perceived job relatedness, opportunity to demonstrate one’s abilities, interpersonal treatment, and propriety of questions” (Steiner & Gilliland, 1996, p. 134).
All of these factors are related to an individual’s perception of fairness in the selection process. When procedural justice is high, and the organization is viewed more positively, process is perceived as fair (Smither et al., 1996). Low procedural justice would occur during an interview if a candidate perceived the selection process as being unfair. “Feelings of unfairness can lead to negative outcomes such as decreased reapplication, decreased recommendations, and lower job attraction” (Bauer et al., 2006, p. 616). Research has found that selection procedures matter the most when an outcome is unfair (Ployhart & Ryan, 1997).

Interpersonal treatment, a component of procedural justice, includes interpersonal effectiveness of the interviewer and two-way communication. Applicants in a face-to-face or phone interview should be treated by the interviewer with warmth and respect. In a video interview, applicants may view the use of technology as cold and impersonal. Job applicants may expect the same interpersonal treatment in a video interview that they would receive in a face-to-face or telephone interview. Applicants may also expect the same interpersonal treatment they would receive during a two-way communication. During a two-way communication, applicants have the ability to ask questions and learn information about the job and organization that will help them make their decision (Gilliland, 1993). Applicants who do not receive good interpersonal effectiveness, two-way communication, and the ability to ask questions may feel like the interview process was not procedurally fair.

Job candidates who were satisfied with their video interview and feel that they performed well on the interview will view the video interviewing process more positively. It is these candidates who will most likely want to complete a video interview in the future because they will view video interviewing as being procedurally fair. Job candidates favoring video
interviewing will believe that employers are able to select the best possible candidate from the applicant pool by reviewing the video interview that the job candidates competed.

*H1: The perception of video interviewing as procedurally fair is positively related to overall favorability of video interviewing.*

**Ability to Communicate Information**

Communication plays an important role in the interview process. Employers are trying to find out if the candidate is a good fit for the organization and applicants want to find out if the organization is a good fit for them. This information is gathered during the communication process that takes place throughout the interview. During the interview, applicants want to make sure that they are able to fully communicate information about themselves to the interviewer. They not only want the interviewer to know their interest in the position and the organization but they also want to communicate to the interviewer that they can fit with the organization (person-organization fit) and the job (person-job fit; Chapman et al., 2005). Interviewees need to communicate that they are competent, that they stand out compared to other candidates, and that the behaviors they discuss in the interview will continue into the future (Silvester & Anderson, 2003). Depending on the job, candidates may also want to communicate their personality. For example, an applicant who is interviewing for a position in the healthcare field may want the interviewer to know that they are caring and outgoing. Applicants want the interviewer to find out more about them (e.g., passion, drive, and determination) than what is written on their resume.

At the end of an interview, candidates want to feel like they were able to fully convey all of the information that they want the interviewer to know about them in order for the interviewer
to make a well informed decision. Since video interviewing changes the communication process by only allowing the sender to give information, the applicant may not view video interviewing as an effective mode of communication. Employers are told that they will have a chance to see “a candidate’s character and communication skills” during a video interview (HireVue, n.d.). However, it may be hard for candidates to really show their character and communication skills to the employer if the technology is causing barriers to their communication.

Interviews can be conducted in a variety of media which includes the use of technology. Historically, interviewing has used traditional media such as face-to-face or telephone. Recently, these media have been replaced or supplemented with email, videos, teleconferencing, and other newer media sources (Daft et al., 1987). Replacing traditional media with newer ones may have consequences for the parties involved in the communication process. Newer communication media may lack important attributes that traditional channels offer. For example, individuals change the way that they interact when they cannot see each other so replacing a face-to-face interview with a media that doesn’t allow the interviewee to see the interviewer may alter the communication (Silvester & Anderson, 2003). Newer media does not necessarily offer interviewers another channel to communicate through because the differences in the media can potentially alter the communication (Ramirez et al., 2007).

The varying characteristics of communication media makes them suitable for different situations. For example, face-to-face and telephone conversations are more spontaneous and synchronized than email (Chapman et al., 2003). Email is not typically used for interviewing but it is an example of an asynchronous communication medium. Communication conducted with media other than face-to-face may have pauses that confuse the interviewee or the conversation may not flow as well. Employers select a medium that fits their needs but that medium may not
be preferred by job applicants (e.g., face-to-face is preferred over videoconferencing; Chapman & Rowe, 2002). Candidates may prefer a certain type of medium because they know they can effectively communicate through it. Effective communication can only occur when the message is heard and understood by the receiver with no misunderstandings so both parties need to be comfortable with the medium being used in order for an effective communication to occur.

Applicants who feel that their message was heard by the interviewer with no misunderstandings will most likely favor the use of video interviewing in the selection process. Candidates who favor video interviewing in the selection process will feel like they were able to convey their KSA’s, their interest in the job and organization, and any other information that they feel that the interviewer needs to know about them during the video interview. They will feel positive about the interview and they will feel that the interviewer has the information necessary to make an informed decision. Therefore, those who feel that they were able to communicate information about themselves to the interviewer will favor the use of video interviewing in the selection process.

H2: The ability to communicate information is positively related to overall favorability of video interviewing.

Procedural Fairness

In this study I examine two factors that may contribute to the perception of fairness in a video interviewing. These include travel constraints and level of job position. Travel constraints not only refers to the ability of candidates to be able to travel for an interview due to commitments in their life but it also looks at whether video interviewing made it easier to interview based on the candidates schedule. Candidates who have a lot of travel constraints may
view video interviewing more positively since they wouldn’t have to travel for an interview which may be difficult for that individual. Level of job position refers to whether the candidate is applying for an entry-level position or something much higher such as a senior-level position. I will now explain how travel constraints are related to procedural fairness. Then I will explain why candidates’ perceptions of fairness may change depending on their level of position.

**Travel Constraints**

A candidate’s perception of fairness may also be impacted by constraints that are placed on their ability to travel. Job applicants and interviewers are often geographically dispersed in today’s global economy so travel or technology is necessary to facilitate the interview (Chapman et al., 2003). Employers during the recent economic recession have had to find ways to cut costs so they have had to find alternative selection methods due to rising travel costs (Straus et al., 2001). Video interviewing is a cost effective alternative to face-to-face interviews since it eliminates travel costs. Video interviewing may also be a cost effective alternative to telephone interviews because employers do not have to spend large amounts of money on international calls.

Video interviewing is also more cost effective than conducting a videoconference. Videoconferencing can cost an employer $300 or more per hour compared to video interviewing which is $175 per interview. Conducting a videoconference after traditional work hours may cost employers $700-900 an hour. Videoconferencing also requires candidates to drive to specific locations or businesses (e.g., Kinkos, Regus) in order to conduct the interview so it may cost candidates money and waste their time. Neither the candidate nor the employer would have to travel to conduct the interview so both parties would save time and money.
The use of video interviewing may not only reduce travel for a candidate but it also saves the candidate’s time by allowing them to conduct the interview when it is convenient for them. Candidates do not have to take time out of their schedule to arrange a phone interview. Video interviewing can be completed outside the work hours so candidates wouldn’t have to miss work at their current job or family obligations. Candidates may also save time since they wouldn’t have to travel across town, across the country, or across the globe for an interview if the employer eliminated face-to-face interviews in their selection process. Video interviewing would allow employees to interview with other organizations at their convenience. The flexibility that video interviewing provides helps candidates who have travel constraints. Flexibility allows for job candidates to have a work-life balance when they are in the process of searching for a new position because they would not have to be constantly traveling for interviews. Candidates who have family, work, or other commitments, such as volunteering, that restrict their ability to travel will view video interviewing as procedurally fair since it allows them to interview at their convenience.

Flexibility with interviewing may benefit candidates in a variety of ways. Employees no longer stay with an organization for 20 or 30 years as they did in the past. Studies have found that “nearly half of all employees are at least passively looking for jobs, and a sizable minority are continually actively searching” (Ployhart, 2006, p. 870). Employees do not want their current organization to find out that they are looking for a new job due to negative consequences, such as termination. Video interviewing allows candidates the ability to interview for positions they normally wouldn’t since they are not restrained by work commitments. Candidates can interview for positions by video interviewing instead of taking time off work to travel for an interview or to be available for a phone interview. It may be difficult for applicants to find time during their
work day to complete a phone interview if they are unable to accept personal calls during the work day.

Job candidates may also think that the use of video interviewing in the selection process is procedurally fair because of different problems they may face with travel. It may not be easy for all candidates to travel for an interview. Candidates may not have easy access to an airport so traveling may require extra time taken out of their schedule. Job candidates who face these types of travel constraints may not want to continue in the selection process if they have to travel a lot to interview with a company.

Candidates who have travel constraints and issues with time will view the video interview process as procedurally fair because it will allow them to have flexibility in the selection process. The use of video interviewing benefits the job candidate by providing them a work-life balance. Applicants are able to interview at their convenience which may be viewed as more fair than a telephone interview that has to be conducted at the employer’s convenience. Video interviewing saves the candidate time and money so they are going to view this saving as being procedurally fair.

*H3: Travel constraints are positively related to perception of procedural fairness.*

**Level of Job Position**

The level of the position that the candidate is applying for may have an impact on the candidate’s perception of fairness during the interview which in turn affects their intentions towards the organization. Applicants applying to a higher status position may expect employers to place more effort into recruiting them and they may expect the personal contact that they would receive in a face-to-face interview (Chapman et al., 2003). Candidates may expect face-to-
face contact because they perceive that as the norm for the level of the position that they are applying to. Applicants feel that they need a higher degree of social contact with the organization in order to gain a better understanding about the position (Martin & Nagao, 1989). Technology may “signal a low level of value placed on potential employees as compared with an organization taking the time, effort, and expense to conduct interviews face-to-face” (Chapman et al., 2003, p. 945). Candidates want to feel like the organization is personally investing in them so employers need to keep a balance between technology and personal relationships (Ensher et al., 2002).

Senior executives, who have high level positions, may be turned off by the use of technology (Straus et al., 2001). In one simulation, “applicants for a high-status job expressed more anger and resentment toward computerized and paper-and-pencil interviewing than toward traditional face-to-face interviews” (Gilliland, 1993). Martin and Nagao (1989) find that the highest level of resentment for the use of computerized interview procedures were expressed by those interviewing for a high status position. Job candidates for high level positions may find computerized interview procedures, such as video technology, inappropriate since the jobs at these levels tend to be less routine. Managerial skills such as communication and leadership may not be adequately tapped by the video interview process (Martin & Nagao, 1989). High level applicants may want a higher level of personal interaction in order to reflect the level or personal interaction they may face in their jobs.

Applicants applying to a higher level job may also feel that the employer is not equalizing the exchange which may be more difficult for employers if employees have higher levels of education (Steers, 1977). The ‘notion of exchange’ that takes place between employees and employers takes place when organizations and individuals make certain demands on each
other (e.g., high productivity, rewards) while they provide something in return (e.g., high quality of work, paycheck; Angle & Perry, 1981). An employee’s desire for a career with the organization decreases when the organization asks the employees to give more than they are receiving (Bowditch et al., 2008; Steers, 1977). Job applicants applying for a higher level position may only perceive interviews to be fair if they are conducted in a personalized, face-to-face setting that equalizes the exchange.

Applicants applying to a higher level job may not feel that video interviewing equalizes the exchange. If the exchange is not equalized, higher level applicants will drop out of the selection process and the quality of candidate that the organization ends up with may not be as high as it could have been. If this does occur, the whole purpose of the selection process is compromised. However, it is hypothesized that high-level applicants will feel that video interviewing is not equalizing the exchange. High-level applicants will want more personalization and a higher degree of social contact.

**H4: A negative relationship exists between the level of position a job candidate is applying to and procedural fairness.**

**Ability to Communicate Information**

**Previous Experience with Webcams and Technology**

There are a variety of barriers that can affect the communication process during a video interview that may be a result of a job candidate’s inexperience with webcams and technology. During a face-to-face interview, candidates analyze the cues that the interviewer sends to see how they are performing. These cues prompt a candidate to provide additional information or to curtail a response (Chapman et al., 2003). These cues are known as back-channel
communication. Back-channel communication “consists of cues that a listener sends to a speaker to indicate that he or she is paying attention and [to] move the conversation forward” (Straus et al., 2001, p. 366). In addition to cues, back-channel communication also involves the feedback that the interviewer provides which will be discussed later.

During the interview process, nonverbal and verbal cues effect an applicant’s belief about their chances of getting the job (Martin & Nagao, 1989). Due to the one-way communication of video interviewing, candidates cannot see the interviewer’s nonverbal cues which eliminate back-channel communication from the interviewer. With video interviewing, interviewees do not have these cues to prompt them so they may not effectively adjust their communication during the interview (Chapman et al., 2003). Candidates who receive no cues may perceive that they are not effectively communicating information about themselves to the interviewer or they may be uncertain about how they are communicating information.

The interviewer can communicate multiple cues to the interviewee during the interview process. Multiple cues are the variety of information channels that are used to communicate a message (Kahai & Cooper, 2003). They can either be verbal or nonverbal. Candidates who do not have experience with webcams or other similar technology may not know how to effectively communicate when their cues are limited or missing. During a face-to-face interview, interviewers may signal to the interviewee what they want to hear based on the verbal and nonverbal cues that they send (Martin & Nagao, 1989). Verbal messages are more important during the selection process because the majority of the information that is communicated during the selection process is communicated through verbal cues (Parton et al., 2002). Applicants want to impress employers through what they say (Silvester & Anderson, 2003) but their nonverbal
cues may also be communicating valuable information to the interviewer so these cues are also important during the selection process.

Nonverbal cues are used to communicate information beyond words. They include appearance, body movements, facial expressions, eye contact, smell, touch (Kahai & Cooper, 2003), and tone of voice (Daft et al., 1987). Nonverbal cues give important clues about how their interview is going. Handshakes, for example, have been found to communicate positive information such as sociability, friendliness, warmth, caring, interpersonal skills, and extroversion (Stewart et al., 2008).

“An interviewee who holds eye contact with the interviewer, while responding to questions, might be seen as more direct, honest, and conscientious than one who looks away. Similarly, an interviewee who leans forward toward the interviewer might be seen as more agreeable or conscientious than one who sits back in the chair. An interviewee who smiles frequently and varies the pitch of his/her voice will likely be perceived as more extraverted and sociable” (DeGroot & Gooty, 2009, p. 181).

Nonverbal cues such as the handshake or eye contact are missing or restricted during a video interview which may be a problem for candidates since they can communicate useful information through these cues (Iddekinge et al., 2006; Daft et al., 1987). Even though interviewers rate applicants mainly on their verbal responses, interviewers often take nonverbal cues into consideration. For example, most students are taught in college that the handshake can make a difference in the interview and that eye contact is very important. Applicants may feel that since their cues are restricted, they are not able to effectively communicate all of the information that they want the interviewer to know about them.

Another barrier to a job candidate’s communication during a video interview may be due to the lack of feedback that the candidate typically received in their back-channel communication. During a two-way communication, immediate feedback takes place when
messages are interpreted and clarified instantly (Kahai & Cooper, 2003). Questions can be instantly asked that allow the sender to make corrections to the information being sent if the receiver does not understand (Daft et al., 1987). Senders are also able to recognize if the receiver does not understand the message through their nonverbal cues which gives the sender the opportunity to portray the information differently if necessary (Kahai & Cooper, 2003). Candidates in a video interview do not receive feedback so they may feel that they are ineffectively communicating information about themselves to the interviewer. The interviewee is left clueless about how well they are communicating their information to the interviewer when they receive no feedback. Candidates who are inexperienced with communicating in this way may feel like the interview went worse or better than it did due to the lack of feedback. Candidates in a video interview are only able to have a self-impression of how the interview went since they didn’t receive feedback or cues from an interviewer.

In addition to back-channel communication barriers, there are other barriers that may affect the communication process during a video interview. One barrier is inexperience with asynchronous technology. Candidates may have problems communicating if they do not have experience using webcams or other technology that are asynchronous. When individuals are communicating with each other simultaneously, their conversation is synchronous (Münzer & Holmer, 2009). Asynchronous communications occur when messages are sent one after the other so there is a lag time which may make it difficult for participants to remain engaged (e.g., email; Paulus & Phipps, 2008). Asynchronous communication, like video interviewing, allows parties to communicate in their own time and place (Naidu & Järvelä, 2006). Individuals can have meaningful conversations using both synchronous and asynchronous modes but each environment may be better suited for different communications. For example, “synchronous
environments are better suited for socializing and asynchronous ones for serious discussion” (Paulus & Phipps, 2008). This barrier is unique to video interviewing because telephone and face-to-face interviewers are both synchronous so these mediums are better for socializing.

In addition to the problems that applicants may face due to the type of media, applicants may also face barriers due to problems with the technology. Technological issues, such as the webcam stops working or the computer has an error, can arise during the interview and these problems can affect how well a candidate performs. Although the quality of webcams and technology has improved, applicants may still face problems that are a result of the equipment that they are using to conduct the interview. Webcams may not be as high of quality as they need to be to give a good, clear picture or the microphone may not pick up the interviewee's voice correctly. The microphone could possibly pick up other noises that may distract the interviewer when they view the videos. It is likely that candidates will believe that they were not able to effectively communicate themselves during their interview if these technological issues arise.

When using webcams, applicants also have to be aware of other issues with the webcam. For example, poor lighting could make the candidate look funny on the computer screen. Applicants also have to be aware of what the webcam is picking up in the background. The background may communicate a message to the interviewer that is different than what the interviewee wants to communicate. For example, if the webcam is picking up clutter in the background and the candidate is trying to communicate that they are organized, the interviewer will receive an inconsistent message. Although telephone interviews may also have technological problems, such as the interviewee receiving another call or a text message during the interview or the cell phone could drop the call, there seems to be a larger amount of problems that could go wrong with the technology required for a video interview.
Candidates may also face barriers to communication due to their internet connection. If an applicant is in the middle of an interview and they lose their internet connection, it can throw off their concentration. Even though candidates using HireVue’s system are able to start their interview where they left off, they may feel like their responses are not as good as they could have been if the internet problem had not occurred. The internet can also cause problems for certain demographic groups (e.g., older workers, women, and minorities) who use the internet less than other groups (Bauer et al., 2004). These candidates may not be as familiar with how to use the internet or how to fix internet problems that may arise during the interview. HireVue does offer assistance to those who have computer problems so this may help candidates feel more comfortable with the technology.

Technology can also be a barrier to communication because it allows for more interruptions or intrusions to occur (Blackman, 2002). For example, applicants interviewing on their home computer may have someone message them online, one of their children may walk into the room while they are interviewing, or their cat could jump onto their computer desk and walk in front of the webcam. All of these interruptions can distract the applicant and affect their ability to communicate during the interview. However, it is important to remember that no selection process is free from interruptions. As previously mentioned, candidates taking a telephone interview may get another call or a text message. Applicants in a face-to-face interview may have someone walk in with an important question for the interviewer or the interviewer may have to take a phone call during the interview.

The actual length of the interview may also be a barrier to communication. Since the interview is structured, applicants can only answer questions that they are asked and their responses are limited. In HireVue’s system, candidates only have three minutes to respond to a
question so they may feel rushed to respond to the question or they may run out of time. These factors combined with the lack of interviewer, can significantly shorten the interview (Blackman, 2002). Interviewers in a face-to-face interview can get off topic or they may ask additional questions to clarify information which can extend the length of the interview. “Briefer interviews would undoubtedly result in less information about the job candidate being revealed and used in the judgment process” (Blackman, 2002, p. 209). Therefore, applicants may feel that they weren’t able to convey all of the necessary information due to the shortened length of interview.

Candidates need to feel comfortable with the medium that is being used so they can focus on the interview instead of trying to figure out how to use and communicate in the medium. Candidates, who have previously used webcams or something similar to them, will feel more comfortable with the media since they have experience using it (Straus et al., 2001). If candidates do not have experience, they may find themselves unsure about how to effectively communicate over the webcam. For example, they may be unsure whether to keep eye contact with their computer screen or the webcam. Inexperienced candidates may have their webcam on a setting, such as “follow me,” where the webcam follows their movements. If the applicant talks a lot with their hands and the camera is constantly following the hands instead of staying focused on the candidate, this could cause problems during the interview.

If applicants have experience with webcams and technology, they may be more confident that they can effectively communicate information about themselves to the interviewer through that media. Candidates unfamiliar with webcams may perceive that the medium is a barrier to their communication. However, even if candidates are familiar with webcams they still may not be using them correctly during the video interview. For example, candidates familiar with
webcams can make the same mistake of keeping eye contact with the screen instead of the webcam.

Comfort with video interviewing may arise over time as experience with video interviewing grows. As candidates gain experience with video interviewing, they will learn how to effectively communicate by video. If applicants have seen themselves on a video recording, they may understand how to effectively communicate by video. Students, for example, may be more familiar with video recordings of themselves if they have participated in a mock interview on-campus where the interview was recorded. Other applicants who have used Skype, a software application that allows users to connect online through videoconferencing, may also be more comfortable with video interviewing since they have past experience using webcams. Candidates could also feel more comfortable if they practiced recording themselves with video cameras or webcams prior to the interview. Flip cameras have recently become more popular by allowing users to easily upload videos to their computers to be placed on websites like YouTube. Candidates who have used any of these technologies, and have an understanding of their presence on camera, will have a better understanding of how to communicate effectively through technology. This is especially true if they have received feedback about their presence on videos. The more experience a candidate has with webcams or related video technology, the more candidates will view video interviewing as an effective communication medium.

_H5: Candidates experience with webcams, or related technology, will be positively related to their ability to communicate information over the video interview._
Sample

The sample for this survey came from job candidates who completed a video interview using HireVue’s video interviewing process between February 1st, 2010 and March 29th, 2010. Job candidates have a variety of backgrounds and were applying to a variety of companies so the sample was mixed. HireVue created the first internet-based video interviewing solution in 2004. Companies located in over 90 countries and ranging from Fortune 500 to growing startups have all used HireVue’s system. Their client list includes a variety of organizations such as Google, Oracle, Rio Tinto, Dish Network (HireVue, n.d.), Whirlpool, and the Austin Independent School district (HireVue, July 2009).

A recruitment email and flyer that gave detailed information about the study and a link for the survey on Survey Monkey’s website were sent to HireVue. HireVue emailed recruitment material to 463 job candidates who had recently participated in both live and non-live video interviewing. Out of the 463 job candidates, approximately 385 of the candidates completed a non-live video interview. The survey was filled out by a total of 94 people. Since the study focuses on non-live video interviewing, 17 surveys could not be used because they were completed by job candidates who conducted a live video interview. An additional four surveys could not be used because the respondent did not identify what type of interview that they had completed with HireVue. The final sample size for this study is 73 which gave me a response rate of 19.0%.

After receiving the final sample, descriptive statistics were ran on the 73 respondents. Males composed 54.2% while females composed 45.8%. The survey split age into eleven
categories and asked respondents to check the category that included their age. The mean age of the sample fell into the 36-40 year old category (SD = 2.12). The 21-25 year old category received the highest frequency of responses. The mean, median, and mode for the highest level of education all fell into the Bachelor’s Degree category. Out of the sample, 86.3% of respondents had a Bachelor’s Degree or Master’s Degree. Over one-third of the respondents had never used a webcam prior to their video interview (37%) and 32.9% of candidates only used a webcam a few times a year.

Candidates were asked to write in the title of the position that they were interviewing for in order to help determine the level of job position that the candidates were applying to during their video interview. Due to the variety of different types of positions that candidates were applying to, I was unable to analyze this data in the way that I had hoped. However, it is interesting to see the variety of different industries that are using video interviewing in their selection process. The jobs range from internships to Fire Chief to Vice President of Manufacturing. Examples of the jobs are listed in Table 3.1. It was surprising to see video interviewing being used for skill based jobs such as Sous Chef and Fire Chief.

**Table 3.1: Examples of Positions Candidates Applied For**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Engineer</td>
<td>Principal Legal Counsel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief Financial Accountant</td>
<td>Consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail District Manager</td>
<td>Supply Base Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail Sales Representative</td>
<td>Sous Chef</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher (High School Science)</td>
<td>Strategic Alliance Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resources Internship</td>
<td>Leadership Development Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Sales Manager</td>
<td>Director of Retail Automation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Chief</td>
<td>Staff Accountant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sr. Organization Development Specialist</td>
<td>Vice President of Manufacturing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internships</td>
<td>Retail Excel Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager in Training</td>
<td>Catering Sales Manager</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Job candidates were also asked to identify how many years of experience that they had working in their field. Experience ranged from 0 to 33 years experience. The mean was 10.46 years with a standard deviation of 8.84. About 54% of respondents had 10 or less years of experience while 33.7% of respondents had between 11 and 20 years of experience. Almost a quarter of applicants didn’t know how many years experience was required for the position. Years of experience required for the position ranged from 0 to 20. The mean was 4.56 years (SD = 3.99).

The last time that the majority (65.2%) of the candidates applied to a position was this year. The farthest back that a candidate had looked for a job was in 1999. The number of jobs that the candidates had currently applied to ranged from 0 to 500. Most of the candidates, 89.2%, have recently applied to 50 or less jobs. Only 12.5% of job candidates received the position they applied to, 21.9% did not receive the position, and the remaining 65.3% have not heard if the position has been filled.

Survey Development

This research began with one main question: What reactions do job candidates have to video interviewing as a selection tool? Given that there is no previous research on video interviewing, a majority of the measures were self-developed along with the help of my thesis committee but I was able to adapt several questions from other research as well. The scale ranged from Strongly Disagree (1) to Strongly Agree (7). After reliability for each variable was analyzed, I averaged the items used in the measure to arrive at a composite score that was used in the remainder of the analysis. Level of job position is the only variable that I used that I was unable to obtain a composite score.
Traditional control variables were used in this study. The control variables are: gender, age, and education. Potential differences in reactions based on whether the candidate was male or female is the reason that gender was used as a control variable. Age is controlled for because older workers may be less familiar with webcams and technology so their reactions may differ. Age was measured on an 11-item scale ranging from 18-20 to over 65 years old. Education was measured on a 5-item scale that ranged from High School Diploma to PhD. I controlled for education because higher education may signal a difference in the candidates’ reactions to the video interviewing process.

Overall favorability of video interviewing as a selection tool was identified by an eleven-item scale that achieved the highest reliability (Cronbach’s $\alpha = 0.94$) out of the measures in this survey. Four of the questions used to measure this item were borrowed from Chapman et al. (2003). They are identified in Table 3.2 with (C). Three questions for this variable had to be reverse coded in order to make all questions positive. They are identified in the table with (R).

### Table 3.2: Overall favorability of Video Interviewing Measure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Video interviewing was a positive experience.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would not hesitate to do a video interview in the future.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am satisfied with my video interview.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel that video interviews should be used in the selection process.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would prefer a face-to-face interview instead of a video interview.</td>
<td>(R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would prefer a phone interview instead of a video interview.</td>
<td>(R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I expect to proceed to the next step in the selection process.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The interview gave me the opportunity to present my best side.</td>
<td>(C)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I found the interview difficult.</td>
<td>(R) (C)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I performed well in the interview.</td>
<td>(C)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel positive about the outcome of this interview.</td>
<td>(C)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Procedural fairness was measured by a four-item scale. For this variable, all of the questions were adapted from Steiner & Gilliland’s (1996) procedural justice measures to fit
video interviewing. The measures are listed in Table 3.3. One of the questions for this variable had to be reverse coded. This measure received high reliability (Cronbach’s $\alpha = 0.88$).

**Table 3.3: Procedural Fairness Measure**

| The video interviewing method appears to be based on solid scientific research. |
| Video interviewing is a logical method for identifying qualified candidates for the job in question. |
| Video interviewing will detect an individual’s important qualities that differentiate them from others. |
| Video interviewing is impersonal and cold. (R) |

Ability to communicate was measured using an eleven-item scale. Three of the questions for this measure were reverse coded and they are identified in Table 3.4. The eleven questions that tested for ability to communicate received high reliability (Cronbach’s $\alpha = 0.87$).

**Table 3.4: Ability to Communicate Information Measure**

| I had no problems answering questions in the time/space allotted. |
| It was easy to communicate without receiving cues from the interviewer. |
| It was easy to communicate without receiving feedback from the interviewer. |
| I was able to explain my knowledge, skills, and abilities during the video interview. |
| I was able to show interest in the job. |
| I was able to show interest in the organization. |
| I was able to convey my personality during the video interview. |
| I felt like my interview was missing something. (R) |
| I was able to fully explain myself to the interviewer. |
| I had problems with the internet connection during the video interview. (R) |
| I had problems with my webcam during the video interview. (R) |

The independent variables were all self-developed due to the lack of developed measures in these areas. Travel constraints is measured by an eight-item measure that was developed for this survey. This measure also received high reliability (Cronbach’s $\alpha = 0.88$). The measures are listed in Table 3.5.
Table 3.5: Travel Constraints Measure

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>It is difficult for me to travel for interviews due to:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitments at work.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family obligations.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitments outside of work and family (e.g., volunteer work).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel from my current location is not easy.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Video interviewing saved me time since I did not have to travel for the interview.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It was easier for me to interview since I did not have to take time off at my current job.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I liked the schedule flexibility that was provided to me by the video interview.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If I had to fly for this interview, I would not have been able to continue in the selection process.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Level of job position was measured through a single item. The question used to identify level of job position was multiple choice. It is listed in Table 3.6. Job candidates responded the multiple choice question by selecting the level of the position from three choices: entry-level, mid-level, and senior-level. These three choices were then put on a scale ranging from 1 for entry-level to 3 for senior level. This scale was used to conduct analysis for this variable throughout this study. Almost half (47.9%) of respondents are applying for a mid-level position. The remainder of the respondents were split with 27.4% applying to entry-level positions and 24.7% applying to senior-level.

Table 3.6: Level of Job Position Measure

| The position you are applying to is considered: |                      |
|_____Entry level |                      |
|_____Mid-level |                      |
|_____Senior level |                      |

Previous experience with webcams and related technology was identified through a four-item measure. The four measures that achieved high reliability (Cronbach’s α = 0.81) are listed in Table 3.7.
Table 3.7: Experience with Webcams, and Related Technology Measure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience with Webcams, and related technology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prior to this interview, I have never used a webcam. (R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have experience using webcams.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have recorded myself in the past using video technology (e.g., Recorded a mock interview or a video for YouTube).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have previously used a videoconferencing system (e.g., Skype or a system at work).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chapter 4

Results

Table 4.1 lists descriptive statistics which includes means, standard deviations, and correlations for all of the variables. Since level of job position and education are ordinal variables, a separate correlation was conducted between these variables and the other variables. Instead of using the Pearson Correlation, the Spearman Rank Correlation Rho was used.

Age is positively correlated with education ($r = 0.32; p < 0.01$) and the level of position ($r = 0.63; p < 0.01$). These results are not surprising since most people have more education as they get older. Individuals also work their way up the corporate ladder and obtain a higher level of position as they gain knowledge and experience. There was a negative relationship between experience with webcams and age ($r = -0.31; p < 0.01$). Older individuals are not as experienced with technology as younger individuals so it is not unusual that experience is negatively correlated with age.

It was interesting to find that the level of position has a negative relationship ($r = -0.27; p < 0.05$) with gender. Female respondents in this study identified that they were applying for lower level positions compared to the male respondents. Level of position also has a significant relationship with education. This result can be expected since more education would most likely get the candidate a higher position within the organization.

There is a positive relationship ($r = 0.83; p < 0.01$) between the ability to communicate information and the overall favorability of video interviewing in the selection process. Another positive relationship ($r = 0.89; p < 0.01$) exists between procedural fairness and the overall favorability of video interviewing. These results provide preliminary support for Hypothesis 1 and 2.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Gender (1 = male, 2 = female)</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Age (11-item scale)</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>-0.21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Education$^+$ (5-item scale)</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>-0.13</td>
<td>0.32**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Experience with Webcams</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>-0.14</td>
<td>-0.31**</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Level of Position$^+$ (3-item scale)</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>-0.27*</td>
<td>0.63**</td>
<td>0.33**</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Travel Constraints</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>-0.16</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Ability to Communicate Information</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>-0.17</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.49**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Procedural Fairness</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>-0.15</td>
<td>-0.19</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.50**</td>
<td>0.85**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Overall Favorability of Video Interviewing</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.49**</td>
<td>0.83**</td>
<td>0.89**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05; **p < .01; N = 73

$^+$Spearman Rho Correlation
A positive relationship \((r = 0.50; \ p < 0.01)\) exists between travel constraints and procedural fairness. This provides preliminary support for Hypothesis 3. Travel constraints also had a positive relationship with ability to communicate information \((r = 0.49; \ p < 0.01)\) and overall favorability of video interviewing \((r = 0.49; \ p < 0.01)\). A positive relationship was also found between procedural fairness and ability to communicate information \((r = 0.85; \ p < 0.01)\).

### Table 4.2: Regression Analysis on Overall Favorability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Step 1</th>
<th></th>
<th>Step 2</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(\beta) (Std.)</td>
<td>(t)</td>
<td>(\beta) (Std.)</td>
<td>(t)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Control Variables</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>-0.68</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td>-1.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>-0.20</td>
<td>-1.78</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Independent Variables</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to Communicate Information</td>
<td>0.31**</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedural Fairness</td>
<td>0.64**</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(R^2) (adj.)</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\Delta R^2) (adj.)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall F</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>172.24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F-change</td>
<td></td>
<td>170.97</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05; **p < .01; \(N = 73\)

Hierarchical multiple regressions were conducted in order to test the hypotheses. In the first step I entered the three control variables: gender, age, and education. In this step, these three variables were regressed on the dependent variable. In the second step I entered the independent variables. In Table 4.2, overall favorability of video interviewing as a selection tool was regressed on the control variables, ability to communicate information, procedural fairness, and travel constraints. There is a significant relationship between overall favorability of video interviewing as a selection tool and procedural fairness \((\beta = 0.64; \ p < 0.01)\). Ability to communicate information also has a significant relationship with overall favorability \((\beta = 0.31; \ p < 0.01)\). Hypothesis 1 and 2 have been supported.
Table 4.3: Regression Analysis on Procedural Fairness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Step 1</th>
<th>Step 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>β (Std.)</td>
<td>t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control Variables</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>-0.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>-0.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>-0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent Variables</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of Position</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>1.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel Constraints</td>
<td>0.47**</td>
<td>4.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R² (adj.)</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>0.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Δ R² (adj.)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall F</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>14.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F-change</td>
<td>13.74</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05; **p < .01; N = 73

Procedural fairness was regressed on the control variables, level of job position, and travel constraints in Table 4.3. A significant relationship exists between procedural fairness and travel constraints (β = 0.47; p < 0.01). Level of position does not have a significant (β = 0.23; p = 0.13) relationship with procedural fairness. Hypothesis 3 has been supported while Hypothesis 4 has been rejected. In the last hierarchical multiple regression in Table 4.4, ability to communicate information was regressed on the control variables and experience with webcams.

Table 4.4: Regression Analysis on Ability to Communicate Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Step 1</th>
<th>Step 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>β (Std.)</td>
<td>t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control Variables</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
<td>-0.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent Variables</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience with Webcams</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R² (adj.)</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Δ R² (adj.)</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall F</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F-change</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05; **p < .01; N = 73
Experience with webcams ($\beta = 0.06; p = 0.68$) does not have a significant relationship with ability to communicate information. Hypothesis 5 has not been supported.

**Figure 4.1: Regression Results Model**

As seen in Figure 4.1, there is a significant relationship between travel constraints and procedural fairness, and procedural fairness and overall favorability of video interviewing as a selection tool. Given these results, next level testing needs to be conducted to determine if travel constraints has a direct relationship with overall favorability of video interviewing. Only the top half of the original model is needed for this test so the model was redrawn (Figure 4.2) and the variables in this partial model were tested separately.

**Figure 4.2: Partial Model on Overall Favorability of Video Interviewing**
After conducting a hierarchical multiple regression with overall favorability regressed on procedural fairness, travel constraints, and level of job position, it was determined that a significant relationship ($\beta = 0.88; p < 0.01$) only exists between overall favorability of video interviewing and procedural fairness. There is no significant relationship between travel constraints and overall favorability of video interviewing or between level of job position and overall favorability of video interviewing. The results of this regression are in Table 4.5.

### Table 4.5: Regression Analysis on Partial Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Step 1</th>
<th>Step 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\beta$ (Std.)</td>
<td>t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Control Variables</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>-0.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
<td>-0.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>-0.00</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Independent Variables</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedural Fairness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel Constraints</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of Job Position</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R^2$ (adj.)</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\Delta R^2$ (adj.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall F</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F-change</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05; **p < .01; N = 73
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Discussion

Overall Favorability

The first two hypotheses (1 and 2) were supported. Both ability to communicate information and procedural fairness were strongly related to overall favorability of video interviewing as a selection tool. Candidates most likely felt that they had the opportunity to demonstrate their abilities through the video interviewing system (Steiner & Gilliland, 1996). It may have been easy for candidates to communicate information about themselves to the interviewer because the type of interview questions that candidates responded to during the video interview were not different than those questions that they would respond to during a normal telephone interview. Job candidates who had prepared for their video interview in the same way that they always prepare for an interview were ready to answer the questions in the video interview which is why they felt that they were able to communicate information about themselves to the interviewer.

Applicants who felt that they could communicate successfully viewed video interviewing more favorably. They may believe that video interviewing is just another tool that employers can choose from for the selection process. Candidates were able to communicate information across the webcam to the interviewer. Applicants were not restricted in their ability to communicate their interest in the job and the organization; their knowledge, skills, and abilities; and any other additional that they wanted to communicate to the interviewer so they are viewing video interviewing favorably.
Candidates who felt that it was procedurally fair to conduct the interview through video interviewing also favored the use of video interviewing in the selection process. These results were expected. One candidate felt “the video format was fine - even helpful and effective in meeting candidates for an initial screening without the cost of international travel.” They also mentioned that they found the video principle itself to be good so maybe interviewees just need to get used to the idea of interviewing over webcams. Another candidate was nervous at the beginning of the interview “but by the first 30 seconds into the 1st question, I was at ease. I would think this is a great tool for hiring managers to narrow down candidates quickly, review the interviews again if necessary, and seriously cut down on travel time and money. I loved it!”

Candidates, who felt that video interviewing is procedurally fair, may have felt that the process was objective which is why they favored it (Rosenfeld, 1997). All applicants were asked the exact same set of questions and there was no way for the interview itself to be influenced by the interviewer. In phone and face-to-face interviews, interviewers can sometimes get off track so the conversation may head in a direction that is not appropriate for the interview (e.g., talking about football or the interviewer’s alma mater).

**Procedural Fairness**

Hypothesis 3 stated that travel constraints were positively related to the candidate’s perception of procedural fairness. A significant relationship between these two variables was found. Results were as expected for this relationship. Individuals who are constrained and not able to travel due to commitment or time are more likely to view the use of video interviewing as fair since they do not have to travel. It’s easier for candidates to complete the interview on their own time so they do not have to miss work or their other commitments.
The fourth hypothesis looked at the relationship between the level of position that the candidate was applying to and procedural fairness. It was hypothesized that candidates applying to higher level positions would have a negative relationship with procedural fairness. However, there was an insignificant relationship between the two variables. Therefore, Hypothesis 4 was not supported. One possible reason for this is that there may have not been enough of higher level applicants in the study in order to achieve significant results. The majority of applicants had applied to mid-level positions and only about a quarter of the respondents indicated that the position they were applying for was considered senior-level. There was one candidate who stated “I am an IT professional and thought the process was cold and ineffective for a senior level interview.” Therefore, further research needs to be conducted in this area in order to really determine if level of position makes a difference when using video interviewing.

Another reason that the hypothesis may have been rejected could deal with the measures that were used to measure level of position. The measure for level of position was ordinal which was different than the nominal measures that were used to measure procedural fairness. Level of position was measured by only one question where as procedural fairness was a combined value. The difference in measures created a problem when it came to running statistical measures such as correlations and regressions so it could have also been the reason that the hypothesis was rejected.

Finally, level of the position may have to do more with an individual’s age, education, and length of time spent in their field than the actual level that they consider the position they are applying to. These three variables were correlated with one another. It was also discovered that that there was a negative relationship between experience with webcams and both age and years in the field. Older individuals in the workplace are not as experienced with webcams especially
when they have been in their field for an extended period of time. Older individuals tend to have higher level positions since they have more experience and education so this may be why the level of position should be measured including these variables.

**Ability to Communicate**

Hypothesis 5, webcam experience is positively related to the ability to communicate information, was rejected. The relationship between the two variables was not significant. I expected that the more experience a job candidate has with webcams, the more they will feel like they were able to communicate effectively over the video medium. The results I expected may not have been achieved in this study for a couple of reasons.

First, despite the lack of statistical significance, there were several candidates who made comments at the end of the survey about problems that they had communicating. One candidate stated “I feel that I could have performed better had I been able to interact with an interviewer.” Another candidate stated “I would have learned more about the organization in a face-to-face interview.” A third applicant said “I felt I was unable to show any personality without having another human to interact with.” A fourth job candidate stated “Without being able to see the interviewer’s body language to know if I was on the right track with my responses to the questions, it was very stressful.” There seems to be a perception that candidates cannot communicate all of the information that they want the interviewer to know about them through video interviewing even though statistically, there was no significant relationship.

Some candidate’s felt rushed by the timing of the interview. They stated in the comment section: “30 seconds is not long enough to read and understand the questions and collect your thoughts before the answer timer begins,” and “only having 30 seconds to read a question and then respond is very nerve racking and made me feel flustered and hurried to come up with a
response.” Other candidates felt rushed with their responses due to the time clock. Candidates responded “Having never done this before, I raced through the interview as if I was taking a timed test. I looked foolish and I am embarrassed.” This is an issue that HireVue could alter within their system. Other systems may not have the same problem but candidates felt their ability to communicate was restricted by the time. Applicants with less webcam experience may have made these comments because they feel like they were being penalized for their inability to respond quickly (Bauer et al., 2006).

Other candidates felt unable to communicate due to the lack of personal interaction during the video interview. Candidates found video interviewing to be lacking verbal cues, nonverbal cues, and feedback since the interviewer was not present. One candidate mentioned “The video system, non-live, give[s] the prospective employee no room to feed off of [the] interviewer. Often you can get a sense of how you are doing, you also have the opportunity to elaborate on answers and/or “fix” answers.” While one candidate felt that they were unable to show their personality without interacting with the interviewer, another found it to be much easier than they thought it would be. A third candidate stated “I did not mind the webcam interview process other than I am a people person and it was strange to not be able to make eye contact with an individual and shake their hand.”

There may not have been a significant relationship between experience with webcams and ability to communicate information because the problems that candidates faced with video interviewing may not have been large enough to affect the candidates overall ability to communicate. For example, 56.9% of respondents slightly disagreed, disagreed, or strongly disagreed that “it was easy to communicate without receiving feedback from the interviewer” during the video interviewing. Another example is that 76.7% of respondents slightly agreed,
agreed, or strongly agreed that “I felt like my interview was missing something.” Individuals may have felt the inability to communicate some information due to the use of videos but overall, they were able to communicate information about themselves to the interviewer.

Second, job candidates who had no experience with webcams may have had to quickly learn how to use the technology because of the importance of the interview. Without conducting a video interview, candidates would not have been able to remain in the applicant pool for the position. Job candidates were possibly able to adapt to the situation by finding ways to communicate information to the interviewer over their webcams. Applicants may have put more effort into the communication process because they went into the interview thinking they would have difficulty communicating due to the impersonal, cold nature of the video (Martin & Nagao, 1989). The current recession may have also played a role by forcing job candidates to quickly adapt to the technology because candidates may have been desperate for a job. Job candidates desperate for a job may have done anything in order to remain in the applicant pool. It may have been helpful to ask the respondents if they were currently unemployed or even see how long they were unemployed.

Third, since this study was only conducted at one point in time, there is no way of knowing if candidates had dropped out of the applicant pool because they did not want to complete a video interview due to their unfamiliarity with webcams. One candidate stated “I almost did not do it [the interview] when I found out it was going to be a video interview.” This candidate actually ended up staying in the process because “I thought this was the way the world is moving and it would be [a] good experience.” However, there may have been other candidates who withdrew from the applicant pool because they were so nervous to complete a video interview due to their inexperience. Candidates who withdrew may have had other opportunities
for jobs so it didn’t make a difference to them whether or not they remained in the applicant pool.

These results further emphasize the importance for human resources to understand how candidates are perceiving and reacting to selection tools, especially when the selection tools are new (Steiner & Gilliland, 2001). It also further emphasizes the importance of studying applicant reactions in actual selection settings is reinforced through this study. Real job applicants have much more at stake than individuals in a lab setting so it is important to analyze their reactions to the use of video interviewing in the selection process.

**Practical Implications**

Results of the study hold several important implications for the use of video interviewing in the Human Resource field. First, candidates did favor the use of video interviewing in the selection process. Even though further research into video interviewing needs to be conducted, this initial research provides support for the use of video interviewing by the applicants. Employers have been choosing video interviewing because of the benefits that they have received from it so it is good to see that applicants are also reacting favorably to it. Since applicants favor video interviewing, they should have positive behavioral intentions. They should recommend organizations using video interviewing to others, accept offers if one is made, reapply to the organization if rejected, and remain in the applicant pool for other organizations that are also using video interviewing in their selection process (Ployhart & Ryan, 1997). The favorability of the use of video interviewing in the selection process may grow even more as video interviewing becomes more widely used (Steiner & Gilliland, 1996).
Fairness reactions are very similar to overall favorability. Candidates who believed that the process is fair will reapply to the organization, recommend it to others, and have a higher job attraction (Bauer et al., 2006). Candidates who felt that they were able to communicate over the video medium will most likely have similar reactions to those who felt it was fair. These are all good reasons for human resources to use video interviewing in their selection process.

Another implication for human resources is related to the candidate’s ability to travel. Although video interviewing typically replaces phone interviews, video interviewing can also eliminate face-to-face interviews since employers are able to watch the video interviews multiple times and have multiple managers review the interviews. Managers using video interviewing are able to eliminate interviews out of the selection process. Candidates with travel constraints view video interviewing as both fair and favorable.

Therefore, video interviewing would be most beneficial in situations where candidates are geographically dispersed. This finding is really important for human resources because with e-recruiting, organizations have candidates apply to jobs from all over the country and even the world. Video interviewing will be especially useful for candidates applying to international positions because they would not have to spend time or money trying to travel for interviews. It would also be beneficial for organizations to use video interviewing internally when they are trying to hire expatriates. Managers who are working overseas are able to interview job candidates for the expatriate position without having to fly them abroad. However, it is important to keep in mind that all candidates need to be interviewed through the same process so candidates who are not geographically dispersed would still have to conduct a video interview if employers decide to use video interviewing in the selection process.
The level of job position also holds an important implication for human resources. While this study did not find a significant relationship between the level of job position that the candidate was applying for and procedural fairness, other studies looking at videoconferencing in the selection process have found a significant relationship (Straus et al., 2001; Gilliland, 1993; Martin & Nagao, 1989). Human resources will need to conduct their own research to see how job candidates applying to their organization are reacting to the use of video interviewing in the selection process. One candidate stated during the survey “I am an IT professional and thought the process was cold and ineffective for a senior level interview.” Job candidates applying to higher level positions may be turned away be the impersonal nature of non-live video interview but their reactions may not have been captured if they withdrew from the selection process.

Applicants reactions may not only change based on the level of the position but they may also change based on the actual job. Another candidate stated “I can see the value in an internet interview for some positions (CPA, a foreign position, scientist) however in a sales, hospitality, or customer service field, the process is not focused on the key characteristic employers are looking for...interaction with a live person.” These statements show that human resources still needs to be hesitant about what types of jobs video interviewing is being used for until more research is conducted.

Human resources could modify the video interviewing process to make it more personal for higher-level candidates. For example, instead of having these candidates read questions from a screen, they could watch a recording of someone reading the question. This may help candidates feel like they are responding to that person so the interview may become more personal. One candidate stated in the survey that “it was odd that I had no idea to whom I was...
speaking but they could see and assess me” so this may help all candidates feel more comfortable during the video interview process.

Candidates who felt uncomfortable during the video interviewing process seem to realize that this is where human resources is heading. Technology has become part of our everyday lives so they are willing to try things like video interviewing even though they still may be hesitant to use technology. Video interviewing may be the future for initial interviews so candidates want to gain experience using this selection tool. People are hesitant to change and when the interview process has been conducted a certain way for a period of time they may view this change as unfair.

It is important for human resources to recognize that there is still a large group of individuals (over a third of the respondents in this study) who are unfamiliar with webcams. Human resources needs to be aware that those with higher education and who are older in age are the individuals who have the least amount of experience with webcams. Even though the results didn’t reflect that there was a significant relationship between webcam experience and an individual’s ability to communicate information during the interview, several candidates made comments at the end of their survey about their inability to communicate. One job candidate stated “It was my first video interview and was nervous. I believe even if I am selected the marks I got would have been higher if I had experience with webcams.” Another candidate felt that “the webcam is a great tool to use but, it can be a little intimidating to some people and a little too impersonal.” During their video interview they said they actually froze when the system began recording responses even though they had practiced their responses ahead of time. A third job candidate stated that video interviewing was not beneficial for interviewees because they had no one to ask if they had a misunderstanding, or needed clarification, for a question. These are just a
few of the examples of job candidates comments about how their experience was affected by the webcams and technology used.

It is likely that the majority of job applicants will have never conducted a video interview in their past so they may be hesitant of the process. Human resources needs to make sure that they fully explain the video interviewing process to the job candidates prior to their interview. Candidates need to be educated on what interviewers look for in a video interview. Since it is a new selection tool, applicants may feel that the employer is looking for different qualities in the video than they would normally look for during a phone interview. Candidates are unsure not only of the actual video interviewing process but they are also unsure of what to do to conduct a good video interview. For example, candidates want to know what to put in the background of the webcam in order to make their interview more successful. Candidates are unsure if interruptions or problems with the technology will be counted against them by employers. Human resources really needs to make sure that job candidates have a better understanding of video interviewing if it is used in the selection process.

**Limitations and Directions for Further Research**

There are several limitations for this study so researchers should take caution when interpreting the results given the low response rate, low sample size, unvalidated survey, and other limitations that arose during the research process. The first limitation is due to the low sample size and the low response rate which may have had an effect on the results of this study. A larger sample size may have been more representative of the actual population. However, even though the sample was small, the results were still significant. Second, I only surveyed those who completed a video interview with HireVue. Therefore, results may vary depending on the
company that is providing the video interviewing service. There are other video interviewing companies, such as Green Job Interview, who may have their video interviewing process setup differently so applicants reactions to their process may differ. Finally, the sample may be limited due to the fact that people tend to respond more when their response is extreme – either very positive or negative experience. Those that had a neutral experience may not have been enticed enough to participate in the survey because their opinions were neither positive nor negative. Therefore, this research should be replicated with a larger sample size.

Since no prior research has been conducted in this area, the majority of the measures had to be created by myself and my thesis committee. Therefore, some of the measures used may be flawed. For example, correlations between ability to communicate information, procedural fairness, and overall favorability of video interviewing in the selection process were very high. This means that these variables could be all measuring the same construct. A future study should be conducted to determine whether these variables are measuring the same construct. One way that this could be accomplished is by having a time lag in the study. Ability to communicate information could be measured right after the video interview and after a few weeks, procedural fairness and overall favorability should be measured. In addition to determining whether or not these variables are measuring the same construct, this would also help reduce the response bias.

Not only do measures for experience with webcams and level of job position need to be validated for future research, but these areas also need to be researched more. Research should be conducted looking specifically at candidates with no experience using webcams compared to candidates who have a lot of experience using webcams. Studying these extremes may help researchers to identify better if there is a relationship or not between these two variables.
Researchers should also compare control variables such as age, tenure, and education to webcam experience.

Future research should also be conducted by looking specifically at entry-level candidates compared to senior-level candidates. It would also be beneficial to work on creating a better way of measuring the level of job position that a candidate is applying to. A more accurate measure may also change the results of the study in this area. Researchers may also want to look at how the perceptions of candidates applying to different types of jobs may vary. One job candidate mentioned that they could see the use of video interviewing for certain positions such as accounting, scientist, or an international position but not for other positions such as sales, hospitality, or customer service. Candidates applying for positions that require them to be outgoing and extroverted may not have the same reactions as those applying to positions that do not require these types of characteristics.

Another implication is due to candidates only being surveyed at one specific point in time. The candidate’s reactions and perceptions were studied cross-sectionally and not longitudinally which may have an effect on the results. Only one step in the selection process was looked at so candidates reactions could have changed over time as they moved forward in the selection process or were rejected from the applicant pool. The study did not capture reactions from individuals who may have applied but then withdrew their application for different reasons, such as they didn’t want to conduct a video interview. The people who stayed in the selection process may have certain characteristics, such as familiarity with the use of video and technology that the others who dropped out did not have.

A longitudinal study should be conducted to determine whether applicants are dropping out before the video interview because they do not want to complete it, due to feeling
uncomfortable with the technology, or if applicants may drop out later on in the selection process, due to their feelings of how they did during the video interview. Applicant withdrawal could be very harmful to organizations. Applicants with a lower level of experience with computers may self-select from the process due to their lack of knowledge with the technology (Bauer et al., 2006) or higher ability applicants drop out due to the impersonal nature of the technology. Therefore, more research needs to be conducted to see if candidates are withdrawing from the process due to the use of video interviewing.

Even though I did ask for the outcome of the interview, the candidate’s reaction to the video interview may have changed once they found out whether they were offered the position or not. Applicant’s perceptions and reactions can change during each stage of the selection process so they may vary depending on which phase of the selection process that the applicants are in (Ployhart & Ryan, 1997; Hausknecht et al., 2004). For example, if a candidate was passed over for the position they may not view the use of video interviewing as positively as those who moved on to the next step of the selection process or even those who received a job offer.

In addition to these implications, there was one area that was overlooked during this study – job candidates experience with the interview process. Applicants who have more experience with the selection process may have different expectations of the process than those who have less experience. Similar to interview experience, work experience may also have different affects on applicant reactions. “Individual differences in life experiences may…affect applicant reactions to selection system characteristics” (Viswesvaran & Ones, 2004, p. 173). There was an attempt to look at experiences based on looking at an individual level of job position and how many years experience they have in their field but these measures weren’t
sufficient enough to analyze how an applicant’s experiences could affect their reactions. Future research should also ask candidates about their previous experience with the selection process.

Future research on video interviewing also needs to be conducted on the validity of the video interview process. Video interviewing has a very structured process since each candidate is asked the same exact set of questions. Structured interviews have the highest validity so it is important to see if video interviewing also has a high validity. Structured interviews have even higher validity when a panel of interviewers is used (Parton et al., 2002). Video interviewing offers employers the ability for a similar situation by allowing multiple interviewers to review the video interview. Multiple views of the candidate would help reduce bias and other issues so researchers should find out if video interviewing has increased validity due to these characteristics.

As well as testing the structure for validity, the video interviewing process also needs to be tested for validity for different occupations. During the survey it was surprising to find that employers are using video interviewing for skill based occupations. It may be expected that video interviewing is more suited for cognitive occupations so it would be interesting to see if the validity of video interviewing would change based on the occupations or even the industry that is using them in their selection process. It would be interesting to see if job relatedness for video interviewing is higher in some occupations compared to others.

There is also a lot of exploratory research that needs conducted on video interviewing. Technology does not always have positive benefits for organizations or the people using it. Video interviewing may cause managers to have interview overload. Since employers can interview more candidates due to the low costs, interviewers may be overloaded with the amount of videos they have to watch. Instead of sitting in five one-hour interviews, they now have to
watch ten one-hour interviews. Interviewers may not give their full attention to the interviews they are watching or they may be more distracted while sitting at their desks. Managers may not be giving their full attention to the video interviewing. This is an area that should be researched in the future because these behaviors could affect applicants.

There is also a great deal of research that needs to be conducted on the interviewers. Since the interviewers do not play an active role in interviewing candidates, they may have different perceptions or reactions to the process. For example, as mentioned above, interviewers may be overloaded with the amount of video interviews that they need to watch which may cause them stress or a loss in productivity in the other work they are responsible for. Managers may also need more training in order to know what to look for in the candidate’s responses. “The process of evaluating videotaped interviews may involve a substantially different rating context than what interviewers who conduct FTF [face-to-face] interviews experience” (Iddekinge et al., 2006, p. 351). The rating may be much different from that of a telephone interview because the manager has access to information (e.g., race and gender) that they would not normally receive during a phone interview. It is important for managers to be trained properly on what to look for during a video interview.
Chapter 6

Conclusion

The purpose of this study was to look at applicant reactions about the use of video interviewing in the selection process. Although not all of the hypotheses were supported, this study does provide valuable information to human resource professionals about the use of video interviewing since it is the first study to research this area. Several job candidates seemed to really enjoy the video interviewing experience. Applicants commented “everything was great,” “it was much easier than I thought it was going to be. I love the technology,” “I did enjoy the video interview,” “I loved it!,” and “I loved this experience.”

The current study advances the understanding of applicant reactions to the use of video interviewing in the selection process but there is still a need for more exploratory research in this area. Applicant reactions to the selection process are important since any experience with an organization can influence an applicant’s perception of that organization. Perceptions of the organization begin with the very first experience with the organization which may occur during the selection process. Negative applicant reactions can have consequences for an organization so employers should be aware of the reactions that applicants are having to their selection process.

Job candidates in this study positively viewed the use video interviewing in the selection process. Applicants were able to communicate information about themselves to the interviewer over the webcams and those with travel constraints viewed the video interviewing process as fair. All of this is good news for organizations that are currently using video interviewing or are planning to use video interviewing in their selection process. However, human resources needs to take caution when using video interviewing, and using the results of this study, since this is the first study to be conducted on video interviewing.
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Appendix A: Thesis Diagram

Overall Favorability of Video Interviewing as a Selection Tool

H1
Procedural Fairness

H2
Ability to Communicate Information

H3
Travel Constraints

H4
Level of Job Position

H5
Previous Experience with Webcams, & Related Technology
Appendix B: E-mail Request to Participate in Survey

Dear Chip,

Thank you for your willingness to help me with my thesis research. As you know, I am currently working on my master’s in Human Resources and Employment Relations at Pennsylvania State University and a thesis is required for graduation. My adviser, Sumita Raghuram, has extensive experience in researching and I think that this research opportunity will be very beneficial to HireVue.

The purpose of my research is to:

1. Explore job applicants overall reactions to the use of video interviewing in the selection process.
2. Explore job applicant’s reactions to video interviewing as a communication process.

I have developed a questionnaire for my research and I was wondering if you could help me send out the survey to job candidates who have already conducted a video interview. The attached flyer gives additional information about the study and the survey process. The data will only be used for my thesis and no company or individuals will be identified.

I believe that these results will be beneficial to HireVue and the organizations that use your video interviewing service given that they should help improve the video interviewing process. I will be happy to share the results of my research with HireVue or anyone who is interested in the results. If you would like to receive a copy of my report, please contact me at the email below.

I greatly appreciate your help. Any questions or concerns about this research opportunity can be directed to me at nlt122@psu.edu or to my adviser, Professor Sumita Raghuram at raghuram@psu.edu.

Sincerely,

Nicole Toldi
Graduate Student
Human Resources and Employment Relations
Pennsylvania State University
130 Willard Building, State College, PA 16803
Appendix C: Email from HireVue CEO

Dear (Name),

I hope this finds you well. We are working with Penn State University to conduct formalized academic research into candidate experience with video interviews. I would really appreciate it if you would take a few minutes to complete the survey developed by Nicole Toldi, a graduate student at Penn State University. This survey is completely anonymous to employers, it is for the purposes of our further improvement and researching the candidate experience. This is the first research of its kind in the industry and we are very excited about this.

Here is a link to the survey [http://www.surveymonkey.com/s/VideoInterview](http://www.surveymonkey.com/s/VideoInterview) and an explanation of the project is below

Please let me know if you have any questions -

Mark Newman
CEO
HireVue
801-232-7432
mnewman@hirevue.com
Appendix D: Recruitment Flyer

Video Interviewing Research Opportunity

Have you recently completed a video interview? Are you interested in sharing your opinions on your video interviewing experience? Are you willing to participate in a study to find out how job applicants are reacting to video interviewing?

If so, I would like to invite you to be a part of a study on video interviewing that is looking at characteristics such as effective communication, fairness in the selection process, and overall favorability of video interviewing.

I am a graduate student in Human Resources and Employment Relations at Pennsylvania State University. I am doing this research on video interviewing for my master’s thesis, which is required for my graduation.

My aim is to study job applicant reactions to the use of video interviewing in the selection process. The only purpose of this data is for my thesis. A final copy of my thesis will be submitted to the library at Pennsylvania State University and the results will be shared with HireVue. Your participation in the research will remain confidential. During this study, I will be surveying a variety of companies using video interviewing and I will not be tracking what company you are applying to so the organization will not know where the data is from. This will help to ensure that your responses remain confidential.

If you are interested, please click on the link below. It will take you to a website where you will view the consent form which gives more information about the student. After clicking next on the consent, it will begin to ask you questions. It should only take you about 15 minutes to answer questions. Once you have completed all questions, the final screen will thank you for your participation and you will simply have to click on ‘Done’ to send in your survey.

http://www.surveymonkey.com/s/VideoInterview

By completing the survey, you are automatically consenting so do not fill out the survey if you do not want to be included.

If you would like to learn more about the study before completing the survey, please contact the Principal Investigator, Nicole Toldi and nlt122@psu.edu.
Appendix E: Informed Consent Form

Implied Informed Consent Form for Social Science Research
The Pennsylvania State University

Title of Project: Job Applicant Reactions to the use of Video Interviewing as a Selection Tool

Principal Investigator: Nicole Toldi, Graduate Student
130 Willard Building
University Park, PA 16802
(814) 360-0792; nlt122@psu.edu

Advisor: Dr. Sumita Raghuram
122 Willard Building
University Park, PA 16802
(814) 865-5425; raghuram@psu.edu

You are invited to take part in a research study conducted by Nicole Toldi from the Department of Labor Studies and Employment Relations at the Pennsylvania State University. Before you decide whether or not to participate in the study, you should read this form and ask questions if there is anything that you do not understand.

1. Purpose of the Study: The purpose of this survey is to gather information about your perceptions and reactions to video interviewing. I plan to use the data acquired to find out if applicants perceive video interviewing as an effective communication medium, if applicants perceive the process as fair, and if applicants favor the use of video interviewing in the selection process.

2. Participants: participants must be 18 years of age or older.

3. Procedures to be followed: You will be asked to answer 53 questions on a survey.

4. Duration: It will take approximately 15 minutes to complete the survey.

5. Statement of Confidentiality: Your participation in this research is confidential. The survey does not ask for any information that would identify who the responses belong to. In the event of any publication or presentation resulting from the research, no personally identifiable information will be shared because your name is in no way linked to your responses. Your confidentiality will be kept to the degree permitted by the technology used. No guarantees can be made regarding the interception of data sent via the Internet by any third parties.

6. Right to Ask Questions: Please contact Nicole Toldi at (814) 360-0792 or nlt122@psu.edu with questions or concerns about this study.
7. **Voluntary Participation:** Your decision to be in this research is voluntary. You can stop at any time. You do not have to answer any questions you do not want to answer.

Completion of the survey implies that you have read the information in this form and consent to take part in the research. Please print off this form to keep for your records. If you are unable to print on the computer you are using, please contact the researcher to receive a copy by email.
Appendix F: Survey

GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS: You are asked to complete the following questions as part of this survey. The questionnaire should only take 15 minutes to complete.

Part 1 – Perceptions of the Video Interview

Let’s start with some questions about how you perceived the video interview. For each issue below, please indicate the degree to which you agree or disagree with the following statements by circling the appropriate number.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Slightly Disagree</th>
<th>Unsure/Neutral</th>
<th>Slightly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I had no problems answering questions in the time/space allotted.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. It was easy to communicate without receiving cues from the interviewer.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. It was easy to communicate without receiving feedback from the interviewer.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I was able to explain my knowledge, skills, and abilities during the video interview.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I was able to show interest in the job.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I was able to show interest in the organization.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I was able to convey my personality during the video interview.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I felt like my interview was missing something. (R)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. I was able to fully explain myself to the interviewer.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. I had problems with the internet connection during the video interview. (R)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Problems with the internet connection were easily resolved during the video interview. (H)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. I had problems with my webcam during the video interview. (R)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Problems with my webcam were easily resolved during the video interview. (H)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. The video interviewing method appears to be based on solid scientific research.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Video interviewing is a logical method for identifying qualified candidates for the job in question.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
16. Video interviewing will detect an individual’s important qualities that differentiate them from others. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
17. Video interviewing is impersonal and cold. (R) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
18. Video interviewing was a positive experience. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
19. I would not hesitate to do a video interview in the future. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
20. I am satisfied with my video interview. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
21. I feel that video interviews should be used in the selection process. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
22. I would prefer a face-to-face interview instead of a video interview. (R) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
23. I would prefer a phone interview instead of a video interview. (R) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
24. I expect to proceed to the next step in the selection process. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
25. The interview gave me the opportunity to present my best side. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
26. I found the interview difficult. (R) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
27. I performed well in the interview. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
28. I feel positive about the outcome of this interview. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
29. Prior to this interview, I have never used a webcam. (R) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
30. I have experience using webcams. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
31. I have recorded myself in the past using video technology (e.g., Recorded a mock interview or a video for YouTube). | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
32. I have previously used a videoconferencing system (e.g., Skype or a system at work). | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
33. I have previously completed a video interview. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
34. Video interviewing is very innovative and forward thinking. (H) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
35. It is difficult for me to travel for interviews due to: | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
  a. Commitments at work. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
  b. Family obligations. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
  c. Commitments outside of work and family (e.g., volunteer work). | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
36. Travel from my current location is not easy. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
37. Video interviewing saved me time since I did not have to travel for the interview. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
38. It was easier for me to interview since I did not have to take time off at my current job. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
I liked the schedule flexibility that was provided to me by the video interview.

If I had to fly for this interview, I would not have been able to continue in the selection process.

*Questions with an (R) were reverse coded.
**Questions with an (H) were asked by HireVue.

Part 2—BACKGROUND INFORMATION

The following questions ask about you. Your responses will remain anonymous and confidential. Please check the appropriate answer under each question.

1. What is your gender? _____Male  _____Female

2. What is your age?
   _____18-20  _____21-25  _____26-30  _____31-35  _____36-40
   _____41-45  _____46-50  _____51-55  _____56-60  _____61-65
   _____Over 65 yrs.

3. How frequently have you used a webcam?
   _____Every day
   _____2-3 times a week
   _____A few times a month
   _____A few times a year
   _____Never

4. Which type of video interview did you participate in?
   _____Non-live –Questions appeared on the screen and I responded. I had no interaction with an interviewer during the interview.
   _____Live –The interviewer asked me questions and I responded. This format is similar to videoconferencing.

5. Please select your highest level of education.
   _____High School Diploma or GED
   _____Associate’s Degree
   _____Bachelor’s Degree
   _____Master’s Degree
   _____PhD

6. The position you are applying to is considered:
   _____Entry level
   _____Mid-level
   _____Senior level

7. Position applied for: ___________________________
8. How many years experience do you have in your field? __________years

9. How many years of experience are required for this position? __________years

10. When was the last time you applied for a job (month and year)? __________

11. About how many other jobs have you currently applied to? __________

12. I was selected for the position that I video interviewed for.
   _____Yes
   _____No
   _____Position has not been filled yet

13. Any additional comments.

______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________

WHEN YOU ARE FINISHED, PLEASE CHECK TO MAKE SURE YOU HAVE ANSWERED ALL OF THE QUESTIONS IN EACH SECTION OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE.

THANK YOU FOR YOUR PARTICIPATION IN THIS STUDY! I APPRECIATE THE TIME THAT YOU TOOK OUT OF YOUR SCHEDULE TO HELP ME WITH MY RESEARCH.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Any additional comments.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>It was my first video interview and was nervous. I believe even if am selected the marks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I got the call back after the video interview. I have a third interview coming up but has</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not happened yet.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There was not enough time to prepare responses (30 seconds). I feel there was enough time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to respond (3 minutes). Also, a non live interview was not a positive experience and did</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not allow me to put my best foot forward through personal interaction. I felt it was very</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>one dimensional.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Everything was great except for the time clock.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I didn't like the video interview. It would have helped if we could record a sample with</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>questions prior. Having never done this before, I raced through the interview as if I was</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>taking a timed test. I looked foolish and I am embarrassed. If I had to do a second interview, I think I would be much better.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I strongly disliked this, would have been better live I'm sure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 seconds is not long enough to read and understand the question and collect your thoughts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>before the answer timer begins.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I really thought I was not going to be able to show my personality in a webcam interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>but I found that was not the case and I was able to be ME and it was much easier than I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>thought it was going to be. I love the technology.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel that I could have performed better had I been able to interact with an interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>er. This form of interview was impersonal and I was not satisfied with the format of it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I also did not like that I had to complete the interview within 3 days of receiving the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>webcam. I felt I could have done better if I had more time to prepare myself.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I did enjoy the video interview. I felt I could better explain myself in a face to face</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>interview. I believe I would have learned more about the organization in a face to face</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>interview.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I thought the video format was fine - even helpful and effective in meeting candidates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for an initial screening without the cost of international travel; in this particular one</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>it was odd that I had no idea to whom I was speaking (non-live) but they could see and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>assess me; and without prior knowledge of the type of questions it was hard to know where</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to put emphasis (e.g. whether now was the moment to express enthusiasm for the job or if</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>there would be later questions that would address that), and I also did not know how</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>technical those questions would get - but these are particular points about the interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I sat rather than about the video format which in principle I think is good.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The webcam is a great tool to use but, it can be a little intimidating to some people and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a little too impersonal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sucked - about says it all.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position is not filled yet, but I am being flown out by the company in a couple weeks for</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a second interview.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think the timer should less visible. It is easily distracting and causes you to rush.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat awkward, but overall I felt it was OK.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am an IT professional and thought the process was cold and ineffective for a senior level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>interview.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I would possibly avoid a job if selection were based solely on video interview. The process could have been improved if it were a live interview rather than non-live. I felt I was unable to show any personality without having another human to interact with.

I think that webcam is not going away but I think there could have been a better "warm up" time with questions or something that would make the interviewee maybe more comfortable. Overall it was fun doing to the degree that even someone with my length of experience still was a bit nervous!!!

I strongly feel it is important to outline the expectation for response length ahead of time. When given 3 minutes, people may attempt to fill the time instead of giving their most honest answer.

I loved this experience. It was a huge time saver for me personally. At first I was a bit nervous but by the first 30 seconds into the 1st question, I was at ease. I would think this is a great tool for hiring managers to narrow down candidates quickly, review the interviews again if necessary, and seriously cut down on travel time (i.e. recruiting cycle time) and money. I loved it!

I like the idea of the video interview and definitely see the benefit. I still however am traveling for a face to face. I also found the camera to be intimidating, even though I had rehearsed my responses I froze when the camera was recording.

I turned it down.

I can see the value in an internet interview for some positions...CPA, a foreign position, scientist...however in a sales, hospitality, customer service field, the process is not focused on the key characteristic employers are looking for...interaction with a live person. In a "people" field, I feed and flow off of the client/interviewer. An internet interview does not allow for those warm interactions.

I think the webcam interviews are a very innovative and creative way to give employers the opportunity to see the personality of applicants. However I do not think the non-live interviews are very beneficial for applicants. There is no one to speak to if there is a misunderstanding regarding the way questions are phrased. Furthermore only having 30 seconds to read a question and then respond is very nerve racking and made me feel flustered and hurried to come up with a response.

I did not mind the webcam interview process other than I am a people person and it was strange to not be able to make eye contact with and individual and shake their hand.

Video interviewing is an impersonal process that doesn't allow for a thorough evaluation of both verbal and non-verbal communication. I do not recommend it.

I am an HR student myself, so I hope you can capture this. During the interview recording, my alarm rang, this is because I was giving the interview at home and it may be viewed unprofessional but the question is: What kind of assumptions can a company make based on such actions. Also, how should an Interviewee present herself during the interview e.g.: what kind of background makes them more appealing. What tone makes them more convenient to be heard? I would have appreciated to have a chance to view my responses and also add any comment below each question. Instead I just did the recording.

I would have appreciated an e-mail from the company I was interviewing with to confirm they received my interview. I was uncomfortable looking at myself on camera while trying to demonstrate confidence.

I am sure as an interviewer, this is a wonderful tool to help the employer choose employees. I found this interview process to be difficult. I almost did not do it when I found out it was going to be a video interview. But I thought this was the way the world is moving and it would be a good experience. Without being able to see the interviewee's body language to know if I was on the
right track with my responses to the questions, it was very stressful. I waited until after hours to
do the interview but still had several interruptions and was not able to complete my response to
one of the questions. I thought we would have had a phone interview as a follow-up to the video
interview but we did not. I think that would have been better.

| The video system, non-live, give the prospective employee no room to feed off of interviewer. Often you can get a sense of how you are doing, you also have the opportunity to elaborate on answers and/or "fix" answers. In this system you cannot go back, and are never presented another opportunity to give more feedback. Another daunting thing is that the timer is intimidating. |
| This was an uncomfortable experience. I will be working in HR and I will not be using this service. While it's "innovative," a Skype interview is a more interactive experience and reflects more positively on a company. |