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Abstract

This study examined whether individuals who utilize impression management tactics perceived different types of job interviews as being more fair through an organizational justice framework. Specifically, this study examined whether ingratiation or self-promotion tactics moderated the relationship between interview condition and procedural justice, as well as informational justice. A student-based sample was used and participants (N = 162) were randomly assigned to one of the three interview conditions. The interview conditions were an in-person, face-to-face interview, a videoconference interview, and a phone interview. Results showed a strong significant main effect for those who highly utilize impression management tactics perceiving the in-person, face-to-face interview as being more procedurally just than the phone interview condition (p < .01) and more informationally just than both the phone and video interview conditions (p < .01). Interestingly enough, there were no differences between the phone and video-based interviews on either justice criterion. There was no significant interaction between impression management and interview condition on either justice criterion. This study has vast implications, given that various types of interview media may not be perceived by job applicants as organizationally just and thus, organizations may need to stick to the traditional face-to-face job interview if they want to be perceived as fair from job applicants. Future research should examine other individual difference factors that may affect job applicants’ ability to impression management and further examine whether phone and/or video-based interviews lead to applicant-perceived injustice.
Chapter I

Review of the Literature

Applicant perceptions regarding an organization’s selection process are important in understanding the effectiveness of selection procedures (Borman, Hanson, & Hedge, 1997; Chan & Schmitt, 2004; Ployhart & Ryan, 1998; Rynes & Connerley, 1993; Smither, Reilly, Millsap, Pearlman, & Stoffey, 1993). Subsequent applicant behaviors, such as accepting an organization’s job offer, continuing to be a consumer of the organization’s product or service, and/or being an advocate or opponent of the organization are all possible responses to an organization’s selection policies (Ryan & Ployhart, 2000; Rynes, 1993, Schmitt & Gilliland, 1992). In addition, ethical and even legal issues may arise if an applicant perceives a selection policy to be unfair (Gilliland, 1993; Seymour, 1988; Smither, et al., 1993).

The phrase “applicant perceptions” in a literature search has most frequently been associated with studies of applicant perceptions of fairness during the organizational selection process. An example is Gilliland’s (1993) organizational justice framework for identifying and understanding applicant perceptions of fairness of selection procedures. Organizational justice can be defined as the examination of fairness in an organizational context (Greenberg, 1987a). Because of potential ethical and legal problems, and because of the increased attention to justice perceptions in general, there has been a surge in the literature in the last two decades examining applicant perspectives in the organizational selection process (Anderson, 2004; Gilliland, 1993, 1994; Hlsheger & Anderson, 2009;
Murphy, 1986; Ployhart & Harold, 2004; Ployhart & Ryan, 1997; Ryan & Ployhart, 2000).

Of all the selection devices used by organizations, employment selection interviews continue to be among the most commonly utilized methods in organizational selection (Schmidt & Zimmerman, 2004; Wilk & Cappelli, 2003). Particularly, structured interviews predict job performance (McDaniel, Whetzel, Schmidt, & Mauer, 1994), display high reliability and validity (Latham, Saari, Pursell, & Campion, 1980), and in some cases, display incremental validity above and beyond that of traditional cognitive ability tests (Schmidt & Hunter, 1998). Applicants have also viewed interviews as more relevant to the job when compared to cognitive ability tests (Hausknecht, Day, & Thomas, 2004). This applicant view of job relevance is important for organizations, based on the previously stated ethical and legal concerns of perceived unfairness.

According to Gilliland (1993) and Bauer, Maertz, Dolen, and Campion (1998), organizational justice is a useful framework for examining and understanding the perceptions of job applicants. Many studies have also demonstrated applicant perceptions of organizational justice to be predictive of applicant reactions towards selection procedures (Anderson, Born, & Cunningham-Snell, 2002; Gilliland & Chan, 2001; Chan & Schmitt, 2004; Gilliland, 1993; Greenberg, 1993, Hausknecht et al., 2004; Schmitt & Chan, 1998). Therefore, it is important to further understand the perceptions of fairness of the structured selection interview from applicants’ perspectives.

In order to further understand applicant perceptions towards selection methods like structured interviewing, we must examine the characteristics of applicants and understand the dynamic relationship between the applicant and the situation. Impression
Management (IM), or an individual’s attempt in influencing the impression another person may form about them (Leary & Kowalski, 1990), is one area that may contribute to an understanding of the situational dynamics of applicant perceptions during a selection process. Even though there may be varying degrees of IM based on individual differences of applicants, such that some use IM tactics more frequently than others or use stronger IM forms than others (e.g., non-verbal IM tactics in addition to verbal IM tactics; Turnley & Bolino, 2001), all applicants may display some form and degree of IM, as long as the outcome of the interview is made salient to the applicant (e.g., getting hired) (Stevens & Kristof, 1995). Also, when it comes to IM tactics, different people can use different IM tactics in the same situation (Higgins, Judge, & Ferris, 2003). Levashina and Campion (2007) found that over 90% of their undergraduate applicants faked in a simulated job interview by using various IM tactics. Therefore, IM is a factor that shows high variability in its usage, as well as high frequency in individual utilization of these behaviors. This is important, due to the fact that IM is involved in both the interview process and context.

In addition to understanding applicants who impression manage in interviews and their justice perceptions of the interview process, it is important to recognize changes in technology that affect the way organizations select applicants. Technological advances like e-mail, videoconferencing, and virtual work environments have progressed much more rapidly than the corresponding research in understanding their intended and unintended effects (Straus, Miles, & Levesque, 2001). Thus, it is important to further examine different technological mediums of selection and how these interplay with IM and organizational justice. Morgeson and Ryan (2009) suggest future research on
applicant perspectives focus on both the dynamics of applicant IM and, among other things, the context in which selection procedures are practiced. Therefore, the aim of this study was to assess applicants using IM tactics in various organizational selection interview mediums. The purpose of this study was also to identify applicants’ subsequent reactions towards the organization’s selection process itself, through an organizational justice perspective. A review of the relevant literatures of the constructs of organizational justice, impression management, and the various interviewing media will be conducted first, followed by proposed hypotheses.

Organizational Justice

For the last several decades, a major theoretical focus of the industrial-organizational psychology literature has been on the topic of organizational justice. Some justice-based studies include applicant reactions to high technological recruiting devices (Anderson, 2004), applicant reactions of the fairness of selection procedures implemented by organizations (Gilliland, 1993; Ployhart & Ryan, 1998), employee feelings on organizational drug testing (Crant & Bateman, 1989; Murphy, Thornton, & Prue, 1991), and the perceived fairness of accommodations for other employees with disabilities under the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA; Colella, Paetzold, & Belliveau, 2004).

Organizational justice derives from equity theory (Adams, 1965) or the notion that individuals attempt to attain a state of fairness or equity in terms of comparison others by observing the ratio of perceived inputs versus perceived outputs the individual has relative to a comparison other. Comparison others include anyone who is perceived to significantly influence the individual’s perceptions towards equitable fairness principles. This is a subjective perception, thus even when an equitable allocation of outcomes
exists, the perception may show an inequitable balance between two individuals. Essentially, if there is an inequitable ratio compared to the other person, either inequitably overpaid or inequitably underpaid, dissatisfaction will occur in terms of guilt and anger, respectively. If there is a perceived equal ratio in terms of the individual and the target person, satisfaction results (Adams, 1965; Greenberg, 1990b).

An important underlying assumption to equity theory and all other organizational justice theories is that all individuals in an organization value fairness and have an inherent desire to promote or maintain fairness in the organization (Spector, 2008). This idea is proposed in this study as well, in that all individuals must actually want a fair process and a fair outcome, whether that be in comparison to other people or the perceived fairness of the processes themselves without a direct comparison to another person.

In terms of equity theory, most research has focused on the inequitable ratio of underpayment (receiving lower levels of outcomes for the same level of input, relative to a comparison other), rather than overpayment or equitable ratios (Greenberg, 1982). Throughout equity theory’s history, most studies examining equity theory used student-based samples in simulated work environments to identify equitable and inequitable ratios. Because of this, some researchers argued that this approach lowered equity theory’s utility in its generalizability towards real-work environments, since the circumstances can dictate what individuals perceive as being salient or not. According to Greenberg (1990b), however, equity theory still is thought by most organizational justice researchers as a sound theory that has demonstrated external validity.
Distributive Justice

Distributive justice, which can be defined as the perceived fairness of an outcome derived from a decision process (Greenberg, 1986a), emerged in part from equity theory. The literature has shown distributive justice to be contingent on how individuals, who allocate rewards, behave. Leventhal’s (1976a) Justice Judgment Model discusses this notion and is a contrary approach to equity theory, due to the Justice Judgment Model being a proactive approach focusing on behavior of those who distribute rewards and equity theory a reactive approach focusing on just the reactions of those who perceive inequitable outcomes (Greenberg, 1990b). Greenberg and Colquitt (2005) stated that Leventhal (1976a) and Deutsch (1975), among others, expanded equity theory from a single norm (equity) to multiple norms (e.g., equality and need), demonstrating that “...most allocation situations are governed by multiple allocation goals served by multiple allocation norms” (p. 20). Cohen (1987) stated that equity theory and the Justice Judgment Model together are the fundamental ideas behind distributive justice theory.

Traditional distributive justice studies have used student samples ranging from grade-school children to undergraduate college students. These studies examined differences of the distribution of grades or some type of salient reward, despite differences in productivity or effort (i.e., inputs, outputs) derived from equity theory and Homans’ (1961) distributive justice theory (Bagarozzi, 1982; Benton, 1971; Deutsch, 1979; Enright, Bjerstedt, Enright, Levy, Lapsley, et al., 1984; Ogunlade, 1977; Tompkins & Olejnik, 1978). Most studies throughout the literature on distributive justice have focused on outcomes such as pay, hiring decisions, and even promotions. Typically, when individuals react to an outcome of a decision, the reactions tend to be directed
toward the specific outcome and not necessarily the person or the organization giving the outcome (Cohen-Charash & Spector, 2001; Colquitt, 2001). Distributive justice has specifically been shown to be related to many organizational outcomes, such as job performance, organizational commitment, and occupational stress (Xi, Jianhong, & Kan, 2007). Although distributive justice is still important, procedural justice has been much of the focus in the organizational justice literature today.

**Procedural Justice**

Procedural justice has become a central element of organizational justice research. It is defined as the perceived fairness of a procedure utilized in making a decision (Folger & Greenberg, 1985). Research has shown that procedural justice is related to many organizational outcomes, such as organizational commitment (Folger & Konovsky, 1989), job satisfaction, and specific attitudes towards authorities and/or organizations enacting a decision (Lind & Tyler, 1988). According to Lind and Tyler (1988), procedural justice research was prompted by individuals not only looking at the outcome of a decision, but how that decision was derived. Procedural justice most notably emerged from Thibaut and Walker’s *Procedural Justice: A Psychological Analysis* (1975), in which they examined, in a legal context, the fairness of procedures when individuals had a degree of control in a decision making process. Specifically, participants had the ability to voice their opinions and/or actually influence the process of the final decision in some fashion, these processes being termed process control and decision control. It was found that when individuals were given the option of having a voice (i.e., process control) in the decision-making process, they were more likely to see it as just or fair. Leventhal (1980) stated that perceived process fairness is contingent on
rules of procedures. These rules are a) consistency of implemented procedures across people and time, b) having unbiased procedures, c) having accurate information that is utilized in making the final decision, d) having the ability to correct for errors in the procedures and/or decision, e) holding an ethical and/or moral view, f) having principles, and g) that all individuals who are affected by the decision have a say in the matter. This notion expanded procedural justice to make it a more complex dimension of organizational justice. Research has also shown that procedural justice reactions tend to focus on the organization that utilized the decision making process rather than the person or the specific outcome like the reactions in distributive justice (Cohen-Charash & Spector, 2001). Deutsch (1975) also discussed the notion of examining justice, in terms of the process of making a certain decision, in what he calls the process injustice of decision-making procedures. Deutsch states “...People are more apt to accept decisions and their consequences if they have participated in making them” (p. 139). This coincides with Thibaut and Walker’s claims.

**Interactional Justice**

A third approach to organizational justice is interactional justice, or the perceptions an individual has about the treatment received from a decision maker (Bies & Moag, 1986). It identifies aspects such as communication, nonverbal cues, and even the tone of a person’s voice. It is up to the perceiver to identify which of these cues are positive or negative in terms of whether they are being treated fairly or unfairly. There has been some disagreement in the literature on interactional justice. According to Greenberg (1993a), interactional justice should be divided into two aspects, those being interpersonal justice and informational justice. Interpersonal justice can be defined as
showing interest and concern about an outcome (e.g., showing a genuine interest into why a person received a bad performance rating). Informational justice can be defined as giving the people the information they need to evaluate and react to a given procedure (e.g., the performance rating was based on how much output a person produced in a fiscal quarter).

Interactional justice being broken up into interpersonal and informational justice has also prompted some debate in the organizational literature for a two factor approach (i.e., distributive and procedural), three factor approach (i.e., distributive, procedural, and interactional), or four factor approach (i.e., distributive, procedural, interpersonal, and informational). A meta-analysis by Cohen-Charash and Spector (2001) tested the three factor structure of distributive, procedural, and interactional justice using 190 organizational justice studies, including both laboratory and field studies. They found that although the constructs of distributive, procedural, and interactional justice are highly related, they are indeed three distinct constructs. They also found that all three dimensions were similarly related to multiple aspects of job satisfaction and organizational commitment, while procedural justice was specifically related to job performance and counterproductive work behaviors. A meta-analysis by Colquitt, Conlon, Wesson, Porter, and Ng (2001) included 183 studies using the four-factor structure of organizational justice with interactional being broken into interpersonal and informational justice (Colquitt, 2001). They found these four factors predicted many of the same outcomes as the Cohen-Charash and Spector meta-analysis but had stronger effects and a stronger factor structure. It is important to note that both studies utilized different methodologies, which has left room for debate in terms of the established factor
structure of organizational justice. Most authors agree, however, that there are at least three factors of organizational justice. Despite the theoretical nature of organizational justice, this construct lends itself as a useful criterion that may demonstrate how individual difference factors, such as IM, affect people’s perceptions of justice in organizations. Therefore, IM will be the next construct for review.

**Impression Management**

In terms of individual difference factors affecting the way one perceives organizational justice, IM may demonstrate profound differences in the way individuals perceive situations, such as interviewing for a job. Turnley and Bolino (2001) state that there are differences in how individuals utilize IM tactics. According to Stevens and Kristof (1995), verbal and nonverbal forms of IM tend to be the most important behaviors, in terms of influencing interviewers’ perceptions of applicants, which therefore affect the interviewers’ subsequent evaluations of the interviewee. This supports the notion that IM varies across individuals and that it is a fundamental process that occurs in employment interviewing.

The process of IM in terms of its description was first proposed by Goffman (1959), who coined the term “self-presentation” in his book *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life*. Goffman (1959) suggested that individuals in society are like actors on a stage that put on “performances” for the audience to demonstrate a specific side of themselves. This audience is the social network of the actor in his or her immediate environment. Thus, the individual’s subsequent behavior is a function of the environment that serves as a context, and this context acts in combination with the characteristics of both the actor and the audience to form distinct stimuli that are perceived by both the
actor and the audience. These stimuli form an overall definition of the situation. This situation then acts to guide the actor’s behavior to form the most appropriate impression (Gardner & Martin, 1988). If perceptions of the situation from both the audience and actor are congruent, positive impressions of the actor will take place and the extent of incongruency will lead to negative impressions of the actor (Gardner & Martin, 1988).

The terms *self-presentation* and *impression management* have been used interchangeably throughout the literature by many authors, although a few have described IM as an overall umbrella term that encompasses self-presentation as a facet (Leary & Kowalski, 1990). A distinction between IM and self-presentation was made by Shenkler (1980) when he defined IM as an “attempt to control images that are projected in real or imagined social interactions” (p. 6) and self-presentation as the projected images that are deemed self-relevant. IM has also been known in the literature as *influence tactics* (Higgins & Judge, 2004; Higgins et al., 2003), *political influence behavior* (Judge & Bretz, 1994), and even *organizational politics* (Ferris, Perrewe, Anthony, & Gilmore, 2000). IM was a source of much empirical attention when it was first proposed by Goffman in 1959, sparking many studies in the social sciences.

In an organizational context, IM has been extensively studied in several areas, most being in the setting of the traditional face-to-face selection interview, due to the extent to which value is placed on the interviewee’s performance in selection interviews when making hiring decisions (Weiss & Feldman, 2006). Tsai, Chen, and Chiu (2005) examined IM tactics used in job interviews, specifically observing the effects of self-focused tactics (i.e., verbalizing a person’s own competencies), other-focused tactics (e.g., agreeing with or flattering the interviewer) and nonverbal tactics (e.g., body
language, making eye contact with the interviewer) and their effect on interviewer evaluations. They also proposed that there are three moderators operating with regard to the three IM tactics discussed above, which are interview structure, customer-contact requirement, and interview length (Tsai et al., 2005). They found that applicant self-focused IM tactics influenced interviewer evaluations and that the higher the interview structure was, the less the applicant non-verbal IM tactics affected interview evaluations (Tsai et al., 2005).

Another recent study by Van Iddekinge, McFarland, and Raymark (2007) examined antecedents of IM in structured interviews. The authors specifically looked at the effects of personality and interview format, examining the strength of the interview situation and how it interacts with the antecedents (i.e., personality variables) to affect IM behaviors, such as self-focused tactics. They wanted to observe how the strong versus weak situation (Mischel, 1973) would interact with the dispositional antecedents of IM. Their findings suggest that an interviewee’s personality affects the use of verbal IM behaviors, which subsequently affects interview performance. They discovered that situational strength moderated antecedent IM behavioral relationships (Van Iddekinge et al., 2007). Weiss and Feldman (2006) examined the effect of using deception as an IM tactic in job interviews and found that extraverts and high self-monitors are more likely to lie in an interview about their qualifications and experiences. Individuals in general are more likely to lie about their qualifications and experiences in more technical, non-ambiguous jobs, due to the fact that the job requirements are more concrete and require less ambiguous qualifications. These studies are a sample of a plethora of extensive research of IM in interview contexts.
Other areas of IM research focus on a variety of factors. Harris, Kacmar, Zivnuska, and Shaw (2007) found that individuals high in political skill who also demonstrate high levels of IM were more likely to be perceived as higher performers, shedding light on how political skill, which is the ability to understand other people at work and utilize this knowledge to benefit the person’s goals, is highly related to IM. Peeters and Lievens (2006) examined IM verbal and non-verbal tactics with regards to underlying individual difference factors in structured interview formats while also under the directions to use or not use IM tactics. They found that when given the instructions to form a favorable impression, participants used more IM assertive, self-focused tactics as well as verbal other-focused tactics. They also found that interview structure influenced which types of IM tactics were used. There has also been research that has developed a theoretical framework in the role IM plays in the feedback-seeking process (Morrison & Bies, 1991), as well as how IM behavior affects supervisory performance ratings (Wayne & Liden, 1995).

Looking into the theoretical nature of IM, there have been a number of proposed models, such as the taxonomies of Tedeschi and Melburg (1984) and Wayne and Ferris (1990). However, according to the literature, Jones and Pittman (1982) developed a conceptualized taxonomy that is being utilized by most contemporary researchers of IM (Turnley & Bolino, 2001). The five strategies of this IM taxonomy are ingratiation, self-promotion, exemplification, supplication, and intimidation (Turnley & Bolino, 2001). Ingratiation is when individuals perform flattering behaviors; self-promotion is when individuals convey their accomplishments to promote perceived competence; exemplification is when individuals go above and beyond normative behavior to receive
attention; supplication is when individuals are perceived to demonstrate their incompetence’s to observers to receive the notion of being inferior; and intimidation, which is when individuals demonstrate power or are perceived at using their power to be perceived as being dangerous (Bolino & Turnley, 1999). Jones and Pittman (1982) were the first to make a distinction between the dimensions of ingratiation and self-promotion, which are the two most frequently studied IM tactics in the literature (Higgins et al., 2003). These studies have all demonstrated IM to be a multidimensional construct (Jones & Pittman, 1982; Kacmar, Harris, & Nagy, 2007; Turnley & Bolino 2001; Weiss & Feldman, 2006).

Leary and Kowalski (1990) conducted a literature review of IM that discussed many proposed ideations and models of IM while simultaneously proposing a two-component model of the construct. Their model suggests that IM is composed of two independent processes that operate according to different situational and dispositional antecedents, the first process being impression motivation and the second, impression construction. Impression motivation consists of three factors, which are the goal-relevance of impressions, the value of desired goals, and the discrepancy between the desired image and current image. Impression construction consists of five factors which are the self-concept, the desired and undesired identity images, role constraints, the target’s values, and the current or potential social image (Leary & Kowalski, 1990). More recently, Turnley and Bolino (2001) conducted a study examining the individual difference factor of self-monitoring on Jones and Pittman’s (1982) taxonomy of the five strategies of IM (ingratiation, self-promotion, exemplification, supplication, and intimidation). They found that high self-monitors can better use the IM tactics of
ingratiation, self-promotion, and exemplification than low self-monitors. High self-monitors using these tactics were deemed competent, likable, and dedicated. Low-self monitors were not as effective in using these tactics and thus, did not portray the positive images according to observers, but in some cases, actually elicited negative perceptions from others (Turnley & Bolino, 2001).

Despite IM research being a common topic among organizational researchers, there are some issues that must be addressed before future research can be implemented. According to Rao, Schmidt, and Murray (1995), there are shortcomings in the IM literature, most notably issues with using student samples instead of organizational samples, only using some aspects of IM, and having difficulties coming up with a universal measure for IM. In all areas of psychology, the issue with student samples is important when it comes to research. Obviously, with student samples the notion of generalizable results is somewhat limited. However, it is important to note that without a solid theoretical framework that promotes sound psychometrics in measurement, generalizable results will be hampered, independent of sampling.

The IM literature tends to focus on ingratiation and self-promotion IM tactics more than others, especially in an interview context (Stevens & Kristof, 1995). A meta-analysis by Higgins et al. (2003) identified 31 studies that examined the IM tactics of ingratiation, self-promotion, rationality, assertiveness, exchange, and upward appeal and how these tactics related to the specific work outcomes of various performance assessments, such as performance appraisals and extrinsic success, which they measured by assessing salary and promotions in a career. Ingratiation was found to have a positive effect on both outcomes, with its strongest effect on performance assessments. Self-
promotion was found to have weak effects on both performance assessments and extrinsic success. Because of the multitude of studies that have used ingratiating and self-promoting IM behaviors to represent the IM construct, the same method was implemented in this study.

**Interviewing Contexts**

In terms of identifying perceptions of fairness in interview contexts, Gilliland and Steiner (2001) suggest that applicant perceptions of *injustice* are more important in determining subsequent behavior than the applicant’s perceptions of *justice*. This is an important consideration in using selection methodologies; if a specific selection method is deemed unfair for assessing applicants, this can lead to negative implications for organizations. Some studies examined differences between types of interview media and subsequent reactions of interviewees (applicants). Straus et al. (2001) examined the differences in interviewer judgment and applicant reactions towards communication media of a telephone interview, a videoconference-based interview over the Internet, and a traditional, face-to-face interview. They found that interviewers had more favorable evaluations of applicants in the telephone versus the face-to-face interview condition, particularly if the applicants were less physically attractive. There were essentially no differences in terms of interviewer evaluations of applicants between the face-to-face and videoconference interview conditions. Applicants, however, did have less favorable reactions towards the videoconference interview condition versus the face-to-face interview condition.

Chapman and Rowe (2002) examined how applicants viewed organizations, in terms of attractiveness, based on the type of interview medium and interview structure.
Their results revealed that an interaction exists between interview medium (face-to-face vs. videoconference interviewing) and interview structure, on applicant performance, that is, the applicant’s subjective satisfaction with his or her interview performance. Specifically, they showed that unstructured interviews during a face-to-face interview provided more organizational attraction and performance satisfaction from applicants in comparison to structured interviews. They also found that structured interviews during a videoconference interview provided more organizational attractiveness and performance satisfaction from applicants when compared to unstructured interviews. Applicant perceptions of the interviewer’s performance were rated higher in the face-to-face condition than videoconference condition.

Chapman, Uggerslev, and Webster (2003) identified differences in fairness among the interview conditions of the face-to-face, telephone, and videoconference interviews. In addition, they examined interview difficulty, applicants’ expectancies of a favorable interview outcome, and intentions of applicants to accept a job offer. They proposed and found an interaction between self-monitoring and interview medium on applicant perceptions of fairness. Specifically, they found a negative correlation between self-monitoring and perceptions of fairness in the telephone interview condition, a positive correlation between self-monitoring and perceptions of fairness in the face-to-face interview condition, and no relationship between self-monitoring and perceptions of fairness in the videoconference interview condition. They also found that the face-to-face interview condition was viewed more fairly by applicants than the other conditions. They also found that applicants were more likely to have intentions of accepting a job in the face-to-face interview than the telephone and videoconference interview conditions.
Applicant expectancies of a favorable interview outcome were highest in the face-to-face interview condition followed by the telephone interview condition.

In addition to the above studies, Potosky (2008) discusses the dynamics of communication media and the factors that affect communication media channels. She developed a theoretical framework that identifies various communication exchange processes among media used in personnel assessment, such as interactive interviews and surveys. The factors that affect the communication media channels are: transparency, or the degree that allows clear communication to occur without obstruction; social bandwidth, or the rate of data transfer; interactivity, or the speed of reciprocal communication that takes place; and surveillance, which is the probability that a third party could capture the data accumulating through the medium. Both Potosky and Lievens and De Soete (2010) state that face-to-face interactions should be highest in all four factors affecting communication media channels.

Overall these studies have answered important questions, in terms of examining differences between interview media and identifying individual difference factors, such as self-monitoring, under different interview contexts. The purpose of this paper, then, was to extend and confirm some of these findings, while also addressing issues with specific methodologies, and proposing new ways of examining the dynamics of the interview and individual differences among job interview applicants. First, this study will extend the literature of IM by identifying various interview contexts in which IM can be utilized. Second, this analysis will provide an understanding of how those who tend to use IM tactics in an interview setting view the organizational selection procedures, in terms of fairness. Finally, this analysis will extend the previous findings of Chapman et
al. (2003) by providing an investigation of applicant perceived fairness in interviewing contexts by considering the procedural and informational justice dimensions of organizational justice. Proposed hypotheses are presented next.
Chapter II

Rationale and Hypotheses

IM is one of the most extensively studied topics in employment interviewing (Posthuma, Morgeson, & Campion, 2002). Nevertheless, only one study to the researcher’s knowledge has examined applicant perceptions of fairness using IM tactics in multiple interview contexts. This is surprising considering that most, if not all, individuals use some form of IM tactic in employment interviews, and understanding how IM might differ across interview contexts should have value. Martin and Nagao (1989) tested applicant reactions to the interviewing contexts of face-to-face, computer, and paper-pencil-based interviews, where the paper-pencil-based “interview” was essentially a job application. They found that applicants displayed more anger and resentment in the computerized and paper-pencil interviewing conditions when compared to the traditional, face-to-face interview condition. This finding helped guide the rationale for the proposed hypotheses.

It has also been shown that different interview media elicit different reactions from applicants (Chapman & Rowe, 2002; Chapman et al., 2003; Martin & Nagao, 1989; Straus et al., 2001). Thus, it is thought that individuals who utilize IM tactics will not have the same experience or same opportunity to do so in different interview formats, such as with telephone and videoconference interview media. Rynes and Miller (1983) found that applicants believed both verbal and non-verbal cues to influence interview outcomes. It may be that non-verbal cues not only are absent in a phone-based interview,
but non-verbal cues may not be as prevalent in a videoconference-based interview as well when compared to an in-person, face-to-face interview. Leary and Kowalski (1990) also discussed that different circumstances motivate individuals to use IM tactics and Peeters and Lievens (2006) demonstrated that there was motivation to use IM tactics when applicants were instructed to make a favorable impression in an interview context. Thus, a selection interview is an incentive for applicants to use IM tactics in order to present a favorable impression of themselves to the interviewer.

Research has also shown that applicants will tend to specifically use ingratiation and self-promotion IM tactics, such as verbal and non-verbal tactics, to present themselves in a good light and try to impress the interviewer (Higgins & Judge, 2004; Peeters & Lievens, 2006; Stevens & Kristof, 1995). It is thought that the perceived ability of applicants to display verbal and non-verbal ingratatory and self-promoting behaviors in the videoconference and phone conditions will be inhibited and thus, applicants will more likely become frustrated with the interview process and come away with feelings of injustice. This leads to Hypothesis 1 which is as followed:

H1: The effects of interview condition on procedural justice will be moderated by ingratiation and self-promotion tactics. Specifically, individuals higher in ingratiation and self-promotion tactics will have a positive relationship with procedural justice in the face-to-face interview condition, a negative relationship in the videoconference interview condition, and a weaker, negative relationship in the phone interview condition.

For exploratory purposes, an analysis of the same interaction effect in the primary hypothesis was incorporated, only on a different criterion; informational justice. There is,
however, a difference in the weaker effect. Instead of the weaker interaction effect of impression management tactics and justice in the phone condition, it will be postulated in the videoconference, due to the previous discussion regarding the factors that affect communication channels (e.g., transparency).

**Exploratory Hypothesis 1:** The effects of interview condition on informational justice will be moderated by the impression management tactics of ingratiation and self-promotion. Specifically, individuals higher in the impression management tactics of ingratiation and self-promotion will have a positive relationship with informational justice in the face-to-face interview condition, a negative relationship in the phone interview condition, and a weaker, negative relationship in the videoconference interview condition.

Ingratiation and self-promotion were measured as two separate dimensions of the impression management construct for the primary and exploratory hypotheses. However, for exploratory purposes, they were also combined into one overall measure of impression management to identify any potential effects on procedural and informational justice.
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Method

Participants

Participants were recruited through the undergraduate participant pool at Xavier University. The university’s IRB reviewed and approved the project before any data were collected (see Appendix H). A description of the study was posted on the research participation board in Elet Hall. Participants received course credit or extra credit in their undergraduate psychology course(s), at the discretion of their instructors. They also had the opportunity to win one $100 gift card to www.amazon.com in a random drawing for participating. Diversity was addressed by allowing all undergraduate students enrolled in psychology classes the same opportunity to participate in the study. There were no exclusionary criteria for the study. Based on a power analysis (Cohen, 1992), a sample size estimate of 156 participants (52 participants per condition) was needed in order to attain 0.80 power to detect a medium effect with an alpha level of .05. There were a total of 162 participants (54 per condition) in the study, of whom 59.3% were male, 82.1% were Caucasian, and over 97% were between 18 and 23 years of age.

Measures

Demographics. Demographics were assessed using an original, self-report measure that asked participants about their class level, college major, gender, age, and race (see Appendix A).

Organizational Justice. Organizational justice was assessed using Colquitt’s (2001) Organizational Justice measure (see Appendix B). For this study, only the
procedural justice items and informational justice items of the measure were used. There are a total of seven procedural justice items, of which items 1 and 2 were derived from Thibaut and Walker (1975) and items 3-7 were derived from Leventhal (1980). These items are scored on a 5-point Likert-type scale ranging from 1 (*to a very small extent*) to 5 (*to a very large extent*). Cronbach’s alpha for the procedural justice items in this study was .76, which is consistent with previous research (Colquitt, 2001). An example item is as follows: “The following items refer to the procedures used to arrive at your outcome. To what extent have you been able to express your views and feelings during those procedures.” It is important to note that a change was made to the anchor item. Instead of, “Refer to the procedures used to arrive at your outcome”, the text, “Refer to the procedures used to make a selection decision” was utilized.

The informational justice facet contained five items, which were derived from Bies and Moag (1986) and Shapiro, Buttner, and Barry (1994) for items 1 and 2 and items 3, 4, and 5, respectively. This facet is scored on the same 5-point Likert-type scale as the procedural justice facet. Cronbach’s alpha in this study was .86 for the informational justice measure.

**Impression Management: Ingratiation.** Ingratiation was measured using Higgins and Judge’s (2004) approach of extrapolating ingratiations from the Stevens and Kristof (1995) measure (see Appendix C). This measure consists of nine items scored on a 7-point Likert-type scale ranging from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 5 (*strongly agree*). An example item is as follows: “I complimented the interviewer or organization”. The ingratiation measure displayed Cronbach’s alpha of .80 for this study.
Impression Management: Self-promotion. Self-promotion was measured using items extrapolated both from Stevens and Kristof (1995) and Wayne and Ferris (1990) (see Appendix C). This same approach can also be found in Higgins and Judge’s (2004) study of influence tactics utilized in interviews. This five-item measure is scored on the same 7-point Likert-type scale as ingratiation. Cronbach’s alpha for the self-promotion measure for this study was .68. Ingratiation and self-promotion were measured separately in order to determine an individual’s level of impression management.

Procedure

Upon agreeing to participate, participants were randomly assigned to one of three conditions: a face-to-face, in-person interview with an interviewer; a videoconference interview in which a laptop computer was provided that displayed a human interviewer on the screen so that both the interviewer and participant could see and hear each other using interactive voice-over-IP software (Skype); or a telephone-based interview, in which an interviewer and participant could only hear each other. Each interview lasted approximately 20 minutes and was conducted in an isolated room. Upon arriving at the interview, participants received a consent to participate form that was signed and dated (see Appendix D). The consent form described the study’s purpose in broad terms. They were not told the specifics of the interview condition manipulation until the debriefing session at the end of the interview. Participants were informed that the best interview performer would receive a $100 gift card. Once the experiment had concluded, participants were debriefed and were told that interview performance was not actually being evaluated, but for participating, they would be entered in a drawing for one $100 gift card to www.amazon.com. This was to ensure participant motivation during the
interview simulation. Participants were then told by a job interviewer to imagine they are an applicant interviewing for their dream job and were encouraged to “get the job by trying their best” (see Appendix E). In order to further motivate participants, it was emphasized that a person needed to have plenty of interview practice in order to get a job, especially in a tough economy where businesses have the ability to be very selective. The idea was for participants to know that job interview performance is critical in a person’s occupational pursuit.

Once participants were told the importance of their job interview performance, they took part in a structured interview (see Appendix F) which asked questions about problem solving strategies, personal experiences, what they looked for in a job, and how they thought they could contribute to a company’s success. These interview questions were the same type of questions participants would experience in a real job interview (“Sample Interview Questions,” Society for Human Resource Management, n.d.). Once the interview session had concluded, the participants completed the organizational justice measures as well as the impression management measures, both of which were paper-and-pencil measures. In order to mitigate potential order effects, a counterbalance procedure was implemented, in which half of the participants in each interview condition received the organizational justice measures first followed by the impression management measures second and the other half, the impression management measures first, followed by the organizational justice measures. Once the measures were completed, participants were thanked for their participation and debriefed on what variables were actually being assessed in the experiment and were informed about the experimental manipulation of job interview context, as well as the interview gift card
incentive (see Appendix G). Participants were then given information on the university’s Career Services Center (also Appendix G) and were informed that if they wanted more job interview practice and constructive advice on job interview performance to visit Career Services. Finally, participants were informed that none of their individual data would be reported, that all data would be reported in aggregate form, and if they were interested in the results they could contact the principal investigator. A sign-in sheet was there to collect participants’ names and contact information to ensure credit and gift cards were received, but once credit was given, there was no identifying information tied back to the participants’ individual data.
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Results

Table 1 displays the means, standard deviation, and intercorrelations of the variables of interest. There were no effects related to age, gender, race, class, or college major on any variable. However, there were two statistically significant differences between two of the interviewers on perceptions of informational justice, indicating that the interviewer/applicant social interaction was affected by one interviewer in particular. Excluding the particular interviewer differences, however, there were no other significant differences between the other interviewers.

The main hypothesis, which stated that the effects of interview condition on procedural justice would be moderated by gratiation and self-promotion tactics, with individuals higher in gratiation and self-promotion having a positive relationship with procedural justice in the face-to-face interview condition, a negative relationship in the videoconference interview condition, and a weaker, negative relationship in the phone interview condition, was not supported, as can be seen in Table 2. The unweighted effects coding variables of e1 and e2 were representative of the face-to-face, phone, and video interview conditions, respectively, as is suggested by the literature (Cohen, Cohen, West, & Aiken, 2003; Pedhazur, 1997). The process of effects coding generated a total of 2 effect variables, each representing one of the 3 levels of the interview condition variable. Scholars (Cohen et al., 2003; Pedhazur, 1997) suggest reporting k-1 effects variables to eliminate redundancy in reporting the reference variable, since it is coded -1 per condition. In this case, the reference variable was the video condition, but any
condition could be the reference variable, since all of their respective values as beta
weights are contingent upon another because the relationship in such a regression
equation is an overall linear function.
Table 1.

Means, Standard Deviations, and Intercorrelations Between Study Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Proc Justice</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>(.76)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Info Justice</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.52&quot; (86)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Ingratiation</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>.26&quot; .28&quot; (80)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Self-Promotion</td>
<td>4.57</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>.18&quot; .05</td>
<td>.35&quot; (68)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Ing + Self-Prom</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>.27&quot; .15</td>
<td>.83&quot;</td>
<td>.81&quot; (80)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Note: Proc Justice = Procedural Justice  
Info Justice = Informational Justice  
Ing = Ingratiation  
Self-Prom = Self-Promotion  
Ing + Self-Prom = Combined Social Desirability Scales
Table 2.

Summary of Regression Analysis for Variables Predicting Perceptions of Procedural Justice (N = 162)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE B</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>ΔR²</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>e1</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.21*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>e2</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.21*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ING</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.22**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>e1</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>e2</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ING</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>e1xING</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.66</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE B</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>ΔR²</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>e1</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.27*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>e2</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.27*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SP</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.20**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>e1</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.36*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>e2</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>-.02*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SP</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.20**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>e1xSP</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>e2xSP</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2. (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE B</th>
<th>$\beta$</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>$\Delta R^2$</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>e1</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.23**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c2</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.23**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ING+SP</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.25***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>e1</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>e2</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ING+SP</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.26***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>e1xING+SP</td>
<td>-.001</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.007</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>e2xING+SP</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.68</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* $= p < .05$
** $= p < .01$
*** $= p < .001$

Note: e1 = Effect Variable 1
    e2 = Effect Variable 2
    ING = Ingratiation
    SP = Self-Promotion
    ING+SP = Combined Impression Management Variable
The exploratory hypothesis examined the same relationships as Hypothesis 1, with the only difference being the utilization of informational justice rather than procedural justice as the criterion. The exploratory hypothesis was also not supported. A total of six regressions were performed, three with procedural justice as the criterion to test Hypothesis 1 and three with informational justice as the criterion to test the exploratory hypothesis, using interview condition and facets of impression management as predictors (Tables 2 and 3). Main effects of each facet of impression management and interview condition, as well as the interaction term of these variables, were examined with both the procedural and informational justice criteria.
Table 3.

**Summary of Regression Analysis for Variables Predicting Perceptions of Informational Justice (N = 162)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE B</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>ΔR²</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>e1</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>e2</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ING</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>e1</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>e2</td>
<td>-.32</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>-.35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ING</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>e1xING</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-.26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>e2xING</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model</td>
<td>Variable</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>SE B</td>
<td>β</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>ΔR²</td>
<td>p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>e1</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>e2</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SP</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>e1</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>e2</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SP</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>e1xSP</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>e2xSP</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3. (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>$B$</th>
<th>$SE_B$</th>
<th>$\beta$</th>
<th>$R$</th>
<th>$\Delta R^2$</th>
<th>$p$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td></td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>e1</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.36***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>e2</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ING+SP</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td></td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>e1</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>e2</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ING+SP</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>e1xING+SP</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>e2xING+SP</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* = p<.05
** = p<.01
*** = p<.001

Note: e1 = Effect Variable 1
e2 = Effect Variable 2
ING = Ingratiation
SP = Self-Promotion
Although IM tactics did not moderate the relationship between either interview condition and procedural justice or informational justice, the means were in the right direction (see Table 4), and the mean in the face-to-face interview condition was significantly higher versus the phone interview conditions on the procedural justice criterion \( F(2, 159) = 5.67, p < .01 \) and significantly higher than both the phone and video interview condition on the informational justice criterion \( F(2, 159) = 9.06, p < .01 \). Scheffe post hoc tests revealed these differences. It is important to note that the phone and video perceptions of justice were not significantly different from one another for either justice variable. This leads to a very important and intriguing notion about the perceptions of job applicants with regard to organizational selection interviews.
Table 4.

*Means and Standard Deviations of Procedural and Informational Justice Across Interview Condition*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interview Condition</th>
<th>PJ Mean</th>
<th>PJ SD</th>
<th>IJ Mean</th>
<th>IJ SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Face-to-Face</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>0.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>0.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Video</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>0.79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PJ = Procedural Justice  
IJ = Informational Justice
Chapter V

Discussion

This study attempted to demonstrate how interview media affects the perceptions of applicants, specifically the perceived procedural and informational justice of individuals who tend to be higher in impression management in certain interview contexts. The primary and exploratory hypotheses were not supported, however. It was surprising to find that there was essentially no significant interaction between impression management, procedural justice, informational justice, and interview condition, given that previous research seems to point to this notion.

The main effects of interview condition on both procedural and informational justice, specifically individuals perceiving higher procedural justice in the face-to-face interview condition versus the phone interview condition and individuals perceiving higher informational justice in the face-to-face interview condition versus both the phone and video interview conditions, may shed some light on how organizations proceed in interviewing job applicants. The face-to-face interview condition being perceived more procedurally just than the phone interview by participants is not all that surprising, given that participants more than likely felt that it better simulated a real job interview than a phone interview would. Even though the procedures were identical, interviewing them in a formal, face-to-face setting may contain more fidelity than the phone interview.

The face-to-face interview condition being perceived more informationally just than both the phone and video interview conditions was somewhat expected, although the
lack of difference between the phone and video interview conditions was not anticipated. This finding in of itself, however, has tremendous implications for organizations who utilize both video and phone interviews as part of their organizational selection process. One reason for this could be that the progression of technological advances and the inherent benefits they provide can make most individuals succumb to the pro-innovation bias (Anderson, 2004; Rogers, 2003), that is the belief that the adoption of a new technological innovation is more beneficial than that of a traditional method of accomplishing tasks. This may be the perception that organizations have today regarding how they select and assess job applicants; that is, the more sophisticated the technology in screening job applicants, the better they are perceived by job applicants, the more organizations save, and so forth. The main effects findings of this study and those of other studies (Chapman et al., 2003; Straus et al., 2001) however, may show otherwise. An event as salient and as complicated as a job interview may need that personable approach that phones or even video-conference technology cannot replace. Something as simple as shaking an interviewer’s hand, getting a look at the office, observing how job incumbents behave and communicate with one another as a job candidate walks into the organization, all potentially influence the perception the job candidate may have of the interviewer and the overall organization. These elements may form the overall perception puzzle of organizational justice, yet in this study, because there were no job incumbents and an actual office, these effects are likely to have been minimal.

Finally, one interesting finding not expected was the fact that individuals were more inclined to report a higher degree of impression management in the face-to-face interview condition versus the other two interview conditions. Ingratiation was
significantly higher in the face-to-face interview condition than the phone or video interview conditions. This was true only for ingratiation and not so for self-promotion. A possible explanation for this finding may be related to how the applicant perceives the interviewer. In the face-to-face interview condition, the applicant has more informational cues and thus, may be more inclined to ingratiate him- or her-self with the interviewer, simply because they may know more about the interviewer, such as how the interviewer greets them, whether the interviewer has a family, or whether the interviewer is a sports fan based on the information present in an office environment, such as pictures of family and sports memorabilia. The applicant in turn, can use this information to ingratiate the interviewer by discussing with them family life or about a particular sports team that the interviewer likes. This can be done in either the in-person, face-to-face interview or the video interview, although not as likely in the video interview, due to not having a full view of the interviewer’s office environment. With self-promotion, simply talking about one’s accomplishments and competencies can be done across all three interview conditions, which may explain why there was no significant finding with self-promotion across interview conditions. In addition, there may simply be more time to “naturally” interact with the interviewer, whereas in phone or video interviews, there may be more time pressure to get it over with and once the interview is completed, the parties simply log off or hang up. This would be an intriguing avenue for future research.

Contributions

The findings suggest that there are no differences in the perceptions of procedural and informational justice of applicants regarding phone or video-based interviews. If organizations are particularly interested in using these methods for interviewing, then the
present study suggests that it does not matter which method they use if they are concerned about applicant perceptions of procedural and informational justice. That is, whether an organization decides to use phone or video-based interviewing, there should not be any difference in how applicants perceive the conditions from a procedural or informational justice perspective. This is surprising given that video-based interviews could provide more information to the company than a phone interview, simply by providing the interviewer with physical information, such as what the applicant looks like, how they dress and present themselves, and finally, how they interact with someone in a “virtual” face-to-face setting. Research shows that these are important informational cues that can signify how the interviewer perceives the applicant’s ability to fit in with the organization (Bretz, Rynes, & Gerhart, 1993; Cable & Judge, 1997; Rynes & Gerhart, 1990). It is worth emphasizing again, however, that the present study suggests that an organization that is truly concerned about perceptions of justice should likely avoid either phone or video-based interviewing in favor of the generally-preferred face-to-face style. The implications of this finding are vast, in terms of how much time, effort, and resources organizations spend on using technology in interviewing job applicants.

The lack of support for the exploratory hypothesis regarding the interactive effects of interview medium and impression management on informational justice was also not expected. Information processing theory would suggest that type of interview media should have some effect on the quality of communication between both parties, yet these results show otherwise regarding the interaction. However, this notion is again supported when only the main effect of interview medium is considered. Informational cues with regard to interviewer-applicant interaction and quality of communication
between both parties has affected how people perceived the situation in previous studies (Chapman & Rowe, 2002; Lievens & De Soete, 2010; Potosky, 2008; Straus et al., 2001), which is inherently related to informational justice by giving the applicant enough information to make a judgment about the situation they are in. This could be related to the informational justice measure used in this study, given that it may have failed to capture these cues that the research demonstrates should have been accounted for, although these cues are reflected in how informational justice is measured in this instrument. This particular instrument, derived from Colquitt (2001), for measuring informational justice as a facet of organizational justice has received much empirical support and is the most widely-known measure of the organizational justice dimension, informational justice.

Even though the results were not supportive of the hypotheses, organizations can still benefit from the findings of this study. If an organization wants to be perceived by applicants to care a great deal in meeting with applicants and can afford to do so, then the face-to-face interview is the suggested method based on the results of this study. Future research should examine whether applicants perceive organizations who use both phone and video interviews as part of their selection interview process as not valuing the interview process, in general. There could be a “psychological wall” that is created when technological-mediated interviews occur. Applicants may not view such processes as “real” interviews and thus, will not put their best foot forward until they get an in-person, face-to-face interview. This notion is equally intriguing as it is disastrous for organizations who spend billions of dollars on such interviewing approaches and this may only get worse as technology continues to exponentially progress.
Another area of future research should examine whether using video-based job interviews could open employers up to potential discriminatory issues. If face-to-face interviews are perceived to be more fair than video interviews, applicants in video-based interviews may feel that video interviews are unfair practices and could potentially pursue litigation, due to perceived discrimination based on age, race, gender, and even attractiveness. Future research should focus on these individual difference factors with regard to video-based interviews in an organizational justice and/or fairness context.

Limitations

Like any empirical study, the methodology utilized is never perfect and the trade-offs in terms of the methodology in this study make it no exception. Using an experimental manipulation and random assignment of participants to three types of interview contexts allowed for maximum internal validity to be captured, which promotes causation to be stated more boldly than if this were a correlational study (Whitley, 2002). The design does, however, simultaneously limit the generalizability of the results, due to low external validity (using undergraduate students rather than real job applicants). These factors bring forth both the strengths and limitations of the study. It is important to note, however, that this study did contain variability in responses in ways that are consistent with prior literature with both student-based samples (Martin & Nagao, 1989; Straus et al., 2001) and real job applicant-based samples (Chapman et al., 2003) by demonstrating differential perceptions of justice across interview conditions. This was met in conjunction with interpretable effects of impression management tactics, only the expected interactions of interview condition and impression management on procedural and informational justice did not materialize.
Another potential limitation of the study is the saliency of the interview condition. The motivation of participants may be limited, due to the outcome of interview performance not being as important for participants receiving class credit and the chance to win a reward than real job applicants trying to get a real job. This however, has the potential to generalize positive results, because if a study can find a strong effect in a student sample with seemingly low motivation, the effect size would likely be higher using real job applicants trying to achieve the important objective of getting hired for a desired job. In addition, it is likely college students may have more familiarity with technology than the average person in a real-world work setting and therefore, the finding that individuals perceived the face-to-face interview condition as being more just than the phone and video interview conditions may be actually magnified in the real-world, working population.

It is also important to note that the questions asked during the interview simulation were consistent with real-world interviewing questions. The participants’ responses to these questions in this study were real examples from previous work and class experience, which tend to be given in a real job interview setting. Thus, even though the stakes were not very high, the mechanics of the questions from the interviewer and the answers given by the participants seemed to produce a professional conversation that paralleled that of a real job interview. Moreover, the fact that mean differences emerged across interview mediums on perceptions of both procedural and interactional justice suggests that the manipulation did have an effect on the participants, if not the interaction hypothesized.
The use of technology also presents study limitations. Using specialized videoconference software, such as Skype, always poses the risk for malfunction, thus interrupting the experiment. Fortunately, the technological issues were minimal for this study. An example was the frozen image of the interviewer with just the audio being transmitted. This, however, only occurred with two applicants in the video interview condition. Excluding these two cases made no difference in the pattern of the study results, however. Technological issues also had implications in how participants perceived the informational justice of such issues. The timing of the voice and video data also may not be synchronized, which could present an unrealistic situation, when compared to a face-to-face interview, and may cause frustration among the participants. The telephone may also malfunction in the telephone interview condition, although the likelihood of this occurring does not seem to be as high as the videoconference condition because all the calls in the study were made within the same service area, making the likelihood of call disruption relatively constant and thus, no dropped calls were reported by any of the interviewers. Since these issues limit the experimental strength of a study but also demonstrate real-world occurrences, an interesting area of future research could be to examine the effects of technological problems or dropped calls on applicant perceptions of the interview process and therefore, the likelihood of job offer acceptance by applicants. This could be a potential element of the “psychological wall” concept discussed earlier.

**Conclusion**

This study demonstrated that perceptions of both procedural and informational justice are significantly affected by interview medium, but that interview condition did
not significantly interact with impression management tactics. Since interviewing job applicants will continue to be a primary assessment activity across all industries and organizational levels and, since organizations and job applicants will continue to play this game of projecting the best image of themselves, these areas will continue to be important aspects of the industrial/organizational psychology literature.
Chapter VI

Summary

Applicant perceptions regarding an organization’s selection process are important in understanding the effectiveness of selection procedures (Borman, Hanson, & Hedge, 1997; Chan & Schmitt, 2004; Ployhart & Ryan, 1998). According to Gilliland (1993), organizational justice, which is the examination of fairness in an organizational context (Greenberg, 1987a), is a useful framework for examining and understanding the perceptions of job applicants. It is also important to understand the perceptions of fairness of the structured selection interview from applicants’ perspectives, given that structured interviews predict job performance (McDaniel, Whetzel, Schmidt, & Mauer, 1994), display high reliability and validity (Latham, Saari, Pursell, & Campion, 1980), and continue to be among the most commonly utilized methods in organizational selection (Schmidt & Zimmerman, 2004).

We must also examine the characteristics of applicants and understand the dynamic relationship between the applicant and the situation. Impression Management (IM), or an individual’s attempt in influencing the impression another person may form about them (Leary & Kowalski, 1990), is one area that may contribute to an understanding of the situational dynamics of applicant perceptions during a selection process.

In addition to understanding applicants who impression manage in interviews and their justice perceptions of the interview process, it is important to recognize changes in technology that affect the way organizations select applicants. It has been shown that
different interview media elicit different reactions from applicants (Chapman & Rowe, 2002; Chapman et al., 2003; Martin & Nagao, 1989; Straus et al., 2001). Research has also shown that applicants will tend to specifically use ingratiation and self-promotion IM tactics, such as verbal and non-verbal tactics, to present themselves in a good light and try to impress the interviewer (Higgins & Judge, 2004; Peeters & Lievens, 2006; Stevens & Kristof, 1995). It is thought that the perceived ability of applicants to display verbal and non-verbal ingratiationary and self-promoting behaviors in the videoconference and phone conditions will be inhibited and thus, applicants will more likely become frustrated with the interview process and come away with feelings of injustice. This leads to Hypothesis 1:

H1: The effects of Ingratiation and Self-Promotion tactics on Procedural Justice will be moderated by interview condition. Specifically, individuals higher in Ingratiation and Self-Promotion will have a positive relationship with Procedural Justice in the Face-to-Face interview condition, a negative relationship in the videoconference interview condition, and a weaker, negative relationship in the phone interview condition.

For exploratory purposes, an analysis of the same interaction effect in the primary hypotheses was incorporated, only on a different criterion; informational justice. There is, however, a difference in the weaker effect. Instead of the weaker interaction effect of Impression Management tactics and Justice in the phone condition, it was postulated in the videoconference, due to the previous discussion regarding the factors that affect communication channels (e.g., transparency).
Exploratory Hypothesis 1: The effects of the Impression Management tactics of Ingratiation and Self-promotion on Informational Justice will be moderated by interview condition. Specifically, individuals higher in the Impression Management tactics of Ingratiation and Self-promotion will have a positive relationship with Informational Justice in the Face-to-Face interview condition, a negative relationship in the phone interview condition, and a weaker, negative relationship in the videoconference interview condition.

Ingratiation and Self-Promotion were measured as two separate dimensions of the Impression Management construct for the primary and exploratory hypotheses. However, for exploratory purposes, they were combined into one overall measure of Impression Management to identify any potential effects on procedural/informational justice.

Method

Participants

The demographics of the study's 162 participants showed that 59.3% were male, 82.1% were Caucasian, and over 97% were between 18 and 23 years of age. Participants were recruited through the undergraduate participant pool at Xavier University. Participants received course credit or extra credit in their undergraduate psychology course(s), at the discretion of their instructors. They also had the opportunity to win one $100 gift card to www.amazon.com in a random drawing for participating.

Measures

Demographics. Demographics were assessed using an original self-report measure that asks participants about their class level, college major, gender, age, and race.
**Organizational Justice.** Organizational justice was assessed using Colquitt’s (2001) Organizational Justice measure. For this study, only the procedural and informational justice items of the measure were used. There were a total of 7 procedural justice items, of which items 1 and 2 were derived from Thibaut and Walker (1975) and items 3-7 were derived from Leventhal (1980). These items are scored on a 5-point Likert-type scale ranging from 1 (*to a very small extent*) to 5 (*to a very large extent*). Cronbach’s alpha for the procedural justice items in this study was .76, which is consistent with previous research (Colquitt, 2001).

The Informational Justice facet contained 5 items, which were derived from Bies and Moag (1986) and Shapiro, Buttner, and Barry (1994) for items 1 and 2 and items 3, 4, and 5, respectively. This facet is scored on the same 5-point Likert-type scale as the procedural justice facet. Cronbach’s alpha in this study was .86 for the Informational Justice measure.

**Impression Management: Ingratiation.** Ingratiation was measured using Higgins and Judge’s (2004) approach of extrapolating ingratiation items from the Stevens and Kristof (1995) measure (see Appendix C). This measure consists of nine items scored on a 7-point Likert-type scale ranging from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 5 (*strongly agree*). An example item is as follows: “I complimented the interviewer or organization”. The ingratiation measure displayed Cronbach’s alpha of .80 for this study.

**Impression Management: Self-promotion.** Self-promotion was measured using items extrapolated both from Stevens and Kristof (1995) and Wayne and Ferris (1990) (see Appendix C). This same approach can also be found in Higgins and Judge’s (2004) study of influence tactics utilized in interviews. This five-item measure is scored on the
same 7-point Likert-type scale as ingratiation. Cronbach’s alpha for the self-promotion measure for this study was .68. It is important to note Ingratiation and Self-promotion were measured separately in order to determine an individual’s level of impression management.

Procedure

Upon agreeing to participate, participants were randomly assigned to one of three conditions: a face-to-face, in-person interview with an interviewer; a videoconference interview in which a laptop computer was provided that displayed a human interviewer on the screen so that both the interviewer and participant could see and hear each other; or a telephone-based interview, in which an interviewer and participant could only hear each other. Each interview lasted approximately 20 minutes and was conducted in an isolated room. Upon arriving at the interview, participants received a consent to participate form that was to be signed and dated. The consent form described the study’s purpose in broad terms. They were not told the specifics of the interview condition manipulation until the debriefing session at the end of the interview. Participants were informed that the best performer in the interview would receive a $100 gift card. Once the experiment concluded, participants were debriefed and were told that interview performance was not actually being evaluated, but for participating, they were entered in a drawing for one $100 gift card to www.amazon.com. This was to ensure participant motivation during the interview simulation. Participants were then told by a job interviewer to imagine they were an applicant interviewing for their dream job and would be encouraged to “get the job by trying their best”. The idea was for participants to know that job interview performance is critical in a person’s occupational pursuit.
Once participants were told the importance of their job interview performance, they took part in a structured interview which asked questions about problem solving strategies, personal experiences, what they looked for in a job, and how they thought they could contribute to the company’s success. These interview questions were the same type of questions participants would experience in a real job interview (“Sample Interview Questions,” Society for Human Resource Management, n.d.). Once the interview session had concluded, the participants completed the organizational justice measures as well as the impression management measures, all of which were paper-and-pencil measures. In order to mitigate potential order effects, a counterbalance procedure was implemented, in which half of the participants in each interview condition received the organizational justice measures first followed by the impression management measures second and the other half, the impression management measures first, followed by the organizational justice measures. Once the measures were completed, participants were thanked for their participation and debriefed on what variables were actually being assessed in the experiment and informed about the experimental manipulation of job interview context, as well as the interview gift card incentive. Participants were then given information on the university’s Career Services Center and were informed that if they wanted more job interview practice and constructive advice on job interview performance, to visit Career Services.
Results

There were no effects related to age, gender, or race, on any variable, however there were two statistically significant differences between two of the interviewers on perceptions of informational justice, indicating that the interviewer/applicant social interaction was affected by one interviewer in particular.

The main hypothesis, which stated that the effects of ingratiating and self-promotion on procedural justice would be moderated by interview condition, with individuals higher in ingratiating and self-promotion having a positive relationship with procedural justice in the face-to-face interview condition, a negative relationship in the videoconference interview condition, and a weaker, negative relationship in the phone interview condition, was not supported. The face-to-face interview condition did not significantly predict perceptions of procedural justice when individuals were higher in ingratiating. The exploratory hypothesis examined the same relationships as Hypothesis 1, with the only difference being the utilization of informational justice rather than procedural justice as the criterion. The exploratory hypothesis was also not supported.

A total of six regressions were performed, three with procedural justice as the criterion to test Hypothesis 1 and three with informational justice as the criterion to test the exploratory hypothesis, using interview condition and facets of impression management as predictors (Tables 2 and 3). The process of effects coding (Cohen et al., 2003) generated a total of 2 effect variables, each representing one of the 3 levels of the interview condition variable. Main effects of each facet of impression management and interview condition, as well as the interaction term of these variables, were examined with both the procedural and informational justice criteria.
Although interview condition did not moderate the relationship between either impression management and procedural justice or impression management and interactional justice, the means were in the right direction, such that the mean in the face-to-face interview condition was higher versus the phone and video interview conditions and the mean in the video interview condition was higher than in the phone condition. A one-way ANOVA indicated a significant main effect for interview condition on both procedural \((F(2, 159) = 5.67, p < .01)\) and interactional \((F(2, 159) = 9.06, p < .01)\) justice, with Scheffe post hoc tests revealing that the effect on procedural justice was carried by a difference between face-to-face and phone conditions, and the effect on interactional justice resulted from significant differences between face-to-face and both phone and video conditions. Phone and video perceptions of justice were not significantly different from one another for either justice variable.
Discussion

This study attempted to demonstrate how interview media affects the perceptions of applicants, specifically the perceived procedural and informational justice of individuals who tend to be higher in impression management in certain interview contexts. The primary and exploratory hypotheses were not supported, however. It was surprising to find that there was essentially no significant interaction between impression management and interview condition on justice perceptions, given previous research.

The main effects of interview condition on both procedural and informational justice may shed some light on how organizations proceed in interviewing job applicants. The face-to-face interview condition being perceived more procedurally just than the phone interview by participants is not surprising, given that participants likely felt that it better simulated a real job interview. Even though the procedures were identical, interviewing them in a formal, face-to-face setting may offer more fidelity than the phone interview.

The face-to-face interview condition perceived more informationally just than the phone and video interview conditions was somewhat expected, although the lack of difference between the phone and video interview conditions was not. The progression of technological advances and the inherent benefits they provide can make most individuals succumb to the pro-innovation bias (Anderson, 2004; Rogers, 2003). This may be the perception that organizations have today regarding how they select and assess job applicants; the more sophisticated the technology in screening job applicants, the better they are perceived by job applicants, the more organizations save, and so forth. The main
effects findings and those of other studies (Chapman et al., 2003; Straus et al., 2001) however, may show otherwise. An event as salient and as complicated as a job interview may need that personable approach that phones or even video-conference technology cannot replace. Something as simple as shaking an interviewer’s hand, potentially influences the perception the job candidate may have of the interviewer and the overall organization. These elements may form the overall perception puzzle of organizational justice

Finally, one interesting finding not expected was the fact that individuals were more inclined to report higher impression management in the face-to-face interview condition versus the other two conditions. Ingratiation was significantly higher in the face-to-face interview than the phone or video interview. This was true only for ingratiation and not so for self-promotion. A possible explanation for this finding may be related to how the applicant perceives the interviewer. In the face-to-face interview condition, the applicant has more informational cues and thus, may be more inclined to ingratiate him- or her-self with the interviewer, simply because they may know more about the interviewer, such as how the interviewer greets them. Also, there may simply be more time to “naturally” interact with the interviewer, whereas in phone or video interviews, there may be more time pressure to get it over with and once the interview is completed, the parties simply log off or hang up. This would be an intriguing avenue for future research.

Contributions

The findings suggest that there are no differences in the perceptions of procedural and informational justice of applicants regarding phone or video-based interviews. If
organizations are particularly interested in using these methods for interviewing, then the present study suggests that it does not matter which method they use if they are concerned about applicant perceptions of procedural and informational justice. However, if an organization decides to use phone or video-based interviewing, there would not be any difference in how applicants would perceive the conditions from a procedural or informational justice perspective. This is surprising given that video-based interviews could provide more information to the company than a phone interview, simply by providing the interviewer with physical information, such as what the applicant looks like, how they dress and present themselves, and finally, how they interact with someone in a face-to-face setting. Research shows that these are important informational cues that can signify how the interviewer perceives the applicant’s ability to fit in with the organization (Bretz, Rynes, & Gerhart, 1993; Cable & Judge, 1997; Rynes & Gerhart, 1990). It is worth emphasizing again, however, that the present study suggests that an organization that is truly concerned about perceptions of justice should likely avoid either phone or video-based interviewing in favor of the strongly-preferred face-to-face style.

The lack of support for the exploratory hypothesis regarding the effects of interview mediums and impression management on informational justice was also not expected. Information processing theory would suggest that type of interview media should have some effect on the quality of communication between both parties, yet these results show otherwise regarding the interaction. However, this notion is again supported when only the main effect of interview medium is considered. Informational cues with regard to interviewer-applicant interaction and quality of communication between both parties has affected how people perceived the situation in previous studies (Chapman &
Rowe, 2002; Lievens & De Soete, 2010; Potosky, 2008; Straus et al., 2001), which is inherently related to informational justice by giving the applicant enough information to make a judgment about the situation they are in.

Even though the results were not supportive of the hypotheses, organizations can still benefit from the findings of this study. If an organization wants to be perceived by applicants to care a great deal in meeting with applicants and can afford to do so, then the face-to-face interview is the suggested method based on the results of this study. Future research should look at using real job applicants to further validate the findings.

**Limitations**

Like any empirical study, the methodology utilized is never perfect and the trade-offs in terms of the methodology in this study make it no exception. Using an experimental manipulation and random assignment of participants to three types of interview contexts allowed for maximum internal validity to be captured, which promotes causation to be stated more boldly than if this were a correlational study (Whitley, 2002). The design does, however, simultaneously limit the generalizability of the results, due to low external validity (using undergraduate students rather than real job applicants). These factors bring forth both the strengths and limitations of the study. It is important to note, however, that this study did contain variability in responses in ways that are consistent with prior literature by demonstrating differential perceptions of justice across interview conditions. This was met in conjunction with interpretable effects of impression management tactics, only the expected interactions of interview condition and impression management on procedural and informational justice did not materialize.
Another potential limitation of the study is the saliency of the interview condition. The motivation of participants may be limited, due to the outcome of interview performance not being as important for participants receiving class credit and the chance to win a reward than real job applicants trying to get a real job. This however, has the potential to generalize positive results, because if a study can find a strong effect in a student sample with seemingly low motivation, the effect size would likely be higher using real job applicants trying to achieve the important objective of getting hired for a desired job. It is also important to note that the questions asked during the interview simulation were consistent with real-world interviewing questions. The participants’ responses to those questions in this study were real examples from previous work and class experience, which tend to be given in a real job interview setting. Thus, even though the stakes were not very high, the mechanics of the questions from the interviewer and the answers given by the participants seemed to produce a professional conversation that paralleled that of a real job interview. Moreover, the fact that mean differences emerged across interview mediums on perceptions of both procedural and interactional justice suggests that the manipulation did have an effect on the participants, if not the interaction hypothesized.

The use of technology also presents study limitations. Using specialized videoconference software, such as Skype, always poses the risk for malfunction, thus interrupting the experiment. Fortunately, the technological issues were minimal for this study. An example was the frozen image of the interviewer with just the audio being transmitted. This, however, only occurred with two applicants in the video interview condition. Excluding these two cases made no difference in the pattern of the study
results, however. Technological issues also had implications in how participants perceived the informational justice of such issues. The timing of the voice and video data also may not be synchronized, which could present an unrealistic situation, when compared to a face-to-face interview, and may cause frustration among the participants. The telephone may also malfunction in the telephone interview condition, although the likelihood of this occurring does not seem to be as high as the videoconference condition because all the calls in the study were made within the same service area, making the likelihood of call disruption relatively constant and thus, no dropped calls were reported by any of the interviewers. Since these issues limit the experimental strength of a study but also demonstrate real-world occurrences, an interesting area of future research could be to examine the effects of technological problems or dropped calls on applicant perceptions of the interview process and therefore, the likelihood of job offer acceptance by applicants.

Conclusion

This study demonstrated that perceptions of both procedural and informational justice are significantly affected by interview medium, but that interview condition did not significantly interact with impression management tactics. Since interviewing job applicants will continue to be a primary assessment activity across all industries and organizational levels and, since organizations and job applicants will continue to play this game of projecting the best image of themselves, these areas will continue to be important aspects of the industrial/organizational psychology literature.
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Appendix A
Demographics

What is your classification level?

A. Freshman
B. Sophomore
C. Junior
D. Senior
E. Graduate Student

What is your major? (Please write in) ______________________

What is your gender?

A. Male
B. Female

What is your age range?

A. 18-23 years
B. 24-29 years
C. 30-35 years
D. 36-50 years
E. > 50 years

How would you describe your race?

A. Caucasian
B. African American
C. Hispanic
D. Native American/Alaskan Native
E. Hawaiian Native/Pacific Islander
F. Other
Appendix B

Colquitt’s Organizational Justice Measure (Colquitt, 2001).

Procedural Justice

The following items refer to the procedures used to make a selection decision. To what extent:

1. Have you been able to express your views and feelings during those procedures?

   1           2           3           4           5  
   To a very small extent  To a small extent  Neutral  To a large extent  To a very large extent

2. Have you had influence over the (outcome) arrived at by those procedures?

   1           2           3           4           5  
   To a very small extent  To a small extent  Neutral  To a large extent  To a very large extent

3. Have those procedures been applied consistently?

   1           2           3           4           5  
   To a very small extent  To a small extent  Neutral  To a large extent  To a very large extent

4. Have those procedures been free of bias?

   1           2           3           4           5  
   To a very small extent  To a small extent  Neutral  To a large extent  To a very large extent

5. Have those procedures been based on accurate information?

   1           2           3           4           5  
   To a very small extent  To a small extent  Neutral  To a large extent  To a very large extent
6. Have you been able to appeal the (outcome) arrived at by those procedures?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To a very small extent</td>
<td>To a small extent</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>To a large extent</td>
<td>To a very large extent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. Have those procedures upheld ethical and moral standards?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To a very small extent</td>
<td>To a small extent</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>To a large extent</td>
<td>To a very large extent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Informational Justice

The following items refer to the authority figure who enacted the selection procedure. To what extent:

1. Has the interviewer been candid in their communications with you?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To a very small extent</td>
<td>To a small extent</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>To a large extent</td>
<td>To a very large extent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Has the interviewer explained the procedures thoroughly?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To a very small extent</td>
<td>To a small extent</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>To a large extent</td>
<td>To a very large extent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Were the interviewer’s explanations regarding the procedures reasonable?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To a very small extent</td>
<td>To a small extent</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>To a large extent</td>
<td>To a very large extent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Has the interviewer communicated details in a timely manner?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To a very small extent</td>
<td>To a small extent</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>To a large extent</td>
<td>To a very large extent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. Has the interviewer seemed to tailor their communications to individuals’ specific needs?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To a very small extent</td>
<td>To a small extent</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>To a large extent</td>
<td>To a very large extent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix C

Items in Ingratiation and Self-Promotion Scales (Impression Management Tactics)

Note: All items were adapted by Higgins and Judge (2004) from Stevens and Kristof (1995) and Wayne and Ferris (1990).

Please indicate your level of agreement for the following items by using the rating scale below.

**Ingratiation**

1 = Strongly Disagree  
2 = Disagree  
3 = Somewhat Disagree  
4 = Neutral  
5 = Somewhat Agree  
6 = Agree  
7 = Strongly Agree

1. I praised the organization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. I complimented the interviewer or organization.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. I discussed non-job-related topics about which the interviewer and I share similar opinions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. I discussed interests I shared in common with the interviewer.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. I found out what kind of person the organization was seeking and explained how I fit in.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. I indicated my interest in the position and the company.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. I indicated my enthusiasm for working for this organization.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. I smiled a lot or used other friendly non-verbal behaviors.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. I maintained eye contact with the interviewer.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Self-Promotion

1. I played up the value of positive events that I took credit for.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. I described my skills and abilities in an attractive way.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. I took charge during the interview to get my main points across.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. I took credit for positive events even if I was not solely responsible.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. I made positive events I was responsible for appear better than they actually were.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
INFORMED CONSENT FORM

You are being given the opportunity to voluntarily participate in a study conducted through Xavier University. The purpose of this study is to examine how various aspects of job interview conditions affect applicants’ perceptions. You have volunteered to participate in the study through the Xavier University Undergraduate Participant Pool. You will be asked to complete the interview simulation along with two paper-pencil surveys. This process should last approximately 20 minutes. Once you have finished, you will be debriefed.

There are no known risks associated with this study. The benefits of this study include preparation for future job and/or school interviews through interview practice. You may also receive course credit or extra credit, at the discretion of your instructor. As a participant, you are assured confidentiality and no identifying information will be included with your answers through the interview or on the two surveys. Once all the data are collected and all participants have received course credit, all data will become anonymous and will not be tied back to any identifying information. All data will be kept and stored in a secured area only accessible to the principal investigator for six years after any results are published. The data will only be reported in aggregate form. If you are interested, you will have an opportunity to see the results once the study concludes by e-mailing the principal investigator.

Refusal to participate in this study will have NO EFFECT ON ANY FUTURE SERVICES you may be entitled to from the University. You are FREE TO WITHDRAW FROM THE STUDY AT ANY TIME WITHOUT PENALTY.

If you have any questions at any time during the study, you may contact the principal investigator Justin Gregg at greggi11@xavier.edu or his thesis chair, Dr. Morrie Mullins, at 513-745-3170 or at mullins@xavier.edu. Questions about your rights as a research participant should be directed to the Xavier University’s Institutional Review Board at (513) 745-2870.

I have been given information about this research study and its risks and benefits and have had the opportunity to ask questions and to have my questions answered to my satisfaction. I freely give my consent to participate in this research project.

_________________________ Date ______________________ Signature

THE DATE APPROVAL STAMP ON THIS CONSENT FORM INDICATES THAT THIS PROJECT HAS BEEN REVIEWED AND APPROVED BY XAVIER UNIVERSITY’S INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD.
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**Script for job interviewer:** “Imagine you are interviewing for your dream job no matter what that may be. Think about that circumstances and the fact you have made it to the selection interview. Please use this as practice, since a person can never have enough interview practice, especially in a tough economy and where businesses have the luxury of being very selective of their applicants. Regardless of the situation, however, interview performance is always critical in a person's job pursuit. Any questions?”
Appendix F

Structured Interview

Script: “Again, use this as interview practice for future interviews. Do you have any questions? If not, let’s begin!”

1. So tell me about yourself.

2. Describe a situation, in which you worked with a team on a project and what was the end result?

3. Describe a time when you had to overcome a situation and what were the strategies you used when overcoming the obstacle...

4. How would a good friend describe you?

5. What two or three things are most important to you in your job?

6. Why should any company hire you?

7. What did you like/dislike about your last job?

8. What would you like to be doing five years from now?

9. What motivates you?

10. Tell me about a time when you were under considerable pressure to meet one or more goals.
Appendix G
Debriefing Form

This study identified whether those who score higher on an individual difference factor, impression management, perceive different types of interview conditions as being fair/unfair and whether the procedures utilized in those conditions are perceived as fair/unfair. The experimental design randomly placed participants into different interviewing formats, those being a face-to-face in person interview, a face-to-face interview using voice-over IP software called Skype, or a telephone interview condition. There was no job interview performance actually evaluated and there is no $100 gift card reward for best job interview performance. However, because of your participation, you will be entered into a random drawing to receive one $100 gift card to www.amazon.com. If you are have any questions regarding job interview information, please see the information below. If you have questions about any aspect of the study, please ask the research assistant with you now or you can contact the principal investigator Justin Gregg at greggi1@xavier.edu or his Thesis Advisor, Dr. Morrie Mullins at mullins@xavier.edu or at (513) 745-2870. Your participation is greatly appreciated. Thank you for your time!

***Need job interview information? Visit the XU Career Services Center website today! www.xavier.edu/career

For interviewing resources, click on the “Student” tab, then “Interviewing” for a PDF guide and more.***
February 22, 2011

Justin Gregg
8955 Perry Ave.
Carlisle, OH 45035

Re: Protocol #1048, The Effects of Impression Management and Interview Context on Applicant Perceptions of Organizational Justice

Dear Mr. Gregg:

The IRB has reviewed the revised materials regarding your study, referenced above, and has determined that your study is approved in the Expedited category under Federal Regulation 45CFR46. Approval expires February 22, 2012. A progress report, available at http://www.xavier.edu/irb/forms.cfm, is due by that date.

If you wish to modify your study, including any changes to the approved Informed Consent form or methodology, it will be necessary to obtain IRB approval prior to implementing the modification. If any adverse events occur, please notify the IRB immediately.

Please contact our office if you have any questions. We wish you success with your project!

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Kathleen J. Hart, Ph.D., ABPP
Vice Chair, Institutional Review Board
Xavier University

KH:mm

C: Morrie Mullins, advisor