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Abstract

In this experimental study, the effects of candidate-related (ethnicity), interviewer-related (perceived similarity and professional experience), and social factors (impression management) on the outcome of the job interview, and their inter-relationship is studied. Real recruiters and interviewers have participated, a setting infrequently been done. In addition, we broadened literature by investigating the interaction effect between ethnicity of the candidate and impression management tactics (ingratiation and self-presentation). Results show that Moroccan candidates are evaluated lower than Dutch candidates on Communication skills. Additionally, professional experience moderates this relationship, in such a way Moroccan candidates are evaluated lower when interviewers have little experience. When the interviewer feels he\(^1\) and the candidate are similar in values and personality, he will rate the candidate higher, compared with a non-similar candidate. Considering impression management tactics used by the candidate, it seems that after controlling for professional experience, using no tactics is far more effective than using ingratiation or self-presentation (i.e., exaggerating own suitability/competence). A three-way interaction between ethnicity, professional experience and impression management illustrates that Moroccan and Dutch candidates are benefited by using different impression management strategies, when confronted with interviewers with varying amounts of experience. Unexpected findings (i.e., perceived similarity) are discussed, including suggestions for further research.

\(^{1}\) or she
Theoretical background

Nowadays, the job interview is the most frequently used assessment method when hiring personnel (Cook, 2004). It has been a topic for scientific studies since approximately 1915 (Campion, Palmer & Campion, 1997). One of the first to publish a meta-analysis concerning the validity of this assessment method was Wagner (1949). He found that a standardized interview was best tool to obtain accurate results. Since then, the importance of a standardized procedure has been confirmed many times. Researchers also focused on possible threats against the validity of the interview. Biases of all sort may result in lower interview validities, which means candidates receive ratings and evaluations that do not represent their true capabilities. As the interview is used most frequently (Cook, 2004) and validated best, it is important to understand the influencing factors that may harm the validity of this method. Understanding and managing these factors leads to more candidates having the opportunity of a fair selection process. In addition, employers will be able to estimate the true potential of candidates, which may reduce unpleasant surprises afterwards and missing-out on human capital.

With this study, we will attempt to answer the following research question: “How do social factors, candidate-related factors, and recruiter-related factors influence the outcome of the job interview, and how do they interact?” Factors that will be investigated are: impression management tactics employed by the candidate (i.e., a social factor), ethnicity of the candidate (i.e., a candidate-related factor), and recruiters’ perceived similarity and professional experience (i.e., recruiter-related factors). We are among the first investigating interaction effects between ethnicity and impression management tactics. Furthermore, we focus on broadening the current literature on the topic of recruiter-related factors (perceived similarity and professional experience) by using real recruiters and interviewers as participants. Previous research has mainly been conducted with surrogates (students), and therefore are limited in ecological validity. In addition to the scientific value, extended knowledge about the factors above, and their role during the job interview, will provide practical tips for candidates as well as recruiters to improve result behavior.
The validity of the job interview

There are several types of job interviews. Often the standardized, or structured, interview is distinguished from the semi-structured and unstructured interview. Campion, Palmer and Campion (1997) listed several criteria for the ‘structuredness’ of an interview, including standardizing the type of questions (for example open or closed), and whether or not candidates are allowed to elaborate further after having answered questions. The possibility to ask all candidates the same questions defines a structured interview as well. In its structured form an interviewer will ask the same questions in the same order to each candidate. The second best option is asking the same questions, but also leaving room to vary the order and further discuss interesting topics. In practice, this type is used more often than the former one (Kok & De Jongh, 2004). At the lowest level, there is no structure at all. In an unstructured interview, the interviewer simply discusses what comes up in the conversation. As a consequence, unstructured interviews leave much more room for biases, something that undermines equal chances for all candidates (Van der Maessen de Sombreff & Abell, 2001).

Schmidt and Hunter (1998) confirmed Wagner’s (1949) conclusion that the more structured an interview is, the higher its predictive validity will be. Overall, structured job interviews have a predictive validity \( (r = .51) \), which is much higher compared to that of unstructured interviews \( (r = .38) \). Although this conclusion is well known among researchers, it seems that unstructured interviews are still used quite often. This may be a consequence of poorly trained selectors (Van der Maessen de Sombreff & Abell, 2001) or ambiguous motives of HR professionals (e.g. risk of boredom due to doing exactly the same, without any room for flexibility or autonomy) (Campion, et al., 1997). Highly structured interviews decrease the feeling of control the interviewer has over the process, the interview questions, and the decision-making (Lievens & DePaepe, 2004). After all, the process, questions and information for decision-making, is already fixed before even seeing the candidate. Interviewers may experience a lower perception of autonomy because of this. However, a prepared set of questions may also be seen as limiting bias, and therefore the right thing to do (Hakel, 1982, as described in Campion et al., 1997).
While interviews can vary in their format, they may also vary in the type of questions asked. In a situational interview, the interviewer mainly asks questions that start with ‘What if…’. For example, when a future sales manager has an interview, the interviewer could ask: ‘What if a customer starts complaining while the store is full of people?’ The interviewer evaluates the intended reaction of the candidate in that situation instead of one’s real reactions. These types of questions leave room for socially desirable responding. Behavioral description interviews (BDIs) are based on real experiences the candidate has had in his or her life. Instead of a hypothetical situation, the candidate is asked to describe his or her behavior in a previous situation, based on the notion that behavior in the past is a valid predictor for future behavior (Janz, 1989). The STAR (Situation Task Action Result) -method is a tactic often used during BDI’s. The STAR-method depends on asking about a concrete situation and elaborating on unclear issues, which reduces the opportunity to fake (Derycke, 1997). The candidate recalls a situation in which he or she used a specific competency, for example pro-activeness. The interviewer then needs to establish his or her role (task) in this situation (what were you expected to do?), his or her actions (what did you do?), and the result (how did it work out?).

The predictive validity of the situational interview ranges from .27 to .32 for low and medium complexity jobs. However, in the case of a highly complex job, the situational interview is less suited, as its validity drops to .17. In the latter situation, the behavioral interview is a better method, with a validity of .31 (Huffcutt et al., 2004). Other researchers found a corrected validity of .45 for the situational interview and .56 for the behavioral interview (Taylor & Small, 2002). Most researchers and practitioners recommend the behavioral interview because of the reduced opportunity of faking by candidates (Derycke, 1997).
Factors influencing the validity of job interviews

We have now established some of the psychometric characteristics of the job interview as an assessment method. Over the past years, researchers have tried to enhance the validity of the job interview by identifying factors that may (adversely) impact its validity, more specifically; that may nuance validity and in what way. This approach allows for a more qualitative analysis. In the most recent meta-analysis about the job interview (Posthuma, Morgeson & Campion, 2002) an overview of several factors that may influence the interview outcome has been made, including social factors.

Social factors
Social factors are factors that characterize the interaction between the interviewer and the candidate (Posthuma et al., 2002). During the interview, both the interviewer and the candidate exchange a lot of verbal information as well as non-verbal information. Information type and impression management (IM) tactics are two social factors that will be discussed more thoroughly, before elaborating on individual difference factors of the candidate and interviewer.

Verbal and Non-verbal information
In the literature, the effects of verbal cues and the impact of non-verbal cues during the job interview have been investigated extensively. Overall researchers agree about the fact that they both influence interview outcomes (Posthuma et al., 2002). One of the aspects of verbal behavior that has been studied, besides the actual content of the message, is the candidate’s voice. Before recent studies showed attractive people being viewed more positively and are more likely to be hired (e.g., Hosoda, Stone-Romero, & Coats, 2003), Miyake and Zuckerman (1993) proposed that voice may play a role in the attractiveness of a person, and therefore evaluations of that person. Indeed a positive relationship appeared to exist between the perceived attractiveness of the speaker’s voice and the listeners' perceived similarity to the speaker. Thus, the voice of a person may affect whether the listener views the person as similar or not. Voice is not something we often focus our explicit attention on, because the content of the message is what we are supposed to pick up. Content
information is an important (and legitimate) source of information for interviewers, however, as illustrated interviewers apparently also focus on illegitimate sources of information such as pitch of the voice.

Another illegitimate source of information may be non-verbal information cues (like gaze, smile, hand movements). Burnett and Motowidlo (1998) found a significant positive correlation between performance-judgments made on visual information only and verbal information only. This implies that interviewers use both types of information during the interview. More interestingly, they discovered that visual information, like attractiveness and gaze, affects ratings of several managerial competencies. This means that these types of information help interviewers assess competencies such as planning and organizing. Especially the candidate’s gaze and attractiveness influenced these ratings.

The effect of visual/non-verbal information on interviewers’ judgments seems to be mediated by interpersonal interactions (DeGroot & Motowidlo, 1999). When interviewers are confronted with visual cues, they experience emotional reactions based on what they infer about the candidate, for example, they experience feelings of trust. These inferences can color the judgment of the interviewer. In a recent study, DeGroot and Gooty (2009) examined whether these visual cues could be used to attribute personality traits (Big5). They found that interviewers are able to attribute traits like conscientiousness, based on visual cues like attractiveness and smiling. Tucker and Friedman (1993) demonstrated a moderating effect of gender. They showed that in a social interaction, friendly, dominant females are perceived to have an aggressive personality. This was not the case for the men.

Overall, verbal and non-verbal information each provide interviewers with valuable information. The best prediction of job success is made when both types of information are present (Posthuma et al., 2002). However, non-verbal information and non-relevant verbal information may be a source for bias, since it often is not related to job relevant qualifications. Interviewers therefore have to be aware of such effects and understand the processes that occur during the information transfer. In addition social interaction holds room for other biases.

**Impression management tactics**

Since the job interview implies an interaction between two people, it is not surprising that several strategies exist that may affect this social interaction. Impression
Impression management (IM) is defined as a set of behaviors people use to influence the impression they make on others (Ellis, West, Ryan, & Deshon, 2002) with the goal to leave a positive impression. Job candidates particularly employ IM-tactics during their job interview, hoping to receive positive evaluations (Gilmore & Ferris, 1989).

**Figure 1.** Schematic overview of IM-tactics.

IM-tactics can be categorized as verbal or non-verbal, and within these two categories further distinctions can be made (see Figure 1 for a schematic overview) (Ellis et al., 2002). Non-verbal IM-tactics include for example, dress code, eye contact, and as discussed above, smiling and gesture. As shown in Figure 1, verbal IM-tactics can be either assertive or defensive. The use of these tactics depends on the candidate’s goal. When one’s goal is to protect one’s image, defensive tactics will be employed. Examples include making excuses, apologizing, and justifying one’s actions. When the goal is to portray a positive image of oneself, for example (e.g., as being competent for the job) assertive tactics will be used. Defensive tactics have not been studied often on an individual level, the focus lies more on assertive strategies (Bolino, Kacmar, Turnley & Gilstrap, 2008). There are different types of assertive strategies. One can focus on the target (i.e., other-focused IM-tactics, such as ingratiation) or on oneself (i.e., self-focused IM-tactics, such as self-presentation) (Peeters & Lievens, 2006). The two tactics that have been studied most in personnel selection research are self-presentation and ingratiation. Self-presentation is defined
as letting the interviewer know about accomplishments and experiences to appear competent; it is, therefore, categorized as self-focused. Other-focused tactics, including ingratiating, are meant to enhance the interpersonal relationship between the candidate and the interviewer, for example by making compliments (Bolino et al., 2008).

Several studies confirmed the positive influence of using IM-tactics on interview outcomes (Higgins, Judge, & Ferris 2003; Higgins & Judge, 2004; Peeters & Lievens, 2006). In general, candidates that use verbal IM-tactics are evaluated as more suitable for the job. Self-presentation and ingratiating (both being verbal, assertive tactics) are most studied and also seem to be used most often by candidates (Stevens & Kristof, 1995). Because these two tactics will be studied in this thesis, from here on further ingratiating and self-presentation are not explicitly specified under IM-tactics. Based upon this evidence, the following hypothesis is developed.

**Hypothesis 1a.** Candidates that employ assertive impression management-tactics will be evaluated more positively than candidates that do not employ such tactics, and are otherwise equally suitable for the job.

Researchers also focused on the differences between these IM-tactics. In a meta-analysis, Higgins and his colleagues (2003) found that ingratiating but not self-presentation, leads to positive evaluations. Self-presentation can be effective, but only in very specific circumstances, for example in situations where it is difficult to verify the authenticity of the answer. However, Proost, Schreurs, De Witte, and Derous (in press) showed that a combination of self-presentation and ingratiating had the best effect on interviewer ratings and action recommendations (e.g. reject the candidate/ invite for a second interview). The second best effects were found for self-promotional IM-tactics and after that for ingratiating. Other studies, however, state that self-focused tactics are most effective in selection contexts (Peeters & Lievens, 2006). It is possible that moderators explain these different results. For example, individuals may have a preset dispositional preference, due to their personality and therefore may use certain tactics more often (Van Iddinke, McFarland, & Raymark, 2008). Individuals with high levels of self-monitoring may be highly aware of their behavior and may be able to adjust the image they portray to the particular situation (Bolino & Turnley, 2003; Snyder & Copeland, 1989). Because of their self-monitoring
capacities, they may implement IM-tactics in a more effective way (Turnley & Bolino, 2001). Besides personality characteristics, the effectiveness of a tactic may also depend on the type of interview questions. Situational questions elicit ingratiation tactics, where behavioral questions are often answered using self-presentation tactics (Ellis et al., 2002). In the Netherlands, behavioral interviews are encouraged to be used because of its validity and reduced opportunity to fake answers (Derycke, 1997), therefore, in this thesis, STAR questions (see further) are included in the stimulus material. Therefore, the following hypothesis is formulated:

**Hypothesis 1b.** During behavioral-based interviews, candidates that employ self-promotional IM-tactics will be evaluated more positively than candidates that employ ingratiation IM-tactics, who are otherwise equally suitable for the job.

**Individual difference factors**

Individual difference factors are characteristics that differ between individuals, like gender, ethnicity, personality, and other inter-individual factors. Researchers have always been interested in the influence of such factors on interview outcomes (Posthuma et al., 2002). Within the job interview, several characteristics of the candidate and the interviewer may affect the interview process and outcomes.

**Candidate characteristics**

Nowadays many selection strategies include assessing to some extent personality (De Fruyt et al., 2009) to predict job performance. Since personality is a valid predictor of job performance (in combination with other methods like cognitive ability), its use and influence on selection methods is not unexpected (Schmidt & Hunter, 1998). As discussed, interviewers also assess candidates’ personality during the job interview; as such, inferred personality traits may influence interview outcomes. However, other candidate characteristics, such as e.g. candidate appearance, which are not job-related, valid predictors, may still influence interview outcomes.

_Candidate appearance_ is a well-studied characteristic, and following the recent publications an important one. Hosoda and colleagues (2003) indicate that attractive individuals score higher on several job-related outcomes, like hiring recommendations, ranking, performance evaluations, and even income (Judge, Hurst
& Simon, 2009). Scientists tested several theories about appearance. One of them is the implicit personality theory (Asch, 1946). This theory explains how individuals form their impressions of others. According to Asch (1946) people subconsciously connect personal attributes to each other, as if they belong together, like appearance and successfulness. An example of this is the ‘what’s-beautiful-is-good stereotype’ (Eagly, Ashmore, Makhijani & Longo, 1991). According to this stereotype, individuals associate beauty or attractiveness, with positive/good attributes. Therefore, when an interviewer assesses a very attractive candidate, he or she may associate this candidate with positive job-outcomes. While one can somewhat change ones beauty, other appearance cues we can’t, like ones background.

**Ethnicity**

A characteristic candidates often can’t hide from others is their ethnicity or race. Technically, race is a biological term, while ethnicity stems from political and social origins. Researchers use the words race and ethnicity mostly interchangeably. However, since race reflects a group of beings that are genetically equal (Van Dale Online, 2009), it seems that the differences between individuals as described in prejudice and racism literature rather reflect social and political influences. Therefore, ethnicity is a better term to use, referring to a feeling of connectedness between individuals, based upon race, culture, language, religion, nationality, and physical appearance (Universiteit van Amsterdam, 2009).

Ethnicity has always been a topic of interest in personnel selection literature. In general, researchers conclude that belonging to a minority group has more often a negative than positive effect on selection outcomes. Blacks, homosexuals, and women are the groups often identified as victims of hiring discrimination (Cook, 2004). According to the stereotype literature, the chances of discrimination during selection are higher when there is little known about individual information of the candidate. This means that the danger lies in the initial stages of selection, i.e. resume screening and job interviews. An example of such a danger is the ethnic bias, which means we view members of our own ethnic group as more positive than those belonging to other ethnic groups (Tajfel & Turner, 1986).

In this thesis, we are particularly interested in one ethnic minority group, namely Dutch-Moroccans. In most Western countries, migrants with Moroccan and Turkish backgrounds are currently more often stereotyped and discriminated against.
Bovenkerk, Gras and Ramsoedh (1995) investigated employment opportunities of migrant workers in the Netherlands. Their audit study led them to conclude that in comparison with the Dutch candidates, candidates with an Moroccan background experienced more discrimination during the initial stages of selection (pre-interview and after the interview). Although in the Netherlands, efforts, like affirmative action and diversity policies are made to counter discrimination against minorities, recent studies also show that Moroccan candidates still experience discrimination.

The conclusions of Bovenkerk and his colleagues (1995), have been experimentally replicated in two studies done by Derous (2007). It appears that candidates with a Moroccan name get fewer callbacks and lower job suitability ratings, irrespective of the job type (degree of customer contact), gender and socio-economical status. Given the biases that may occur, and recent studies, we expect that, in relation to a low-level job, Moroccan candidates who are as equally suitable for the job as Dutch candidates, will receive lower interview ratings.

**Hypothesis 2.** Moroccan candidates will be evaluated more negatively than Dutch candidates while they are otherwise equally suitable for the job.

In relation to IM, several researchers have studied which type of individuals use certain tactics. As discussed, individuals who are classified as high self-monitors; i.e. are aware of the effects of their behavior on their surroundings (Snyder & Copeland, 1989), use IM-tactics more effectively (Turnley & Bolino, 2001). In addition, it seems that at least in a group setting men use far more tactics than women, and using too many tactics is perceived as less positive, than using no tactics at all or just using tactics to create a positive image in their group members (Bolino & Turnley, 2003). However, in a more individual setting, such as a job-interview, using two tactics (ingratiation and self-promotion) can lead to more positive results than one, or no tactics at all (Proost et al., in press). These findings suggest that interviewers may have concepts about which individuals engage in different types of impression management behavior. It can be hypothesized that when this behavior does not fit the interviewers’ image of the interviewee, the interviewee may be perceived as less authentic. The lack of authenticity may result in evaluations that are more negative.

As far as we know, no previous research has investigated interviewers’ perception of impression management effectiveness of candidates with different
ethnic backgrounds. In the Netherlands, about one fifth of the working population has a non-Dutch ethничal background (CBS, 2009). The Netherlands is, according to Hofstede’s (1980) organizational culture categories, classified as an individualistic country. Individuals of such countries have a different feeling of selfhood, than individuals with a more collectivistic background, like in more collectivistic countries, such as Morocco. In individualistic countries, individuals feel they are independent and unique; they are encouraged to express themselves and stand out in a crowd. However, in more collectivistic countries, the self is viewed as interdependent of others. The focus lies on fitting in, and having good social relationships (Kunda, 1999).

Since the immigration of Moroccan labor workers, the amount of Dutch-Moroccans has grown (CBS, 2010). Living in the Netherlands, results to some degree in cultural transmission (Phalet & Schönplug, 2001). In their study, Phalet and Schönplug (2001), analyzed cultural transmission in Dutch-Moroccans. They concluded that values regarding individualism were difficultly passed on through generations. Only children, whose parents stimulated their autonomy, were less collectivistic than their parents were. It can be safely said that regarding (e.g.) family and group focus, Dutch-Moroccans value different values than native Dutch. The attitudes (or perception) of native Dutch about Dutch-Moroccans includes words like, ‘never alone’ and ‘traditional’ (Pinto, 2004). There seems to be a clear distinction in gender roles. Native Dutch respondents perceive male Dutch-Moroccans to be the head provider, and female Dutch-Moroccans to be the caretaker of the family (Pinto, 2004).

Within the impression management strategies, self-promotion has a more ‘individualistic’ focus and ingratiation, is more ‘group/other’ oriented. Literature on authenticity shows that individuals consider being true to ones nature, or ‘real’, as a determining factor for being trusted (e.g. Gillath, Sesko, Shaver & Chun, 2010). It is to be expected that when a native Dutch interviewer perceives a Dutch-Moroccan candidate as being more focused on collectivistic values (especially female Dutch-Moroccan) (Pinto, 2004), the candidate may appear less natural when he or she engages in self-presentation. Following this line of reasoning, we expect that Dutch interviewers will rate Dutch-Moroccan candidates, who use self-presentation during the interview, lower compared with Dutch candidates using self-presentation. This moderation will be tested in Hypothesis 3.
Hypothesis 3. Moroccan candidates, who employ the impression management-tactic self-presentation, will be evaluated more negatively, than Dutch candidates who employ self-presentation tactics and Dutch and Moroccan candidates who use ingratiation.

Interviewer characteristics

In the following section two interviewer-related factors will be discussed that may interact with the topics and effects discussed above, namely the interviewers’ perceived similarity and professional experience.

Perceived similarity

Some authors consider similarity to be a social factor (Posthuma et al., 2002), it may however also be placed under interviewer characteristics. During the interview, perceived similarity requires two individuals, the interviewer and candidate, who interact with each other. Because of the final decision power of the interviewer, the influence of perceived similarity will be discussed from the viewpoint of the interviewer; as an interviewer characteristic.

According to the perceived similarity hypothesis, the interviewer will give a more positive evaluation if he or she can identify with the candidate (Sears & Rowe, 2003). Perceived similarity is very subjective, and stems from similarities in values, personality and behavior (Zellmer-Bruhn, Maloney, Bhappu, & Salvador, 2008). Research on perceived similarity has been done in the context of manager-subordinate relationships and teams. Results show that perceived similarity between managers and subordinates leads to more positive performance appraisals (Pulakos & Wexley, 1983). In addition, perceived similarity in teams seems more important than actual demographic similarity between team members. Therefore, the conclusion can be drawn that not the actual similarity, but the way individuals perceive the similarity is important (Harrison, Price, Gavin, & Florey, 2002).

In selection contexts, perceived similarity between the interviewer and candidate may influence interviewer’s judgments (Graves, 1993; Sears & Rowe, 2003). First, people use their own behavior as a reference point when judging others, even when they have no experience with the topic to be judged (Dunning & Hayes,
1996). It is possible that interviewers see themselves as good employees and use their own behaviors as reference point (Ferris & Judge, 1991). Chen, Lee, and Yeh (2008) confirmed in their study that the more similar the recruiters felt to the candidate (perceived similarity), the better the interviewer estimated the person-job fit of the candidate. Based on this literature, we expect candidates who are perceived to be similar by the interviewer to score higher after the interview, which is postulated in Hypothesis 4a.

**Hypothesis 4a.** Candidates will receive higher interview scores, when the interviewer perceives himself as more similar to the candidate than less.

Furthermore, a relationship between IM-tactics and perceived similarity has been established. Specifically Chen and his colleagues (2008) discovered that candidates who employed ingratiation were seen by the interviewer as more similar to themselves in values and beliefs. Consequently, they received higher performance appraisals (e.g. person-organization fit). Ingratiation by itself had no direct influence on person-organization fit (Chen et al., 2008). Although the researchers did measure other variables, such as hiring recommendation and job offer, they did not study the direct relationship between ingratiation and the outcome measures, nor the moderating influence of similarity. As discussed earlier, ingratiation and self-presentation do seem to influence interview ratings (Higgins, 2003; Proost et al., in press). We propose that perceived similarity acts as a moderator in this relationship, in such a way that high perceived similarity will lead to more positive effects of IM-tactics.

**Hypothesis 4b.** Perceived similarity of the interviewer with the candidate, will moderate the relationship between IM-tactics of the candidate and the interview outcome, in such a way that candidates using a tactic (self-presentation or ingratiation) will receive higher scores when perceived similarity is high.

Social identity theory (Tajfel & Turner, 1986) offers a more suitable approach when studying the moderating influence of similarity on the relationship between ethnicity and interview ratings. According to the theory, we put people constantly in social
categories, such as women, sports player, Moroccans, etc. These categories often go together with stereotypes, or beliefs about the group (Hamilton & Sherman, 1994). Individuals also categorize themselves and consider themselves as belonging to an “in-group”. In-groups contrast with “out-groups”, which are the groups ‘others who are different’ belong in. In-group – out-group distinctions are made upon race, ethnicity, gender, religion. Since ones self-esteem is related to group membership, people will put effort in keeping-up their group and self-esteem. One way to do this, is labeling the out-group members as negative and the in-group as positive, often called “in-group favoritism”. Researchers confirmed this effect in many settings (Dasgupta, 2004). Following this reasoning, when one feels similar to someone, that person may be viewed as belonging to the in-group and will be evaluated positively. A very dissimilar individual may be categorized as an out-group member and as such can be viewed more negatively than in-group members.

Based on the above, the amount of ‘in-group favoritism’ may function as a buffer during the interview in such a way that members of the in-group will be forgiven for their ‘shortcomings’ (e.g. ethnicity), while the same shortcomings will be weighted more heavily (i.e., negatively) when belonging to an out-group. A recent study did not find any effects of perceived similarity on the relationship between ethnicity and interview ratings. The perceived similarity used, was defined as similar in beliefs and values (De Meijer, Born, Van Loon, Van der Molen, in press). Therefore, in this study we use the concept of ethnic identification to illustrate how much individuals feel as ‘belonging to the ethnic in-group’ (Van Heelsum, 1997). Ethnic identity is a social identity (Tajfel & Turner, 1996) focused on similar descent, history of cultural heritage (Phinney, 1996) (e.g. language, religion) (Van Heelsum, 1997). The more the members identify themselves with their ethnic in-group, the greater they experience the difference between them and other ethnic (out-)groups, and consequently feel dissimilar to them. Therefore, we expect perceived similarity (operationalized as ethnic identity) to moderate the relationship between the ethnicity of the candidate and interview scores. When interviewers feel similar (do not identify much with their own in-group), Moroccan candidates will receive higher interview scores, than when the interviewer feels dissimilar (Hypothesis 4c).

Furthermore, as far as we know, there is no published literature on this specific topic, but based on studies confirming parts of the relationship, we expect the perception of similarity to affect the interaction between ethnicity, impression
management and interview scores in such a way Moroccan candidates will benefit from using self-presentation when interviewers identify less with their own in-group (Dutch) (Hypothesis 4d).

Hypothesis 4c. Ethnic identification of the interviewer, will moderate the relationship between Ethnicity of the candidate and the interview outcome, in such a way that Moroccan candidates will receive higher scores when interviewers identify less with their own ethnic background.

Hypothesis 4d. Ethnicity, IM-tactics and Ethnic identification will interact in such a way that self-presentation will have a more positive effect on evaluations of Moroccan candidates, when Ethnic identification of the interviewer is lower

Professional experience
Students are often compared with actual professional interviewers (Lievens & Peeters, 2008; Lopes & Fletcher, 2004). Yet, research among surrogate participants (like students) often has yielded inconclusive evidence which might be attributed to the specific methodology used. Despite advantages of using lab studies among students like testing and controlling for contingencies that are difficult to control for among real recruiters, ecological validity will suffer. For instance, it might not be possible to discover and discuss the effect of interviewer experience on ratings as well as the predictive validity of interview ratings. Differences in professional experience among trained professionals are worth considering and have not been investigated extensively. Hence, this study will contribute to existing research by administering a policy-capturing study among real interviewers.

During their work, interviewers gain knowledge and extend their frameworks and cognitive schemes (Graves, 1993). One would expect this to have a positive effect on reducing biases and ease in interviewing. Gehrlein, Dipboye and Shahani (1993) confirmed this relationship: experienced interviewers’ ratings provided more valid grade point average (GPA) predictions, compared to less experienced interviewers. De Meijer and colleagues (2007) also found that recruiters belonging to the majority group, are less experienced with assessing ethnic minority candidates, and therefore risk more biased response. In addition, the experience of
the interviewer may affect the behavior of candidates. The more experienced interviewers were, the fewer candidates used the IM-tactic ‘entitlements’; i.e. falsely claiming their responsibility over situations (Delery & Kacmar, 1998). Concerning the professional experience of the interviewer, three hypotheses have been postulated.

**Hypothesis 5a.** The professional experience of the interviewer will moderate the relationship between the impression management-tactics and interview outcome, in such a way that interview scores will be more inflated when interviewers are less experienced.

**Hypothesis 5b.** The professional experience of the interviewer will moderate the relationship between the ethnicity of the candidate and interview outcome, in such a way that interview scores will be lower for Moroccan candidates compared to Dutch applicants when interviewers are less experienced.

**Hypothesis 5c:** Ethnicity, impression management and professional experience will interact in such a way that self-presentation will have a more positive effect on evaluations of Moroccan candidates when interviewers have less professional experience.
**Study summary**

This study will focus on several influencing factors in the candidate, the interviewer and the social process between them, that could affect the validity of the job interview. The study hypotheses are schematically presented in Figure 2. We will investigate evaluation of four specific competencies; problem analysis, convincing, planning and organizing and communication skills. Also a more general evaluation and intended actions of the interviewer are included in the evaluation. With regard to the independent variables, candidate and interviewer-related factors will be tested as well as a social factor. The social hypothesis addresses the use of IM-tactics (Hypothesis 1; H1). The candidate-related hypothesis concerns the ethnicity of the candidate (Hypothesis 2; H2). The interaction between candidates with different ethnical backgrounds will be for the first time be investigated via the use of IM-tactics (Hypothesis 3; H3). The moderating effect of two interviewer-related characteristics is investigated; interviewers’ perceived similarity to the candidate (Hypothesis 4; H4), and professional experience (Hypothesis 5; H5).

Figure 2. Schematic overview of study hypotheses.
Method

Participants

For this study, data were collected from 61 HR-professionals in several large recruitment companies with locations throughout the Netherlands. Participants were randomly assigned to the experimental conditions (see further; stimulus material). The average age of the participants was 36.39 years ($SD = 10.39$), 52.5% was male and 47.5% was female. One participant indicated having a different ethnic background than Dutch (Moroccan), two participants perceived themselves as having both Dutch and ethnic roots (i.e., Dutch-Antilleans). Professions of the participants varied between recruiter, assessment consultant, psychologist, advisor and intermediary, 13% indicated having a managerial position. About 80% of them worked full-time, the other 20% either worked part-time or combined work with study. Roughly 72% of the participants had a masters’ degree, 26% had a bachelors’ degree$^2$, and the rest of the participants had intermediate vocational training$^3$.

Design and procedure

We used for this thesis a 3 (IM-tactic: ingratiation vs. self-presentation vs. control) $\times$ 2 (Ethnicity: Dutch vs. Moroccan) between-subject design, with Professional experience and Perceived similarity as covariates. IM-tactic was manipulated by using three different versions of the job interview (ingratiation, self-presentation and no tactic; control), participants were confronted with during the exercise. Ethnicity (Dutch and Moroccan) was manipulated through simulation using two actresses instead of real candidates (see further; stimulus material). Perceived similarity and Professional experience were measured once in the questionnaire (see further; measures).

Participants were approached via e-mail, telephone or face-to-face; they received no reimbursement for their participation. After consenting, they received an invitation that contained an instruction and the internet-link to the exercise. At no point, the real purpose of the study was mentioned to minimize social desirable

---

$^2$ Dutch equivalent: hbo-niveau

$^3$ Dutch equivalent: mbo-niveau
responding. Information about the background of the study was limited to the notion it was a study about job-interviews.

When participants followed the link, they would read a short introduction where they would be explained about their role and task (i.e., a interviewer evaluating a candidate for a job). Then they would see the job profile and resume of the candidate, and they would be instructed to study these thoroughly. After studying, participants were presented with a video-clip of a fragment from the job-interview. Thereafter the participants were asked to fill-out a questionnaire. Participants were thanked for their efforts. No feedback about their performance was given. The total exercise took approximately 25 to 30 minutes. Finally, participants were given the opportunity to stay up-to-date about the study, they were also asked if they could be approached for participation in future studies.

**Stimulus materials**

*Film fragments.* Stimulus material for this study was a short fragment of a job-interview between an interviewer (only voice) and a candidate. A recent meta-analysis (Barrick, Shaffer, & DeGrassi, 2009) showed no differences between a ‘real’ interview setting and a ‘mock’ interview. Research demonstrated sex as a possible confounding variable: men and women tend to use different IM-tactics and a different amount of these (Bolino & Turnley, 2003). Because these sex effects were not part of this study, we controlled for it by only interviewing one female candidate. There were six experimental conditions. Therefore, six different film fragments/versions were developed and recorded. The duration of each fragment was approximately ten minutes. IM-tactics and the ethnic background of the candidate were manipulated in each version; see Table 1 for a more detailed schematic overview.
Table 1.
Variation of IM tactics and ethnic background in video fragments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Version</th>
<th>IM tactic</th>
<th>Ethnic background</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Duration (minutes)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Self-promotion</td>
<td>Dutch</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>10.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Ingratiation</td>
<td>Dutch</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>10.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>None (control)</td>
<td>Dutch</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>8.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Self-promotion</td>
<td>Moroccan</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>10.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Ingratiation</td>
<td>Moroccan</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>11.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>None (control)</td>
<td>Moroccan</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>9.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The fragments consisted of a short introduction in which the interviewer briefly explained the procedure and content of the job-interview. Then the candidate was asked about her motivation for the job. After her answer, which was held constant across versions, the screen turned black to make it seem as if the interviewer and candidate discussed prior work experiences. The interviewer then moved on to the STAR-method for assessing three job-competencies: problem analysis, convincing, and planning and organizing. The interviewer concluded the interview, after these questions were answered.

The scripts of the fragments were written-out for each version. In the general script (control), no explicit marks were made that might be considered as self-promotion or ingratiation. In the script for the self-promotion conditions, several answers differed so that it seemed that the candidate was using that particular IM-tactic (i.e., enhancing suitability). The same procedure was followed for the ingratiation conditions, where the candidate tried to compliment the interviewer and the recruiting organization.

Some examples of different answers across different tactics are given below (see Appendix A for the full scripts):

- **Question:** ‘Shall we make an appointment for the 28th?’

  **Answer [control/ingratiation]:** ‘Yes, that’s fine by me. What time did you have in mind?’

  **Answer [self-promotion]:** ‘Well, as you may understand I have many important appointments in my current job. But luckily I can make it that day, what time did you have in mind?’
- Question: ‘You just told me that you had to write several reports about budgets and this requires a lot of information processing. How do you deal with that information, can you give an example?’

Answer [control/self-presentation]: ‘Let me think, well the situation was ….’

Answer [ingratiation]: ‘HmmHmm, let me think, yes that is indeed a very important part of this job also. Very sharply seen! Well the situation was ….’

In addition to the IM-tactics the candidate used, the ethnic background of the candidate was manipulated. The control-, ingratiation-, and self-promotion condition was filmed with a Dutch actress and a Moroccan actress. They were selected on the basis of their age and appearances. The Dutch actress was 25 years old and the Moroccan actress’s age was 27 years. They both spoke fluently Dutch and were dressed as if they went to a real job interview (formal and without any typical ethnic elements). Both the actresses had some experience with acting, but they weren’t professionals. The scripts were sent to them two weeks before the recording date, so they had enough time to prepare themselves for the interview. They also received instructions about their wardrobe and also some general pointers for acting the different IM-tactics.

All six fragments were recorded on the same day and the actresses both received a financial reward for their efforts. Recording took place in a video-room in the Erasmus Behavioral Lab. The interviewer was placed so that he wasn’t caught on the video. The candidate sat on a chair behind a table with only the upper-part of the body being visible on screen.

**Resume and job profile.** A resume and a job profile were also developed for this study. These were held constant across conditions. The job that the candidate applied for was that of assistant controller, a back-office job that requires a bachelor’s degree. By choosing these settings, it was possible to keep the moderating effect of job level (Hosoda et al., 2003) under control (medium education). In addition, a back-office job was chosen to control for any inferences participants could make about possible client-contact. A motive for excluding minority candidates can be the lower level of communicating skills (Kruisbergen & Feld, 2002). A front-office job requires often more verbal communication. Research showed that minority group members
were more often discriminated against, when applying for front-office jobs compared with back-office jobs (De Beijl, 2000).

Several real job profiles of assistant controllers were studied to develop a job profile. The job profile (see Appendix B) consists of information about the mock telecommunication organization, the place in the organization, content of the job, job competencies and job demands. The resume of the candidate was matched to the job requirements, so that, regarding background (work experience) and education, the candidate was a suitable candidate. The resume consisted of previous work experiences, education, and other information (e.g. possession of a driver's license). Personal information was left out and limited to the age and gender of the candidate.

Measures

Evaluation of candidates: Competencies (specific). To evaluate the candidate, participants had to score the candidate on the job-related competencies. For each competency they were asked to rate the candidate on a scale from 1 (not good) to 6 (very good). These competencies were: problem analysis, convincing, planning and organizing and communication skills. The question asked was: “Rate the candidate on the four competencies you see below. You can choose from the answers: not good, less good, average, good and very good.” Participants could click on each competency to check its definition. These four items together measured the overall behavioral competency level. The correlations between the items (see Table 2) are all found to be significantly positive ones ($p = .05$). The Cronbach’s Alpha ($\alpha = .71$), indicates a moderate reliability. After an explorative factor analysis, all four items loaded positive on one factor, which explained 53.5% of the variance. The mean score on the variable ‘Competency evaluation’ was 3.30, with a standard deviation of 0.63. This means, that on average participants gave an average rating to candidates.

Evaluation of candidates: Overall job suitability. Besides the Competency evaluation, participants were also asked to give an overall job suitability evaluation. In previous research, the most commonly used method (see for example Derous, Nguyen, & Ryan, 2009; Peeters & Lievens, 2006; Gilmore & Ferris, 1989; Higgins & Judge, 2004; Stevens & Kristof, 1995), instead of using behavioral anchors as is
done when they rate their competency skills. Four items, scored on a scale from 1 (not good at all) to 6 (very good), measured the overall job qualification of the candidates (Peeters & Lievens, 2006). Examples of items are: ‘Based on the interview, how do you rate the overall qualifications of the candidate for this job?’ and ‘How suitable is this candidate for the job of assistant controller?’. These four items composed the Overall job suitability of the candidate. This measure had a good reliability (α = .87). The average score on this measure was about the same as the Competency evaluation, M = 3.34 (SD = 0.68). Explorative factor analysis showed that all four items loaded on one factor, which explained 72.82% of the variance. All four items were positively related to each other (p < .001), see Table 2.

**Evaluation of candidates: Future actions.** The final evaluation variable is about Future actions. The difference with the other two evaluation measures, is that participants have to indicate here their intentions. According to the Theory of planned behavior (Terry & O'Leary, 1995) a person’s intentions are a reliable predictor of their actions. Participants were asked to answer three questions on a 5-point Likert-type scale where they had to estimate the chance (1 = < 20%; 5 = > 80%) they would; 1. Invite this candidate to a second interview, 2. Employ the candidate, and 3. Reject the candidate (contra-indicative) (Stevens & Kristof, 1995; Proost et al., in press). The items were highly intercorrelated (positively) and were all significant (p < .001). Explorative factor analysis further showed that all items loaded positively on one factor, which explained 90.56% of the total variance. The averaged score on this measure was 3.39 (SD = 1.10), and the scale has a very high reliability (α = .95).
### Table 2.

**Reliability, inter-item and scale correlations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Competency evaluation</strong></td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>.71*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Problem analysis</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>.74**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Convincing</td>
<td>2.49</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>.81**</td>
<td>.47**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Communication skills</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>.74**</td>
<td>.38**</td>
<td>.49**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Organizing</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>.62**</td>
<td>.34**</td>
<td>.32*</td>
<td>.26*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6. Overall evaluation</strong></td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>.84**</td>
<td>.58**</td>
<td>.60**</td>
<td>.77**</td>
<td>.49**</td>
<td>.87*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Over1</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>.76**</td>
<td>.57**</td>
<td>.52**</td>
<td>.63**</td>
<td>.51**</td>
<td>.89**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Over2</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>.68**</td>
<td>.47**</td>
<td>.49**</td>
<td>.67**</td>
<td>.34**</td>
<td>.85**</td>
<td>.65**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Over3</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>.66**</td>
<td>.37**</td>
<td>.47**</td>
<td>.74**</td>
<td>.35**</td>
<td>.84**</td>
<td>.62**</td>
<td>.67**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Over4</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>.77**</td>
<td>.59**</td>
<td>.59**</td>
<td>.58**</td>
<td>.48**</td>
<td>.84**</td>
<td>.77**</td>
<td>.59**</td>
<td>.52**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>11. Future actions</strong></td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>.72**</td>
<td>.49**</td>
<td>.56**</td>
<td>.66**</td>
<td>.36**</td>
<td>.86**</td>
<td>.71**</td>
<td>.75**</td>
<td>.71**</td>
<td>.78**</td>
<td>.95*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Fut1</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>.68**</td>
<td>.45**</td>
<td>.53**</td>
<td>.66**</td>
<td>.33**</td>
<td>.84**</td>
<td>.65**</td>
<td>.80**</td>
<td>.69**</td>
<td>.73**</td>
<td>.95**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Fut2</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>.69**</td>
<td>.50**</td>
<td>.54**</td>
<td>.63**</td>
<td>.31*</td>
<td>.81**</td>
<td>.68**</td>
<td>.69**</td>
<td>.68**</td>
<td>.72**</td>
<td>.96**</td>
<td>.85**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Fut3</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>.68**</td>
<td>.46**</td>
<td>.54**</td>
<td>.60**</td>
<td>.37**</td>
<td>.82**</td>
<td>.71**</td>
<td>.66**</td>
<td>.65**</td>
<td>.78**</td>
<td>.95**</td>
<td>.84**</td>
<td>.88**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. *N* = 61; fat correlations are on scale-level

*p < .05; **p < .001; *scale reliability (Cronbach’s α)*
Ethnic Identification. We measured the Ethnic identification of the participant with the Ethnic identification scale based on Phinney (1992) which contains four items. Example items are: “My (Dutch or other) identity is an important part of me” and “I feel truly connected to the (Dutch or other) group I belong to”. All items are positively correlated ($p < .01$) and the reliability of the scale was good ($\alpha = .86$).

Professional experience (general and evaluating). To control for professional experience, participants indicated the number of years they had worked in general. On average, participants have 12.21 years of work experience ($SD = 9.2$). Following Lievens and Peters (2008) participants were also asked to specify the amount of evaluating work experience (judging/evaluating others). On average they had 7.82 years of experience ($SD = 7.3$), with a minimum of less than a year experience and maximally 34 years of experience. Finally, participants’ current job type, age, gender and their highest level of education were collected.

Manipulation checks

To check whether the manipulations worked, a manipulation check was included in the questionnaire. Participants were asked to indicate whether the candidate behaved in an ingratiaional (giving the interviewer compliments) or self-promotional (exaggerated own suitability) way. They finally had to indicate the candidate’s ethnical background of, European, African, Asian, Latin or Arabic, to check the ethnicity manipulation.

Regarding the IM manipulation, scores on the self-presentation check for participants from the control- and ingratiation condition should be low. They both weren’t confronted with behavior linked to self-presentation (i.e., exaggerating own skills). Participants from the self-presentation condition should score significantly higher, than the other two conditions. The same follows for the ingratiation condition: control and self-presentation participants should score low, and ingratiation participants significantly higher.

Two separate ANOVAs were conducted to test the above. Results show significant differences between the mean scores on manipulation of ingratiation $F(2,$
60) = 86.67, \( p < .01 \) and self-presentation \( F(2, 60) = 64.17, \ p < .01 \) (see Figure 2). Exploring these findings with a post-hoc analysis confirmed our expectations. For the ingratiation condition, the hypothesized effect occurs. No significant differences are found between the control group and the self-presentation group, \( t(43) = -.80, \ p = .43 \), but the ingratiation group differs significantly from the control group (\( t(38) = -13.82, \ p < .01 \)) and self-presentation group (\( t(35) = -9.52, \ p < .01 \)). For the self-presentation condition, results also confirm that the mean score for self-presentation is higher than the ingratiation group (\( t(35) = 5.87, \ p < .01 \)) and control group (\( t(43) = -12.93, \ p < .01 \)).

![Figure 2. ANOVA results for the manipulation checks on IM-tactics](image)

To determine the effect of the ethnicity manipulation, we used a chi-square test. All participants were asked which ethnic group the candidate belonged to. Their answers have been split up in two groups: Dutch/European and Other/Non-European. If our manipulation would have worked, half of the participants would have indicated the candidate was Dutch and the other half would have answered the candidate had another background, because the assignment to conditions was random. After analyzing the results we saw a significant difference in the answers that were given. The candidate was more often allocated to Dutch, than to another ethnic background, \( \chi^2 = 10.25, \ p < .01 \). This means our manipulation did not work as expected, which may influence further results.
Results

Descriptive statistics

Table 3 shows the descriptive statistics of the study variables and their inter-correlations. As can be seen, the three dependent variables (Competency evaluation, Overall evaluation and Future actions) form a cluster; they all correlate with each other in a positive manner. We can also see that the General professional experience and perception of Similarity, are related to all dependent variables. When the candidate is perceived to be similar, participants give higher ratings to Competency evaluation \( r = .51 \), Overall evaluation \( r = .54 \) and Future actions \( r = .49 \). And the more experience participants have, the lower ratings they give on Competency evaluation \( r = -.28 \), Overall evaluation \( r = -.38 \) and Future actions \( r = -.32 \). There is a strong positive relationship between the two types of Professional experience \( r = .70 \). Evaluating professional experience does have a negative relationship with Overall evaluation \( r = -.28 \), but not with Competency evaluation and Future actions. The more experience with judging others, the lower the ratings are. Finally, Similarity does not relate to the amount of professional experience. Ethnic identification is not correlated to any of the variables.

Table 3.
Descriptive statistics and correlations between study-variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>.71**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>.84**</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>.72**</td>
<td>.86**</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>12.21</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>-.28*</td>
<td>-.38**</td>
<td>-.32*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>7.82</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.28</td>
<td>-.25</td>
<td>.70**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>.51**</td>
<td>.54**</td>
<td>.49**</td>
<td>-.21</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>36.40</td>
<td>10.39</td>
<td>-.27</td>
<td>-.39**</td>
<td>-.35**</td>
<td>.94**</td>
<td>.75**</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=61, *p<.05; **p<.001, a Scale reliability (Crohnbach's alpha), b reliability could not be computed, scale consists out of one item.
Hypothesis testing

Hypothesis 1 investigated the effect of the social influence factor IM on interviewer evaluations after the interview. Hypothesis 1a states that candidates who use IM-tactics are successful in obtaining higher interview scores (Competency evaluation, Overall evaluation and Future actions), compared with equally suitable candidates who don’t use those tactics. To test this hypothesis, we conducted three separate ANOVAs with IM-tactic as between-subject factor (ingratiation, self-presentation and none) and the three evaluation variables (Competency evaluation, Overall evaluation and Future actions) as dependent variables. Results show no significant effect for IM-tactic on any of the evaluation measures ($F_{	ext{Competency}}(2, 58) = 0.42$, $F_{	ext{Overall}}(2, 58) = 0.45$, $F_{	ext{Future}}(2, 58) = 1.08$). Hypothesis 1b investigated the effectiveness of the tactic self-presentation on Competency- and Overall evaluation and Future actions. A Helmert contrast was used to test this, but no supporting significant data was found, $p_{	ext{Competency}} = .36$, $p_{	ext{Overall}} = .93$, $p_{	ext{Future}} = .60$. Following the above Hypothesis 1a and 1b are rejected.

The effect of Ethnicity of the candidate (candidate-related factor) was tested with Hypothesis 2. We expected Moroccan candidates to be evaluated more negatively than Dutch candidates while they were otherwise equally suitable for the job. Three separate ANOVAs were conducted, with Ethnicity (Moroccan, Dutch) as independent factor and the three evaluation measures, Competency- and Overall evaluation and Future actions, as dependent variables. No significant results were found ($F_{	ext{Competency}}(1, 59) = 1.45$, $F_{	ext{Overall}}(1, 59) = 0.46$, $F_{	ext{Future}}(1, 59) = 0.18$). Additional testing showed, however, a marginal significant result on a competency-level. Results indicate that Ethnicity of the candidate influenced the interview ratings on Communication skills, $F(1, 59) = 3.31$, $p = .07$. Dutch candidates were rated as good ($M = 4.00; SD = 0.92$) while Moroccan candidates received a lower score ($M = 3.59; SD = 0.80$).

The interaction effect between Ethnicity of the candidate and IM-tactics used during the interview, was tested in Hypothesis 3. We expected Moroccan candidates, who employ the IM-tactic self-presentation, to be evaluated more negatively, than Dutch candidates who employ self-presentation tactics and Dutch and Moroccan candidates who use ingratiation. Figures 3.1, 3.2 and 3.3 illustrate the effects of ethnicity and IM-tactics on respectively Competency evaluation, Overall
evaluation and Future actions. Although none of these effects are statistically significant ($F_{Competency}(2, 55) = 1.22$, $F_{Overall}(2, 55) = 1.64$, $F_{Future}(2, 55) = 2.02$), it should be noted that we do see a consistent pattern between the ratings. In the control and self-presentation condition, Dutch candidates are rated higher than Moroccan candidates. Surprisingly, this is not the same in the ingratiation condition, in which case Moroccan candidates obtain higher ratings.

![Figure 3.1](image1)

**Figure 3.1** Interaction between Ethnicity and IM-tactics on the outcome measures Competency Evaluation (3.1), Overall Evaluation (3.2), and Future Actions (3.3).

With Hypothesis 4 we study the interviewer-related variable perceived Similarity. Hypothesis 4a investigates the main effect of perceived Similarity on Competency evaluation, Overall evaluation and Future actions. We used three separate regression analyses to test this. Results show perceived Similarity to have significant main effects on Competency evaluation ($F_{Competency}(1, 60) = 20.47$, $p < .01$), Overall evaluation ($F_{Overall}(1, 60) = 24.03$, $p < .01$), Future actions ($F_{Future}(1, 60) = 19.02$, $p <
All beta-weights are positive, which indicates a positive relationship. The higher the perceived Similarity scores, the higher candidates were rated. We therefore accept Hypothesis 4a, and reject the null-hypothesis.

Hypothesis 4b stated that perceived Similarity, will moderate the relationship between IM-tactics and the interview outcome. We expected candidates using a IM-tactic to score higher on Competency evaluation, Overall evaluation and Future actions when perceived Similarity is high. To test Hypothesis 4b, three separate ANCOVA’s were conducted with IM-tactic as between-subject factor, perceived Similarity as covariate and the three evaluation variables (Competency evaluation, Overall evaluation and Future actions) as dependent variables. We tested the effect of the interaction term perceived Similarity (standardized) and IM-tactic. No significant moderation effects of perceived Similarity were found, $F_{Competency}(2, 55) = 0.69$, $F_{Overall}(2, 55) = 0.32$, $F_{Future}(2, 55) = 1.22$. Based on these results Hypothesis 4b is rejected.

With Hypothesis 4c the moderating effect of perceived Similarity operationalized as Ethnic identification on the relationship between Ethnicity and interview outcome (Competency evaluation, Overall evaluation and Future actions) is tested. We expected Moroccan candidates to receive higher scores when interviewers identify less with their own ethnic background. We used three separate ANCOVAs with Ethnicity as between-subject factor, Ethnic identification as covariate, and Competency evaluation, Overall evaluation and Future actions as dependent variables. Again, none of the interaction terms were significant, $F_{Competency}(1, 57) = 0.31$, $F_{Overall}(1, 57) = 0.41$, $F_{Future}(1, 57) = 1.60$, which means we have to reject Hypothesis 4c. The three way interaction between Ethnicity, IM-tactics and Ethnic identification came up in Hypothesis 4d. Self-presentation is thought to have a more positive effect on evaluations (Competency evaluation, Overall evaluation and Future actions) of Moroccan candidates, when Ethnic identification of the interviewer is lower. Statistical testing (ANCOVA) shows no significant results for any of the evaluation measures, $F_{Competency}(5, 51) = 1.16$, $F_{Overall}(5, 51) = 1.12$, $F_{Future}(5, 51) = 1.82$.

As stated, the interviewer-related variable, Professional experience was studied with Hypothesis 5. In this study we measured two types of Professional experience, General professional experience and Evaluating professional experience (see measures). To test Hypotheses 5 the same approach was used as in testing
Hypotheses 4 (ANCOVA). Both types of Professional experience are entered in the model as covariates, IM-tactics and Ethnicity are between-subject variables and the three evaluation measures (Competency evaluation, Overall evaluation and Future actions) serve as dependent variables. The results of the statistical analyses are seen in Table 4.1 (main effects) and 4.2 (interaction effects).

**Table 4.1**
Main effects (ANCOVA), for each dependent variable

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent variable</th>
<th>IM-tactics</th>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>General Exp</th>
<th>Evaluating Exp</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>df F p η²</td>
<td>df F p η²</td>
<td>df F p η²</td>
<td>df F p η²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competency evaluation</td>
<td>2 0.88 .45 .04 1 1.34 .25 .03 1 9.70 .00 .18 1 0.45 .51 .01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall evaluation</td>
<td>2 2.34 .11 .10 1 0.80 .38 .02 1 10.60 .00 .20 1 0.11 .74 .00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future actions</td>
<td>2 3.76 .03 .15 1 0.52 .48 .01 1 6.42 .02 .13 1 0.13 .72 .00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a Covariates (General Professional Experience and Evaluating Professional Experience) are transformed into standardized variables to correct for possible multi-collinearity effects.

Taking into account the covariates General professional experience and Evaluating professional experience, several significant main effects occur. Although we rejected Hypothesis 1a, it seems IM-tactics do have a significant influence on Future actions, $F_{Future}$ (2, 60) = 3.76, $p < .05$, $η^2 = .15$. This effect is shown in Figure 4. Using a Helmert-contrast, we find the control group is significantly higher rated ($M = 3.63$, $SD = .20$) than the candidates using ingratiation ($M = 2.80$, $SD = .31$) and self-presentation ($M = 2.94$, $SD = .22$). There is no significant difference between the two tactics. There is also a significant main-effect for General professional experience on all three dependent variables, $F_{Competency}$ (1, 60) = 9.70, $p < .01$, $η^2 = .18$; $F_{Overall}$ (1, 60) = 10.60, $p < .01$, $η^2 = .20$; $F_{Future}$ (1, 60) = 6.42, $p < .05$, $η^2 = .13$. This means that raters with more Professional experience in general, give lower ratings than fairly inexperienced raters.
Figure 4. Main effect of IM-tactic on Future actions, controlled for General professional experience.

Table 4.2
Interaction effects (ANCOVA), for each dependent variable

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>IM-tacticsxEthnicity</th>
<th>EthnicityxGeneral experience</th>
<th>EthnicityxEvaluating experience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>df</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competency Eva</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Eva</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future actions</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>.45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Table 4.2 continued)

Hypothesis 5a tests the moderating effect of Professional experience of the interviewer on the relationship between IM-tactics and interview outcome (Competency evaluation, Overall evaluation and Future actions), in such a way that interview scores will be more inflated when interviewers are less experienced. A
marginal significant effect occurred for Future actions, more specific General professional experience moderated the relationship between IM-tactics and Future actions, $F_{\text{Future}}(2, 60) = 2.58, p = .09, \eta^2 = .11$. Figure 5 illustrates this effect, it is shown that scores are the same for all IM-tactics when General professional experience is low. However when raters are very experienced, the control group receives higher scores than the groups using a tactic (ingratiation, self-presentation). The amount of Evaluating experience had no effect. Based on the above, Hypothesis 5a is partially accepted.

*Figure 5. Moderation effect of General Professional Experience on the relationship between IM-tactics and Future Actions*

Hypothesis 5b investigates the moderation-effect of Professional experience on the relationship between Ethnicity and interview evaluation. We expected interview scores to be lower for Moroccan candidates compared to Dutch when interviewers have less Professional experience. First of all it appears that Evaluating experience seems to moderate the relationship between Ethnicity and Competency evaluation, $F_{\text{Competency}}(1, 60) = 5.26, p < .05, \eta^2 = .11$. The less Evaluating professional experience raters had, the greater the difference between the scores of Dutch and Moroccan candidates, while Dutch candidates were evaluated more positively. A marginally significant effect of Evaluating professional experience occurred on the relation between Ethnicity and Overall evaluation, $F_{\text{Overall}}(1, 60) = 2.94, p = .09, \eta^2 = .06$. In this situation, raters also evaluate Moroccans lower compared with a Dutch candidate, when they were less experienced in evaluating others. No significant results were found for the moderator General professional experience. Based on these results we partially accept Hypothesis 5b.
Hypothesis 5c explored the three-way interaction between Ethnicity, IM-tactics and Professional experience. We expected self-presentation to have a less positive effect on evaluations of Moroccan candidates when interviewers have more Professional experience. We noticed a (marginal) significant effect of General professional experience, on Competency evaluation ($F_{Competency}$ (1, 60) = 2.40, $p = .10$, $\eta^2 = .10$), and significant effects on Overall evaluation ($F_{Overall}$ (1, 60) = 3.28, $p < .05$, $\eta^2 = .13$) and Future actions ($F_{Future}$ (1, 60) = 5.48, $p < .01$, $\eta^2=.20$). The effect of this moderation showed the same pattern for the three evaluations measures (Competency evaluation, Overall evaluation and Future actions) (see Figure 6 for the aggregated pattern). The IM-tactics differed in their effectiveness for Dutch and Moroccan candidates for different levels of Professional experience. For Moroccan candidates it seems that ingratiation was a better tactic than self-presentation which is as effective as using no tactic, however when raters gain experience they perceive the use of self-presentation as more negative, while no tactic remains as effective as ingratiation. The reverse holds for Dutch candidates, they can best use self-presentation or no tactic when sitting in front of an inexperienced rater. Ingratiation is considered as far more ineffective than the former two. However in front of an experienced rater, it is wise to employ no tactic, since self-presentation is considered more negative than no tactic. Ingratiation remains the least effective.
Discussion

With this thesis we investigated the effects of social (IM-tactics), candidate-related (Ethnicity), and interviewer-related (Similarity and Professional experience) factors on job-interview outcome. Mock interviews were used to test real recruiters, which allows us to broaden current literature on the topic of interviewer-related factors. Despite the sparse data in literature we challenged ourselves as one of the first to investigate the interaction effect between the social factor Impression management, and the candidate-related factor Ethnicity.

Social factor: Impression Management tactics

Based on previous literature, we expected the effect of IM-tactics on interview outcome to be a positive one, i.e., candidates who employ IM-tactics are evaluated as more suitable for the job (Higgins, Judge, & Ferris 2003; Higgins & Judge, 2004; Peeters & Lievens, 2006). Considering only IM-tactics and its influence, we found no differences between using a tactic or not. Since previous studies most often have used inexperienced raters (i.e., students) instead of real recruiters, this could be an explanation for the fact that we found no such results. Primarily because we did find an effect for IM-tactics on interview outcome, when we controlled for the Professional experience of the raters. It appears that there is no difference in effectiveness of ingratiation or self-presentation, but using no tactic is more and most effective in ‘influencing’ interview scores.

A possible explanation for the latter finding is the ambiguity of information derived from IM considering a back-office job (assistant controller). IM can be regarded as a manipulation strategy, which is meant to influence the interview outcome while the interviewer remains naïve. Following this line of reasoning, IM-tactics should influence interview outcome disregarding the type of job at stake. However, it is also possible, that a certain degree of IM is desirable for certain kind of jobs like a front-office or sales job. Following this definition, use of IM-tactics is not so much a manipulation strategy, but more inherent to someone’s personality, and can be regarded as more leaning towards a competency itself. For a back-office job, which does not require much external social contact, IM may have little predictive value. This may also explain the fact that no difference in effectiveness was observed.
between the two tactics in rating a back-office employee; it is simply not considered relevant information in relation to job suitability.

*Candidate-related factor: Ethnicity*

In this study we manipulated the ethnicity of the candidate in such a way raters saw a Dutch or a Moroccan female candidate. Our results indicate a marginal significant effect for the influence of Ethnicity on the competency Communication skills, i.e. the convenience and ease with which the candidate knows how to make herself understood. Raters evaluated the communication skills of the Moroccan candidate as lower than those of the Dutch candidate. This is to be expected, since Dutch politics have been focusing on teaching minority group members living in the Netherlands to speak fluent Dutch through for example national campaigns (e.g. 'It starts with language, [www.hetbegintmettaal.nl](http://www.hetbegintmettaal.nl)'). The language and communication skills of a Moroccan candidate may therefore be evaluated extra critically, while we expect Dutch candidates to speak fluent Dutch and do not pay extra attention to it.

Considering the other competencies, overall suitability, and decisions after the interview (e.g. hiring candidate), no differences were observed between the Moroccan and Dutch candidate. This is somewhat surprising, since it was found that compared with Dutch candidates, members from minority groups were often less frequently invited after an interview (Derous, 2007). There are several explanations for this finding. First, according to the results of our manipulation check for Ethnicity, the manipulation did not work as expected. Raters perceived the Moroccan candidate as Dutch at a higher rate than chance would predict. This may suppress the expected effects, especially because the power of the study is not very strong (\(N = 61\)). Furthermore, from a design point of view, it is possible that the educational level required for the job may function as a moderator between ethnicity and interview outcome. According to a recent study of Hosoda, Stone, and Stone-Romero (2003) females from a minority group applying for jobs that require low level education, encounter effects that are more negative compared with majority group members. This effect does not occur when women applied for jobs that required higher levels of cognitive ability. The job the candidates applied for in this study required a medium education level, therefore, it is possible study raters may have interpreted the job as simply not low-level, which may have eliminated possible effects. Also it is probable that no effect was found because of the nature of the job at stake; a back-office job,
which requires not much client-contact. This effect has been demonstrated by De Beijl (2000).

**Interviewer-related factors: Perceived similarity and Professional experience**

Considering our interviewer-related factors, similarity and professional experience, results were very divergent. In line with previous studies we found that the more similar raters perceived the candidate to themselves, in particular to personality and values, the higher the interview ratings were, and the greater the likelihood of a proposal for a positive follow-up (e.g. hiring, inviting to a second interview). Contrary to our expectations, perceived Similarity did not moderate the effect of IM-tactics on interview outcome. A possible reason is the way the candidate was presented to the interviewer. We used a mock interview, which was presented to the raters via a computer screen. Some of the cues normally used in perceiving another person, may not be effectively transferred, which may have affected the feeling of perceived Similarity. It can also be expected that the relationship between perceived Similarity and IM-tactics on interview outcome, is not so much a moderation, but a mediation. Chen and colleagues (2008) tested this the mediation of similarity and found that this mediated the relationship between ingratiation and person-organization fit. This hypothesis could be investigated further. Furthermore, to test the moderation effect of Similarity on the relationship between Ethnicity and interview outcome, we used a different operationalization of perceived Similarity: Ethnic identification. Based on the social identity theory (Tajfel & Turner, 1986), we expected raters to be milder when confronted with Moroccan candidates if they identified less with their own ethnic background (Dutch). Our result did not confirm this expectation, which can be explained by the lack of effect of the ethnicity manipulation. This hypothesis is based on the in-group - out-group differences. Without this feeling of ‘out-group’, the result we would have found is to be expected.

Hypothesis 5 investigated the effect of the professional experience of the interviewer/rater. Our results show that Professional experience moderates the relationship between the use of IM-tactics and the intentions of the interviewer after the interview (Future actions). The more Professional experience in evaluating raters had, the less positive the effect of using IM-tactics was. When raters had little experience in evaluating others there was no difference between using a tactic or not on intentions of the raters. This finding supports the ongoing theory that trained HR
professionals are able to withstand biases. However this effect seems to be true only for intentions after the interview, because we found no such results for the Competency evaluation and Overall evaluation. This may be explained by the fact that more or less experience does not influence the way raters cope with social manipulation. For the moderating effect of Professional experience on the relationship between Ethnicity and interview outcome we found a somewhat different result. In this case we found that General professional experience does affect the effect of Ethnicity on Competency evaluation and Overall evaluation, the effect only being marginal. As we expected, the moderation worked in such a way that the less General experience interviewers had, the lower the scores were for Moroccan candidates compared with Dutch candidates. There were however no effects on Future actions, which means experienced and inexperienced raters both use the same strategy in determining follow-up actions for Moroccan and Dutch candidates.

Since evaluating and decision making are considered as two different steps in the process of assessment centers. It is possible that in spite of experience, the participants took a conservative approach in determining a follow-up action. Considering the theory we expect less experienced raters to ‘fall’ for the ethnicity bias, and reject the Moroccan candidates more often. But given present day focus on promoting diversity and preventing discrimination, inexperienced raters may take this into account when forming intentions for future actions. They seem to correct their biased evaluation. A theory exists which offers the possibility that more Professional experience may coincide with less self-doubt and more perceived objectivity. This in turn leads to the “I think, therefore it is true” effect, where interviewers stop being critical of their own thoughts, and let biases contaminate their judgments (Uhlmann & Cohen, 2007). However, inexperienced raters are not used to making high stake decisions they may be more critical and conscious about themselves than the highly experienced professional. Consequently, the role of perceived objectivity and its relations with professional experience should be investigated further.

Interaction effects
Because with this study we were also interested in the interaction effects between the study-variables, three hypotheses focused on the interaction between IM-tactics and Ethnicity. Furthermore we tested two three-way interactions, between IM, Ethnicity, and perceived Similarity and Professional experience.
We did not find any effects for the interaction between IM-tactics and Ethnicity. However, this may have been caused by the influence of the interviewer. When the interviewer's Professional experience is taken into account a significant three-way interaction emerges. Our results show a significant three-way interaction between IM-tactics, Ethnicity and General professional experience, which are in line with our previous expectations. Moroccan and Dutch candidates seem to benefit from different tactics during the job interview, when they are confronted with (in)experienced interviewers. When confronted with an inexperienced interviewer, Moroccan candidates received higher interview scores when they employ ingratiation tactics. Dutch candidates should refrain from using ingratiation and use self-presentation or no tactic at all. In front of an experienced interviewer, different strategies could be employed to receive the best possible evaluation. Based on our results, Moroccan candidates can now choose to either keep using ingratiation tactics, or stop using tactics at all. Dutch candidates benefit most from refraining use of strategies.

There was no interaction between IM-tactics, Ethnicity and Ethnic identification. However, the same argument may be applicable as given for the lack of moderation-effect of ethnic identity. That is the reduced effect of the ethnicity manipulation, since participants in general identified with their in-group (Dutch). It is possible that prejudice has a significant influence when considering the effect of Ethnic identification. Unprejudiced interviewers may, in spite of their own in-group feelings, be less affected by the differences between Dutch and Moroccan candidates, while the opposite may be true for prejudiced interviewers. Which will be further detailed in the next section: Limitations and suggestions for further research.

Limitations and suggestions for further research

As mentioned above, a suggestion for future researchers is to incorporate the prejudice of the interviewer into the research design. In our design we were not able to control for prejudice, which may play a significant role when studying candidate ethnicity. The implicit association test (IAT) may offer a suitable method. Greenwald and Banaji (1995) argue that traditional measures of prejudice may fail to measure the unconscious process which underlies prejudiced behavior. They developed the IAT to measure these implicit attitudes. Our implicit attitudes demonstrate a implicit
association between an object (e.g. woman) with an evaluation (e.g. good). The speed of connecting these two words in a test, provide a measure for the strength of this association in our minds. The stronger the association, the more difficult it becomes to picture a woman as bad. The same holds for prejudice based on race. If interviewers have formed strong connections between ethnic minorities and negative evaluations (e.g. bad/criminal) they are considered as prejudiced.

Second, the sample size in this study was small \( (N = 61) \). Several marginal effects were found, as different patterns without any significance. A larger sample size may reveal patterns that given the limitations of the small sample studied remain undiscovered. With a larger sample size a more sophisticated design may be possible in order to stratify for sex. In this study we used only female candidates, which might have biased the outcome. However, differences between male and female Moroccan candidates are to be expected, for example in education level, and amount of discrimination (Van den Cruyce, 2005). Taking interviewer-related factors into consideration, as mentioned above, perceived objectivity may be taken into account. A possible way to integrate this in the design, is using a prime which leaves participants aware of their objectivity. By taking this approach the research finding of Uhlmann and Cohen (2007) can be replicated, using an interesting group of participants, namely interviewers.

**Practical implications**

Based on the results found in this study, some practical implications for candidates, interviewers as well as politics can be made. First of all, candidates should understand the effect of their tactics on the interview process and seriously consider the implications before employing these. They are partly dependent on the kind of interviewer they will meet, and they will have to adjust their tactic to their own ethnicity. Important to mention, is the fact that being oneself is always the better technique when confronted with experienced interviewers.

Furthermore, interviewers benefit from being aware of their own judgment processes. As they gain experience, they become more strict towards candidates, but are also less prone to for example ethnic bias. Therefore, gaining experience and training ones skills does seem effective.
Conclusion
After conducting this study, we can conclude that social, candidate-related and interviewer related factors influence the interview outcome. Some direct effects were found, for example that ethnicity (of the candidate) influenced the evaluation of the candidate’s communication skills. Furthermore, the more professional experience interviewers had, the less lenient they were when evaluating candidates. Professional experience also moderated the relationship between IM-tactics and ethnicity, and interview outcome. In both cases, more professional experience led to less sensitivity to bias. In addition, IM-tactics were less effective, and there was no difference between the interview scores of Dutch and Moroccan candidates. Finally, we found that use of IM-tactics, ethnicity and professional experience interact with each other. Results show that IM-tactics are only useful, when choosing a tactic that matches the candidate’s ethnicity and when it compatible with the level of professional experience of the interviewer. The effect of perceived similarity did not lead to the hypothesized results, explanations were given for further research.
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Appendices

Appendix A Scripts (in Dutch)

AI Control group

I: interviewer, S: sollicitant
I ZWART BEELD... Goed mevrouw, bedankt voor het komen!
Sollicitant zit al aan tafel, camera is op haar gericht
S Geen probleem
I Mooi. We gaan nu het interview in, we hebben hiervoor ongeveer een uur. In die tijd zullen we het hebben over uw motivatie, loopbaan. En ook over een aantal competenties die relevant zijn voor de functie van assistant controller. Ik zal tijdens het gesprek wat dingen opschrijven, vooral om mijn geheugen te helpen. Vindt u dat erg?
S Nee hoor
I Heeft u verder nog vragen voordat we van start gaan?
S Vooral nog niet eigenlijk.
I Ok, dan wou ik beginnen met de vraag waarom u heeft gesolliciteerd bij Teletrans
S Dat is goed, de reden van mijn sollicitatie is voornamelijk het takenpakket dat wordt aangeboden door Teletrans. In mijn huidige functie ben ik niet zozeer bezig met adviseren. En na vijf jaar ben ik wel toe aan wat anders. Het werk als controller blijft voor mij interessant, en de adviserende taken die de functie biedt, voegen net de verdieping toe die ik zoek.
I Ok, dat is duidelijk, het takenpakket is uitgebreider dan u nu heeft en daar bent u aan toe.
S Ja dat klopt
I Goed, dan wil ik nu graag wat meer weten over onder andere uw huidige functie, maar ook wat u nog meer heeft gedaan tot nu toe. Zullen we beginnen met uw opleiding, ik zie hier op uw cv dat u bedrijfseconomie heeft gestudeerd?
S Inderdaad, aan de HES in Rotterdam
I Vanwaar die keuze?
S De keus was niet erg moeilijk,
... OVERGANG ...

Dan komt het beeld terug en maakt de sollicitant zogenaamd een zin af:
Dus dat was waar de nadruk op lag.
I Nu, we hebben uw loopbaan voor het grootste gedeelte besproken. U solliciteert nu voor assistant controller, en er zijn een aantal competenties die hierbij van belang zijn. Een daarvan is het vermogen om situaties of problemen te analyseren.
S Ughhhhh
I U gaf bijvoorbeeld net aan dat u in uw huidige functie rapporten moest schrijven over de budgettering en dat u daarvoor veel informatie moet verwerken. Hoe gaat u met die informatie om? Kunt u een voorbeeld geven?
S Even denken, nou het is zo dat ik een keer werd gevraagd door mijn leidinggevende om een eerste versie van de rapportage te schrijven. Ik had al helemaal geen geordende info, degene die daar verantwoordelijk voor was, was ziek. Voor me lagen dus alle stukken, zonder enig systeem erin.
I Hoe ging u daarmee om?
S Het was mijn verantwoordelijkheid om deze rapportage op te stellen, en daarvoor moest ik dus eerst alle informatie en stukken hebben die daarvoor nodig is. Ik ben toen begonnen met het selecteren van de relevante stukken. Ik had al eerder geholpen bij het opstellen van die rapporten. Aan de hand daarvan wist ik wat ik uiteindelijk nodig zou hebben. Ik heb dus alles even kort doorgenomen en de irrelevante informatie apart gelegd. Alles wat ik wel nodig had, had ik bij elkaar neergelegd. Dat maakt het een stuk makkelijker om uiteindelijk te gaan schrijven
I En hoe is het afgelopen?
S Nou, ik heb de rapportage geschreven obv de info die ik had geselecteerd en toen dat eenmaal af was heb ik pas gekeken naar de rest van de stukken. Er bleek niets in te zitten wat ik had laten liggen, dus dat is goed gegaan.
I Ok, mooi zo.. een andere competentie die van belang is voor de functie waarvoor u nu solliciteert is namelijk uw organiserend vermogen. Kunt u situatie noemen waarin er van u werd verwacht iets te organiseren?
S Ja dat kan ik wel. De afgelopen tijd heb ik op mijn werk de mogelijkheid om in overleg bepaalde
taken op me te nemen. Ik mag deze dan zonder echte supervisie van de Controller afronden. Nu is het zo dat als we een bepaald project doen, er altijd vooraf een bepaalde plan van aanpak moet worden gemaakt. Deze krijgt de klant dan te zien, en zo is het voor ons ook duidelijk wanneer er wat moet gebeuren. Dit kan namelijk per klant verschillen.

I Ok, en kun je dan concreet een voorbeeld geven van zo’n situatie?
S Nou ongeveer een half jaar terug had ik de verantwoordelijkheid om voor een van onze klanten zo’n plan van aanpak op te stellen. Van te voren had ik dit overlegd met de Controller en ik mocht het zelfstandig afhandelen.

I En hoe heb je dat dan aangepakt?
S Allereerst heb ik natuurlijk een afspraak met de klant ingepland. Hier was de Controller ook bij, en we hebben eigenlijk geïnventariseerd wat er precies moest gebeuren. Er zijn bijvoorbeeld dingen die elke maand gedaan moeten worden, zoals de salarisadministratie, en ook dingen die maar 1x per jaar hoeven. Denk maar aan de jaarrekening. Goed met deze lijst ben ik aan de slag gegaan. Ik heb een jaaroverzicht gemaakt en per maand of zelfs week een uiteindelijk doel opgesteld. Hierbij moest ik ook rekening houden met eventuele zaken die fout kunnen lopen, want die zijn er altijd. Ik heb dit teruggekoppeld naar de klant en een aantal afspraken tussendoor ingepland. Gewoon om te kijken of alles goed loopt en of er dingen moeten worden aangepast tussendoor.

I Ok, en wat vond de klant ervan?
S We zijn nu een half jaar verder, en ondertussen zijn er 2 evaluatieafspraken geweest. Hieruit bleek dat ze eigenlijk hartstikke tevreden zijn. Het was goed dat ik wat ruimte had ingepland, want het bleek dat er wat meer tijd nodig was voor de vergaderingen met het financieel bestuur. Ik heb dat opnieuw aangepast en sindsdien gaat het prima.

I Ok, fijn om te horen! Goed, ik wou tot slot nog even ingaan op een vaardigheid die van belang is voor de functie, namelijk overtuigingskracht. Je gaf aan dat je nog geen ervaring hebt met adviezen geven in je huidige functie. En zoals je zelf al zei, is het wel een onderdeel van de functie bij Teletrans. Kun je daarom, misschien in een andere setting, toch een situatie voor ogen halen waar je iemand moest overtuigen van jouw mening of plan?
S Ja, dat kan ik op zich wel. Het staat me nog best goed bij, omdat ik er eerlijk gezegd best moeite mee had. Maar ik had tijdens mijn huidige functie, ongeveer 2 jaar nadat ik daar was begonnen, gehoord over een cursus Boekhouden. Dat leek me hartstikke leuk om te doen. Ik heb toen geinformeerd bij het instituut dat die cursus verzorgde en daar kreeg ik te horen dat ik het ook via mijn werk kon doen. Op die manier hoefde ik de kosten niet zelf te betalen. Dat klonk toch wel interessant, dus ik ben naar mijn manager toegestapt om hem te overtuigen om mij die cursus te laten doen.

I Hoe heb je dat aangepakt?
S Ik heb eigenlijk gewoon een afspraak met hem ingepland, en we hebben het erover gehad. Ik had informatie meegenomen en uitgelegd waarom ik het graag wou doen. Uiteindelijk was hij het er niet mee eens. Het was niet zozeer dat hij het een slecht idee vond, maar hij vond het tijdstip wat ongelukkig. Nou dat was jammer, want ik had echt mijn zinnen gezet op die cursus. En eigenlijk zou het het een positief uit kunnen pakken voor mijn werk. Achteraf vond ik dat ik beter had kunnen aanpakken. Ik heb nu uiteindelijk wel mijn zin gekregen, maar dat is niet echt te wijten aan mijn overtuigingsstrategie. De manager was het er dus niet mee eens, toch zie ik hier op je cv dat je die cursus wel hebt gedaan.

I De manager was het er dus niet mee eens, toch zie ik hier op je cv dat je die cursus wel hebt gedaan.
S Ja dat klopt, ik ben na die afspraak er niet echt op terug gekomen. Maar na een maand ongeveer kwam mijn manager er zelf mee, hij vroeg of ik het nog wou doen. Nou ik heb natuurlijk ja gezegd. Achteraf vond ik overigens wel dat ik het beter had kunnen aanpakken. Ik heb nu uiteindelijk wel mijn zin gekregen, maar dat is niet echt te wijten aan mijn overtuigingsstrategie.

I Wat had je anders gedaan als je er nu op terugkijkt?
S Als ik nu terugdenk aan die situatie weet ik dat ik goede argumenten had. Ik had ze alleen niet efficiënt gebruikt. Als ik het over mocht doen, zou ik vertellen waarom ik de cursus wou doen, en ook het belang benadrukken voor mijn werkgever. Als de manager het er dan niet mee eens was, zou ik dieper ingaan op wat precies de redenen waren. Ik zou eigenlijk meer in discussie gaan. Nu had ik het te snel opgegeven.

I Ok, duidelijk. Nou ik heb eigenlijk geen vragen meer. Zijn er nog vragen aan uw kant, wilt u nog wat anders kwijt?
S Even zien, ik vroeg me wel af hoe het nu verder gaat met terugkoppeling ed.
I Ok… Ik ga uiteindelijk een rapport opstellen, wat met uw toestemming naar de opdrachtgever gaat. Het lijkt met het beste om een afspraak te maken voor een nabespreking. U krijgt dan het rapport te lezen en kunt vragen stellen als u die heeft. En met uw toestemming gaat het rapport daarna naar de opdrachtgever.

S Ok dat is duidelijk.
I Goed dan pak ik even mijn agenda, om een datum te prikken...
S Oja, ik zal de mij nipt even bijpakken
I Even zien wat vind u van de 28e...
S Ja dat kan wel, hoe laat? ... ZWART BEELD Beeld wordt weer zwart, film is afgelopen.

All 
Ingratiation condition

I: interviewer, S: sollicitant
I ZWART BEELD... Goed mevrouw, bedankt voor het komen!
Sollicitant zit al aan tafel, camera is op haar gericht
S Geen probleem
I Mooi. We gaan nu het interview in, we hebben hiervoor ongeveer een uur. In die tijd zullen we het hebben over uw motivatie, loopbaan. En ook over een aantal competenties die relevant zijn voor de functie van assistant controller. Ik zal tijdens het gesprek wat dingen opschrijven, vooral om mijn geheugen te helpen. Vindt u dat erg?
S Nee hoor
I Heeft u verder nog vragen voordat we van start gaan?
S Wat prettig dat u dat vraagt; Vooralsnog niet eigenlijk.
I Ok, dan wou ik beginnen met de vraag waarom u heeft gesolliciteerd bij Teletrans
S Dat is goed, de reden van mijn sollicitatie is voornamelijk het takenpakket dat wordt aangeboden door Teletrans. In mijn huidige functie ben ik niet zozeer bezig met adviseren. En na vijf jaar ben ik wel toe aan wat anders. Het werk als controller blijft voor mij interessant, en de adviserende taken die de functie biedt, voegen net de verdieping toe die ik zoek.
I Ok, dat is duidelijk, het takenpakket is uitgebreider dan u nu heeft en daar bent u aan toe.
S Ja dat klopt. Dat heeft u heel goed ingeschat.
I Goed, dan wil ik nu graag wat meer weten over onder andere uw huidige functie, maar ook wat u nog meer heeft gedaan tot nu toe. Zullen we beginnen met uw opleiding, ik zie hier op uw cv dat u bedrijfseconomie heeft gestudeerd?
S Inderdaad, aan de HES in Rotterdam, dat heeft u uitstekend gezien.
I Van waar de keuze?
S De keuze was niet erg moeilijk,
... OVERGANG ... Beeld wordt langzaam zwart (gedeelte cv bespreken komt niet in het filmpje. Dan komt het beeld terug en maakt de sollicitant zogenaamd een zin af:
Dus dat was waar de nadruk op lag.
I Nu, we hebben uw loopbaan voor het grootste gedeelte besproken. U solliciteert nu voor assistant controller, en er zijn een aantal competenties die hierbij van belang zijn. Een daarvan is het vermogen om situaties of problemen te synthetiseren.
S Inderdaad, aan de HES in Rotterdam, dat heeft u uitstekend gezien.
I Van waar de keuze?
S De keuze was niet erg moeilijk,
... OVERGANG ... Beeld wordt langzaam zwart (gedeelte cv bespreken komt niet in het filmpje. Dan komt het beeld terug en maakt de sollicitant zogenaamd een zin af:
Dus dat was waar de nadruk op lag.
I Nu, we hebben uw loopbaan voor het grootste gedeelte besproken. U solliciteert nu voor assistant controller, en er zijn een aantal competenties die hierbij van belang zijn. Een daarvan is het vermogen om situaties of problemen te synthetiseren.
S Uhuuuhh
I U gaf bijvoorbeeld net aan dat u in uw huidige functie rapporten moest schrijven over de budgettering en dat u daarvoor veel informatie moet verwerken. [I: hier instemmend laten mee hum hum —en] Hoe gaat u met die informatie om? Kunt u een voorbeeld geven?
S Hum hum - Even denken, Jazeker dat is inderdaad van belang bij het werk wat ik doe, dat heeft u goed gezien! Nou het is zo dat ik een keer werd gevraagd door mijn leidinggevende om een eerste versie van de rapportage te schrijven. Ik had alleen geen geordende info, degene die daar verantwoordelijk voor was, was ziek. Voor me lagen dus alle stukken, zonder enig systeem erin.
I Hoe ging je daarmee om?
S Dat is een goede vraag. Het was mijn verantwoordelijkheid om die rapportage op te stellen, en daarvoor moest ik dus eerst alle informatie en stukken hebben die daarvoor nodig is. Ik ben toen begonnen met het selecteren van de relevante stukken. Ik had al eerder geholpen bij het opstellen van die rapporten. Aan de hand daarvan wist ik wat u uiteindelijk nodig zou hebben. Ik heb dus alles even kort doorgenomen en de irrelevante informatie apart gelegd. Alles wat ik wel nodig had, had ik bij elkaar neergelegd. Dat maakt het een stuk makkelijker om uiteindelijk te gaan schrijven
I En hoe is het afgelopen?
S Humhum, inderdaad, de afloop. Ja, meestal wordt het belang hiervan over het hoofd gezien, Ik vind het erg relevant dat u hier naar vraagtenl. Nou, ik heb de rapportage geschreven obv de info
die ik had geselecteerd en toen dat eenmaal af was heb ik pas gekeken naar de rest van de stukken. Er bleek niets in te zitten was ik had laten liggen, dus dat is goed gegaan.

I Ok, mooi zo.. een andere competentie die van belang is voor de functie waarvoor u nu solliciteert, is organiserend vermogen. Kun u situatie beschrijven waarin er van u werd verwacht iets te organiseren? *(humhum, ja)*

S Ja dat kan ik wel. De afgelopen tijd heb ik op mijn werk de mogelijkheid om in overleg bepaalde taken op te nemen. Ik mag deze dan zonder echte supervisie van de Controller afronden. Nu is het zo dat als we een bepaald project doen, er altijd vooraf een bepaald plan van aanpak moet worden gemaakt. Deze krijgt de klant dan te zien, en zo is het voor ons ook duidelijk wanneer er wat moet gebeuren. Dit kan namelijk per klant verschillen.

I Ok, en kun je dan concreet een voorbeeld geven van zo’n situatie?

S Jazeker, wil ik dat voor u doen. Nou ongeveer een half jaar terug had ik de verantwoordelijkheid om voor een van onze klanten zo’n plan van aanpak op te stellen. Van te voren had ik dit overlegd met de Controller en ik mocht het zelfstandig afhandelen.

I En hoe heb je dat dan aangepakt? *(Itee instemmend laten meehumen, alsof ie volledig op zelfde golflengte zit als iter)*

S Allereerst werd een afspraak met de klant ingepland. Hier was de Controller ook bij, en we hebben eigenlijk geïnventariseerd wat er precies moest gebeuren. Er zijn bijvoorbeeld dingen die elke maand gedaan moeten worden, zoals de salarisadministratie, en ook dingen die maar 1x per jaar hoeven. Denk maar aan de jaarrekening. Goed met deze lijst zijn we aan de slag gegaan. Er is een jaaroverzicht gemaakt en per maand of zelfs week een uiteindelijk doel opgesteld. Hierbij moest ook rekening gehouden worden met eventuele zaken die fout kunnen lopen, want die zijn er altijd. We hebben dit teruggekoppeld naar de klant en een aantal afspraken tussendoor ingepland.

I Ok, en wat vond de klant ervan? *(humhum, ok ja)*

S Nou, we zijn nu een half jaar verder, en ondertussen zijn er 2 evaluatieafspraken geweest. Hieruit bleek dat ze tevreden zijn. Het was goed dat we wat extra ruimte hadden ingepland, want het bleek dat er wat meer tijd nodig was voor de vergaderingen met het financieel bestuur.

I Nou dat is mooi. Hoe heb je je ervan, om het voor de eerste keer zelf af te handelen?

S Ja dat is een goede vraag, het is inderdaad belangrijk hoe je het zelf ervaart. Prettig dat u daarnaar vraagt, even zien..

I Ok, fijn om te horen! Goed, ik wou tot slot nog even ingaan op een vaardigheid die van belang is voor de functie, namelijk overtuigingskracht. *(ja ja correct → beetje binnensmonds)*

S Ja dat kan ik wel. Het staat me nog best goed bij, omdat ik er eerlijk gezegd best moeite mee had. Maar ik had tijdens mijn huidige functie, ongeveer 2 jaar nadat ik daar was begonnen, gehoord over een cursus Boekhouden. Dat leek me hartstikke leuk om te doen. Ik heb toen geïnformeerd bij het instituut dat die cursus verzorgde en daar kreeg ik te horen dat ik het ook via mijn werk kon doen. Op die manier hoefde ik de kosten niet zelf te betalen. Dat klonk toch wel interessant, dus ik ben naar mijn manager toegestapt om hem te overtuigen om mij die cursus te laten doen.

I De manager was het er dus niet mee eens, toch zie ik hier op je cv dat je die cursus wel hebt gedaan.

S Ja dat klopt, ik ben na die afspraak er niet echt op terug gekomen. Maar na een maand ongeveer kwam mijn manager er zelf mee, hij vroeg of ik het nog wou doen. Nou ik heb natuurlijk ja gezegd. Achteraf vond ik overigens wel dat ik het beter had kunnen aanpakken. Ik heb nu uiteindelijk wel mijn zin gekregen, maar dat is niet echt te wijten aan mijn overtuigingsstrategie.
Wat had je anders gedaan als je er nu op terugkijkt?

Ik vond dat u alle vragen heel helder gesteld heeft zodat ik nu zelf bijna geen vragen meer heb, nee, alles heeft u goed voorgesteld. Dank hiervoor. Of misschien… een heel klein vraagje van mijn kant dan. Even zien, ik vroeg me wel af hoe het nu verder gaat met terugkoppeling ed. U krijgt dan het rapport te lezen en kunt vragen stellen als u die heeft. En met uw toestemming gaat het rapport daarna naar de opdrachtgever.

Ok, duidelijk. Nu ik heb eigenlijk geen vragen meer. Zijn er nog vragen aan uw kant, wilt u nog wat anders kwijt?

Ik vind dat u alle vragen heel helder gesteld heeft zodat ik nu zelf bijna geen vragen meer heb, nee, alles heeft u goed voorgesteld. Dank hiervoor. Of misschien… een heel klein vraagje van mijn kant dan. Even zien, ik vroeg me wel af hoe het nu verder gaat met terugkoppeling ed. U krijgt dan het rapport te lezen en kunt vragen stellen als u die heeft. En met uw toestemming gaat het rapport daarna naar de opdrachtgever.

Ik vind dat u alle vragen heel helder gesteld heeft zodat ik nu zelf bijna geen vragen meer heb, nee, alles heeft u goed voorgesteld. Dank hiervoor. Of misschien… een heel klein vraagje van mijn kant dan. Even zien, ik vroeg me wel af hoe het nu verder gaat met terugkoppeling ed. U krijgt dan het rapport te lezen en kunt vragen stellen als u die heeft. En met uw toestemming gaat het rapport daarna naar de opdrachtgever.

Ok dat is helemaal duidelijk. Ik wil trouwens nog even zeggen dat ik het hele interview als erg prettig heb ervaren. Ik was toch zenuwachtig en u heeft voor een ontspannen sfeer gezorgd, waardoor deze zenuwen zo goed als verdwenen zijn. Teletrans heeft in ieder geval een goede beslissing gemaakt om het assessment hier uit te besteden!

Ja dat is duidelijk, het takenpakket is uitgebreider dan u nu heeft en daar bent u aan toe.

Ok, dat is duidelijk, het takenpakket is uitgebreider dan u nu heeft en daar bent u aan toe.

Ok dan wou ik beginnen met de vraag waarom u heeft gesolliciteerd bij Teletrans.

Dat is goed, de reden van mijn sollicitatie is voornamelijk het takenpakket dat wordt aangeboden door Teletrans. In mijn huidige functie ben ik niet zoveer bezig met adviseren. En na vijf jaar ben ik wel toe aan wat anders. Het werk als controller blijft voor mij interessant, en de adviserende taken die de functie biedt, voegen net de verdieping toe die ik zoek.

Ok, dat is duidelijk, het takenpakket is uitgebreider dan u nu heeft en daar bent u aan toe.

Ok, dat is duidelijk, het takenpakket is uitgebreider dan u nu heeft en daar bent u aan toe.

Goed, dan wil ik nu graag wat meer weten over onder andere uw huidige functie, maar ook wat u nog meer heeft gedaan tot nu toe. Zullen we beginnen met uw opleiding, ik zie hier op uw cv dat u bedrijfseconomie heeft gestudeerd?

Inderdaad, aan de HES in Rotterdam.

Vanwaar die keuze?

Welke keuze was hier gemaakt, en waarom?

Welke keuze was hier gemaakt, en waarom?

In de loop van deze loopbaan ben ik veel weten over andere functies. Maar ook wat u nooit meer heeft gedaan tot nu toe. Zullen we beginnen met uw opleiding, ik zie hier op uw cv dat u bedrijfseconomie heeft gestudeerd?

S

Nee hoor,

Heeft u verder nog vragen voordat we van start gaan?

Ja dat klopt.

Vooral nog niet eigenlijk.

Ok, dan wou ik beginnen met de vraag waarom u heeft gesolliciteerd bij Teletrans?

Dat is goed, de reden van mijn sollicitatie is voornamelijk het takenpakket dat wordt aangeboden door Teletrans. In mijn huidige functie ben ik niet zoveer bezig met adviseren. En na vijf jaar ben ik wel toe aan wat anders. Het werk als controller blijft voor mij interessant, en de adviserende taken die de functie biedt, voegen net de verdieping toe die ik zoek.

Ok, dat is duidelijk, het takenpakket is uitgebreider dan u nu heeft en daar bent u aan toe.

Ja dat klopt.

Goed, dan wil ik nu graag wat meer weten over onder andere uw huidige functie, maar ook wat u nog meer heeft gedaan tot nu toe. Zullen we beginnen met uw opleiding, ik zie hier op uw cv dat u bedrijfseconomie heeft gestudeerd?

Inderdaad, aan de HES in Rotterdam.

Vanwaar die keuze?

Welke keuze was hier gemaakt, en waarom?

Welke keuze was hier gemaakt, en waarom?

Welke keuze was hier gemaakt, en waarom?
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Welke keuze was hier gemaakt, en waarom?

Welke keuze was hier gemaakt, en waarom?
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Welke keuze was hier gemaakt, en waarom?
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Welke keuze was hier gemaakt, en waarom?

Welke keuze was hier gemaakt, en waarom?

Welke keuze was hier gemaakt, en waarom?

Welke keuze was hier gemaakt, en waarom?

Welke keuze was hier gemaakt, en waarom?

Welke keuze was hier gemaakt, en waarom?

Welke keuze was hier gemaakt, en wa...
om? Kunt u een voorbeeld geven?
S Even denken, nou het is zo dat ik een keer werd gevraagd door mijn leidinggevende om een eerste versie van de rapportage te schrijven. Ik had alleen geen geordende info, degene die daar verantwoordelijk voor was, was ziek. Voor me lagen dus alle stukken, zonder enig systeem in erin.
I Hoe ging je daarmee om?
S Het was mijn verantwoordelijkheid om die rapportage op te stellen, en daarvoor moest ik dus eerst alle informatie en stukken hebben die daarvoor nodig is. Ik ben toen begonnen met het selecteren van de relevante stukken. Ik had al eerder geholpen bij het opstellen van die rapporten. Aan de hand daarvan wist ik wat ik uiteindelijk nodig zou hebben. Ik heb dus alles even kort doorgenomen en de irrelevante informatie apart gelegd. Alles wat ik wel nodig had, had ik bij elkaar neergelegd. Dat maakt het een stuk makkelijker om uiteindelijk te gaan schrijven.
I En hoe is het afgelopen?
S Nou het is heel erg goed afgelopen; ik ben door mijn collega's hiervoor gefeliciteerd. Ik heb de rapportage geschreven obv de informatie die ik had geselecteerd en toen dat eenmaal af was heb ik pas gekeken naar de rest van de stukken. Er bleek helemaal niets in te zitten wat ik had laten liggen. Uiteindelijk had ik dus mijn taak boven verwachting afgerond. Mijn leidinggevende gaf dit later ook aan. De hele afdeling heeft er zelfs iets aan gehad, want ik kon de rapporten nu vaker gaan schrijven.
I Ok, mooi zo.. een andere competentie die van belang is voor de functie waarvoor u nu solliciteert, is organiserend vermogen. Kunt u situatie beschrijven waarin er van u werd verwacht iets te organiseren?
S Ja dat kan ik wel. De afgelopen tijd heb ik op mijn werk de mogelijkheid om in overleg bepaalde taken op te nemen. Ik mag deze dan zonder supervisie van de Controller afronden. Nu is het zo dat als we een bepaald project doen, er altijd vooraf een plan van aanpak moet worden gemaakt. Deze krijgt de klant dan te zien, en zo is het voor ons ook duidelijk wanneer er wat moet gebeuren. Dit kan namelijk per klant verschillen.
I Ok, en kun je nu een concreet voorbeeld geven van zo'n situatie?
S Nou ongeveer een half jaar terug had ik de verantwoordelijkheid om voor een van onze klanten zo'n plan van aanpak op te stellen. Van te voren had ik dit overlegd met de Controller, hij zei dat ik de capaciteiten had om het zelfstandig af te handelen. Ik vond ook zelf dat ik hiervoor de geschikte persoon was.
I En hoe heb je dat dan aangepakt?
S Allereerst heb ik natuurlijk een afspraak met de klant ingepland. Hier was de Controller ook bij, al was dat alleen maar voor de vorm, dat gaf gewoon een wat professioneler beeld. Ik heb echter alle voorbereidingen getroffen en uiteindelijk het gesprek gevoerd. Tijdens het gesprek heb ik geïnventariseerd wat er precies moest gebeuren. Er zijn bijvoorbeeld dingen die elke maand gedaan moeten worden, zoals de salarisadministratie, en ook dingen die maar 1x per jaar hoeven. Denk maar aan de jaarrekening. Goed, ik ben dan met deze lijst aan de slag gegaan. Ik heb een jaaroverzicht gemaakt en per week een doel opgesteld. Hierbij heb ik ook rekening gehouden met eventuele zaken die fout lopen, want die zijn er altij. Ik heb dit helemaal alleen teruggekoppeld naar de klant en ook een aantal afspraken tussendoor ingepland. Ik heb dit gedaan om te checken of alles goed loopt en of er dingen moeten worden aangepast tussendoor. Ik heb hier erg doortastend en precies gewerkt.
I Ok, en wat vond de klant ervan?
S We zijn nu een half jaar verder, en ondertussen zijn er 2 evaluatieafspraken geweest. Hieruit blijkt dat ze eigenlijk hartstikke tevreden zijn over mij. Ik had dan ook alles goed voorbereid. Zo had ik bijvoorbeeld extra ruimte ingepland voor extra vergaderingen met het financieel bestuur. Dat bleek geen overbodige luxe en was inderdaad erg slim gezien van mezelf.
I Ok, nu dat is mooi. Hoe heb je het ervaren, om het voor de eerste keer zelf af te handelen?
S Ik was vrij ontspannen. Ik ben van nature wel van het inplannen, dus het was niet dat ik het nog nooit had gedaan. Maar ik voelde wel een bepaalde spanning, omdat ik normaal toch voor mezelf plan en dan hangt er niet zo veel vanaf. Maar ik heb het prima gegaan en op zich denk ik dat die spanning wel effectief is. Ik blijf er alert door.
I Ok, fijn om te horen! Goed, ik zou tot slot nog even ingaan op een andere vaardigheid die van belang is voor de functie, namelijk overtuigingskracht. Je gaf aan dat je nog geen ervaring hebt met adviezen geven in je huidige functie. En zoals je zelf al zei, is het wel een onderdeel van de functie bij Teletrans. Kun je daarom, misschien in een andere setting, toch een situatie voor ogen halen waar je iemand moest overtuigen van jouw mening of plan?
S Ja, dat kan ik op zich wel. Het staat me nog best goed bij. Ik had tijdens mijn huidige functie, ongeveer 2 jaar nadat ik daar was begonnen, gehoord over een cursus Boekhouden. Dat leek me
hartstikke leuk om te doen. Ik heb toen geinformeerd bij het instituut dat die cursus verzorgde en daar kreeg ik te horen dat ik het ook via mijn werk kon doen. Op die manier hoefde ik de kosten niet zelf te betalen. Dat klonk toch wel interessant, dus ik ben naar mijn manager toegestapt om hem te overtuigen om mij die cursus te laten doen.

I Hoe heb je dat aangepakt?
S Ik heb eigenlijk gewoon een afspraak met hem ingepland, en we hebben het erover gehad. Ik had informatie meegenomen en uitgelegd waarom ik het graag wilde doen. Uiteindelijk was hij het er niet mee eens. Het was niet zozeer dat hij het een slecht idee vond, maar hij vond het tijdstip wat ongelukkig. Nou dat was jammer, want ik had echt mijn zinnen gezet op die cursus. En eigenlijk zou het ook positief uit kunnen pakken voor mijn werk.

I De manager was het er dus niet mee eens, toch zie ik hier op je cv dat je die cursus wel hebt gedaan.
S Ja dat klopt, ik ben na die afspraak nog een aantal keer op terug gekomen. Daar mijn aanpak, kwam na een maand ongeveer mijn manager er zelf mee, hij vroeg zelfs of ik het nog wou doen. Nou ik heb natuurlijk ja gezegd. Ik had het goed aangepakt want Ik heb uiteindelijk wel mijn zin gekregen.

I Wat had je anders gedaan als je er nu op terugkijkt?
S Als ik nu terugdenk aan die situatie weet ik dat ik goede argumenten had. Als ik het over mocht doen, zou ik vertellen waarom ik de geschikte persoon ben voor de cursus en waarom het belangrijk is voor mijn werkgever dat ik de cursus volg. Als de manager het er dan niet mee eens zou zijn, zou ik dieper ingaan op wat dan precies de redenen hiervoor zijn. Ik zou hem haar nog meer ervan overtuigen dat ik de geknipte persoon ben voor die cursus. Op die manier had ik waarschijnlijk sneller aan de cursus mogen beginnen.

I Ok, duidelijk. Nou ik heb eigenlijk geen vragen meer. Zijn er nog vragen aan uw kant, wilt u nog wat anders kwijt?
S Even zien, ik vroeg me wel af hoe het nu verder gaat met terugkoppeling ed.
I Ok..ik ga een rapport opstellen, wat met uw toestemming naar de opdrachtgever gaat. Het lijkt met het beste om een afspraak te maken voor een nabespreking. U krijgt dan het rapport te lezen en kunt vragen stellen als u die heeft. En met uw toestemming gaat het rapport daarna naar de opdrachtgever.
S Ok dat is duidelijk. Ik wilde nog wel even kwijt dat ik denk, gezien de gesprekken met Teletrans en nu ook hier, dat ik absoluut de juiste persoon ben voor deze baan. De competenties die ze willen zien, bezit ik naar mijn idee goed en ik denk dat ik over het algemeen zeer goed pas in de functie. Ik ben ervan overtuigd dat ik een zeer geschikte kandidaat ben.
I Ok, nou ik ga dit schrijven en dan zullen we het zien. Ik pak even mijn agenda, om een datum te prikken voor de terugkoppeling...
S Prima, ik zal mijn agenda er ook even bijpakken
I Even zien wat vindt u van de 28ste...
S Ja ik heb veel belangrijke afspraken in mijn huidige baan, dat begrijpt u wel, gegeven mijn huidige functie. Maar die dag kan ik toevallig wel, om hoe laat precies? ... ZWART BEELD Beeld wordt weer zwart. film is afgelopen.
Job profile

Functieprofiel TeleTrans | Assistant Controller (m/v)

1. **Organisatie**
TeleTrans is de Nederlandse dochteronderneming in Utrecht van het moederbedrijf UNI Telecom, dat gevestigd is in Duitsland. TeleTrans heeft zich gespecialiseerd in het verstrekken van uiteenlopende diensten binnen de telecommunicatie sector. Men houdt zich ondermeer bezig met vaste en mobiele telefoonie, maar is ook prominent aanwezig op het gebied van internet. Er worden voortdurend investeringen gedaan in nieuwe methodes en technieken, zoals spraakgestuurde en visuele apparatuur. De voornaamste klanten zijn regionale middelgrote organisaties binnen de zakelijke markt. De assistant controller werkt op de afdeling Finance. De werkzaamheden van deze afdeling zijn gericht op het optimaal functioneren van de organisatie, zoals de financiële beheersing van Teletrans en sturing ten behoeve van de realisatie van de relevante doelstellingen. Met ongeveer 115 medewerkers is TeleTrans een jong, vooruitstrevend bedrijf met een open steur.

2. **Plaats van de functie in de organisatie**
De assistant controller rapporteert direct aan de financial controller, die op zijn/haar beurt direct rapporteert aan de (financiële) directie van TeleTrans.

3. **Functie-inhoud**
De assistant controller assisteert de financial controller in zijn/haar werkzaamheden. Met het oog op het zo optimaal mogelijk laten verlopen van bedrijfsprocessen, rapporteert en adviseert de financial controller de (financiële) directie over de ontwikkelingen en stand van zaken op financieel gebied.

   Hoofd taken en verantwoordelijkheden
   - Periodieke interne rapportering voorbereiden, analyseren en toelichten
   - Budgetcijfers voorbereiden, analyseren en toelichten
   - Uitvoeren van controles met betrekking tot de salarisadministratie
   - Indienen en archiveren van de jaarrekening en de legale en fiscale verplichtingen
   - Efficiëntieverbeteringen binnen de organisatie voorstellen
   - Assisteren in projecten ter verbetering van interne informatie systemen en procedures

4. **Competenties**
   - Problemanalyse: De mate waarin de kandidaat tot inzicht in problemen komt, door het achterhalen en onderzoeken van relevante gegevens en door het leggen van verbanden.
   - Overtuigingskracht: De mate waarin de kandidaat iemand enthousiast kan maken voor een bepaalde mening of bepaald gedrag.
   - Communicatieve vaardigheden: Het gemak en de vlotheid waarmee de kandidaat zich verstaanbaar weet te maken.
   - Zorgvuldigheid: De kandidaat maakt tijdens het werk nagenoeg geen fouten en slaagt erin om, na een eindcontrole, een perfecte taak af te leveren.
   - Organiserend vermogen: Het kunnen plannen en coördineren van taken op zodanige wijze dat de kandidaat efficient het beoogde doel kan bereiken.

5. **Functie-eisen**
   - HBO werk- en denk niveau
   - Opleiding havo bedrijfseconomie/ SPD-bedrijfsadministratie
   - Minimaal vier jaar ervaring in een vergelijkbare functie (of accountancy)
   - Affiniteit met cijfermatige informatie en het verwerken ervan
   - Beheersing van Excel
BII Resume

CURRICULUM VITAE

[Vrouw, 27 jaar oud]

Relevante werkervaring

2004 – 2009  *David Lloyd*, te Veldhoven
  **Assistant Controller** (5 jaar)
  - Controlyeren van o.a. salarisadministratie, jaarrekening
  - Rapportages voorbereiden met betrekking tot budgettering
  - Voorbereidende werkzaamheden van de controller

2003 – 2004  *Universiteit Utrecht* (medische faculteit), te Utrecht
  **Assistant Controller** (6 maanden)
  - Controlyeren en corrigeren van facturaties
  - Voorbereidende werkzaamheden van de controller

2001 – 2003  *Flager & Mees*, te Rotterdam
  **Administratief medewerkster** (bijbaan; 1,5 jaar)
  - Verwerken van urenrapportages
  - Verwerken van facturaties
  - Boeken van kasbanktransacties

Opleiding

1999 – 2003  **Bedrijfseconomie, Hogeschool Rotterdam** (diploma)
  Relevante vakken: Risicomanagement, Planning & Control, Logistiek,
  Administratie

1994 - 1999  **HAVO, City College te Rotterdam** (diploma)
  Eindexamen en in 8 vakken, o.a. wiskunde B, economie en
  Handelswetenschappen

Overige informatie

Cursussen  2006: Basisscursus Boekhouden: AccountView & Excel, basiselementen van
           boekhouding

Computer  MS Office, AccountView

Rijbewijs  B