UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA

GRADUATE COLLEGE

# I KNOW WHAT I WANT WHEN I SEE IT: THE EFFECTS OF TRAINING ON FIT DETECTION THROUGH THE EMPLOYMENT INTERVIEW

A DISSERTATION

SUBMITTED TO THE GRADUATE FACULTY

in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the

Degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

By

KIMBERLY S. HESTER

Norman, Oklahoma

2013

# I KNOW WHAT I WANT WHEN I SEE IT: THE EFFECTS OF TRAINING ON FIT DETECTION THROUGH THE EMPLOYMENT INTERVIEW

A DISSERTATION APPROVED FOR THE

DEPARTMENT OF PSYCHOLOGY

BY

_____
Dr. Michael D. Mumford, Chair

_____
Dr. Shane Connelly

_____
Dr. Eric A. Day

_____
Dr. M. Ronald Buckley

_____
Dr. Jorge L. Mendoza

**Acknowledgements**

There are many people who contributed to the present effort whom I would like to thank. In particular I would like to extend thanks to Dr. Michael Mumford, my advisor, for his guidance, advice, and honest feedback not just in terms of the present study, but throughout graduate school. I would also like to thank the members of my committee, Dr. Eric Day, Dr. Shane Connelly, Dr. Mike Buckley, & Dr. Jorge Mendoza, for their considerations and suggestions. An acknowledgement should also be given to my labmates, David Peterson, Jensen Mecca, Carter Gibson, Vince Giorgini, Kelsey Medeiros, Paul Partlow, Logan Watts, and Logan Steele for their help and support. I would like to thank Darin Nei for being my rock throughout graduate school and my family and friends for their ongoing support and encouragement, which serve as my foundation throughout everything.

## Table of Contents

## List of Tables

## List of Figures

## Abstract

Fit is important for organizations and can lead to a number of positive outcomes, including satisfaction and organizational commitment. It is unclear whether interviewers can accurately assess person-organization and person-job fit through the employment interview. This study used a mixed between-subject and within-subject design to assess the effects of training on the identification of fit vis-à-vis value congruence. Analyses confirmed that interviews can be used to assess this type of fit. Further, training can be useful for improving the accuracy of this assessment; however, people are better at identifying a lack of values rather than a presence of values. Additionally, interviewers' ratings of likeability, overall fit, and employability (i.e., hiring decision and pay decision) were related to perceived value congruence. These findings and their implications for organizations are discussed.



*Keywords:* person-organization fit, person-job fit, perceived value congruence, actual value congruence, subjective value congruence, interviews

# I Know What I Want When I See It: The Effects of Training on Fit Detection Through the Employment Interview

The attraction-selection-attrition (ASA) framework (Schneider, 1987) suggests that both employers and applicants are attracted to each other based on similarity. This similarity can be described as fit and can have many positive outcomes both for an applicant and an organization. A meta-analysis by Kristof-Brown, Zimmerman, and Johnson (2005) found that person-job fit and person-organization fit were strongly related to many positive outcomes, such as job satisfaction and organizational commitment, and negatively related to outcomes such as intention to quit and strain. Therefore, it is important for organizations to select employees who have a high fit for a job or organization.

While many are in agreement about the importance of fit, there are still differing opinions about how fit should be conceptualized, defined, and measured (Kristof, 1996). Fit can be assessed at many levels, such as person-job fit (PJ fit), person-group fit (PG fit), person-vocation fit (PV fit), person-organization fit (PO fit), and person-environment fit (PE fit). Depending on the level, the conceptualization of fit changes to match the attributes that are important at that level.

Within each level, fit can also involve a congruence of many different attributes. For example, Edwards (1991) argues that PJ fit can be conceptualized in two ways: 1) demands-abilities fit, in which the knowledge, skills, and abilities (KSAs) of the individual match the requirements of the job, or 2) needs-supplies fit, in which the needs of the individual are met by the attributes of the job. Caldwell and O'Reilly (1990) argue that PO fit involves the congruence of knowledge, skills, and abilities (KSAs) between an individual and organization. Moos (1987) defined PO fit as the congruence between individual needs, organizational structures, and

reinforcement systems. Bowen, Ledford, and Nathan (1991) argue that PO fit involves congruence between an individual's personality and an organization's image. Chatman (1989) discusses PO fit as the congruence between the values of an individual and an organization. In addition, there are several ways to measure PO fit. Due to the complexity inherent in this area, the few studies examining fit have produced conflicting results. Therefore, the purpose of the present study was to address some of these issues related to measurement and respond to a call for more controlled laboratory research in the area of fit assessment through the interview (Judge, Higgins, & Cable, 2000; Posthuma, Morgeson, & Campion, 2002).

**Fit as Value Congruence**

While fit has been defined and measured in numerous ways (Kristof, 1996), some of the key attributes related to fit are the values of an individual, the underlying needs met by a job, and the values of an organization (Cable & DeRue, 2002; Chatman, 1989; 1991; Judge & Bretz, 1992; Kristof-Brown et al., 2005). At the level of the individual, values are important for assessing fit for several reasons. While researchers have defined values in many ways, all agree that values affect behavior. Allport, Vernon, and Lindsey (1951) argue that values are motives. French and Kahn (1962) extended this to say that values motivate through goal-directed behavior. Further, values are enduring beliefs that facilitate a person's adaptation to his or her environment (Fishbein & Ajzen, 1975; Rokeach, 1973). These definitions suggest that individuals experiencing a mismatch between their own values and the values of the job or organization will experience a lack of motivation and an inability to adapt to their work environment. As such, it is important for the work-related values of an individual to match the values met by a job and the values of an organization.

At the level of the job, it has been argued that congruence between the needs of an individual and the supplies of the job is an important aspect of fit. As such, needs-supplies fit has been the focus of many theories, including adjustment, well-being, and satisfaction (Kristof et al., 2005). If a person's needs are met by a job, many positive outcomes are possible. Further, a cluster of related needs make up a value (Lofquist & Dawis, 1978; McCloy et al., 1999). Therefore, a focus on needs-supplies fit involves assessing the congruence between individual values and the needs, or values, met by a job. For example, Kemelgor (1982) found that value congruence between a supervisor and subordinate resulted in higher job satisfaction due to congruence facilitating attainment of desired job attributes. Posner, Kouzes, and Schmidt (1985) also discovered that individuals found their jobs to be more desirable when personal values matched those of the organization, which led to increased job satisfaction. However, Edwards (1991) has cautioned researchers about the interpretation of these studies. These studies have typically examined congruence between individuals in the organization and inferred how this congruence impacts fit with the job but have not measured needs or whether these needs are being met by the job. There is a lack of research in this area as most PJ fit research has focused on the demands-abilities congruence.

At the level of the organization, values are also important. Chatman (1991) argues that value systems are important to organizations as they help define the culture that dictates appropriate behavior of members and motivate the activities and functions of the organization. In a study examining the role value congruence plays in an organization, Enz (1988) found that having values congruent with top managers was a determinant of departmental power. In a study examining congruence between personal values and organization values, Posner et al. (1985)

found that shared values were related to positive outcomes such as organizational goals and organizational commitment.

Because values have a strong impact on individual behavior, job choice, and dictate the culture of an organization, Chatman (1989) argues that without value congruence, one of three things may happen. First, a new employee may change his or her values to fit within the values of the job or organization (e.g., Weiss, 1978). Second, a new employee may change the values of the job or organization (e.g., Kohn & Schooler, 1978). Last, the new employee might leave the job or organization (Kristof-Brown et al., 2005). As these outcomes are likely not desirable, an argument can be made for the importance of hiring for value congruence.

Other research has suggested that work-value congruence has led to other positive outcomes for organizations, such as organizational citizenship behaviors (OCBs) and employee happiness. O'Reilly and Chatman (1986) found that value congruence predicted extra-role behaviors and turnover. Morse's (1975) findings suggested that individuals were more comfortable and competent in organizations that had similar values to their own. Chatman (1991) found that individuals who had high work value congruence with an organization had high job satisfaction, adjusted quickly, and were less likely to leave the organization. All of this research seems to suggest that fit, in terms of work value congruence, is important for an organization. As such, a useful way to conceptualize fit is the value congruence between the individual and the organization or job.

**Interviews**

Given that value congruence influences several organizational outcomes, businesses need to find techniques to assess the values of job candidates to ensure congruence with specific jobs and organizations more generally. One potential technique for assessing values in a pre-

employment context is an interview. Rynes and Gerhart (1990) argue that fit has most often been assessed through the employment interview for selection purposes because the attributes considered for fit are interpersonally exhibited and evaluated. In their review of the interview literature, Judge et al. (2000) state that very little research has focused on fit in the context of the interview, despite the fact that many researchers have argued for the use of employment interviews to assess applicants' value congruence (Chatman, 1991; Ferris & Judge, 1991). Further, the few studies conducted on assessing fit through employment interviews have obtained conflicting results due to various forms of measurement (Adkins, Russell, & Werbel, 1994; Bretz, Rynes, & Gerhart, 1993; Cable & Judge, 1997; Rynes & Gerhart, 1990).

With regard to measuring value congruence, there are a few key distinctions to consider. More specifically, congruence has been assessed by measuring an interviewer's perception of applicant, job, or organization values to obtain an estimate of *perceived congruence*. Congruence has also been assessed by comparing direct measurements of applicant values to determine *actual congruence* (Cable & Judge, 1997; Judge et al. 2000). Last, measures of overall fit, also known as *subjective fit*, ask an interviewer to provide an overall impression of applicant fit. This distinction is important in that the comparison of actual congruence, perceived congruence, and subjective fit has led to different outcomes in terms of the ability of an interviewer to assess fit.

In one such study, Rynes and Gerhart (1990) asked recruiters to complete a series of measures after interviewing MBA students. These measures asked the recruiters to assess attributes of the applicants, their overall employability, and their degree of subjective fit. They found that recruiters were able to distinguish between overall employability and fit. Further, they found a higher within-firm recruiter agreement for fit than between-firm recruiter

agreement. The authors interpreted this result as evidence that recruiters' assessment of fit had some basis in actual firm characteristics, rather than some idiosyncratic recruiter preference. Last, they found that recruiter assessment of fit was related to the MBA students' attributes, such as goal orientation, and not job qualifications, such as work experience. While Rynes and Gerhart (1990) were directly assessing subjective fit, their results suggest that perceived congruence may be influenced by actual congruence; however, this was not directly assessed.

In another study using campus recruiters, Bretz et al. (1993) chose to avoid imposing a description of fit. They asked recruiters to answer a series of questions about fit in an attempt to assess the recruiters' ideas of fit and extract specific examples. The researchers then independently coded the interviews for information about fit. They found that while the literature may be arguing for selecting on congruence in values or culture, recruiters focused on experience, appearance, and social skills. Therefore, if interviewers are not provided with information about fit and important attributes, perceived fit will not be influenced by actual congruence.

In another related study, Adkins, Russell, and Werbel (1994) had campus recruiters complete the Comparative Emphasis Scale (CES, Ravlin & Meglino, 1987) assessing personal work values and what they perceived to be their corporations' work values. Applicants also completed the CES so that the researchers could obtain a score for actual congruence. After each interview, the recruiters scored the applicant on employability and subjective fit. They found that congruence between the values of the applicant and the interviewer was related to employability and fit. However, congruence between the values of the applicant and the organization was not related to employability and subjective fit. Therefore, actual value congruence did not appear to be related to subjective fit.

In a fourth study, Cable and Judge (1997) directly assessed actual value congruence, perceived value congruence, and subjective fit. They administered an Organizational Culture Profile (OCP; O'Reilly, Chatman, & Caldwell, 1991) to assess applicants' values. The OCP was also administered to the interviewers to assess their perceptions of the applicants' values as well as their perceptions of their organizations' values. They found a small but significant relationship between actual and perceived value congruence. However, perceived value congruence had a larger impact on subjective fit perceptions than actual value congruence.

Taken as a whole, these findings suggest several things. There is some evidence that, if told to assess overall subjective fit, interviewers base their assessments solely on experience and social skills rather than on value congruence. Additionally, perceived value congruence appears to be related to subjective fit. However, when directly assessed, perceived value congruence is impacted by actual congruence. These observations suggest that depending on how fit is assessed, differing relationships between perceived congruence and actual congruence are obtained. However, if it is directly assessed, it appears that there is a relationship between perceived value congruence and actual value congruence. Further, the employability and subjective fit is related to perceived fit. Therefore, it appears that if fit is explained to interviewers, actual congruence impacts perceived congruence, subjective fit, and other employability opinions. This led to the first hypothesis:

> *Hypothesis One:* Interviewers' assessment of perceived value congruence, subjective fit, and likeability will be influenced by actual congruence. Interviewer's employment decisions (i.e., hiring decision, pay recommendation) will be influenced by actual congruence.

However, there is a caveat to these findings. The findings of Bretz et al. (1993) suggest that experience and social skills may impact assessment of fit. Therefore, it is important to consider the situations under which experience and social skills may be important. One important consideration may be whether the focus is on selecting for congruence with job values or organization values.

Much of the research discussed has focused on PO fit. This is because most of the research on PJ fit has addressed demands-abilities congruence (i.e., the individual having the necessary KSAs to perform a job) rather than needs-supplies congruence (i.e., individual needs met by a job). While demands-abilities congruence is important for PJ fit, organizations can screen for this type of congruence earlier in the selection process through resume screens and other similar techniques rather than assessing demands-abilities congruence in the interview setting. Further, it is important for organizations not to lose sight of the needs-supplies congruence that is also important for PJ fit. Jobs may either meet or not meet sets of needs, which can be grouped to represent values, of an individual (Lofquist & Dawis, 1978; McCloy et al., 1999). Therefore, when selecting based on a match between individual needs, or values, and the values of the organization, it makes sense to also consider a match with the values met by the job. Regardless, the ability demands of a job make it difficult to assess PJ fit without considering experience given that employers may use work experience to gauge the knowledge and skills of a candidate (Bretz et al., 1993). Similarly, values are interpersonally exhibited and evaluated, making social skills important for assessing both PO and PJ fit as well (Rynes & Gerhart, 1990). These observations led to the second hypothesis:

*Hypothesis Two:* Experience and social skills will interact with organization value congruence and job value congruence such that high experience level will diminish the

accuracy of the identification of job value congruence while high social skills will enhance the identification of both job and organization value congruence.

**Training**

While several authors have argued for the effectiveness of interviews as a method for assessing fit (Adams, 1999; Rynes & Gerhart, 1990), they have not ignored the problems that interviews have as a selection tool (Judge et al., 2000). It is widely accepted that unstructured interviews are poor predictors of performance (Arvey & Campion, 1982; Harris, 1989). On the other hand, the structured interview has received broad support in the literature as a selection tool (Arvey & Campion, 1982; Campion, Palmer, & Campion, 1997; Harris, 1989).

In their review of structured interviews, Campion et al. (1997) argued for several different methods of adding structure to improve the interview process, of which two are relevant to the present effort. First, they suggested the use of detailed anchor rating scales to improve the interview. Another way interviews can be structured is to provide interviewers with training.

Vance, Kuhnert, and Farr (1978) assessed the use of behavioral rating scales in a study using audio recordings of interviews. Behavioral rating scales provide a description of expected behavior. These behaviors are linked to anchor points that provide illustrations of behavior expected from an applicant at each of the points on the scale. The authors assessed the impact of using behavioral rating scales to reduce interview error in comparison to a typical rating scale. Vance et al. found that using the behavioral rating scale reduced rater error and increased rater accuracy. Therefore, Campion et al. (1997) argue that detailed anchor rating scales should be used to enhance objectivity resulting in better test-retest and inter-rater reliability and agreement. It is logical that these findings would extend to the identification of values through the interview.

Research on assessing value congruence through interviews also suggests that training may be useful (Judge et al., 2000). When not provided with guidance, interviewers are not accurate at assessing actual congruence (Bretz et al., 1993). Other research has found conflicting results about the ability of interviewers to detect personal attributes. For example, Arvey and Campion (1982) have argued that interviewers have difficulty assessing personal characteristics. However, Paunonen, Jackson, and Oberman (1987) found that interviewers were able to assess values in applicants. Therefore, it is likely that training to use a behavioral rating scale would be useful for assessing value congruence.

While training is not necessarily a method for adding structure, Campion et al. (1997) argue that it is a frequently used way to make sure that other structural components are implemented correctly (Dipboye, 1992). Several studies (Latham, Saari, Pursell, & Campion, 1980; Maurer & Fay, 1988; Vance et al., 1978) have found that training interviewers to use rating scales led to high reliability, they have not examined the unique effects of the training, which the present effort will consider vis-à-vis the next two hypotheses:

> *Hypothesis Three:* Interviewers receiving PO fit training will be better at identifying organization value congruence. Interviewers receiving PJ fit training will be better at identifying job value congruence. Individuals receiving training in both PO and PJ fit will be better at identifying both organization and job value congruence.

> *Hypothesis Four:* Interviewers will be influenced by their training to like, hire, and pay more for applicants with a high value congruence matching the focus of their training.

While training should help interviewers identify value congruence, past research suggests that individuals are better at identifying values in some applicants than in others. Eder and

Buckley (1988) have argued that the judgment of interviewers is impacted more by their own cognitive organization than by actual attributes of the applicant. For example, Rosenhan (1973) conducted a study examining the ability to distinguish sanity from insanity in a psychiatric hospital. When pseudopatients (i.e., sane people who had never suffered from psychiatric disorders) checked themselves into psychiatric hospitals, the real patients were better able to identify the sane individuals than were the professional mental health workers. The mental health workers were looking for a presence of abnormal behaviors indicating that the individuals were sick. Alternatively, the other patients appeared to notice a lack of abnormal behaviors which helped them correctly identify the pseudopatients. This suggests that individuals are better at classifying people if they focus on a lack of an attribute than the presence of an attribute. Similarly, Rowe (1989) found that interviewers give more weight to negative information than to positive information. These observations led to the fifth, and final, hypothesis:

> *Hypothesis Five:* People will be more accurate at identifying applicants with low values than applicants with high values.

## Method

### Study Overview

In order to test these hypotheses, participants were trained to assess fit with one of three possible training modules, while the experience, social skills, PO fit, and PJ fit of applicants were manipulated to be high or low. As such, the study design involved a between-subject factor with three levels (training type) and four within-subject factors (experience, social skills, PO fit, PJ fit) with two levels each.

## Participants

Participants were recruited from a large, southwestern university. Undergraduate students chose from a list of studies in order to receive extra credit in their psychology courses. Of the 147 who chose to participate in the present study, 44 were men, 97 were women, and six did not identify their sex. The average age of the sample was 19.

## Procedures

Students were recruited to take part in the present study, which was described as a business scenario in which participants would take on the role of managers in charge of hiring a new employee. When the participants arrived, they were first asked to complete a timed covariate during the first 15 minutes of the five-hour study. Additionally, they were asked to complete untimed covariates and a background information questionnaire during the last hour of the study. Measures of intelligence, personality, and risk taking were included as covariate control variables that might confound the relationships being investigated.

After completing the first timed covariate measure, participants read a scenario asking them to take on the role of manager for a small local business. As a manager, each participant would be assisting in the process of selecting a new administrative assistant from a set of 16 applicants who had been chosen for interviews. Participants were informed that they would be completing a training to assist them in this process. After the training, they were asked to read transcripts of interviews with the 16 applicants and answer a series of questions about each applicant. These questions asked the participants to assess the values, subjective fit, and likeability of each applicant. Last, the participants were asked to make a hiring and pay decision for each applicant.

**Covariate Measures**

**Employee Aptitude Survey (EAS).** Given the cognitive demands of the task at hand, a measure of intelligence was included as a covariate measure. The EAS was used to measure intelligence. This measure asks participants to read several statements and decide if each is true or false. Participants also had the option to respond "not sure." Grimsley, Ruch, Warren, and Ford (1985) and Ruch and Ruch (1980) have provided evidence for the predictive and construct validity of this measure as a test of intelligence. The retest reliability for this measure is around .80.

**Risk Taking.** Due to the fact that participants were asked to make decisions that could impact the organization in the scenario, such as pay decisions, a measure of risk taking was included as a covariate measure. The Domain-Specific Risk-Attitude Scale (Weber, Blais, & Betz, 2002) assesses several content domains, including financial, health/safety, recreational, ethical, and social decisions. This 40-item measure asks participants to read statements and respond with their likelihood of engaging in each activity. An example activity is "Betting a day's income at the horse races," in which the participant was asked to answer on a scale from one, indicating very unlikely, to five, indicating very likely. This measure yielded an acceptable average internal consistency coefficient ($\alpha$ = .75). Evidence for the construct validity of this measure has been provided by Weber, Blais, and Betz (2002).

**Personality.** The Five Factor Model Questionnaire (FFMQ; Gill & Hodgkinson, 2007) was used as a global assessment of personality. The FFMQ measures openness, conscientiousness, extraversion, agreeableness, and neuroticism. Participants were asked to read a list of 80 adjectives and respond with the extent to which each word described them on a scale from one indicating "not like me" to five indicating "very like me." This measure yielded an

acceptable average internal consistency coefficient ($\alpha$ = .76). Evidence for the construct validity of this measure has been provided by Gill and Hodgkinson.

**Demographics.** Participants were asked to answer several questions on a background data form. These items were self-reported and included questions about age, gender, work experience, standardized test scores, and GPA.

**Measures**

**Values.** The work importance profiler (WIP; McCloy et al., 1999) was used to create a values benchmark rating scale for use during the training. This benchmark rating scale was shortened to create the measure used in the assessment task. The WIP was chosen because it is easily accessible on the O*NET website (a tool for career exploration and job analysis) and because the values are easy to understand compared to other value taxonomies, which include values such as hedonism and universalism that might be hard for participants to understand in the context of the work environment (e.g., Schwartz, 1992). The WIP identifies six values, each with associated needs. These six values and their associated needs can be found in Figure 1 and Figure 2.

The benchmark rating scale included definitions of each value in addition to definitions of the associated needs. Next, using a brainstorming technique (Campion et al., 1997; Campion, 1988) guided by the WIP measure, the researchers wrote descriptions and examples of low, medium, and high needs. To provide evidence of the content validity of these descriptions and examples, five graduate students familiar with the content area were asked to read definitions of the values and associated needs. They were then asked to read the descriptions and examples and rate each on a scale from one (low) to five (high). Following the guidelines suggested by Pulakos (1997), two standards were met: high agreement among raters and a high percentage of

ratings at the proper level for each example. In order to meet these standards, ratings were assessed to make sure they fell within .5 points from the expected value. That is to say, an example intended to represent a low level of a value, which should receive a score of 1, received ratings no higher than a 1.5. Further, inter-rater reliability was computed. The five graduate students' ratings of the descriptions and examples were reliable ($r_{wg}$ = .81). This measure yielded an acceptable average internal consistency coefficient ($\alpha$ = .78).

**Subjective Fit.** Because a single measure of both PO and PJ fit did not exist, items from measures of PO fit and PJ fit (Judge & Cable, 1997; Saks & Ashforth, 1997) were combined to produce a new, seven-item measure of overall fit. An example item is: "To what extent would this applicant find the kind of work they are looking for?" Participants responded using a 5-point Likert-type scale with the anchors of one indicating to a very little extent and five indicating to a very large extent. This measure yielded an acceptable average internal consistency coefficient ($\alpha$ = .93).

**Likeability.** Rather than focus on specific type of likeability such as interpersonal attraction (e.g., Berscheid, 1985; Newcomb, 1956) or perceived similarity (e.g., Byrne, Clore, & Worchel, 1966), general likeability was measured by pulling seven items from various measures (e.g., Findlay, Girardi, & Coplan, 2006; Kohn, 1995; Raza & Carpenter, 1987). Example items include: "I like this applicant" and "I would want to work with this person." Participants responded using a 5-point Likert-type scale with anchors of one indicating strongly disagree and five indicating strongly agree. This measure yielded an acceptable average internal consistency coefficient ($\alpha$ = .92).

**Hiring Decision.** The hiring decision was measured by the following item: "Would you hire this applicant?" Participants responded with yes or no.

**Pay Decision.** The pay decision was measured by the following item: "If you hired this applicant, at what level would you start his or her salary?" Participants responded to a 5-point Likert-type scale with an anchor of one indicating far below base pay, three indicating base pay, and five indicating far above base pay.

## Training Manipulation

The training served as a between-participant manipulation. Each participant completed one of three possible training modules: PJ-fit training, PO-fit training, or combination training (both PJ and PO fit). This training was designed to be a Frame-of-Reference (FOR) training to improve participants' ability to accurately assess value congruence using the values benchmark rating scale (Bernardin & Buckley, 1981). This training was designed following the guidance of Pulakos (1997) and followed the steps of the training developed by Pulakos (1986). This format was adjusted to be a self-paced, paper-and-pencil format similar to Marcy and Mumford (2007). As such, it involved three main sections: reading a written lecture, practice with immediate elaborative feedback, and a final discussion of values.

**Written lecture.** The written lecture included three main sections. The first section, a general discussion about values and fit, was similar across all three training modules. First, values in general and their relationship to fit were discussed. Next, fit was defined and the importance, including outcomes, of fit was described. This section was used to discuss the multidimensional nature of fit (Pulakos, 1997). Last, the usefulness of selecting on the basis of these values was described. While this discussion was present in all three training modules, the specific content, such as the definition of fit, was focused on either PJ fit, PO fit, or both.

Each training module then discussed a set of specific values. These values were discussed in terms of their definition and importance. The PJ fit training focused on values

associated with the job of administrative assistant. The PO fit training focused on the values associated with the organization in the scenario. The combination training focused on the values for both the job and the organization. The values assigned to be important for the job were achievement, independence, and recognition. A definition of each can be found in Figure 1. The values assigned to be important for the organization were relationships, support, and working conditions. A definition of each can be found in Figure 2. The combination training discussed all six values. Participants were then asked to complete a multiple choice quiz in order to ensure active processing of the content. If a participant got more than one question incorrect, they were asked to review the material and repeat the quiz. After the quiz, the participants were provided with a list of definitions of needs associated with each value. Following this information, the participants were quizzed again. If participants got more than one question incorrect, they were asked to review the material and repeat the quiz.

The third section of the written lecture presented and discussed benchmark rating scales. Since the participants were undergraduate students unfamiliar with these scales, they needed to be educated about benchmark ratings scales in general. Therefore, a description was provided including information about how they are developed and their purpose. The participants were then quizzed on this material. If participants got more than one question incorrect, they were asked to review the material and repeat the quiz. Next, the values benchmark rating scale was presented. Definitions of each value were provided again. Following these definitions, a discussion of the anchors for low, medium, and high levels of the value were provided. Last, a behavioral benchmark was provided. An example of a benchmark rating scale for one of the values can be found in Figure 3. Following this information, the participants were quizzed again.

If participants got more than one question incorrect, they were asked to review the material and repeat the quiz.

**Practice with immediate elaborative feedback.** After completing the written lecture section, participants were then provided with the opportunity to practice assessing an applicant. The instructions informed the participants that they would be reading transcripts from interviews held for a job several years prior. The participants then worked through three practice interviews.

After reading through the first practice interview transcript, participants were provided with the true scores on each value and rationale for the scores. True scores were obtained by having subject matter experts score each participant. Similar to the process of checking the behavioral examples for the values benchmark rating scale, reliability was assessed to check for agreement. The subject matter experts' ratings were reliable ($r_{wg}$ = .85). After reading through the second practice interview transcript, participants were asked to provide a score for each value as well as rationale for these scores. Next, the true scores and rationale were provided. Participants were then asked to identify differences between their scores and the true scores as well as differences between their rationales and the provided rationales. Last, they were asked to give a final score and rationale for the second practice interview transcript. This process was repeated for the third, and final, practice interview transcript.

**Final discussion of values.** To serve as a final discussion of values, participants were asked to complete an open-response quiz about the values and their associated needs. Their responses on this quiz, as well as all other quizzes, were checked by a researcher to ensure completion, accuracy, and active processing.

**Within Manipulation: Assessment Task**

After completing the training, all participants began the assessment task. During the assessment task, participants were asked to read the interview transcripts for the 16 applicants. Participants viewed the transcripts in a random order so as to avoid an order effect. After reading the transcript of each applicant, participants were asked to answer a series of questions. This set of questions was composed of the items from the study measures of values, fit, likeability, pay decision, and hiring decision.

Each applicant transcript was manipulated to be high or low on experience, social skills, organization value congruence, and job value congruence. These four within-subject factors were crossed to produce all possible combinations, which resulted in 16 transcripts. All interview transcripts contained responses to the same interview questions. However, value congruence was manipulated using varying questions. For example, for applicant one, the response to the third and fourth question contained information about values. However, for applicant two, the second and fifth question contained information about values. The first question was always used to manipulate experience and the second question was always used to manipulate social skills. This was done so that participants would not be able to pick up a pattern to use in assessing the values of the applicant. This was not a concern for experience or social skills because participants were not asked to assess these characteristics. An example of an interview transcript can be seen in Figure 4.

To ensure these transcripts adequately displayed the attributes in question at the desired levels, graduate students familiar with the content area rated these transcripts using the benchmark rating scale prior to the study. Any perceived problems were addressed and the transcripts were adjusted. A second set of graduate students then rated the transcripts using the values benchmark rating scale. This second set of graduate students reliably ($r_{wg}$ = .79) scored

each transcript as it had been manipulated (i.e., high when it was supposed to be high, low when it was supposed to be low; Pulakos, 1997).

**Dependent Variables**

The measures of values, fit, likeability, pay decision, and hiring decision were used to compute the dependent variables. In order to assess a match between the manipulated values and the participant ratings of values, a $D^2$ congruence score was computed (Edwards, 1994) for each of the six values. Then, using the $D^2$ scores for all values, an average assessment accuracy score was computed. This accuracy score represents the relationship between perceived value congruence and actual value congruence. This score was reverse coded to make interpretation easier to understand. Therefore, higher scores are more accurate. Similarly, an average fit and likeability score were also computed.

**Analyses**

A mixed analysis of covariance design was computed with four within-subject factors (experience, social skills, organization value congruence, job value congruence) and one between-subject factor (training type). Five separate analyses were computed for each of the five dependent variables: assessment accuracy, likeability, subjective fit, pay decision, and hiring decision. In all analyses, only the covariate controls that produced relationships significant at the .05 level with the dependent variables were retained.

## Results

**Assessment Accuracy**

The within-subject effects from the mixed analysis of covariance with assessment accuracy as the dependent variable can be seen in Table 1. Intelligence ($F(1,137) = 8.06$, $p = .005$), social risk taking ($F(1,137) = 9.93$, $p = .002$), and age ($F(1,137) = 6.60$, $p = .011$)

produced significant relationships with assessment accuracy. More specifically, intelligence was positively related to accuracy, while social risk taking and age were negatively related to accuracy.

A significant main effect ($F(1,137) = 6.31$, $p = .013$) was obtained for the level of experience of the applicant. Inspection of cell means indicated that when applicant experience was high, participants were not able to identify values as accurately ($m = 3.78$, $SE = .07$) as when applicant experience was low ($m = 4.67$, $SE = .09$). Therefore, when applicant experience was high, participants were less accurate as measured by comparing actual value congruence to perceived congruence value scores. This suggests that experience level is distracting for people identifying values.

A significant interaction ($F(1,137) = 12.86$, $p < .001$) was obtained for the manipulated experience and social skills of the applicant. Participants were best at identifying values when experience was low and social skills were high ($m = 4.469$, $SE = .09$) compared to when experience was high regardless of whether social skills were high or low ($m = 3.78$, $SE = .09$). Again, experience appears to be distracting for selecting based on values, but social skills may be helpful. This may suggest that individuals need social skills to successfully express their values.

A significant interaction ($F(1,137) = 3.84$, $p = .024$) was obtained for training condition and applicant job value congruence. Participants who received PJ-fit training were significantly more accurate at identifying applicants who had low job value congruence ($m = 4.46$, $SE = .15$) than identifying those who had high job value congruence ($m = 3.72$, $SE = .16$). This would suggest that training helped participants but that they were better at identifying those with low value congruence than with high value congruence.

A significant three-way interaction ($F(1,137) = 3.62$, $p = .029$) was obtained for training condition, the experience of the applicant, and the organization value congruence of the applicant. Participants who received PO-fit training or the combination training more accurately identified applicants with low organization value congruence ($m = 4.57$, $SE = .20$) than applicants with high organization value congruence, especially if the applicant was also high in experience ($m = 3.55$, $SE = .15$). Again, this seems to suggest that experience can undermine the ability to identify organization value congruence. Further, people are better at identifying low value congruence than high value congruence.

A significant three-way interaction ($F(1,137) = 5.34$, $p = .006$) was obtained for training condition, the social skills of the applicant, and organization value congruence of the applicant. Participants who received PJ-fit training or combination training were best at identifying values in applicants who had high social skills and low organization value congruence ($m = 4.80$, $SE = .20$) compared to applicants who had both high social skills and high organization value congruence ($m = 3.53$, $SE = .16$). However, those participants who received PO-fit training were best at identifying values when applicants had both low social skills and low organization value congruence ($m = 4.50$, $SE = .17$) compared to applicants who had both high social skills and high organization value congruence ($m = 3.66$, $SE = .16$). Therefore, regardless of training, participants are better at identifying low value congruence. Further, people trained in PO fit are less accurate at identifying organization value congruence if the applicant has high social skills, but social skills do not appear to distract those who have received PJ fit training or combination training.

A significant three-way interaction ($F(1,137) = 7.95$, $p < .001$) was obtained for training condition, social skills of the applicant, and job value congruence of the applicant. Again,

participants who received PJ-fit training or combination training were best at identifying values in applicants who had high social skills and low job value congruence ($m$ = 4.71, $SE$ = .21) compared to all other applicants ($m$ = 3.84, $SE$ = .18). However, those participants that received PO-fit training were best at identifying values when applicants had either low social skills and high job value congruence ($m$ = 4.86, $SE$ = .22) or high social skills and low job value congruence ($m$ = 4.85, $SE$ = .21) and were particularly poor at identifying values in applicants who had both high social skills and high job value congruence ($m$ = 3.12, $SE$ = .15). This provides additional support for the hypothesis that people are better at identifying individuals with low value congruence. Again, we see that people trained in PO fit are less accurate at identifying organization value congruence if the applicant has high social skills, but social skills do not appear to distract those who have received PJ fit training or combination training.

**Subjective Fit**

The within-subject effects from the mixed analysis of covariance with subjective fit as the dependent variable can be seen in Table 2. Extraversion ($F$(1,133) = 7.97, $p$ = .033) and gender ($F$(1,133) = 9.93, $p$ = .002) produced significant relationships with subjective fit. More specifically, extraversion and gender were positively related to subjective fit with females rating applicants as having a higher overall fit.

A significant main effect ($F$(1,133) = 7.39, $p$ = .007) was obtained for the level of social skills of the applicant. Inspection of cell means indicated that when the social skills of the applicant were manipulated to be high, participants perceived the applicant as a better overall fit ($m$ = 3.29, $SE$ = .04) compared to when the social skills were manipulated to be low ($m$ = 2.85, $SE$ = .03). This provides support for the moderating effects of social skills on the relationships between actual congruence and perceived congruence.

A significant interaction ($F(1,133) = 17.91$, $p = .007$) was obtained for training condition and the manipulated PJ fit ($F(1,133) = 17.91$, $p = .007$) of the applicant. Participants who received PJ-fit training appropriately perceived those with high job value congruence as a better overall fit ($m = 3.61$, $SE = .06$) than participants who received PO fit training ($m = 3.23$, $SE = .06$) or combination training ($m = 3.3$, $SE = .06$). Further, participants who received the PJ Fit training or the combination training did perceive a significant difference in fit between applicants with high job value congruence ($m = 3.42$, $SE = .06$) and applicants with low job value congruence ($m = 2.70$, $SE = .06$). Similarly, a significant interaction ($F(1,133) = 10.87$, $p \leq .001$) was obtained between training condition and organization value congruence of the applicant. Again, those who received PO-fit training or combination training perceived a significant difference in fit between applicants with high organization value congruence ($m = 3.40$, $SE = .06$) and applicants with low organization value congruence ($m = 2.69$, $SE = .07$). This provides some evidence for the effectiveness of value congruence training at helping people identify fit through an interview. Further, it supports the hypothesis that fit would be related to actual value congruence.

**Likeability**

The within-subject effects from the mixed analysis of covariance with likeability as the dependent variable can be seen in Table 3. Extraversion ($F(1,139) = 5.12$, $p = .025$) and health risk taking ($F(1,139) = 5.18$, $p = .024$) produced significant relationships with perceptions of likeability. More specifically, extraversion was positively related to likeability while health risk taking was negatively related to likeability.

A significant main effect ($F(1,139) = 4.22$, $p = .042$) was obtained for social skills. Inspection of cell means indicated that participants liked applicants who had high social skills (*m*

= 3.49, *SE* = .027) significantly more than those applicants who had low social skills (*m* = 3.03, *SE* = .03). This provides support for the moderating effects of social skills on the relationships between actual congruence and perceived congruence.

A significant interaction ($F(1,139) = 5.86$, $p = .004$) was obtained for training condition and the organization value congruence of the applicant. Inspection of cell means indicated that participants who received the PO-fit training or the combination training liked applicants with high organization value congruence significantly more (*m* = 3.44, *SE* = .05) than those applicants with low organization value congruence (*m* = 3.05, *SE* = .05). This distinction was not made for those who received PJ-fit training. Similarly, a significant interaction ($F(1,133) = 11.052$, $p = .000$) was obtained for training condition and the job value congruence of the applicant. Again, participants who received the PJ-fit training or the combination training liked applicants with high job value congruence significantly more (*m* = 3.53, *SE* = .05) than those applicants with low job value congruence (*m* = 2.98, *SE* = .05). This suggests that likeability is related to actual congruence. Further, participants may be influenced by their training to want to hire applicants who demonstrate a better fit.

**Hiring Decision**

The within-subject effects from the mixed analysis of covariance with hiring decision as the dependent variable are shown in Table 4. A significant interaction ($F(1,141) = 6.13$, $p = .003$) was obtained for training condition and the organization value congruence of the applicant. Inspection of cell means indicated that participants who received the PO-fit training or the combination training were significantly more likely to hire applicants with high organization value congruence (*m* = 3.42, *SE* = .10) than those applicants with low organization value congruence (*m* = 2.41, *SE* = .13). This distinction was not made for those who received PJ-fit

training. Similarly, a significant interaction ($F(1,141) = 15.12$, $p \leq .001$) was obtained for training condition and the manipulated PJ fit of the applicant. Again, participants who received the PJ-fit training or the combination training were significantly more likely to hire applicants with high job value congruence ($m = 3.50$, $SE = .12$) than those applicants with low job value congruence ($m = 2.36$, $SE = .10$). This suggests that hiring decision is related to actual congruence. Further, participants may be influenced by their training to want to hire applicants who demonstrate a better fit.

**Pay Decision**

The within-subject effects from the mixed analysis of covariance with pay decision as the dependent variable can be seen in Table 5. Agreeableness ($F(1,140) = 5.11$, $p = .025$) produced a significant relationship with pay decision. More specifically, agreeableness was positively related to pay decision.

A significant interaction ($F(1,140) = 9.34$, $p \leq .001$) was obtained for training condition and organization value congruence of the applicant. Similar to previous results, participants who received PO-fit training or combination training planned to pay the applicants with high organization value congruence significantly more ($m = 2.95$, $SE = .06$) than those applicants with low organization value congruence ($m = 2.50$, $SE = .06$). Similarly, a significant interaction ($F(1,140) = 4.66$, $p = .011$) was obtained for training condition and job value congruence of the applicant. Again, participants who received PJ-fit training or combination training planned to pay the applicants with high job value congruence significantly more ($m = 3.02$, $SE = .06$) than those applicants with low job value congruence ($m = 2.57$, $SE = .05$). Similar to previous results, this may suggest that pay decision is related to actual congruence. Further, participants may be

influenced by their training to want to pay applicants more who demonstrate higher value congruence.

## Discussion

Before moving to a discussion of the findings, a few limitations are worth noting. First, the present study used an undergraduate student sample. While students are familiar with interview situations, it is important to note that they do not have as much expertise as professionals (Ericsson, 2004). To address this limitation, participants' training included information that might not be necessary for a professional, such as the importance of fit and the impact on turnover. A second limitation related to the student sample is the nature of the interview task. There is a possibility that these findings obtained using a paper-and-pencil task would not generalize to a real world setting. In a real-world setting, there are consequences for an incorrect hire or a false rejection and individuals may face additional pressure or motivation to perform (Posthuma et al. 2002). In their review of interview research, Arvey and Campion (1982) discussed the few studies comparing stimulus material and concluded that paper-people had different results than those in real interviews; however, these differences were minimal. Therefore, more research is needed to determine whether the same findings would be obtained in more experienced populations in a real interview setting.

Another limitation is that the present effort used a limited values set. Other values taxonomies exist (e.g., Rokeach, 1979; Schwartz, 1992), but the present study used only the six values in the WIP. Further, the present effort did not assess conflicting values because half were reserved for PO fit while the other half were reserved for PJ fit. That is to say, we did not consider situations where the values of the job and the values of the organization conflict. For example, an accounting job may not fulfill a high need for creativity, but an organization may

value creativity. Future research is needed to expand the current findings to these complicated situations that likely occur in organizations.

Even bearing these limitations in mind, the present effort does have some noteworthy findings. First, it appears that training people to identify values improves their ability to identify values through the interview process. Participants who received PO Fit training were better at identifying organization value congruence and participants who received PJ Fit training were better at identifying job value congruence. Additionally, those who received the combination training were good at identifying both. These findings provide support for hypothesis three. As such, it appears that people are capable of assessing values during interviews for the purpose of selecting on the basis of both organization and job fit, and combination training may be the best approach for organizations interested in both.

This finding has two important caveats. First, the accuracy of value congruence identification appears to be impacted by the experience and social skills of applicants. Overall, people were worse at identifying value congruence when experience of applicants was high. More specifically, experience and social skills appeared to be distracting for people who received PO-fit training, resulting in less accurate identification of organization value congruence. However, those who received PJ-fit training or combination training were better at identifying value congruence when the applicant had high social skills if they were low in value congruence. These findings were opposite of hypothesis two and suggest several things. First, it may be best to screen for experience in an earlier stage of the selection process. Second, combination training may work best, but it is important to bear in mind that the applicant may need high social skills for the interviewer to identify applicants' values. This suggests that social skills may be necessary for expression of values, regardless of type of fit, but are only important for

the identification of low value congruence. For high value congruence, social skills appear to be distracting. Further, one of the limitations with interviews is that applicants can fake responses (i.e., socially desirable responding or impression management; Stevens & Kristof, 1995). Therefore, people with high social skills may engage in response distortion in an interview and may appear to have values that align with the organization as a result. Alternatively, interviewers may assume that an applicant is faking if they have high social skills and high values. This may explain the drop in accuracy for those situations. This implication must be borne in mind when selecting on fit through the interview.

A second important note about training is that people appear to be better at identifying a lack of values than a presence of values. That is to say that people appear to be better at identifying low value congruence than high value congruence. This finding supports hypothesis five and suggests several things. First, this may have implications for future training efforts. It may be better to focus training on identifying low individuals given that people appear to be better at identifying low values. This may result in different training strategies using different questions and an alternative scoring logic. It may be assumed that 4s and 5s on a scale are meaningful while in reality 1s and 2s are more meaningful. That is to say that it may be more important for organizations to be able to identify people without values than it is to discriminate between people with moderate or high values. This suggests that value congruence identification may have a threshold effect: Once an individual reaches a certain level of value congruence, increased congruence will have diminishing returns. Therefore, organizations may want to focus on identifying people at the low end of the scale to screen out those individuals. This research finding may suggest that interviewing for fit should take a screen-out approach (i.e., looking for disqualifying factors) rather than screen-in approach (i.e., looking for desirable characteristics;

Ryan & Sackett, 1992). This is an important implication given that Ryan and Sackett found that only 21.6% of assessors from various areas, including differing graduate training (I/O or non-I/O) and differing professional affiliations (SIOP and non-SIOP), felt that they use a screen-out approach. If this is the case, it may be important to include the interview as an earlier screening step of the selection process. However, this must be balanced with the reality of the cost and time that interviews require.

The last set of findings relates to the issues discussed about conflicting findings in previous research due to a comparison across perceived congruence, actual congruence, and subjective fit. The present effort obtained findings suggesting that perceived congruence, subjective fit, employability, and likeability were all related to actual congruence. Again, the relationship between perceived congruence, subjective fit, and actual congruence appears to be moderated by experience and social skills. This provided some support for hypotheses one and two. These findings suggest that if trained on fit, interviewers' ratings of perceived congruence can be used as decently accurate assessments of fit in that they are highly related to actual congruence. Further, ratings of overall subjective fit, employability, and likeability can be used in a similar way in that they are also related to actual congruence. However, some caution must be observed in that participants completed all measures. Therefore, their ratings of perceived congruence may have impacted their scores on the subjective fit, employability, and likeability measures. Future research may be needed in this area to compare these separately.

In support of hypothesis four, it was found that training on fit impacts these other assessments of employability and likeability. When trained on PJ fit, participants rated high job value congruence applicants higher in terms of likeability and hireability and made larger pay recommendations. The same was true for individuals trained on PO fit when scoring applicants

high in organization value congruence. Again, this has implications for the timing of the use of the interview to assess fit. If training interviewers to assess fit, this may impact their ultimate hiring and pay decisions. Given that people are better at identifying low value congruence individuals, it may be unwise to use the interview to assess fit as a last stage of the selection process.

**Conclusion**

Taken as a whole, these findings suggest that interviews can be used to assess fit in terms of value congruence. Training can be useful for improving the accuracy of this assessment; however, people are better at identifying a lack of values rather than a presence of values and this can be complicated by the experience and social skills of the applicant. More research is needed to test these hypotheses in actual organizations.

## References


Adams, G. A. (1999). Sociometric selection and the employment interview: An empirical examination. *International Journal of Action Methods, 52,* 71−79.

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.

Allport, G. W., Vernon, P. E., & Lindsey, G. (1951). *Study of values: Manual of directions*, (rev. edn). Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin.

Arvey, R. D., & Campion, J. E. (1982). The employment interview: A summary and review of recent research. *Personnel Psychology, 35,* 281−322.

Bernardin, H. J., & Buckley, M. R. (1981). Strategies in rater training. *Academy of Management Review, 6,* 205−212.

Berscheid, E. (1985). Interpersonal attraction. In G. Lindzey and E. Aronson (Eds.) *Handbook of social psychology* (3rd ed., Vol. 2, pp. 413−484). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Bowen, D. E., Ledford, G. E., & Nathan, B. R. (1991). Hiring for the organization, not the job. *Academy of Management Executive, 4,* 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.

Byrne, D., Clore Jr, G. L., & Worchel, P. (1966). Effect of economic similarity-dissimilarity on interpersonal attraction. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 4,* 220−224.

Cable, D. M., & Judge, T. A. (1997). Interviewers' perceptions of person-organization fit and organizational selection decisions. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 82,* 546−561.

Cable, D. M., & DeRue, D. S. (2002). The convergent and discriminant validity of subjective fit perceptions. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 87,* 875−884.

Caldwell, D. F., & O'Reilly, C. A. (1990). Measuring person-job fit with a profile-comparison process. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 75,* 648−657.

Campion, M. A. (1988). Interdisciplinary approaches to job design: A constructive replication with extensions. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 73,* 467−481.

Campion, M. A., Palmer, D. K., & Campion, J. E. (1997). A review of structure in the selection interview. *Personnel Psychology, 50,* 655−702.

Chatman, J. A. (1989). Improving interactional organizational research: A model of person-organization fit. *Academy of Management Review, 14,* 333−349.

Chatman, J. A. (1991). Matching people and organizations: Selection and socialization in public accounting firms. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 36,* 459−484.

Dipboye, R. L. (1992). *Selection interviews: Process perspectives.* Cincinnati, OH: South-Western.

Eder, R. W., & Buckley, M. R. (1988). The employment interview: An interactionist perspective. *Research in Personnel and Human Resources Management, 6,* 75−107.

Edwards, J. R. (1991). Person-job fit: A conceptual integration, literature review, and methodological critique. In C. L. Cooper and I. T. Robertson (Eds). *International review of industrial and organizational psychology* (Vol. 6, pp. 283−357). Oxford, England: John Wiley & Sons.

Edwards, J. R. (1994). The study of congruence in organizational behavior research: Critique and a proposed alternative. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 58,* 51−100.

Enz, C. (1988). The role of value congruity in intraorganizational power. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 33,* 284−304.

Ericsson, K. A. (2005). Recent advances in expertise research: A commentary on the contributions to the special issue. *Applied Cognitive Psychology, 19,* 233−241.

Ferris, G. R., & Gilmore, D. C. (1977). Effects of mode of information presentation, sex of applicant, and sex of interviewer on simulated interview decisions. *Psychological Reports, 40,* 566.

Ferris, G. R., & Judge, T. A. (1991). Personnel/human resources management: A political influence perspective. *Journal of Management, 17,* 447−488.

Findlay, L. C., Girardi, A., & Coplan, R. J. (2006). Links between empathy, social behavior, and social understanding in early childhood. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly, 21,* 347−359.

Fishbein, M., & Ajzen, I. (1975). *Belief, attitude and behavior.* Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

French, J. R. P., Jr. & Kahn, R. L. (1962). A programmatic approach to studying the industrial environment and mental health. *Journal of social issues, 18,* 1−47.

Gill, C. M., & Hodgkinson, G. P. (2007). Development and validation of the five-factor model questionnaire (FFMQ): An adjectival-based personality inventory for use in occupational settings. *Personnel Psychology, 60,* 731–766.

Grimsley, G., Ruch, F. L., Warren, N. P., & Ford, J. S. (1985). *Manual for the employee attitude survey, test of verbal reasoning.* Glendale, CA: Psychological Services.

Harris, M. M. (1989). Reconsidering the employment interview: A review of recent literature

and suggestions for future research. *Personnel Psychology, 42,* 691−726.

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. M. (1997). Applicant personality, organizational culture, and organization attraction. *Personnel Psychology, 50,* 359−394.

Judge, T. A., Higgins, C. A., & Cable, D. M. (2000). The employment interview: A review of recent research and recommendations for future research. *Human Resource Management Review, 10,* 383−406.

Kemelgor, B. H. (1982). Job satisfaction as mediated by the vale congruity of supervisors and their subordinates. *Journal of Occupational Behaviour, 3,* 147−160.

Kohn, L. S. (1995). *The relative effects of interview structure and person-organization fit on recruiting outcomes: An individual differences perspective* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation or master's thesis). Rice University, Houston, Texas.

Kohn, M., & Schooler, C. (1978). The reciprocal effects of the substantive complexity of work and intellectual flexibility: A longitudinal assessment. *American Journal of Sociology, 84,* 24−52.

Kristof, A. L. (1996). Person-organization fit: an integrative review of its conceptualizations, measurement, and implications. *Personnel Psychology, 49,* 1−49.

Kristof-Brown, A. L., Zimmerman, R. D., & Johnson, E. C. (2005). Consequences of individuals' fit at work: A meta-analysis of person-job, person-organization, person-group, and person-supervisor fit. *Personnel Psychology, 58,* 281−342.

Latham, G. P., Saari, L. M., Pursell, E. D., & Campion, M. A. (1980). The situational interview. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 65,* 569−573.

Lofquist, L. H., & Dawis, R. V. (1978). Values as second-order needs in the theory of work adjustment. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 12,* 12−19.

Maas, J. B. (1965). Patterned scaled expectation interview: Reliability studies on a new technique. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 49,* 431−433.

Marcy, R. T., & Mumford, M. D. (2007). Social innovation: Enhancing creative performance through casual analysis. *Creativity Research Journal, 19,* 123–140.

Maurer, S. D., & Faye, C. (1988). Effect of situational interviews, conventional structured interviews, and training on interview rating agreement: An experimental analysis. *Personnel Psychology, 41,* 329−344.

McCloy, R., Waugh, G., Medsker, G., Wall, J., Rivkin, D., & Lewis, P. (1999). *Development of the O* NET computerized work importance profiler*. Raleigh, NC: National Center for

O* NET Development.

Moos, R. H. (1987). Person-environment congruence in work, school, and health care settings. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 31,* 231−247.

Morse, J. (1975). Person-job congruence and individual adjustment. *Human Relations, 28,* 841−861.

Newcomb, T. M. (1956). The prediction of interpersonal attraction. *American Psychologist, 11,* 575−586.

O'Reilly, C. A., & Chatman, J. A. (1986). Organization commitment and psychological attachment: The effects of compliance, identification, and internalization on prosocial behavior. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 71,* 492−499.

O'Reilly, C. A., Chatman, J. A., & Caldwell, D. F. (1991). People of organizational culture: A profile comparison approach to assessing person-organization fit. *Academy of Management Journal, 34,* 487−516.

Paunonen, S. V., Jackson, D. N., & Oberman, S. M. (1987). Personnel selection decision: Effects of applicant personality and the letter of reference. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 40,* 96−114.

Posner, B. Z., Kouzes, J. M., & Schmidt, W. H. (1985). Shared values make a difference: An empirical test of corporate culture. *Human Resource Mangement, 24,* 293−309.

Posthuma, R. A., Morgeson, F. P., & Campion, M. A. (2002). Beyond employment interview validity: A comprehensive narrative review of recent research and trends over time. *Personnel Psychology, 55,* 1−81.

Pulakos, E. D. (1986). The development of training programs to increase accuracy with different rating tasks. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 38,* 76−91.

Pulakos, E. D. (1997). Ratings of job performance. In D. L. Whetzel & G. R. Wheaton (Eds.) *Applied measurement methods in industrial psychology.* (pp. 291−317). Cleveland: Davis-Black.

Ravlin, E. C., & Meglino, B. M. (1987). Issues in work values measurement. In W. C. Frederick (Ed.), *Research in corporate social performance and policy* (Vol. 9, pp. 153−183). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Raza, S. M., & Carpenter, B. N. (1987). A model of hiring decisions in real employment interviews. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 72,* 596−603.

Rokeach, M. (1973). *The nature of human values.* New York: The Free Press.

Rokeach, M. (1979). From individual to institutional values: With special reference to the values of science. In M. Rokeach (Ed.), *Understanding human values. Individual and societal*

(pp. 47−70). New York: Free Press.

Rosenhan, D. L. (1973). On being sane in insane places. *Science, 179,* 250−258.

Rowe, P. M. (1989). Unfavorable information and interview decision. In R. W. Eder, & G. R. Ferris (Eds.), *The employment interview: Theory, research, and practice* (pp. 77−89). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Ruch, F. L., & Ruch, W. W. (1980). *Employee aptitude survey.* Los Angeles, CA: Psychological Services.

Rynes, S., & Gerhart, B. (1990). Interviewer assessments of applicant "fit": An exploratory investigation. *Personnel Psychology, 43,* 13−35.

Saks, A. M., & Ashforth, B. E. (1997). A longitudinal investigation of the relationships between job information sources, applicant perceptions of fit, and work outcomes. *Personnel Psychology, 50,* 395−426.

Schneider, B. (1987). The people make the place. *Personnel Psychology, 40,* 437−453.

Schwartz, S. H. (2006). Universals in the content and structure of values: Theoretical advances and empirical tests in 20 countries. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology, 25,* 11−65.

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.

Vance, R. J., Kuhnert, K. W., & Farr, J. L. (1978). Interview judgments: Using external criteria to compare behavioral and graphic scale ratings. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 22,* 279−294.

Weber, E., Blaise, A., & Betz, N. (2002). A domain-specific risk-attitude scale: Measuring risk perceptions and risk behaviors. *Journal of Behavioral Decision Making, 15,* 263−290.

Weiss, H. (1978). Social learning of work values in organizations. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 63,* 711−718.

# Appendix A: Tables

Table 1

*Within-Subject Effects from the Mixed Analysis of Covariance with Assessment Accuracy as the Dependent Variable*

| **Variable** | **MS** | ***F*(1, 137)** | ***p*** | **$\eta^2$** |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Experience | 24.486 | 6.313 | .013 | .044 |
| Social Skill | 11.870 | 2.781 | .098 | .020 |
| PJ Fit | .697 | .103 | .749 | .001 |
| PO Fit | 9.525 | 1.312 | .254 | .009 |
| Experience * Social Skill | 56.800 | 12.862 | .000 | .086 |
| Experience * PJ Fit | 1.126 | .277 | .599 | .002 |
| Experience * PO Fit | 7.133 | 1.578 | .211 | .011 |
| Experience * Training | 3.738 | .964 | .384 | .014 |
| Social Skill * PJ Fit | 37.506 | 7.836 | .006 | .054 |
| Social Skill * PO Fit | 3.962 | 1.045 | .308 | .008 |
| Social Skill * Training | 12.545 | 2.939 | .056 | .041 |
| PO Fit * PJ Fit | 42.064 | 8.213 | .005 | .057 |
| PJ Fit * Training | 26.068 | 3.839 | .024 | .053 |
| PO Fit * Training | 8.031 | 1.106 | .334 | .016 |
| Experience * Social Skill * PJ Fit | 1.037 | .248 | .619 | .002 |
| Experience * Social Skill * PO Fit | 16.330 | 4.541 | .035 | .032 |
| Experience * Social Skill * Training | 9.389 | 2.126 | .123 | .030 |
| Experience * PJ Fit * Training | 11.139 | 2.741 | .068 | .038 |
| Experience * PO Fit * PJ Fit | 14.286 | 3.170 | .077 | .023 |
| Experience * PO Fit * Training | 16.358 | 3.619 | .029 | .050 |
| Social Skill * PO Fit * PJ Fit | 11.934 | 2.715 | .102 | .019 |
| Social Skill * PJ Fit * Training | 38.071 | 7.954 | .001 | .104 |
| Social Skill * PO Fit * Training | 20.230 | 5.337 | .006 | .072 |
| PO Fit * PJ Fit * Training | 7.914 | 1.545 | .217 | .022 |
| Experience * Social Skill * PJ Fit * Training | 2.070 | .496 | .610 | .007 |
| Experience * Social Skill * PO Fit * PJ Fit | 11.625 | 3.004 | .085 | .021 |
| Experience * Social Skill * PO Fit * Training | 9.823 | 2.731 | .069 | .038 |
| Experience * PO Fit * PJ Fit * Training | 4.960 | 1.101 | .336 | .016 |
| Social Skill * PO Fit * PJ Fit * Training | 22.931 | 5.216 | .007 | .071 |
| Experience * Social Skill * PO Fit * PJ Fit * Training | .351 | .091 | .913 | .001 |

*Note:* MS = mean square, *F*(df) = F-ratio(degrees of freedom), *p* = significance level, $\eta^2$ = partial eta squared effect size.

Table 2

*Within-Subject Effects from the Mixed Analysis of Covariance with Subjective Fit as the Dependent Variable*

| **Variable** | **MS** | ***F*(1, 133)** | ***p*** | **$\eta^2$** |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Experience | 1.648 | 1.349 | .248 | .010 |
| Social Skill | 5.911 | 7.392 | .007 | .053 |
| PJ Fit | .180 | .181 | .671 | .001 |
| PO Fit | 4.700 | 3.503 | .063 | .026 |
| Experience * Social Skill | .509 | .953 | .331 | .007 |
| Experience * PJ Fit | .300 | .538 | .464 | .004 |
| Experience * PO Fit | .525 | .696 | .406 | .005 |
| Experience * Training | .670 | .549 | .579 | .008 |
| Social Skill * PJ Fit | .337 | .598 | .441 | .004 |
| Social Skill * PO Fit | 1.547 | 2.639 | .107 | .019 |
| Social Skill * Training | .726 | .908 | .406 | .013 |
| PO Fit * PJ Fit | .003 | .005 | .943 | .000 |
| PJ Fit * Training | 17.802 | 17.905 | .000 | .212 |
| PO Fit * Training | 14.582 | 10.869 | .000 | .140 |
| Experience * Social Skill * PJ Fit | 1.195 | 2.288 | .133 | .017 |
| Experience * Social Skill * PO Fit | 2.462 | 2.873 | .092 | .021 |
| Experience * Social Skill * Training | .538 | 1.007 | .368 | .015 |
| Experience * PJ Fit * Training | .377 | .677 | .510 | .010 |
| Experience * PO Fit * PJ Fit | .233 | .394 | .531 | .003 |
| Experience * PO Fit * Training | 1.121 | 1.487 | .230 | .022 |
| Social Skill * PO Fit * PJ Fit | .104 | .193 | .661 | .001 |
| Social Skill * PJ Fit * Training | 2.755 | 4.881 | .009 | .068 |
| Social Skill * PO Fit * Training | .178 | .303 | .739 | .005 |
| PO Fit * PJ Fit * Training | .708 | 1.077 | .344 | .016 |
| Experience * Social Skill * PJ Fit * Training | .840 | 1.608 | .204 | .024 |
| Experience * Social Skill * PO Fit * PJ Fit | .001 | .002 | .964 | .000 |
| Experience * Social Skill * PO Fit * Training | .575 | .671 | .513 | .010 |
| Experience * PO Fit * PJ Fit * Training | 1.181 | 2.001 | .139 | .029 |
| Social Skill * PO Fit * PJ Fit * Training | .339 | .628 | .535 | .009 |
| Experience * Social Skill * PO Fit * PJ Fit * Training | 2.848 | 3.940 | .022 | .056 |

*Note:* MS = mean square, *F*(df) = F-ratio(degrees of freedom), *p* = significance level, $\eta^2$ = partial eta squared effect size.

Table 3

*Within-Subject Effects from the Mixed Analysis of Covariance with Likeability as the Dependent Variable*

| **Variable** | **MS** | ***F*(1, 139)** | ***p*** | **$\eta^2$** |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Experience | 1.228 | 1.528 | .218 | .011 |
| Social Skill | 2.881 | 4.220 | .042 | .029 |
| PJ Fit | .805 | 1.010 | .317 | .007 |
| PO Fit | .318 | .425 | .515 | .003 |
| Experience * Social Skill | .006 | .013 | .908 | .000 |
| Experience * PJ Fit | .159 | .375 | .541 | .003 |
| Experience * PO Fit | .074 | .146 | .703 | .001 |
| Experience * Training | .505 | .628 | .535 | .009 |
| Social Skill * PJ Fit | .042 | .070 | .792 | .001 |
| Social Skill * PO Fit | .974 | 1.893 | .171 | .013 |
| Social Skill * Training | .402 | .589 | .556 | .008 |
| PO Fit * PJ Fit | .023 | .053 | .818 | .000 |
| PJ Fit * Training | 8.816 | 11.052 | .000 | .137 |
| PO Fit * Training | 4.378 | 5.857 | .004 | .078 |
| Experience * Social Skill * PJ Fit | 1.319 | 2.702 | .102 | .019 |
| Experience * Social Skill * PO Fit | .457 | .712 | .400 | .005 |
| Experience * Social Skill * Training | .625 | 1.290 | .279 | .018 |
| Experience * PJ Fit * Training | .671 | 1.587 | .208 | .022 |
| Experience * PO Fit * PJ Fit | .039 | .078 | .780 | .001 |
| Experience * PO Fit * Training | .321 | .638 | .530 | .009 |
| Social Skill * PO Fit * PJ Fit | .093 | .223 | .638 | .002 |
| Social Skill * PJ Fit * Training | 1.690 | 2.778 | .066 | .038 |
| Social Skill * PO Fit * Training | .343 | .668 | .515 | .010 |
| PO Fit * PJ Fit * Training | 1.047 | 2.430 | .092 | .034 |
| Experience * Social Skill * PJ Fit * Training | 1.106 | 2.265 | .108 | .032 |
| Experience * Social Skill * PO Fit * PJ Fit | .163 | .334 | .564 | .002 |
| Experience * Social Skill * PO Fit * Training | .157 | .244 | .784 | .003 |
| Experience * PO Fit * PJ Fit * Training | .367 | .742 | .478 | .011 |
| Social Skill * PO Fit * PJ Fit * Training | .390 | .938 | .394 | .013 |
| Experience * Social Skill * PO Fit * PJ Fit * Training | 1.051 | 2.159 | .119 | .030 |

*Note:* MS = mean square, *F*(df) = F-ratio(degrees of freedom), *p* = significance level, $\eta^2$ = partial eta squared effect size.

Table 4

*Within-Subject Effects from the Mixed Analysis of Covariance with Hiring Decision as the Dependent Variable*

| **Variable** | **MS** | ***F*(1, 141)** | ***p*** | **$\eta^2$** |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Experience | 371.301 | 80.958 | .000 | .365 |
| Social Skill | 281.168 | 90.845 | .000 | .392 |
| PJ Fit | 501.522 | 126.799 | .000 | .473 |
| PO Fit | 375.277 | 81.063 | .000 | .365 |
| Experience * Social Skill | 82.838 | 30.595 | .000 | .178 |
| Experience * PJ Fit | 7.805 | 3.043 | .083 | .021 |
| Experience * PO Fit | .345 | .140 | .709 | .001 |
| Experience * Training | 3.882 | .846 | .431 | .012 |
| Social Skill * PJ Fit | 4.861 | 1.618 | .205 | .011 |
| Social Skill * PO Fit | 14.477 | 5.751 | .018 | .039 |
| Social Skill * Training | 2.020 | .653 | .522 | .009 |
| PO Fit * PJ Fit | 1.537 | .506 | .478 | .004 |
| PJ Fit * Training | 59.818 | 15.124 | .000 | .177 |
| PO Fit * Training | 28.372 | 6.129 | .003 | .080 |
| Experience * Social Skill * PJ Fit | 17.988 | 8.543 | .004 | .057 |
| Experience * Social Skill * PO Fit | 2.846 | .840 | .361 | .006 |
| Experience * Social Skill * Training | .361 | .133 | .875 | .002 |
| Experience * PJ Fit * Training | 1.877 | .732 | .483 | .010 |
| Experience * PO Fit * PJ Fit | 105.156 | 42.219 | .000 | .230 |
| Experience * PO Fit * Training | 1.009 | .411 | .664 | .006 |
| Social Skill * PO Fit * PJ Fit | 1.969 | .813 | .369 | .006 |
| Social Skill * PJ Fit * Training | 8.541 | 2.843 | .062 | .039 |
| Social Skill * PO Fit * Training | 1.987 | .789 | .456 | .011 |
| PO Fit * PJ Fit * Training | 1.704 | .561 | .572 | .008 |
| Experience * Social Skill * PJ Fit * Training | 1.027 | .488 | .615 | .007 |
| Experience * Social Skill * PO Fit * PJ Fit | 27.031 | 11.592 | .001 | .076 |
| Experience * Social Skill * PO Fit * Training | 2.271 | .671 | .513 | .009 |
| Experience * PO Fit * PJ Fit * Training | .373 | .150 | .861 | .002 |
| Social Skill * PO Fit * PJ Fit * Training | .829 | .342 | .711 | .005 |
| Experience * Social Skill * PO Fit * PJ Fit * Training | 2.330 | .999 | .371 | .014 |

*Note:* MS = mean square, *F*(df) = F-ratio(degrees of freedom), *p* = significance level, $\eta^2$ = partial eta squared effect size.

Table 5

*Within-Subject Effects from the Mixed Analysis of Covariance with Pay Decision as the Dependent Variable*

| **Variable** | **MS** | ***F*(1, 140)** | ***p*** | **$\eta^2$** |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Experience | 1.546 | 1.404 | .238 | .010 |
| Social Skill | .285 | .375 | .541 | .003 |
| PJ Fit | .309 | .428 | .514 | .003 |
| PO Fit | .003 | .004 | .952 | .000 |
| Experience * Social Skill | .085 | .161 | .689 | .001 |
| Experience * PJ Fit | .089 | .182 | .671 | .001 |
| Experience * PO Fit | .028 | .059 | .808 | .000 |
| Experience * Training | .812 | .737 | .480 | .010 |
| Social Skill * PJ Fit | .465 | .952 | .331 | .007 |
| Social Skill * PO Fit | 2.594 | 5.752 | .018 | .039 |
| Social Skill * Training | 1.014 | 1.334 | .267 | .019 |
| PO Fit * PJ Fit | 1.173 | 2.449 | .120 | .017 |
| PJ Fit * Training | 3.364 | 4.664 | .011 | .062 |
| PO Fit * Training | 7.978 | 9.336 | .000 | .118 |
| Experience * Social Skill * PJ Fit | 2.448 | 4.770 | .031 | .033 |
| Experience * Social Skill * PO Fit | .000 | .000 | .985 | .000 |
| Experience * Social Skill * Training | .229 | .436 | .647 | .006 |
| Experience * PJ Fit * Training | .730 | 1.485 | .230 | .021 |
| Experience * PO Fit * PJ Fit | .394 | .934 | .335 | .007 |
| Experience * PO Fit * Training | .644 | 1.344 | .264 | .019 |
| Social Skill * PO Fit * PJ Fit | .239 | .587 | .445 | .004 |
| Social Skill * PJ Fit * Training | 1.198 | 2.455 | .090 | .034 |
| Social Skill * PO Fit * Training | 2.298 | 5.095 | .007 | .068 |
| PO Fit * PJ Fit * Training | .114 | .238 | .789 | .003 |
| Experience * Social Skill * PJ Fit * Training | .339 | .660 | .518 | .009 |
| Experience * Social Skill * PO Fit * PJ Fit | 1.568 | 3.640 | .058 | .025 |
| Experience * Social Skill * PO Fit * Training | 1.211 | 2.386 | .096 | .033 |
| Experience * PO Fit * PJ Fit * Training | .410 | .971 | .381 | .014 |
| Social Skill * PO Fit * PJ Fit * Training | .051 | .126 | .882 | .002 |
| Experience * Social Skill * PO Fit * PJ Fit * Training | 2.764 | 6.416 | .002 | .084 |

*Note:* MS = mean square, *F*(df) = F-ratio(degrees of freedom), *p* = significance level, $\eta^2$ = partial eta squared effect size.

## Appendix B: Figures

Figure 1. *Definitions of the Person-Job Fit Values Definitions.*

**Relationships**

*Definition:* Individual values providing service to others and working with co-workers in a friendly, non-competitive environment.

*Needs Associated with Relationships*

- Co-workers: Individual indicates a need to have co-workers who are easy to get along with.
- Moral Values: Individual indicates a need to **not** be put in situations where they would be pressured to do things that go against their sense of right and wrong.
- Social Service: Individual indicates a need to do things for other people.

**Support**

*Definition:* Individual values working with supportive management that stands behind its employees.

*Needs Associated with Support*

- Company Policies and Practices: Individual indicates a need to be treated fairly by supervisors and co-workers.
- Human Relations Support: Individual indicates a need to have supervisors who would back up their workers with management.
- Technical Support: Individual indicates a need to have supervisors who train their workers well.

**Working Conditions**

*Definition:* Individual values employment security and good working conditions.

*Needs Associated with Working Conditions*

- Activity: Individual indicates a need to be busy all the time.
- Compensation: Individual indicates a need to be paid comparable to that of other workers.
- Security: Individual indicates a need to feel that they have steady employment.
- Variety: Individual indicates a need to do something different every day.

Figure 2. *Definitions of the Person-Organization Fit Values Definitions.*

**Achievement**

*Definition:* Individual values work that is results oriented, as well as work that allows a person to use their strongest abilities, giving them a feeling of accomplishment.

*Needs Associated with Achievement*

- Ability Utilization: Individual indicates a need to make use of abilities to their full extent when completing work.
- Achievement: Individual indicates a need to have work that gives the individual a feeling of accomplishment.

**Independence**

*Definition:* Individual values working on their own and making their own decisions.

*Needs Associated with Independence*

- Creativity: Individual indicates a need to try out his or her own ideas.
- Responsibility: Individual indicates a need to make his or her own decisions.
- Autonomy: Individual indicates a need to plan their work with little supervision.

**Recognition**

*Definition:* Individual values opportunities for advancement, leadership, and recognition of achievement.

*Needs Associated with Recognition*

- Advancement: Individual indicates a need for an opportunity for advancement.
- Authority: Individual indicates a need to give directions and instructions to others.
- Recognition: Individual indicates a need to receive recognition for the work they complete.
- Social Status: Individual indicates a need to be looked up to by others in the organization or community.

Figure 3. *Example Benchmark Rating Scale*

**Achievement:** Individual values work that is results oriented, as well as work that allows a person to use their strongest abilities, giving them a feeling of accomplishment.

- Ability Utilization: Individual indicates a need to make use of abilities to their full extent when completing work.
- Achievement: Individual indicates a need to have work that gives the individual a feeling of accomplishment.

*Scale & Benchmarks*

1) **Low Achievement Value:** An individual with a low achievement value will not seek to make use of their abilities to their full extent. They also do not have a need to complete a task in a way that will give them a sense of accomplishment. As a result, they will prefer to meet the minimum possible performance requirements. This may also be identified as a lack of discussion about the need for achievement or to utilize abilities.

   Example language: *"I think my strength is that I try to always meet my boss's expectations. For example, one of my bosses once told me that I always complete my reports exactly as they requested. I am dependable in that I will try to meet any standard you set for me. "*

2) **Low-to-Average Achievement Value**

3) **Average Achievement Value:** Individuals with an average achievement value will seek to make use of their abilities to their full extent in order to perform the best that they believe they can. It is also important that they have work that gives them a sense of accomplishment when they complete it to the best of their ability.

   Example language: "*I would say one of my strengths is that I always try to complete a task to the best of my ability. For example, my boss at my last job gave me an assignment to organize and file some documents. I took the initiative to reorganize the filing system to make this process more streamlined and efficient in the future. My boss loved that I did this without being asked!"*

4) **Average-to-High Achievement Value**

5) **High Achievement Value:** An individual with a high achievement value has grand ideas about using their abilities to achieve large, unexpected, or highly successful tasks. They not only want to perform the best that they possibly can, but also they want to perform better than all others.

   Example language: *"I quickly moved up the ranks in my last job. I think that my bosses realized that I am a go getter and recognized my contributions. I made many changes as a manager that I believe prevented the company from going under and repositioned the company in the market. For example, I helped in the development of a customer service training that has now been implemented company wide. This made me a highly valuable and irreplaceable employee in my last job."*

Figure 4. *Example Interview Transcript*

POSITION: Administrative Assistant

*Applicant 1* ::::::::::::::::::Start Interview::::::::::::::::::

- **Briefly describe your work experience.**
  *I have had a couple jobs that have prepared me for this position. While getting my Associate's degree, I worked as a bank teller. In this position, I gained experience in answering phones and communicating with others. I also had to be very organized with numbers and information. After graduating, I worked for a few years as a secretary in a doctor's office. There I further developed my administrative skills, but also gained experience in general office management such as maintaining records, organizing a filing system, and scheduling.*
- **What experience do you have interacting with customers or clients?**
  *I have quite a bit of experience dealing with customers and patients. As a bank teller, it was important to listen and communicate clearly because I was dealing with peoples' money. We also had to constantly try to persuade customers to open new accounts. Therefore, I honed my persuasion skills. As a secretary in the doctor's office, it was very important to listen and really pay attention to patients in order to make sure they get the help that they need. This helped me hone my coordination skills because there was always a lot of activity in the office.*
  - **What is the most difficult thing about interacting with clients or customers?**
    *Sometimes a patient would get panicky because they were concerned about their baby, but they did not necessarily have an emergency situation. Therefore, it was very important for me to read the situation and figure out the best way to react to make sure the patients remain calm, but also get the attention they need. I often had to do this over the phone which is tricky, but it allowed me to really hone my ability to perceive verbal cues.*
- **What are your career goals and how do you think this position will meet those goals?**
  *While I have enjoyed being a secretary, I am looking for a new job because I want to advance my career. I feel that this position would allow me to grow as a person and an employee. I am looking for a position that will give me more responsibilities to take care of on my own. I would like to have more freedom to propose changes or projects, even if they are small. I would even appreciate the opportunity for advancement in a company that I know I could work for, for the rest of my career.*
- **What are your strengths?**
  *I am really good at taking the initiative to figure things out on my own. For example, when I worked in the doctor's office, I discovered that their system for entering and storing data was not very efficient. I figured out a better way to complete this task. My boss recognized this ability and allowed me to take the initiative on other tasks. I also feel that I am a very organized person. If I was not organized, I probably would not have developed a very good data storage system. Being organized has also allowed me to always be able to instantly assist customers and patients or find important information for a doctor.*
- **What are your weaknesses?**
  *I feel that I am easily bored. I like to have plenty of things to do and I get bored if I have to do the same activity day in and day out. I don't mind doing some of the same things every day. For example, I know that as an administrative assistant I would have some duties, like answering phones, that I would do every day. However, I also know that I would be provided with the opportunity to do new tasks. This would also be remedied by the eventual opportunity to move into new positions. While it was nice that my last boss recognized my work, it never led to the opportunity for a promotion. I think that is eventually why I got bored in the position.*
- **What qualities do you appreciate in a leader or supervisor?**
  *I think it is important to have a boss who listens to their subordinates. My last boss was great about noticing any extra time or effort that I put in. She was also willing to listen to my ideas and didn't get angry that I was trying to change the way things were done with the data storage system. She was even willing to help me promote and implement the change in the entire office.*
- **Tell me about a time where you had a conflict or disagreement with a coworker. How did you handle the situation and how did it turn out?**
  *When I worked at the bank, most of the tellers got along well. But, there was one girl who was always talking bad about other employees behind their backs. At first I simply tried to include the girl in our conversations in the hopes that she could build a better relationship with the rest of us. When this did not work, I eventually confronted her and explained that it made me uncomfortable for her to talk bad about others in the work place because we were all friends. Somehow this seemed to work, because after that she started joining in our conversations and eventually became much friendlier.*

::::::::::::::::::End Interview::::::::::::::::::