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ABSTRACT

Applying the definitions of objective and subjective fit originally proposed by French, Caplan, and Harrison (Caplan, 1983; 1987; French & Kahn, 1962; French et al., 1974, 1982; Harrison, 1978, 1985), this study examined how a match in regulatory focus (Higgins, 1997; 1998) between an interviewer and applicant influenced interviewers’ evaluation of an applicant. In the proposed model, objective regulatory fit was identified as an antecedent of subjective regulatory fit and a distal predictor of evaluations of the applicant. Subjective regulatory fit was hypothesized to predict evaluations of the applicant through mediators. Participants in a computer-based interview simulation played the role of the interviewer, where an applicant’s responses were prerecorded. Pre- and post-interview measures and evaluations were collected. No support was found for the effect of objective regulatory fit on evaluations of the applicant. However, support was found for subjective regulatory fit being positively related to evaluations of the applicant. Furthermore, the positive relationship between subjective regulatory fit and evaluations of the applicant was partially mediated by liking and value from fit. In summary, it was found that the greater the perceived regulatory fit, the higher the evaluations of the applicant were, and this was due to greater liking and perceived value of the applicant.
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CHAPTER I

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

The employment interview has been the subject of research studies for over 80 years (Gatewood, Feild, & Barrick, 2011), resulting in a large number of both quantitative and qualitative reviews (Arvey & Campion, 1982; Harris, 1989; Macan, 2009; Moscoso, 2000; Posthuma, Morgeson, & Campion, 2002; Schmitt, 1976; Ulrich & Trumbo, 1965; Wagner, 1949). Despite the already substantial body of literature, a narrative review by Posthuma et al. indicated that interest in researching employment interviews was growing.

The interest of academics in the employment interview has been matched by the frequency of its use by practitioners. Dipboye’s (1992) review of surveys of hiring practices indicated that the interview was the most frequently used selection method, surpassing other common screening techniques (see also Topor, Colarelli, & Han, 2007). Justifying its popularity in research and use in applied settings, recent reviews and studies suggested that the structured interview was a highly valid selection device.

Despite the current agreement in the literature on the psychometric advantage of structuring interviews, the validity gained by structuring interviews is only as good as the interviewers’ willingness to follow the structure. As stated by Brtek and Motowidlo (2002), “we cannot always assume that interviewers use a structured format as its
developers intended, and if they do not, there is no reason to expect their judgments to be any more valid than judgments based on an unstructured format” (p. 185). This statement accentuated a common criticism of interviews, which was that they leave room for variability in interviewer judgment. This study examined interviewer motivation, as it is an important factor that can influence interviewer judgment.

Regulatory focus theory (Higgins 1997, 1998), a theory of self-regulation, was applied in this study to help understand interviewer motivation. Regulatory focus theory proposes two self-regulatory orientations, which are known respectively as promotion and prevention. A more recent application of regulatory focus theory, regulatory fit (Higgins, 2000; 2005) examines the congruence between an individual’s regulatory focus and the goal pursuit strategy of accomplishing his/her goals. In this study, regulatory fit was applied to the interview in order to better understand interviewers’ ratings of an applicant. In order to apply the concept of regulatory fit to the employment interview, this study also integrated two conceptualizations of fit, objective and subjective fit, from the person-environment fit literature.

In what follows, the framework on which this study was based on will be described. First, a brief overview of interviews will be provided. Next, the basic tenets of regulatory focus theory and regulatory fit will be outlined. Then a description of objective and subjective fit will be introduced. Lastly, the application of regulatory fit to interviews will be presented.

The Employment Interview

An interview is defined as “a dialogue initiated by one or more persons to gather information and evaluate the qualifications of an applicant for employment” (Dipboye,
Interviews can take place in many different forms, including face-to-face, over the phone, or even over the internet, and can be given at different stages of the selection process. The questions used in the interview can gauge a variety of characteristics, including job knowledge, personality, person-organization fit, and cognitive ability. Ultimately the interviewer uses this information to evaluate the applicant to make hiring recommendations.

Prior to 1980, a majority of the I/O psychology literature on employment interviews dismissed the interview as a useful selection device (Dipboye, 1992). Most of the literature on employment interviews questioned both the reliability and validity of the interview. Along with questions about the psychometric properties of employment interviews, researchers (e.g., Dreher, Ash, & Hancock, 1988; Heneman, Schwab, Huett, & Ford, 1975; Kopelman, 1975; Landy & Bates, 1973; Latham, Wexley, & Pursell, 1975; Whetzel, Wilson, & Kort, 1981; Zedeck, Tziner, & Middlestad, 1983) also attended to judgment biases that interviewers committed while conducting interviews. These judgment biases were seen as threats to the validity of the interview. Some of the common judgment biases included the central tendency error, leniency error, severity error, halo effect, and contrast effect (e.g. Cooper, 1981; Saal, Downey, & Lahey, 1980).

In response to concerns about the low reliability and validity of the employment interview, along with potential judgment biases committed by interviewers, researchers (e.g., Dreher & Sackett, 1983; Dipboye, 1992) turned to cognitive models in order to explain rater errors. These cognitive models assumed that the interviewer was gathering and processing information about the applicant for the purpose of assessing the applicant’s fit with the job. The models accounted for factors that influenced an
interviewer before the interview started (e.g. interviewer’s training, experience, and knowledge about the applicant and job) and continued to account for interview factors (e.g. how applicant responds) throughout the interview.

Social factors, which examined the dyadic interaction between interviewer and applicant, have been studied to explain influences on interview outcomes. Some social factors that have been studied in regards to the employment interview include applicant fit (Adkins, Russell, & Werbel, 1994; Cable & Judge, 1997; Rynes & Gerhart, 1990), verbal and nonverbal behavior (Burnett & Motowidlo, 1998; DeGroot & Motowidlo, 1999; Liden, Martin, & Parsons, 1993; Motowidlo & Burnett, 1995; Willemyns, Gallois, Callan, & Pittman, 1997), impression management (Delery & Kacmar, 1998; Gilmore & Ferris, 1989; Howard & Ferris, 1996; Kacmar, Delery, & Ferris, 1992; McFarland, Ryan, & Kriska, 1997; Stevens, 1997; Stevens & Kristof, 1995), information exchange (Williams, Radefeld, Binning, & Sudak, 1993), and interviewer-applicant similarity (Graves & Powell, 1995; Lin, Dobbins, & Farh, 1992; Prewett-Livingston, Field, Veres, & Lewis, 1996; Schmitt, Pulakos, Nason, & Whitney, 1996; Sears & Rowe, 2008).

A majority of early research studies in this area conceptualized interviewer-applicant similarity in terms of demographic characteristics (e.g. race and gender). The effects of interviewer-applicant demographic similarity have been examined in many popular reviews of the interviews. Many of the reviews concluded that there was a positive effect of interviewer-applicant similarity on applicant ratings (Arvey & Campion, 1982; Harris, 1989; Posthuma et al., 2002; Schmitt, 1976). Posthuma et al. speculated that the effect of similarity was likely due to the interviewer socially
identifying with the applicant. They adopted social identity theory (Tajfel, 1978) as an explanation for this effect.

Attitudinal similarity may be less obvious to an interviewer; however, it could be potentially more important. According to Graves (1993), the perception of attitudinal similarity may increase applicant liking and influence interviewers’ ratings and the types of questions that are asked. This study looked at special case of similarity, which was similarity in regards to interviewer and applicant regulatory focus.

Regulatory focus theory, which has been previously applied to organizational level constructs such as leadership (e.g. De Cremer, Mayer, van Dijke, Schouten, & Bardes, 2009; Kark & van Dijk, 2007; Moss, Ritossa, & Ngu, 2006; Neubert, Kacmar, Carlson, Chonko, & Roberts, 2008), groups (e.g. Sassenberg, Jonas, Shah, & Brazy, 2007; Spanjol, Tam, Qualls, & Bohlmann, 2011), and fairness (e.g. Li, Evans, Christian, Gilliland, Kausel, & Stein, 2011; Brebels, De Cremer, van Dijke, & van Hiel, 2011) to name a few, has yet to be applied to areas of selection. Regulatory focus is an important variable to consider in regards to employment interviews, because it is related to motivational processes – specifically how one maintains and attains goals. Looking at similarity in terms of regulatory focus between an interviewer and applicant is important because it can have implications for how both individuals work together within an organizational context.

Regulatory Focus Theory

Regulatory focus theory (Higgins, 1997, 1998, 2000) distinguishes between two major goal classes that result in self-regulation differences. First, a promotion focus is concerned with nurturant needs, such as accomplishment and growth. Second, a
prevention focus is concerned with security needs, such as safety and protection. Self-regulation in a promotion focus versus prevention focus differs in various aspects. Success and failure in a promotion focus orientation are experienced as gains and non-gains respectively, while success and failure in a prevention focus orientation are experienced as non-loss and loss respectively. The affective responses associated with success and failure for promotion focus orientations are cheerfulness and dejection, while the affective responses associated with success and failure for a prevention focus orientation are quiescence and agitation. The strengths of both regulatory foci vary independently of each other, and motivations can be high or low simultaneously.

According to Higgins (1997, 1998), regulatory focus can be conceptualized as a trait variable that is influenced by one’s upbringing and socialization. Nurturant parenting promotes a promotion focus where self-regulation is concerned with accomplishments, hopes, and aspirations (e.g., ideals). Security parenting engenders a prevention focus where self-regulation is concerned with safety, duties, and obligations (e.g., oughts). Momentary situations can also induce promotion or prevention focus concerns (Higgins, 1997, 1998). Just as parental upbringing can influence one’s trait regulatory focus orientation by communicating to him/her how to attain desired end-states, performance feedback and task instructions can communicate concerns with presence/absence of positive outcomes (promotion concerns) and absence/presence of negative outcomes (prevention concerns). Thus, regulatory focus can be viewed both as an individual difference (trait) variable and as a situation-induced (state) variable.

Another major proposition of regulatory focus theory is that each regulatory foci is related to a strategic means of goal attainment (Crowe & Higgins, 1997; Higgins, 1997,
Individuals with a promotion focus orientation have a preference to use an *eager* strategy of goal attainment, while individuals with a prevention focus orientation have a preference to use a *vigilant* strategy of goal attainment. From a signal detection standpoint, an eager strategy involves increasing “hits” and protecting against errors of omissions (“misses”), while a vigilant strategy involves increasing “correct rejections” and minimizing errors of commission (“false alarms”). Those individuals with a promotion focus orientation prefer an eager strategy, since this strategy increases the presence of positive outcomes (ensures “hits”) and minimizes the absence of positive outcomes (ensures against “misses”). Likewise, those individuals with a prevention focus orientation prefer a vigilant strategy, since this strategy increases the absence of negative outcomes (ensures “correct rejections”) and minimizes the presence of negative outcomes (ensures against “errors of commission”).

Regulatory fit (Higgins, 2000; 2005) is a related concept that has also received a lot of research attention. When an individual’s orientation matches the goal pursuit means used in accomplishing a goal, the person experiences regulatory fit. For example, an individual who has a promotion focus will experience regulatory fit when he or she uses eager means of pursuing a goal. Studies have shown that high regulatory fit can increase individuals’ motivation (e.g. Förster, Higgins, & Idson, 1998; Shah, Higgins, & Friedman, 1998), increase individuals’ imagining feeling better (worse) when making a desirable (undesirable) choice (e.g. Idson, Liberman, & Higgins, 2000; 2004), and increase alertness in individuals and their positive post-decision evaluations (e.g. Idson et al., 2004). Additionally, when regulatory fit is high, studies have shown that individuals prospectively and retrospectively enjoy goal pursuit more (e.g. Freitas & Higgins, 2002;
Lastly, individuals assign higher monetary value to an object they have chosen when the decision was made with higher regulatory fit (e.g. Higgins & Idson, 2000). Thus, having higher regulatory fit has been shown in previous studies to influence individuals’ processes and motivation during tasks, and their evaluations both before and after tasks.

The outcomes of regulatory fit have been examined and theorized in many previous studies. Many of these studies have shown that when one experiences a match between his/her strategic inclinations with the demands of a task, that individual experiences a subjective feeling of “rightness” (e.g. Camacho, Higgins, & Luger 2003; Cesario & Higgins, 2008), and enjoyment (e.g. Freitas & Higgins, 2002; Higgins, Pittman, & Spiegel, 2006). Another outcome of an experience of regulatory fit is the concept of value from fit, which was originally proposed by Higgins (2000, 2008). Value from fit proposes that when individuals experience fit, it enhances people’s evaluative judgments or “liking” of experiences or targets (e.g. objects, tasks, or people) that they have to evaluate. Past studies (e.g. Avnet & Higgins, 2003, 2006; Brodscholl, Kober, & Higgins, 2007; Förster & Higgins, 2005; Higgins et al., 2003; Wang & Lee, 2006) have supported the value from fit proposal. Thus, feeling of rightness, enjoyment, liking, and value from fit were examined in this study.

Although regulatory fit is traditionally viewed from the standpoint as a match between the strategic inclination of an individual and the task involved (as described above), this study adopted the notion that regulatory fit could also be viewed as the match between the strategic orientations of two or more individuals. More recent studies (e.g., Camacho, Higgins, & Luger, 2003; Lockwood, Jordan, & Kunda, 2002; Ritchie, 2009;
Sassenberg, Jonas, Shah, & Brazy, 2007) lend support to this notion. For example, in a lab setting, Ritchie (2009) examined the effect of regulatory fit between a supervisor and subordinate on leader-member exchange quality. Other studies that lend support to this conceptualization of regulatory fit have shown that an individual’s regulatory focus is related to the regulatory focus of the groups he/she chooses (Sassenberg et al., 2007), an individual’s feeling of “rightness” is related to the regulatory fit of his/her regulatory focus and the conflict resolution choices of authority figures (Camacho et al., 2003), and the fit between individuals’ and role models’ regulatory focus is related to their motivation (Lockwood et al., 2002).

In order to integrate the application of regulatory fit to the employment interview, I turned to the person-environment fit literature. The P-E fit literature lends great support for the idea of examining congruence between one’s abilities and the demands of the environment. Examining interviewer-applicant similarity in terms of regulatory fit can be seen as a special case of fit between two individuals. Therefore, the definitions and conceptualizations of P-E fit can apply in this study.

**Person-Environment Fit**

Person-environment fit is defined as the congruence, match, or similarity between the person and environment (Dawis, 1992; Edwards, 2008; Edwards, Caplan, & Harrison, 1998; Muchinsky & Monahan, 1987; Schneider, Kristof, Goldstein, & Smith, 1997). Edwards (2008) reviewed various models of P-E fit applied to different organizational outcomes and gave a comprehensive review of a model of P-E fit applied to the work stress literature proposed by French, Caplan, and Harrison (Caplan, 1983; 1987; French & Kahn, 1962; French et al., 1974, 1982; Harrison, 1978, 1985). With regards to fit,
French and Kahn distinguished between the objective and subjective person and environment. In short, the objective person and environment referred to the actual skills that one possessed and the true environment that he or she was in. The subjective person and environment were the person’s perceived skills and the perceived environment that he or she believes was around him or her.

The constructs of objective and subjective fit have been applied further. Kristof (1996) posited that these forms of fit should be considered in the measurement of P-E fit. Objective fit would be related to improved process outcomes, regardless of whether fit is perceived. For example, Cable and Judge (1995) explained that even if congruence were not perceived to exist between a person and an organization, the actual congruence between these two entities would still lead to positive outcomes due to facilitated communication. Conversely, subjective fit resembles an attitude, and as a result, perceptions of subjective fit should be related to positive outcomes related to attitudes. For example, if one feels that he or she fits well with an organization, it would likely lead to satisfaction or commitment. Thus, Kristof proposed that subjective fit should have more of an impact on individual attitudinal outcomes, whereas, objective fit should be more influential on process and performance outcomes.

The constructs of objective and subjective fit were also applied in models of P-E fit and work stress (Caplan, 1983, 1987; Harrison, 1978, 1985; French et al., 1982). In these models, the effects of both objective and subjective fit were differentiated. Objective fit was considered a distal predictor of work stress outcomes, and was also viewed as an antecedent of subjective fit. The perception of subjective fit was seen as a proximal cause of outcomes of work stress. In this study, I adopted the same

It was important to look at both objective and subjective fit because each could have unique effects on interviewers’ applicant ratings. Three models were proposed in this study. First, a model examining the direct effect of objective fit on applicant ratings was proposed. Secondly, a mixed model of both objective fit and subjective fit, on applicant ratings was proposed. In this model, objective fit was viewed as a distal predictor, while subjective fit was viewed as a proximal predictor of applicant ratings. A third model proposed that only subjective fit was a predictor of applicant ratings.

The Employment Interview and Regulatory Focus

As stated above, although interviews have been proven to be valid selection devices, interviewer judgment still remains variable when making decisions on applicants, and therefore it is important to examine factors that can influence the interviewer. I have introduced the basic tenets of regulatory focus, and will propose in this section that it can influence interviewers’ ratings of an applicant. In order to explain my rationale for developing a model of regulatory fit and its application to an interview, I utilized the conceptualizations of objective and subjective P-E fit described by French, Caplan, and Harrison (Caplan, 1983; 1987; French & Kahn, 1962; French et al., 1974, 1982; Harrison, 1978, 1985).

Objective Fit

To date there are no known published studies examining both objective and subjective regulatory fit. Subjective fit has been theorized to have a proximal effect on P-E fit outcomes; however, the effect of objective fit on applicant ratings should not be
ignored, since it was originally theorized (French & Kahn, 1962) that objective fit would still have an effect on P-E fit outcomes. Additionally, many regulatory fit studies that manipulated fit do not measure participants’ perceptions of fit (subjective fit). Even though these studies did not label their fit as French, Caplan, and Harrison did, they were capturing objective fit. In order to be consistent with these traditional regulatory fit studies, I first examined objective fit. Figure 1.1 diagrams the proposed outcomes from objective fit, operationalized as the match or mismatch between interviewer and applicant regulatory focus.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interviewer Focus</th>
<th>Applicant Promotion Focus</th>
<th>Applicant Prevention Focus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Promotion Focus</td>
<td>Hi perceived applicant fit with org</td>
<td>Lo perceived applicant fit with org</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hi predicted performance</td>
<td>Lo predicted performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hi predicted satisfaction</td>
<td>Lo predicted satisfaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lo predicted turnover</td>
<td>Hi predicted turnover</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hi likelihood of hire</td>
<td>Lo likelihood of hire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevention Focus</td>
<td>Lo perceived applicant fit with org</td>
<td>Hi perceived applicant fit with org</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lo predicted performance</td>
<td>Hi predicted performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lo predicted satisfaction</td>
<td>Hi predicted satisfaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hi predicted turnover</td>
<td>Lo predicted turnover</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lo likelihood of hire</td>
<td>Hi likelihood of hire</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1.1. Proposed outcomes of objective interviewer-applicant regulatory fit.

To examine regulatory fit, the regulatory focus of both the interviewer and applicant (a fictitious person) was manipulated in this study, resulting in four distinct groups: (a) interviewer promotion/applicant promotion, (b) interviewer promotion/applicant prevention, (c) interviewer prevention/applicant promotion, and (d) interviewer prevention/applicant prevention. It was hypothesized that congruence between the manipulated interviewer and applicant regulatory focus (objective fit) would result in higher applicant evaluations. Thus, the cells that indicate a higher evaluation
were the cells where the interviewer and applicant regulatory foci matched. In addition to having an influence on outcomes, objective regulatory fit was also examined as an antecedent to subjective fit (French & Kahn, 1962).

**Subjective Fit**

One of the major propositions of the theory of fit proposed by French, Caplan, and Harrison was that subjective fit was the proximal cause of the outcomes of fit. Harrison’s (1978) model of P-E fit and psychological stress proposed that subjective fit was a proximal antecedent of psychological strain. When evaluating the boundaries of this theory of fit, Edwards (2008) noted that the application of subjective fit extended to other outcomes such as job satisfaction, physical health, job performance, and organizational effectiveness. Thus, it was important to examine perceptions of fit (subjective fit) because subjective fit was a proximal cause of outcomes. Figure 1.2 diagrams the model of antecedents and consequences of subjective fit tested in this study, from the perspective of the interviewer.

*Figure 1.2. Proposed model of objective and subjective interviewer-applicant regulatory fit.*
In Figure 1.2 it was proposed that the manipulated interaction between the interviewer and applicant regulatory focus (objective fit) would effect the interviewer’s perceptions of both his/her own regulatory focus and the perception of the applicant’s regulatory focus. In this study, the interviewer was asked to respond to a set of items measuring his/her state level regulatory focus and also a set of items measuring perceptions of the applicant’s state level regulatory focus. It was proposed that the interviewer’s perception of his/her and the applicants’ regulatory focus would interact to effect his/her perception of subjective fit with the applicant. A set of items measured subjective fit from the interviewer’s perspective. Lastly, subjective fit was expected to illicit greater feelings of rightness, liking, enjoyment, and value from fit (common outcomes of regulatory fit). These four variables would account for the effect of subjective fit on the evaluation of the applicant. Lastly a third model (see Figure 1.3) was proposed in this study, ignoring the effect of objective fit on subjective fit. Support for this proposed model would demonstrate that subjective regulatory fit had an effect on applicant ratings.
Figure 1.3. Proposed model of subjective interviewer-applicant regulatory fit.

Summary

In summary, this study examined the effect of self-regulatory processes on interviewers’ ratings of an applicant. It observed the manipulated effect of interviewer-applicant regulatory fit on applicant ratings (objective fit). In addition, it examined perceived interviewer-applicant regulatory fit. Specifically it measured the effect that subjective regulatory fit would have on feeling of rightness, enjoyment, liking, and value from fit. The effect of subjective fit on the applicant evaluation was examined through these four variables.

To test the hypothesized model, an experiment with the two between-subjects factors of interviewer regulatory focus and applicant regulatory focus was conducted. Thus, a two-by-two experimental design was adopted, creating four experimental groups: (a) interviewer promotion/applicant promotion, (b) interviewer promotion/applicant prevention, (c) interviewer prevention/applicant promotion, and (d) interviewer
prevention/applicant prevention. Participants completed a computer-based simulation of a job interview, playing the role of the interviewer. After completing various personality measures to be used as covariates, participants completed a priming manipulation, which primed either a state promotion or prevention focus. Participants then interviewed the fictional applicant for the position of a fitness leader at a university recreation center. The applicant, whose responses were prerecorded, displayed promotion or prevention focus responses. Measures of the participants’ state regulatory focus, their perceptions of the applicant’s regulatory focus, and their perceived regulatory fit were recorded post-interview. In addition, participants’ feeling of rightness, enjoyment, liking, and value from fit, and evaluation of applicant were collected after the interview.
CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

The present study will apply regulatory fit theory to the context of the employment interview. In the following chapter, a brief review of the current landscape of research on the employment interview will be presented. Empirical studies that have examined interviewer and applicant fit will be reviewed. Secondly, this chapter will introduce regulatory focus theory and regulatory fit by defining these theories and reviewing relevant research. Then this chapter will introduce a model of P-E fit, based on definitions originally proposed by French, Caplan, and Harrison (Caplan, 1983; 1987; French & Kahn, 1962; French et al., 1974, 1982; Harrison, 1978, 1985). Using the framework of French, Caplan, and Harrison, this chapter will conclude by generating hypotheses and proposing models integrating regulatory fit with the employment interview.

The Employment Interview

Interview Criterion-Related Validity

Research on the employment interview has looked at various components of the interview, including social factors, cognitive factors, individual differences, and measures and outcomes. One of the most popular areas of research on the employment interview has been on its criterion-related validity. Before the early 1980’s, research (e.g. Arvey &
Campion, 1982; Hunter & Hunter, 1984; Mayfield, 1964, Schmidt, 1976; Ulrich & Trumbo, 1965; Wagner, 1949; Wright, 1969) on the interview almost entirely dismissed the employment interview as a valid selection method. A majority of these studies had conclusions that could be described as pessimistic at best in regards to the criterion-related validity of the interview. In one of the earliest reviews of the interviews, Wagner noted issues with the research methods conducted on interviews at the time. Specifically, only 25 of the 106 published studies at the time were experiments and many had contradicting opinions. Another early narrative review (Ulrich & Trumbo) of the employment interview suggested that interviews did not add much value over other selection methods. Hunter and Hunter conducted one of the earliest meta-analytic studies that examined the criterion-related validity of employment interviews. Hunter and Hunter used meta-analysis to determine the validity coefficient for various selection methods. They found a correlation of .14 (corrected for error of measurement) between the employment interview and supervisor performance ratings.

The pessimistic view of the criterion-related validity of the interview changed in 1988 (Moscoso, 2000). Since this time, many researchers (e.g. Huffcutt & Arthur, 1994; Huffcutt, Conway, Roth, & Klehe, 2004; Huffcutt & Woehr, 1999; Marchese & Muchinsky, 1993; McDaniel, Whetzel, Schmidt, & Mauer, 1994; Schmidt & Rader, 1999; Wiesner & Cronshaw, 1988) turned to meta-analysis in order to examine the validity of the employment interview. A study by Weisner and Cronshaw was the first of many meta-analysis studies to reexamine the validity of the employment interview and found an overall mean validity of .47 (corrected for restriction of range). Accounting for structure, Weisner and Cronshaw examined both unstructured and structured interviews.
and found validity coefficients of .31 and .62 (corrected for range restriction) respectively. Huffcutt and Arthur’s meta-analysis corrected for limitations of Hunter and Hunter’s (1984) meta-analysis. Huffcutt and Arthur corrected for sampling error, criterion unreliability, and range restriction in their analyses. They found an average validity correlation of .37. Additionally, Huffcutt and Arthur examined the validity of the employment interview based on four levels of structure. They found that when structure was at its lowest, the validity of the interview was only .20; however, at its highest structure level, the validity of the interview was .57.

McDaniel, Whetzel, Schmidt, and Mauer (1994) conducted an exhaustive meta-analysis on the validity of the employment interview. They looked at different components of the interview, including the content of the interview (situational, job related, or psychological), structure, and the criteria measured. Correcting for range restriction, the authors reported an average validity of .37 between interviews and job performance. Additionally for training performance and job tenure McDaniel et al. found validity coefficients of .36 and .20 respectively. For job performance as the criterion, situational interviews (.50) had the highest validity over job related (.39) and psychological (.29) interviews. When comparing structured versus unstructured interviews, structured interviews (.44) had higher validity for job performance than unstructured interviews (.33).

On the subject of the criterion-related validity of the employment interview, although early research did not find the employment interview to be a valid selection instrument, the current stance in the literature is that employment interviews do have adequate validity for job performance. Unlike research before the early 1980’s, the
pendulum has swung back in favor of the employment interview. One of the major findings from the more recent meta-analyses was that structured interviews had higher validity than unstructured interviews.

*Interview Construct Validity*

A second major area of research has been on the construct validity of employment interviews. These studies primarily focused on what constructs were being measured by interviews. Many different constructs have been looked at within the interview, including cognitive ability (e.g. Berry, Sackett, & Landers, 2007; Cortina, Goldstein, Payne, Davidson, & Gilliland, 2000; Huffcutt, Roth, & McDaniel, 1996; Salgado & Moscoso 2002), personality (e.g. Barrick, Patton, & Haugland, 2000; Conway & Peneno, 1999; Huffcutt, Conway, Roth, & Stone, 2001; Roth, van Iddekinge, Huffcutt, Edison, and Schmidt (2005); Salgado & Moscosco, 2002; van Dam, 2003; van Iddekinge, Raymark, & Roth, 2005), and other constructs (Allen, Facteau, & Facteau, 2004; Blackman & Funder, 2002; Lievens, Harris, Van Keer, & Bisqueret, 2003; Sue-Chan & Latham, 2004; Townsend, Bacigalupi, & Blackman, 2007)

A meta-analysis conducted by Huffcutt, Roth, and McDaniel (1996) demonstrated a positive relationship between the employment interview and cognitive ability. They reported an average validity coefficient of .40, correcting for range restriction and measurement error, suggesting that on average approximately 16% of the variance in interview constructs represents cognitive ability. Huffcutt et al. looked at interview structure as a moderator of the interview-ability relationship. The results showed a .52 interview-ability correlation for low structured interviews and a correlation of .35 for high structured interviews. As the structure of the interview increased, the interview
correlation with cognitive ability decreased. Thus ability accounted for more variance in unstructured than structured interview scores. These results suggested that structured interview scores measured constructs beyond ability.

Cortina, Goldstein, Payne, Davidson, and Gilliland (2000) used a combination of meta-analysis and regression to determine the incremental validity on job performance that structured interviews had over cognitive ability and conscientiousness. Cortina et al. reported their results, accounting for range restriction. From the meta-analyses, Cortina et al. found a weak relationship between unstructured interviews and cognitive ability (.06). However, for structured interviews Cortina et al. reported a moderate relationship between interviews and cognitive ability (.25). Note that these findings contradict the findings from the Huffcut et al. (1996) study cited above. Cortina et al. also found that the relationship between structured interviews and conscientiousness was moderate (.26). Lastly they found from their regression analyses that interviews accounted for variance in job performance above both cognitive ability and conscientiousness.

Salgado and Moscoso (2002) investigated the construct validity of the interview by using meta-analysis to examine multiple constructs, including general mental ability, job knowledge, job experience, situational judgments, the Big Five personality dimensions, grade point average, and social skills. They divided interviews into two different groups based on interview content. These groups were conventional interviews and behavior interviews (Janz, 1982; Janz, Hellervik, & Gilmore, 1986). Conventional interviews were composed of questions directed at checking credentials, description of experience, and self-evaluative information. Behavior interviews included questions directed at job knowledge, job experience, and behavior descriptions. In regards to
general mental ability, accounting for unreliability and range restrictions, Salgado and Moscoso found a stronger correlation between conventional interviews and general mental ability (.41) than behavior interviews and general mental ability (.28).

A more recent meta-analysis conducted by Berry, Sackett, and Landers (2007) examined the correlation (corrected for range restriction) between interviews and cognitive ability. Compared to earlier meta-analyses examining the relationship between interviews and cognitive ability, Berry et al. found a smaller correlation (.27) between interviews and cognitive ability. Berry et al. also looked at the moderating effects of interview structure and format on the relationship between interviews and cognitive ability. Similar to the findings of Huffcutt et al. (1996), Berry et al. found that lower interview structure led to a stronger interview-ability relationship. In regards to interview format, it was found that the situational interview format had a stronger interview-ability correlation than the behavioral description interview format. This most recent meta-analysis controlled for studies where the interviewers had previous access to cognitive ability scores and restriction of range issues.

Many studies (e.g. Barrick, Patton, & Haugland, 2000; Conway & Peneno, 1999; Huffcutt, Conway, Roth, & Stone, 2001; Roth, van Iddekinge, Huffcutt, Edison, & Schmidt, 2005; Salgado & Moscosco, 2002; van Dam, 2003; van Iddekinge, Raymark, & Roth, 2005) investigated the relationship between employment interviews and personality. For example, the previously mentioned meta-analysis study by Salgado and Moscoso found a positive relationship between conventional interviews and personality. Salgado and Moscoso reported corrected correlations of .38, .34, .30, .26, and .28.
between conventional interviews with emotional stability, extraversion, openness to experience, agreeableness, and conscientiousness respectively.

Conway and Peneno (1999) examined the construct validity of general interview questions, situational interview questions, and patterned behavior description interview questions. In regards to personality, Conway and Peneno found that general interview questions reflected personality the most. They found positive correlations between personality traits and general interview questions, with the highest correlations being between general interview questions with Agreeableness (.17) and Neuroticism (.16).

Huffcutt, Conway, Roth, and Stone (2001) conducted an exhausted search of the employment interview literature in order to develop a taxonomy of constructs measured by employment interviews. After analyzing the results of 47 studies, Huffcutt et al. identified seven constructs measured by interviews, including general mental ability, knowledge and skills, personality, applied social skills, interests and preferences, organizational fit, and physical attributes. The most frequently measured construct was personality. Conscientiousness was the most frequently measured personality trait.

Roth, van Iddekinge, Huffcutt, Edison, and Schmidt (2005) examined personality saturation in the employment interview. The construct validity of personality was measured in both situational and behavioral interviews. Overall Roth et al. found that the relationship between self-reported personality and structured interviews was generally low. One of the main conclusions from the Roth et al. study was that structured interviews do not capture personality unless they are intended to measure it.

Van Iddekinge, Raymark, and Roth (2005) intentionally measured personality with their study design, in order to measure response inflation of interviewees. The
personality traits measured by van Iddekinge et al. were agreeableness, conscientiousness, and emotional stability. Interviewees completed the NEO Personality Inventory to assess personality. Interviewers assessed interviewee personality with this same scale. Using multitrait-multimethod analysis and confirmatory factor analysis, van Iddekinge et al. found evidence for the construct related validity of personality interviews. Thus, the authors found that personality could be measured intentionally.

In addition to cognitive ability and personality, construct-related validity studies of interviews have looked at additional constructs. In addition to cognitive ability and personality, the meta-analysis study conducted by Salgado and Moscosco (2002) found that employment interviews can measure job knowledge, job experience, situational judgment, grade point average, and social skills. More recently, studies have found that employment interviews can measure integrity and counterproductive work behaviors (Blackman & Funder, 2002; Townsend, Bacigalupi, & Blackman, 2007). Emotional intelligence (Sue-Chan & Latham, 2004), organizational citizenship behaviors (Allen, Facteau, & Facteau, 2004), and self-discipline, tenacity-resilience, teamwork, and cross-cultural awareness (Lievens, Harris, Van Keer, & Bisqueret, 2003) were other constructs that have been measured in employment interview studies.

Interviewer-Applicant Similarity in the Employment Interview

Many past research studies have examined interviewer-applicant similarity. These studies investigated how similarities on demographic characteristics or attitudes influence interview processes and outcomes. Demographic similarity refers to the effect of similarity of race or gender between the interviewer and applicant on the outcomes of an employment interview. Attitude similarity often refers to the effect of similarity of
personality or attitudinal variables between the interviewer and applicant on the outcomes of an employment interview.

Two perspectives that have been adopted to explain how interviewer-applicant similarity effects interview outcomes are the similarity-attraction paradigm (Byrne, 1961) and social identity theory (Ashforth & Mael, 1989; Tajfel & Turner, 1986). The similarity-attraction paradigm suggests that people rate similar others positively, because they “like” those who are similar to them. This global evaluation of “liking” can influence interviewers to also infer other positive attributes. For example, if a female is interviewing another female applicant, this can cause the interviewer to “like” the applicant and will subsequently assume that the applicant has other positive attributes. The social identity paradigm suggests that our self-concept is tied to the groups (e.g. demographic groups) that we belong to. In order for us to maintain positive self-concepts, we tend to give favorable evaluations of our own in-group and people who belong to our in-group. Thus, if a Black interviewer is interviewing a Black applicant, the interviewer may give a positive rating to the applicant, because it would be consistent with his favorable evaluation of his own in-group.

Below is a short summary of studies that have examined interviewer-applicant similarity. Overall there is mixed findings for interviewer-applicant similarity. A review of studies looking at demographic similarity will be presented first, followed by a review of studies looking at attitudinal similarity.

*Demographic Similarity.* Overall, the results of studies examining demographic similarity have been mixed (McCarthy, van Iddekinge, & Campion, 2010), with the results ranging from no effects for demographic similarity to small to moderate effects.
The reason for these mixed results can be attributed to a number of factors, including differences in study design (lab versus field), sample size differences, and interview type (e.g. type of structure versus unstructured, or panel versus one-on-one). Over the last 12 years, there have been five published studies (e.g. Buckley, Jackson, Bolino, Veres, & Feild, 2007; Goldberg, 2005; McCarthy et al., 2010; McFarland, Ryan, Sacco, & Krista, 2004; Sacco, Scheu, Ryan, & Schmitt, 2003) that have examined demographic similarity. Below is a review of these most recent studies.

Sacco et al. (2003) examined demographic similarity by using data from 12,203 undergraduate applicants who participated in recruiting interviews for a variety of jobs in a large manufacturing firm. These applicants were students who were soon to graduate from college. They were administered one-on-one behavioral based interviews from one of 708 college recruiters. The unique aspect of this study was that it used hierarchical linear modeling (HLM) to test the effects of race (White, Black, Asian, Hispanic) and gender similarity on ratings. Overall, Sacco et al. did not find any significant effects of race or gender similarity on ratings. The authors attributed the lack of an effect on the fact that the interviews were highly structured and were designed from job analysis.

McFarland et al. (2004) looked at race similarity in 1,334 police officer applicants and 21 interviewers. Interviews consisted of situational judgment questions and were conducted by three mixed-race panels of interviewers. The authors wanted to see the effect of mixed-race panel composition on ratings of applicants. Results of the study showed that predominantly White panels provided significantly higher ratings to applicants of all races compared to predominantly Black panels. Lastly, the authors found
that Black raters evaluated Black applicants more favorably when on predominantly Black panels.

Goldberg (2005) used data from 273 recruiter-applicant pairs. Recruiters and applicants were recruited from career service offices from three separate colleges. Goldberg had recruiters who were conducting the interviews complete surveys before and after their interviews. Demographic information for both the recruiter and applicant was collected, along with the recruiters’ overall assessment of the interview with the applicant. A follow up phone call was made between two and four months after the interview in order to see whether the applicant was offered the position. Results from the study showed no significant effect for gender similarity or age similarity. In fact, an effect for gender dissimilarity was found, where male recruiters preferred female applicants. Lastly, only a small effect was found for race similarity. White recruiters rated White applicants higher. No differences were found for Black recruiters who rated Black applicants.

Buckley et al. (2007) examined the effect of racial similarity in interview panels. In this study Buckley et al. created four-member interview panels with White and Black raters. The interview panel compositions were manipulated so that all White/Black racial combinations were represented in the study. Interview panels watched 73 videotaped interview responses from police officer candidates responding to situational interview questions. Results from the study showed a small effect for racial similarity. Specifically it was found that primarily Black panels rated Black applicants higher than White applicants, and primarily White panels rated White applicants higher than Black applicants.
McCarthy et al. (2010) examined the effects of interviewer-applicant gender and race (White, Black, Hispanic, and Asian) similarity on ratings. In this study, 73 interviewers administered three interviews (experienced-based, situational, and past-behavioral) to 19,931 applicants. Interviewers worked in pairs. Based on HLM analysis, McCarthy et al. did not find any significant effects of gender and race similarity on interview ratings. They attributed their findings of no demographic similarity effects to the high structure of the interviews used in the study.

**Attitudinal Similarity.** Attitudinal similarity is another form of similarity that can effect interviewer perceptions of applicants. Although interviewers can easily discern similarity based on demographics, attitudinal similarity is less obvious but can be potentially more important (Posthuma et al. 2002). Attitudinal similarity can trigger increased applicant liking and can influence ratings and the types of questions asked (Graves, 1993). The number of studies on attitudinal similarity within the last ten years is sparse compared to the studies on demographic similarity. Below is a review of three recent studies that have looked at interviewer-applicant attitudinal similarity.

Kristof-Brown, Barrick, and Franke (2002) examined personality and impression management tactics as antecedents of interviewer perceptions of similarity. In this study 25 human resource representatives conducted mock interviews with 72 undergraduate participants. Participants were instructed to interview as if they were applying for a job in their business field (e.g. finance, human resources). After completing the 30-minute interviews, participants completed surveys on their personality and use of impression management tactics, while interviewers completed surveys on their perceived similarity to the applicant. Results from this study showed that agreeableness was associated with
the non-verbal cue impression management tactic, which in turn influenced interviewers’ perceptions of similarity. The primary purpose of this study was to examine how personality and impression management influenced interviewer perceptions of fit; however, it did not look at how fit influenced interviewer ratings of applicants. Thus, although helpful in understanding antecedents of fit perceptions, this study did not examine how fit perceptions translate to interviewer ratings.

Sears and Rowe (2003) looked at the similarity in regards to the interviewer and applicant personality. In this study, conscientiousness of student participants was measured and subsequently these participants had to watch interviews of two different candidates exuding high and low levels of conscientiousness respectively. Participants then rated candidates on their job suitability. Results showed that participants who were high in conscientiousness rated candidates high in conscientiousness higher on job suitability. This result did not extend for raters low in conscientiousness and candidates low in conscientiousness. Thus, the findings from Sears and Rowe show that interviewer personality could interact with applicant personality to influence perceptions of applicants.

Garcia, Posthuma, and Collela (2008) tested a path model linking demographic similarity and human capital similarity to interviewer’s perception of similarity, mediating variables (e.g. liking, expected performance, and applicant fit), and subsequent hiring recommendations. Human capital was considered one’s years of education, academic major, years of experience, and GPA. In this study, data from 114 interviewer-applicant pairs were examined from actual interviews conducted in a university career center. Information on applicants’ demographics and human capital was taken.
Interviewers’ demographic and human capital information were measured in addition to their perceptions similarity and perceptions of the applicant. The results from the study showed that perceptions of similarity were positively related to liking the applicant and expected performance. However, expected performance was the only significant mediator between perceptions of similarity and perceptions of applicant fit. Perception of applicant fit was positively related to hiring recommendation. Thus, perception of interviewer-applicant similarity was indirectly related to hiring recommendation.

*Employment Interview Summary*

Summarizing the previous research on the employment interview, it can be concluded that the interview is an important tool as it has strong criterion-related validity and it can measure a variety of constructs (e.g. cognitive ability, personality). Previous studies examining interviewer-applicant similarity were reviewed. Recent interviewer-applicant similarity studies have primarily looked at demographic similarity and have found mixed results. Less attention has been given to attitudinal similarity, with two studies (Garcia et al., 2008; Sears & Rowe, 2002) in the last ten years finding support for similarity (in personality and human capital) being related to higher ratings or hiring recommendations.

Although less attention has been given to attitudinal similarity in recent years, attitudinal similarity can be potentially more important (Posthuma et al., 2002). To date no study has looked at similarity in regulatory focus between an interviewer and applicant, which is the goal of this dissertation. The following section will review regulatory focus theory and its related constructs.
Regulatory Focus Theory

Self-regulation is the process of attaining and maintaining goals (Vancouver & Day, 2005). It occurs in relation to both desired end states and undesired end states (Higgins, 2000). The distinction between approaching desired end states and avoiding undesired end states have been modeled by animal learning-biological models (e.g. Gray, 1982; Hull, 1952; Konorski, 1967; Lang, 1995; Miller, 1944; Mowrer, 1960), cybernetic-control models (e.g. Carver & Scheier, 1990; Powers, 1973), and dynamic models (e.g. Atkinson, 1964; Lewin, 1935; Lopes, 1987; McClelland, Atkinson, Clark, & Lowell, 1953). Self-regulatory processes in the workplace have been of common interest to both practitioners and organizational researchers (Kanfer, 2005). Topics in the workplace such as goal setting, goal attainment, and goal revision, along with many others have all been examined under the framework of self-regulation. Regulatory focus theory (Higgins, 1997, 1998) is a theory of self-regulation, and it has often been applied to understand various processes and behaviors in the workplace. It is the goal of the present study to use regulatory focus theory in order to help better understand motivations surrounding an interviewer.

Defining Regulatory Focus

According to Higgins (2000), “regulatory focus theory assumes that self-regulation operates differently when serving fundamentally different needs, such as the distinct survival needs of nurturance (e.g. nourishment) and security (e.g. protection),” (p. 1219). Parents’ social regulation styles can have a heavy influence on their children’s regulatory focus. For example, some parents can emphasize nurturance by displaying and withholding love when desired end states are met or unmet. Conversely, parents can
emphasize security by safeguarding to meet desired end states. These social regulatory styles can influence an individual’s view about getting along in the world. The nurturant social regulatory style represents a promotion focus, in which self-regulation is concerned with the presence or absence of positive outcomes. A prevention focus is represented by the security social regulatory style. This regulatory focus style is concerned with the presence or absence of negative outcomes.

Earlier work by Higgins (1991) on self-discrepancy theory displays how caregiver-child interactions can influence regulatory focus of the child. In some instances, this relationship can breed a strong promotion focus, reflecting hopes, wishes, and aspirations (strong ideals); however, in other instances the caregiver-child relationship can foster a strong prevention focus, reflecting duties, responsibility, and obligations (strong oughts). In relation to accomplishing goals, self-discrepancies and self-congruence are both represented by these ideals and oughts. Ideals, represented by hopes, wishes, and aspirations serve as maximal goals. Self-discrepancies to these ideals represent a lack of positive outcomes while self-congruence represents the presence of these positive outcomes. Thus, ideal self-regulation involves promotion focus concerns with advancement, aspirations, and accomplishments. Individuals who have a promotion focus are concerned with optimizing the presence of positive outcomes, and minimizing the lack of positive outcomes. Related to these positive or lack of positive outcomes, success and failure result in cheerfulness- and dejection-related emotions respectively. Oughts, represented by duties, obligations, and responsibilities serve as minimal goals. Self-discrepancies to these oughts represent a presence of negative outcomes while self-congruence represents a lack of negative outcomes. Ought self-regulation represents
prevention focus concerns with protection, safety, and responsibilities. Individuals who have a prevention focus are concerned with minimizing the presence of negative outcomes. Related to these lack of or presence of negative outcomes, success and failure result in quiescence- and agitation-related emotions.

To this point, regulatory focus has been discussed from an individual differences perspective; however, regulatory focus can be situationally induced. Momentary situations can influence individuals to attain goals differently. Feedback from a boss to an employee or a teacher to a student can communicate gain-nongain concerns with the presence and absence of positive outcomes (promotion focus). Additionally, this same feedback can be communicated from a perspective of nonloss-loss, with concerns related to the absence or presence of negative outcomes (prevention focus). Therefore, depending on how instructions or feedback is framed, individuals may be induced by the situation to approach a task differently than their biological orientation.

Individuals with different regulatory foci differ in their means of goal pursuit (Crowe & Higgins, 1997; Higgins, 1997, 1998). Regulatory focus theory distinguishes between eagerness means and vigilant means of goal pursuit. Higgins (2000) described these means of goal pursuit in signal detection terms. Eagerness involves ensuring correct hits and ensuring against errors of omission or misses, and vigilance involves ensuring correct rejections and ensuring against errors of commission or false alarms. It is proposed by regulatory focus theory that there is a natural fit between promotion focus concerns and eager means of goal pursuit, because eagerness means ensure the presence of positive outcomes (ensure hits) and ensure against the absence of positive outcomes (ensure against errors of omission). For example, an interviewer would want to make sure
he selects the best candidates (ensure hits), and makes sure he doesn’t reject qualified candidates as well (ensure against errors of omission). Regulatory focus theory also proposes that there is a natural fit between prevention focus concerns and the use of vigilance means, because vigilance means ensure the absence of negative outcomes (ensure correct rejections), and ensure against the presence of negative outcomes (ensure against errors of commission). For example, an interviewer would want to be careful, making sure that he is rejecting a poor fitting employee (ensure correct rejection), and not selecting a poor fitting one (ensure against errors of commission).

Assessing Regulatory Focus

As described above, regulatory focus can be assessed from both trait and state perspectives. To date, there have been several scales that assess trait level regulatory focus. When assessing state-level regulatory focus, a majority of the studies will assume the regulatory focus orientation that has been primed by the situation. The following section will review scales that have been used to assess trait-level regulatory focus and common methods used to prime state-level regulatory focus.

Trait-level regulatory focus. Regulatory focus can be examined as a stable individual difference. It is initially influenced by one’s interaction with his/her parents (Higgins, 1997), but later solidified through positive and negative experiences with different goals (Higgins et al., 2001), and concerns with actual/ideal or actual/ought self discrepancies (Higgins, 1997). To date there have been several scales (Higgins, Bond, Klein, & Strauman, 1986; Higgins, Friedman, Harlow, Idson, Ayduk, & Taylor, 2001; Jordan, Lockwood, & Kunda, 2002; Wallace & Chen, 2006) developed to assess trait-level regulatory focus. These scales are described below.
One of the earliest measures of trait-level regulatory focus was the Selves Questionnaire (Higgins et al., 1986), which was based off of Higgins’s self discrepancy theory. The Selves Questionnaire compares one’s actual, ideal, and ought selves. Participants are asked to list attributes and rate the extent to which they actually possess, would ideally like to possess, or believe they ought to possess their listed attributes. The listed attributes for the actual self are compared to those of the ideal and ought selves. Discrepancies between the actual/ideal selves and actual/ought selves are calculated based on the matches/mismatches of the actual selves attribute list with the ideal/ought selves attribute lists. According to Higgins et al. discrepancies indicate the extent to which an individual is concerned with a promotion or prevention focus. Larger discrepancies indicate a greater self-regulatory concern. Thus, actual-ideal self-discrepancies indicate activation of a promotion focus, while actual-ought self-discrepancies indicate activation of a prevention focus.

Higgins, Shah, and Friedman (1997) later adapted the Selves Questionnaire, to create a measure of “Self Guide Strength.” The Self Guide Strength measure is based off of attitude accessibility research, which states that stronger attitudes are more readily accessible in memory. Thus, the Self Guide Strength measure is an adapted version of the Selves Questionnaire, which is administered via computer, with reaction times recorded for each participant. The time it takes for participants to list ideal/ought self attributes and to rate each of them is recorded. Faster reaction times indicate a stronger self-regulatory concern.

Higgins et al. (2001) developed the Regulatory Focus Questionnaire (RFQ), a self-report questionnaire used to assess trait-level regulatory focus. Working off of the
premise that past success with promotion-related eagerness results in people using eagerness means to approach new tasks, and past success in vigilant-related vigilance results in individuals using vigilant means to approach new tasks, the RFQ asks respondents about their subjective past histories of using promotion or prevention related strategies. The RFQ is an 11-item scale that asks respondents to respond to items about their past success or failures with accomplishing positive outcomes (promotion focus) or avoiding negative outcomes (prevention focus). There are six items reflecting the promotion focus subscale and five items reflecting the prevention focus subscale. Higgins et al. demonstrated adequate convergent and discriminant validity, along with strong reliability (internal consistency and test-retest reliability) of the RFQ in a series of studies.

A second self-report measure of trait-level regulatory focus was the General Regulatory Focus Measure (GRFM), developed by Lockwood et al. (2002; study 3). The GRFM asks respondents to endorse items reflecting promotion and prevention goals. The GRFM is divided into two distinct 9-item subscales. Respondents endorse items indicating the frequency to which they think of the specific promotion or prevention item. Lockwood et al. found that the promotion subscale was related to recalling influential positive role models, while the prevention subscale was related to recalling influential negative role models. These results lend support to the GRFM being an adequate self-report measure of chronic regulatory focus.

Although, there are two popular self-report measures in the literature, upon further examination, each self-report measure may be measuring different components of regulatory focus. The RFQ, which was initially based off of Higgins et al. (1986) work on
self-discrepancy and self-guide theory, has a tendency to tap past promotion/prevention experiences, especially with parental figures. The GRFM, which was originally developed off of a “reference point” definition of regulatory focus, emphasizes success/failure or gain/loss. In an attempt to examine the self-report regulatory focus measures further, Summervile and Roese (2008) conducted a study comparing the RFQ and GRFM. Summervile and Roese found that the constructs measured by the GRFM overlapped with Carver and White’s (1994) BIS/BAS sensitivity scale, but the RFQ did not overlap with this scale. In addition, when correlated with the PANAS (Watson, Clark, & Tellegen, 1984), the GRFM promotion and prevention subscales correlated with the PA and NA scales respectively. No relationships were found between the PANAS and the RFQ. The major conclusion of this study was that the GRFM and the RFQ were examining different components of regulatory focus theory. Whereas the RFQ is examining past experiences, the GRFM captures non-loss and non-gain situations, which are closely related to the affect captured by the BIS/BAS and PANAS scales.

Most recently, Wallace and colleagues (Wallace & Chen, 2006; Wallace, Chen, & Kanfer, 2005; Wallace, Johnson, & Frazier, 2009) developed the Regulatory Focus at Work Scale (RWS). Operating off of the premise that one’s work-related regulatory focus is moderately stable over time (Brockner & Higgins, 1997) the RWS aims to measure one’s regulatory focus at work, similar to other individual difference variables. According to Wallace and Chen (2006), work-specific regulatory focus is due to both stable personal attributes (e.g. personality) and malleable situational stimuli (e.g. leadership and work climate). Whereas the RFQ and GRFM measure one’s chronic self-regulatory inclination, the RWS also captures the aspect of regulatory focus at work that
can be influenced by situational cues (e.g. leadership and work climate). The RWS is a twelve-item scale separated into promotion and prevention focus subscales. Over a series of studies, Wallace et al. (2009) demonstrated that the RWS was reliable, valid, and showed incremental validity beyond other trait regulatory focus measures in predicting work related outcomes such as task, citizenship, safety, and productivity performance.

*State-level regulatory focus.* Regulatory focus can be momentarily primed through different environmental cues. By having individuals think about their hopes/aspirations and duties/obligations, focus on positive or negative outcomes, or write about their ideals and oughts, state level regulatory focus can be induced by the situation. Three common priming techniques have been utilized by Freitas and Higgins (2002), Higgins et al. (2001), and Higgins, Roney, Crowe, and Hymes (1994).

Freitas and Higgins (2002; study 2) primed regulatory focus by having participants think about current ideals or oughts. To prime promotion, participants were asked to, “Please think about something you ideally would like to do. In other words, think about a hope or aspiration that you currently have. Please list the hope or aspiration in the space below,” (p. 3). To prime a prevention focus, participants were asked to, “Please think about something you think you ought to do. In other words, think about a duty or obligation that you currently have. Please list the duty or obligation in the space below,” (p. 3). Participants then had to list either five eager-related or vigilant-related action plans, and rate their anticipated enjoyment of implementing those plans. Consistent with the authors’ expectations, the participants who were induced with a state-level promotion focus rated their eager-related action plans the highest. A similar result was found for participants who were induced with a state-level prevention focus and their
enjoyment ratings of vigilant-related action plans. Thus, since participants rated the goal pursuit strategies that were consistent with their state-level regulatory focus the highest, it can be concluded that the priming manipulation was effective.

Higgins et al. (2001; study 5) primed regulatory focus by having participants write about their past regulatory successes or failures. Participants were asked to write about three circumstances when they experienced promotion (or prevention) success. For example, in the promotion success condition, participants were asked to write about a time, “when they felt like they were made progress toward being successful in life; compared to most people they were able to get what they wanted out of life; when trying to achieve something important to them, they performed as well as they ideally would like to,” (p. 19). After being primed, participants were asked to list up to seven goals, and up to seven ways to obtain those goals. The results from this study showed that participants who were primed to think about promotion successes more means per goal, reflecting an eager means of goal pursuit. Participants in the prevention success condition listed fewer means per goal, reflecting a vigilant goal pursuit. Thus, since participants’ goal pursuit strategies reflected the primed regulatory focus goal orientations, one can conclude that the priming manipulation utilized by Higgins et al. was effective.

Other researchers (Higgins, Roney, Crowe, & Hymes, 1994; Freitas & Higgins, 2002; Freitas, Liberman, & Higgins, 2002; Higgins, Bond, Klein, & Strauman, 1986; Liberman et al., 2001; Strauman & Higgins, 1987) primed regulatory focus by having individuals think about their hopes and aspirations (promotion focus), or duties and obligations (prevention focus). Higgins et al. (1994) originally utilized this priming technique. To prime a promotion focus, they asked participants to write a short essay on
their hopes and aspirations. Participants were asked to briefly describe their current hopes and goals and to include a discussion of how they differed from their hopes and goals as they were growing up. Participants in the prevention condition were asked to briefly describe their current sense of duty and obligation and to include a discussion of how it differed from their sense of duty and obligation as they were growing up. After being primed, participants read an excerpt about four days in the life of a student, and they were asked to freely recall events from the excerpt. Higgins et al. recorded the number of events that would describe approaching and avoiding matches and mismatches to desired end states. Results from this study showed that participants primed with a promotion focus recalled more events that described approaching matches, whereas those primed with a prevention focus recalled more events that would be described as avoiding mismatches. Thus, since the primed regulatory focus matched the type of events recalled, one can conclude that the priming technique utilized by Higgins et al. was successful.

Regulatory Fit

Higgins (2000, 2005) suggests that one’s orientation to a goal can be sustained (regulatory fit) or disrupted (regulatory non-fit) by the strategy used to achieve the goal. Individuals with a promotion orientation prefer eager goal pursuit strategies, while individuals with a prevention orientation prefer vigilant goal pursuit strategies (Cesario, Gramt, & Higgins, 2004; Crowe & Higgins, 1997). When one’s orientation to a goal matches the means used to approach the goal, it will produce a state of regulatory fit. For example, regulatory fit would occur if a person who is promotion focused used eager means to pursue a goal or if a person who is prevention focused used vigilant means to
pursue a goal. According to Cesario (2006), this experience of regulatory fit can have motivational, experiential, and evaluative implications.

Studies have shown that experiencing regulatory fit can increase individuals’ motivation (e.g. Forster, Higgins, & Idson, 1998; Shah, Higgins, & Friedman, 1998), increase individuals’ imagining feeling better (worse) when making a desirable (undesirable) choice (e.g. Idson, Liberman, & Higgins, 2000a; 2000b), and increase alertness in individuals and their positive post-decision evaluations (e.g. Idson et al., 2000b). Additionally, when regulatory fit occurs, studies have shown that individuals prospectively and retrospectively enjoy goal pursuit more (e.g. Freitas & Higgins, 2000; Higgins & Idson, 2000). Lastly, individuals assign higher monetary value to an object they have chosen when the decision was made with regulatory fit (e.g. Higgins & Idson, 2000). Thus, experiencing regulatory fit has been shown in previous studies to influence individuals’ processes and motivation during tasks, and their evaluations both before and after tasks. The following sections will attempt to explain how these outcomes of regulatory fit occur. The main premise is that when individuals experience fit, they “feel right” about the task, and this “feeling of rightness” can influence other outcomes of fit.

Feeling of Rightness. Higgins (2000, 2005) proposed that one of the mechanisms of the effect of regulatory fit on individuals’ experience is a “feeling of rightness.” According to Cesario and Higgins (2008), “when individuals experience regulatory fit they feel right about what they are doing, and this experience of feeling right can inform their evaluation of different aspects of the activity,” (p. 416). Researchers (Appelt, Zou, & Higgins, 2010; Cesario et al., 2004) describe “feeling of rightness” as a nonemotional subjective experience in which people feel that their goal pursuit is correct and fitting.
This feeling is distinct from feeling good from a hedonic pleasant positive mood. Feeling of rightness intensifies people’s evaluative responses to what they are doing (Appelt, Zou, Arora, & Higgins, 2009). That is, it doesn’t alter people’s response valence; however, it increases one’s response magnitude. Therefore, attitudes that are already positive will be perceived as more positive, and attitudes that are already negative will be perceived as more negative when individuals feel right about what they are doing.

Past regulatory fit studies have demonstrated the “feeling of rightness” outcome of regulatory fit. Cessario and Higgins (2008) looked at the regulatory fit between a message source and another person. In this study, participants’ regulatory focus was measured with the RFQ, and then they watched a video of a person advocating an after-school assistance program for children. Half of the participants watched a video of the advocate displaying promotion focus nonverbal cues, while the other half watched a video of the advocate displaying prevention focus nonverbal cues. One of the dependent variables used in this study was a “feeling of rightness” index, which was a scale asking participants to indicate the extent to which how “right” or “wrong” they felt about the program. Results from this study showed a significant interaction between individuals’ trait level regulatory focus and the message source regulatory focus (promotion or prevention focus delivery) on “feeling of rightness,” $\beta = .75$, $t(39) = 3.91$, $p < .001$. Cessario and Higgins examined the significance of the slope of the promotion and prevention focus delivery style. They concluded that the promotion focus delivery style produced a higher feeling of rightness for participants higher in promotion focus, $t(39) = 2.89$, $p = .006$. Similarly, for a prevention focus delivery style, participants higher in prevention focus reported higher feelings of rightness, $t(39) = -2.68$, $p < .01$. 
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Appelt et al. (2009; study 2) demonstrated the “feeling of rightness” in a study exploring buyer and seller regulatory focus in a negotiation setting. They made a case for buyers fitting a prevention focus, since buyers should be cautious in not overpaying. Conversely sellers should fit a promotion focus, since sellers should seek to maximize their profits. After, completing a negotiation over a notebook in a lab experiment, Appelt et al. had participants complete a scale measuring their subjective experience of fit during the negotiation. Applet et al. analyzed their data by using a 2 (chronic regulatory focus: prevention versus promotion) x 2 (role: buyer versus seller) ANOVA. They found a significant interaction between chronic regulatory focus and role on regulatory fit, $F(1, 98) = 5.55, p = .02$. The results of the study showed that participants who were in the fit conditions (e.g. prevention buyers and promotion sellers) reported higher subjective feelings of fit (rightness) than their counterparts (prevention sellers and promotion buyers).

Camacho et al. (2003) demonstrated how the “feeling of rightness” from manipulated fit transferred to moral evaluations in four studies. Participants had to recall past transgressions of omission and commission that they committed (study 1), and rated how guilty they felt. In study 1, a significant interaction between promotion focus and type of error was found, indicating that when one was high in promotion focus and committed an error of omission, they felt more “wrong,” $\beta = .61, p = .05$. A similar finding was demonstrated for prevention focus and error type, indicating that when one was high in prevention focus and committed an error of commission, they felt more “wrong,” $\beta = -.68, p < .05$. Thus when the type of transgression did not match their regulatory focus (e.g. error of omission and a promotion focus), individuals felt “wrong”
and in turn rated their feelings of guilt higher. In subsequent studies, participants had to recall past conflict resolutions made by authority figures in their past (study 3) and had to read about public policies (study 4). The results from study 3 revealed a significant interaction between promotion focus and the strategic resolution made by an authority figure ($\beta = .15, p < .05$), indicating that the higher an individual was in promotion focus, the more right he or she judged an eager resolution. Likewise, a significant interaction was found between a prevention focus and the strategic resolution by an authority figure ($\beta = -.15, p < .05$), indicating a higher feeling of rightness for individuals higher in prevention focus and who judged a vigilant resolution. In study 4, participants had to read a proposal of a policy change framed eagerly or vigilantly. Results from study 4, demonstrated that individuals high in promotion focus judged the eager proposal as more morally right ($\beta = .77, p < .05$), and individuals high in prevention focus judged the vigilant proposal as more morally right ($\beta = -.72, p = .06$). In both studies (studies 3 and 4), participants in the regulatory fit conditions rated their conflict resolution and public policies as more “right” than in the non-fit conditions.

The idea of “feeling of rightness” originally proposed by Higgins (2000, 2005) has been shown in many previous studies. To date a majority of the studies examining “feeling of rightness” elicit higher levels of this variable by manipulating (priming) participants’ state regulatory focus. Individuals who experience regulatory fit feel right because the manner in which they are accomplishing a task matches their natural (or primed) inclinations. The way a task is accomplished is equally as important as the outcome. The “feeling of rightness” has been described as a mechanism that can explain
the other outcomes of regulatory fit. The next sections will describe three of these outcomes – the “value from fit” hypothesis, liking, and task enjoyment.

*Value from fit.* Higgins (2000, 2005) also proposed the “value from fit” hypothesis, which was the idea that when individuals experience regulatory fit, the inherent value of a task increases. This value can transfer to the evaluation of objects and experiences. In a classic set of studies demonstrating the “value from fit” hypothesis, Higgins, Idson, Freitas, Spiegel, and Molden, (2003) examined participants’ estimated price of a mug. Participants completed the self guide strength measure to assess their self-regulatory orientation. They were then told that in addition to their usual payment for participation they could choose between a mug and pen as a gift. Higgins et al. (2003) framed the follow up instructions for making the decision between the mug and the pen with either eagerness or vigilance. Half of the participants received the eager strategy instructions, which asked them to think of what they could gain by choosing the mug or pen. The second half of the participants received the vigilant strategy instructions, which asked them to think of what they would lose by not choosing the mug or pen. As predicted, a majority of the participants choose the mug. When subsequently asked to estimate the price of the mug, participants in the fit conditions (e.g. chronic promotion focus – eager strategy and chronic prevention focus – vigilant strategy) estimated a higher price for the mug compared to participants in the non-fit conditions. Specifically, ideal strength and strategic framing interacted, $\beta = 1.15, F(1, 74) = 7.67, p < .01$, indicating that the higher an individual’s promotion focus, the higher the assigned value in the eager condition. Ought strength and strategic framing interacted, $\beta = -1.09, F(1, 74) = 8.47, p < .01$, indicating that the higher an individual’s prevention focus, the higher
the assigned value in the vigilant condition. Across multiple studies conducted by Higgins et al., participants in the regulatory fit conditions estimated the cost of the mug as 50 to 70% higher.

Researchers have demonstrated other examples of studies demonstrating the transfer of value from fit. For example, studies by Förster and Higgins (2005) and Brodscholl, Kober, and Higgins (2007) replicated the results of the Higgins et al. (2003) mug studies with modifications to the manipulation of fit. Avnet and Higgins (2003) found that people would be willing to spend over 40% more money on a book-light when they experience regulatory fit, $\beta = 64.15, F(1, 69) = 9.57, p < .03$. Avnet and Higgins (2006) found a similar finding, in that participants were willing to pay more for correction fluid after experiencing regulatory fit, $F(1, 59) = 7.53, p < .008$. The value from fit phenomena has also been applied to other nonmonetary post-task evaluations. Higgins et al. (2003, study 4) demonstrated that individuals who experience regulatory fit rated photos of dogs as more “good natured,” even when the prior task eliciting regulatory fit did not relate to the rating task, $F(1, 88) = 6.09, p < .02$. Idson, Liberman, & Higgins (2000, 2004) demonstrated that anticipating a desirable choice is more positive for promotion focused individuals, while anticipating an undesirable choice is more negative for prevention focused individuals.

Liking. Value from fit has been well defined and examined in past literature as stated above. Although it is traditionally defined as a value assigned to an inanimate object, value from fit has been operationalized to apply to perceptions of individuals. Two studies have incorporated liking as a proxy for value from fit. Sassenberg, Jonas, Shah, and Brazy (2007) measured individuals’ perception of group value as a proxy for
value from fit in a social context. In application of regulatory fit theory to leader-member exchange (LMX), Ritchie (2009) directly measured liking as a component of value from fit.

More recently, Hamstra, van Yperen, Wisse, and Sassenberg (2013) demonstrated liking as an outcome of regulatory fit in two experiments. In study 1, Hamstra et al. had their participants complete a regulatory focus measure, and then had them read a job application letter expressing promotion or prevention goals. Participants then completed measures of regulatory fit and liking. Results from study 1, demonstrated an interaction between letter type (promotion or prevention) and evaluator regulatory focus on liking, $B = .36, t(68) = 2.70, p < .01$. That is, when one’s regulatory focus matched the regulatory focus in the letter the evaluator liked the writer better. These results were for when both promotion and prevention focus matched. In study 2, Hamstra et al. replicated the findings from study 1, when the evaluator’s regulatory focus was manipulated. They further demonstrated in a mediation model, that the experience of regulatory fit mediated the relationship between matching and liking. When regulatory fit was added to the model of matching and liking, the relationship between matching and liking was no longer significant, $B = .27, t(57) = 1.02, p = .31$, and the direct effect between regulatory fit and liking was significant, $B = .48, t(57) = 6.30, p < .001$. Thus, although not conceptualized often, when applying value from fit to the context of people, liking has been operationalized similarly as value from fit as an outcome of regulatory fit.

*Enjoyment.* Consistent with the proposal of regulatory fit by Higgins (2000), Freitas and Higgins (2002) stated that a determinant in action enjoyment is the action’s fit with one’s phenomenological state. Based on this premise, one can conclude that when
one experiences regulatory fit, he/she will experience higher levels of enjoyment. Higgins would argue that this experience of enjoyment is due to the feeling of rightness that accompanies experiencing regulatory fit.

There have been multiple studies demonstrating enjoyment as an outcome of regulatory fit. In a study by Freitas and Higgins (2002, study 1), participants had their regulatory focus primed by completing an essay-writing task. In a second purportedly unrelated task, participants had to read several strategies for attaining a goal of earning a high GPA. Half of the participants received strategies framed in eagerness terms (e.g. complete homework promptly) while the other half received strategies framed in vigilance terms (e.g. stop procrastinating). Participants then had to rate how much they would enjoy each behavior. Results from this study showed that the participants in the promotion/eager strategy condition rated their strategies as more enjoyable than the participants in the nonfit conditions, $F(1, 79) = 5.44, p < .025$. In a second study by Freitas and Higgins, participants had their regulatory focus primed. However, during this second study, participants had to generate their own eager/vigilant strategies and subsequently had to rate their anticipated enjoyment. Results from this study demonstrated that when individuals were in the regulatory fit conditions, they rated their anticipated enjoyment significantly higher than when they were in the nonfit conditions, $F(1, 109) = 11.84, p < .001$. In a third study by Freitas and Higgins, participants had their regulatory focus primed, and were asked to identify “helpful” (eagerness) or “harmful” (vigilance) elements among an array of geometric figures. Results from this third study showed that individuals in the prevention focus – vigilance condition rated the task as more enjoyable, $F(1, 56) = 7.55, p < .01$. 
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Freitas, Liberman, and Higgins (2002) also demonstrated increased task enjoyment as an outcome of regulatory fit. They proposed that when completing a task, avoiding distractions would be consistent with a prevention focus orientation. When given a vigilant message decryption task (identifying counterfeit messages), participants who were presented with distractions rated the task as more enjoyable. Participants who were given an eager message decryption task (identifying authentic messages) who were not presented with distractions rated the task as more enjoyable. These findings between task and regulatory focus prime were significant, $\beta = .43, F(1, 86) = 5.66, p = .02$. These results mirrored those of a second study conducted by Freitas et al. where participants had their regulatory focus primed, and were required to solve math problems while trying to avoid distractions, $\beta = .42, F(1, 118) = 7.50, p < .01$. Participants who had a prevention focus primed and were presented with distractions while they solved math problems, rated the task as more enjoyable. Promotion focus primed participants who were not presented with distractions while they solved math problems rated the task as more enjoyable.

*Regulatory Fit and Social Interactions*

When Higgins (2000; 2005) originally defined regulatory fit, it was conceptualized as the relation between one’s orientation to an activity and the means used to pursue that activity. Specifically, regulatory fit would occur when promotion focus individuals complete tasks with eagerness, or when prevention focus individuals complete tasks with vigilance. The support for regulatory fit and its subsequent outcomes when one’s self-regulatory orientation matches the manner in which one completes a task has been consistent across the regulatory fit literature. Many of those studies were
described above. Fewer studies have examined how regulatory fit can be created when individuals with matching (or mismatching) regulatory foci interact. Since it is the goal of this dissertation to examine regulatory fit between two individuals, studies looking at how regulatory fit can be created through social interaction will be reviewed.

Evidence of the effects of regulatory fit occurring within social interaction has been demonstrated across multiple studies. For example, in the previously cited study by Cessario and Higgins (2008) regulatory fit was determined based on a match (or mismatch) between a person delivering a message and the participant who was receiving it. Participants in the fit conditions reported feeling more positive about the message and felt more persuaded by the argument of the message. Camacho et al. (2003, Study 3) had participants recall past conflict resolutions made by authority figures in their past and had them rate how right they felt those decisions were. Participants who were in the regulatory fit conditions (e.g. promotion focus participants recalling eager conflict resolutions and prevention focus participants recalling vigilant conflict resolutions) rated the decisions as more right compared to participants in the nonfit conditions. Galinsky, Leonardelli, Okhuysen, and Mussweiler (2005) examined the interaction of dyads in a negotiation setting. They found that dyads that were both promotion focused achieved jointly optimal outcomes in a negotiation setting, compared to pairs who were both prevention focused. Thus, in general, these studies show that social interaction, specifically between two individuals can elicit regulatory fit.

The extension of regulatory fit between individuals has been specifically applied to the context of leadership. Kark and van-Dijk (2007) proposed that specific leadership behaviors could elicit promotion and prevention orientations in followers. In regards to
regulatory fit, in an unpublished dissertation, Ritchie (2009) found partial support for regulatory fit, defined as congruence in regulatory focus between a supervisor and subordinate, being positively related to leader member exchange ratings, $\beta = .13, p < .10$. Moss, Ritossa, and Ngu (2006) found that corrective-avoidant behaviors associated with vigilant leadership, led to decreased affective ($\beta = -.18, t = -2.45, p < .05$) and normative ($\beta = -.17, t = -2.14, p < .05$) commitment in promotion-focused subordinates.

Regulatory fit has also been applied to groups. Sassenberg, Jonas, Shah and Brazy (2007) looked at power status of groups and how individuals with primary promotion or prevention foci perceived them. Operating off of the premise that the power and status of groups serves the regulatory focus needs of members, Sassenberg et al. found over a series of five studies that higher power groups fit the needs of a promotion focus by providing members with a better opportunity to sustain nurturance and achievement needs, while lower power groups fit the needs of a prevention focus due to a focus on safety and security. In another study related to group applications of regulatory fit, Spanjol, Tam, Qualls, Bohlmann (2011) used a product launch simulation and placed individuals into two-person teams, to examine the types of decisions dyads made. Spanjol et al. compared the decisions of the matched promotion, matched prevention, and mixed groups. They found that the matched promotion focus group (compared to the prevention focus) introduced a greater number of new products ($F(1, 39) = 23.12, p < .01$), had faster new product introductions ($F(1, 39) = 22.10, p < .01$), and more new product introductions ($F(1, 56) = 23.47, p < .01$). Spanjol and Tam (2010) examined dyadic decision making with a management simulation. They found change in decisions were
positively related with promotion focus dyads ($\beta = .48, p < .05$) and negatively related with prevention focus dyads ($\beta = - .71, p < .01$).

*Regulatory Focus Summary*

Summarizing the discussion of regulatory focus theory, the basic tenants of regulatory focus were introduced. Individuals adopting a promotion focus tend to focus on achievement opportunities and prefer to adopt an eager goal pursuit strategy, while individuals with a prevention focus are concerned with safety and security and prefer to adopt a vigilant goal pursuit strategy. Regulatory focus can be conceptualized as a stable individual difference variable or can be primed by the situation. Common methods such as the selves questionnaire or a variety of self-report measures were reviewed as assessment measures of trait-regulatory focus. Popular priming techniques used to elicit momentary, state-level regulatory focus were also reviewed above.

Regulatory fit, an extension of regulatory focus theory, had traditionally been defined as a relation between one’s orientation to an activity and the means used to pursue that activity. Past studies were reviewed, detailing common outcomes of regulatory fit, including a perceived feeling of rightness, value from fit, liking, and enjoyment. Although most traditional studies examined regulatory fit as a function of the relation between one’s orientation and goal pursuit means, recent regulatory fit studies applied the regulatory fit paradigm to look at dyadic social interactions between individuals with matching or mismatching regulatory foci.

It was the goal of this study to look at regulatory fit as a function of the match or mismatch of regulatory focus between two individuals. Before describing the specific outcomes implied by regulatory fit theory, it is important to also understand the basic
principles related to the person-environment literature. The following section will introduce one application of the person-environment literature and it is the goal to apply these definitions to the current study.

Person-Environment Fit

Person-environment fit is defined as the congruence, match, or similarity between the person and environment (Dawis, 1992; Edwards, 2008; Edwards, Caplan, & Harrison, 1998; Muchinsky & Monahan, 1987; Schneider, Kristof, Goldstein, & Smith, 1997). Person-environment fit has been conceptualized so as to look at the needs of the person and the rewards provided by the environment (Dawis & Lofquist, 1984; Porter & Lawler 1968), the abilities of the person and the demands of the environment (McGrath, 1976; Sells, 1970; Shirom, 1982), and the similarity between the person and the social environment, which includes individuals, groups, organizations, and vocations (Chatman, 1989; Holland, 1997; Meglino, Ravlin, & Adkins, 1989; Schneider, 1987).

In a large scale review of the P-E fit literature, Edwards (2008) reviewed various models of P-E fit applied to different organizational outcomes. Edwards gave a comprehensive review of a model of P-E fit applied to the work stress literature proposed by French, Caplan, and Harrison (Caplan, 1983; 1987; French & Kahn, 1962; French et al., 1974, 1982; Harrison, 1978, 1985). In regards to fit, French and Kahn were the first to distinguish between the objective and subjective person and environment. They defined the accuracy of one’s self-concept as the match between the objective and subjective person and the accuracy of perceptions of reality as the match between the objective and subjective environment.
French et al. (1974) further defined objective and subjective fit with equations. Objective fit ($F_o$) was defined as $F_o = E_o - P_o$, where $E_o$ is the objective environment and $P_o$ is the objective person. Subjective fit ($F_s$) was defined as $F_s = E_s - P_s$, where $E_s$ is the subjective environment and $P_s$ is the subjective person. French et al. also defined accuracy ($A$) as the accuracy of self-assessment ($A = P_o - P_s$). Another way to define accuracy is that it is the difference between the actual abilities of the person (objective person) and the abilities that the person perceives he/she possesses (subjective person).

Contact with reality ($C$) was defined as the congruence between one’s objective and subjective environment ($C = E_o - E_s$). A second way to define contact with reality is that it is the difference between the actual demands of the actual environment (objective environment) and the demands of the environment that the person perceives (subjective environment). One major conclusion of French et al. was that subjective fit was the key predictor of psychological strain. They further elaborated that individuals try to resolve misfit by either resolving their objective P-E fit (termed coping) or their subjective P-E fit (termed defense).

The definitions of objective and subjective fit originally defined by French et al. (1974) were further applied to models of P-E fit and work stress (Caplan, 1983, 1987; Harrison, 1978, 1985; French et al., 1982). These models accounted for the outcomes of stress and illness by proposing that the objective person and environment caused the subjective person and environment, which in turn led to strains and illness. Thus, objective fit was considered a distal predictor of the outcomes (e.g. strains and illness) of P-E fit. Objective fit was also considered an antecedent of subjective fit. Secondly, it was the perception of subjective fit that was a proximal cause of strains and illness.
Interviewer-Applicant Regulatory Fit: Development of Hypotheses

The goal of this study was to apply the basic principles of regulatory fit theory to the employment interview. Three potential models of how fit could influence an interviewer’s ratings of an applicant are introduced below. The definitions of P-E fit proposed by French, Caplan, and Harrison (Caplan, 1983; 1987; French & Kahn, 1962; French et al., 1974, 1982; Harrison, 1978, 1985) served as a foundation for these models. Hypotheses were developed to test these models. In what follows, first a model of objective fit will be presented. Secondly, a hybrid model of both objective and subjective fit will be presented. Lastly, a model of subjective fit will be presented.

Model of Objective Fit

French and Kahn (1962) proposed that objective fit was determined based on the true environment and one’s actual skills. Under this definition of fit, objective fit was created, and not influenced by one’s perceptions. This definition of fit was consistent with the ways regulatory fit was demonstrated in the studies cited above (e.g. Avnet & Higgins, 2003; Brodscholl, Kober, & Higgins, 2007; Förster & Higgins, 2005; Freitas & Higgins, 2002; Freitas, Liberman, & Higgins, 2002; Higgins et al., 2003). In these studies participants’ regulatory focus was primed (or their chronic regulatory focus was measured), and they participated in tasks in a manner that was congruent or incongruent with their orientation. These studies demonstrated that regulatory fit traditionally was examined similar to French and Kahn’s definition of objective fit, in that they manipulated the task environment but did not operationalize fit from a person’s subjective perspective. Figure 2.1 depicts a model of how past studies have demonstrated objective fit.
Figure 2.1. Depiction of objective fit. The true environment and an individual’s traits (Objective Fit) directly effects the dependent variable.

In addition to the robust findings showing an effect of one’s primed regulatory focus and the task they completed, recent studies demonstrated that fit could be created through social interaction between two individuals. Two of these studies applied regulatory fit to leadership, showing that congruence between leaders’ and followers’ regulatory focus influenced follower commitment (Moss et al., 2006) and LMX ratings (Ritchie, 2009). Other studies applied regulatory fit to groups, demonstrating that congruence of regulatory focus between two-person teams led to a greater level of change decisions made for promotion matched teams (Spanjol & Tam, 2010) and a greater number of new products introduced by promotion matched teams (Spanjol et al., 2011). Thus, these studies demonstrated that a match between two individuals’ regulatory foci could conceptualize regulatory fit.

As outlined above, traditional studies priming regulatory focus and having a participant complete a task in a congruent or incongruent manner were modeling objective fit since they were not asking participants to attend to their perceptions of fit created by the manipulations in the studies. In addition, recent studies demonstrated that regulatory fit effects were found between the social interactions of two individuals. That is, regulatory fit effects were demonstrated when two individuals’ regulatory foci were
congruent. Taken together, and being consistent with the original definition of objective
fit, it was expected that:

_Hypothesis 1_: Manipulated interviewer and applicant regulatory focus will effect
applicant ratings. Specifically, higher applicant ratings are expected when the
regulatory focus of the interviewer and applicant are congruent.

**Model of Objective and Subjective Fit**

French and Kahn (1962) also introduced the concept of subjective fit. Unlike
objective fit, which was the true match between the environment and one’s skills,
subjective fit was the fit that one perceived. Kristof (1996) proposed that perceived
(subjective) fit would have a greater impact on individual attitudinal outcomes, compared
to actual (objective) fit, which would be more influential on process and performance
outcomes. Since an applicant rating was the outcome variable in this study, and it was an
attitudinal variable, subjective fit was examined further. French et al. (1974) proposed
that objective fit was an antecedent of subjective fit. Figure 2.2 depicts a model of
objective fit being a distal predictor, and subjective fit being a proximal predictor of a
dependent variable.

![Figure 2.2](image)

*Figure 2.2. Objective fit is shown as a predictor of subjective fit. Subjective fit is shown
as a proximal predictor of a dependent variable.*

Relating to regulatory fit, priming studies demonstrated how one’s objective
environment influenced one’s perceptions. Three common priming techniques utilized by
Freitas and Higgins (2002), Higgins et al. (2001), and Higgins et al (1994) were
described above. These priming techniques momentarily induced a regulatory focus by having subjects concentrate on a situation and having them think about their hopes/aspirations and duties/obligations, focus on positive or negative outcomes, or write about their ideals and oughts.

Galinsky, Leonardelli, Okhuysen, and Mussweiler (study 2; 2005) adopted a context-specific prime of regulatory focus. In their study on negotiations, Galinsky et al. wanted to see how buyers with different regulatory foci negotiated a purchase of a building with a seller. Using a context-specific prime, they primed buyers with either a promotion or prevention orientation, by having them write down negotiation behaviors and outcomes they would hope to achieve (seek to avoid) and how they could promote (prevent) these behaviors. They found as expected that promotion focused negotiators achieved more beneficial outcomes than did prevention focused negotiators.

Consistent with the definition of subjective fit by French and Kahn (1962), priming studies have demonstrated how the objective environment (the prime) could influence individuals’ perceptions of their environment. Based on these past priming studies, the following two hypotheses proposed objective fit as an antecedent of subjective fit. The first of these two hypotheses stated:

\textit{Hypothesis 2}: Manipulated interviewer and applicant regulatory focus will effect (a) interviewer state promotion focus, (b) interviewer state prevention focus, (c) perceived applicant promotion focus, and (d) perceived applicant prevention focus.

Both state interviewer regulatory focus and perceived applicant regulatory focus served as direct outcomes of the manipulation. However, a measure of perceptions of subjective regulatory fit was equally important. Subjective perceptions of fit were commonly measured in studies measuring fit. For example, person-organization fit
studies (e.g. Cable & Judge, 1996; Chatman, 1989; Lauver & Kristof-Brown, 2001) asked participants the extent to which their values fit those of an organization. In another example, Cable and DeRue (2002) measured perceived fit on three dimensions (person-organization, needs-supplies, and demands-abilities fit) by asking participants how they perceived fit on these dimensions. In the current study, subjective regulatory fit was measured similarly, where participants assessed the extent to which their regulatory focus matched the applicant’s regulatory focus. Based on French and Kahn’s (1962) proposition that objective regulatory fit was an antecedent of subjective fit, the following hypothesis was proposed:

*Hypothesis 3:* (a) Interviewer state promotion and perceived applicant promotion focus will interact and (b) interviewer state prevention and perceived applicant prevention focus will interact to effect interviewer subjective regulatory fit.

The second half of the model of objective and subjective fit was the contribution that subjective fit had on outcomes. As stated above, subjective fit should be viewed as a proximal predictor of outcomes. Thus, what is presented below is the process by which subjective regulatory fit influences applicant ratings. The following hypotheses apply to both the combined model of objective and subjective fit, and the final model, which is proposed below – a model that only accounts for subjective fit.

*Model of Subjective Fit*

The hypotheses above demonstrated the value that objective fit would have on affecting both subjective fit and applicant ratings. Figure 2.3 depicts the general model of subjective fit. Based on this general model, it is the individual’s perceptions of fit that directly affect the outcomes being measured. The literature review above showed
common outcomes of regulatory fit. In what follows will be a proposal of how these outcomes of subjective regulatory fit can affect applicant ratings.

Figure 2.3. Depiction of subjective regulatory fit. The individual’s perception of fit directly affects outcomes.

Common outcomes of regulatory fit included feeling of rightness, enjoyment, value from fit, and liking. The feeling of rightness proposition proposed that when individuals experience regulatory fit they feel right about what they are doing due to their goal pursuits correctly fitting. This can in turn intensify people’s evaluative responses to what they are doing (Appelt, Zou, Arora, & Higgins, 2009). Past studies (e.g. Appelt et al., 2009; Camacho et al., 2003; Cessario & Higgins, 2008) have been reviewed above, demonstrating feeling of rightness as an outcome of regulatory fit. A second commonly measured outcome of regulatory fit is enjoyment. Freitas and Higgins (2002) stated that a determinant in action enjoyment is the action’s fit with one’s phenomenological state. Another way to state this is that when one experiences regulatory fit, he/she will experience higher levels of enjoyment. Often enjoyment has been hypothesized as a result of feeling of rightness. Multiple studies (Freitas & Higgins, 2002; Freitas et al., 2002) described above have demonstrated enjoyment as an outcome of regulatory fit.

A third commonly measured outcome of regulatory fit was value from fit. The value from fit hypothesis (Higgins, 2000, 2005) was described earlier, which was the idea that when individuals experience regulatory fit, the inherent value of the task increases...
causing the evaluation of objects and experiences to also increase. Value from fit was demonstrated in the studies by a variety of authors described above (Avnet & Higgins, 2003, 2006; Brodcholl et al., 2007; Förster & Higgins, 2005; Higgins et al., 2003; Idson et al., 2000, 2004). More recently, as a proxy for value from fit, some researchers (Hamstra et al., 2013; Ritchie, 2009; Sassenberg et al., 2007) have used liking when regulatory fit was used with people instead of objects.

Based on past studies examining regulatory fit, four commonly measured outcome variables, feeling of rightness, enjoyment, value from fit, and liking have been shown to be related to the experience of regulatory fit. In the current study, these four variables were proposed as proximal outcomes of regulatory fit. Therefore, the following hypothesis was proposed:

**Hypothesis 4:** Interviewer subjective regulatory fit will be positively related to (a) feeling of rightness, (b) enjoyment, (c) value from fit, and (d) liking.

In addition to being outcome variables of regulatory fit, feeling of rightness, enjoyment, value from fit, and liking have been shown in past studies to be linked in to subsequent outcomes. For example, Camacho et al. (2003) demonstrated how the “feeling of rightness” from fit transferred to moral evaluations. Ritchie (2009) proposed that value from fit and liking would mediate the relationship between regulatory fit and LMX. Petokva (2011) proposed that feeling of rightness, enjoyment, and liking would be an antecedent of affective learning outcomes. Freitas et al. (2002) demonstrated that enjoyment mediated the relationship between prevention-focused participants outperforming promotion-focused participants under distracting conditions. Thus, highlighted above were examples of regulatory fit variables being antecedents of other
outcome variables. Based on these previous findings, this study proposed similarly that these variables would predict applicant ratings:

*Hypothesis 5:* (a) Feeling of rightness, (b) enjoyment, (c) value from fit, and (d) liking will be positively related to applicant ratings.

One of the main propositions of French and Kahn’s (1962) conceptualization of person-environment was that subjective fit would be more proximally related to outcome variables. Kristof (1996) further elaborated on the concept of subjective fit, comparing actual (objective) and perceived (subjective) fit. While actual fit would have an impact on process and performance outcomes (objective outcomes), it was perceived fit that would predict attitudinal variables. Applicant ratings was an attitudinal variable, and should be influenced by subjective fit, according to propositions made by French and Kahn, and Kristof. Therefore, it was proposed that:

*Hypothesis 6:* Interviewer subjective regulatory fit will be positively related to applicant ratings.

Past studies on employment interviews and fit have often relied on the similarity-attraction paradigm (Byrne, 1961) to help explain the relationship between fit and interview outcomes. Based on the similarity-attraction paradigm, people rate similar others positively, because they “like” those who are similar to them. The global evaluation of “liking” could influence interviewers to infer other positive attributes. Liking was already proposed in the model as an outcome of perceived regulatory fit. In addition, it could be argued that the other outcome variables, value from fit, enjoyment, and feeling of rightness, were additional subjective outcome variables that could effect the global evaluation of “liking.” Adopting the principle of the similarity-attraction paradigm that the global evaluation of liking could influence the interviewer to infer
other positive attributes, this study proposed that the outcomes of regulatory fit would mediate the relationship between perceived regulatory fit and applicant ratings. Also, as described in detail above, Garcia, et al. (2008) demonstrated a path model linking interviewer’s perception of similarity to mediating variables (e.g. liking, expected performance, and applicant fit) and subsequent hiring recommendations, thus providing a precedent study on examining mediating variables on the relationship between perceptions of similarity and interview outcomes. The following hypothesis was proposed:

*Hypothesis 7:* (a) Feeling of rightness, (b) enjoyment, (c) value from fit, and (d) liking will mediate the relationship between interviewer subjective regulatory fit and applicant ratings.

In conclusion, the hypotheses presented above provide for support for the three models of fit. Table 2.1 is a summary of each hypothesis and the associated models. The hypotheses allowed for support for multiple models to exist. That is, it was possible for objective fit to have a direct effect on applicant ratings (objective fit model), while at the same time, it could have an effect on subjective regulatory fit, which could also have an effect on applicant ratings (objective/subjective fit model). Another possible outcome was that objective regulatory fit would not have an effect on subjective regulatory fit, but subjective regulatory fit would still effect applicant ratings (subjective fit model).
### Table 2.1

**Hypotheses Summary**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Associated Model(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis 1</td>
<td>Manipulated interviewer and applicant regulatory focus will effect applicant ratings. Specifically, higher applicant ratings are expected when the regulatory focus of the interviewer and applicant are congruent.</td>
<td>Objective Fit Model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis 2</td>
<td>Manipulated interviewer and applicant regulatory focus will effect (a) interviewer state promotion focus, (b) interviewer state prevention focus, (c) perceived applicant promotion focus, and (d) perceived applicant prevention focus.</td>
<td>Objective/Subjective Fit Model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis 3</td>
<td>(a) Interviewer state promotion and perceived applicant promotion focus will interact and (b) interviewer state prevention and perceived applicant prevention focus will interact to effect interviewer subjective regulatory fit.</td>
<td>Objective/Subjective Fit Model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis 4</td>
<td>Interviewer subjective regulatory fit will be positively related to (a) feeling of rightness, (b) enjoyment, (c) value from fit, and (d) liking.</td>
<td>Objective/Subjective Fit ModelSubjective Fit Model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis 5</td>
<td>(a) Feeling of rightness, (b) enjoyment, (c) value from fit, and (d) liking will be positively related to applicant ratings.</td>
<td>Objective/Subjective Fit ModelSubjective Fit Model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis 6</td>
<td>Interviewer subjective regulatory fit will be positively related to applicant ratings.</td>
<td>Objective/Subjective Fit ModelSubjective Fit Model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis 7</td>
<td>(a) Feeling of rightness, (b) enjoyment, (c) value from fit, and (d) liking will mediate the relationship between interviewer subjective regulatory fit and applicant ratings.</td>
<td>Objective/Subjective Fit ModelSubjective Fit Model</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER III

METHOD

Study Overview

To test the previously stated hypotheses, an experiment with two between-subjects factors (interviewer regulatory focus and applicant regulatory focus) was conducted. Thus, a two-by-two experimental design was adopted, creating four experimental groups – interviewer promotion/applicant promotion, interviewer promotion/applicant prevention, interviewer prevention/applicant promotion, and interviewer prevention/applicant prevention. Participants completed a computer-based simulation of a job interview and played the role of the interviewer. They interviewed an applicant for the position of a staff worker at a university recreation center. The applicant’s responses were prerecorded and played back to the interviewer, as he or she asked questions via the computer-based interview interface. Dependent measures of the participants’ state regulatory focus, perceived applicant regulatory focus, perceived regulatory fit, feeling of rightness, enjoyment, value from fit, liking, and applicant ratings were collected.

Interviewer regulatory focus was manipulated by having participants complete a two-part priming task prior to the interview. Two response sets that reflected a promotion or prevention focus orientation were recorded for the applicant. Participants were
randomly assigned to receive one of these applicant response sets. Table 3.1 diagrams the four conditions that were examined in this study.

Table 3.1

*Experimental Conditions*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interviewer Promotion Focus</th>
<th>Applicant Promotion Focus</th>
<th>Applicant Prevention Focus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interviewer Promotion Focus</td>
<td>Interviewer completed promotion focus primes and applicant responded with promotion focus answers.</td>
<td>Interviewer completed promotion focus primes and applicant responded with prevention focus answers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewer Prevention Focus</td>
<td>Interviewer completed prevention focus primes and applicant responded with promotion focus answers.</td>
<td>Interviewer completed prevention focus primes and applicant responded with prevention focus answers.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A high level overview of the Procedure section is provided in Table 3.2. Participants completed all steps in a laboratory setting in the order that each step is listed in the table below. In summary, participants completed self-report measures and primes prior to interviewing the applicant. After the interview, participants completed additional measures, which included self-report scales and an evaluation of the applicant. A detailed description of these measures and procedures are provided in the following sections.
Table 3.2

*Procedure Section Overview*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appendix</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Consent Form</td>
<td>Participants read and signed the consent form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Introduction Screen</td>
<td>Participants told that they would complete various personality measures and then conduct a mock interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Demographic Information</td>
<td>Participants reported their demographic information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Trait Regulatory Focus Questionnaire</td>
<td>Participants completed the trait regulatory focus questionnaire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Regulatory Focus at Work Scale</td>
<td>Participants completed the regulatory focus at work scale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Trait PANAS</td>
<td>Participants completed trait PANAS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Personality Questionnaire</td>
<td>Participants completed personality questionnaire (IPIP scale)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>State Regulatory Focus Prime Induction #1</td>
<td>Participants completed first promotion/prevention focus prime task</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Mock Interview Instruction Screen</td>
<td>Participants received initial instructions for their mock interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>Job Description</td>
<td>Participants read job description of fitness leader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>Applicant Personal Statement</td>
<td>Participants clicked on the link and viewed the personal statement made by the applicant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>State Regulatory Focus Prime Induction #2</td>
<td>Participants completed context specific regulatory focus prime task</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>Mock Interview</td>
<td>Participants completed the interview simulation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>Feeling of Rightness Questionnaire</td>
<td>Participants completed the feeling of rightness scale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>Enjoyment Questionnaire</td>
<td>Participants completed the enjoyment scale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>Value from Fit Questionnaire</td>
<td>Participants completed the value from fit scale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q</td>
<td>Applicant Expected Performance Ratings</td>
<td>Participants completed expected performance ratings for the applicant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>State Regulatory Focus Questionnaire</td>
<td>Participants completed the state regulatory focus questionnaire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>Perceived Applicant Regulatory Focus Questionnaire</td>
<td>Participants completed the perceived applicant regulatory focus questionnaire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>Subjective Regulatory Fit Scale</td>
<td>Participants completed the subjective regulatory fit scale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U</td>
<td>Debriefing</td>
<td>Participants debriefed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Participants

Participants ($N = 269$) were undergraduate students from psychology courses at The University of Akron. In return for their involvement, participants received extra credit. Based on Cohen (1977), this sample size accounted for a statistical power of .80 and a medium effect size ($f = .25, p < .05$). Thirty-three participants were removed from the analyses due to incomplete data or not following the priming manipulation described below (see Chapter 4). Thus, the final sample included 236 individuals. Participants were randomly assigned to one of the four experimental conditions. Of the sample, 62 were in the interviewer promotion/applicant promotion condition, 55 were in the interviewer promotion/applicant prevention condition, 61 were in the interviewer prevention/applicant promotion condition, and 58 were in the interviewer prevention/applicant prevention condition.

Materials

*Computer-Based Interview*

Participants playing the role of an interviewer conducted a computer-based interview with an applicant whose responses were prerecorded. The interview was composed of an introductory personal statement by an applicant and videotaped answers to questions. Participants were able to freely choose which questions out of a list to ask, and determined when to end the interview and rate the applicant. The computer tracked the total length of time spent interviewing and the number of promotion and prevention questions asked.

To ensure that participants could not simply ask all questions, and were forced to choose the questions they felt best captured the information they needed to rate the
applicant, participants were given a maximum of 9 minutes to interview the applicant. This time limit was based on the average length of time it took expert raters to go through the interview. The time limit was chosen so that the applicant could have enough time to get through a majority of the questions if he or she decided to continue for the full 9 minutes, yet would not have time to ask all questions. A timer at the bottom of the screen counted downwards, so that participants could monitor the amount of time they had left throughout the interview. The timer at the bottom of the screen started as soon as the first interview question was asked. A copy of the interview questions can be found in Appendix M.

State Regulatory Focus Prime

Participants’ state regulatory focus orientation was primed in a two-part task. First, participants were primed with a regulatory focus induction developed by Higgins et al. (2001). Participants in the promotion focus condition were asked to, “Please write about a time in the past when: a) you felt you made progress toward being successful in life, b) compared to most people you were able to get what you wanted out of life, and c) trying to achieve something important to you, you performed as well as you ideally would have liked to.” Participants in the prevention focus condition were asked to, “Please write about a time in the past when: a) being careful enough avoided getting you in trouble, b) you stopped yourself from acting in a way that your parents would consider objectionable, and c) you were careful not to get on your parents’ nerves.” Appendix H displays the first part of the regulatory focus prime.

In the second part of the priming task, participants completed a context-specific task. The task was adapted from a context-specific priming task originally developed by
Galinsky, Leonardelli, Okhuysen, and Mussweiler (2005; Study 2). Participants were asked to think about their role as the interviewer and to write a response to the following set of instructions, “Before interviewing the applicants we want you to get into your role as an interviewer. Imagine yourself as an actual interviewer. Please take a couple of minutes to briefly describe the interviewer behaviors and outcomes you hope to achieve (seek to avoid) during this interview. Think about how you could promote (prevent) these behaviors and outcomes.” Appendix L displays the second part of the regulatory focus prime.

**Applicant Responses**

The “applicant” recorded two different sets of responses. The first set of responses included promotion focus answers to the interview questions, while the second set of responses included prevention focus answers to the interview questions. Participants were randomly assigned to receive one set of the applicant responses.

**Job Description**

Participants read a job description of a recreation center fitness leader (see Appendix J). The job description was adapted from the actual job description handed to The University of Akron recreation center employees. In the process of modifying the job description, words that would prime a promotion or prevention focus were replaced with neutral words.

**Interview Script**

The interview script consisted of an introductory statement made by the applicant, followed by a list of questions for the participant to ask. Before conducting the interview, participants watched an introductory personal statement made by the applicant.
(see Appendix K). Following the introductory statement, participants were given further instructions and then completed the interview. The introductory statement was not included in the timed portion of the interview. All participants received the same introductory personal statement, as it was not intended to prime a regulatory orientation.

The structure of the script was written so that questions were framed as promotion focus, prevention focus, or neutral. In addition, two different responses to each question were written, reflecting a promotion or prevention focus. Thus, a set of responses was created for a promotion focus applicant and a prevention focus applicant, regardless of the regulatory focus of the question asked. All interview questions and responses can be found in Appendix M.

The interview script was developed in a two-step process. In the first step, the introductory statement and the interview questions were initially developed, and given to a set of proofreaders to edit. Graduate-level psychology students ($N = 8$) served as proofreaders. These proofreaders edited the script for grammar and for content, in order to ensure that the questions and responses each reflected the specific regulatory focus intended. Proofreaders also edited responses so that they reflected typical responses from an undergraduate student. Lastly, the proofreaders were instructed to ensure that the responses for the promotion and prevention focus applicants were similar in length.

In the second step of the interview script development a second set of proofreaders was recruited to examine the face-validity of the applicant responses. This separate group of expert raters ($N = 5$), composed of graduate-level psychology students, read each interview question and both sets of responses. Expert raters rated on a 3-point scale (-1 = Prevention Focus, 0 = Neutral, and 1 = Promotion Focus) the extent to which
they felt each question and its responses represented a regulatory focus. In order for a question or response to be considered for inclusion for the final script, at least three out of five raters had to agree with the initial regulatory focus of the question or response. If there was disagreement with a question or response, the question or response was revised or eliminated from the script. Based on results from the expert raters, four questions were deleted from the final script and three questions were revised. The final script included 40 questions – 15 had a promotion focus, 15 had a prevention focus and 10 were neutral. For all questions, a set of promotion and prevention focus responses was developed.

Raters also recorded the length of the interview ($N = 5$). The expert raters along with a colleague of their choosing went through the interview and timed the length of time it took to go through all questions, and one set of responses. The average length of time it took for the expert raters to go through the interview was 13 minutes and 43 seconds ($M = 806$ seconds, $SD = 92.6$ seconds). This average was used to determine the amount of time granted to participants to complete the interview simulation.

Measures

*Trait Regulatory Focus*

The trait regulatory focus of the participants was assessed with a regulatory focus questionnaire, originally developed by Lockwood, Jordan, and Kunda (2002). The regulatory focus questionnaire was an 18-item scale consisting of two subscales designed to measure promotion and prevention goals. Within the regulatory focus questionnaire, there were nine Promotion scale items and nine Prevention scale items. Items were rated on a 5-point Likert response scale, which was modified from the 9-point scale utilized by Lockwood et al. The reliabilities in the current study were sufficient for both the
promotion ($\alpha = .85$) and prevention ($\alpha = .78$) subscales. The promotion and prevention subscales were not correlated with one another ($r = .05, p = .47$). The trait regulatory focus questionnaire can be found in Appendix D.

State Regulatory Focus

Individuals’ state regulatory focus was assessed with a modified version of the regulatory focus questionnaire (Lockwood, Jordan, Kunda, 2002). The state regulatory focus scale was an 18-item scale consisting of two subscales designed to assess state-level promotion and prevention goals. Within the state regulatory focus questionnaire there were nine state promotion and nine state prevention items. Items were rated on a 5-point Likert response scale, and the reliabilities in the current study were sufficient for both the state promotion ($\alpha = .86$) and state prevention ($\alpha = .80$) subscales. The promotion and prevention subscales were correlated with one another ($r = .22, p < .01$).

See Appendix L for the state regulatory focus questionnaire.

Perceived Applicant Regulatory Focus

Participants rated their perceptions of their applicant’s regulatory focus with a modified version of the state regulatory focus questionnaire (Lockwood, Jordan, Kunda, 2002). The perceived applicant regulatory focus scale consisted of 18 items modified from the state regulatory focus scale, revised to reflect the perceptions of the applicant’s regulatory focus during the interview. Nine items measured applicant promotion focus and nine items measured applicant prevention focus. Items were rated on a 5-point Likert response scale, and the reliabilities in the current study were sufficient for both the perceived applicant promotion ($\alpha = .84$) and perceived applicant prevention ($\alpha = .79$).
subscales. The subscales were not correlated with one another ($r = -.03$, $p = .63$). See Appendix S for the state regulatory focus questionnaire.

**Perceived Subjective Regulatory Fit**

Participants rated their perceptions of regulatory fit with the applicant with nine items. The items were originally developed for this study. Items were rated on a 5-point Likert response scale, and the reliability of the scale in the current study was sufficient ($\alpha = .85$). See Appendix T for the perceived subjective regulatory fit scale.

**Feeling of Rightness**

Feeling of rightness was assessed with a four-item scale developed by Petkova (2011). This scale assessed participants’ sense of feeling “right” during the interview process. Items were adapted in order to reflect the interviewer-applicant context. Items were rated on a 5-point Likert response scale, which was modified from the 7-point scale originally utilized by Petkova. The reliability of this scale in the current study ($\alpha = .75$) was sufficient. See Appendix N for the feeling of rightness scale.

**Enjoyment**

Enjoyment was assessed with a three-item scale developed by Freitas and Higgins (2002). This scale assessed participants’ enjoyment of the interview process. The items were adapted in order to reflect the interviewer-applicant context. Items were rated on a 5-point Likert response scale, which was modified from the 7-point scale utilized by Freitas and Higgins. The reliability of this scale in the current study was sufficient ($\alpha = .86$). See Appendix O for the enjoyment scale.
Value from Fit and Liking

Value from fit was assessed with an eight-item scale utilized by Ritchie (2009). The Value from Fit scale included a four-item subscale measuring how much interviewers liked the applicant and a four-item subscale measuring how much interviewers valued the applicant. Items were rated on a 5-point Likert response scale, which was adapted from the 7-point scale originally utilized by Ritchie. The reliabilities in the current study for the liking (α = .87) and value (α = .86) subscales were both sufficient. Liking was adapted from a scale originally developed by Wayne and Ferris (1990). Value was adapted from a scale originally developed by Sassenberg et al. (2007) measuring group value. All value from fit items in this study were modified to reflect the interviewer-applicant context. See Appendix P for the value from fit items.

Evaluation of the Applicant

The evaluation of the applicant consisted of items designed to measure the perceptions of the applicant’s person-organization fit, perceptions of the applicant’s predicted performance, perceptions of the applicant’s likely satisfaction with the job, probability of the applicant’s turnover and retention, and the probability of recommending the applicant for hire. Items were adapted from Briks (2009) and scored on a 5-point Likert response scale. Ratings on all items were summed to obtain the final expected performance rating score. The reliability of the expected performance ratings in the current study (α = .89) was sufficient. Appendix Q lists the expected performance rating questions.
Personality

Extraversion, Agreeableness, Conscientiousness, and Emotional Stability were measured in this study. These personality traits were assessed with the 10-item short scales from the International Personality Item Pool (IPIP; Goldberg et al., 2006). Each item was rated on a 5-point Likert response scale. The reliabilities in the current study for the Extraversion ($\alpha=.92$), Agreeableness ($\alpha=.87$), Conscientiousness ($\alpha=.88$), and Emotional Stability ($\alpha=.91$) were sufficient. Appendix G lists the personality items.

Positive and Negative Affect Schedule (PANAS)

Trait level positive and negative affects were measured in this study. Trait PA and NA were assessed with the Positive and Negative Affective Schedule (PANAS; Watson, Clark, & Tellegen, 1988). The PANAS was a 20-item scale consisting of ten items assessing PA and ten items assessing NA. Participants were given a list of 10 PA and 10 NA descriptors and asked to indicate, “To what extent you generally feel this way, that is how you feel on the average.” Items were rated on a 5-point Likert response scale, with higher scores indicating higher levels of PA or NA. The reliability coefficients in the current study indicated sufficient reliability for PA ($\alpha = .89$) and NA ($\alpha = .85$). To see the complete PANAS, please refer to Appendix F.

Regulatory Focus at Work

Wallace and Chen (2006) developed a work context-specific scale measuring stable regulatory focus at work, the regulatory focus at work scale. The regulatory focus at work questionnaire was a 12-item scale consisting of two subscales designed to measure promotion and prevention at work. Within the regulatory focus at work scale, there were six promotion subscale items and six prevention subscale items. Items were
rated on a 5-point Likert response scale, and the reliabilities in the current study were sufficient for both the work promotion (α = .81) and work prevention (α = .85) subscales. The promotion and prevention subscales were highly correlated with one another (r = .57, p < .01). The trait regulatory focus questionnaire can be found in Appendix E.

Procedure

Participants completed all measures on the computer. Upon arrival, participants received a brief introduction to the study by the research assistant. The participants were told that the researcher would like to collect measures of their personality and that in the study they would be playing the role of an interviewer in an interview simulation. After receiving the introduction, participants were given an informed consent form. The informed consent form (see Appendix A) detailed the study and stated the potential benefits and risks of participation in the study. Participants read and signed the informed consent form.

After collecting informed consent forms, the research assistant logged the participants onto the computer, where they were taken to a web-based survey. The first screen of the survey was the introduction screen (see Appendix B). It thanked the participant for participating and detailed the process of the study. The introduction screen reminded the participants that they would be playing the role of an interviewer in the study and that the researcher would like to collect information about their personality. This introduction screen also told participants that they would first complete the personality measures and that they would receive additional instructions for the interview simulation after completing the personality measures. At the bottom of the introduction
screen, there was a “proceed” button that participants clicked on to advance to the next set of pages.

Participants proceeded to the next set of pages where they completed demographic information (see Appendix C), the trait regulatory focus scale (Lockwood et al., 2002; Appendix D), regulatory focus at work scale (Wallace & Chen, 2006; Appendix E), trait PANAS (Watson et al. 1988; Appendix F), and the personality measures (IPIP; Goldberg et al., 2006; Appendix G). After completing the personality measures, participants raised their hands, and the research assistant logged them into the interview simulation portion of the study.

The first page of the interview simulation portion of the study included the first regulatory focus induction task (Higgins et al., 2001; Appendix H). The task appeared to be related to the previous personality measures. A text box where participants could type their responses to the priming task appeared on the screen. After submitting their typed responses, participants clicked on the “proceed” button to get them to the next page.

The next page was the mock interview instruction screen (see Appendix I). The purpose of the instruction screen was to give a general description of the mock interview to the participants. This instruction screen told the participants the following: a) the fitness leader position at the SRWC opened up along with a sentence describing the job; b) the participant would be playing the role of interviewer; c) they would first read a job description of the position; d) they would then view an introductory personal statement made by the applicant; e) they would then be able to ask the applicant questions; and f) further instructions on each screen would walk them through the interview simulation.
interface. Participants then clicked on the “proceed” button to get to the job description page.

The next screen was the job description page (see Appendix J). Instructions at the top of the screen requested that participants review the job description and proceed to the next screen after they felt comfortable knowing the job specifics of the position. Participants then clicked on the “proceed” button and were taken to the applicant personal statement page. On the applicant personal statement page, instructions requested that participants click on the link to the personal statement. Clicking on the link caused a pop up window to appear with the applicant’s personal statement (see Appendix K). Participants then clicked “proceed,” and were taken to the next page.

The final page that participants were taken to before being able to start the interview simulation was the second regulatory focus prime (see Appendix L). Instructions at the top of the page told the participant that before they get the chance to interview the applicant, the researcher requests that they think about their role as an interviewer. Participants submitted their typed response in a text box. Once they completed the task, they hit “proceed” and were taken to the interview simulation page.

The interview simulation page had a set of instructions at the top of the page. Participants were told the following: a) they could click on any question in any order; b) once a question was asked, they could not go back and ask that same question again; c) they had up to 9 minutes to complete the interview and they were allowed to end the interview at any point in time to proceed to rate the applicant; and d) the timer would start as soon as they asked (clicked on) the first question. The interview simulation page had all of the questions listed, grouped into the four sections, Education and Career
Goals, Past Work Behaviors, Situational Judgment, and Miscellaneous (see Appendix M). Participants were able to click on each question and a pop up video of the applicant’s response appeared. After the response appeared, the link to the question was no longer available for the participant to click on. A timer counted down on the screen to remind participants of the remaining time. At the bottom of the screen participants could click on the “end interview” button where they would end the interview and be taken to the applicant rating pages.

After completing the interview simulation, participants raised their hands, and the research assistant took them to another web-based survey, where they completed the feeling of rightness (Petkova, 2011; Appendix N), enjoyment (Freitas & Higgins, 2002; Appendix O), and value from fit (Ritchie, 2009; Appendix P) scales. Next they rated the applicant by completing the evaluation of the applicant scale (see Appendix Q). Lastly, participants completed the state regulatory focus questionnaire (Lockwood, Jordan, & Kunda, 2002; Appendix R), the perceived applicant regulatory focus questionnaire (Lockwood, Jordan, & Kunda, 2002; Appendix S), and the subjective regulatory fit scale (see Appendix T). Upon completion, participants were thanked for their time and were debriefed (see Appendix U) by the research assistant.
CHAPTER IV
RESULTS

Statistical Analysis Strategy

The principal analysis for analyzing the data was hierarchical regression analysis. In all analyses, control variables were entered in the regression equation in step 1. In subsequent steps, independent variables were entered in order to determine unique contributions of the independent variables on the dependent variable. For Hypotheses 1 and 2, which looked at the manipulation effects on the dependent variables, contrast coding (Judd, 2000) was utilized. Moderated regression analysis (Aiken & West, 1991; Stone & Hollenbeck, 1984; Zedeck, 1971) was utilized to test Hypothesis 3, which examined the interaction of state regulatory focus and perceived applicant regulatory focus on a subjective fit. Lastly, mediated regression analysis (Baron & Kenny, 1986) was adopted in order to test Hypotheses 4-7, which examined the effect of subjective regulatory fit on applicant ratings through mediators.

Hypotheses 1 and 2, which examined the effects of the manipulations on applicant ratings, state regulatory focus, and perceived regulatory applicant focus identified comparisons between conditions. Due to the independent variables being categorical, multiple regression analysis with orthogonal contrast coding (Judd, 2000) was utilized. Although between-subjects ANOVA could have been utilized for these analyses, Davis
(2010) stated that multiple regression is preferred over analysis of variance (ANOVA) for six reasons. These six reasons included providing researchers the ability to 1) use both continuous and categorical or nominal independent variables, 2) examine trends in data, such as patterns beyond linear data representation, 3) have more flexibility and conceptual clarity, 4) understand where statistically significant mean differences are occurring beyond simple omnibus tests, 5) have the potential to increase statistical power against Type II error, and 6) have more thoughtful hypotheses about the data.

Contrasts were set up based on guidance provided by von Eye and Schuster (1998). The first step in setting up contrasts is to determine the number of contrasts to be created. The number of contrasts is determined based on the number of groups/categories minus 1. In this study, there were 4 conditions, which would allow for 3 contrasts (4 - 1 = 3).

When determining the contrasts between groups, Thompson (2006) defined simple and complex contrasts. Simple contrasts are contrasts that test for differences between only two groups, while complex contrasts are those that test for multiple group mean differences. For this study, complex contrasts, comparing 2 or more group means were utilized. The first contrast compared the primed promotion focus groups (conditions 1 and 2) with the primed prevention focus groups (conditions 3 and 4): \( C_1 = (1, 1, -1, -1) \). The second contrast compared the applicant promotion focus groups (conditions 1 and 3) with the applicant prevention focus groups (conditions 2 and 4): \( C_2 = (1, -1, 1, -1) \). Lastly, the final contrast compared the congruent interviewer/applicant regulatory focus groups (conditions 1 and 4) with the incongruent interviewer/applicant regulatory focus groups (conditions 2 and 3): \( C_3 = (1, -1, -1, 1) \).
The last step in setting up contrast codes was to create the coding design matrix (Davis, 2010), by creating a column for each contrast, and placing the corresponding contrast vector in each of these columns. For example, based on the contrasts identified above, for Condition 1, \( C_1 = 1, \ C_2 = 1, \) and \( C_3 = 1. \) The values for Condition 2 were \( C_1 = 1, \ C_2 = -1, \) and \( C_3 = -1. \) Condition 3 values include \( C_1 = -1, \ C_2 = 1, \) and \( C_3 = -1. \) Lastly, the values for Condition 4 were \( C_1 = -1, \ C_2 = -1, \) and \( C_3 = 1. \) Table 4.1 is the coding design matrix utilized to analyze Hypotheses 1 and 2.

Table 4.1

*Coding Design Matrix*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>( C_1 )</th>
<th>( C_2 )</th>
<th>( C_3 )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Interviewer Pro – Applicant Pro</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Interviewer Pro – Applicant Pre</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Interviewer Pre – Applicant Pro</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Interviewer Pre – Applicant Pre</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Preliminary Data Analysis

*Initial Data Screening*

Data were examined in order to detect careless responders and potential outliers. In order to detect careless responders, a search through survey responses, a review of the number of interview questions selected, and a review of the content of responses on the regulatory focus primes were conducted. Missing survey data was found for one participant, resulting in the removal of this participant. Three participants only selected one interview question during the interview simulation, resulting in their removal. Lastly, four participants did not follow the first prime and another 25 did not follow instructions on the second prime, resulting in their removal. In total 33 participants were removed due to being careless responders, resulting in a final sample size of 236.
Of the remaining sample (N = 236), an outlier analysis was conducted in order to identify outliers on the dependent and mediator variables. For all dependent and mediator variables standardized residuals were calculated and graphed in a box plot. Across the entire sample, one participant had outliers on two variables (value from fit and enjoyment). A review of this participant’s responses was conducted in order to identify any response biases. Due to no response biases identified, the participant’s data was kept in the analysis. Thus, no participants were eliminated due to the outlier analysis.

Participants

Table 4.2 provides a breakdown of the demographics. Overall the mean age of the sample was 22.3 years (SD = 5.9), 63.1% were female, and 20.8% were minorities. The sample included 41.5% psychology majors, who worked on average 61.6 months (SD = 60.7) and visited the recreation center an average of 1.3 (SD = 1.7) times a week. In order to determine equality of groups on key demographic variables, analysis of variance was conducted on age, work experience, and visits to the recreation center. No significant differences were found for age (F(3, 232) = 1.048, p = .372), work experience (F(3, 232) = .493, p = .687), and visits to the recreation center (F(3, 232) = .238, p = .870). In addition, the groups did not vary by gender, $\chi^2(3, 236) = 5.136, p = .160$.
Table 4.2

Participant Descriptive Statistics by Condition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age (SD)</td>
<td>21.8 (5.4)</td>
<td>21.4 (3.6)</td>
<td>22.6 (6.8)</td>
<td>23.2 (7.1)</td>
<td>22.3 (5.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females (%)</td>
<td>64.5%</td>
<td>50.9%</td>
<td>65.6%</td>
<td>70.7%</td>
<td>63.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minorities (%)</td>
<td>27.4%</td>
<td>21.8%</td>
<td>13.1%</td>
<td>20.7%</td>
<td>20.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psych Majors (%)</td>
<td>38.7%</td>
<td>38.2%</td>
<td>41.0%</td>
<td>48.3%</td>
<td>41.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work experience (SD)</td>
<td>57.7 (58.4)</td>
<td>56.0 (46.5)</td>
<td>65.0 (70.1)</td>
<td>67.6 (65.0)</td>
<td>61.6 (60.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekly visits to rec (SD)</td>
<td>1.3 (1.6)</td>
<td>1.4 (1.8)</td>
<td>1.2 (1.8)</td>
<td>1.4 (1.6)</td>
<td>1.3 (1.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>236</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Age is in years. Work experience is in months. Percentage of minorities include African-American, Asian, Hispanic, Two or More, and Other ethnicities. Condition 1 was interviewer and applicant promotion. Condition 2 was interviewer promotion and applicant prevention. Condition 3 was interviewer prevention and applicant promotion. Condition 4 was interviewer and applicant prevention.

Table 4.3 provides a breakdown of group differences on key trait measures. An analysis of variance was conducted in order to determine differences between the conditions. No significant differences were found across the groups for trait promotion focus ($F_{(3, 232)} = 1.131, p = .337$), agreeableness ($F_{(3, 232)} = .531, p = .661$), extraversion ($F_{(3, 232)} = .473, p = .702$), neuroticism ($F_{(3, 232)} = 2.322, p = .076$), trait positive affectivity ($F_{(3, 232)} = .423, p = .736$), and trait negative affectivity ($F_{(3, 232)} = .588, p = .623$). Group differences were found for trait prevention focus ($F_{(3, 232)} = 3.579, p < .05$). Tukey post-hoc comparisons revealed that there were mean differences between condition 1 ($M = 26.2, SD = 6.3$) and condition 3 ($M = 29.4, SD = 7.4$), and condition 1 ($M = 26.2, SD = 6.3$) and condition 3 ($M = 29.6, SD = 5.9$). Despite condition 1 being lower on trait prevention focus, overall there was equality on the trait measures across groups.
Table 4.3

Trait Measures by Condition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trait Promotion (SD)</td>
<td>37.6 (5.5)</td>
<td>39.2 (4.7)</td>
<td>38.7 (5.0)</td>
<td>38.6 (4.1)</td>
<td>38.5 (4.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trait Prevention (SD)</td>
<td>26.2 (6.3)</td>
<td>28.0 (5.8)</td>
<td>29.4 (7.4)</td>
<td>29.6 (5.9)</td>
<td>28.3 (6.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreeableness (SD)</td>
<td>42.3 (6.5)</td>
<td>42.7 (5.8)</td>
<td>43.2 (5.9)</td>
<td>43.6 (5.4)</td>
<td>42.9 (5.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extraversion (SD)</td>
<td>35.0 (9.2)</td>
<td>34.6 (9.3)</td>
<td>34.5 (10.0)</td>
<td>36.2 (7.6)</td>
<td>35.1 (9.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neuroticism (SD)</td>
<td>24.9 (9.8)</td>
<td>24.2 (7.9)</td>
<td>28.2 (9.1)</td>
<td>26.0 (8.4)</td>
<td>25.9 (8.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trait PA (SD)</td>
<td>38.9 (6.8)</td>
<td>38.6 (6.3)</td>
<td>37.7 (7.4)</td>
<td>38.0 (6.2)</td>
<td>38.3 (6.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trait NA (SD)</td>
<td>18.5 (6.2)</td>
<td>19.2 (6.3)</td>
<td>19.9 (6.5)</td>
<td>19.4 (5.6)</td>
<td>19.3 (6.2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N 62 55 61 58 236

Note. Condition 1 was interviewer and applicant promotion. Condition 2 was interviewer promotion and applicant prevention. Condition 3 was interviewer prevention and applicant promotion. Condition 4 was interviewer and applicant prevention.

Correlations

Table 4.4 presents the correlations and the internal consistency of the control, independent, dependent, and mediation variables used in the analyses. Significant correlation coefficients ranged between 0.13 and 0.71, and all scales demonstrated adequate internal consistency. The three control variables, trait promotion, trait prevention, and agreeableness, were significantly related to the independent and dependent variables. Due to these significant relationships, these three control variables were included in all analyses. For a full correlation matrix that includes all variables measured in this study, please view Appendix V.
### Table 4.4

**Correlations Amongst Constructs**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Trait Pro</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(.85)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Trait Pre</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(.78)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Agree</td>
<td>.21**</td>
<td>- .09</td>
<td>(.87)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Feeling Right</td>
<td>.28**</td>
<td>- .13</td>
<td>.18**</td>
<td>(.75)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Enjoyment</td>
<td>.29**</td>
<td>- .12</td>
<td>.27**</td>
<td>.54**</td>
<td>(.86)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Value Fit</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>- .12</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.42**</td>
<td>.37**</td>
<td>(.86)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Liking</td>
<td>.20**</td>
<td>- .02</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.47**</td>
<td>.48**</td>
<td>.64**</td>
<td>(.87)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Expected Per</td>
<td>.25**</td>
<td>- .05</td>
<td>.15*</td>
<td>.40**</td>
<td>.30**</td>
<td>.70**</td>
<td>.61**</td>
<td>(.89)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. State Pro</td>
<td>-.18**</td>
<td>- .04</td>
<td>-.28**</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.22**</td>
<td>(.80)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. State Pre</td>
<td>-.33**</td>
<td>- .04</td>
<td>-.30**</td>
<td>-.25**</td>
<td>-.41**</td>
<td>.23**</td>
<td>.39**</td>
<td>.28**</td>
<td>(.86)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. App Pro</td>
<td>.27**</td>
<td>- .09</td>
<td>.19**</td>
<td>.23**</td>
<td>.16*</td>
<td>.26**</td>
<td>.30**</td>
<td>.40**</td>
<td>.34**</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>(.84)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. App Pre</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.34**</td>
<td>- .13</td>
<td>-.26**</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.32**</td>
<td>-.24**</td>
<td>-.32**</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.41**</td>
<td>- .03</td>
<td>(.79)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Perceive RF</td>
<td>.29**</td>
<td>- .04</td>
<td>.18**</td>
<td>.29**</td>
<td>.29**</td>
<td>.41**</td>
<td>.48**</td>
<td>.46**</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.39**</td>
<td>- .13</td>
<td>(.85)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Mean**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Trait Pro</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Trait Pre</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Agree</td>
<td>.21**</td>
<td>- .09</td>
<td>(.87)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Feeling Right</td>
<td>.28**</td>
<td>- .13</td>
<td>.18**</td>
<td>(.75)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Enjoyment</td>
<td>.29**</td>
<td>- .12</td>
<td>.27**</td>
<td>.54**</td>
<td>(.86)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Value Fit</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>- .12</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.42**</td>
<td>.37**</td>
<td>(.86)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Liking</td>
<td>.20**</td>
<td>- .02</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.47**</td>
<td>.48**</td>
<td>.64**</td>
<td>(.87)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Expected Per</td>
<td>.25**</td>
<td>- .05</td>
<td>.15*</td>
<td>.40**</td>
<td>.30**</td>
<td>.70**</td>
<td>.61**</td>
<td>(.89)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. State Pro</td>
<td>-.18**</td>
<td>- .04</td>
<td>-.28**</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.22**</td>
<td>(.80)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. State Pre</td>
<td>-.33**</td>
<td>- .04</td>
<td>-.30**</td>
<td>-.25**</td>
<td>-.41**</td>
<td>.23**</td>
<td>.39**</td>
<td>.28**</td>
<td>(.86)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. App Pro</td>
<td>.27**</td>
<td>- .09</td>
<td>.19**</td>
<td>.23**</td>
<td>.16*</td>
<td>.26**</td>
<td>.30**</td>
<td>.40**</td>
<td>.34**</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>(.84)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. App Pre</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.34**</td>
<td>- .13</td>
<td>-.26**</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.32**</td>
<td>-.24**</td>
<td>-.32**</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.41**</td>
<td>- .03</td>
<td>(.79)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Perceive RF</td>
<td>.29**</td>
<td>- .04</td>
<td>.18**</td>
<td>.29**</td>
<td>.29**</td>
<td>.41**</td>
<td>.48**</td>
<td>.46**</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.39**</td>
<td>- .13</td>
<td>(.85)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Mean* and standard errors are displayed in Table 4.5.

**Means of Key Dependent Variables by Condition**

As an initial manipulation check, four separate one-way analysis of covariances were conducted in order to determine group differences on state promotion focus, state prevention focus, perceived applicant promotion focus, and perceived applicant prevention focus. In all analyses the opposite regulatory focus of the dependent variable was controlled for by being entered as the covariate. Table 4.5 displays the adjusted means and standard errors.
Table 4.5

Dependent Measures by Condition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State Pro Focus (Std Error)</td>
<td>34.0 (.79)</td>
<td>33.0 (.84)</td>
<td>34.3 (.80)</td>
<td>33.0 (.82)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Pre Focus (Std. Error)</td>
<td>21.2 (.76)</td>
<td>22.3 (.80)</td>
<td>23.4 (.76)</td>
<td>22.0 (.78)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant Pro Focus (Std. Error)</td>
<td>37.9 (.59)</td>
<td>37.6 (.63)</td>
<td>37.8 (.59)</td>
<td>39.4 (.61)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant Pre Focus (Std. Error)</td>
<td>23.6 (.79)</td>
<td>25.7 (.84)</td>
<td>24.0 (.79)</td>
<td>24.1 (.82)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N   62   55   61   58

Note. Condition 1 was interviewer and applicant promotion. Condition 2 was interviewer promotion and applicant prevention. Condition 3 was interviewer prevention and applicant promotion. Condition 4 was interviewer and applicant prevention.

Overall, when controlling for the opposite regulatory focus of the dependent variable, there were no differences across groups. There was no manipulation effect on state promotion focus while controlling for state prevention focus, \( F_{(3, 231)} = .676, p = .57 \). There was no manipulation effect on state prevention focus while controlling for state promotion focus, \( F_{(3, 231)} = 1.4, p = .24 \). There was no manipulation effect on perceived applicant promotion focus while controlling for perceived applicant prevention focus, \( F_{(3, 231)} = 1.94, p = .12 \). Lastly, there was no manipulation effect on perceived applicant prevention focus while controlling for perceived applicant promotion focus \( F_{(3, 231)} = 1.24, p = .30 \). Thus, there was no initial support for the manipulation effect on state promotion focus, state prevention focus, perceived applicant promotion focus, and perceived applicant prevention focus.
Factor Structure of Mediators

The factor structure of the four mediator variables, feeling of rightness, enjoyment, value from fit, and liking was examined. Principal components analysis with oblimin rotation was conducted. The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin measure of sampling adequacy was .89, above the recommended value of .6. Bartlett’s test of sphericity was significant, $\chi^2(105) = 1917.54, p < .001$. The initial eigen values showed the first factor explained 43.4% of the variance, the second factor explained 12.9% of the variance, the third factor explained 7.6% of the variance, and the fourth factor explained 6.9% of the variance. Overall, support for the four mediator scales being distinct was found. Table 4.6 displays the factor loadings for each item.

Table 4.6

Results from the Confirmatory Factor Analysis of Mediators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscales and Items</th>
<th>Factor Loadings</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Feeling of Rightness</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. It felt ‘right’ while listening to the information presented in the interview.</td>
<td>.332</td>
<td>.156</td>
<td><strong>.383</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I felt uneasy while conducting the interview.</td>
<td>.084</td>
<td>-.025</td>
<td><strong>.852</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I felt comfortable during the interview.</td>
<td>-.058</td>
<td>-.036</td>
<td><strong>.770</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Conducting the interview felt ‘wrong.’</td>
<td>-.031</td>
<td>.112</td>
<td><strong>.733</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Enjoyment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Conducting the interview was interesting.</td>
<td>.054</td>
<td><strong>.901</strong></td>
<td>-.068</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Conducting the interview was enjoyable.</td>
<td>-.012</td>
<td><strong>.818</strong></td>
<td>.152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Conducting the interview was exciting.</td>
<td>-.068</td>
<td><strong>.867</strong></td>
<td>.012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Value From Fit</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. The thought of having this person as a SRWC employee is attractive.</td>
<td><strong>.853</strong></td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>-.060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I would value having this person as a SRWC employee.</td>
<td><strong>.909</strong></td>
<td>.028</td>
<td>.047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I would NOT like having this person as a SRWC employee.</td>
<td><strong>.740</strong></td>
<td>.061</td>
<td>.076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. It would feel good to have this person as a SRWC employee.</td>
<td><strong>.745</strong></td>
<td>-.045</td>
<td>.013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Liking</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. I think this applicant would make a good friend.</td>
<td>-.111</td>
<td>-.059</td>
<td>.088</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I would get along well with this applicant.</td>
<td>-.010</td>
<td>.107</td>
<td>-.034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I like this applicant very much.</td>
<td>.223</td>
<td>.119</td>
<td>-.065</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Working with this applicant would be a pleasure.</td>
<td>.323</td>
<td>-.032</td>
<td>.022</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N = 236. Primary factor loadings are in bold. Factor loadings are standardized.
Hypothesis Testing

Objective Fit Model

Hypothesis 1 stated, manipulated interviewer and applicant regulatory focus will effect applicant ratings. Higher ratings are expected when the regulatory focus of the interviewer and applicant are congruent. In order to test this hypothesis, a planned comparison between conditions 1 (interviewer promotion/applicant promotion) and 4 (interviewer prevention/applicant prevention) versus conditions 2 (interviewer promotion/applicant prevention) and 3 (interviewer prevention/applicant promotion), on expected performance was examined. Support for Hypothesis 1 would lend support for the model demonstrating that objective fit directly predicts expected performance ratings. Expected performance was first regressed on the control variables, trait promotion, trait prevention, and agreeableness. In step two, expected performance was regressed on the three contrast variables described in the previous section. Table 4.7 displays the uncorrected means of each condition.

Table 4.7

Mean expected performance ratings across interviewer/applicant matched and mismatched conditions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conditions</th>
<th>Interviewer/Applicant Match</th>
<th>Interviewer/Applicant Mismatch</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expected Performance (SD)</td>
<td>50.7 (6.0)</td>
<td>50.0 (7.0)</td>
<td>50.4 (6.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>236</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Matched group includes the mean of expected performance across interviewer promotion/applicant promotion (condition 1) and interviewer prevention/applicant prevention (condition 4) conditions. Mismatched group includes the mean of expected performance across interviewer promotion/applicant prevention (condition 2) and interviewer prevention/applicant promotion (condition 3) conditions.
The result of the regression analysis of Hypothesis 1 is presented in Table 4.8. In the first step of the model, expected performance was regressed on trait promotion, trait prevention, and agreeableness. The three control variables significantly predicted expected performance, \( R^2 = .07, F_{(3, 232)} = 5.84, p < .001 \). Out of the three control variables, trait promotion uniquely predicted expected performance ratings, \( \beta = .23, p < .001 \). In step 2, the three contrast variables were added as independent variables.

In order for Hypothesis 1 to be supported, the added contrast variables should account for significant prediction in expected performance. In addition, \( C_3 \), the contrast between interviewer-applicant matched versus unmatched regulatory focus, should uniquely predict expected performance. The added contrast variables did not account for significant variance in expected performance ratings, \( \Delta R^2 = .01, \Delta F_{(3, 229)} = .85, p = .47 \). Examining the test of Hypothesis 1 further, the unique contributions of the contrast variables were examined. The difference between the interviewer promotion and prevention focus groups on expected performance were not significant, \( C_1, \beta = -.08, p = .24 \). The applicant promotion and prevention focus groups did not differ on expected performance, \( C_2, \beta = -.02, p = .73 \). Lastly, the interviewer/applicant regulatory focus match and mismatched groups did not significantly predict expected performance, \( C_3, \beta = .07, p = .29 \). There was no support for Hypothesis 1. Thus, there was no significant difference between the regulatory focus matched conditions (conditions 1 and 4) and the regulatory focus unmatched conditions (conditions 2 and 3) on expected performance.
Regression Analysis for H1: Interviewer and applicant regulatory focus will effect applicant expected performance ratings. Higher ratings are expected when the regulatory focus of the interviewer and applicant are congruent.

Table 4.8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Step 1</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Step 2</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>SE B</td>
<td>β</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>SE B</td>
<td>β</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trait Promotion Focus</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.23***</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.23***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trait Prevention Focus</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreeableness</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.49</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>-.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>-.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>36.56</td>
<td>4.31</td>
<td></td>
<td>37.05</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΔR²</td>
<td>.07***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΔF</td>
<td>5.84***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.85***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<.05, **p<.01, ***p<.001. C1 contrasts interviewer promotion versus prevention focus prime. C2 contrasts applicant promotion versus prevention focus. C3 contrasts interviewer-applicant matched versus unmatched regulatory focus. Dependent variable is expected performance ratings.

Since the manipulated regulatory focus of the interviewer and applicant did not directly predict applicant expected performance, the first model proposed, where objective fit predicts applicant expected performance directly could be ruled out. The subsequent analyses below will determine whether objective fit influenced expected performance ratings indirectly. Support for both Hypotheses 2 and 3 would provide evidence that objective fit is an antecedent of subjective fit, while support for Hypotheses 4-7 would provide evidence that subjective fit was a direct predictor of expected performance.

Objective/Subjective Fit Model

Hypothesis 2 stated, manipulated interviewer and applicant regulatory focus will effect (a) interviewer state promotion focus, (b) interviewer state prevention focus, (c)
perceived applicant promotion focus, and (d) perceived applicant prevention focus. Four separate regression analyses were examined with state promotion, state prevention, applicant promotion, and applicant prevention entered as the dependent variables. The dependent variables were first regressed on the control variables, trait promotion, trait prevention, and agreeableness. In step two, the dependent variables were regressed on the three contrast variables.

In order to test Hypotheses 2a and 2b planned comparisons between the primed promotion focus conditions (conditions 1 and 2), and the primed prevention focus conditions (conditions 3 and 4) on state promotion and prevention focus were examined. Table 4.9 displays the means for the interviewer state promotion and prevention regulatory focus by condition.

Table 4.9

Mean interviewer state regulatory focus across primed conditions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conditions</th>
<th>Interviewer Primed Promotion Focus</th>
<th>Interviewer Primed Prevention Focus</th>
<th>Total Across All Conditions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interviewer State Promotion (SD)</td>
<td>33.4 (6.6)</td>
<td>33.8 (6.0)</td>
<td>33.6 (6.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewer State Prevention (SD)</td>
<td>21.7 (6.3)</td>
<td>22.7 (5.8)</td>
<td>22.2 (6.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>236</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Primed promotion focus group includes the mean of interviewer state regulatory focus across the interviewer promotion focus primed conditions (conditions 1 and 2). Primed prevention focus group includes the mean of interviewer state regulatory focus across the interviewer prevention focus primed conditions (conditions 3 and 4).

The result of Hypothesis 2a is presented in Table 4.10. In the first step of the model, interviewer state promotion focus was regressed on trait promotion, trait prevention, and agreeableness. The three control variables significantly predicted state promotion focus, $R^2 = .17$, $F(3, 232) = 15.65, p < .001$. Out of the control variables, both
trait promotion ($\beta = .29, p < .001$) and agreeableness ($\beta = .21, p < .001$) uniquely predicted state promotion focus. In step 2, the three contrast variables were added as independent variables.

In order for Hypothesis 2a to be supported, the added contrast variables should account for significant prediction in state promotion focus. In addition, $C_1$, the contrast between the primed promotion focus conditions (conditions 1 and 2) versus the primed prevention focus conditions (conditions 3 and 4) should uniquely predict state promotion focus. The added contrast variables did not account for significant variance in state promotion focus, $\Delta R^2 = .02, \Delta F(3, 229) = 1.51, p = .21$. Examining the test of Hypothesis 2a further, $C_1$ did not significantly predict state promotion focus, $\beta = -.01, p = .92$. There was no support for Hypothesis 2a. Thus, there was no significant difference between the primed promotion focus conditions (conditions 1 and 2) and the primed prevention focus conditions (conditions 3 and 4) on state promotion focus.

Although, there was no difference in the prediction of state promotion focus between the interviewer promotion and prevention focused groups ($C_1$), an unexpected finding was that the contrast between the applicant promotion and prevention focused response groups, $C_2$, significantly predicted state promotion focus, $\beta = .13, p < .05$. The groups who received the promotion focus applicant responses ($M = 34.2, SD = 5.5$) scored higher in state promotion than the prevention focus applicant response groups ($M = 33.0, SD = 7.1$).
Regression Analysis for $H2a$: Manipulated interviewer and applicant regulatory focus will affect interviewer state promotion focus.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Step 1</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Step 2</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$B$</td>
<td>$SE$ $B$</td>
<td>$\beta$</td>
<td>$B$</td>
<td>$SE$ $B$</td>
<td>$\beta$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trait Promotion Focus</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.29***</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.30***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trait Prevention Focus</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreeableness</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.21***</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.21***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$C_1$</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>-.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$C_2$</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.13*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$C_3$</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>-.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>9.47</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td></td>
<td>8.73</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\Delta R^2$</td>
<td>.17***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\Delta F$</td>
<td>$15.65_{(3, 232)}$***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1.51_{(3, 229)}$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<.05, **p<.01, ***p<.001. $C_1$ contrasts interviewer promotion versus prevention focus prime. $C_2$ contrasts applicant promotion versus prevention focus. $C_3$ contrasts interviewer-applicant matched versus unmatched regulatory focus. Dependent variable is state promotion focus.

The result of Hypothesis 2b is presented in Table 4.11. In the first step of the model, interviewer state prevention focus was regressed on trait promotion, trait prevention, and agreeableness. The three control variables significantly predicted state prevention focus, $R^2 = .15$, $F_{(3, 232)} = 13.39$, $p < .001$. Out of the control variables, both trait promotion ($\beta = -.21$, $p < .001$) and trait prevention ($\beta = .34$, $p < .001$) uniquely predicted state prevention focus. In step 2, the three contrast variables were added as independent variables. The added contrast variables did not account for significant variance in state prevention focus, $\Delta R^2 = .01$, $\Delta F_{(3, 229)} = 1.28$, $p = .28$. Examining the test of Hypothesis 2b further, $C_1$ did not significantly predict state prevention focus, $\beta = -.02$, $p = .71$. There was no support for Hypothesis 2b. Thus, there was no significant
difference between the primed promotion focus conditions (conditions 1 and 2) and the primed prevention focus conditions (conditions 3 and 4) on state prevention focus.

Table 4.11

Regression Analysis for H2b: Manipulated interviewer and applicant regulatory focus will effect interviewer state prevention focus.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE B</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE B</th>
<th>β</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trait Promotion Focus</td>
<td>-.26</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.21***</td>
<td>-.27</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.22***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trait Prevention Focus</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.34***</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.34***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreeableness</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>-.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.66</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>-.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>20.64</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td></td>
<td>21.13</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ΔR²                      | .15***|      |       | .01 |      |       |

ΔF                       | 13.39**(3, 232)*** |      |       | 1.28**(3, 229)*** |

*p<.05, **p<.01, ***p<.001. C₁ contrasts interviewer promotion versus prevention focus prime. C₂ contrasts applicant promotion versus prevention focus. C₃ contrasts interviewer-applicant matched versus unmatched regulatory focus. Dependent variable is state prevention focus.

For Hypotheses 2c and 2d, planned comparisons between the applicant promotion response conditions (conditions 1 and 3), and applicant prevention response conditions (conditions 2 and 4) on perceived applicant promotion and prevention focus were examined. Table 4.12 displays the means for the interviewer state promotion and prevention regulatory focus by condition.
Table 4.12

Mean perceived applicant regulatory focus across assigned applicant regulatory focus responses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conditions</th>
<th>Promotion Focus Applicant Responses</th>
<th>Prevention Focus Applicant Responses</th>
<th>Total Across All Conditions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Applicant Pro RF (SD)</td>
<td>37.9 (4.2)</td>
<td>38.5 (5.0)</td>
<td>38.2 (4.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Applicant Pre RF (SD)</td>
<td>23.8 (6.1)</td>
<td>25.0 (6.2)</td>
<td>24.4 (6.2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N 123 113 236

Note. Promotion focus applicant response group includes the mean of perceived applicant regulatory focus across the applicant promotion focus response conditions (conditions 1 and 3). Prevention focus applicant response group includes the mean of perceived applicant regulatory focus across the applicant prevention focus response conditions (conditions 2 and 4).

The result of Hypothesis 2c is presented in Table 4.13. In the first step of the model, perceived applicant promotion focus was regressed on trait promotion, trait prevention, and agreeableness. The three control variables significantly predicted applicant promotion focus, $R^2 = .09, F_{(3, 232)} = 7.83, p < .001$. Out of the control variables, both trait promotion ($\beta = .22, p < .001$) and agreeableness ($\beta = .13, p < .05$) uniquely predicted applicant promotion focus. In step 2, the three contrast variables were added as independent variables. The added contrast variables did not account for significant variance in applicant promotion focus, $\Delta R^2 = .02, \Delta F_{(3, 229)} = 1.94, p = .12$. Examining the test of Hypothesis 2c further, $C_2$ did not significantly predict applicant promotion focus, $\beta = -.04, p = .51$. There was no support for Hypothesis 2c. Thus, there was no significant difference between the applicant promotion focus conditions (conditions 1 and 3) and the applicant prevention focus conditions (conditions 2 and 4) on perceived applicant promotion focus.
Table 4.13

*Regression Analysis for H2c: Manipulated interviewer and applicant regulatory focus will effect perceived applicant promotion focus.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Step 1</th>
<th>Step 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>SE B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trait Promotion Focus</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trait Prevention Focus</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreeableness</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>23.90</td>
<td>3.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΔR²</td>
<td>.09***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΔF</td>
<td>7.83**(3,232)***</td>
<td>1.94*(3,229)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<.05, **p<.01, ***p<.001. C₁ contrasts interviewer promotion versus prevention focus prime. C₂ contrasts applicant promotion versus prevention focus. C₃ contrasts interviewer-applicant matched versus unmatched regulatory focus. Dependent variable is perceived applicant promotion focus.

Although, there was no difference in the prediction of perceived applicant promotion focus between the applicant promotion and prevention focused response groups (C₂), an unexpected finding was that the contrast between the interviewer-applicant regulatory focus matched and mismatched groups, C₃, significantly predicted perceived applicant promotion focus, β = .13, p < .05. The interviewer-applicant regulatory focus matched groups (M = 38.6, SD = 4.3) perceived the applicant promotion focus as higher than the interviewer-applicant regulatory focus mismatched groups (M = 37.7, SD = 4.9).

The result of Hypothesis 2d is presented in Table 4.14. In the first step of the model, perceived applicant prevention focus was regressed on trait promotion, trait prevention, and agreeableness. The three control variables significantly predicted applicant prevention focus, $R^2 = .14$, $F_{(3,232)} = 12.23$, $p < .001$. Out of the control
variables, both trait prevention ($\beta = .32$, $p < .001$) and agreeableness ($\beta = -.13$, $p < .05$) uniquely predicted applicant prevention focus. In step 2, the three contrast variables were added as independent variables. The added contrast variables did not account for significant variance in applicant prevention focus, $\Delta R^2 = .02$, $\Delta F_{(3, 229)} = 1.30$, $p = .27$.

Examining the test of Hypothesis 2d further, $C_2$ did not significantly predict applicant promotion focus, $\beta = -.07$, $p = .26$. There was no support for Hypothesis 2d. Thus, there was no significant difference between the applicant promotion focus conditions (conditions 1 and 3) and the applicant prevention focus conditions (conditions 2 and 4) on perceived applicant prevention focus.

### Table 4.14

*Regression Analysis for H2d: Manipulated interviewer and applicant regulatory focus will effect perceived applicant prevention focus.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Step 1</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trait Promotion Focus</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trait Prevention Focus</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.33***</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.34***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreeableness</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.13*</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-.43</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-.28</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>16.41</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td></td>
<td>16.29</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\Delta R^2$</td>
<td>.14***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\Delta F$</td>
<td>12.23(3,232)***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.30(3,229)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<.05, **p<.01, ***p<.001. C_1 contrasts interviewer promotion versus prevention focus prime. C_2 contrasts applicant promotion versus prevention focus. C_3 contrasts interviewer-applicant matched versus unmatched regulatory focus. Dependent variable is perceived applicant prevention focus.

Hypothesis 3 stated, *(a) interviewer state promotion and perceived applicant promotion focus will interact and (b) interviewer state prevention and perceived...*
applicant prevention focus will interact to effect interviewer subjective regulatory fit. To test this hypothesis, moderated regression (Aiken & West, 1991; Stone & Hollenbeck, 1984; Zedeck, 1971) was utilized. Two separate regression equations were analyzed in order to test Hypotheses 3a and 3b respectively. In step one of the regression equation, perceived regulatory fit was regressed on the control variables (trait promotion, trait prevention, and agreeableness). In step 2, the independent variables were entered. In the final step, the interaction term between the independent variables was entered. In order to reduce multicollinearity, variables were mean centered for these moderated regression analyses (Aiken & West, 1991).

The results of Hypotheses 3a are presented in Table 4.15. In step 1, the control variables significantly predicted perceived regulatory fit, $R^2 = .09$, $F_{(3, 232)} = 8.06$, $p < .001$. Out of the control variables, trait promotion ($\beta = .27$, $p < .001$) uniquely predicted subjective regulatory fit. In step 2, state promotion ($\beta = .36$, $p < .001$) and applicant promotion ($\beta = .25$, $p < .001$) uniquely predicted subjective regulatory fit. In the final step, the interaction between state promotion and applicant promotion focus was entered, resulting in significant prediction of subjective regulatory fit, $\beta = .19$, $p < .001$. Thus, initial support for Hypothesis 3a was found.
Table 4.15

Regression Analysis for H3a: Interviewer state promotion and perceived applicant promotion focus will interact to effect interviewer subjective regulatory fit.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE B</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE B</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE B</th>
<th>β</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trait Promotion Focus</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.27***</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trait Prevention Focus</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreeableness</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Promotion Focus</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.36***</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.34***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant Prom Focus</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.25***</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.27***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Pro x App Pro</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.19***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>16.16</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>4.51</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>50.66</td>
<td>13.93</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ΔR²  | .09  | .21  | .04  |
ΔF   | 8.06(3, 232)*** | 34.41(2, 230)*** | 11.96(1, 229)***

*p<.05, **p<.01, ***p<.001

The results of Hypothesis 3b are presented in Table 4.16. As displayed in the previous analysis, the control variables, specifically, trait promotion focus predicted subjective regulatory fit. In step 2, both state prevention (β = .14, p < .05) and applicant prevention focus (β = -.19, p < .01) significantly predicted subjective regulatory fit.

Lastly, in step 3, the interaction between interviewer state prevention focus and applicant prevention focus was entered, however, the interaction term (β = .07, p = .28) did not significantly predict subjective regulatory fit.
Table 4.16

Regression Analysis for H3b: Interviewer state prevention and perceived applicant prevention focus will interact to affect interviewer subjective regulatory fit.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Step 1</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Step 2</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Step 3</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>SE B</td>
<td>β</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>SE B</td>
<td>β</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>SE B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trait Promotion Focus</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.27***</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.31***</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trait Prevention Focus</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreeableness</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Prevention Focus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant Pre Focus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.19**</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Pre x App Pre</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>16.16</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>16.40</td>
<td>4.34</td>
<td>23.04</td>
<td>7.54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΔR²</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΔF</td>
<td>8.06</td>
<td>(3, 232)</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>(2, 230)</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>(1, 229)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<.05, **p<.01, ***p<.001

To determine the pattern of the significant interactions between interviewer state promotion focus and perceived applicant promotion focus on subjective regulatory fit, two separate predicted regression lines at high and low levels of subjective regulatory fit were calculated as outlined by Cohen and Cohen (1983). This pattern was only examined for the interaction of interviewer and applicant promotion focus (Hypothesis 3a) because the interaction for interviewer and applicant prevention focus (Hypothesis 3b) was not significant. The high-level regression lines were calculated at one standard deviation above the mean, while the low-level regression lines were calculated at one standard deviation below the mean. Figure 4.1 diagrams the interaction between state promotion focus and applicant promotion focus. As expected, the effect of perceived applicant regulatory focus on subjective regulatory fit is stronger when the interviewer has a higher
state promotion focus. Thus, support for H3a can be concluded and overall H3 is partially supported.

Figure 4.1. Graph of H3a: State interviewer promotion and perceived applicant promotion focus will interact to affect interviewer subjective regulatory fit. Note. Graph displays predicted means of subjective regulatory fit.

Although Hypothesis 3a was supported, as a whole, the model of objective fit indirectly predicting expected performance ratings through subjective fit was not supported. Based on the result of Hypothesis 2, objective fit initially did not influence state regulatory focus of the interviewers. Additionally, when ignoring condition, and examining the interaction of state level interviewer regulatory focus and perceived applicant regulatory focus on subjective regulatory fit, the interaction was not significant for prevention focus. Furthermore, when examining the interaction for promotion focus, one would expect that when both state and applicant regulatory focus are low, perceived regulatory fit would still be high; however, this was not the case when examining the interaction of promotion focus. Conversely, when state and applicant regulatory focus were low, perceived regulatory fit was low. Taking the results of Hypotheses 2 and 3
together, there was no support for objective regulatory fit being an antecedent to subjective regulatory fit. The remaining hypotheses will test the final model, which predicted that subjective fit would predict expected performance.

**Subjective Fit Model**

Hypothesis 4 stated, *Interviewer subjective regulatory fit will be positively related to (a) feeling of rightness, (b) enjoyment, (c) value from fit, and (d) liking.* Separate regression equations were analyzed, with control variables (trait promotion, trait prevention, and agreeableness) entered in step 1, and subjective regulatory fit entered as the independent variable in step 2. In order for Hypothesis 4 to be supported, subjective regulatory fit should significantly predict the dependent variables above and beyond the control variables.

The results for Hypothesis 4a are displayed in Table 4.17. In step 1, trait promotion, trait prevention and agreeableness were all entered as control variables, predicting feeling of rightness. The three control variables accounted for significant variance in feeling of rightness, $R^2 = .11$, $F_{(3, 232)} = 9.04, p < .001$. Of the control variables, trait promotion ($\beta = .26, p < .001$) and trait prevention ($\beta = -.13, p < .05$) uniquely predicted feeling of rightness. In step 2, subjective regulatory fit was entered. This resulted in accounting for significant variance in feeling of rightness, $\Delta R^2 = .04$, $\Delta F_{(1, 231)} = 11.43, p < .001$. Subjective regulatory fit uniquely predicted feeling of rightness ($\beta = .22, p < .001$). Hypothesis 4a was supported. Subjective regulatory fit was positively related to feeling of rightness.
Table 4.17

Regression Analysis for H4a: Interviewer subjective regulatory fit will be positively related to a) feeling of rightness.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Step 1</th>
<th>Step 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>SE B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trait Promotion Focus</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trait Prevention Focus</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreeableness</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjective Regulatory Fit</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>11.09</td>
<td>1.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΔR²</td>
<td>.11****</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΔF</td>
<td>9.04(3, 232)***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<.05, **p<.01, ***p<.001

The results for Hypothesis 4b are displayed in Table 4.18. In step 1, trait promotion, trait prevention and agreeableness were all entered as control variables, predicting enjoyment. The three control variables accounted for significant variance in enjoyment, $R^2 = .13$, $F_{(3, 232)} = 11.91, p < .001$. Of the control variables, trait promotion ($\beta = .23, p < .001$) and agreeableness ($\beta = .19, p < .01$) uniquely predicted enjoyment. In step 2, subjective regulatory fit was entered. This resulted in accounting for significant variance in enjoyment, $\Delta R^2 = .04$, $\Delta F_{(1, 231)} = 10.93, p < .001$. Subjective regulatory fit uniquely predicted enjoyment ($\beta = .21, p < .001$). Hypothesis 4b was supported. Subjective regulatory fit was positively related to enjoyment.
Table 4.18

*Regression Analysis for H4b: Interviewer subjective regulatory fit will be positively related to enjoyment.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Step 1</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Step 2</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>SE B</td>
<td>β</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>SE B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trait Promotion Focus</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.23***</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.18**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trait Prevention Focus</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreeableness</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.19**</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.17***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjective Regulatory Fit</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.21***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>4.78</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΔR²</td>
<td>.13***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.04***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΔF</td>
<td>11.91_(3, 232)_***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10.93_(1, 231)_***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<.05, **p<.01, ***p<.001

The results for Hypothesis 4c are displayed in Table 4.19. In step 1, trait promotion, trait prevention and agreeableness were all entered as control variables, predicting value from fit. The three control variables did not account for significant variance in value from fit, R² = .02, F_(3, 232) = 1.79, p = .15. Subsequently, none of the control variables uniquely predicted value from fit. In step 2, subjective regulatory fit was entered. This resulted in accounting for significant variance in value from fit, ΔR² = .16, ΔF_(1, 231) = 45.36, p < .001. Subjective regulatory fit uniquely predicted value from fit (β = .42, p < .001). Hypothesis 4c was supported. Subjective regulatory fit was positively related to value from fit.
Table 4.19

Regression Analysis for H4c: Interviewer subjective regulatory fit will be positively related to value from fit.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE B</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>Step 1</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE B</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>Step 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trait Promotion Focus</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trait Prevention Focus</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreeableness</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td></td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjective Regulatory</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>15.25</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td></td>
<td>12.17</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΔR²</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.16***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΔF</td>
<td>1.79_(3,232)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>45.36_(1,231)***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<.05, **p<.01, ***p<.001

The results for Hypothesis 4d are displayed in Table 4.20. In step 1, trait promotion, trait prevention and agreeableness were all entered as control variables, predicting liking. The three control variables accounted for significant variance in liking, \( R^2 = .04, F_{(3,232)} = 3.43, p < .05 \). Of the control variables, only trait promotion (\( \beta = .19, p < .01 \)) uniquely predicted liking. In step 2, subjective regulatory fit was entered. This resulted in accounting for significant variance in liking, \( \Delta R^2 = .19, \Delta F_{(1,231)} = 56.84, p < .001 \). Subjective regulatory fit uniquely predicted liking (\( \beta = .46, p < .001 \)). Hypothesis 4d was supported. Subjective regulatory fit was positively related to liking.
Table 4.20

*Regression Analysis for H4d: Interviewer subjective regulatory fit will be positively related to liking.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Step 1</th>
<th>Step 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>SE B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trait Promotion Focus</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trait Prevention Focus</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreeableness</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjective Regulatory Fit</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>10.62</td>
<td>1.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΔR²</td>
<td>.04*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΔF</td>
<td>3.43(3, 232)*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<.05, **p<.01, ***p<.001

Hypothesis 5 stated, *(a) Feeling of rightness, (b) enjoyment, (c) value from fit, and (d) liking will be positively related to expected performance.* In order to test this hypothesis, expected performance was regressed on control variables in step 1. In step 2, all independent variables were entered as independent variables of expected performance. Multicollinearity for the independent variables added in step 2 was examined. Tolerance and variance inflation factor (VIF) were used as indicators for multicollinearity. According to Tabachnick and Fidell (2001), a tolerance value of .10 is recommended as the minimum level of tolerance. For VIF, Pan and Jackson (2008) recommend a maximum value of 4 as the threshold for multicollinearity. All tolerance indicators were greater than .10 and all VIF indicators were less than 4. Therefore no multicollinearity existed for the independent variables.

Results of the regression analysis are displayed in Table 4.21. In step 1, the control variables accounted for significant variance in expected performance, $R^2 = .07$, $F_{(3, 232)} = 5.84, p < .001$. Of the control variables, trait promotion ($\beta = .23, p < .001$).
uniquely predicted expected performance. In step 2, with the independent variables entered, a significant amount of variance was explained, \( \Delta R^2 = .50, \Delta F(4, 228) = 65.82, p < .001 \). Feeling of rightness did not uniquely predict expected performance, above and beyond the other variables, \( \beta = .06, p = .26 \). Thus, Hypothesis 5a was not supported.

Enjoyment was a significant predictor of expected performance, \( \beta = -.11, p < .05 \).

Although Hypothesis 5b was supported, it should be noted that the relationship between enjoyment and expected performance was negative, which is the opposite direction of the hypothesized relationship. This will be discussed in the next section. Lastly, value from fit (\( \beta = .54, p < .001 \)) and liking (\( \beta = .26, p < .001 \)) were both significantly related to expected performance, supporting Hypotheses 5c and 5d.

Table 4.21

*Regression Analysis for H5: (a) Feeling of rightness, (b) enjoyment, (c) value from fit, and (d) liking will be positively related to expected performance.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Step 1</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Step 2</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>SE B</td>
<td>( \beta )</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>SE B</td>
<td>( \beta )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trait Promotion Focus</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.23***</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.15***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trait Prevention Focus</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreeableness</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liking</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.26***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enjoyment</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-.30</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>-.11*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value from Fit</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.54***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feeling of Rightness</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>36.56</td>
<td>4.31</td>
<td></td>
<td>10.56</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( \Delta R^2 \) | .07*** | .50*** |
\( \Delta F \) | 5.84(3, 232)*** | 65.82(4, 228)*** |

*p<.05, **p<.01, ***p<.001

Hypothesis 6 stated, *interviewer subjective regulatory fit will be positively related to expected performance.* To test this hypothesis, expected performance was regressed on
the control variables in step 1. In step 2, perceived regulatory fit was entered as the independent variable. Table 4.22 presents the results of the regression analysis for Hypothesis 6. When entered into step 2 of the regression equation, perceived regulatory fit accounted for significant variance in expected ratings beyond the control variables, $\Delta R^2 = .15$, $\Delta F_{(1, 231)} = 45.83, p < .001$. Perceived regulatory fit was a significant predictor of expected performance ratings ($\beta = .41$, $p < .001$), supporting Hypothesis 6. Thus, a successful relationship between subjective regulatory fit and expected performance was established from Hypothesis 6.

Table 4.22

*Regression Analysis for H6: Interviewer subjective regulatory fit will be positively related to applicant ratings.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Step 1</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Step 2</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$B$</td>
<td>$SE$</td>
<td>$\beta$</td>
<td>$B$</td>
<td>$SE$</td>
<td>$\beta$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trait Promotion Focus</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.23***</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trait Prevention Focus</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreeableness</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Regulatory Fit</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.41***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>36.56</td>
<td>4.31</td>
<td></td>
<td>29.65</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\Delta R^2$</td>
<td>.07***</td>
<td></td>
<td>.15***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\Delta F$</td>
<td>5.84_{(1, 232)}***</td>
<td>45.83_{(1, 231)}***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<.05, **p<.01, ***p<.001

Hypothesis 7 stated, (a) *Feeling of rightness, (b) enjoyment, (c) value from fit,* and (d) *liking will mediate the relationship between interviewer subjective regulatory fit and applicant ratings.* To test this hypothesis, a four-step mediated regression method (Baron & Kenny, 1986; James & Brett, 1984; Judd & Kenny, 1981) was used. The first step in the mediated regression method is to establish a significant relationship between
the independent variable and dependent variable by regressing the dependent variable (expected performance) on the independent variable (regulatory fit). The second step is to show that the independent variable is correlated with the mediators (feeling of rightness, enjoyment, value from fit, and liking). Thirdly, the mediators need to demonstrate a correlation with the dependent variable. Lastly, to conclude full mediation, the effect of the independent variable on the dependent variable should be zero, when controlling for the mediators.

Leading up to Hypothesis 7, the first three steps in the mediated regression method (Baron & Kenny, 1986; James & Brett, 1984; Judd & Kenny, 1981) were established. The independent variable, subjective regulatory fit, was positively related to expected performance (see Hypothesis 6). Subjective regulatory fit was related to the mediators, feeling of rightness, enjoyment, value from fit, and liking, supporting the second step in the mediated regression method (see Hypothesis 4). To support the third step, the mediators were significantly correlated to expected performance (see Hypothesis 5). Hypothesis 7 tested the final step of the mediated regression method, which regressed expected performance on subjective regulatory fit, feeling of rightness, enjoyment, value from fit, and liking. In order for full mediation to occur, the effect of subjective regulatory fit on expected performance should be zero. In other words, the relationship between relationship between the independent variable and dependent variable should be non-significant when including the mediator variables.

The result of the analysis for Hypothesis 7 is displayed in Table 4.23. In step 1, expected performance was regressed on the control variables. In step 2, perceived regulatory fit was entered as an independent variable, resulting in a significant amount of
change in variance accounted for, $\Delta R^2 = .15$, $\Delta F_{(1, 231)} = 45.82, p < .001$. In step 3, value from fit, enjoyment, feeling of rightness, and liking were entered as independent variables, resulting in a significant amount of change in variance accounted for, $\Delta R^2 = .35$, $\Delta F_{(4, 227)} = 45.05, p < .001$. When entered as a predictor along with the mediators, perceived regulatory fit still significantly predicted expected performance ratings ($\beta = .10, p < .05$). It should be noted that the relationship between subjective regulatory fit and expected performance was stronger without accounting for the mediators. Partial mediation can be concluded at this point in the analysis; however, the extent to which partial mediation occurred cannot be examined simply by using the 4-step mediated regression method (Baron & Kenny, 1986; James & Brett, 1984; Judd & Kenny, 1981).

Table 4.23

Regression Analysis for H7: (a) Feeling of rightness, (b) enjoyment, (c) value from fit, and (d) liking will mediate the relationship between interviewer subjective regulatory fit and applicant ratings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Step 1</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Step 2</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Step 3</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$B$</td>
<td>SE $B$</td>
<td>$\beta$</td>
<td>$B$</td>
<td>SE $B$</td>
<td>$\beta$</td>
<td>$B$</td>
<td>SE $B$</td>
<td>$\beta$</td>
<td>$B$</td>
<td>SE $B$</td>
<td>$\beta$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trait Promotion Focus</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.23***</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.13***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trait Prevention Focus</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreeableness</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Regulatory Fit</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.41***</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.10*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liking</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.22***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value from Fit</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.52***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enjoyment</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-.30</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>-.11*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feeling of Rightness</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>36.56</td>
<td>4.31</td>
<td>29.66</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>10.40</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\Delta R^2$</td>
<td>.07***</td>
<td>.15***</td>
<td>.35***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\Delta F$</td>
<td>5.84$_{(3, 232)}$***</td>
<td>45.83$_{(1, 231)}$*</td>
<td>47.05$_{(4, 227)}$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<.05, **p<.01, ***p<.001
A test of the indirect effects was adopted in order to determine the extent to which the mediators mediated the relationship between subjective regulatory fit and expected performance. Although the most common approach to examining indirect effects is the Sobel test (see Baron & Kenny, 1986), in their review of multiple mediator model analyses, Preacher and Hayes (2008) recommended using bootstrapping to obtain confidence intervals for the total indirect effect and the specific indirect effects of each mediator. The bootstrapping approach will account for multicollinearity found with having multiple mediators in the same equation. Thus, bootstrapping with 95% confidence intervals was adopted.

The total indirect effect and the specific indirect effects of each mediator are presented in Table 4.24. For the total indirect effect, the confidence interval (ranging from .23 to .47) associated with the point estimate (.34), did not include zero within its range. Since zero did not fall within this interval, the total indirect effect of all four mediators was significant. Thus, support for partial mediation can be concluded. An examination of the specific indirect effects indicates that only liking and value from fit were statistically significant independent mediators of the effect of subjective regulatory fit on expected performance. Figure 4.2 diagrams the path model for Hypothesis 7.

Table 4.24

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indirect Effect</th>
<th>Point Estimate</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>Confidence Intervals</th>
<th>Lower</th>
<th>Upper</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Indirect Effect</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liking</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value from Fit</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enjoyment</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feeling of Rightness</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Based on the partial support found for the proposed model above, it can be concluded that subjective fit predicted expected performance through liking and value from fit. Thus, taking the results from all hypotheses together, it can be concluded that subjective fit was a proximal predictor of the evaluation of the applicant, while objective fit did not work as a proximal or distal predictor of the applicant evaluation. Further discussion on the implications of these findings will be discussed below.
CHAPTER V
DISCUSSION

The purpose of this chapter is to summarize the results of the study and discuss the implications. This section will begin with a summary of the major findings of the study. Next it will discuss limitations and ideas for future research. Lastly, contributions, implications, and a general summary will be provided.

Summary of Results

Three potential models were proposed at the beginning of the study. These models examined the specific contributions of objective and subjective regulatory fit on applicant ratings. Support for the hypotheses provided evidence for support of each model. Table 5.1 shows a summary of the results of each hypothesis. Below is an explanation of the results.
Table 5.1

Summary of hypotheses and results.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Associated Model(s)</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis 1</td>
<td>Manipulated interviewer and applicant regulatory focus will effect applicant ratings. Specifically, higher applicant ratings are expected when the regulatory focus of the interviewer and applicant are congruent.</td>
<td>Objective Fit Model</td>
<td>No support for H1. Objective Fit Model not supported.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis 2</td>
<td>Manipulated interviewer and applicant regulatory focus will effect (a) interviewer state promotion focus, (b) interviewer state prevention focus, (c) perceived applicant promotion focus, and (d) perceived applicant prevention focus.</td>
<td>Objective/Subjective Fit Model</td>
<td>No support for H2. Objective/Subjective Fit Model not supported.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis 3</td>
<td>(a) Interviewer state promotion and perceived applicant promotion focus will interact and (b) interviewer state prevention and perceived applicant prevention focus will interact to effect interviewer subjective regulatory fit.</td>
<td>Objective/Subjective Fit Model</td>
<td>Partial support for H3a. No support for H3b. Objective/Subjective Model not supported.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis 4</td>
<td>Interviewer subjective regulatory fit will be positively related to (a) feeling of rightness, (b) enjoyment, (c) value from fit, and (d) liking.</td>
<td>Subjective Fit Model</td>
<td>Full support for H4.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis 5</td>
<td>(a) Feeling of rightness, (b) enjoyment, (c) value from fit, and (d) liking will be positively related to applicant ratings.</td>
<td>Subjective Fit Model</td>
<td>No support for H5a and H5b. Full support for H5c and H5d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis 6</td>
<td>Interviewer subjective regulatory fit will be positively related to applicant ratings.</td>
<td>Subjective Fit Model</td>
<td>Full support for H6.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis 7</td>
<td>(a) Feeling of rightness, (b) enjoyment, (c) value from fit, and (d) liking will mediate the relationship between interviewer subjective regulatory fit and applicant ratings.</td>
<td>Subjective Fit Model</td>
<td>Partial support for H7. Subjective Fit Model partially supported.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The first model proposed that objective regulatory fit would directly effect applicant ratings. Hypothesis 1 tested the effect of manipulated interviewer and applicant regulatory focus on applicant ratings but was not supported. When comparing the conditions where the interviewer and applicant regulatory foci were congruent against the conditions where they were incongruent, no significant differences were found between groups. Although support for the objective fit model was not supported, subsequent analyses tested the effects objective fit had as a distal predictor of applicant ratings.

The second model of fit, examined both objective and subjective fit. It proposed that objective regulatory fit would effect subjective regulatory fit and subjective regulatory fit would predict applicant ratings. Hypotheses 2 and 3 were proposed in order
to provide support for objective fit effecting subjective fit. Hypothesis 2 proposed that the manipulated interviewer and applicant regulatory focus would effect the interviewer’s state regulatory focus and the perception of the applicant’s regulatory focus. This hypothesis was not supported. The manipulation of the interviewers’ regulatory focus did not effect their state level regulatory focus, nor did it effect their perception of the applicant’s regulatory focus.

The state regulatory focus of the interviewer and perceived regulatory focus of the applicant were examined in Hypothesis 3. Hypothesis 3 looked at the interaction of these two variables and their effect on subjective regulatory fit. Only partial support was found for Hypothesis 3. The interviewers’ state promotion focus interacted with their perceived applicant promotion focus to effect subjective regulatory fit. When both state and perceived promotion focus were high, it resulted in the highest rating of subjective regulatory fit. The interaction for state and perceived prevention focus on subjective regulatory fit was not significant. Although Hypothesis 3 was only partially supported, overall, support for the second model could not be concluded.

The third model of fit tested the effect of subjective regulatory fit on applicant ratings. Subjective regulatory fit was directly related to applicant ratings (Hypothesis 6). It was also found that subjective regulatory fit was positively related to feeling of rightness, enjoyment, value from fit, and liking (Hypothesis 4). These four variables are common outcomes found in regulatory fit studies and were proposed mediators in this study.

Hypothesis 5 examined the relationship between the mediators and applicant ratings. Significant positive relationships were found between value from fit and liking
with applicant ratings. Feeling of rightness was not significantly related to applicant ratings, and enjoyment was negatively related to applicant ratings. Thus, only partial support was concluded for Hypothesis 5.

Hypothesis 7 examined the mediation of subjective regulatory fit on applicant ratings. When applicant ratings were regressed on subjective regulatory fit and the mediators, subjective regulatory fit still predicted applicant ratings, but not as strongly as when applicant ratings were regressed on subjective regulatory fit alone. A bootstrapping approach recommended by Preacher and Hayes (2008) was used, in order to determine the significance of the indirect effect of the mediators. The total indirect effect was significant, and when examining the specific indirect effects of the mediators, value from fit and liking had significant indirect effects. Thus, it can be concluded that the relationship between subjective regulatory fit and applicant ratings was partially mediated by value from fit and liking. Since the subjective fit model proposed that state regulatory fit would effect applicant ratings through the mediators, and only value from fit and liking mediated this relationship, partial support for the subjective fit model can be concluded.

Although the model of subjective regulatory fit was supported, it is important to understand why the models with objective fit were not supported. Below are potential explanations for why both models with objective fit were not supported. Kristof (1996) proposed that the type of fit should be considered in the measurement of P-E fit. Objective fit would be related to improved process outcomes, and can occur even when fit is not perceived. For example, if two people are similar, they may work better together, and produce at a higher rate. This increased production can occur even if they
do not perceive this similarity. In this example, production is an objective outcome. Subjective fit resembles an attitude, and due to this, perceptions of subjective fit should be related to positive attitudes. For example, if one feels like he or she fits in the organization, it would likely lead to satisfaction or commitment. Applicant ratings in this study were subjective evaluations, which were more in-line with subjective fit. Had the dependent variable in this study been an objective outcome (e.g. accuracy of hire if subsequent performance is known), the model of objective fit may have had a greater effect on the outcome variable.

Another potential explanation for why objective fit did not have an effect on subjective fit may be related to the measures. Similar to the applicant ratings being subjective, state regulatory focus, perceived applicant regulatory focus, and subjective regulatory fit are all attitudinal variables. Thus, manipulating the regulatory focus of both the interviewer and applicant, and then having the interviewer respond to subjective items may not result in a noticeable effect.

A third explanation for objective fit not having an effect on state and perceived regulatory focus may be due to the fact that raters often don’t think about their own regulatory focus or that of others. When one is asked to respond to items on regulatory focus, they may not be familiar with the constructs. Although the reliabilities of the scales were acceptable, the ability to tap into whether one is familiar or understands the items even at a surface level, is hard to determine.

Hypothesis 3a, which examined the interaction between state promotion focus and perceived applicant promotion focus on subjective regulatory fit revealed an interesting finding related to objective fit. Figure 5.1 diagrams how the expected interaction between
interviewer and applicant promotion focus should have effected perceived regulatory fit. As expected in the current study, the effect of perceived applicant regulatory focus on subjective regulatory fit was strongest when levels of state promotion focus were high. Contrary to Figure 5.1, the effect of perceived applicant promotion focus on subjective regulatory fit was weak when there were low levels of state promotion focus.

![Perceived Regulatory Fit - Expected Results](image)

*Figure 5.1. Proposed interaction of interviewer and applicant promotion focus on perceived regulatory fit.*

Figure 5.2 diagrams the actual results from Hypothesis 3a. The effect of perceived applicant promotion focus on subjective regulatory fit was actually low when state promotion focus was low. When state promotion focus was high, subjective regulatory fit was high, regardless of how the promotion focus of the applicant was perceived. Thus, subjective regulatory fit was related more to the state promotion focus, than the combination of state and perceived promotion focus.
Although not significant, the interaction effect of perceived applicant prevention focus and state prevention focus on subjective regulatory fit appeared as expected. Figure 5.3 diagrams the interaction between interviewer and applicant prevention focus on perceived regulatory fit. The findings for prevention focus matches the expected results (see Figure 5.1). Once again, it should be cautioned that while these findings graphically appear to map onto the expected results, they were not significant through hypothesis testing. Taking the results from Hypotheses 3a and 3b together, future research should examine potential explanations for why subjective regulatory fit can be expected to be different based on promotion and prevention foci. Future research could look at components of promotion and prevention foci that account for differences that one perceives on fit. Lastly, for a promotion focus, is there a component across this dimension that primes interviewers to perceive fit?
Although the support for subjective regulatory fit model was supported, not all of the proposed variables mediated the relationship between subjective regulatory fit and applicant ratings. Both enjoyment and feeling of rightness demonstrated significant positive relationships with subjective regulatory fit, but neither was significantly related to the dependent variable, applicant ratings. Unexpectedly, enjoyment was negatively related to applicant ratings. One potential explanation for these findings was that enjoyment and feeling of rightness were more related to the interview process, compared to feelings about the applicant. These responses to the interview process did not extend to the evaluation of the applicant. Conversely, the variables that did show to be significant mediators, value from fit and liking, were both related to the applicant. It was unexpected that enjoyment and feeling of rightness would not be related to applicant ratings; however, following the explanation above, on a positive note, the interviewer was able to distinguish thoughts on the process from the ratings of the applicant.
Limitations and Future Research

Even though this study provided a contribution to the field, it was not without its limitations. One inherent limitation was with the population examined in the study. Although this study benefited by having a lab environment to control for extraneous variables on the outcome, the artificiality of a lab environment limited the external validity. Having college students play the role of an interviewer with no training in interviewing and without negative implications for selecting a poor applicant can be different from a hiring manager in a corporate environment. A hiring manager has many other concerns that may not be considered by a college student in a mock interview environment. For example, a hiring manager may need to sell the job or weigh an applicant against other qualified candidates. In order to mitigate this limitation, this study attempted to create a job context that would be familiar to most college students. The job of a recreation center staff member was a job that many college students could relate to and understand the job responsibilities for. Additionally, college students undergoing a manipulation prior to the interview may not be as effective as the trait level regulatory foci. On average, the lab study conducted took between 30-45 minutes for participants to complete, including the scales, primes, and interview simulation. There could be pitfalls of the manipulation only having short term effects that did not span the entire length of time that the participants were in the lab. Future research examining regulatory fit and interviews should consider the application of regulatory fit in a real life setting.

A second limitation of this study was the measures used in this study. As stated before, one proposition of objective fit was that objective fit was more closely related to objective measures (Kristof, 1996). As described above, since the outcomes were all
attitudinal in nature (subjective evaluations of an applicant), this could have limited the
effect that objective fit had in this study. Future research could look at introducing
objective measures. Some examples of objective measures could be having the
interviewer select actual candidates, and measuring their performance over time, or
having current employees participate in mock interviews as candidates and evaluating the
interviewers’ selection decisions based on concurrent performance data.

A limitation that was discussed above was that interviewers often aren’t aware of
their own regulatory focus, let alone the regulatory focus of others. Asking the
interviewers to evaluate the fit between their regulatory focus with that of the applicant
can cause an issue with the regulatory fit scale. Future research could introduce emotional
intelligence as a variable that could control for this lack of personal awareness of one’s
regulatory focus. Salovey and Mayer (1990) defined emotional intelligence as “a subset
of social intelligence that involves the ability to monitor one’s own and others’ feelings
and emotions, to discriminate among them and to use this information to guide one’s
thinking and actions” (p. 189). Perhaps the ability for emotionally intelligent individuals
to identify their own and others’ emotions can extend to perceptions of their own and
others’ regulatory focus. It should be cautioned that age could interact with emotional
intelligence as emotional intelligence may vary depending on life experiences. Thus,

studies with college student participants may not be the most applicable research designs
to consider emotional intelligence as a mediating variable. Nonetheless, future research
looking at regulatory fit should look at emotional intelligence as a mediating variable.

In addition to looking at applicant ratings, a study like this can also lead to future
studies looking at cognitive processes. Priming a regulatory focus, and having a
participant conduct an interview with an applicant can lead to additional influences other than the final rating of the applicant. Future research could examine the processes that one goes through to get to the applicant ratings. Some examples could include, the number of promotion and prevention focus questions asked or the interview length. These cognitive measures can have implications for the regulatory focus literature. For example, one who is primed with a prevention focus may be more vigilant throughout an interview. This may lead to asking more safety questions or taking more time to process responses. Potential findings could have implications for selection in manufacturing environments requiring safety.

Although this study did not propose directional hypotheses on how the different conditions would effect some of these cognitive processes, data on number of questions asked, the types of questions asked (promotion, prevention, or neutral), and the total length of time spent on the interview were collected. Supplemental analyses comparing the means of these variables across the conditions are presented in Appendix W. These supplemental analyses examined the effect of primed regulatory focus, regulatory focus congruence between interviewer and applicant, and state regulatory focus on these cognitive process variables.

The first set of supplemental analyses looked at the effect of primed regulatory focus on the cognitive process variables. Independent sample t-tests compared the promotion and prevention focus primed groups on the cognitive process variables. No significant differences between the primed promotion and prevention focus groups were found for the total number of questions asked, number of promotion and prevention focus questions asked, nor total elapsed interview time.
The second set of supplemental analyses looked at the effect of the regulatory fit on the cognitive process variables. Independent sample t-tests compared the interviewer-applicant regulatory focus matched and mismatched groups on each cognitive process variable. No significant differences between the interviewer-applicant regulatory matched and mismatched groups were found for the total number of questions asked, number of promotion and prevention focus questions asked, nor total elapsed interview time.

The third set of analyses examined the relationship between state regulatory focus and the cognitive process variables. Correlations between state promotion and prevention focus, total number of questions asked, promotion and prevention questions asked and total elapsed time were examined. A significant positive relationship between promotion focus questions asked and state prevention focus, \( r = .15, p < .05 \). Unexpectedly, the higher one’s prevention focus, the more promotion questions were asked.

Although the results of the current supplemental analyses only yielded one significant finding, future research studies should continue to look at the relationship between regulatory focus and cognitive processes. One unexpected finding was that state prevention focus was related to a higher percentage of promotion questions asked. This finding should be taken with caution as there was no a priori rationale that would have predicted this result. Due to the number of variables and analyses, it can be expected that some variables would be related by chance. While this study was conducted in a lab, future research could look at these same cognitive process variables in field settings.

An extension for understanding interviewer cognitive processes better can be seen in a recent study by Marr and Cable (2014), where the authors looked at the implications of a selling orientation in an interview. They examined the interviewer’s accuracy on
judging the disposition of an applicant when the interviewer had to also “sell” the job
during the interview. In both a lab and two field studies, they found that interviewers who
had to sell the job to applicants were less accurate in determining the applicants’
dispositions. Marr and Cable concluded that this was due to the fact that judging another
individual accurately in an interview setting is an effortful process, and requires cognitive
resources. When an interviewer is selling an interview, they allocate resources to selling
the position, opposed to concentrating on evaluating the applicant accurately. Based on
this premise, regulatory focus can aid interviewers in making more accurate ratings of an
applicant. A vigilant interviewer who is primarily prevention focused may be more
accurate, as they will spend more time interpreting an applicant’s responses and
behaviors during an interview. While this study was interested in examining the
implications for a match between an interviewer and applicant on regulatory focus, future
research should look at the implications for the regulatory focus of an interviewer on
cognitive processes and outcomes during an interview.

Marr and Cable’s (2014) study also introduces accuracy as another outcome that
was not examined in this study. Future studies should look at regulatory focus and
accuracy of the interviewer. For example, measuring an applicant’s personality with
objective measures prior to the interview and then having the interviewer estimate the
applicant’s personality post-interview would be one way to measure accuracy. This study
attempted to do this similarly by having the interviewer complete the perceived applicant
regulatory focus scale. Field studies can take a longitudinal approach by tracking new
hires’ performance over an extended period of time post-hire.
The application of regulatory focus can also have implications for other areas of selection. One of these areas is in testing. The framing of instructions from a promotion or prevention focus standpoint can have implications for applicants who may be taking an entry level test. Instructions framed with a promotion focus may cause applicants to answer more questions or view the selection process in total as an opportunity to demonstrate knowledge. Conversely, instructions framed with a prevention focus may cause applicants to be more cautious in answering questions, or even viewing the interview process as a way to simply not come off as looking like a poor applicant. To date, no other research study has looked at the framing of instructions on applicant response behavior.

Situational judgment tests can also look at regulatory focus. The way situational judgment questions are framed can elicit congruent responses. Prevention focus questions are likely to elicit examples of prevention focus behaviors and vice versa. One example application of this can be in the manufacturing industry, where safety (prevention focus) is valued. Situational judgment questions should be framed accordingly so that they are garnering safety (prevention focus) examples from the applicant.

Contributions and Implications

Although this study had its limitations, it also had some solid contributions. This study was the first to apply regulatory focus theory to one of the most popular areas of selection, the interview. The contributions of this study should have implications for two areas of psychology – specifically in the areas of employment interviews and regulatory focus. For employment interviews, this study was the first to introduce motivation in the form of regulatory focus as a variable that can influence interviewer decision-making.
Similar past studies exploring the social-cognitive aspects of the interview process have looked at the interaction between interviewer and applicant; however, to date, none have examined the interaction of interviewer and applicant regulatory focus.

The findings of this study can aid organizations in improving their interview process. Understanding both the interviewer and applicant regulatory focus can help explain reasons for why some interviewers give applicants high or low ratings. This interaction can account for variability in interviewers’ ratings throughout the interview process. Since regulatory focus is both a chronic and situationally induced variable, organizations can further minimize this effect in its interviewers. First, by the process of selection, organizations can minimize the regulatory fit effects by selecting interviewers who do not strongly favor one regulatory focus mindset over the other. Secondly, through organizational culture and/or modifying interview instructions, an interviewer’s regulatory orientation focus can be primed, potentially minimizing the effects of one’s regulatory focus on applicant ratings. Lastly, organizations can also measure applicants’ chronic regulatory focus in order to control for confounds of an interviewer-applicant regulatory fit (or incongruence).

For the area of regulatory focus, this study further supported the basic propositions of regulatory focus theory and regulatory fit and it showed that it could be applied to one of the most popular areas of selection – the interview. Whereas regulatory focus theory has often been applied to understanding traditional “O” constructs, this dissertation demonstrated that it’s application can extend to “I” constructs as well. Secondly, this study extended the application of regulatory fit to demonstrate that it is an inter-individual process. In the past, a majority of the literature on regulatory fit applied
its components to intra-individual processes, such as congruence between a person’s regulatory orientation and the means of goal pursuit; however, this study helped support the notion that regulatory focus could be viewed as an inter-individual process as well. It showed that regulatory fit could have an effect when one experiences regulatory fit between two individuals. Lastly, this study was the first to conceptualize regulatory fit both objectively and subjectively. The extension of this definition of regulatory fit can have implications for future studies examining regulatory fit. For example, instead of manipulating regulatory fit and assuming fit effects, one can look at whether a person actually perceives the fit. This perception of fit (subjective fit) can be a proximal indicator of many of the outcomes experienced with regulatory fit studies.

Summary

In this study, regulatory fit theory (Higgins, 2000; 2005) was applied to the interview in order to better understand interviewers’ ratings of an applicant. Many past reviews of the interview concluded that there was a positive effect of interviewer-applicant similarity on applicant ratings (Arvey & Campion, 1982; Harris, 1989; Posthuma, et al., 2002; Schmitt, 1976); however, none of these studies looked at similarity in regulatory focus. While similarity can be measured based on physical attributes, Graves (1993) proposed that looking at attitudinal similarity was potentially more important. Similarity in regards to regulatory focus was of primary interest in this study because of its past connections to other variables (e.g. liking, increased perceived value, enjoyment of process, and a feeling of rightness) that would lead to higher applicant ratings.
In order to examine regulatory fit between an interviewer and applicant, this study proposed three models of fit based on the definitions of P-E fit originally introduced by French, Caplan, and Harrison (Caplan, 1983; 1987; French & Kahn, 1962; French et al., 1974, 1982; Harrison, 1978, 1985). Objective fit referred to the actual match between the person and environment, while subjective fit referred to the fit that the person perceived between the person and environment. The three models proposed and tested in this study looked at how objective regulatory fit influenced both applicant ratings and subjective regulatory fit; and how subjective regulatory fit effected applicant ratings directly.

Although support was not found for the models proposing objective regulatory fit effecting applicant ratings and subjective regulatory fit, this study found support for a model of subjective regulatory fit directly effecting applicant ratings. The main finding was that the relationship between subjective regulatory fit and applicant ratings was partially mediated by value from fit and liking. That is, when the interviewers perceived there was a fit, they valued and liked the applicant, and in turn gave her higher ratings.

Based on these findings, this study contributed to both the regulatory focus and employment interview literature. For the regulatory focus literature, it was the first to define and measure regulatory fit both objectively and subjectively. Its application to the employment interview demonstrated that regulatory focus could be applied to areas of selection, whereas in the past it has been primarily applied to traditional organizational constructs. For employment interviews, this study demonstrated that attitudinal fit, specifically on regulatory fit could increase interviewers’ ratings of an applicant. Future research should attempt to look at additional selection areas where regulatory focus theory can be applied. In regards to the employment interview, regulatory focus should
be examined as a variable that can influence interviewers’ cognitive processes in evaluating an applicant.

Follow-up studies should attempt to build realism that a lab study like this one, was not able to deliver. Future studies should look at true dyadic interactions between interviewer and applicant, opposed to interviewing another via a computer interface. Longer term, future studies should look at regulatory fit in the field. These studies should continue to examine the interviewers’ perceptions of fit with the applicant. They should also continue to examine the effect of objective fit between interviewer and applicant; however, the measures should go beyond hiring recommendations. In order to fully understand the effects of objective fit, future field studies should take a longitudinal approach and examine objective outcome measures, such as retention rate and performance.
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APPENDICES
APPENDIX A

INFORMED CONSENT

SUBJECT’S NAME: ___________________________ DATE: ________________

PROJECT TITLE: Regulatory Focus and Interviewer Perceptions

INVESTIGATOR’S NAME: Andrew Lam, M.A.

RESEARCH PURPOSE AND DESCRIPTION OF PROCEDURES: The purpose of this study is to gain a better understanding of interviewers’ perceptions of an applicant. In this study you will first be asked to respond to survey items regarding your personality. Then you will conduct a computer simulated interview with an applicant for a staff member job opening at a university recreation center. After completing the interview you will be asked to rate the applicant and respond to additional personality questions.

TIME COMMITMENT INVOLVED: Approximately 45 minutes.

RISKS AND DISCOMFORTS: Minimal risk. You are not required to take part in the research and you may decline to participate without any penalty.

BENEFITS: You can help to increase the principal investigator’s understanding of interviewers’ personality and perceptions of an applicant. You will gain experience being in an interview setting.

ALTERNATIVES: You may discontinue participation at any time.

CONSENT:
I have fully explained to _____________________, the subject, the nature and purpose of the above-described procedure and the risks that are involved in participation. I have answered and will answer all questions to the best of my ability.

__________________________
Investigator’s Signature

I have been fully informed of the above described procedure with its possible benefits and risks. I understand that my responses will be maintained in a confidential manner by the researcher. I voluntarily give permission for my participation in this study. I know that the investigator and his/her associates will be available to answer any questions I may have. If, at any time, I feel my questions have not been adequately answered, I may request to speak with the advisor of this
research project (Dr. Dennis Doverspike, 330-972-8372), Chair of the Department of Psychology (Dr. Paul Levy, 330-972-7280) or the Associate Director of Research Services of the University of Akron (Ms. Sharon McWhorter, 330-972-8311). I understand that I am free to withdraw this consent and discontinue participation in this project at any time without penalty. I am also aware that within one year of my participation a copy of this Informed Consent form will be provided to me upon request.

_________________________
Signature of Subject
Dear participant,

I would like to thank you in advance for participating in my study. In this study I am interested in collecting information about your personality and your interview perceptions of an applicant. In the first part of this study, you will complete surveys measuring aspects of your personality. After completing these measures you will complete a computer simulated interview. You will play the role of the interviewer during the simulated interview. After completing the interview you will be asked to respond to additional questions about your interview with the applicant.

When you are ready to move onto the next screen please click the “Proceed” button at the bottom of the screen. Once you click “Proceed” you cannot go back. You will receive further instructions about conducting the computer simulated interview after you have completed the personality measures. If you have additional questions during this study, please raise your hand and the research assistant will assist you.

You are now ready to start this study. Please click “Proceed.”
APPENDIX C

DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION

Instructions: Please answer the following questions by selecting the appropriate option or indicating your response in the space provided.

1. Age ______ 2. Gender (select one)
   Male    Female

3. What is your race? (select one)
   Caucasian
   African American
   Hispanic/Latino
   Asian/Pacific Islander
   Two or More
   Other

4. Major ______________________________________

5. Do you have any work experience? (select one)
   Yes    No

6. [If Yes] Please indicate the length of your work experience: _____ Years, _____ Months

7. Do you exercise at the University of Akron SRWC? (select one)
   Yes    No

8. [If Yes] Please indicate the number of times per week that you go to the SRWC: _____ Times Per Week.

9. Are you currently employed or have been employed in the past by the University of Akron SRWC?
   Yes    No
APPENDIX D

TRAIT REGULATORY FOCUS SCALE

Instructions: For the following statements, indicate the extent to which each statement reflects how you *typically* perceive various aspects of your life on a scale from 1 to 9.

1 = Not at all true of me
2 =
3 =
4 =
5 = Very true of me

Trait Regulatory Focus Items
1. In general, I am focused on preventing negative events in my life.
2. I am anxious that I will fall short of my responsibilities and obligations.
3. I frequently imagine how I will achieve my hopes and aspirations.
4. I often think about the person I am afraid I might become in the future.
5. I often think about the person I would ideally like to be in the future.
6. I typically focus on the success I hope to achieve in the future.
7. I often worry that I will fail to accomplish my academic goals.
8. I often think about how I will achieve academic success.
9. I often imagine myself experiencing bad things that I fear might happen to me.
10. I frequently think about how I can prevent failures in my life.
11. I am more oriented toward preventing losses than I am toward achieving gains.
12. My major goal in school right now is to achieve my academic ambitions.
13. My major goal in school right now is to avoid becoming an academic failure.
14. I see myself as someone who is primarily striving to reach my “ideal self”—to fulfill my hopes, wishes, and aspirations.
15. I see myself as someone who is primarily striving to become the self I “ought” to be—to fulfill my duties, responsibilities, and obligations.
16. In general, I am focused on achieving positive outcomes in my life.
17. I often imagine myself experiencing good things that I hope will happen to me.
18. Overall, I am more oriented toward achieving success than preventing failure.
APPENDIX E

REGULATORY FOCUS AT WORK SCALE

Instructions: For the following statements, rate how often you focus on these thoughts and activities when you are working.

1 = Never
2 =
3 =
4 =
5 = Constantly

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regulatory Focus at Work Scale</th>
<th>I focus on:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Following rules and regulations at work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Completing work tasks correctly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Doing my duty at work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>My work responsibilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Fulfilling my work obligations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>On the details of my work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Accomplishing a lot at work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Getting my work done no matter what.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Getting a lot of work finished in a short amount of time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Work activities that allow me to get ahead at work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>My work accomplishments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>How many job tasks I can complete.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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APPENDIX F

TRAIT PANAS SCALE

This scale consists of a number of words that describe different feelings and emotions. Read each item and then mark the appropriate answer in the space next to the word. Indicate to what extent you generally feel this way, that is how you feel on the average. Use the following scale to record your answers.

1 = Very Slightly or Not At All
2 = A Little
3 = Moderately
4 = Quite a Bit
5 = Extremely

_____ Interested  _____ Irritable
_____ Disinterested  _____ Alert
_____ Interested  _____ Ashamed
_____ Excited  _____ Inspired
_____ Upset  _____ Inspired
_____ Strong  _____ Nervous
_____ Guilty  _____ Determined
_____ Scared  _____ Attentive
_____ Hostile  _____ Jittery
_____ Enthusiastic  _____ Active
_____ Proud  _____ Afraid
APPENDIX G

PERSONALITY MEASURES

On the following pages there are phrases describing people's behaviors. Please use the rating scale below to describe how accurately each statement describes you. Describe yourself as you generally are now, not as you wish to be in the future. Describe yourself as you honestly see yourself, in relation to other people you know of the same sex as you are, and roughly your same age. So that you can describe yourself in an honest manner, your responses will be kept in absolute confidence. Please read each statement carefully, and then fill in the bubble that corresponds to the number on the scale.

1 = Very Inaccurate
2 = Moderately Inaccurate
3 = Neither Inaccurate nor Accurate
4 = Moderately Accurate
5 = Very Accurate

Extraversion
1. Am the life of the party.
2. Feel comfortable around people.
4. Talk to a lot of different people at parties.
5. Don’t mind being the center of attention.
6. Don’t talk a lot. (-)
7. Keep in the background. (-)
8. Have little to say. (-)
9. Don’t like to draw attention to myself. (-)
10. Am quiet around strangers. (-)

Agreeableness
1. Am interested in people.
2. Sympathize with other’s feelings.
3. Have a soft heart.
4. Take time out for others.
5. Feel others’ emotions.
6. Make people feel at ease.
7. Insult people. (-)
8. Am not interested in other people’s problems. (-)
9. Feel little concern for others. (-)
10. Am not really interested in others. (-)

**Conscientiousness**
1. Am always prepared.
2. Pay attention to details.
3. Get chores done right away.
4. Like order.
5. Follow a schedule.
6. Am exacting in my work.
7. Leave my belongings around. (-)
8. Make a mess of things. (-)
9. Often forget to put things back in their proper place. (-)
10. Shirk my duties. (-)

**Emotional Stability**
1. Am relaxed most of the time.
2. Seldom feel blue.
3. Get stressed out easily. (-)
4. Worry about things. (-)
5. Am easily disturbed. (-)
6. Get upset easily. (-)
7. Change my mood a lot. (-)
8. Have frequent mood swings. (-)
9. Get irritated easily. (-)
10. Often feel blue. (-)
APPENDIX H

STATE REGULATORY FOCUS PRIME I

For the following items, please use the text boxes to describe your experiences. Please take a moment to think about each item, and write 3-5 sentences for each item, describing your experiences in the past. Please write in complete sentences. Your responses should explain what you did and can include additional information (e.g. background information, how you felt in response, etc).

Promotion Focus Condition
Please write about a time in the past when:

a) you felt you made progress toward being successful in life
   [TEXT BOX]

b) compared to most people you were able to get what you wanted out of life
   [TEXT BOX]

c) trying to achieve something important to you, you performed as well as you ideally would have liked to.
   [TEXT BOX]

Prevention Focus Condition
Please write about a time in the past when:

a) being careful enough avoided getting you in trouble
   [TEXT BOX]

b) you stopped yourself from acting in a way that your parents would consider objectionable
   [TEXT BOX]

c) you were careful not to get on your parents’ nerves.”
   [TEXT BOX]
APPENDIX I

MOCK INTERVIEW INSTRUCTIONS

Thank you for your efforts so far. You are now ready to participate in the computer-simulated interview. For the interview, you will be playing the role of the interviewer. You will be interviewing an applicant who has recently applied for a fitness leader position at the University of Akron’s Student Recreation & Wellness Center (SRWC). The fitness leader position is a staff member who walks around the recreation center or works from the information desk in order to aid gym members. A more detailed description of the fitness leader position can be found on the next page. Please click “Proceed” to read the job description of the fitness leader position. Further instructions will be given after you have reviewed the job description.
APPENDIX J

JOB DESCRIPTION FOR FITNESS LEADER STAFF

The University of Akron
Job Description

Job Title:        Fitness Leader
Department:      Fitness & Wellness
Reports To:      Manager, Fitness & Wellness

Position Summary:
Under the direct supervision of the Manager of Fitness & Wellness, the Fitness Leader is responsible for having working knowledge of the proper use of free weights, cardiovascular equipment and selectorized machines, enforcing policies and procedures of the exercise floor as well as the SRWC, taking an active role in the daily maintenance and cleanliness of the exercise floor, promoting member exercise incentive programming, and delivering positive customer service at all times.

Job Specifics:

1. Delivers world class customer service at all times.

2. Is familiar with SRWC emergency procedures, protocols, and display confidence in the implementation of each.

3. Keeps the SRWC a safe and clean environment for members.

4. Follows the equipment reporting policy for all equipment irregularities, including any that are standard maintenance and repair.

5. Becomes proficient in and enforces all policies, procedures, guidelines and rules of the SRWC in a firm, fair and consistent manner when applicable.

6. Develop positives communication skills with all peers, superiors and employees.
7. Attends staff meetings and training classes. Assists in staff training through direct instruction and/or participation.

8. Displays proficiency in the operation of basic computer skills as well as CSI software.

9. Provides individual guidance and backup support to unit staff as assigned.

10. Circulates on the exercise floor (including the Track and Lounge area) in an effort to assist any guests or members with questions or exercise issues they may have.

11. Initiates appropriate assistance and instruction with members and/or guests if they appear to be in need of assistance or if they are endangering themselves or others.

12. Follows the regular cleaning and maintenance inspection program. All equipment needs to be inspected and cleaned at least weekly.

13. Demonstrates confidence and familiarity with all exercise floor equipment. Performs equipment orientations for members regarding free weights, cardiovascular equipment and selectorized machines.

14. Assists in the development and implementation of member exercise incentive programs to motivate and enhance member participation. Maintains current knowledge on and encourage participation in all SRWC programs, services and activities.

15. Performs daily operational tasks in a timely and proficient manner as directed.
APPENDIX K
APPLICANT PERSONAL STATEMENT

The interview will have a similar set up to this page. In order to “ask” a question to the applicant, you must click on the question. Once a question is clicked on, a popup window will appear with the applicant’s recorded response. As a sample item, please click on the applicant personal statement below:

Introductory Personal Statement

Hello, my name is Rachel Smith. I am 20 years old, and I was born in Ohio. When I was growing up my family moved a lot, and I ended up graduating high school from a small, private school. I am studying exercise science and look forward to graduating in 2013. After I get my degree I want to go to graduate school for my master’s degree and become a physical therapist.

I have held various jobs in high school and my first two years of college. I worked at a local McDonalds in high school. I have worked in retail at Best Buy and have had a hostess job at a local restaurant most recently. Over the summer I return home and work as a lifeguard at a local pool. In my free time I enjoy swimming, soccer, Pilates, catching up with friends, and volunteering at the Humane Society.
APPENDIX L

STATE REGULATORY FOCUS PRIME II

Promotion Condition
Before you get to interview the applicant, I want you to get into your role as the interviewer.

Close your eyes and imagine yourself as an actual interviewer.

Please take a couple of minutes to briefly describe the interviewer behaviors and outcomes you hope to achieve during this interview. [TEXT BOX]

Describe how you could promote these behaviors and outcomes. [TEXT BOX]

Prevention Condition
Before you get to interview the applicant, I want you to get into your role as the interviewer.

Close your eyes and imagine yourself as an actual interviewer.

Please take a couple of minutes to briefly describe the interviewer behaviors and outcomes you seek to avoid during this interview. [TEXT BOX]

Describe how you could prevent these behaviors and outcomes. [TEXT BOX]
You are now ready to begin the interview. To ask a question, simply click on the question that is listed in the question queue. The applicant response will appear in a popup window. In order to help you find the question you may want to ask, questions are organized into four major categories. You may ask any question in any category in any order. Once you have asked a question, the question will disappear from the queue and you will not be able to ask it again.

You will be given up to 12 minutes to interview the applicant; however, it is not required for you to use the entire length of time (you can use the whole time if you want). The timer at the bottom of the screen will count down as soon as you click on your first question. Once you feel comfortable with the applicant, you may click “Proceed” at the bottom of the screen to rate the applicant.

Major Categories
1. Education and Career Goals
2. Past Work Behaviors
3. Situational Judgment
4. Miscellaneous Information

Education and Career Goals

Q1: Why did you decide to go to The University of Akron?
Pro: I chose The University of Akron because I felt that it was a *good opportunity* to choose the school with the strongest exercise science program that I could get into. In addition, I enjoyed the location and beautiful campus.

Pre: I chose The University of Akron because I felt that I was *obligated* to choose the school with strongest exercise science program that I could get into. In addition, I enjoyed the location and beautiful campus.

Q2: Why did you decide to choose exercise science as your major?
Pro: I am majoring in exercise science because I feel that it *ideally* gives me the best background and training *to accomplish my goal* of becoming a successful physical therapist.
Pre: I am majoring in exercise science because I feel that it ought to give me the best background and training that is required in order to become a successful physical therapist.

Q3**: What requirements do you need to graduate?
Pro: In order to graduate I look forward to completing my regular coursework and at least 120 hours of practicum experience.

Pre: In order to graduate it I am required to complete my regular coursework and have at least 120 hours of practicum experience.

Q4*: What course do you look forward to taking the most and why?
Pro: The course that I look forward to taking the most is sports nutrition because I feel like I can apply it to my everyday life and attain an even better diet that I have today.

Pre: The course that I look forward to taking the most is sports nutrition because I feel like I can apply it to my everyday life and maintain the good diet that I already have.

Q5**: What course do you want to avoid the most and why?
Pro: The course that I want to avoid the most is physics because I heard it is hard and I could potentially not earn a good grade.

Pre: The course that I want to avoid the most is physics because I heard it is hard and I want to avoid getting a bad grade.

Q6: Describe yourself as a student.
Pro: As a student I always strive to earn high grades. I feel that it is my goal to put extra time in the library so that I can be prepared for the tests that often come up. I always work on projects well in advance of their due date and end up turning projects in on time. Lastly, I actively make it a goal of mine to meet other students in my class. It is a good feeling having new friends in each class.

Pre: As a student I always try to maintain high grades. I feel that it is my duty to put extra time in the library so that I can be prepared for the tests that often come up. I always work on projects well in advance of their due date and end up turning projects in on time. Lastly, I actively make it an obligation of mine to meet other students in my class. It is a good feeling having new friends in each class.
Q7: Why do you want to be a physical therapist?
Pro: I have always played sports when I was growing up. Going through training in sports and also having a few stints of my own in physical therapy for various sports related injuries have actually given me a firsthand account of what the job entails. I guess you can say I liked my experience in physical therapy and thought that I could enjoy doing the same for a living. By the age of 14 I aspired to be a physical therapist one day.

Pre: I have always played sports when I was growing up. Going through training in sports and also having a few stints of my own in physical therapy for various sports related injuries have actually given me a firsthand account of what the job entails. I guess you can say I liked my experience in physical therapy and thought that I could enjoy doing the same for a living. By the age of 14 I ought to be a physical therapist one day.

Q8*: How will working at the SRWC help you attain your future career goals?
Pro: Both the rec center and physical therapy are in similar fitness environments. I feel that working at a rec center is actually more related to physical therapy than many of the other jobs that I have had in the past. I hope my experience working here will look good on a future resume or even an application to specialize in physical therapy in grad school.

Pre: Both the rec center and physical therapy are in similar fitness environments. I feel that working at a rec center is actually more related to physical therapy than many of the other jobs that I have had in the past. I need experience working here in order to look good on a future resume or even an application to specialize in physical therapy in grad school.

Q9: Describe how you see yourself ten years from now.
Pro: Ten years from now, I ideally see myself as a physical therapist. At that point in time, I would hope to have my master’s degree and working at a hospital, helping patients rehabilitate from injuries.

Pre: Ten years from now, I ought to be a physical therapist. At that point in time I would feel obligated to have my master’s degree and working at a hospital, helping patients rehabilitate from injuries.

Work Behaviors

Q10*: In general, what are some of your strengths as a worker?
Pro: My strengths as a worker are that I am punctual, I always put in 100% effort, and I am always in a good mood.

Pre: My strengths as a worker are that I am never late, I never give less than 100% effort, and I am never in a bad mood.
Q11**: In general, what are some of your weaknesses as a worker?
Pro: I don’t have many, but one of my weaknesses is that I tend to rush to decisions quickly. For example, on my job as a hostess I would decide to seat large parties before looking at the seating chart, and this would cause other parties to wait longer to be seated.

Pre: I don’t have many, but one of my weaknesses is that I tend to deliberate on decisions slowly. For example, on my job as a hostess I would check the seating chart and physically walk back to the dining area to ensure that tables would be open, and this would cause other parties to wait longer to be seated.

Q13*: What did you accomplish at your last job?
Pro: At my last job as a lifeguard I promoted and encouraged a healthy environment around the swimming pool.

Pre: At my last job as a lifeguard I enforced and maintained a safe environment around the swimming pool.

Q14**: Tell me about something that you failed at on a previous job.
Pro: I certainly failed at my job as a lifeguard. I would often focus on creating new ideas for how to make the swim environment more fun and enjoyable. I was trying to be innovative, but I often lost sight of the rules of the pool.

Pre: I certainly failed at my job as a lifeguard. I would often focus on abiding by every single rule of the pool for how to make the swim environment safe. I was trying to be careful and cautious, but I often lost sight of creating a fun environment.

Q15*: Tell me about a job that you succeeded at.
Pro: At my job at Best Buy I would look for opportunities to talk to customers in my department to see if I could answer any of their questions. I feel that I succeeded at this job, because many of them would tell my supervisor that I was very friendly and helpful.

Pre: At my job at Best Buy I would make it an obligation to talk to customers in my department to see if I could answer any of their questions. I feel that I succeeded at this job, because many of them would tell my supervisor that I was very helpful and knowledgeable.

Q16**: Tell me about a time when you prevented something bad from happening at work.
Pro: At my job at Best Buy I was able to prevent a customer from shop lifting a digital camera. When I saw a customer disconnect a display model camera from the display stand I contacted the front desk that we had the opportunity to stop a shop lifter. They
were able to apprehend the shoplifter before he left the store. I am just glad we gained the opportunity to get the camera back.

Pre: At my job at Best Buy I was able to prevent a customer from shop lifting a digital camera. When I saw a customer disconnect a display model camera from the display stand I alerted the front desk that we were about to lose a camera from our display. They were able to apprehend the shoplifter before he left the store. I am just glad that we were able to not lose the camera.

Q17*: Tell me about a time when you promoted a positive change at work.
Pro: As a hostess, I noticed that the patrons waiting to be seated were blocking one of the main walkways. This caused a lot of the servers to bump into customers when they were carrying full trays of food. Noticing this problem, I saw an opportunity for a better option and rearranged the seating area in the waiting area of the restaurant. I felt elated by the success the new seating rearrangement I had created.

Pre: As a hostess, I noticed that the patrons waiting to be seated were blocking one of the main walkways. This caused a lot of the servers to bump into customers when they were carrying full trays of food. Noticing this problem, I decided to prevent anymore problems and rearranged the seating area in the waiting area of the restaurant. I felt relieved by the safety the new seating rearrangement provided.

Q18**: Tell me about a time where you avoided conflict at work.
Pro: When I worked at McDonalds, I had a manager who would take advantage of her smoke breaks. It made me mad that I would work hard nonstop during my shifts, while she stepped outside to smoke every 45 minutes. One day she accused me of slacking on the job. I calmly explained to her that I was trying my hardest and I was trying to think of ways to be more effective but we were understaffed. I think she got my point, as I noticed her taking less frequent breaks after. I am glad that I made the situation better by remaining calm and positive.

Pre: When I worked at McDonalds, I had a manager who would take advantage of her smoke breaks. It made me mad that I would work hard nonstop during my shifts, while she stepped outside to smoke every 45 minutes. One day she accused me of slacking on my responsibilities. Instead of snapping back at my boss, I explained to her that I was trying my hardest and doing what I was told but we were understaffed. I think she got my point, as I noticed her taking less frequent breaks after. I am glad that I did not make the situation worse by pointing out that I was following the rules.

Q19*: What accomplishment were you most proud of at work?
Pro: The accomplishment that I am most proud of at work is when I helped a drowning child. When I noticed a child relentlessly flapping his arms and splashing water in the
deep end, I jumped right in and helped him. I guess he was younger and had not had swim lessons yet but found himself in the deep end.

Pre: The accomplishment that I am most proud of at work is when I prevented a child from drowning. When I noticed a child relentlessly flapping his arms and splashing water in the deep end, I jumped right in and prevented him from drowning. I guess he was younger and had not had swim lessons yet but found himself in the deep end.

Q20**: Give me an example of a time where you were careful at work.
Pro: At McDonalds I was always careful at the cash register. When giving back customers their change, I would count the money out in front of them. I wanted to make sure that I did not gain any extra money at the cash register.

Pre: At McDonalds I was always careful at the cash register. When giving back customers their change, I would count the money out in front of them. I wanted to make sure that I did not lose customers’ money at the cash register.

Situational Judgment

Q24*: Tell me how you would promote one of our fitness programs (e.g. spinning class, zumba, etc.) to our gym members.
Pro: In order to promote our fitness programs to our gym members, I would highlight the advantages of participating in the programs we offer. For example, for a spinning class, I would emphasize perks like enhancing one’s self-confidence or achieving good cardiovascular health.

Pre: In order to make our gym members aware of our fitness programs, I would emphasize the potential health risks associated with not participating in the programs we have available. For example, for a spinning class, I would emphasize issues like harming one’s self-confidence or weakening one’s cardiovascular health.

Q25**: Tell me how you would prevent one of our members from injuring himself or herself while working out on the exercise equipment.
Pro: In order to promote a healthy work environment, I would proactively watch gym members while they used the equipment. I would also encourage members ask for my assistance if they wanted to use rather heavy weights and new equipment.

Pre: In order to prevent members from becoming injured at the gym, I would be vigilant of improper uses of the gym equipment. I would require members to ask for my assistance if they wanted to use rather heavy weights and new equipment.
Q26**: How would you avoid dealing with conflict with a coworker?
Pro: If a coworker had a problem with me I would just simply *approach* him to *clear up* any conflict at work.
Pre: If a coworker had a problem with me I would just simply *avoid* him in order to *prevent* further conflict at work.

Q27*: You noticed a SRWC member hogging a treadmill. How would you approach this member in order to improve the gym experience for all members?
Pro: If one of our members was hogging a treadmill, I would simply *approach him or her* to remind him or her that he or she had 5 more minutes left before he or she would have to finish up. I would then offer to *him or her* other *cardio options* such as the exercise bikes, ellipticals or even participating in one of our many fitness classes available.
Pre: If one of our members was hogging a treadmill, I would simply *warn* him or her that *he or she had 5 more minutes left before he or she would have to get off*. I would point out that he or she would have to *use one of our other* *cardio options* such as the exercise bikes, ellipticals or even participating in one of the remaining fitness classes available.

Q28**: Your supervisor just notified you that he decided to cut back on your work hours; however, you really needed the hours to make money. How would you react to this loss of potential earnings?
Pro: I would talk with my coworkers to see if I could take one of their shifts in order to *increase my work hours*.
Pre: I would talk with my coworkers to see if I could take one of their shifts in order to *prevent losing my work hours*.

Q29*: Your supervisor just notified you that he has given you additional work hours; however, you have a busy schedule with work and school already. How would you react to this gain in work hours?
Pro: I would take the initiative and juggle my schedule around to take up the additional work hours. I could also collaborate with my coworkers to see if any of them would be interested in taking up an additional shift or two.
Pre: I would compromise some of my study and sleep time in order to prevent my boss from thinking that I am unappreciative of the work I am given.

Q30**: You noticed a SRWC member just fainted while on the exercise bike. What would you do to prevent further injury?
Pro: I would immediately *rush* in to handle the situation. First, I would *ensure* the well-being of the injured member by laying the member down away from the equipment. Then
I would contact my supervisor and obtain appropriate medical attention, which may include calling an ambulance if the situation warranted it.

Pre: I would immediately be aware of the situation. First, I would prevent further harm to the injured member by laying the member down away from the equipment. Then I would contact my supervisor and obtain appropriate medical attention, which may include calling the ambulance just as a safe measure.

Q31*: You noticed a SRWC member just dropped a weight on his foot. What would you do to promote his well-being?
Pro: I would sit him down and assess the severity of the injury. This would be followed by icing and elevating the foot in order to speed recovery of the foot. I would then inform my supervisor of the situation.

Pre: I would sit him down and assess the severity of the injury. This would be followed by icing and elevating the foot in order to reduce the swelling of the foot. I would report the incident to my supervisor.

Q32**: You noticed two SRWC members arguing over use of a bench. How would you diffuse the situation?
Pro: I hope to resolve the solution amicably by listening to both sides to find a positive solution that both members can agree upon. This would promote a better working environment for our other members. Then I would inform my supervisor as to what happened.

Pre: My duty would be to resolve the problem fairly by listening to both sides to find an appropriate solution that both members can agree upon. This would prevent the situation from escalating. Then I would report the incident to my supervisor.

Q33*: You notice a pair of SRWC members not putting weights back in their proper place after using them. How would you approach the situation in order to improve the overall gym experience for all members?
Pro: I would kindly approach him or her and gently remind them to return the weights back where he or she originally got them.

Pre: I would warn him or her that I will have no choice but to report them if they fail to put the weights back to where he or she originally got them.
Q34**: At this job you need to inspect the fitness equipment to ensure that it is working properly. How vigilant would you be in inspecting the fitness equipment?
Pro: Ensuring that the fitness equipment is *fully functional* is an important task! I would definitely be *open* to inspecting the fitness equipment while working on the floor. I would be particularly thorough in checking out every nook and detail.

Pre: Ensuring that the fitness equipment is not *defective* is an important task. I would be willing to inspect the fitness equipment when *necessary* while working on the floor. I would be particularly *careful* in checking out every nook and detail.

Q35*: At this job you often find yourself cleaning the fitness equipment in order to promote cleanliness. How eager would be to clean the fitness equipment?
Pro: You gotta do what you gotta do. If it *promotes* health, I would look *forward* to cleaning the equipment while I am working on the floor.

Pre: You gotta do what you gotta do. If cleaning equipment is part of by *duties and responsibility* then I wouldn’t *hesitate* to clean the equipment while I am working on the floor.

Miscellaneous

Q36: Why do you want to work here?
Pro: I want to work here because I feel that having work experience in a fitness related field such as the SRWC *will give me a good opportunity* to get into grad school for physical therapy. I think it will look good on a grad school application. In addition I naturally enjoy being in this environment.

Pre: I want to work here because I feel that having work experience in a fitness related field such as the SRWC *is necessary* to get into grad school for physical therapy. I think it will look good on a grad school application. In addition I naturally enjoy being in this environment.

Q37: What extracurricular activities do you enjoy?
Pro: In my free time I volunteer at the Humane Society. I always *look forward to* volunteering. In addition, I like to work out and *relish the opportunity* to be fit.

Pre: In my free time I volunteer at the Humane Society. I always *make sure that I* volunteer. In addition I like to work out and *make it an obligation* to get fit.

Q38*: What role model do you aspire to be like?
Pro: My grandfather. He *always kept a positive* attitude and was *persistent* at achieving his goals. He *always made people feel better* around him.
Pre: My grandfather. He *never* had a *negative* attitude and *refused to fail* at achieving his goals. He *never made people feel worse* around him.

Q39**: What role model would you avoid becoming?  
Pro: My high school biology teacher. Since he had tenure, he did not care how he treated the students. He came off as really arrogant, disrespectful, and lazy. His personality made it almost impossible to *get a good grade* in his class.

Pre: My high school biology teacher. Since he had tenure, he did not care how he treated the students. He came off as really arrogant, disrespectful, and lazy. His personality made it almost impossible to *not get a bad grade* in his class.

Q40: What sports do enjoy watching? Why?  
Pro: I enjoy watching football the most. *It’s exciting to watch big plays that score from any place on the field. I especially like watching the high scoring games where teams are scoring multiple touchdowns.*

Pre: I enjoy watching golf the most. *The precision, skill, and concentration that golf requires are what I appreciate. I especially enjoy the low scoring games where multiple competitors are scoring well below par.*

Q41: How would your friends describe your personality?  
Pro: My friends would say that I am very *adventurous*, outgoing, and fun to be around.

Pre: My friends would say that I am very *responsible*, outgoing, and fun to be around.

Q42: What do you typically like to do on the weekend?  
Pro: I like to make new friends so I often find myself hanging out with new friends on the weekend.

Pre: I don’t want to lose contact with my friends so I often find myself hanging out with friends on the weekend.

Q43*: Tell me about a time where you did everything in your power to win something you wanted.  
Pro: In high school I played soccer. In our district semifinals match I worked *relentlessly on offense and scored 2 goals, in order to go up on our rivals. We ended up winning by the score of 2-1.*
Pre: In high school I played soccer. In our district semifinals match I played *relentless defense in order to prevent our rivals from scoring on us*. We ended up *shutting out the opponent* and won 1-0.

Q44**: Tell me about a time where you made sure you did not lose in a game.
Pro: I’m very competitive, so when my *roommate started gaining points* on me in a game of Words with Friends, I decided that *I did not want give up a win*. In my game I *looked for opportunities to spell big words to gain big points*.

Pre: I’m very competitive, so when I started *losing points to my roommate* in a game of Words with Friends, I decided that *I did not want to lose*. In my game I *played conservatively and tried to prevent my opponent from spelling big words*.

*Indicates promotion focus orientation question.
**Indicates prevention focus orientation question.
APPENDIX N

FEELING OF RIGHTNESS

Please indicate your response to the following statements regarding your thoughts and experiences while interviewing your applicant.

1 = Strongly Disagree
2 = Disagree
3 = Neither Agree nor Disagree
4 = Agree
5 = Strongly Agree

Feeling of Rightness
1. It felt ‘right’ while listening to the information presented in the interview.
2. I felt uneasy while conducting the interview.
3. I felt comfortable during the interview. (R)
4. Conducting the interview felt ‘wrong.’ (R)
APPENDIX O

ENJOYMENT SCALE

Please indicate your response to the following statements regarding your thoughts and experiences while interviewing your applicant.

1 = Strongly Disagree
2 = Disagree
3 = Neither Agree nor Disagree
4 = Agree
5 = Strongly Agree

Enjoyment
1. Conducting the interview was interesting.
2. Conducting the interview was enjoyable.
3. Conducting the interview was exciting.
APPENDIX P

VALUE FROM FIT SCALE

Please indicate your response to the following statements regarding your perceptions of the applicant with whom you interacted with during the interview.

1 = Strongly Disagree
2 = Disagree
3 = Neither Agree nor Disagree
4 = Agree
5 = Strongly Agree

Value
1. The thought of having this person as a SRWC employee is attractive.
2. I would value having this person as a SRWC employee.
3. I would NOT like having this person as a SRWC employee. (R)
4. It would feel good to have this person as a SRWC employee.

Liking
1. I think this applicant would make a good friend.
2. I would get along well with this applicant.
3. I like this applicant very much.
4. Working with this applicant would be a pleasure.
APPENDIX Q

EVALUATION OF APPLICANT

1. How well do you think the applicant would fit in at the University of Akron SRWC?
   1—Very Poorly
   2
   3—Average
   4
   5—Very Well

2. How well do you think the applicant would fit into a similar type of recreation center?
   1—Very Poorly
   2
   3—Average
   4
   5—Very Well

3. How well do the goals of this individual match the goals of the University of Akron SRWC?
   1—Very Poorly
   2
   3—Average
   4
   5—Very Well

4. How well do you think the applicant will get along with other SRWC staff coworkers?
   1—Very Poorly
   2
   3—Average
   4
   5—Very Well
5. How well do you think the applicant will perform machine cleaning and maintenance responsibilities?
   1—Very Poorly
   2
   3—Average
   4
   5—Very Well

6. How well do you think the applicant will perform working one-on-one with SRWC members?
   1—Very Poorly
   2
   3—Average
   4
   5—Very Well

7. Will the applicant be satisfied working at the University of Akron SRWC?
   1—Not at All
   2
   3—Neutral
   4
   5—Definitely

8. Will the applicant be satisfied working with the University of Akron SRWC members?
   1—Not at All
   2
   3—Neutral
   4
   5—Definitely

9. Will the applicant be satisfied working for the University of Akron?
   1—Not at All
   2
   3—Neutral
   4
   5—Definitely

10. What is the likelihood of the applicant leaving this position before the end of the semester?
    1—Not at All
    2
    3—Neutral
    4
    5—Definitely
11. What is the likelihood of the applicant returning to this position the following semester?
   1—Not at All
   2
   3—Neutral
   4
   5—Definitely

12. Would you recommend this person for a follow up interview?
   1—Not at All
   2
   3—Neutral
   4
   5—Definitely

13. Would you recommend this person for hire?
   1—Not at All
   2
   3—Neutral
   4
   5—Definitely
APPENDIX R

STATE REGULATORY FOCUS

Instructions: For the following statements, indicate the extent to which each statement reflects your perceptions as they took place *DURING THE INTERVIEW PROCESS.*

1 = Not at all true of me
2 =
3 =
4 =
5 = Very true of me

State Regulatory Focus Items
1. I was focused on preventing negative impressions in the interview.
2. I was anxious that I would fall short of my responsibilities in the interview.
3. I imagined how I would achieve my aspirations in the interview.
4. I thought about things I was afraid might happen in the interview.
5. I thought about the things I ideally wanted to happen in the interview.
6. I focused on the success I hoped to achieve in the interview.
7. I worried that I would fail to accomplish the goal of the interview.
8. I thought about how I would achieve success in the interview.
9. I imagined experiencing bad things that I feared might happen in the interview.
10. I thought about how I could prevent failures in the interview.
11. I was more oriented toward preventing losses than achieving gains in the interview.
12. My major goal in the interview was to achieve success.
13. My major goal in the interview was to avoid failure.
14. I primarily tried to reach an “ideal” outcome in the interview.
15. I primarily tried to fulfill my duties during the interview.
16. I was focused on achieving positive outcomes in the interview.
17. I imagined experiencing good things that I hoped would happen in the interview.
18. I was more oriented toward achieving success in the interview than preventing failure.
APPENDIX S

PERCEIVED APPLICANT REGULATORY FOCUS

Instructions: For the following statements, indicate the extent to which each statement reflects your perceptions as they took place *DURING THE INTERVIEW PROCESS.*

1 = Not at all true of me
2 =
3 =
4 =
5 = Very true of me

Perceived Applicant Regulatory Focus Items

1. I felt the applicant was focused on preventing negative impressions in the interview.
2. I felt the applicant was anxious that she would fall short of her responsibilities in the interview.
3. I felt the applicant imagined how she would achieve her aspirations in the interview.
4. I felt the applicant thought about things she was afraid might happen in the interview.
5. I felt the applicant thought about the things she ideally wanted to happen in the interview.
6. I felt the applicant focused on the success she hoped to achieve in the interview.
7. I felt the applicant worried that she would fail to accomplish the goal of the interview.
8. I felt the applicant thought about how she would achieve success in the interview.
9. I felt the applicant imagined experiencing bad things that she feared might happen in the interview.
10. I felt the applicant thought about how she could prevent failures in the interview.
11. I felt the applicant was more oriented toward preventing losses than achieving gains in the interview.
12. The applicant’s major goal in the interview was to achieve success.
13. I felt the applicant’s major goal in the interview was to avoid failure.
14. I felt the applicant primarily tried to reach an “ideal” outcome in the interview.
15. I felt the applicant primarily tried to fulfill her duties during the interview.
16. I felt the applicant was focused on achieving positive outcomes in the interview.
17. I felt the applicant imagined experiencing good things that she hoped would happen in the interview.

18. I felt the applicant was more oriented toward achieving success in the interview than preventing failure.
APPENDIX T

SUBJECTIVE REGULATORY FIT SCALE

Instructions: For the following statements, indicate the extent to which each statement reflects your perceptions as they took place DURING THE INTERVIEW PROCESS.

1 = Not at all true of me
2 =
3 =
4 =
5 = Very true of me

Perceived Applicant Regulatory Focus Items
1. My major goals matched the applicant’s major goals during the interview.
2. My emphasis on success matched the applicant’s emphasis on success during the interview.
3. My emphasis on failure matched the applicant’s emphasis on failure during the interview.
4. My concerns of failure matched those of the applicant’s concerns of failure during the interview.
5. My focus on achieving success matched the applicant’s focus on achieving success during the interview.
6. The applicant and I had a similar degree of concern with avoiding failure during the interview.
7. The applicant and I had a similar degree of concern with having a successful interview.
8. The applicant and I were similar in terms of our desire to avoid any major issues during the interview.
9. The applicant and I were similar in terms of our desire to have the best interview possible.
Dear Participant,

Thank you for taking the time to participate in this survey! We value the time that you have spent participating in this study and we want to make sure that you benefit and learn from your experience.

This study was examining the effect of regulatory focus theory (Higgins, 1997; 1998) on interviewer perceptions. Regulatory focus theory is a theory on self-regulation and it proposes that individuals primarily adopt two different orientations to goals. Individuals with a promotion focus experience success and failure through gains and non-gains, while individuals with a prevention focus experience success and failure through non-loss and loss. Regulatory focus can be primed by the situation, and previous research has shown that individuals who are primed with a promotion focus will use different goal pursuit strategies than individuals who are primed with a prevention focus. In this study you were primed with either a promotion or prevention focus by writing about your past and thinking about your interviewer behaviors. You also received responses from an applicant whose responses were primarily promotion or prevention focused. When we analyze our results, we will examine how a match (or mismatch) between the interviewer and applicant on regulatory focus will influence the interviewer's ratings of the applicant.

For any further questions or concerns about this research study, please feel free to contact the primary researcher (Drew Lam, lam10@uakron.edu, 330-972-7280). If, at any time, you feel your questions have not been adequately answered, you may request to speak with the advisor of this research project (Dr. Dennis Doverspike, 330-972-8372), Chair of the Department of Psychology (Dr. Paul Levy, 330-972-7280) or the Associate Director of Research Services of the University of Akron (Ms. Sharon McWhoter, 330-972-8311). Thank you again for your participation.

Sincerely,

Andrew Lam, M.A.
Department of Psychology
## FULL CORRELATION MATRIX

| Correlations among Constructs | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 | 21 | 22 |
| 1. Time Questions Asked      | - |
| 2. Time Translations Time     | .50** | - |
| 3. Task Prevention Focus      | .11 | .11 | (20) |
| 4. Task Prevention Focus      | .04 | -.14* | .02 | (.70) |
| 5. Regulatory Focus at Work–Pre | -.03 | -.09 | .24** | .37* | (11) |
| 6. Regulatory Focus at Work–Pre | -.02 | -.03 | .37** | .82 | .57** | (35) |
| 7. Task Positive Attentiveness | .01 | -.05 | .86** | -.32** | .39** | .27** | (30) |
| 8. Task Negative Attentiveness | -.04 | -.09 | .28** | .39** | -.06 | -.12 | -.44** | (25) |
| 9. Extraversion               | .05 | -.02 | .37** | -.24** | .29** | .08 | .32** | .31** | (.20) |
| 10. Aggression                | .10 | .05 | .31** | -.36 | .27** | .20** | .32** | .18** | .24** | (.17) |
| 11. Conscientiveness          | -.06 | -.07 | .31** | -.17** | .21** | .22** | .08** | -.32** | .39 | .10** | (.11) |
| 12. Extraversion              | -.02 | -.08 | -.29** | .57** | -.07 | .05 | -.47** | .70** | -.32** | -.14* | -.27** | (31) |
| 13. Feeling of Rightness      | .13 | .10 | .28** | -.13 | .21** | .22** | .39** | -.21** | .24** | .10** | .18** | .20** | (31) |
| 14. Empathy                   | .03 | .04 | .29** | -.12 | .19** | .19** | .38** | -.25** | .21** | .27** | .19** | -.23** | .54** | (.30) |
| 15. Like                      | .05 | .06 | .20** | -.02 | .17** | .19** | .29** | -.20** | .11 | .08 | .09 | -.30 | .42** | .57** | (.18) |
| 16. Trust from Fb             | .01 | .06 | .08 | -.12 | .11 | .08 | .07 | -.07 | .04 | .08 | .09 | -.30 | .42** | .57** | (.18) |
| 17. Expertise                 | .05 | .06 | .20** | -.02 | .17** | .19** | .29** | -.20** | .11 | .08 | .09 | -.30 | .42** | .57** | (.18) |
| 18. User Formation Focus      | .03 | -.01 | .29** | -.10 | .23** | .23** | .39** | -.12 | .28** | .39** | -.11 | -.34 | .32** | .57** | (.30) |
| 19. Task Prevention Focus     | -.02 | -.05 | .18** | .03** | .47 | .32** | .39** | -.34 | -.04 | -.16** | .39** | -.21** | -.05 | .13 | .39 | .22** | (30) |
| 20. Applicant Regulatory Focus–Pre | .06 | .04 | .27** | .35 | .34** | .36** | .37** | .10 | .09 | .35 | .18** | .29** | .37** | .49** | .24** | .35 | (16) |
| 21. Applicant Regulatory Focus–Pre | .12 | -.08 | .29** | -.12 | .03 | -.08 | -.23** | .28** | -.03 | -.12 | -.12** | .25** | -.19** | -.01 | .32** | .24** | .32** | -.01 | .41** | .45** | (-.01) |
| 22. Perceived Regulatory Fit  | .01 | .03 | .26** | -.34 | .32** | .33** | .17** | .12 | .10** | .14** | .10 | .28** | .28** | .45** | .49** | .48** | .01 | .39** | -.13 | (13) |
| Mean                         | 1.85 | 3.87 | 3.5 | 2.6 | 2.8 | 3.7 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 2.9 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 2.9 | 3.0 | 2.9 | 3.0 | 2.9 | 3.0 | 2.9 | 3.0 | 2.9 |
| SD                           | .65 | 1.49 | 3.9 | 6.3 | 6.5 | 7.7 | 6.3 | 6.3 | 6.3 | 6.3 | 6.3 | 6.3 | 6.3 | 6.3 | 6.3 | 6.3 | 6.3 | 6.3 | 6.3 | 6.3 | 6.3 |
APPENDIX W

ADDITIONAL ANALYSES

Overview

Additional analyses were conducted on cognitive process variables. Data were collected on the total amount of time elapsed during the interview, and the number of promotion, prevention and neutral questions asked. The purpose of the additional analyses was to determine the effect of regulatory focus on the cognitive process variables. Also, these analyses were used to determine the relationship between state regulatory focus and the cognitive process variables. Three research questions were addressed.

Research Question 1: Is there an effect of primed regulatory focus on the cognitive process variables?

Research Question 2: Is there an effect of similarity of regulatory focus between interviewer and applicant on the cognitive process variables?

Research Question 3: What is the relationship between state regulatory focus and the cognitive process variables?

Cognitive Process Variables

Total Interview Time Elapsed

The total amount of time elapsed during the interview was measured in seconds. Participants were given a maximum of 9 minutes to interview the applicant. A timer at the bottom of the screen counted downwards, so that participants could monitor the
amount of time they had left throughout the interview. The timer at the bottom of the screen started as soon as the first interview question was asked.

*Types of Questions Asked*

Participants chose from a list of 40 questions to ask the applicant. In total there were 15 promotion focus, 15 prevention focus, and 10 neutral questions. The computer-based simulation recorded which questions were asked. In order to control for the variability of total number of questions asked, a percentage for each type of question asked was calculated for each participant. The total number of questions asked by the interviewer was also collected.

*Proportion of First Questions Asked*

In order to examine the short term effect of the regulatory focus prime, a proportion of the first five questions asked that were promotion and prevention focus were measured. As above, a percentage of promotion focus and prevention focus questions was calculated for each participant.

**Analyses**

Research Question 1 asked, “Is there an effect of primed regulatory focus on the cognitive process variables?” In order to address this question, independent samples t-tests were conducted in order to determine mean differences between promotion and prevention focus primed groups on each cognitive process variable. Means and standard deviations are reported in Table W.1.
Table W.1

*Mean cognitive processes across primed conditions.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conditions</th>
<th>Interviewer Primed Promotion Focus</th>
<th>Interviewer Primed Prevention Focus</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Time Elapsed (SD) (104.9)</td>
<td>321.5 (108.4)</td>
<td>335.7 (101.3)</td>
<td>328.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Questions Asked (SD) (6.5)</td>
<td>15.8 (6.5)</td>
<td>16.7 (6.6)</td>
<td>16.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of Promotion Questions (SD) (10.0)</td>
<td>38.8 (9.5)</td>
<td>40.0 (10.5)</td>
<td>39.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of Prevention Questions (SD) (10.5)</td>
<td>32.7 (9.8)</td>
<td>32.6 (11.2)</td>
<td>32.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of First Questions – Pro (SD) (17.8)</td>
<td>37.0 (18.1)</td>
<td>34.9 (17.4)</td>
<td>35.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of First Questions – Pre (SD) (17.4)</td>
<td>20.6 (18.1)</td>
<td>22.4 (16.8)</td>
<td>21.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| N       | 117 | 119 | 236 |

*Note.* Primed promotion focus group includes the mean of cognitive processes across the interviewer promotion focus primed conditions (conditions 1 and 2). Primed prevention focus group includes the mean of cognitive processes across the interviewer prevention focus primed conditions (conditions 3 and 4).

The results showed no significant differences in cognitive processes based on primed conditions. The time elapsed for the promotion focus groups ($M = 321.5$, $SD = 108.4$), and prevention focus groups ($M = 335.7$, $SD = 101.3$) were not significantly different, $t(234) = -1.04, p = .30$. The total number of questions asked for the promotion focus groups ($M = 15.8$, $SD = 6.5$), and prevention focus groups ($M = 16.7$, $SD = 6.6$) were not significantly different, $t(234) = -.97, p = .33$. The proportion of promotion focus questions asked for the promotion focus groups ($M = 38.8$, $SD = 9.5$), and prevention focus groups ($M = 40.0$, $SD = 10.5$) were not significantly different, $t(234) = -.90, p = .37$. The proportion of prevention focus questions asked for the promotion focus groups
(M = 32.7, SD = 9.8), and prevention focus groups (M = 32.6, SD = 11.2) were not significantly different, t(234) = .06, p = .95. The proportion of the first five questions that were promotion focus for the promotion focus groups (M = 37.0, SD = 18.1), and prevention focus groups (M = 34.9, SD = 17.4) were not significantly different, t(234) = .92, p = .36. The proportion of the first five questions that were prevention focus for the promotion focus groups (M = 20.6, SD = 18.1), and prevention focus groups (M = 22.4, SD = 16.8) were not significantly different, t(234) = -.80, p = .43. Thus, no differences in cognitive processes based on primed conditions were found.

Research Question 2 asked, “Is there an effect of similarity of regulatory focus between interviewer and applicant on the cognitive process variables?” In order to address this question, independent samples t-tests were conducted in order to determine mean differences between interviewer/applicant regulatory focus matched and mismatched groups on each cognitive process variable. Means and standard deviations are reported in Table W.2.
Table W.2

*Mean cognitive processes across interviewer/applicant matched and mismatched conditions.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conditions</th>
<th>Interviewer/Applicant Match</th>
<th>Interviewer/Applicant Mismatch</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Time Elapsed (SD) (104.9)</td>
<td>329.8 (99.8)</td>
<td>327.5 (110.4)</td>
<td>328.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Questions Asked (SD) (6.5)</td>
<td>16.4 (6.6)</td>
<td>16.0 (6.5)</td>
<td>16.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of Promotion Questions (SD) (10.0)</td>
<td>39.7 (9.6)</td>
<td>39.1 (10.5)</td>
<td>39.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of Prevention Questions (SD) (10.5)</td>
<td>31.5 (11.1)</td>
<td>33.9 (9.7)</td>
<td>32.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of First Questions – Pro (SD) (17.8)</td>
<td>35.2 (17.6)</td>
<td>36.7 (18.0)</td>
<td>35.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of First Questions – Pre (SD) (17.4)</td>
<td>20.2 (16.5)</td>
<td>23.0 (18.3)</td>
<td>21.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N 120 116 236

*Note.* Matched group includes the mean of cognitive processes across interviewer promotion/applicant promotion (condition 1) and interviewer prevention/applicant prevention (condition 4) conditions. Mismatched group includes the mean of cognitive processes across interviewer promotion/applicant prevention (condition 2) and interviewer prevention/applicant promotion (condition 3) conditions.

The results showed no significant differences in cognitive processes based on matched and mismatched conditions. The time elapsed for the matched groups (*M* = 329.8, *SD* = 99.8), and mismatched groups (*M* = 327.5, *SD* = 110.4) were not significantly different, *t*(234) = .17, *p* = .87. The total number of questions asked for the matched groups (*M* = 16.4, *SD* = 6.6), and mismatched groups (*M* = 16.0, *SD* = 6.5) were not significantly different, *t*(234) = .47, *p* = .64. The proportion of promotion focus questions asked for the matched groups (*M* = 39.7, *SD* = 9.6), and mismatched groups (*M* = 39.1, *SD* = 10.5) were not significantly different, *t*(234) = .42, *p* = .68. The proportion
of prevention focus questions asked for the matched groups ($M = 31.5$, $SD = 11.1$), and mismatched groups ($M = 33.9$, $SD = 9.7$) were not significantly different, $t(234) = -1.83$, $p = .07$. The proportion of the first five questions that were promotion focus for the matched groups ($M = 35.2$, $SD = 17.6$), and mismatched groups ($M = 36.7$, $SD = 18.0$) were not significantly different, $t(234) = -.67$, $p = .51$. The proportion of the first five questions that were prevention focus for the matched groups ($M = 20.2$, $SD = 16.5$), and mismatched groups ($M = 23.0$, $SD = 18.3$) were not significantly different, $t(234) = -1.23$, $p = .22$. Thus, no differences in cognitive processes based on matched conditions were found.

Research Question 3 asked, “What is the relationship between state regulatory focus and the cognitive process variables?” A correlation matrix is presented in Table W.3 below demonstrating the relationships between state promotion and prevention focus with the cognitive process variables. Out of the four cognitive process variables measured, only the proportion of promotion focus questions asked had a significant relationship with state regulatory focus. Specifically, there was a positive relationship between promotion focus questions asked and state prevention focus, $r = .15$, $p < .05$. Unexpectedly, the higher one’s prevention focus, the more promotion questions were asked.
Table W.3

Correlations with state regulatory focus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. State Pro</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. State Pre</td>
<td>.22**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Time Elapsed</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Total Questions</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.85**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Pro Questions</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.15*</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Pre Questions</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-.51**</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>33.6</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>328.7</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>39.4</td>
<td>32.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>104.9</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Additional Exploratory Analyses

Additional exploratory analyses were conducted in order to address the effect of trait level variables on the dependent variables. Three trait variables of interests were positive affectivity, negative affectivity, and trait promotion focus. These traits may exert a direct effect on the dependent variables of interest. Three research questions related to these variables are below.

Research Question 4: Is there an effect of positive affectivity on feeling of rightness, enjoyment, value from fit, liking, state regulatory focus, perceived applicant regulatory focus, and perceived regulatory fit?

Research Question 5: Is there an effect of negative affectivity on feeling of rightness, enjoyment, value from fit, liking, state regulatory focus, perceived applicant regulatory focus, and perceived regulatory fit?

Research Question 6: Is there an interaction between trait promotion focus and applicant regulatory focus on subjective regulatory fit?

In order to test Research Questions 4 and 5, which examined the effect that both trait positive and negative affectivity had on out measures, bivariate correlations were examined. Table W.4 displays the correlation matrix between these variables. Trait
positive affectivity was related to feeling of rightness ($r = .33$, $p < .01$), enjoyment ($r = .36$, $p < .01$), liking ($r = .26$, $p < .01$), state promotion focus ($r = .39$, $p < .01$), state prevention focus ($r = -.22$, $p < .01$), perceived applicant promotion focus ($r = .18$, $p < .01$), perceived applicant prevention focus ($r = -.13$, $p < .05$), and subjective regulatory fit ($r = .32$, $p < .01$). Trait negative affectivity was related to feeling of rightness ($r = -.21$, $p < .01$), enjoyment ($r = -.25$, $p < .01$), state prevention focus ($r = .32$, $p < .01$), perceived applicant prevention focus ($r = .26$, $p < .01$), and subjective regulatory fit ($r = -.17$, $p < .01$). Thus, overall trait positive and negative affectivity related to the dependent measures.

Table W.4

Correlations with trait positive and negative affectivity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Trait PA</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Trait NA</td>
<td>-.44**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Feeling Rt</td>
<td>.33**</td>
<td>-.21**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Enjoyment</td>
<td>.36**</td>
<td>-.25**</td>
<td>.54**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Value Fit</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.42**</td>
<td>.37**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Liking</td>
<td>.26**</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.47**</td>
<td>.48**</td>
<td>.64**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. State Pro</td>
<td>.39**</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>.25**</td>
<td>.44**</td>
<td>.23**</td>
<td>.39**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. State Pre</td>
<td>-.22**</td>
<td>.32**</td>
<td>-.28**</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.22**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. App Pro</td>
<td>.18**</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.23**</td>
<td>.16*</td>
<td>.26**</td>
<td>.30**</td>
<td>.34**</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. App Pre</td>
<td>-.13*</td>
<td>.26**</td>
<td>-.26**</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.32</td>
<td>-.24**</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.41**</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Reg Fit</td>
<td>.32**</td>
<td>-.17**</td>
<td>.29**</td>
<td>.29**</td>
<td>.41**</td>
<td>.48**</td>
<td>.48**</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.39**</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean 38.3 19.3 16.5 11.1 16.3 14.8 33.6 22.2 38.2 24.4 32.2
SD 6.7 6.2 2.5 2.3 2.8 2.5 6.3 6.1 4.6 6.2

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

Research Question 6 looked to examine if there was an interaction between trait promotion focus and the applicant regulatory focus group on perceived promotion focus. In order to test this research question, the sample was median split on trait promotion...
focus, creating two groups: high trait promotion focus and low trait promotion focus. A 2x2 (trait promotion focus by applicant regulatory focus group) between subjects analysis of variance was then conducted. Table W.5 displays the means for each group. Overall there was not a significant interaction effect of trait promotion focus and the applicant regulatory focus on perceived applicant promotion focus, \( F_{1,231} = .445, p = .51 \). Thus, perceived applicant promotion focus did not vary across levels of trait promotion focus and applicant regulatory focus condition.

Table W.5

Mean perceived applicant promotion focus across assigned applicant regulatory focus responses and trait promotion focus.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conditions</th>
<th>High Trait Pro Applicant Pro</th>
<th>High Trait Pro Applicant Pre</th>
<th>Low Trait Pro Applicant Pro</th>
<th>Low Trait Pro Applicant Pre</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Applicant Pro (SD)</td>
<td>38.6 (4.7)</td>
<td>39.8 (4.6)</td>
<td>36.8 (4.7)</td>
<td>37.3 (4.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>