

THE EMPLOYMENT INTERVIEW: A REVIEW OF RECENT RESEARCH AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

Timothy A. Judge
Chad A. Higgins
University of Iowa, Iowa City, IA, USA

Daniel M. Cable
University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, Chapel Hill, NC, USA

The past decade has seen continued interest in the [employment interview](#), with several changes in research emphasis. The present review is a comprehensive examination of interview research conducted since Harris last reviewed this literature. We begin with a review of the traditional areas of interview research: reliability, validity, structured interviews, inter-viewer differences, equal employment opportunity issues, impression management, and decision-making processes. Next, we review and discuss more recent developments in interview research such as the use of the interview as a means of assessing person±organization (P±O) fit and applicant reactions to the employment interview. Throughout the review, suggested topics for future research are discussed.

There is perhaps no more widely used selection procedure than the employment interview. Despite decades of research questioning the validity of the interview and the reliability of interviewers, most organizations still include some type of interview in their selection process. Recent research has investigated a number of different aspects of the interview in an attempt to elucidate the reasons behind their continued use. In addition, several recent studies have presented new psychometric evidence that provides support for the continued use of the employment interview. Our review of this recent research will bring together a wide variety of studies which, when considered together, may provide a better picture of the employment interview and provide us with avenues for future research.

Direct all correspondence to: Timothy A. Judge, Department of Management and Organizations, College of Business Administration, University of Iowa, Iowa City, IA 52242, USA; E-mail: tim-judge@uiowa.edu

Human Resource Management Review,
Volume 10, Number 4, 2000, pages 383±406
All rights of reproduction in any form reserved.

Copyright # 2000
by Elsevier Science Inc.
ISSN : 1053 ± 4822

CONVENTIONAL WISDOM ON THE INTERVIEW

Until very recently, the interview, as typically conducted, was thought to be plagued by many problems. The following is probably an accurate summary of conventional wisdom regarding the employment interview:

- . There is low reliability among interviewers regarding what questions should be asked of applicants and how applicants are evaluated.
- . Applicant appearance including facial attractiveness, cosmetics, and attire, biases interviewer evaluations. A recent study of appearance bias in the interview was provided by an experiment finding that moderately obese applicants (especially female applicants) were much less likely to be recommended for employment, even controlling for job qualifications
- . Non-verbal cues (eye contact, smiling, etc.) also bias interviewer ratings (Dipboye, 1992).
- . [Job Vacancy](#) Interviewers give more weight to negative information than to positive information. Research suggests it takes more than twice as much positive as negative information to change an interviewer's initial impression of an applicant. As a result, the unstructured interview has been labeled a "search for negative evidence" (Rowe, 1989).
- . Primacy effects—where information is obtained prior to the interview or during its early stages—dominate interviewer judgments. Research has shown that on average, interviewers reach final decisions about applicants after only 4 min of a 30-min interview. These first impressions are particularly influential because interviewers engage in hypothesis confirmation strategies that are designed to confirm their initial impressions. Interviewers with positive first impressions of an applicant sell the applicant more on the company, do more recruiting, and tell them more about the company (Dougherty, Turban, &
- . Similarity effects, where applicants who are similar to the interviewer with respect to race, gender, or other characteristics, receive higher ratings and also bias interviewer judgments.
- . Interviewers have poor recall. One study demonstrated this by giving managers an exam based on factual information after watching a 20-min videotaped interview. Some managers got all 20 questions correct but the average manager only got 10 questions right (Carlson, Thayer, Mayfield, & Peterson, 1971).

Due to these factors, the typical, unstructured interview has been argued to be a relatively invalid method of selecting employees. However, the publication of Harris (1989, p. 720) signaled a change in direction and optimism of interview research. Harris noted in his review, "Earlier re-views of this literature were quite negative about the validity of the interview as a selection tool; recent research suggests that the interview

may be much more valid." Harris also reviewed research in other areas, such as decision-making in the interview and the effects of interviews on applicants. In the next sections, we review interview research since the Harris review.

INTERVIEW RESEARCH SINCE 1989

Since Harris's (1989) review a decade ago, interview research has provided many new insights into the interview. Table 1 contains a categorization and brief summary of the goals and findings of interview research in the past decade. As shown in the table, the research streams are grouped into four categories: (1) Psychometric properties (reliability and validity) of the inter-view; (2) Ways of improving the interview, which include structured inter-views, recognition of individual differences in interviewer validity [lowongan kerja](#), and consideration of equal employment opportunity; (3) Process issues, which concern applicant impression management and interviewer decision-making processes; and (4) two new areas of research—person±organization (P±O) fit and the effects of interviews on applicants. Below, we provide a review of studies on the interview published since the Harris (1989) review. The review is grouped into the topical areas that are depicted in Table 1, which are the ones that have attracted most of the attention of interview researchers since 1989.

Psychometric Properties of the Interview

Reliability. As was noted earlier, it has been argued that reliability of the interview is low, in that interviewers do not agree among themselves in terms of what questions should be asked of applicants and how applicants are evaluated. Furthermore, it has been argued that interviewers base their decisions on different factors, have different hiring standards [jobs for 14 year olds](#), and differ in the degree to which their actual selection criteria match their intended criteria (Graves & Karren, 1996). A recent meta-analytic review of 111 studies, however, shows that the reliability of the interview varies widely depending on the situation. Conway, Jako, and Goodman (1995) found that the average reliability of highly structured individual interviews was 0.59, while the reliability of unstructured individual interviews was 0.37. As might be expected, reliability was much higher for panel interviews. Surveys reveal that in practice, unstructured interviews are much more likely to be used than structured and, in this case, the reliability of the average interview is likely to be close to 0.37. Thus, individual interviews are only moderately valid. Structured interviews are considerably more reliable, which of course is one of the goals of structured interviews. That structured and unstructured inter-views have such different levels of reliability may explain differences in the validity of structured and unstructured interviews, which will be considered in the "Structured interviews" section [loker jakarta](#).

TABLE 2
Validity of Structured Interview Controlling for Cognitive Ability

	Without range restriction corrections	With range restriction corrections
Cognitive ability (B)	0.48	0.42
Structured interview (B)	0.12	0.27
Multiple correlation (R)	0.54	0.59

Note: Correlation between cognitive ability scores and structured interview performance was estimated at 0.40 (Huffcutt et al., 1996). Validity of cognitive ability was estimated at 0.53 (Hunter & Hunter, 1984). Validity of structured interview was estimated to be 0.31 (without range restriction correction) and 0.44 (with range restriction correction) (McDaniel et al., 1994).

Validity. Although for 50 years the conventional wisdom was that interviews had low validity, publication of several influential reviews in the last decade has challenged this conclusion. In particular, McDaniel, Whetzel, Schmidt, and Maurer (1994) conducted a meta-analysis of the literature and found that the mean validity of all interviews was 0.26 (without correcting estimates for range restriction—see below). This estimate is higher than what has typically been assumed. This overall estimate does not distinguish between structured and unstructured interviews, which will be discussed below.

Improving the Interview

Structured Interviews. It has been known for some time that structured interviews are more valid than unstructured interviews. The McDaniel et al. (1994) meta-analysis estimated the validity of structured interviews to be 0.31, while the validity of unstructured interviews was 0.23. (We think the actual validity of unstructured interviews may be lower than this, as truly unstructured interviews probably would have no numerical scores; meaning they could not have a validity score attached to them.) Another study (Huffcutt & Arthur, 1994) suggested even higher validities for structured interviews (0.57 when highly structured). However, it is difficult to know how to interpret this estimate since it was corrected for range restriction (which is a procedure that is not without controversy; Sackett, Schmitt, Tenopyr, Kehoe, & Zedeck, 1985; Schmidt, Hunter, Pearlman, & Rothstein-Hirsch, 1985). Because corrections for range restriction have such a dramatic effect on estimated validity, and because such corrections have not been used in many meta-analyses in the selection literature, the merits of such corrections need to be researched further. Despite concerns over these corrections, however, results do clearly suggest that scores on structured interviews are non-trivially related to job performance [loker kerja](#).

In the past few years, researchers have attempted to better understand the conditions under which structured interviews are most valid. For example, several studies have investigated the validity of future-oriented or situational interviews ("What would you do if . . . ?") versus experience-based or behavioral interviews ("What did you do when . . . ?"). The

McDaniel et al. (1994) meta-analysis suggested that situational interviews are more valid, while two studies directly comparing the formats suggested that experienced-based interviews are more valid (Campion, Campion, & Hudson, 1994; Pulakos & Schmitt, 1995). The other issue that has dominated recent research on structured interviews is that of incremental validity. One pre-1989 study suggested that structured interviews, while valid, did not contribute incremental validity controlling for cognitive ability tests (Campion, Pursell, & Brown, 1988). This result caused Campion et al. (1988, p. 36) to label structured interviews, "orally administered cognitive ability test[s]." More recently, several studies have suggested that structured interviews do add incremental validity beyond cognitive ability tests (Campion et al., 1994; Pulakos & Schmitt, 1995). It is clear that cognitive ability is substantially correlated with scores on the structured interview, perhaps at a higher level than the structured interview correlates with job performance (Huffcutt, Roth, & McDaniel, 1996 report a correlation of 0.40 between structured interview and cognitive ability test scores). Table 2 shows the incremental validity of the structured interview controlling for cognitive ability. As the table shows, if estimates are uncorrected for range restriction, the validity of the structured interview appears to be quite small controlling for cognitive ability. We are not necessarily advocating here that organizations abandon use of structured interviews in favor of cognitive ability tests. Rather, we are arguing that more consideration needs to be given to what is being measured in the structured interview, and the implications for incremental validity [job vacancies](#).

Individual Differences in Interviewer Validity. Research has consistently demonstrated that interviewers differ widely in their ability to accurately forecast job performance. This has caused some researchers to wonder whether we should not focus on the validity of the interview, but rather on the validity of the interviewer. It has even been argued that since interviewers differ in their evaluations and use different parts of the rating scale, aggregation of ratings across interviewers systematically understates the ability of interviewer ratings to predict job performance (Dreher, Ash, & Hancock, 1988). Recently, Pulakos, Schmitt, Whitney, and Smith (1996) completed the most comprehensive investigation of individual differences in interviewer validity to date. Analyzing the decisions of 62 interviewers, who completed an average of 25 structured interviews, Pulakos et al. (1996) showed differences in interviewer [kerja online dari rumah](#) validity (correlation between an individual interviewer's ratings and job performance for the interviewees who were hired) ranging from 0.10 to 0.65. Contrary to Dreher et al.'s (1988) arguments, they found that aggregation across interviewers did not lower the estimated validity of the interview. As Pulakos et al. (1996) note, this difference may have been due to the fact that Dreher et al. studied unstructured interviews while Pulakos et al. studied structured interviews. Thus, there appear to be vast differences in interviewer validity, which suggests the somewhat ironic (though obvious) point that those who do the selecting (interviewers) need to be carefully selected themselves.

What background characteristics lead to individual differences in validity is an obvious question for future research.

Equal Employment Opportunity. Numerous studies have investigated the role of equal employment opportunity (EEO) in the interview. Several studies have investigated, for example, whether black, female, or older interviewees received lower ratings than white, male, or younger interviewees. Despite the research attention, this area has suffered from a number of limitations. First, the results have been mixed, with some studies showing sex or racial differences, and other studies showing no differences. Second, few studies investigated demographic similarity in the interview. The literature on demographic similarity would argue that one cannot understand how an interviewer evaluates, say, a female applicant without knowing the sex of the interviewer. Indeed, several recent studies suggest that demographic similarity effects appear to exist in the interview. Namely, white interviewers tend to give white interviewees higher ratings and black interviewees lower ratings, and black interviewers give black interviewees higher ratings and white interviewees lower ratings (Lin et al., 1992; Prewett-Livingston, Feild, Veres, & Lewis, 1996). These studies also suggested that structured interviews did not counteract these race effects.

The role of gender has been studied frequently [jobs for 15 year olds](#), and the most recent results suggest that females do not receive lower ratings than males (Harris, 1989). However, studies investigating sex similarity have been lacking. With respect to the race similarity effects, it is easier to understand why these findings exist (the similarity±attraction paradigm is one of the more robust findings in social psychology) than what should be done about them. The similarity effects would only imply generalized adverse impact if interviewers were demographically imbalanced (e.g., more male interviewers than female). Thus, one practical implication of these findings would be to ensure that interviewers were balanced in terms of demographic characteristics. A recent analysis of dis-crimination cases involving the interview suggested that the employer loses a little under half of all cases that reach district court (Williamson, Campion, Malos, Roehling, & Campion, 1997). Thus, employers need to be concerned with adverse impact in the interview. The same study showed that structured interviews fared significantly better in the courts.

Process Issues

Impression Management. Unlike other selection procedures, the employment interview has a social component. To be sure, the exchange of information is central to the intended purpose of the interview. Yet it must be acknowledged that most questions asked in the interview, if the collection of factual information were the primary purpose of the interview, could more efficiently be collected from an application blank or questionnaire. It may not be too much of an overstatement to conclude that interviews are a bit of an illusion—the evident purpose is the exchange of factual information, but the social dynamics are what really matter (make the interview distinctive). Given the social

nature of the interview and that applicants typically are motivated to impress the interviewer, the inclination of applicants to manage impressions in the interview cannot be denied [work from home jobs](#).

Indeed, a recent study (Stevens & Kristof, 1995) of applicant influence behavior in the context of college interviews revealed that, during the course of an interview, all applicants self-promoted (used positive self-descriptions), and the average applicant engaged in 33 acts of self-promotion and spent roughly 8 minutes on self-promotion during the course of the 30-minute interview. By contrast, roughly half the applicants engaged in some form of ingratiation (praise, compliments, opinion conformity), but the average applicant engaged in only two acts of ingratiation. How well do these tactics work? Recently, Higgins, Judge, and Ferris (2000) completed a meta-analysis, which revealed that ingratiation and self-promotion positively affected an interviewer's evaluation of job candidates. Thus, applicants engage in impression management behaviors, and it appears that those who engage in more of these behaviors achieve higher success in the interview. It is not known what implications applicant impression management have for the interview. On the one hand, impression management would appear to be a source of error in that it stands in the way of interviewers accurately measuring an applicant's true qualifications for the job. On the other hand, to the extent that impression management behaviors are related to job performance (and it appears that they are; Higgins et al., 2000), impression management may not detract from, or may even enhance, the validity of the interview. This would be a worthy area for future research.

Decision-Making in the Interview. The literature studying how interviewers make decisions in the interview continues to expand. One of the more prominent research streams has concerned the effect of interviewers' pre-interview impressions on their subsequent decisions. In one sense, the effect of pre-interview beliefs on post-interview decisions is perfectly logical and functional—most interviewers have collected certain information about an applicant from other sources (applications, resumes, references, test scores) and this information can be quite relevant. Thus, pre-interview information can actually enhance or augment the validity of the interview. Where the situation becomes problematic is when pre-interview perceptions bias the subsequent conduct of the interview, and interviewers' cognitive processes during or after the interview. To the extent that such biases are pervasive, it would undermine the validity of the interview—*if* an interviewer's decisions were purely a function of pre-interview beliefs, then the decision would only be as valid as the pre-interview information. In fact, research indicates that pre-interview impressions influence post-interview evaluations and affect interviewers' behaviors (e.g., interviewers with positive pre-interview impressions spend more time recruiting the applicant) and cognitions (interviewers' pre-interview impressions influence how they interpret applicant behavior during the interview) (Phillips & Dipboye, 1989). Research further indicates that pre-interview impressions influence post-interview evaluations, even controlling for appli-

REFERENCES

- Adkins, C. L., Russell, C. J., & Werbel, J. D. (1994). Judgments of fit in the selection process: The role of work value congruence. *Personnel Psychology, 47*, 605±623.
- Albright, L., Kenny, D. A., & Malloy, T. E. (1988). Consensus in personality judgments at zero acquaintance. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 55*, 387±395.
- Alderfer, C. P., & McCord, C. G. (1970). Personal and situational factors in the recruitment interview. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 54*, 377±385.
- Anderson, J. C. (1987). An approach for confirmatory measurement and structural equation modeling of organizational properties. *Management Science, 33*, 525±541.
- Arvey, R. D., & Campion, J. E. (1982). The employment interview: A summary and review of recent research. *Personnel Psychology, 35*, 281±322.
- Barber, A. E. (1998). *Recruiting employees: Individual and organizational perspectives*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Barber, A. E., Hollenbeck, J. R., Tower, S. L., & Phillips, J. M. (1994). The effects of inter-viewer focus on recruitment effectiveness: A field experiment. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 79*, 886±896.
- Bargh, J. A. (1994). The four horseman of automaticity; awareness, intention, efficiency, and control of social cognition. In R. S. Wyer, & T. K. Srull (Eds.), *Handbook of social cognition* (pp. 1±40). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

- Bass, B. M. (1951). Situational tests: Individual interviews compared with leaderless group discussions. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 11, 67±75.
- Bernieri, F. J., Zuckerman, M., Koestner, R., & Rosenthal, R. (1991). Measuring person perception accuracy: Another look at self/other agreement. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 20, 367±378.
- Borkenau, P., & Liebler, A. (1992). Trait inferences: Sources of validity at zero acquaintance. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 62, 645±657.
- Borkenau, P., & Liebler, A. (1993). Convergence of stranger ratings of personality and intelligence with self-ratings, partner ratings, and measured intelligence. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 65, 546±553.
- Bowen, D. E., Ledford, G. E., & Nathan, B. R. (1991). Hiring for the organization, not the job. *Academy of Management Executive*, 5, 35±51.
- Bretz, R. D., Rynes, S. L., & Gerhart, B. (1993). Recruiter perceptions of applicant fit: Implications for individual career preparation and job search behavior. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 43, 310±327.
- Cable, D. M., & Gilovich, T. (1998). Looked over or overlooked? Prescreening decisions and post-interview evaluations. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 83, 501±508.
- Cable, D. M., & Judge, T. A. (1994). Pay preferences and job search decisions: A person±organization fit perspective. *Personnel Psychology*, 47, 317±348.
- Cable, D., & Judge, T. A. (1996). Person±organization fit, job choice decisions, and organizational entry. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 67, 294±311.
- Cable, D., & Judge, T. A. (1997). Interviewers' perceptions of person±organization fit and organizational selection decisions. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 82, 562±577.
- Campion, M. A., Campion, J. E., & Hudson, J. P., Jr. (1994). Structured interviewing: A note on incremental validity and alternative question types. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 79, 998±1002.
- Campion, M. A., Pursell, E. D., & Brown, B. K. (1988). Structured interviewing: Raising the psychometric properties of the employment interview. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 41, 25±42.
- Carlson, R. E., Thayer, P. W., Mayfield, E. C., & Peterson, D. A. (1971). Improvements in the selection interview. *Personnel Journal*, 50, 268±275.
- Chatman, J. (1989). Improving interactional organizational research: A model of person±organization fit. *Academy of Management Review*, 14, 333±349.
- Chatman, J. (1991). Matching people and organizations: Selection and socialization in public accounting firms. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 36, 459±484.
- Chatman, J. A., & Jehn, K. A. (1994). Assessing the relationship between industry characteristics and organizational culture: How different can you be? *Academy of Management Journal*, 37, 522±553.
- Conway, J. M., Jako, R. A., & Goodman, D. F. (1995). A meta-analysis of interrater and internal consistency reliability of selection interviews. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 80, 565±579.
- Dipboye, R. L. (1992). *Selection interviews: Process perspectives*. Cincinnati, OH: South-Western.
- Dougherty, T. W., Turban, D. B., & Callender, J. C. (1994). Confirming first impressions in the employment interview: A field study of interviewer behavior. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 79, 659±665.
- Dreher, G. F., Ash, R. A., & Hancock, P. (1988). The role of the traditional research design in underestimating the validity of the employment interview. *Personnel Psychology*, 41, 315±327.

- Enz, C. A. (1988). The role of value congruity in interorganizational power. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 33, 284±304.
- Ferris, G. R., & Judge, T. A. (1991). Personnel/human resources management: A political influence perspective. *Journal of Management*, 17, 447±488.
- Gilmore, D. C., & Ferris, G. R. (1989). The effects of applicant impression management tactics on interviewer judgements. *Journal of Management*, 15, 557±564.
- Govindarajan, V. (1989). Implementing competitive strategies at the business unit level: Implications of matching managers to strategies. *Strategic Management Journal*, 27, 25±41.
- Graves, L. M., & Karren, R. J. (1996). The employment selection interview: A fresh look at an old problem. *Human Resource Management*, 35, 163±180.
- Harris, M. M. (1989). Reconsidering the employment interview: A review of recent literature and suggestions for future research. *Personnel Psychology*, 42, 691±726.
- Harris, M. M., & Fink, L. S. (1987). A field study of applicant reactions to employment opportunities: Does the recruiter make a difference? *Personnel Psychology*, 40, 765±784.
- Higgins, C. A., Judge, T. A., & Ferris, G. R. (2000). Influence tactics and work outcomes: A meta-analysis. Manuscript submitted for publication.
- Huffcutt, A. I., & Arthur W., Jr. (1994). Hunter and Hunter (1994) revisited: Interview validity for entry-level jobs. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 79, 184±190.
- Huffcutt, A. I., Roth, P. L., & McDaniel, M. A. (1996). A meta-analytic investigation of cognitive ability in employment interview evaluations: Moderating characteristics and implications for incremental validity. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 81, 459±473.
- Hunter, J. E., & Hunter, R. F. (1984). Validity and utility of alternative predictors of job performance. *Psychological Bulletin*, 96, 72±98.
- Jackson, D. N., Peacock, A. C., & Holden, R. R. (1982). Professional interviewers' trait inferential structures for diverse occupational groups. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 29, 1±20.
- Judge, T. A., & Bretz, R. D. (1992). Effects of work values on job choice decisions. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 77, 261±271.
- Judge, T. A., & Cable, D. (1997). Applicant personality, organizational culture, and job choice decisions. *Personnel Psychology*, 50, 359±394.
- Judge, T. A., & Ferris, G. R. (1991). Personnel/human resources management: A political influence perspective. *Journal of Management*, 17, 447±488.
- Judge, T. A., & Ferris, G. R. (1993). The elusive criterion of fit in human resources staffing decisions. *Human Resource Planning*, 15, 47±67.
- Kristof, A. L. (1996). Person±organization fit: An integrative review of its conceptualizations, measurement, and implications. *Personnel Psychology*, 49, 1±49.
- Lin, T., Dobbins, G. H., & Farh, J. (1992). A field study of race and age similarity effects on interview ratings in conventional and situational interviews. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 77, 363±371.
- Maurer, S. D., Howe, V., & Lee, T. W. (1992). Organizational recruiting as marketing management: An interdisciplinary study of engineering graduates. *Personnel Psychology*, 45, 807±833.
- McDaniel, M. A., Whetzel, D. L., Schmidt, F. L., & Maurer, S.D. (1994). The validity of employment interviews: A comprehensive review and meta analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 79, 599±616.
- O'Reilly III, C. A., Chatman, J., & Caldwell, D. F. 1991. People of organizational culture: A profile comparison approach to assessing person±organization fit. *Academy of Management Journal*, 34, 487±516.

- Parsons, C., Cable, D. M., & Liden, B. (1999). Assessing work values and person-organization fit during the employment interview. In R. Eder (Ed.), *The employment interview: Theory, research, and practice*, 2nd edn.. Sage.
- Parsons, C. K., Cable, D. M., & Wilkerson, J. M. (1999). Assessment of applicant work values through interviewers: The impact of focus and functional relevance. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 72, 561±566.
- Paunonen, S. V., Jackson, D. N., & Oberman, S. M. (1987). Personnel selection decisions: Effects of applicant personality and the letter of reference. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 40, 96±114.
- Phillips, A. P., & Dipboye, R. L. (1989). Correlational tests of predictions from a process model of the interview. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 74, 41±52.
- Pingatore, R., Dugoni, B. L., Tindale, R. S., & Spring, B. (1994). Bias against overweight job applicants in a simulated employment interview. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 79, 909±917.
- Powell, G. N. (1984). Effects of job attributes and recruiting practices on applicant decisions: A comparison. *Personnel Psychology*, 37, 721±732.
- Powell, G. N. (1991). Applicant reactions to the initial employment interview: Exploring theoretical and methodological issues. *Personnel Psychology*, 44, 67±83.
- Prewett-Livingston, A. J., Feild, H. S., Veres III, J. G., & Lewis, P. M. 1996. Effects of race on interview ratings in a situational panel interview. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 81, 178±186.
- Pulakos, E. D., & Schmitt, N. (1995). Experience-based and situational interview questions: Studies of validity. *Personnel Psychology*, 48, 289±308.
- Pulakos, E. D., Schmitt, N., Whitney, D., & Smith, M. (1996). Individual differences in interviewer ratings: The impact of standardization, consensus discussion, and sampling error on the validity of a structured interview. *Personnel Psychology*, 49, 85±102.
- Ricklefs, R. (1979). The hidden hurdle: Executive recruiters say firms tend to hire "our type of person." *Wall Street Journal*, pp. 1W, 1E.
- Rowe, P. M. (1989). Unfavorable information and interview decisions. In R. W. Eder, & G. R. Ferris (Eds.), *The employment interview: Theory, research, and practice* (pp. 77±89). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Rynes, S. L. (1989). The employment interview as a recruitment device. In R. W. Eder, & G. R. Ferris (Eds.), *The employment interview: Theory, research, and practice* (pp. 77±89). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Rynes, S. L. (1991). Recruitment, job choice, and post-hire consequences: A call for new research directions. In M. D. Dunnette, & L. M. Hough (Eds.), *Handbook of industrial/organizational psychology* (Vol. 2, pp. 399±444). Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.
- Rynes, S. L., & Boudreau, J. W. (1986). College recruiting in large organizations: Practice, evaluation, and research implications. *Personnel Psychology*, 39, 729±757.
- Rynes, S., Bretz, R. D., & Gerhart, B. (1991). The importance of recruitment in job choice: A different way of looking. *Personnel Psychology*, 44, 487±521.
- Rynes, S. L., & Gerhart, B. (1990). Interviewer assessments of applicant "fit": An exploratory investigation. *Personnel Psychology*, 43, 13±35.
- Rynes, S. L., & Miller, H. E. (1983). Recruiter and job influences on candidates for employment. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 68, 147±154.
- Sackett, P. R., Schmitt, N., Tenopir, M. L., Kehoe, J., & Zedeck, S. (1985). Commentary on forty questions about validity generalization and meta-analysis. *Personnel Psychology*, 38, 697±798.

- Schmidt, F. L., Hunter, J. E., Pearlman, K., & Rothstein-Hirsh, H. (1985). Forty questions about validity generalization and meta-analysis. *Personnel Psychology*, 38, 697±798.
- Schmitt, N., & Cole, B. W. (1976). Applicant decisions in the employment interview. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 61, 184±192.
- Schneider, B. (1987). The people make the place. *Personnel Psychology*, 40, 437±453.
- Stevens, C. K. (1997). Effects of pre-interview beliefs on applicants' reactions to campus interviews. *Academy of Management Journal*, 40, 947±966.
- Stevens, C. K. (1998). Antecedents of interview interactions, interviewers' ratings, and applicants' reactions. *Personnel Psychology*, 51, 55±85.
- Stevens, C. K., & Kristof, A. L. (1995). Making the right impression: A field study of applicant impression management during job interviews. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 80, 587±606.
- Taylor, M. S., & Bergmann, T. J. (1987). Organizational recruitment activities and applicants' reactions at different stages of the recruitment process. *Personnel Psychology*, 40, 261±285.
- Turban, D. B., & Dougherty, T. W. (1992). Influences of campus recruiting on applicant attraction to firms. *Academy of Management Journal*, 35, 739±765.
- Turban, D. B., & Keon, T. L. (1993). Organizational attractiveness: An interactionist perspective. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 78, 184±193.
- Watson, D. (1989). Strangers' ratings of the five robust personality factors: Evidence of a surprising convergence with self-report. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 57, 120±128.
- Williamson, L. G., Campion, J. E., Malos, S. B., Roehling, M. V., & Campion, M. A. (1997). Employment interview on trail: Linking interview structure with litigation outcomes. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 82, 900±912.
- Wyer, R. S., & Carlston, D. E. (1994). The cognitive representation of persons and events. In R. S. Wyer, & T. Srull (Eds.), *Handbook of social cognition*, 1, (pp. 41±98). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.