Parties involved

recruiter

applicant

expert
Personnel Selection

oldest applied domain
in psychology
General Intelligence

Conscientiousness

Unstructured interview
invalid predictor
The recruiter choosing: *gustus*
The recruiter’s gusto

• Difference between rejecting the weakest and selecting the best (Shafir, 1993)
‘If I think it it is true’ (Uhlmann & Cohen, 2007)

If feeling of objectivity
and stereotype thoughts
-> acting accordingly
The recruiter’s gusto

- **Dilution effect**  
  *(Tetlock & Boettger, 1889)*

- Financial job
- Assessment of integrity and incorruptibility
- Candidate scores high on these characteristics
- Assessor also receives information about the amount of plants the candidate has at home
  ...
The recruiter’s gusto

• Statistical vs Clinical prediction (Grove et al., 2000)
The recruiter’s gusto

‘Why didn’t you succeed?’

Interviewer asks the applicant about an earlier failure
The interviewer is asking the applicant about a prior failure experience:

“In your study results, I saw that you failed that key exam on business economics. What was the reason that you failed”?

• The applicant answers: “Yes, I remember I failed that exam. I did not take enough time for self study for that exam, unfortunately”.

‘Why didn’t you succeed’?
The interviewer is asking the applicant about a prior failure experience:

“In your study results, I saw that you failed that key exam on business economics. What was the reason that you failed”?

• The applicant answers: “Yes, I remember I failed that exam. The lecturer left halfway the course, and then everything became much more difficult for me, unfortunately.”
Interviewer: “Ms Jones, you just told that you left your academic study before having received your diploma and that you have started working on another project. But that afterwards you were not happy about your decision. Why did you leave the university at that time?”

The applicant answers: “When I left the university, I did not think through the consequences of what I did.”
Interviewer: “Ms Jones, you just told that you left your academic study before having received your diploma and that you have started working on another project. But that afterwards you were not happy about your decision. Why did you leave the university at that time?”

The applicant answers: “I guess that when you are young, you do not think very deeply about the consequences of your behavior. My youth was the reason.”
British study (Silvester, 1997):
35 transcripts of interviews

Attribution style:
- Personal vs universal
- Stable characteristic vs instable characteristic
- Under applicant’s control vs not under control of the applicant
- Global vs specific
The International Organization for Standardization (ISO) in Geneva has an HR Office with a staff of recruiters involved in its selection procedures.

Over the years, recruiters Colvin and Hauenstein have proven to give very accurate judgments of the personality of applicants, but the judgments of Gilles and Davis systematically have been less accurate.

Some colleagues at ISO state that Colvin and Hauenstein are very intelligent and therefore are more accurate judges. Yet other colleagues at ISO have expressed doubts whether judgmental accuracy is related to individual differences between judges at all. Instead, they state that Gilles and Davis have been providing less accurate judgments because they simply focus too much on their first impressions of candidates.
‘Dispositional intelligence’ (Christiansen et al. 2005)
Social skills, agreeableness, adjustment (Letzring, 2008)
The recruiter’s gusto

The ultimate choice

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Candidate</th>
<th>Predictor 1</th>
<th>Predictor 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Candidate</th>
<th>Predictor 1</th>
<th>Predictor 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The expert

• Modern technology
The expert

Popularity multimedia tests?

- Technologically advanced (internet, multimedia)
- Applicant reactions (job relevance, fairness perceptions)
The expert

Characteristics

1) Simulations
The expert

Characteristics

2) Videoclips to present situations
The expert

Characteristics

3) Response format: multiple choice (SJT) or open ended (webcam test)
The expert

Characteristics

4) Scoring methods

SJT$s$: compared to answers of a reference group (automatic)

Webcamtest: answers later on assessed by experts
The expert

Advantages

1) Flexibility of assessment -> less costs
2) Realism, detail (Weekley & Jones, 1997)
3) Applicants react positively, are more motivated (Stricker, 1982)
The expert

Statement 1

“It does not make a difference whether one uses technologically advanced tests or classical tests to measure individual differences. The modern tests are old wine in expensive new bottles and they also are quickly outdated...”
"No idea what multimedia tests really are measuring. They look fantastic but there is nothing, no psychological construct, behind them. Nice little toys for IT-people but as a psychologist I cannot be bothered."
The expert

Statement 3

“Multimedia tests such as SJT’s are easy to fake.”
The expert

Statement 4

“Multimedia tests show smaller score differences between ethnic groups than p&p tests.”
The expert

Statement 5

“These multimedia tests make psychologists superfluous. They will lead to unemployment among psychologists.”
Openness

Emotional stability

Conscientiousness

Extraversion

Agreeableness
How to enhance the predictive validity of personality tests?
Contextualisation
(Butter & Born, 2012)
Counterproductive work behavior

Integrity

Conscientiousness
Moscoso & Salgado (2004): Dark side of personality

- Narcisism - contextual job performance: negative relationship

- Antisocial style - gen./contextual/task-performance: negative relationship
The applicants

• What do they want?
Success is getting what you want, happiness is wanting what you get ... (Iyengar et al., 2006)
Maximizers:

Want the best; scrutinize all possibilities

Satisficers:

Search for an option which is good enough
Higher salary, less happy

Lost in the jungle of choices
Impression management

- Self promotion
- Making compliments (Higgins & Judge, 2004)
Video CV
(Hiemstra, 2013)
Social Network Sites

- Identity claims
- Behavioural residues
The chosen

- The happy applicant?

- Positive affectivity leads to work success (Lyubomirski et al., 2005)
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