

# 行政院國家科學委員會專題研究計畫 成果報告

## 面試官對高結構化面談反應之影響因素探討

計畫類別：個別型計畫

計畫編號：NSC94-2416-H-004-047-SSS

執行期間：94年08月01日至95年07月31日

執行單位：國立政治大學企業管理學系

計畫主持人：蔡維奇

計畫參與人員：陳彥君研究生；江欣瑩專任助理

報告類型：精簡報告

報告附件：出席國際會議研究心得報告及發表論文

處理方式：本計畫可公開查詢

中 華 民 國 95 年 10 月 31 日

## 一、摘要

過去研究顯示，當面談的結構程度愈高時，具有愈高的效度。但是一些研究也顯示實務上高結構化面談的實施並不普遍，使用者對於高結構化面談並沒有給予正面評價，與理論有落差，由於面試官的反應會影響到面談的實施，過去卻少有相關研究探討此課題。本文主要在探討面試官個人特徵（權力需求、認知風格）與其對高結構化面談的反應之關連性，以及工作複雜度與組織規範等情境變數所扮演的干擾角色，以瞭解造成面試官負面反應的制度因素，進而提出相關實務建議。本研究邀請了33家公司共292位面試主管參與問卷填寫，並依據其過去半年的面談經驗來評估其對高結構化面談的反應。結果發現據高分析導向認知風格、或身處高組織面談規範下的面試官，會對高結構面談有愈正面的反應，且高分析導向認知風格與工作複雜度會有交互效果。本研究的結果不僅對高結構化面談的理論發展有所貢獻，在實務上將有助於組織瞭解面試主管是否願意採用高結構化面談的原因，進而搭配相關的措施以提高其使用動機，以發揮結構化面談的效益。

關鍵詞：高結構面談、認知風格、權力需求、組織面談規範、工作複雜度

## Abstract

High structured interviews (HSI) have been shown to have high criterion-related validity and reliability but remain much less popular than low structured interviews (LSI). As the issue of interviewer reaction toward HSI remains largely unexamined, this study intends to examine how interviewer-related factors (cognitive style and needs for power) and situational factors (job complexity and organizational interview norms) jointly

influence interviewer reactions toward HSI. Using a sample of 292 interviewers from 33 firms in Taiwan, we found that analytic interviewers and those who worked in firms with higher organizational interview norms reacted more positively toward HSI. Furthermore, analytic interviewers reacted more positively toward HSI for interview positions with higher job complexity. Unexpectedly, in organizations with higher interview norms, interviewers' needs for power were positively related to their reactions toward HSI. Practically, our findings shed light on ways in which organizations could increase interviewers' willingness to conduct HSI so as to ensure the greatest potential of HSI in the process of personnel selection.

Keywords: Structured interviews; cognitive style; needs for power; organizational interview norms; job complexity.

## 二、緣由與研究目的

Many meta-analyses suggest that high structured interviews (HSI) are selection tools with sound validity that can lead to better selection decisions by reducing interviewers' biases in judgment (Campion *et al.*, 1997; Dipboye, 1994). However, several surveys suggest that more than 60 percent of organizations prefer low structured interviews (LSI) over HSI (Terpstra and Rozell, 1997; van der Zee *et al.*, 2002). Obviously, the advantages of HSI have been ignored by industries, and the discrepancy between the academicians and practitioners in their perceived value of structured interviews deserves more research attention.

According to van der Zee *et al.* (2002), most employment interviewers involve lower levels of structure. They suggest that interviewers' underlying beliefs regarding HSI and LSI are related to their own attitudes, subjective perceived norms, and sense of control and these factors further affect interviewers' intentions to use HSI. Recently, Lievens and Paepe (2004) found that interviewers who want to have higher discretion over interview questions, to establish informal contact with interviewees, and to develop interviews efficiently, are less inclined to use HIS; on the other hand, participation in interviewing training and interviewers with higher conventional-typed vocational personalities were more likely to use HSI. Similarly, Chapman and Zweig (2005) found that training plays a role in interview structure, as trained interviewers tended to structure their interviews more than untrained interviewers did.

There are several differences that distinguish the current study from previous studies on interviewer reactions. First, unlike Lievens and De Paepe (2004) who only examined two interview structure components (standardized questions and standardized evaluations), our study examines six structure components that have been identified by prior studies (Campion *et al.*, 1997; Tsai *et al.*, 2005): preparing questions to ask prior to the interview, asking questions based on a job analysis, asking the same questions, asking questions in the same order, rating each answer, and using anchored rating scales. Second, although researchers have argued that interviewer-related factors may be important

to their reactions to HSI (Chapman and Zweig, 2005; Lievens and De Paepe, 2004), none of above studies examined how interviewer-related factors such as cognitive style that has shown to affect individual attitudes and behaviors. To narrow the gap in the literature of interviewer reactions, we examine the relationships between two interviewer-related factors, needs for power and cognitive style, and interviewers' reactions to HSI. Furthermore, to understand the boundary conditions that promote HSI, which remains ignored in previous research (Lievens and De Paepe, 2004), we also examine the moderating roles that two situational variables, organizational interview norms and job complexity, play in interviewer reactions to HSI.

### 三、研究方法

A total of 292 interviewers participated in the current study. The participants were from 33 different companies in Taiwan, including manufacturing (11), financial (12), and service (10) industries. Among all participants, 203 were male (69%) and the mean age was 40.09 years old ( $SD = 7.58$ ). On average, the participants have conducted 33.38 interviews and 60.33% of them had received interviewer training.

Because large-sized companies are more likely to have formal human resources management systems (Barclay, 1999), we chose participants from companies with more than 150 employees or from subsidiary companies of large corporations. We first contacted the human resources representatives for their help in distributing the questionnaires to managers with

employment interviewer experiences. A total of 600 questionnaires were distributed and 418 were returned (response rate = 69.67%). Because organizational interview norms were computed using the composite score of the respondents within the same organization, only organizations with five or more respondents were retained for data analyses (Bryk and Raudenbush, 1992) in order to avoid possible instability in the data when the sample size within the unit is especially small. This resulted in a valid sample of 292 participants from 33 companies.

#### 四、結果與討論

This study found that interviewers' cognitive style is related to their reactions to HSI. Furthermore, for jobs higher in complexity and the higher the analytic orientation of interviewers, the more positive attitudes they have toward HSI. We also found that organizational interview norms not only affected interviewer reactions to HSI but also moderated the relationship between interviewers' needs for power and their reactions to HSI. Because interviewers' attitudes are key to successful interviews, future research should continue to examine other factors that may influence interviewer reactions to HSI, as well as to examine the boundary conditions of such relationships.

#### 五、計畫結果自評

本研究成果的學術或應用價值，可包括下列幾方面：(1)本研究所編製之面試官對高結構面談的反應及組織規範信念等量表，可供日後相關研究參考使用；(2)有別於過去面試官的研究多以

HR 部門人員為對象，由於直線主管也是組織中面談的執行者，且常負有甄選決策權，因此本研究以直線主管作為主要對象，以探討如何提升組織人員對良好甄選工具（即：高結構化面談）的實施意願；(3)過去少數有關探討高結構面談之影響因素的研究著重於面試官個人特徵 (Lievens & De Paepe, 2004)，而忽略情境因素所造成的影響。而本研究加入了兩個情境因素-工作複雜度、組織規範；另外並提出新的個人特徵-認知風格。本研究所得之結果將有助於組織瞭解面試官個人特徵及情境因素對於面談態度及執行意願的影響，進而能採取適當的措施來推行高結構化面談並發揮其效益。整體來說，本研究結果極適合在學術期刊上發表。

#### 六、參考文獻

1. Agor, W. H. (1986). The logic of intuitive decision making: A research-based approach for top management. New York: Quorum Books.
2. Ajzen I. (1991). The theory of planned behavior. Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 50, 179-211.
3. Allision, C. W. & Hayes, J. (1996). The Cognitive Style Index: a measure of Intuition-Analysis for organizational research. Journal of Management Studies, 33,119-135.
4. Barclay, J. M. (1999). Employee selection: A question of structure. Personnel Review, 28, 134-151.
5. Cable, D. M., & Judge, T. A. (1997). Interviewers' perceptions of person-organization fit and organizational selection decisions. Journal of Applied Psychology, 82, 546-561.

6. Campion, M.A., Palmer, D.K., & Campion, J.E. (1997). A review of structure in the selection interview. Personnel Psychology , 50, 655-702.
7. Chapman, D.S., & Rowe, P.M. (2002). The influence of videoconference technology, and interview structure on the recruiting function of the employment interview: A field experiment. International Journal of Selection and Assessment , 10,185-197.
8. Davis, F. D. (1989). Perceived usefulness,perceived ease of use and user acceptance of information technology. MIS Quarterly, 13,319-339.
9. Dipboye, R. L. (1994). Structured and unstructured selection interviews: Beyond the job-fit model, Research in Personnel and Human Resource Management , 12, 79-123.
10. Dipboye, R. L. (1997). Structured selection interviews: Why do they work? Why are they underutilized? In N. Anderson & P. Herriot (Eds.), International handbook of selection and assessment (pp. 455-473). New York: Wiley.
11. Gardner, W.L., & Martinko, M.J. (1996). Using the Myers-Briggs type indicator to study managers: A literature review and research agenda. Journal of Management, 22, 45-83.
12. Huffcutt, A. I., & Arthur, W. (1994). Hunter and Hunter (1984) revisited: Interview validity for entry-level jobs. Journal of Applied Psychology, 79, 184-190.
13. Huffcutt, A.I., & Woehr, D.J. (1999). Further analysis of employment interview validity: A quantitative evaluation of interviewer-related structuring methods. Journal of Organizational Behavior, 20, 549-560.
14. Eder, R.W. (1999). Contextual effects. In Eder RW, Harris MM (Eds.), The employment interview handbook (pp. 143-157). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
15. Fisher,B.L., & Howell, A.W. (2004). Beyond user acceptance: An examination of employee reactions to information technology systems. Human Resource Management, 43, 243-258.
16. Latham, G.P.,& Finnegan, B.J.(1993). Perceived practicality of unstructured , patterned, and situational interviews. In Schuler,H., Farr, J. L., & Smith, M. (Eds.), Personnel selection and assessment: Individual and organizational perspectives (pp.41-55). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
17. Lievens, F., & De Paepe, A. (2004). An empirical investigation of interviewer-related factors that discourage the use of high structure interviews. Journal of Organizational Behavior, 25, 29-46.
18. Messick, S. (1984). The nature of cognitive styles: problems and promise in educational practice. Educational Psychologist, 19, 59-74.
19. McDaniel, M.A., Whetzel ,D.L., Schmidt, F.L., & Maurer, S.D. (1994).The validity of employment interviews: A comprehensive review and meta-analysis. Journal of Applied Psychology, 79, 599-616.
20. Moscoso, S. (2000). Selection interview: A review of validity evidence, adverse impact and applicant reactions,

- International Journal of Selection and Assessment, 8 , 237-247.
21. Eder, R.W., & Harris, M.M. (1999). (Eds.) The employment interview handbook. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
  22. Harris, M.M. (1999). What is being measured? In Eder, R.W., Harris, M.M. (Eds.), The employment interview handbook (pp. 143-157). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
  23. Hunter, J.E. (1980). Test validation for 12000 jobs: An application of synthetic validity and validity generation to the General Aptitude Test Battery(GATB). Washington, DC : U.S. Employment Service.
  24. James, L. R., Demaree, R. G., & Wolf, G. (1984). Estimating within-group interrater reliability with and without response bias. Journal of Applied Psychology, 69, 85-98.
  25. Johns, G. (1991). Substantive and methodological constraints on behavior and attitudes in organizational research. Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 49, 80-104.
  26. Kossek, E. E. (1989). The acceptance of human resource innovation by multiple constituencies. Personnel Psychology, 42, 263-281.
  27. Kohn, L.S., & Dipboye, R. L. (1998). The effects of interview structure on recruiting outcomes. Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 28, 821-843.
  28. Harris, M.M., & Eder, R.W.(1999).The state of employment interview practice. In Eder RW, Harris, M.M. (Eds.), The employment interview handbook (pp. 369-398). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
  29. Posthuma, R.A., Morgeson, F.P., & Campion, M.A. (2002), Beyond employment interview validity: Personnel Psychology, 55, 1-81.
  30. Smith, P.C. & Kendall, L.M. (1963). Retranslation of expectations: An approach to the construction of unambiguous anchors for rating scales. Journal of Applied Psychology, 47, 149-155.
  31. Steers, R., & Braunstein, D. (1976), A behaviorally based measure of manifest needs in work settings. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 9, 251-66.
  32. Steiner, D. & Gilliland, S.W.(1996). Fairness reactions to personnel selection techniques in France and the United States. Journal of Applied Psychology, 81, 134-141.
  33. Terpstra, D.E. & Rozell, E. J. (1997). Why some potentially effective staffing practices are seldom used. Public Personnel Management, 26, 483-495.
  34. van der Zee, K. I., Bakker, P., & Bakker, A.B.(1992).Why are structured interviews so rarely used in personnel selection? Journal of Applied Psychology, 87, 176-184.
  35. Wilk, S., & Cappelli, P. (2003). Understanding the determinants of employer use of selection methods. Personnel Psychology , 56, 103-124..
  36. Wright, P.M., Lichtenfels, P.A., & Pursell, E.D. (1989). The structured interview: Additional studies and meta-analyses. Journal of Occupational Psychology, 62, 191-199.