

FEEDBACK REPORT FOR PARTICIPANTS

**Hiring Professionals' Use and Perceptions of Video
Interviewing**

SMU REB # 18-193

Research Project conducted by:

Maryann Slama

MSc Student

&

Dr. Nicolas Roulin

Associate Professor

Department of Psychology

Saint Mary's University, 923 Robie Street, Halifax, NS B3H 3C3

Email: nicolas.roulin@smu.ca

INTRODUCTION & GOALS OF THE PROJECT

Asynchronous video interviews (AVIs) are an increasingly popular type of video-mediated selection interview. AVIs differ from other types of technology-mediated interviews in that applicants complete AVIs by recording video responses to interview questions in their own time without two-way interaction with an interviewer (Brenner, Ortner, & Fay, 2016). While there has been some preliminary work on applicant reactions to AVIs (Langer, König, & Krause, 2017; Langer, König, & Fitali, 2018) and initial HR reactions (Torres & Gregory, 2018), there has not yet been a concerted effort to determine how hiring managers conduct AVIs. This is despite many commercial software platforms which facilitate AVIs (e.g., HireVue, VidCruiter, SparkHire) and millions of interviews completed to date (HireVue, 2018). The aim of this study is two-fold; First, to get a “state of the art” by determining what design features hiring managers incorporate into AVIs and second, to examine hiring manager reactions. We explore reactions through the lens of the technology acceptance model (TAM) and further contextualize these reactions through their relationships with representatives’ interview structure preferences and technology anxiety.

AVI design refers to the software, technological, and evaluation decisions that an organization or hiring manager makes when they program the interview. We were interested in how hiring managers use design features to specify the conditions of the AVI. For example, what design features are used in the introduction to the interview (video introductions), as applicants respond to interview questions (preparation time, response lengths, re-recording), at the conclusion of the interview (video conclusions), and for evaluation (rating systems, automatic assessment). We were also interested in how current AVI users rate usefulness and ease of use, as well as how non-users perceive these constructs. From a practical perspective, surveying hiring managers about the design features they currently employ in AVIs, or what design features they would employ, will give us a better understanding of how AVIs are conducted and how the experience can differ for applicants across AVIs. From a research perspective, this snapshot could be valuable in determining which design features should be prioritized for empirical study.

PARTICIPANTS, DATA COLLECTION, & ANALYSES

Data were collected from two samples of North American hiring managers. One sample was obtained from provincial HR associations and university career centers ($n = 56$) and one from a pre-screened, and rigorously developed, Mechanical Turk panel ($n = 147$). The respondents were 51.2% female, 52.7% were Bachelor's degree holders. The average age was 40.29 years ($SD = 10.51$). The average tenure was 6.08 years ($SD = 4.87$) and they had conducted an average of 218 in-person selection interviews ($SD = 535.92$).

An online survey included items regarding (1) design features (non-users were asked to report features they would use), (2) interview structure preferences when conducting in-person interviews (measured with 20 items adapted from Chapman & Zweig, 2005), and (3) items regarding the anxiety they have using technology (measured with nine items developed by Meuter, Ostrom, Bitner & Roundtree, 2003). Twelve items adapted from Davis (1989) measured the components of Davis' TAM (usefulness and ease of use of AVIs; behavioral intention to use was measured for non-users).

MAIN FINDINGS

The table below summarizes the main findings regarding the use of (or potential future preference for) various AVI features. For instance, video introductions and conclusions were popular with the majority of users and non-users. In contrast automatic assessment as a sole means of evaluation was endorsed by 6% of current users and only 0.7% of non-users despite frequent discussion of artificial intelligence integration into AVIs (Suen, Chen, & Lu, 2019). In addition, non-users' perceptions of AVI usefulness and ease of use positively correlated with their behavioral intention to use AVIs in the future

Percentage of hiring managers who use/would use AVI design features

Design Feature	Current AVI Users		Potential Future AVI Users	
Including a video introduction	66 %		84.3 %	
Including a video conclusion	46 %		66.7 %	
Restricting the allowed response preparation time	None	28 %	None	26.1 %
	0 to 1 min	18 %	0 to 1 min	24.2 %
	1 to 5 min	22 %	1 to 5 min	31.4 %
	5 to 10 min	10 %	5 to 10 min	8.5 %
	10+ min	22 %	10+ min	9.8 %
Restricting the allowed response length	0 to 2 min	18 %	0 to 2 min	27.5 %
	2 to 5 min	40 %	2 to 5 min	48.4 %
	5 to 10 min	4 %	5 to 10 min	7.2 %
	10+ min	38 %	10+ min	17 %
Allowing re-recording	44 %		57.5 %	
Sometimes using audio recordings only	26 %		19.6 %	
Using automatic assessment scores to rate performance	Automatic scores only	6 %	Automatic scores only	0.7 %
	Automatic + human judgement	24 %	Automatic + human judgement	47.7 %
	Human judgement only	70 %	Human judgement only	51.6 %

If you have any question about this research or our findings, please contact nicolas.roulin@smu.ca.