



**“Can you hear me, ok? Is the video working all right?”**

Use of video tools in recruitment interviews from applicants' and recruiters' perspectives

**Anna Vaittinen**

Essay/Thesis: 30 hp

Program and/or course: Master of Strategic Human Resource Management and Labour Relations

Level: Second Cycle

Semester/year: Spring 2022

Supervisor: Nanna Gillberg

Examiner: Petra Adolfsson

# Abstract

Essay/Thesis: 30 hp

Program: Master of Strategic Human Resource Management and Labour Relations

Level: Second Cycle

Semester/year: Fall 2022

Supervisor: Nanna Gillberg

Examiner: Petra Adolfsson

Report No: xx (not to be filled in by the student/students)

Keywords: Video tools, video interviews, recruitment, job interviews, applicants, recruiters

**Purpose:** The aim of this study is to investigate the use of video tools in recruitment interviews, and what kind of experiences applicants and employers have of them. Moreover, the purpose is to understand the affects of their use on interviews and their outcomes. The study has two perspectives, as it investigates both applicants', and recruiters' experiences.

**Theory:** Goffman's dramaturgical model (1959) was applied in this research to understand how the applicants and recruiters try to manage their performance in video interviews, what role video tools might have in their performance, and how the audience perceives the performance when it occurs in video interviewing context.

**Method:** This study was conducted by interviewing six applicants and six recruiters, who had participated in recruitment interviews that utilized video tools. A qualitative method was chosen, and the semi-structured interviews were held during the spring of 2022 via Zoom.

**Results:** Video tools enable the applicants and recruiters to manage their interview performance before and during the job interview. This management is similar to what they do for in-person interviews, but video tools also require specific preparation steps, like setting the scene. Besides the setting, participants can use props to support their performance.

Video tools can affect the impression participants formulate of each other and the evaluation if they are not aware of the limitations of the video tools. When participants have experience in using video tools, they can focus on the content of the interview and manage challenging situations such as technology failure during the interview. The experienced recruiters can manage the interviewing situation and thus set a base for a successful interview.

Applicants and recruiters both appreciate the flexibility that the use of video tools offers. Other advantages of video tools are saved time, increased productivity, and a sense of safety. Regarding disadvantages, participants mention not being able to show personality, less natural communication, and restricted senses. Overall, interviewees feel positive about their experiences with video tools, and they hope they will be utilized in the future.

# Acknowledgement

First and foremost, the author would like to say thank you to all respondents who participated in the interviews and shared their experiences and thoughts on video tools and recruitment interviews. Your input was a valuable and crucial part of this work. Then, the author would like to acknowledge the assistance of the supervisor Nanna Gillberg, who with great patience and encouragement helped to get this study to the finish line. And whose insight and comments aided in improving this work.

Thank you!

Anna Vaittinen

## **Table of content**

<b>I.</b>	<b>Introduction</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>II.</b>	<b>Aim and research questions</b>	<b>3</b>
	<b>2.1 Research questions</b>	<b>3</b>
	<b>2.2 Disposition</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>III.</b>	<b>Previous research</b>	<b>4</b>
	<b>3.1 Video tools as an interviewing method</b>	<b>4</b>
	3.1.1 <i>Advantages of using video tools in interviewing</i>	<b>4</b>
	3.1.2 <i>Disadvantages of using video tools in interviewing</i>	<b>5</b>
	<b>3.2 Recommendations for a video interview</b>	<b>6</b>
	<b>3.3 Video tools and implications for an interview evaluation</b>	<b>7</b>
	<b>3.4 Summary</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>IV.</b>	<b>Theoretical framework</b>	<b>9</b>
	<b>4.1 Introduction of the dramaturgical model</b>	<b>9</b>
	<b>4.2 Dramaturgical model</b>	<b>10</b>
	4.2.1 <i>Performances</i>	<b>10</b>
	4.2.2 <i>The Front and Back</i>	<b>10</b>
	4.2.3 <i>The performer, audience, and others</i>	<b>11</b>
	4.2.4 <i>Impression management and strategic sharing of information</i>	<b>11</b>
	<b>4.3 Criticism of the dramaturgical model</b>	<b>12</b>
	4.3.1 <i>Criticism of the dramaturgical model</i>	<b>12</b>
	4.3.2 <i>Presentation of self in the digital setting</i>	<b>13</b>
<b>V.</b>	<b>Method</b>	<b>14</b>
	<b>5.1 Selection of research methodology</b>	<b>14</b>
	<b>5.2 Data collection</b>	<b>14</b>
	5.2.1 <i>Primary data - semi-structured interviews</i>	<b>14</b>
	5.2.2 <i>Secondary data</i>	<b>18</b>
	<b>5.3 Trustworthiness</b>	<b>18</b>
	<b>5.4 Limitations</b>	<b>19</b>
	<b>5.5 Ethical considerations</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>VI.</b>	<b>Empirical findings</b>	<b>21</b>
	<b>5.1 Applicant perspective</b>	<b>21</b>
	5.1.1 <i>Preparations for a video interview</i>	<b>21</b>
	5.1.2 <i>Management of performance during the video Interview</i>	<b>23</b>

5.1.3 Impressions and evaluation of the recruiter.....	25
5.1.4 Applicants' experiences with video interviews.....	29
<b>5.2 Recruiter perspective.....</b>	<b>30</b>
5.2.1 Preparations for a video interview.....	30
5.2.2. Management of performance during the video Interview.....	32
5.2.3 Impressions and evaluation of the applicant.....	35
5.2.4 Recruiters' experiences with video interviews.....	39
<b>VII. Discussion.....</b>	<b>42</b>
<b>6.1 How do applicants and recruiters manage the use of video tools?.....</b>	<b>42</b>
6.1.1 Management of the performance before and during the interview.....	42
6.1.2 The Back and Front of the performance.....	43
6.1.3 Managing the setting and the props in the performance.....	43
<b>6.2 How do applicants and recruiters experience the use of video tools?.....</b>	<b>44</b>
6.2.1 Video tools and feeling of safety during the interview.....	44
6.2.2 Communication during a video interview.....	45
6.2.2 Different roles in a video interview setting.....	45
<b>6.3 What implications use of video tools have on interview outcomes?.....</b>	<b>46</b>
6.3.1 Video tools and their implication for evaluation of the candidate.....	46
6.3.2 Significance of previous experience in conducting a successful video interview.....	47
6.3.3 Technology and its role in the evaluation.....	48
6.3.4 Limitations of video tools and strategic sharing of information.....	49
<b>VIII. Conclusion.....</b>	<b>50</b>
<b>7.1 Recommendations regarding the use of video tools.....</b>	<b>51</b>
<b>7.2 Suggestions for further research.....</b>	<b>53</b>
<b>References.....</b>	<b>54</b>
<b>Appendix A.....</b>	<b>59</b>
<b>Appendix B.....</b>	<b>60</b>

# I. Introduction

“Can you hear me, ok?”, “Is the video working all right?” These seem to be the opening lines of conversation when we communicate with each other utilizing video tools. We keep finding ourselves living a life enhanced by the use of technological devices and platforms that enable us to interact with our network via videos. We experience our day-to-day life through these devices and platforms, and the way we communicate has been altered probably in more ways than we even realize. And these changes are not limited only to our personal lives, as we utilize these tools in working life as well. Video tools can be used in various ways in organizations, and they have found their place in recruitment, branding and marketing, training, onboarding, and many more. Moreover, organizations can choose from several different video tools which are the most suitable for them. There are many well-known providers such as Zoom, Google Meets, Microsoft Teams, or Slack that offer a platform for video-mediated communication. The use of these platforms has increased dramatically, as there were 10 million meeting participants at the end of the year 2019 and by the spring of the year 2020 that number had increased to over 300 million (Evans, 2020; Karl et al., 2021)

Globalization has had a significant role in how much we use technological devices and platforms. Going through digital transformation and using technological devices and platforms has helped people to overcome great distances. People can stay connected and communicate no matter the time and location. Sepashvili (2020) describes that in the current global economy digitalisation occurs at increasing velocity and extends to all areas of life. In addition to these great changes, the topic of video tools is strongly connected to current events and trends. It is impossible not to mention the effects of the COVID-19 pandemic, which led to social distancing and remote working practically overnight. Suddenly, it is commonplace to make video calls, have video meetings, or even company events online. Organizations have been forced to change their way of working, including recruitment, as described by Carnevale and Hatak (2020). Kathiravan et al. (2021) state that even though video tools have been used in recruitment in some organizations as normal practice before, in 2020 that suddenly became the new reality for companies in general. One can argue this rapid change must have affected the recruitment outcomes and experiences. Also, as many companies might be considering switching to hybrid models of working (PwC, 2021), using video tools in companies will have long-term implications for recruitment. There is a question of whether companies will keep

utilizing video tools in the future or go back to face-to-face interviews and if applicants prefer companies that can offer different ways to participate in the interviews.

Then, regarding recruitment, Odeku (2015) argues, that it cannot be highlighted enough how important successful recruitments are for companies, as successful recruitment can bring value to the company in a form of a good employee, whereas hiring an unsuitable employee can have a negative impact on the company. Therefore, it is a logical conclusion that conducting successful recruitment and finding an employee with a good organizational fit should be a priority for organizations, no matter if the interviews are conducted in person or via video interviewing method. Video tools offer interesting opportunities and benefits for both companies and applicants. For example, Torres and Mejia (2017) describe how remote interviewing lowers the costs of recruitment, and there is also increased flexibility. And these same aspects apply to the applicants as well, who are trying to manage the interview situation and reach an outcome that is favourable for them or in other words, get selected for the applied position.

For all these reasons, one can argue that video tools are strongly connected to modern life, related to both work and free time, and now more than ever, due to the change brought by the COVID-19 pandemic. We have been forced to rethink the ways we communicate and interact, and there is no turning back. This has implications for all organizations that utilize modern technologies in their operations. Bringing this together with the knowledge that recruitment has a significant role in companies' success, understanding how video tools affect recruitment experiences and outcomes is highly important. And while video interviews in themselves are not a new phenomenon, McColl et al. (2019) mention, that there is still a gap between how much videos are being used in communication and how much they have been investigated. This adds up to the argument of the relevance of this research.

The aim of this study is to investigate the use of video tools in recruitment interviews, and what kind of experiences applicants and employers have of them. Moreover, the purpose is to understand what kind of affects their use might have on interviews and their outcomes. The study will have two perspectives, as it investigates both applicants', and recruiters' experiences. The applicant's point of view will investigate how candidates experience and manage the use of videos, whereas the recruiter's perspective investigates their experiences and evaluation of the candidates. In this research, video interviews mean recruitment interviews that have been conducted synchronously with someone with a help of video tools such as Skype, Zoom, or Google Meets.

## II. Aim and research questions

### 2.1 Research questions

- *How do applicants and recruiters manage and experience the use of video tools in recruitment interviews?*
- *How do video tools affect the evaluation of the recruitment interviews from the perspective of the applicant and recruiter?*

### 2.2 Disposition

This paper has the following sections after the *introduction*. First up, is a chapter that presents *previous research*, that broadly describes relevant literature regarding the topic of video tools in recruitment. Previous literature is followed by a chapter introducing a *theoretical framework* that helps to analyze the results of this research. The theoretical framework covers the concepts of presentation of oneself and impression management. Afterwards, the *method* describes how the research was conducted and how the material was gathered. Then, the findings of the research are presented along with the summary of conducted interviews in *empirical findings*. The final section includes a *discussion* regarding the research questions and *conclusions* of the findings and their reflection on theory. The ending holds suggestions for further research.

## III. Previous research

McColl and Michelotti (2019), empathize that despite the video technology has been widely implemented there is still a limited amount of empirical research regarding the use of video tools. However, more literature can be discovered when including research beyond video interviewing in a corporate context. Thus, the following chapter looks into the topic of video tools in qualitative research interviews, discovering the benefits of using video tools as an interviewing method.

### 3.1 Video tools as an interviewing method

#### *3.1.1 Advantages of using video tools in interviewing*

Hanna (2012) argues that video interviews are a viable option for traditional interviews that are conducted in person and that the benefits of using video tools for conducting interviews in qualitative research are equal to the benefits of in-person interviews. This is because the internet offers a way to reach out to people without the hindrance of distance and because video tools enable synchronous interaction between the people participating in the interview and the interaction has visual and interpersonal features. (Evans et al., 2008; Hanna, 2012). Moreover, video tools make it possible to record communication, both audio and visual interaction. Other benefits of video tools are lower costs, accessibility, less travelling, and consequently more positive ecological impact while creating a feeling of a safe or neutral environment, in which to conduct the interview. (Hanna, 2012)

Krouwel, Jolly, and Greenfield (2019) have come to a similar conclusion on the benefits of video interviews in qualitative research. Besides saving time and costs, their research discovered that in-person interviews were only marginally better than video interviews regarding the generated number of spoken words. According to their results, the number of topics was in both interview methods similar but there tended to be more supportive statements regarding different topics, in in-person interviews than in video interviews. However, the authors argue that the difference was not great, and the benefit of saving time and money might be more significant.

Then, if looking at the benefits from the corporate context, McColl and Michelotti's (2019) research points out similar several advantages, of which saving time and money were considered to be the two greatest benefits. This is even though the companies interviewed in the study had not kept track of

how much money and time they were saving, and they were uncertain how much they were gaining regarding productivity. Then as a third benefit, they mention causing less impact on the environment and as a fourth point that video interviewing can be considered to be safer for the participants. According to the authors, the participants had this factor in mind as during the time of interviewees Europe experienced recurring safety concerns. Then if the members of the interview are in different locations, video as an interviewing method makes organizing the selection committee easier. In addition, they argue that using videos could be beneficial for the organization as it could send a message to applicants that their company is “*modern*” and “*innovative*” (McColl & Michelotti, 2019, p.645).

### ***3.1.2 Disadvantages of using video tools in interviewing***

Then regarding the disadvantages of video tools Karl, Peluchette, and Aghakhani (2021) argue that people may have feelings of tiredness or “*Zoom fatigue*” (Fosslie & Duffy, 2020; Karl et al., 2021; Strassman, 2020). The reason for this is explained to be direct eye contact (Bailenson, 2020; Karl et al., 2021) as outside video meetings people do not tend to look at each other as long, or as closely (Karl et al., 2020; Strassman, 2020). Besides this viewing images on the screen can cause increased activity in our brain and feelings of being alert and it is possible to be overwhelmed by all the information we get by trying to follow the communication of several people (Karl et al., 2021; Morris, 2020). And not only this but people’s focus can be taken by other’s backgrounds on the screen (Fosslie & Duffy, 2020) or their attention might focus on the visible chat features (Karl et al., 2021; Wiederhold, 2020). In some cases, people can start feeling self-conscious, or too aware of themselves if they end up looking at their own picture on the screen during the meeting (Fosslie & Duffy, 2020; Karl et al., 2021). Kydd and Ferry (1994) argue that though from video tools one might expect communication that is similar to in-person interaction regarding the richness of the communication, it would appear that is not the case. Authors argue that compared to an in-person meeting, via video is more difficult to build trust and loyalty and being untruthful is easier.

Then, according to Basch et al., (2020) applicants do not feel as positive about video interviews compared to in-person interviews. They describe that this is because there is a lack of presence that is created when a participant is not able to physically sense the other participant in the same space and they mention that a sceptical view of this interviewing method can be caused by the participants feeling that they are not able to implement their strategy of impression management as well. And not only this, Basch et al., (2020) argue that this sceptical view of video tools as an interviewing method

could lead to interviewees not choosing offered work or even talk negative things about the company conducting the interviews.

### **3.2 Recommendations for a video interview**

Jones and Abdelfattah (2020) describe that the use of video meeting alternatives, that have emerged during the pandemic, can continue as adapted practice in the future. However, not all applicants might be equally prepared to undergo these types of recruitments, and thus Jones and Abdelfattah (2020) offer suggestions on how applicants may optimize their performance in video interviews, and they describe examples of factors that can be distractive during the interview. For advice, they mention three different areas that applicants should take into consideration, which are the preparation of technological platforms, optimizing physical space, and performing a simulated virtual interview. For the first, the authors highlight the importance of preparing technological platforms as trouble with them during the interview can be inconvenient and take a lot of time that should be used for the interview itself. To minimize the risk of this happening one should test the audio, camera, and the platform used in the interview, and close other computer programs that could hinder the connection. There should also exist a plan in case of the connection breaks up. As for optimizing the physical space, the authors argue for choosing a location that would not take the focus out of the interview. This means using neutral background where there is no movement or disturbances. Lighting should be considered as well, so that person's features can be seen clearly. Then Jones and Abdelfattah (2020) advise doing a practice interview, so the applicant can take notice if they do something that could be a disadvantage. This means evaluating if there exist any distractions. As distractions in a virtual interview, they mention the following: “1) *Adjusting glasses, tie or hair*, 2) *glare from glasses (opt for contacts)*, 3) *staring at the screen rather than the camera*, 4) *swivelling or fidgeting in chair*, 5) *touching or itching face*, 6) *interruptions or noise from pets or other people*, 7) “*loud*” *background art or photos*” (Jones & Abdelfattah, 2020, table 1. p 734). During this practice interview, one should check if the chosen outfit looks all right on the screen, and whether they act or speak in any way that would take the focus out of the message they want to convey to the interviewer.

However, all these tips and advice are not only recommended for the applicants. Fatzinger (2016) empathizes, that video interviews offer to the applicants a view of the company environment and culture. For this reason, the presentation of the company should be intentional. Fatzinger (2016) points out that the applicants follow both, verbal and nonverbal signals, during the interview.

### **3.3 Video tools and implications for an interview evaluation**

McColl and Michelotti (2019) argue that video technology has a stronger impact on recruiting and its outcomes than has been assumed previously. Suen et al., (2019) investigate the impact of using videos in recruitment, and whether their use influences decisions made in the Human Resource Department. Their focus was on understanding asynchronous videos (recorded videos) but their findings show some insight into synchronous videos as well. They argue that no matter whether the interview is synchronous or asynchronous impressions and physical appearance are factors in the interview rating. Moreover, in synchronous interviews, the impact of first impressions and physical appearance are highlighted in rating in case they are “extreme”, in a good or a bad way.

From the applicant’s perspective, there is a concern that interviewers are not as invested in video interviews compared to the ones conducted in person. This is one of the points that emerged from Jones and Abdelfattah’s (2020) study regarding conducting medical internship interviews virtually. In addition, applicants were concerned about not being able to evaluate how the faculty members interact between themselves or getting to spend time with the faculty team. From the faculty perspective, members had concerns about how they would be able to conduct technical skill testing, and how well they will be able to know the applicants. The faculty was also concerned about how comfortable the people are with using technology for the interviews. Then both of these groups had concerns about miscommunication, not being able to attend a physical tour, and whether they would be able to demonstrate their personality and soft skills in the same way as in an in-person interview. Additionally, they raised concerns about technology, and how there could be malfunctions or some technology could be new for them, therefore lacking in experience.

But concerns regarding technology might not be unfounded, as the study by Fiechter, Fealing, Gerrard, and Kornell, 2018 suggests. They describe concerns about how internet connection might affect the audio-visual quality of the videos and consequently the evaluation of the video interviews. They argue that because of a poor internet connection some candidates could be at a disadvantage and rated worse than applicants with a good internet connection. However, not all negative impacts in evaluation might be accidental, as Kathiravan et al., (2021) point out the applicants have ways to influence their interviewing performance. They argue that while the use of video tools in recruitment has increased, at the same time the quality of the interview has suffered. According to their claims, this is because applicants can use other tabs or devices while having the interview online. This can mislead the interviewers regarding applicants’ skills, therefore resulting in the hiring of less-skilled candidates.

Then, Karl et al. (2021) argue that people might not be familiar with the social norms and meeting etiquette of virtual meetings. Besides they point out that video meetings do not enable physical presence and therefore a sense of shared space. Besides, video meetings lack touch and scent cues (Karl et al., 2021; Standaert et al., 2016), and individuals are not able to evaluate each other's body language or gestures as well as in-person, nor they can participate in side discussions with other participants or manage physical objects (Karl et al., 2021; Standaert et al., 2021). Video meetings also put restrictions on how much people can observe dynamics within the participants (Karl et al 2021; Kuzminykh & Rintel (2020a).

### **3.4 Summary**

To conclude, there is some literature on video tools, but a lot remains to be investigated. From a corporate point of view, understanding especially how video tools affect the evaluation of the candidates and whether the interviewing method has implications for how successful the recruitments are. The literature regarding organizational practices on video tools or studies investigating the implementation of video tools is lacking. In addition, there is no research on how the HR department limits or enables the use of videos. The existing literature emphasizes suggestions on how applicants can optimize their performance in video interviews, also describing the technical limitations of video interviews and what technical aspects should be taken into consideration when aiming for a successful interview. Like Jones and Abdelfattah (2020) and Dolan (2019) argue, applicants should take notice of technology and test the equipment and connection beforehand. Therefore, based on the previous literature it seems to be a valid concern to show consideration how technology works during the interview as it could affect the interaction and thus the impression given in the interview. It also seems that applicants should consider their surroundings and appearance if they wish to succeed in the interview, and they should be aware of how the first impression can affect the evaluation, to achieve their objectives. So, the matter of performing successfully in a video interview seems to be more complex than just succeeding with technology. At the same time, interviewers should acknowledge the characteristics of the video interview so they can conduct the evaluation without bias and acknowledge that the applicant might try to manage the evaluation.

## IV. Theoretical framework

For companies finding employees who are a suitable fit not only for a job position but also for the whole company, has great importance. For this reason, screening applicants in the recruitment process is crucial and an employment interview plays a great role in this (Bourdage, Roulin, & Levashina, 2017; Huffcutt and Culbertson, 2011; Macan, 2009). Moreover, recruitment and selection have great importance, as if they are unsuccessful, they can have an impact on productivity, human capital, and organizational skill level (Hsu & Leat, 2000; Iles, Chuai, & Preece, 2010; McColl and Michelotti 2019). Previous literature gives the implication that several aspects need to be considered and managed if we wish to perform successfully in a video interview. We need to pay attention to and manage not only our appearance, behaviour, and communication but also the environment and technology (Jones & Abdelfattah (2020). From this perspective, one can consider a job interview to be a performance, where an applicant and recruiter play their parts, presenting themselves in the best possible light and trying to achieve outcomes that suit their needs. For this reason, from a theoretical perspective, the framework *Presentation of self* (Goffman, 1959) and dramaturgical model offers an interesting point of view for this research. The dramaturgical model helps to understand how individuals act and manage interactions with other people and how the participants observe and evaluate each other, therefore aiding in answering the research questions.

### 4.1 Introduction of the dramaturgical model

“*The Presentation of Self in Everyday life*” (1959) is a book by Erving Goffman that presents a dramaturgical model in sociology. This was not only his first book, but it also became his most known work (Khan, 2020). The author himself (1922-1982) is one of the most influential in the field of sociology, and his impact stretches from his days to modern times (Nguyen, 2015). This dramaturgical model, as Nguyen (2015) summarizes, considers individuals to be actors performing on a stage, that are in this context, all social situations, and action is not considered to be something separate for each individual. It should be put into a context where there are others, focus should be on interaction and not on the individual. On a stage, performers try to win over the audience and make them believe the image they are aiming to portray. Performers try to affect their acts in order to sell the performance to the audience. In these performances, the actors aim to present their best selves. Khan (2020) points out that in this framework people’s actions do not stem solely from the individuals’ interests or character. He describes those actions are set in a context where there are existing scripts, performed on a stage that includes sets we have made or inherited. Moreover, there

are props and accessories that enhance the performance. Several terms come from the theatrical world, like “*performer, character, team and audience; stage, front region, back region; masks, cues and props; routines and parts; performances coming off or falling flat; dramaturgical needs, dramaturgical skills and strategies; impression management; and so forth*” (Nguyen, 2015, p. 55).

## **4.2 Dramaturgical model**

### **4.2.1 Performances**

Goffman (1959) explains that when people meet, they try to get information about each other. People aim to get a comprehensive picture that covers socio-economic status, how they view themselves, their attitude, competence, and trustworthiness. All this information aids in forming a view of the situation that helps the participants to know what is expected of them during that situation. The information that is available in the situation becomes according to Goffman, carriers of “sign-vehicles” that transfer this information.

Goffman (1959) explains that individuals can utilize signs or symbols to reach out to their audience. These signs can be divided into two groups, either performer “gives” expressions or “gives off” them. The first group includes information that the performer wants to portray whereas the second group is formed by non-intentional signals. Many times, the signals of the first group are verbal and the signals of the second group are nonverbal. Consequently, it can seem to the audience that an individual’s performance does not support their message. (Goffman, 1959; Kuznekoff, 2012)

Actors are able to manage their performance to some extent by controlling verbal and nonverbal signals, and this means they might try to convey an idealized version of themselves. The motivation behind this is that the performer wishes the audience would be on their side. The performer can choose to empathize some parts of their act in order to achieve their goal. (Goffman, 1959; Kuznekoff, 2012)

### **4.2.2 The Front and Back**

Goffman (1959) describes that the “Front” is the part where the actor does their performance, and which is observed by the audience, and it is formed by the setting and personal front. One aspect of the Front is the “setting”. that can be things like furniture or interior design. Characteristic of setting is that location wise it stays the same, consequently affecting the performer if they need to be in certain location in order to do their act. The setting aids the audience to grasp the context of the performance. The personal front constitutes of characteristics of the individual, such as the performers physical appearance and manner.

The audience forms their impression about the performer based on happenings on the front, but there is also a backstage, which the audience usually does not have access to. This aspect makes it a place where the actor is able to feel comfortable and relaxed. (Goffman, 1959; Kuznekoff, 2012)

#### **4.2.3 *The performer, audience, and others***

In the dramaturgical model, there are three different roles, which are the performer, the audience, and the outsiders. As mentioned, performers are the ones acting and audience is the people witnessing this act and who try to form a view of this actor based on their performance. Goffman (1959) explains that though other participants in a situation could seem like they are just observing the performance passively, they are still “*projecting a definition of the situation by virtue of their response to the individual and by the virtue of any lines of action they initiate to him.*” (p3) Then, the outsider represents a group that does not realize that they are witnessing a performance created by the actor. (Kuznekoff, 2012; Goffman, 1959)

#### **4.2.4 *Impression management and strategic sharing of information***

In the dramaturgical model the performer may choose to perform some specific act depending on who they are doing the performance for. The performances can be very distinct from each other which can create challenges for the performer, as when audience would see some other performance beside the one, they are supposed to see, the actors’ objectives could be in danger. In this situation it is possible that the audience could get a peek to the backstage where the actor tries to adjust their act, or the performer tries to make the situation seem that it is intentional. (Goffman, 1959; Kuznekoff, 2012)

As Goffman (1959) states that in everyday life first impression are important. He further argues that if interaction between the people is based on this “first impression” all the interactions that come later on between these same individuals is determined by this initial interaction. Therefore, highlighting the importance of this first impression and impression management. Goffman describes impression management to be actors’ techniques that they use in order to express features of their performance of self. Goffman (1959) describes that a person can act in a way that aims to affect the audience in some way. Though he argues that usually this is not totally intentional, and they might not be aware they are doing it. He states that individuals try to act in a way that would make avoiding embarrassment easier and take measure against mishaps that they have not managed to successfully avoid in their performance.

If taking a step further from dramaturgical model, Kuznekoff (2012) argues that Goffman's look on stigma (1963), can be highly important if one wants to get a profound view on self-presentation as it helps to discover why some people would choose to try to conceal information about themselves from others and strategically share some information. Stigma is described to be a characteristic an individual has that they personally or by society consider to be damaging. These types of characteristics can be physical and psychological. (Goffman, 1963; Kuznekoff, 2012)

## **4.3 The dramaturgical model in a modern context**

### *4.3.1 Criticism of the dramaturgical model*

However, there also exists some criticism on the dramaturgical model. Khan (2020) argues that Goffman often did not make references to other scholars, nor did he formulate specific research questions. At the same time, he claims that the points Goffman (1959) presents in his work are actually quite obvious. But he does not deny that sometimes this is something that is common in all ideas that turn out to be transformative and most of all the essence of the work becomes obvious only when it is described to readers in a way that makes you think you have been familiar with it all along. Scheibe (1987) describes that Goffman's work has been acclaimed to be atheoretical and trivial, though he also argues that they were never meant to be theoretical but rather conceptual and that the feeling of triviality stems actually from familiarity. This familiarity seems to be aligned with Khans (2020) arguments.

Another point of criticism is the model's adaptability to modern social situations as the environment of our everyday life has changed quite dramatically since the publication of the framework. Nguyen (2015) aims to answer these claims by mentioning that this framework is considered to have great value in helping us to understand social interactions in everyday life. But he empathises that because of the new technologies we use increasingly in our lives, there has been a change in how people act in social situations and in their interactions. For this reason, Nguyen (2015) argues that Goffman's framework needs to be read keeping in mind the changes that have happened in our social environment.

Nguyen (2015) summarizes new technologies have made interactions more complicated than before; besides face-to-face interactions, there are now other ways to communicate, for example digitally. This has caused people to learn and adjust themselves to new ways of expression, and consequently their presentation of oneself may vary depending on the way it is portrayed, and one has now a multi-faced self. Nguyen (2015) argues that these different forms of interaction has caused diversity in the

Front, where individuals perform their act. This means that people are required to manage different stages, in order to achieve the wanted image.

In Goffman's dramaturgical model, interaction is at its core. This interaction means in-person interactions. Nguyen (2015) describes that in Goffman's model and according to him, social interactions make sense solely if there are other individuals physically present. Goffman argues that this is because otherwise, the individuals are not able to use '*psychobiological element(s)*' such as '*emotion, mood, cognition, bodily orientation, and muscular effort*' (Goffman, 1983, p.5) to influence other actors on stage. This means, according to Nguyen (2015), that in this model only in-person interactions are a context in which a person is able to manage their impression on the other actors.

#### **4.3.2 Presentation of self in the digital setting**

Kuznekoff (2012) describes that the importance of the dramaturgical model is acknowledged when trying to try to understand face-to-face interactions between people. He also argues that a similar type of communication can be seen in the digital setting as well. This means that all digital environments where individuals communicate with each other enable the presentation of self. Kuznekoff (2012) argues that in the digital environment, individuals might show themselves in a favourable light by managing what information they share or do not share. Also, in this setting there can be front and backstage; for example, on Facebook, posts demonstrate the performance happening at the front whereas private messages would be the backstage. Then regarding different audiences, the author describes a situation in which a job applicant posts something meant for their private network, but unintentionally it is shared with a wider audience, maybe even with possible employers. Kuznekoff (2012) mentions that nowadays many platforms enable to choose their profile settings that would help keep the front and backstage distinct. In addition, Kuznekoff (2012) believes, it is beneficial to look into how performers manage stigmatizing information in digital settings; people could share information that puts them at disadvantage in private space, like in direct messages, but would not share the same information more widely, for example in Facebook.

Kuznekoff (2012) summarizes that it would seem that presentation of self depends on which setting they are occurring. He claims that the performer is likely to keep in mind the impact their act can have on their future, meaning that if they feel like they are being easily recognized they keep their performance closer to their face-to-face performance. However, in cases where they think they are not easily identified, they might present a self that is more distinct from their real-life performance.

# V. Method

## 5.1 Selection of research methodology

In order to seek answers to research questions, a qualitative method was chosen, as this research required data that would demonstrate experiences of using video tools in recruitment interviews from two different perspectives. Besides, the aim was to understand how applicants try to manage the interview situation and how recruiters evaluate the job seekers. This meant conducting interviews and talking to people about their experiences in recruitment interviews to gather relevant information. Studying people's "*motivation, communication and understanding*" are at the centre of qualitative research methods, in which the focus is on understanding the "*complexities of humans*". (Seaman, 2008) For this reason, the qualitative research method was chosen as an appropriate method for conducting this research. Moreover, the benefits of qualitative research are that it allows to gather richer information and investigate the topic, even though complex, in a detailed manner, and even gathering the data in this method can be a laborious process (Seaman, 2008), it helps the researcher to gain access to information or groups that other methods cannot. (Moriarty, 2011). Also, qualitative study is flexible, as it allows the researcher to adjust details and design along the research process. (Brown, 2010). In addition, the qualitative method suits this research particularly well, because the method enables interviewees to put into words and describe tacit knowledge. (Moriarty, 2011). As results in the following section show, companies and people just started using video tools at the start of the pandemic without further consideration.

In this research, video interviews mean interviews that are conducted synchronously, or in other words, face-to-face interaction with someone with a help of video tools such as Skype, Zoom or Google Meets.

## 5.2 Data collection

### 5.2.1 Primary data - semi-structured interviews

As Charmaz (2006) describes, data collection is part of the process, that will help to understand "*how people make sense of their situations and act on them.*" (2006, p 11). The primary data for this research was collected from 12 semi-structured interviews. Six of them were interviews with job applicants and the other six were interviews with recruiters who had conducted interviews. Semi-structured interviews bring flexibility to interviewing, and their structure can be altered according to

the aim of the research. And they increase the exchange between participants, which then consequently helps the interviewer to react to the situation and come up with follow-up questions. (Kallio et al., 2016)

The duration of the interviews was between 30-45 minutes, and they were conducted via zoom meetings. Zoom meetings were selected as an interviewing method, due to ensure safety during the COVID-19 pandemic, and because of the distance; as the interviewees were in Finland, while the interviewer was located in Sweden. Besides, Zoom offers video and recording possibilities, which were highly important aspects in conducting successful interviews. And of course, using the video interviewing method gave the author understanding of video tools and aided in the process of writing research regarding video interviews. Regarding the language used in the interviews, there were chosen to be conducted in Finnish because the researcher believed finding participants would be easier and the answers would be more profound and detailed as they would not be dependent on the language skill level of the interviewee.

### *Selection of the participants*

As mentioned in the previous paragraph, this study has a Finnish context, and all the interviewees were Finnish nationals. Finland has been of one the leading countries regarding technology and how it has been implemented for everyday use. (Blomstrom et al., 2002). This gave the author expectation that it would not be challenging to find interviewees with experience in using video tools in a work environment. Also, in Finland, the researcher had a better network to reach out to possible interviewees, and practice to some extent snowball sampling strategy through this network. In snowballing strategy one contact leads to another, forming said “*snowball*” effect. (Etikan, et al., 2016). In this research, the author was able to reach out to a few interviewees through one initial contact. The interviewees were contacted via email and LinkedIn.

As Naderifar et al., (2017) explain, a motivation for qualitative research is to get a more profound understanding of some phenomenon, and for this reason, it is crucial to conduct a thoughtful selection process of the research sample. For this research, it was important to gather information from various individuals who had recent experience in recruitment that have utilized videos in the interviewing phase. Selective sampling is often chosen in qualitative research because it aids the researcher in finding interviewees who provide rich data regarding the investigated topic. (Palinkas et al., 2015). Therefore, the sampling strategy was selective sampling, which allows the researcher to determine

whom to interview. Also, this strategy is determined by practicality as it enables efficient interviewing within a limited timeframe. (Coyne, 1997). The aim was to interview people with relevant video experience, therefore there was no need to interview people from a specific field or people working in some particular job position. Interviewees were required to fit into the category of applicant or recruiter to get a comparative perspective for this research. It was necessary to get interviews from applicants who had participated in recruitment and from recruiters who had been part of interviews and applicant evaluation. These two sides, recruiters, and applicants were, therefore, the most important actors and target population of this research. The interviews began in February 2022, and the final interview was conducted in June 2022.

### *Presentation of the interviews*

Figure 1 presents the participants of this research. In the figure, also the type of the interview is mentioned besides the date of the interview. First listed are applicants with identifying numbers 1-6 and second the recruiters with identifying numbers 1-6. The interviewee's job title, and field of work, along with work experience years, are mentioned to give context to analyzing the results.

	Current employment / Field of employment	Type of interview	Date
Applicant 1	Student	Zoom	2022-02-21
Applicant 2	Management consultant / IT	Zoom	2022-03-09
Applicant 3	Becoming self-employed	Zoom	2022-03-14
Applicant 4	Lawyer / Government	Zoom	2022-03-15
Applicant 5	Yoga entrepreneur	Zoom	2022-03-21
Applicant 6	SEO manager / Igaming	Zoom	2022-06-14
Recruiter 1	HR Manager - 1,5 years / IT	Zoom	2022-02-20
Recruiter 2	Marketing Assistant – 2,5 years / Sport Club	Zoom	2022-03-16
Recruiter 3	Service Manager – 4 months / Accounting	Zoom	2022-03-18
Recruiter 4	Recruiter – 3 years / Recruitment	Zoom	2022-03-21
Recruiter 5	HR specialist – 5 years / Recruitment	Zoom	2022-03-22
Recruiter 6	Senior Recruiter - 3 years / Recruitment	Zoom	2022-04-06

Chart 1. Presentation of interviewees

### *Planning and implementation of the interviews*

As mentioned, to find answers to the research questions, semi-structured interviews were chosen. The reason for this was that they enable the interviewer to follow a structure while interviewing but at the same time it is possible to formulate follow-up questions depending on the given answers. Moreover, with semi-structured interviews, the interviewees are more likely to give comprehensive answers as they cannot give yes or no replies.

The interview guides were formulated based on the topics emerging from the previous literature and theory, keeping in mind that with them it should be possible to answer the research questions. The applicants' interview guide had 20 questions, while the recruiter guide had 21 questions. However, there was slight variation depending on each interviewee, as the questions were modified along the way depending on the given answers and the flow of the interview. If at any point during the interview way of speaking or expression of feeling with facial expression or tone, was observed by the researcher, the interviewing questions were modified accordingly to receive more insightful data. The applicant guide had questions regarding five different themes; 1) *preparation for interview* 2) *interview* 3) *evaluation of outcome* 4) *impression* 5) *experience* while the recruiter guide has four themes; 1) *preparation for interview* 2) *interview* 3) *impressions and evaluation of the applicant* and 4) *experience*. Before conducting the interviews, the guides were looked through by the supervisor of the thesis. These guides can be found in Appendix A and Appendix B.

### *Data analysis*

The in-depth interviews were transcribed from the interview recordings. Zoom was chosen for its capability to record the interview. This was an important part of conducting the interviews as then the researcher was able to focus on the discussion and answers of the interviewee, and therefore formulate follow-up questions. Additionally, recordings made it possible to listen to the interviews afterwards and re-listen to them if something was left unclear.

For a study, the transcriptions are a relevant part, as they bring transparency to the research process when there is access to the information that forms the bases for the analysis. (Nikander, 2008) Recordings were then listened to shortly after the interviews, while still having freshly in mind what had been discussed during the interview. Listening was done with great attention, as interviews were held in Finnish, but the transcripts were done directly in English as that is the language of this research. Therefore, understanding and finding the most important content was important so that

nothing was lost in the translation phase. In this research transcripts were done by concentrating on the content, other factors like tone were not included. As Nikander (2008) describes many times role of translation is forgotten when discussing transcriptions. Because translating the gathered data, requires many decisions from the researcher, and this not only has consequences for practicality but the level of “*detail*” in which the transcriptions are made. (Nikander, 2008).

With content analysis overall aim is to have a general view of the researched phenomena while forming categories that describe this phenomenon. In this analysis, words can be filtered into categories of similar types of content (Elo & Kyngäs, 2008). Content analysis was chosen for analysing purposes, as it brings flexibility, and it aims to offer a deeper understanding of the research topic by a process that includes a “*systematic classification process of coding and identifying themes or patterns*” (Hsieh & Shannon, 2005, page 1278). The collected data was analysed and compared from job applicants' and recruiters' perspectives. All answers were systematically analysed and compared per each question in the guide and recurring words and emerging topics were highlighted to categorise the data for analysis.

This study applied an abductive research approach because it fits well in this research, which tries to answer the research questions by combining gathered data with existing knowledge. Timmermans and Tavory (2012) describe that abduction is a way of thinking that helps to understand the investigated topic in relation to already made observations, and this manner, discover underlying connections with existing studies made in different contexts.

### **5.2.2 Secondary data**

Besides the semi-structured interviews, this research used various literature resources. This literature includes peer-reviewed scientific articles and other relevant articles, news, and webpages on the topic of this research. Besides internet resources, books were part of the secondary data. As the literature regarding the topic is not yet extensive, it was beneficial to also read articles that were not strictly scientific articles. This gave current insight on the topic that other literature was not able to provide, as there were many articles regarding video meetings from the time of the COVID-19 pandemic.

## **5.3 Trustworthiness**

The trustworthiness of this research was made greater by utilizing primary and secondary data resources. Combining various resources trustworthiness was increased as the researcher was able to compare information from these different This gave perspective and a deeper understanding of the

topic. The semi-structured interviews were beneficial in order to gather rich data for the analysis. Utilizing the video interviewing method during the interviews it was possible to observe facial expressions in addition to the tone of voice. This helped to manage the communication and gather richer and more trustworthy data.

## **5.4 Limitations**

The biggest limitations of this study were the limited timeframe to conduct the research and the sample size. With the given time it was only possible to conduct a small number of interviews which were also limited to a max of 45 minutes to find enough participants. But at the same time, the small sample size made it possible to be selective when choosing the interviewees which aided in gathering rich data. And as the aim of this research was to understand better the experiences of applicants and recruiters, this was an important aspect in order to answer the research questions.

## **5.5 Ethical considerations**

In the research study, the most important ethical aspect is the safety of the human subjects, therefore also in qualitative studies because conducting the research is often a very thorough process (Mohd Arifin, 2018). This research was conducted in a manner expected by the Swedish secrecy act (Public access to information and secrecy, 2020) in regards that the participants were entitled to access the information gathered from them during the interviewees. The act also states that people have a right to know how and where their information is stored and for how long. Information about this was given to interviewees via a consent form that was sent to them before the interviews. The consent form included general information about the research and its aim. In addition, it provided information to the interviewees about the use of the gathered data and how it is being processed. Besides the Swedish secrecy act, the research followed the guidelines of The European Code of Conduct for Research Integrity (2017) This means that the research has respected the values of reliability, honesty, respect, and accountability throughout the process.

Verbal permission to record was repeated before beginning the interview. Participants were made aware that they could withdraw from the research at any point. To ensure anonymity, the participants were identified only by numbers as shown in Figure 1. This way, persons' identities are not revealed nor are the recruitments they participated in or organizations they work for at any point during the research process. As Orb et al. (2001) describe, it is not possible to know what information emerges

from interviews, but researchers do need to anticipate and consider their possible outcomes and effects on the interviewees. As the research investigates job interviews, individuals and companies must remain anonymous to ensure the confidentiality of recruitments.

## **VI. Empirical findings**

*This section will present in two parts the empirical finding of this research. These findings from the twelve interviews are summarized, first from the applicant's perspective and then second, from the recruiter's perspective. The summaries are categorized according to the interview guides and topics that emerged during the interviews.*

### **5.1 Applicant perspective**

#### **5.1.1 Preparations for a video interview**

##### **Steps in preparing for a video interview**

Applicants can identify and describe steps that they take before the interviews. Some of these steps are something they do in both video and in-person interviews; besides choosing an appropriate outfit, applicants do research on the company and job position, trying to understand what type of applicant the company is looking for. As applicant 1 describes, they read the job ad and get to know the company from their website. Applicant 4 describes their preparations to be extensive, starting with finding information about the company and about the people who will conduct the interview, and possibly even finding some person who has worked for the company before. Applicant 5 mentions they go through their CV to pick up keywords, write notes about their strengths, and questions they would like to ask during the interview. They also think about all the basic questions that they have noticed come up in the interviews. Applicant 3 describes they check they have appropriate clothing besides thinking about basic questions in the same way as applicant 5.

However, video interviews require some specific preparations, as described by the interviewees. This means setting up a location with minimal disturbances, checking the lighting and audio, downloading apps, and checking the functionality of the meeting links. Some participants also utilize notes during the meeting. Applicant 6 mentions that one of the most important things is checking the video links as you get so many of them. Half an hour before the interview, applicant 6 begins to do the preparations, and around five minutes before the meeting, they open the links in case they need to upload some kind of software to the computer, which could take a couple of minutes. And when the

waiting room opens, they check that camera is pointing in the right direction. This aspect is described by applicant 2 as well, who says for the video interview one needs to set up the camera in a way that one is seen in the middle. Applicant 5 mentions making sure they have a charger for the computer, and applicant 4 describes checking beforehand how the lighting looks on the camera. Applicant 2 mentions that if one wants to show their background, they need to make sure it is tidy, so they won't be embarrassed to show it. Applicant 3 emphasizes that they make sure to have a calm space, and not for example some café shop but a private room, and applicant 5 agrees with this as they make sure the environment is calm and that they have the baby with someone else during the interview.

### **Preparations compared to an in-person interview**

Applicant 1 describes the video interview situation to be more relaxed, as one only opens the laptop. However, applicant 3 points out that orienting oneself to the interview can be more difficult when participating from home. Applicant 6 says that the biggest difference is that in the video interview, one gets to be in their own space.

*“You can manage preparations, like showering just before the interview. Travelling to the interview takes time. Maybe the amount of stress is less in a video interview, as fewer variants need to be taken into consideration. I think that for everyone the first impression is very important, so just being on time can give a very meaningful positive impression.”* (Applicant 6)

Applicant 4 says that for a video interview, one thinks about the background, trying to find a place where nothing “*stupid*” is showing. Applicant 3 has a similar point as they say that one needs to check the technology, so there won't be any surprises like the camera turning on too early, and one could see something in the background. The applicant says that before the actual interview they feel more nervous about the video interview because of the technology but during the interview more nervous about the in-person interview. They argue that this is because one can attend video interviews from their own home.

### **Important factors in a video interview**

Interviewees had varying opinions on what elements are the most important in video interviews. But most of them mention that technology should work well, especially internet connection. Applicants 4 and 5 emphasise the functioning connection is the most important thing, as otherwise, it causes frustration. Then, several interviewees mentioned the importance of lighting. Applicant 3 says that

having natural light looks much “*fresher*”. In addition, applicants think that the background should be white or of one colour, as a calm background helps to focus on the matter. Default backgrounds in video platforms divide people’s opinions. Applicant 5 describes that they have used the blurred background, but in their opinion, the other default backgrounds look a bit silly, because the technology isn’t advanced enough, so they don’t look very natural. Applicant 6 however argues that having blurred background makes participants more equal as they cannot judge each other based on the information they can observe from the background. Then, applicants consider audio to be an important factor as it enables communication. Applicant 6 argues that it aids in giving a “*sharp/alert*” presentation of oneself when no one has to ask to repeat things. Overall, applicants think that internet connection and audio can help to give either a professional or unprofessional image.

### **5.1.2 Management of performance during the video Interview**

#### **Technological aspects of the performance**

Interviewees had a mostly positive view of technology. In their experiences, they did not have major troubles with it. And would there have been issues people do not consider that to be too serious. People might get frustrated over it, but the other participants do not take it as a bad sign. People are used to working online, so if something doesn’t work, there are always other options and solutions. Most issues were overcome with easy solutions like joining the meeting again. In the cases of applicants 4 and 6, the meeting had to be changed from a video call to a phone call. Applicant 6 did not mind this change, but applicant 4 says it was disadvantageous, even if it was then possible to read notes. Applicant 4 believes that meeting the other person is such a big deal, that missing it, they did not get to know everything about each other. Some of the applicants recall experiences where there have been issues with the connection if someone is participating from abroad.

#### **Communication between participants during the interview**

Applicants consider in-person interviews to be more relaxed, and more natural. In their experiences video interviews tend to start right away and thus there is less small talk, and the impression they get of the interviewer can be more formal. During the interview, there is less interaction outside the relevant questions, and applicants do not as easily ask questions during the interview, and their answers might not be as in-depth. Applicants think it is more difficult to show personality, and interviews tend to be more structured. As applicant 4 describes: “*video communication is not the same,*

*you clearly wait your turn and in-between, you don't tend to joke around, you speak over one another and then you don't hear something.*" The applicant mentions that making interruptions is more likely if there is some delay in connection; *"So, one easily feels like you don't want to say anything extra. Unless at the end of the discussion, but that either is not normal communication."* Applicant 5 has similar thoughts as in their very structured 30-minute interview the recruiters kept bombing questions, so they did not have much time to ask anything, except at the last minute. Applicant 6 says they let the interviewer set the tone for the interview and communication.

Applicant 3 argues that in in-person interview communication is easy if the interview is going well but also it can be very uncomfortable if it is the opposite. But they say it is easier to take control of the situation in an in-person interview, as there you can greet the person and get the right feeling and create contact with another person. According to the applicant, videos allow some joking but still, the contact remains more distant; nor do they enable showing personality.

### **Body language of the participants during the interview**

Interviewees express that it can be very difficult to focus on watching directly to the person they are talking to. Especially, if they are thinking about their response, or listening intensively, they feel like their gaze starts to wander. Also, it is stated that it can be difficult because, you tend to look at the screen, and not the camera, as you follow the expression of the person you are talking with. If one looks around in an in-person interview it gives a different impression than if they do it in a video interview. Applicant 5 mentions that on video one can see very easily if someone is looking somewhere else. In their experience, one interviewer kept gazing around when others were speaking. This made them wonder if they were listening at all.

Applicant 3 believes body language is not as natural, as one is self-conscious about being on a video, and concentration breaks more easily when the other person is on a screen. Applicant 4 says expression can be seen on camera, but body language no. Video can convey things quite well, but it's still not the same when compared to in-person interviews, as only a small part is visible on the camera. In applicant 6 experience people sometimes have more relaxed body language when on video than they would have at the office. They argue that some managers are more relaxed compared to being more formal in in-person interviews.

## **Presenting oneself successfully in a video interview**

Interviewees have mixed feelings about how they managed to present themselves during the interviews. Applicant 4 feels like presenting oneself has gone pretty much in the same way as in the in-person interviews, whereas applicant 3 thinks that maybe 60% were successful because video interviews were a quite new thing for them and doing more video interviews would make them feel more natural. Applicant 5 agrees that video interview situations are stiffer, and it takes some time to get to know the people you are talking with because in an in-person interview there are things like small talk and meeting at reception, but a video interview just jumps into it, and one needs to be alert from the beginning. Applicant 2 feels like they might have been better in in-person interaction because of the eye contact and expressions. Applicant 1 points out that there were a few moments when they would have liked to add something to say, but it was challenging to disturb the interviewers.

## **Managing obstacles during the video interview**

Interviewees did not experience major obstacles during the interviews besides minor technical difficulties, which they were able to manage. Applicant 2 says that disturbance in the background may take the focus out of the interview, but it is then all right to request the other person to check the microphones. On the same note, applicant 1 says that they would not consider an organization as a potential workplace if they would judge the applicant badly based on a few moments of technical issues. Applicant 6 had some obstacles caused by technical difficulties, and the interview had to be changed from video to phone. However, they feel like because of their experience with video tools they did not feel overwhelmed when obstacles occurred.

### ***5.1.3 Impressions and evaluation of the recruiter***

#### **Video tools' effect on interview performance**

Applicant 2 considers that they gained an advantage when the interview was held on video. In their interview, they had to present a case, but its presentation was limited regarding audience size, and they did not have to perform mental calculations nor utilize a board. Applicant 3 believes that video tools affect the outcome to some extent because they feel like they did not orient themselves well enough to the interviewing situation, like in an in-person interview you take the time for that when

you travel to the interview. Applicants 4 and 5 do not think video tools affected their performance. Applicant 6 thinks that compared to the recorded video interviews, video meeting gives more sense of control over the situation. In their mind video interview is comparable to a live meeting situation, due to interaction happening in both.

### **Impression formulated during the interview**

Applicants mention that it is difficult to evaluate whether the employer would get a different impression when meeting in person. One of the applicants says that they always feel some nervousness at the beginning of the interview, but they feel more “*present*” in an in-person interview, so between these two types, in-person interviews make them less nervous. Applicant 5 says on video interviews one is always a bit nervous about whether the tech will work, and one doesn’t know what will occur, for this reason, in-person one can give a more relaxed impression. However, applicant 1 describes that as a person they are not a relaxed jokester so they don’t think it would make the atmosphere different if meeting in person. Applicant 2 believes the recruiter would have gotten a more genuine impression because expressions are conveyed differently in face-to-face interactions. Applicant 4 has similar thoughts, in-person interviews there have been more spontaneous discussions and questions, as on video one doesn’t want to interrupt the set structure.

### **Factors influencing the impression about the employer**

Interviewees share an opinion that in 2022 companies should have modern equipment, as the opposite would give an unprofessional image. Applicant 3 emphasizes that if HR recruitment tools are not good, one can assume that other tools used within the company are not that great either. They also add that altogether from the beginning, sending links on time etc. is important, because what one sees from the video is the only thing they see about the company, so it affects the overall impression. Then, applicant 4 points out it doesn’t give a very good impression if the other person appears like they do not care about where they are when they attend the meeting.

Applicant 6 has an experience where the interviewers were participating from a very tiny space, and they were also trying to fit into the same screen. *“So, to say it bluntly it seemed a bit unprofessional, as it was like having a call between friends on Friday evening. In experiences where the background was more controlled, it left a more professional image. In my opinion, using blurred background is good, as all people are curious about what there is in the background. Also, there could be a psychological effect, if you can see that someone has a luxurious house or is very cramped. Personally, for this reason, I like blurring as it gives*

*certain equality to the situation and does not create a preconstructed setting between the participants. You focus on the person and not the status.”*

Applicants take notice of how recruiters talk to each other and how they divide the work during the interview. Applicant 5 describes that when thinking about which ones have left the most positive impression, it's the interviews that have been less structured, as in those there have been some questions, but one has had more space. So, from the company and people, one gets a better impression and feeling that it would be nice to work there. According to the applicant, one gets an impression that the workplace is relaxed if the interview situation is the same way. It affects how present in the moment recruiters seem to be, and how well they are listening as one can notice easily if someone is reading their computer screen or something. Applicant 2 emphasizes the importance of the audio, how one uses their voice and what kind of tone they have. In their opinion, it is different from in-person interview, because, for example, you cannot do a handshake, which is important in our culture.

### **The perception of someone via video versus in-person**

Applicants 1 and 2 agree that the positive impressions they got from the employer did correlate with reality. Applicant 2 mentions that the video did successfully convey on this occasion the culture of the workplace and the manner they work. However, the applicant was surprised by how people look so different in person than they do on video. For them was quite funny how one almost has to get to know the people all over again when seeing them live: *“for a person, it is surprisingly important to see that ok, this person is actually quite short or this one this shape, so the categories in your brain go totally different when you see them live”*. Applicant 2 still however wishes they would have been able to visit the workplace. They mention that's something one misses, to see what kind of office they have, and what kind of people works there. These types of physical things are left out in video interviews and are something that is conveyed in the interview so differently. The applicant says that when one goes to the office, you are received at the reception, and you can even meet your possible new co-workers and that's surprisingly important because it is people who make the workplace.

Some applicants believe video interviews have created possibilities because without them they would not have been able to apply to some positions. And in one recruitment, one applicant would have realized to stop the recruitment process earlier if they would have met the employer face-to-face.

## **Areas of improvement for creating a better impression**

Overall, applicants describe their experiences to be positive. Applicants 1 and 2 describe that in their experience the recruiters conducted the interviews successfully and professionally. However, applicants also point out a few areas of improvement. Applicant 3 wishes that preparations would have been as in in-person interviews, they hope for professional and tidy background. Then they mention that in the second round of interviews there could have been more the one interviewer so one could at least that way meet the team. Applicant 4 also empathizes the importance of choosing the background as they say the recruiter could have given a more professional impression. Applicant 5 argues for being in the moment, and not doing something else meanwhile like reading emails. Applicant 6 agrees that preparing for the interview is important for the interviewers as well. As it looks unprofessional if they come to the meeting looking like they forgot they have a meeting. Applicant 6 thinks organizations should focus on using just one or two video tools, not several like in some companies. That way one does not need to think all the time if you have everything up to date and maybe one would at least learn to use them properly. Regarding how organizations could improve their performance applicant 5 recalls an experience where a recruiter's video did not work, but they did not realize that, and they had to interrupt and speak up. This might not have been easy for all applicants, for this reason, recruiters need to manage the situation and ask whether the attendant can see and hear.

Applicant 1 also recalls their experience where there have been present several interviewers. When considering if it's more challenging to perform in the interview with more people attending, the applicant says it depends on what kind of relationship they have between them and how they communicate. If they are very distant and ask questions that are very different, it isn't nice but if they complement each other, an applicant can get a good feeling. Also, the applicant argues that if there are several interviewers, you have to take care of whom you are talking to and looking at, and in their opinion, interviewers should be in the same location to get a better understanding of what kind of workplace they are applying to. The applicant also points out the importance of using a camera, as it gives a weird impression if some use it, and others don't.

### *5.1.4 Applicants' experiences with video interviews*

#### **Use of video tools in the future**

Applicants 1 and 2 feel positive about utilizing video tools in the future. It is mentioned that video tools are practical and they things easier. Applicant 2 mentions that due to the pandemic their use has increased which has brought comfortability, as now they are used daily. Applicant 3 thinks their use would a very good thing, as they allow things to be done from distance. There are many things to improve but still a good way to conduct interviews. They also point out that is more ecological when one does not need to travel to the interview. Applicant 5 appreciates the convenience of online interviews as well because they like the flexibility of participating from their chosen location, like a summer cottage. However, they think that it would be nice if there were for example two rounds of interviews one would be on video and the other face-to-face.

Applicant 4 says video interviews are a positive thing if you are for example applying somewhere abroad. But they say that in a video interview, however, if there are connection issues, asking questions is more difficult, if there are a lot of people. And they point out that in the end, the situation is the same for all applicants. Applicant 6 believes video tools make things easier. As their work requires having video calls to check on things. For them, 70 per cent of work can be done independently but the rest 30 per cent needs confirmation, thus getting that from relevant people is easy via video call. Regarding video interviews, hybrid models could work, one round via video and the second in person.

#### **Advantages and disadvantages of video interviews**

Benefits according to the interviewees are saving time, flexibility in choosing a location, and there is no need to no travel. Several of the applicants also mention feelings of safety that increase when they participate in the interview from home.

The disadvantages mentioned in the research are not meeting people face-to-face, and not having the possibility to see and observe the workplace and co-workers. Applicant 1 mentions those are factors that affect the impression of the employer in a traditional in-person interview. Also, it is mentioned that in video interviews communication feels like it's less complete with lacking facial expression. Applicant 4 points out similar thoughts. Negatives are you might not get a whole overall picture of the person; body language remains incomplete when the whole body is not showing. Also, one might

be doing several things meanwhile and not being present in the moment and people might not prepare as well for the interview when they know they can use a computer during the interview. The positives are you can attend whatever the location, it is convenient and on video interview one can read discreetly notes, and that brings peace of mind. This aspect is also mentioned by applicant 5.

Applicant 4 says they would prefer to attend an in-person interview rather than a video interview even if it is more stressful and demanding because you have to consider body language as well, but they still believe that they can manage the outcome of the interview more. Via video, in their opinion, the impression is more limited. Applicant 3 mentions that you do not get to visit the office where you can get a better understanding of the energy of the company and possibly meet colleagues. No matter if it is a distance job if you are required to work from the office, visiting it is important as maybe the chemistry between applicant and people at the workplace does not match. Applicant 3 also states as cons that one is left with a colder impression, and hustle with the tech.

### **Areas of improvement for future video interviews**

Most applicants consider that the interviews have gone as they hoped for, and they would not have done anything differently. Applicant 1 mentions that they wish they would have been brave enough to take more time in answering questions if there was a pause in conversation and applicant 2 mentions that it would be beneficial to get feedback from someone who sees them on regular bases on video. Applicant 3 thinks that next time they will make better preparations and orient themselves better for the interview situation. As on video, there is no transfer and one can just open the laptop and participate in the interview.

## **5.2 Recruiter perspective**

### *5.2.1 Preparations for a video interview*

#### **Organizational practices for video interviews**

According to the interviewees, organizations do not have agreed practices for video interviews. Recruiters 1 and 3, describes that in their organizations they are required to ask questions regarding certain themes, but otherwise they independently decide what questions will be asked during the interview and this means both in-person and video interviews. Recruiter 2 describes that in their

organizations they only have discussed what kind of questions should be asked and how the evaluation will be done.

This same element comes up from recruiter 6's response. They describe that in their company they do not have set practices, besides not showing any confidential information in the background, each person has free hands in considering which is the best way for them to do the interview. In their organization, the culture is that they are more "real", and you can show your personality. This shows also in how video interviews are conducted. Their organization has not made decisions that switching to video interviews would change how they are conducted. The organization trains recruiters to conduct interviews in a certain manner. There are guidelines on how interviews should be done, but how the video tools are utilized is left for the recruiter to decide. Other recruiters describe they use several types of platforms for video interviews, or as in recruiter 3's company, Microsoft Teams is used for interviewing as it is part of everyday operations as well.

However, some practices regarding the background are described. Recruiters 3 and 4 typically use backgrounds determined by the company whereas recruiter 4 describes that if one is working from home, one just needs to make sure the background is not a mess and there isn't anything private visible. Recruiter 1 mentions that if there is more than one interviewer, in their organization they have decided that they are in different locations to make the situation more equal for the participants during the interview.

### **Steps in preparing for the video interview**

Respondents do not see that video as an interviewing method would affect the proceeding of the video interview or questions in it. Interviewees describe preparation steps such as deciding who will be participating and what questions will be asked, as in all recruitment interviews. One main aspect is always getting to know the person who will be interviewed by going through their CV and Cover Letter. But each interviewee has steps they take in preparation for a video interview. How extensively they prepare depends on the individual, especially regarding technology. Recruiter 2 says they do not do many preparations, as they have been using Teams extensively, so they do not have concerns regarding it. They consider what kind of impression the background will give and set the scene accordingly. For the recruiter 4 preparations depend on the day, if there are many interviews in a row, not much preparation, mostly just quickly going through the CV and checking the job description, and no technical check-ups, as tools are used during the day.

The rest of the recruiters do more preparations. The recruiter 3 reads the applicant's CV and cover letter, which helps to make the interview more personalized, and the applicant would feel that the recruiter has taken time to know them. Recruiter 5 tells they do also preparations regarding the content of the interview, thinking about position and applicant. Recruiter mentions they have a long list of questions prepared and adjust them for context, they also read the CV, set time, and place and send a link and a reminder. Just before the interview, they do another brief, but they say technical preparations do not take time. With video interviews they book always extra time, to sort out any possible issues with technology. Recruiter 6 describes the same type of preparations regarding getting to know the applicant. The recruiter says technical aspects are highlighted compared to the in-person interview. They check the battery and do they need a stand for the computer. Usually, there is no need to have backup equipment. In case there are troubles, having a phone beside the computer is enough.

### **Preparations compared to an in-person interview**

Recruiter 1 describes preparations somewhat different from the in-person interviews, in which one needs to book a room, be prepared for applicants' arrival, ask if they wish something to drink, and "*all the basics*". Making notes in an in-person interview is more difficult. Also, according to the recruiter people tend to arrive very early, which needs to be taken into consideration with preparation as someone needs to attend to them. With video interviews, one just needs to open the computer and enter the meeting. Recruiter 4 also recognizes the applicants' tendency to show up early to the interview, and they also point out that one needs to make sure the environment/office is tidy. They argue that on video the other person cannot see as much. The recruiter tells that in video interviews there is more hustle than in in-person interviews. In those, for example, if you are late, you just send a message but in video interviews there are links and calls and messages, just to arrange the meeting. Recruiters 2 and 5 do not see any difference in preparations for what they do for interviews.

### ***5.2.2. Management of performance during the video Interview***

#### **Technological aspects of the performance**

As recruiter 1 tells, problems with technology are not very common and people are well prepared. The recruiter points out that not all applicants might be brave enough to point out if there are issues with the connection, and that could be troublesome if they did not get the questions that were asked. The recruiter also mentions that if the interviewee has a bad connection, picture, or audio, that affects

the impression that is created, because one might feel they are not as “*present*” in the situation or as “*alert*”, so like if the internet is slow and they have to ask to repeat a lot. The recruiter also mentions the importance of good lighting.

Recruiters 2, 3 and 4 also tell that there have been only slight issues with technology. Recruiter 2 tells that the only challenge was in getting all three interviewers to fit on the same screen. In their opinion, tech can have an effect in case there are issues with it and the applicant feels very nervous about it. Recruiter 3 tells that in their experience there have been a few times when it was necessary to resent the invitation link. Recruiter 4 says that sometimes participants have difficulties in joining the meeting, or they cannot find the link, but otherwise in their case the issue has been the office internet connection.

Recruiter 5 thinks that if something occurs it is usually at the beginning of the interview, for example, Teams doesn’t start, they cannot hear audio, or video is not visible. But they say these things do not determine the interview outcome, but easily the applicant gets frustrated by the situation, and afterwards, it takes some time before the applicant feels relaxed again. The recruiter says technical issues can bring pressure on the applicant.

Only one interviewee describes that there have been several technical difficulties. Recruiter 6 says:

*“Many times, but issues to which individual does not have much influence. This requires a new type of patience and skills from participants, to not show impatience and frustration in challenging situations. But at the same time, technical problems can work as icebreakers in the interview. So, if you do not let problems bother you and take a positive attitude, technical issues can be a shared experience for participants.”*

### **Communication between the participants during the interview**

Regarding communication during the video interview, recruiters have varying experiences. Recruiter 1 says that the communication is not the same in the video interviews, as they “*leave out all the stuff from the beginning, getting some water and coffee, setting the jacket to coat rack. I have always thought that is important and wanted to present because you can get quite a lot of information about their personality and how alert they are, so all that is left out in video interviews, sure in the beginning there is some small talk about daily stuff, but not the same, but at the same time I feel like people can be more relaxed when they are at a distance when maybe they haven’t had thought about how to arrive to the location and so on.*”

Recruiter 2 thinks that they do not feel like they are a “*small talk person*”, and for them, it feels a waste of time to chat for the first ten minutes. But they say that at least in face-to-face interviews it feels more natural, as in video interviews it feels just obligatory and a bit forced. In a video interview,

one does not speak over someone else as easily, which they consider being something positive. In recruiter 3's experience, the communication has been natural via video, and they imagine it is easier for an applicant as they can utilize notes. Recruiter 4 says that in video interviews discussion is more straightforward, and there is more small talk in in-person interviews. But at the same time video interview feels more relaxed, and they say that if someone is nervous, they probably like to participate from their own couch.

Recruiter 5 says there are a lot of differences: *“much more difficult to bring out personality, why I prefer live interviews. I have noticed that some people have a very different way to communicate live than on video. If not much experience, people might answer very sparingly, not look at the camera or their gaze wanders, and you might get an absentminded impression. Very few people joke around, interview on video feels much more formal. In live situations, people tend to laugh together if something awkward happens, but on video more often you pretend you did not notice anything. Harder to create conversation. easily question-answer type of interview. Especially occurs if talking with some a bit older or with someone with less experience with video tools”*.

Recruiter 6 thinks video tools have a neutralizing effect on expressions. They say one cannot see that well small-expression and easily one gets a *“cold image”* or a more formal and stiff impression. They also think that the recruiter has to work more if the other person is feeling nervous to make them more relaxed and the situation more enjoyable.

### **Body language during the interview**

Recruiter 1 points out that if you ask some difficult question, the applicant's gaze can start to wander, and many people can feel like the pause is very long if they have to think about their answer. They also say: *“Many things are left out, like if person's hands are sweating if they are nervous, so as an interviewer that is unfortunate that you cannot see that, so if you would like to make to situations more relaxed you won't get that message and one just keeps on going, so that affects. I can recall one interview where, the person sat on the couch and held the computer on their lap, and that kind of left impression that was not good, it was shaky and felt too relaxed.”*

Recruiter 2 says that in normal life they do not think about body language at all, but on video yes. They mention that they keep watching the picture of themselves while talking, though one should look at the camera and not the screen. However, recruiter 4 says that, if someone is uncomfortable, they might have said the person does not need to look at the camera. Recruiter thinks it's weird advice, and for them, it is ok enough to just look at the screen.

Recruiter 5 mentions that in video interviews gaze wanders, the impression is more limited, and sometimes people accidentally have a close-up picture, which leads to the recruiter not being able to see much. Recruiter 3 says they can read the expression or if the applicant is unsure.

### **Video interview proceedings and the structure of a video interview**

Recruiters describe that the proceedings of the video interviews follow quite closely the ones of the in-person interviews. Recruiter 1 says that interviews have been the same length but maybe there have been more questions, that doesn't always get discussed as in-depth. They say that in person it's easily more natural but on video, it can easily be a "question-answer-question", even if one always tries to comment on each answer. They say that usually, people like to ask questions already during the interview, but on video, they ask them in the end. And on occasions, if the time has run out, and there is a rush, one can feel like they don't have time for all their questions.

Recruiter 2 says it is the same process, and they cannot say whether the length depended on the interviewing method. Recruiter 3 says there is no difference, but questions are asked in the end. Recruiter 4 argues that interviews might be a bit quicker, they start right away, with no rituals at the beginning or end of the interview. Recruiter 5 says interviews are more formal, questions are often asked in the end, and there are fewer questions if the conversation does not bring up any follow-up questions.

Recruiter 6 points out that to have equal opportunity for all applicants, they aim to use the same amount of time. How comfortable the applicant feels to ask questions depends on the individual, but recruiters have the ability to manage the situation at the beginning of the interview and set the tone for how the interview will proceed. Interviewee mentions that the recruiter can usually tell if the applicant has experience with video tools, and lack of experience might not be a disadvantage. The recruiter just needs to adapt to the situation and try to get the focus of the interview from technical aspects to the actual content. With more experienced applicants this transition is just a bit quicker.

### ***5.2.3 Impressions and evaluation of the applicant***

#### **Important factors in formulating an impression of the other participant**

Recruiter 1 describes that one tries to exclude factors that are not relevant for the job in the evaluation, but when writing notes from the interview, one tends to write comments if there have been some

problems but tries not to take them into consideration. They describe that when writing about the first impression it can reflect negatively if there have been issues, or at the same time positively. Recruiter 2 says it would affect the impression if one would not know how to use the video tools, and one would have the microphone on mute several times. They say this would give a weird impression. Recruiter 3 argues that hard and soft skills are important, and they do not take notice of background etc.

Recruiter 4 says that maybe the audio is the most important. As even if the picture would break but as long as the audio is working, it is alright. The recruiter says that for them background is not important, and many people talk from their cars or outside. However, they think that messy background at home might affect the impression. Recruiter 5 also thinks that the quality of the audio is highly important because it's very difficult if one cannot hear what they are saying and there is a lot of disturbance in audio, or if the audio level is very low.

Recruiter 6 does not pay attention unless something is very wrong, and it affects the communication and building connection with the other person. They say: *“if only basics are all right, the other factors just tell more about the personality of applicant and story of their everyday life. So, nothing is right or wrong, it's how the person takes into consideration their surroundings or not.”*

### **Video tools and their effect on interview performance**

Recruiter 1 says that video tools affect applicants' interview performance, even if you would hope it didn't but it is very difficult to exclude. If one doesn't have experience from video calls, the person might not be necessarily as relaxed and might not be their true self and not be able to give replies as well. They cannot say if that is because applicants are nervous overall about the situation, but unfortunately that might affect the evaluation. Recruiter 1 mentions that someone who can be more relaxed and can reply in-depth can get a better evaluation. But the recruiter also says it is the impression of the person that is the most important thing, and the rest just supports how well that is conveyed via video. Recruiter 2 says the answers are the most important thing unless there is some kind of huge problem that cannot be overcome. Recruiter 3 argues image is not important, audio is more important as it is difficult if you cannot hear the answers.

Recruiter 5 says it depends on how experienced they are as they might get frustrated with technology. All people have a *“home persona”*, and *“work persona”*, they think all have an *“online persona”*. So, with videos, one might not use their arms to express themselves and thus impression on video can be more subtle. Moreover, people can be less radiant or not as humorous. Recruiter describes that facts come up via video, and it brings some *“extra”*, but personality is not conveyed as well. They mention

that some people are so nervous about the video interviews that they read directly from the paper, which takes out the personality even more and they make eye contact even less.

### **The difference in impression in video interviews compared to in-person interviews**

Recruiters do not consider there to be much difference in impression between video and in-person interviews. Recruiter 6 says the impression has been livelier, on-screen the impression of personality is not as colourful or as layered, but recruiter 1 argues that if there is an interview of 1 hour, the main characteristics do come up. Recruiter 4 says physical attributes might come as a surprise if you only see their face, and it very physically demanding job, it counts if they are weak and small or the opposite.

Recruiter 5 describes their experience: *“you get this gut feeling about the applicant within the first few minutes, and a feeling as to which position, they would be suitable. It is very hard to explain, but it is something about how you carry yourself. For example, if you are looking for a sales job, you need to come to the meeting with confidence and take control of the situation, and these things are something that you cannot evaluate via video. For the recruiter, you miss this whole first impression via video. Clothes do not matter much, but more so overall tidy appearance. One cannot smell alcohol; it is very important to have the ability to use all senses. Via video, it is easier to improve oneself, or in this case, hide if you have been drinking before the interview.”*

### **Applicants who stand out in the video interviews**

One interviewee thinks an individual's attributes convey via video in the same way as in a live interview, but others have varying opinions on which applicants stand out in video interviews. Recruiter 1 argues that the ones who are shy or are not able to express themselves as strongly, stand out negatively. For the ones with good social skills, the video can be more difficult because they cannot show their skills as much as in an in-person interview. For applicants, the situation is difficult because they cannot read the chemistry between the interviewers as easily. So that takes some of the advantages of those who otherwise have strong social skills. Recruiter 4 says cheery people, stand out, in addition to participants who act professional, but this according to them does not mean just wearing a tie. Recruiter says that they do not necessarily focus on the CV but personality and finding someone who is a good person.

Recruiter 6 has heard that applicants who are very nervous about the interviews, feel more comfortable at home where their senses are not on high alert about new things. Familiar things around you, like your favourite coffee mug, can bring you feelings of safety. But at the same time, others

claim that video makes the interview situation awkward and themselves more nervous. But this according to the recruiter 6, probably relates to cases where applicants do not have much experience with video tools. Recruiter believes that video tools even out the field somewhat between applicants who have strong social skills and the ones who don't. Especially if social skills are not, one's strength, one can manage the interview situation and stand out positively if you are comfortable with video tools.

Recruiter 5 mentions elder people who are not used to working with video tools, which makes the video interviewing situation uncomfortable for them. But also, some young people, who might be comfortable with tech, but do not like watching themselves on a video screen, and otherwise shy people. Recruiter 2 says if the applicant would have extremely high-quality video or audio, good lighting and so on, subconsciously one might give them credit for it.

### **Video tools and their effect on applicant skills evaluation**

Interviewees do not think that the use of video tools would affect the evaluation of applicant skills. Recruiter 1 argues that having two interviewers enables them to evaluate soft skills. Recruiter 2 talks about their recruitment process, in which applicants had a test before the interview, and applicants depending on their interview method presented their works differently. The participants who attended the interview online send their test by email and the ones in the in-person interviews presented theirs printed. In this case, sending the test eliminated the possibility of messing it up, as it was not as good if the print size was not good enough.

Recruiter 5 argues that being a less skilled conversationalist does not mean you are not a good worker. The recruiter has not yet found a way to relax the atmosphere in video interviews in the same way as in the face-to-face interview and what would make the situation easier for the applicant. The recruiter thinks that live meeting rituals help to break the ice and aid the applicant to perform. In live situations, the recruiter can see more easily if the applicant is nervous and then try to make the interview situation more relaxed. On video is harder to tell whether some behaviour is because of their personality or because they are feeling nervous. As a recruiter, recruiter 5 feels like they conduct the interview better in a live interview and therefore think that results can be better for them.

## 5.2.4 Recruiters' experiences with video interviews

### **The success of video interviews**

Recruiters agree that in their experience requirements that utilized video tools have been successful, and organizations have gotten what they were aiming for. However, to some extent, for recruiters, it was difficult to say what kind of role video tools played in the success of the recruitment. But they mention that video interviews have been a success if one measures factors like saved time, and efficiency, meaning how many interviews you can conduct within a certain time. But recruiters also argue that the emotional footprint that you get from video interviews is narrower than it would be when meeting face-to-face at the office. There the emotional impact would have been greater for both participants. Recruiter 1 describes that sometimes in video interviews it is more difficult to get back to some topic if something has been left unclear because it feels more like a repeat compared to the same situation in an in-person interview. Recruiter 6 summarizes: *“recruiters’ job is also very much about managing time and appointments, for this reason, video tools are useful as you only need to find a suitable place for laptop, and you are ready to meet a person. Personally, would like to conduct more interviews face-to-face, which would probably lower productivity but as a recruiter, the interviews would be more profound and better quality”*.

### **Benefits and disadvantages of video interviews**

Recruiter 1 mentions as benefits saving time and that writing notes is more pleasant in online interviews. Also, they say it is nice to see people in different environments and what type of location they have chosen, as from that one can get some type of *“intel”*. Furthermore, they think videos can help to avoid a bias that can be there if a person reminds you of someone you know in person, video can to some extent decrease that. Video as an interview method can make the situation fairer and more focused on the answers and the facts. Therefore, the recruiter sees their use as an opportunity. Recruiter 4 mentions they make everyday life easier because one does not need to anticipate situations as much, as applicants tend to come to the office early. However, as a disadvantage, recruiter 3 points out that not all might have the same opportunities, for example, some applicants might have a camera that is not as good as others and recruiter 2 argues that for the applicant it is more difficult to evaluate how the interview went compared to an in-person interview because it is more difficult to read the atmosphere via video.

## **Use of video tools in the future**

All recruiters agree that the video tools will be utilized in the future in one way or the other. Recruiter 1 hopes that video tools will be used as they save a lot of time when you can conduct interviews anywhere, and one does not have to come to the office for each interview. They hope that there will be flexibility, for example, the first interview could be online and then the second in-person. Recruiter 1 also thinks that maybe there will be an option for the interviewees to select how they want to participate. This sentiment is also shared by recruiters 2 and 6. Recruiter 3 imagines that hybrid models will be utilized because many companies have several locations.

Recruiter 2 points out that video tools should be used, because they make things faster and easier, also for the applicants. Recruiter argues that interviews in-person always require more preparation, and things are more straightforward via video. Recruiter 6 believes the use of video tools in recruitment will be more spontaneous, in the future one can make contact on several platforms, for example, Instagram or LinkedIn. The recruiter says that the interviews would be approachable and make the initial connection easier. They expect the videos to become an effortless part of everyday life and that omnichannel communication will be the way. Recruiter 5 believes there will be new tools, maybe even holograms. But for now, they believe the hybrid model will be the way how things are done.

## **Change in attitudes and use of video tools in organizations**

The pandemic has caused companies and people to become familiar with video tools. Recruiters describe that video tools are widely used, not only in recruitment but also in other organizational functions such as internal/external meetings, seminars, training, onboarding etc. Video tools are used more when compared to the time before the pandemic, also in companies that had not implemented their use previously. For example, recruiter 6 tells that they have stakeholders in traditional fields, such as law, that previously did not utilize video tools in recruitment. Recruiter 5 describes that the past two years have made a huge change in people's opinions on video tools. Before people were uncomfortable using them but now, they usually suggest their use.

As interviewees describe, organizations use different video tools and platforms. Interviewees describe that within an organization it is not uncommon that they use many different tools. There might not be practices on how video meetings or interviews should be conducted or with which platform. Some of

the recruiters mentioned that the companies just started using the platform or tools that they were most familiar with, without considering more thoroughly if that particular tool suited their company's needs the best. Recruiter 6 describes that Microsoft Teams is used because it was a tool of which they had at least some kind of experience at the time when it was necessary to shift quickly to use video tools. The recruiter also points out that companies should educate and train people about their use, so everyone would know the basics. Furthermore, the recruiter points out that organizations should be aware of how their employees feel about the use of videos and whether they feel ok about using them. As if support is not offered, it can put more pressure on employees who are not comfortable with using these tools and have to study independently their use.

Recruiter 1 mentions that not only there has been a change in how extensively video tools are being used, but now companies are also looking into how to proceed in the future. Recruiter 1 mentions hybrid meetings and how in their company they are looking into ways and practices how they can achieve successful meetings.

## VII. Discussion

*This section analyzes the emerging themes of empirical findings with the help of Goffman's dramaturgical model and previous literature. The analysis will try to find answers to the research questions 1) How do applicants and recruiters manage and experience the use of video tools in recruitment interviews? and 2) How do video tools affect the evaluation of the recruitment interviews from the perspective of the applicant and recruiter?*

### **6.1 How do applicants and recruiters manage the use of video tools?**

#### *6.1.1 Management of the performance before and during the interview*

The applicants aim to present their self and their surroundings in the best possible light. This means managing several different aspects of the performance before and during the interview. The findings of this research suggest that applicants do have in mind an idealized performance for job interviews for which they need to do preparations and management during the interview. These steps are taken to be successful in the interview and present oneself in a positive light to the audience. These preparations and management are quite similar to what is done for in-person interviews but with some alterations when interviewing occurs in a video interviewing context. These results resonate with Nguyen's (2015) argument that people are required to manage different stages, to achieve the wanted image, when utilizing different forms of interactions in a digital context.

However, the applicants are not the only ones who have to manage their performance. This applies to the recruiters as well who can adjust their setting and props like applicants, to support their performance and thus the organizational image they wish to portray, while at the same time set the tone for the interview with the help of these same aids. In an in-person interview, applicants visit the workplace and form their opinion about the employer based on the first impression they receive during their visit. When this aspect is left out in the video interview, recruiters need to consider how they will manage their performance and impression in the video setting. In the job interview, the applicant and the recruiter meet each other generally for the first time, so there is the importance of giving a good impression as the interview determines whether the participants will meet again in another interview or even form employment.

### ***6.1.2 The Back and Front of the performance***

Videos as an interviewing method seem to enable participants to manage the interviewing situation and their performance, or in Goffman's dramaturgical terms, the front and back of the performance. Even though front and back are metaphorical in Goffman's dramaturgical model (1959), in video context they seem to fit quite well, as if the video is the "curtain" between front and back. Video tools help to manage the different stages. Participants can manage different aspects of the interview and its setting during the interview and hide factors that are in disfavor for them.

Goffman (1959) describes that performers project their definition of a situation when they are interacting with other participants. If something happens during this communication that would disturb their projection, that can lead to the whole situation becoming awkward. Therefore, the author of this research suggests that if there are troubles, for example with technology, the audience might get an unintentional view backstage which could lead to an uncomfortable situation for the participant as their performance gets disturbed. The audience, or in this case other participants, might have issues with formulating an impression about the applicant if performance has huge contrast to the information the background is giving.

In the dramaturgical model, backstage is a place, where a performer can relax. The findings of this research support this claim, as several of the interviewees describe that interviewing via video brings them comfort and feelings of safety. This arguably can have implications for what kind of experience applicants will have of the recruitment interview and the whole process, and they might perform better in the interview if they are less nervous about the interview situation. However, if the applicant does not have a lot of experience in utilizing the video tools, they could bring more stress regarding the interview, as their management would require more effort from the applicant and that could take the focus out of the interview itself. In that sense, backstage could lose its meaning as a place of relaxation.

### ***6.1.3 Managing the setting and the props in the performance***

During the video interview situation, participants might use the setting and props to support their performance and in the video interview setting applicants can use various aids. These aids can be related to 1) the interview content, 2) the interview setting, 2) technology, and 3) appearance. The props related to the interview content can be something like notes, the applicants have done in preparation for the interview. As also, previous literature (Kathiravan et al., 2021) suggests, that

applicants might use other devices or internet browsers while participating in the interview. This could have direct implications for the evaluation if they would get help with some interview questions compared to an applicant who would attend the interview in person. Then, for the background participants might use several props such as lighting, furniture, mics, and a stand for a computer. Whereas things like drinking coffee can be used as a prop to set a more relaxed atmosphere. Technology is commonly used and part of everyday tasks in the work environment and recruitment processes, but it is also something that can aid or disturb the performance. Though audiences are quite lenient with any possible issues and understand that these types of problems might occur, and they tend to trust that equipment work without additional preparations. Appearance, meaning clothes and make-up, are something that applicants consider before attending an interview. However, on video, this aspect seems to lose some of its significance as the camera usually crops the picture so that the other person is not able to see as much of the other person. The results suggest that regarding props, the other three aspects have a more central role than appearance. This is because technology facilitates the interviewing situation, props help performance management, and the setting can give a lot of information about the performer.

## **6.2 How do applicants and recruiters experience the use of video tools?**

### *6.2.1 Video tools and feeling of safety during the interview*

Regarding feelings of safety, the results of this research support the statement from previous literature (Hanna, 2012) that video interviews increase the feeling of safety in applicants when they can participate in the interview in a familiar environment. This stems from the feeling that participants can manage their settings more. The author of this research argues that this can help applicants in their interview performance. Though at the same time for applicants it can be more difficult to orient themselves in the interview situation as the video setting makes the differentiation between work and home, less clear. In a traditional interview, one travels to the interview and meanwhile turns their focus on the upcoming interaction. Achieving the same mindset in the home environment can be more difficult.

Something that can disrupt the feeling of safety and management of the interview is a failure of technology, whether it is an actual occurrence or just fear of that happening during the interview. Technology is something that can aid or disturb the performance, even though the audience is in general quite lenient with possible issues and understand that these types of problems might occur.

Still, participants feel less in control, and consider they aren't able to manage the situations as much or show their personality in the same way as in person. For this reason, participants would still ultimately choose in-person interviews over video interviews, though they feel safer in the environments they can choose for themselves. Thus, there exists a bit of a contradiction in why participants prefer one interviewing method over another.

### **6.2.2 Communication during a video interview**

During a video interview it is more difficult to interrupt or break the conversation and ask questions, and this makes the communication more one-sided and less natural. This is because the participants are only able to see each other's faces, and not their expressions more profoundly or body language. Therefore, making showing personality more difficult. In addition, in video interviews focus on the conversation is easily lost, as it is difficult to look people in the eyes because the gaze can start to wander during the interaction or participants get distracted by their own image on the screen during the meeting. However, meetings become "*more natural*" when participants have experience using video tools as an interviewing method and they are comfortable communicating via videos as they know they can manage the performance much in the same way as in in-person interviews.

Regarding how the number of participants effect the communication during the interview, results suggest that it is recommendable that only one person is interviewing the candidate as then the applicant can focus more easily on the interaction. In case there are more interviewers participating it can be difficult for the applicant to observe communication between interviewers if they are conducting the interview from different resulting in having many pictures on the screen. Thus, the results of this research align with the argument that video tools put restrictions on how much people are able to observe dynamics within the participants, as suggested by Karl et al. (2021).

### **6.2.2 Different roles in a video interview setting**

In the dramaturgical model (Goffman, 1959) "*others*" are individuals who witness the performance outside the intended audience. In the recruitment interviews all interviewers/recruiters present are for the applicant "*the audience*", but based on the empirical findings of this research, one can argue that if interviewers are participating from different locations and not sharing a screen, the applicant might get a feeling that the other recruiter is the audience, and the other recruiter takes the role of the "*others*". This argument is based on the comments that interviewees feel the communication to be

more one-sided during the video interview, it is harder to create connection and eye contact due to camera settings and several screens. In a video setting, participants do not get a clearer impression of each other if they are unable to observe more easily occurring interactions. This can mean for example that if there are more than one interviewer conducting the interview they would participate from the same location thus giving the applicant an opportunity to observe their communication and culture within the company.

### **6.3 What implications use of video tools have on interview outcomes?**

#### *6.3.1 Video tools and their implication for evaluation of the candidate*

Goffman (1959) argues that mediated interactions such as phone calls do not enable the same level of self-presentation as meeting in person, as giving off expressions are not witnessed by the other participant. Moreover, being physically present is important according to Goffman as then coordination is possible along with mutual monitoring (Goffman, 1979; Rettie, 2009). However, at the time when the presentation of self was first published in 1959, video meetings did not exist, and one can now argue that these statements do not hold in video-mediated communication as we can monitor each other and witness the expression of the other participant is giving off. Results of this research support the argument that meetings held via video come close to in-person meetings, even though some of the aspects, like body language, in video interviews are limited. Findings suggest that sometimes appearances can come as a surprise or personality can prove to be more colourful than the impression was in the video interview. As an example, if strength is something required in the job and via video, this is something very difficult to evaluate.

Moreover, evaluation of applicants can be challenging via video because the topics are not discussed as in-depth. This has implications that recruiters need to balance between performing a growing number of interviews while having still high-quality interviews. Then, video interviews make it possible for the applicant to utilize notes or other devices during the interview. As if an interviewee is nervous the notes can assist them to perform better. However, previous literature suggests that video tools also make it possible to get help in case of a test or difficult question (Kathiravan et al., (2021). This aligns with the results of this research, where in a few experiences applicants gained an advantage when presenting a task via video rather than in person. This leads to the notion that recruiters should consider whether all applicants are on the same line when doing the evaluation. If recruitment contains testing, all applicants should be at least offered the same options.

So, video tools may affect the evaluation. The audience is not able to see what happens backstage of the performance, and they form their impression based on what they witness happening on the front stage. This is as described in Goffman's dramaturgical model, but furthermore, the author of this research argues that video tools enhance the risk of misevaluation, as video tools enable the performer to aid their performance. However, at the same time, video tools as an interviewing method may enable participants to get an unintentional view of backstage, if there are for example unexpected issues with technology. Besides, video meetings lack touch and scent cues (Karl et al 2021; Standaert et al., 2016) and individuals are not able to evaluate each other's body language or gestures as well as in-person. Video meetings also put restrictions on how much people can observe dynamics within the participants (Karl et al., 2021; Kuzminykh & Rintel (2020a).

Kuznekoff (2012) argued that nowadays many platforms enable to choose their profile settings that would help keep the front and backstage distinct. However, in a digital communication context, which includes the use of videos, people can have different selves, and Kuznekoff (2012) also suggests that depending on how likely the actors think that their performance has an effect on them in future or how likely they might see the audience in another context, truer to in-person interaction their performance is. This research supports the notion, as interviewees do not seem to think there is much difference between meeting in person or via video. Some platforms could help to keep front and back apart, but video as a communication method does not seem to do that. The author of this research argues that video tools bring the Front and Back of performance closer together, but at the same time they help to manage the performance by the use of setting and props.

### ***6.3.2 Significance of previous experience in conducting a successful video interview***

According to Goffman (1959), for the performance to be successful and the audience to believe in the performance, the actor needs to believe in their own performance and the part they are playing. There can be extremes, either actor is too emerged in their own act, or they do not even believe it themselves. If this is the case, they are not able to convince the audience of their performance. In the context of video interviews, if the participants do not have much experience with video tools, that can create doubt in themselves and their performance during the interview, consequently affecting how the other participant evaluates them. Also, arguably this could be the reason why the applicant would prefer in-person interviews, though they would consider video interviews to be a good option for traditional interviews.

When utilising video tools in recruitment interviews, the findings of this research suggest that experience of the recruiter has a role in achieving successful recruitment. More experienced recruiters

are more aware of the possible effects of video tools and how they might affect the interview situation. In this research recruiters who actively work with recruitment and interviews were able to describe in more detail how they consider the use of video tools to affect the evaluation of the recruitment interview. Recruiters that do not actively work with recruitment interviews were less aware of the effects as they were also more unfamiliar with conducting interviews overall. The recruiter can evaluate the impression they are receiving more profoundly and, in some cases, manage the interview situation if the applicant is less accustomed to the video interviewing method. With experience and knowledge, the recruiter may be able to compensate for the lack of sense when using video tools. Experienced recruiters are able to observe more details during the interview compared to less experienced interviewers and facilitate and manage the interviewing situation in case there are any issues for example with technology.

If the recruiter has strong experience in using video tools, they can manage not only their own performance but the applicant's as well. Recruiters agree that applicants' lack of experience using video tools usually shows during the interview. However, in case the recruiter is more experienced, they can take notice of that and try to relax the interview situation. For example, they might joke about the technology or even about themselves, to put the interviewee in a more relaxed state and this way they would be able to perform better and demonstrate their skills and personality. Therefore, by managing their performance, recruiters can enable the applicants to achieve their idealised self and performance. This has implications for companies which use video tools in their recruitment. Practices and use of video tools should be discussed among the people doing the interview and management, so that organization can be sure that they will get the optimal outcome from the interviews.

### ***6.3.3 Technology and its role in the evaluation***

Video tools and technology seem to be working surprisingly well according to the experiences of applicants and recruiters. After getting used to utilizing them, people seem to find several positive aspects in. Video tools as an interviewing method do not seem to affect the interview outcomes, and other factors such as personality and comprehensive answers play a more significant role in recruitment interviews. People are understanding if there are difficulties with technology during the interview and generally participants of the interview are able to differentiate the message of the performance even if there would be technical issues. So, problems with technology do not appear to be a great problem but it seems that if performance is enchanted with high-quality video or audio,

that can leave a positive impression and professional image for the other participants/audience. Several of the interviewees used the term “*professional*” when describing what they think about technology and how its functionality could mean for the impression they are formulating. Meaning that well-prepared props can assist the actor to be successful in their performance.

Though some of the previous literature argue for the importance of investigating technical aspects of video interviews (Fiechter et al., 2018) and offer suggestion on how it can be taken into consideration when preparing for a video interview (Jones and Abdelfattah 2020) findings of this research suggest that the video tools that we use today are high quality and integrated part of our daily life. Spending time rechecking and adjusting everything does not add much and might not be necessary. Problems do not seem to be a common occurrence. Adjusting the setting might be an important part of giving the feeling of management to the participant but it might not have much relevance to the performance from the perspective of the audience. Both parties are aware that they could be problems and they are not considered to be serious or have an effect on the outcome of the interview and evaluation.

#### ***6.3.4 Limitations of video tools and strategic sharing of information***

Video tools can help to strategically share information during the video interview. By setting the scene and appearance, the participants can strategically share information about themselves, and they can choose to hide stigmatising information that they believe could have a negative impact on their performance. This can mean hiding nervousness during the interview, as the participants cannot see if the other person is sweating or nervously moving their hands or strategically placing the camera so that the background won't be shown. Because in a video interview one is not able to use all their senses, the evaluation of the other person and their performance is more difficult. For example, one is not able to detect the use of alcohol by smell. Certainly, for example, applicants understand this could be possibly stigmatizing information and they could benefit by choosing the video interviewing method.

## VIII. Conclusion

If Goffman's dramaturgical model considers people to be actors on a theatre stage, video tools may have made all actors on a video screen. Back in 1959, Goffman argued that the dramaturgical model can be only applied to interactions happening in in-person interactions. However, empirical findings of this research demonstrate that in a modern environment where people communicate via video tools in everyday life, it is possible to apply this model to a digital context, as via video participants are able to observe the other participant, and get visual cues and information from their background that helps to evaluate their performance. Thus, theoretical contributions, of this research, is to show that dramaturgical model (Goffman, 1959) has a significance when investigating interactions occurring via video as it helps to understand how participants communicate and manage themselves during job interviews. As job interviews are important encounters that connect the applicants and recruiters generally for the first time for synchronous interaction, this adds to the significance of this research.

Interviews show that at this point people have very different amounts of experience in using video tools and this has implications for how they feel about their use. The benefits of video tools are highlighted when participants have experience from their use, as they can focus on the interview itself instead of technical aspects or being too aware of themselves being on a camera. When participants are aware of the limitations of video tools, such as restricted senses, they are able to observe more relevant things regarding the other party and focus on analyzing their performance.

As Goffman (1959) says, in everyday life, first impressions are important, as they make the path for all following interactions. Then, arguably the first impression in a job interviewing setting is highly crucial as it may determine whether one receives a work offer or accomplishes a new hire. Therefore, having an optimal performance during the interview is part of achieving that goal and as results of this research show video tools enable participants to manage their performance and the interview situation. Applicants and recruiters try to manage the interviewing situation in several ways before and during the interview. The managing can happen concerning the setting or appearance, this way resonating with Goffman's dramaturgical model, or aspects related to the content of the interview. By managing their performance, the individual aims to convince their audience about their message; applicants try to get selected for the job position and recruiters try to select the candidate, who has the best organizational fit and who are most suitable for the position.

Results also suggest that recruiters can manage and set the tone for the interview at the beginning of it. Setting the tone is important because it lays a foundation for communication, and it is less likely that the discussion will be one-sided. In addition, it has significance how natural the communication

feels for both parties. Managing the tone, aids the less experienced applicants to perform better and participants are able to focus more profoundly on the content of the interview rather than the technical aspects.

Technology facilitates video interviews, but their success does not seem to be determined by it. This means that if there is some disturbance in the connection, it does not affect the outcome of the interview because people are aware these types of issues can occur, and one might not be able to control the situation in that regard. On that note, the author of this research argues that the previous literature focuses too heavily on technological aspects, just focusing on advising applicants on how they can succeed in video interviews. The experiences of this research show that major issues are not common, and people use technological equipment on daily basis without the need to check its functionality. This means that video tools have become an integrated part of our work life.

Video tools are here to stay, as suggested by previous literature and the findings of this research. Rather, the question is how companies will choose to utilize them, and which tools will be utilized. At the moment, companies and individuals appear to use several different tools and there hasn't been a discussion on why these particular tools have been chosen or do they fit the organizational needs. Based on the experiences of the interviewees, people want to go towards working in a hybrid model. The reason for this is that it would offer flexibility and the option to choose the method of working suited for personal preferences and needs. Interviewees of this research appreciate the benefits of using video tools but several feel like they would still in the end prefer in-person interviews over video interviews. This is because they believe they can manage them more and present their personality more. It is possible to conduct a successful interview via video tools, but some aspects like communication do not always reach the depth of an in-person interview situation. Video interviews are seen in some cases as more impersonal and less natural.

## **7.1 Recommendations regarding the use of video tools**

Succeeding in a video interview is much more than opening a laptop and checking if there is enough battery. Previous literature gives plenty of advice on the topic, but this research hopes to point out some new aspects that are equally important.

The following suggestions are for the applicants.

**Setting the scene.** The background can be optimized according to what kind of impression the individual wishes to convey. One can think about if neutral background or something showing more

personality is best suited for their situation. As in a video interview, it is more difficult to show personality due to limited screen view, setting can help to stand out.

**Position of the camera.** If possible, set the camera a little bit farther away, to show more of the body language. That makes the interview and communication more natural and expressive when the other participant can make more observations.

**Optimize the audio.** Quality of audio seems to be more important than video quality as problems with the audio can cause greater disturbance in conducting the interview successfully. If possible, get a good microphone, and be sure that the volume is high enough. The video makes the communication richer, but the content is conveyed through talking and listening.

**Don't be afraid of technical difficulties.** Problems with technology can offer an opportunity to show personality and how you handle difficulties. So, do not be afraid of technical mishaps, as they occur from time to time.

**“Act natural”.** Do not be afraid of pauses in conversation or having a cup of coffee or a glass of water at hand. These things are common in in-person interviews, and they can make the situation more natural. However, do not overdo the relaxed atmosphere. For example, having a computer on a bed or eating meanwhile can give an unprofessional impression.

Then, the next suggestions are specifically for recruiters and employers.

**Showcase the company and its culture.** Without the physical visit to the office, the video interview is the moment when the company and its culture are presented to the applicant. For this reason, it would be important that the organizations think about how they present themselves and consider whether there should be policies regarding the use of video tools.

**Equality in evaluation.** Also, companies need to consider if the evaluation is equal for all applicants. If there is part of recruitment that requires demonstrating a skill or pre-prepared task, a video tool might affect the outcome if some applicants have an opportunity to utilize a computer or written notes.

**Being aware of limitations.** The recruiter should consider how video tools limit the use of our senses and how that effect evaluation of the applicant. We are not able to observe the other person fully, with our sense of smell, hearing and seeing limited.

**Book enough time.** Finally, the recruiters should remember to book enough time for the interview to compensate for the pre and after small talk in in-person interviews, which allows participants to observe each other.

## **7.2 Suggestions for further research**

There is still plenty to investigate regarding the use of video tools in video interviews, but also in a larger organizational context of employer branding, onboarding, meetings, and training just to mention a few. As video tools will be certainly utilized in the future as we are going towards a hybrid way of working, we must know more about their possible effects on our interactions and how we evaluate the information we receive through them. As mentioned in the *previous literature* section, a study regarding organizational practices on video tools and implementation of video tools is lacking. The existing literature gives recommendations for succeeding in interviews, but a more general organizational level of investigation is still missing. It would be useful to investigate the employer side more closely. This research investigates experiences from different recruitments, but it would be also beneficial to look into the use of video tools in one recruitment where research could get an insight into how participants evaluate their experiences of the same process they are going through. This type of research could assist companies to improve their practices regarding the use of video tools in their recruitments. In addition, from a human resource management perspective, there is no research on what the HR department's role is in the implementation of video tools in an organisation generally or specifically in recruitment. As recruitments are an important part of companies' performance and success, getting to know how interviewing practices can be improved, is a significant area of study. Then, lastly, because this research is a qualitative study with a limited number of interviewees, conducting a quantitative study could offer a wider insight into people's attitudes towards video tools.

# References

- Bailenson, J. (2020). Why zoom meetings can exhaust us; being gazed at by giant heads can take a mental toll. New technologies may remedy that problem. <https://www.azbuilders.org/wp-content/uploads/Why-Zoom-Meetings-Can-Exhaust-Us-WSJ.pdf>
- Basch, J. M., Melchers, K. G., Kurz, A., Krieger, M., & Miller, L. (2020). It takes more than a good camera: which factors contribute to differences between face-to-face interviews and videoconference interviews regarding performance ratings and interviewee perceptions? *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 36(5), 921–940.
- Blomstrom, M. & Kokko, A. (2002). From Natural Resources to High-Tech Production: The Evolution of Industrial Competitiveness in Sweden and Finland. *Natural Resources: Neither Curse Nor Destiny*.
- Bourdage, J., Roulin, N., & Levashina, J. (2017). Editorial: Impression Management and Faking in Job Interviews. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 8, 1294.
- Brown, A. P. (2010). Qualitative method and compromise in applied social research. *Qualitative Research*, 10(2), 229–248. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1468794109356743>
- Carnevale, J. B., & Hatak, I. (2020). Employee adjustment and well-being in the era of COVID-19: Implications for human resource management. *Journal of business research*, 116, 183–187. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2020.05.037>
- Charmaz, K. (2006). *Constructing Grounded Theory: A Practical Guide through Qualitative Analysis*. London: Sage Publications.
- Coyne, I. (1997). Sampling in Qualitative Research. Purposeful and Theoretical Sampling; Merging or Clear Boundaries?.. *Journal of advanced nursing*. 26. 623-30. 10.1046/j.1365-2648.1997.t01-25-00999.x.
- Dolan, B. (2019). How to successfully navigate a telephone and/or video interview. *FEMS Microbiology Letters*, 366(3), FEMS microbiology letters, 2019-02-01, Vol.366 (3).
- Elo, S., & Kyngäs, H. (2008). The qualitative content analysis process. *Journal of advanced nursing*, 62(1), 107-115.
- Etikan, I., Alkassim, R., & Abubakar, S. (2016). Comparison of snowball sampling and sequential sampling technique. *Biometrics and Biostatistics International Journal*, 3(1), 55.
- Evans A, Elford J and Wiggins D (2008) Using the internet for qualitative research. In: Willig C and Stainton-Rogers W (eds) *The Sage Handbook of Qualitative Research in Psychology*. London: Sage.

- Evans, B. (2020, June 4). The Zoom revolution: 10 eye-popping stats from tech's new superstar. Cloud Wars. <https://cloudwars.co/covid-19/zoom-quarter-10-eye-popping-stats-from-techs-new-superstar/>
- Fatzinger, J. (2016). Review tips for helping search committees create positive perceptions during Skype interviews. *Recruiting & Retaining Adult Learners*, 19(2), 9.
- Fiechter, J., Fealing, C., Gerrard, R., & Kornell, N. (2018). Audiovisual quality impacts assessments of job candidates in video interviews: Evidence for an AV quality bias. *Cognitive Research: Principles and Implications*, 3(1), 1-5.
- Fosslien, L., & Duffy, M. W. (2020, April 29). How to combat Zoom fatigue. *Harvard Business Review*. <https://hbr.org/2020/04/how-to-combat-zoom-fatigue>
- Goffman, E. (1963). *Stigma: Notes on the management of spoiled identity*. New York: Simon & Schuster
- Goffman, E. 1959. *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life*. New York, NY: Anchor Books.
- Hanna, P. (2012). Using internet technologies (such as Skype) as a research medium: A research note. *Qualitative Research : QR*, 12(2), 239-242.
- Hsieh, H. F., & Shannon, S. E. (2005). Three approaches to qualitative content analysis. *Qualitative health research*, 15(9), 1277-1288.
- Hsu, Y. R., & Leat, M. (2000). A study of HRM and recruitment and selection policies and practices in Taiwan. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 11, 413–435. <https://doi.org/10.1080/095851900339936>
- Huffcutt, A. I., and Culbertson, S. S. (2011). Interviews APA Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology (Vol. 2: Selecting and Developing Members for the Organization). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Iles, P., Chuai, X., & Preece, D. (2010). Talent management and HRM in multinational companies in Beijing: Definitions, differences and drivers. *Journal of World Business*, 45, 179–189. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jwb.2009.09.014>
- Jones, R., & Abdelfattah, K. (2020). Virtual Interviews in the Era of COVID-19: A Primer for Applicants. *Journal of Surgical Education*, 77(4), 733-734.
- Kallio H., Pietila A.-M., Johnson M. & Kangasniemi M. (2016) Systematic methodological review: developing a framework for a qualitative semi-structured interview guide. *Journal of Advanced Nursing* 72(12), 2954–2965. doi: 10.1111/jan.1303
- Karl, K. A., Peluchette, J. V., & Aghakhani, N. (2021). Virtual Work Meetings During the COVID-19 Pandemic: The Good, Bad, and Ugly. *Small Group Research*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/10464964211015286>

Kathiravan, M., Madhurani, M., Kalyan, S., Raj, R., & Jayan, S. (2021). A modern online interview platform for recruitment system. *Materials Today : Proceedings*, *Materials today : proceedings*, 2021-07.

Khan, S. (2020). Erving Goffman, *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life* (1959). *Public Culture*, *32*(2), 397-404.

Krouwel, M., Jolly, K., & Greenfield, S. (2019). Comparing Skype (video calling) and in-person qualitative interview modes in a study of people with irritable bowel syndrome - an exploratory comparative analysis. *BMC Medical Research Methodology*, *19*(1), 219.

Kuzminykh, A., & Rintel, S. (2020a). Classification of functional attention in video meetings [Conference session]. 2020 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems, Honolulu, HI, United States. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3313831.3376546>

Kuznekoff, J. (2012). *The Online Presentation of Self: Re-examining Goffman's Presentation of Self Across Contemporary CMC Contexts*.

Kydd, C., & Ferry, D., (1994) Managerial use of video conferencing, *Information & Management*, Volume 27, Issue 6, 1994, Pages 369-375, ISSN 0378-7206, [https://doi.org/10.1016/0378-7206\(94\)90017-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/0378-7206(94)90017-5).  
<https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/0378720694900175>

Macan, T. H. (2009). The employment interview: a review of current studies and directions for future research. *Hum. Resour. Manage. Rev.* *19*, 203–218. doi: 10.1016/j.hrmr.2009.03.006

McCull, Rod, and Marco Michelotti. "Sorry, Could You Repeat the Question? Exploring Video-interview Recruitment Practice in HRM." *Human Resource Management Journal* 29.4 (2019): 637-56. Web.

Mohd Arifin, S. R. (2018). Ethical Considerations in Qualitative Study. *INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF CARE SCHOLARS*, *1*(2), 30–33. <https://doi.org/10.31436/ijcs.v1i2.82>

Moriarty, J. (2011). *Qualitative Methods Overview*. (SSCR Methods Reviews). National Institute for Health Research School for Social Care. [http://eprints.lse.ac.uk/41199/1/SSCR\\_Methods\\_Review\\_1-1.pdf](http://eprints.lse.ac.uk/41199/1/SSCR_Methods_Review_1-1.pdf)

Morris, B. (2020, May 28). Why does Zoom exhaust you? Science has an answer. *Wall Street Journal*. <https://www.wsj.com/articles/why-does-zoom-exhaust-you-science-has-an-answer-11590600269>

Naderifar, Mahin & Goli, Hamideh & Ghaljaei, Fereshteh. (2017). Snowball Sampling: A Purposeful Method of Sampling in Qualitative Research. *Strides in Development of Medical Education*. In Press. 10.5812/sdme.67670.

Nguyen, T. K. (2015). Contemporary social interaction: How communication technologies alter Goffman's dramaturgical model? *Ho Chi Minh City Open University Journal of Science - Social Sciences*, 5(2), 21-32.

Nikander, P. (2008). Working with transcripts and translated data. *Qualitative research in psychology*, 5(3), 225-231.

Odeku, K. (2015). The role of interviewers in job effective recruitment and selection processes. *Journal of Governance and Regulation*. 4. 10.22495/jgr\_v4\_i1\_c2\_p5.

Orb, A., Eisenhauer, L. and Wynaden, D. (2001) Ethics in qualitative research. *Journal of Nursing Scholarship*, 33(1), 93-96.

Palinkas, L. A., Horwitz, S. M., Green, C. A., Wisdom, J. P., Duan, N., & Hoagwood, K. (2015). Purposeful sampling for qualitative data collection and analysis in mixed method implementation research. *Administration and policy in mental health and mental health services research*, 42(5), 533-544.

Public access to information and secrecy. (2020). [Ebook]. Retrieved from <https://www.government.se/4a72cf/contentassets/2ca7601373824c8395fc1f38516e6e03/public-access-to-information-and-secrecy.pdf>

PWC. (2021) It's time to reimagine where and how work will get done. PwC's US Remote Work Survey. [https://www.pwc.com/us/remotework?WT.mc\\_id=CT10-PL102-DM2-TR1-LS3-ND30-PR4-CN\\_ViewpointHighlights-](https://www.pwc.com/us/remotework?WT.mc_id=CT10-PL102-DM2-TR1-LS3-ND30-PR4-CN_ViewpointHighlights-)

Robson, C. (1993) *Real World Research*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Rettie, R. 2009. Mobile Phone Communication: Extending Goffman to Mediated Interaction  
Author(s): Source: *Sociology*, JUNE, Vol. 43, No. 3 (JUNE 2009), pp. 421-438 Published by: Sage Publications, Ltd. <http://www.jstor.com/stable/42857273>

Seaman, C.B. (2008). Qualitative Methods. In: Shull, F., Singer, J., Sjøberg, D.I.K. (eds) *Guide to Advanced Empirical Software Engineering*. Springer, London. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-84800-044-5\\_2](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-84800-044-5_2)

Sepashvili, E. (2020). Supporting digitalization: Key goal for national competitiveness in digital global economy. *Economia Aziendale Online-*, 11(2), 191-198.

Scheibe, K. (1987). RETROSPECTIVE REVIEW: The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life by Erving Goffman (Book Review). *Contemporary Psychology*, 32(6), 501.

Schlenker, B. R., & Pontari, B. A. (2000). The strategic control of information: Impression management and self-presentation in daily life. In A. Tesser, R. B. Felson, & J. M. Suls (Eds.), *Psychological perspectives on self and identity* (pp. 199-232). Washington, DC: American

Psychological Association.

Standaert, W., Muylle, S., & Basu, A. (2021). How shall we meet? Understanding the importance of meeting mode capabilities for different meeting objectives. *Information & Management*, 58(1), 103393. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.im.2020.103393>

Strassman, M. (2020, August 27). Strategies to eliminate zoom fatigue. Fast Company. <https://www.fastcompany.com/90543890/try-this-strategy-to-eliminate-zoomfatigue-and-help-teams-collaborate>

Suen, H., Chen, M., & Lu, S. (2019). Does the use of synchrony and artificial intelligence in video interviews affect interview ratings and applicant attitudes? *Computers in Human Behavior*, 98, 93-101.

The All European Academies (ALLEA). (2017). The European Code of Conduct for Research Integrity. <https://www.allea.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/05/ALLEA-European-Code-of-Conduct-for-Research-Integrity-2017.pdf>

Timmermans, S., & Tavory, I. (2012). Theory construction in qualitative research: From grounded theory to abductive analysis. *Sociological theory*, 30(3), 167-186.

Torres, E., and Mejia, C. "Asynchronous Video Interviews in the Hospitality Industry: Considerations for Virtual Employee Selection." *International Journal of Hospitality Management* 61 (2017): 4-13. Web.

Wiederhold, B. K. (2020). Connecting through technology during the Coronavirus disease 2019 pandemic: Avoiding "Zoom fatigue." *Cyberpsychology, Behavior, and Social Networking*, 23(7), 437–438. <https://doi.org/10.1089/cyber.2020.29188.bkw>

## Appendix A

### Interview guide – Applicants

<b><i>Initial open questions</i></b>
Are you currently employed? What type of position do you have and how long have you been in the position?
Did this current position include a video interview? If older experience, did the video interview lead to a job offer in that case?
Do you have experience with different video tools? How extensive? (Asynchronous vs synchronous video interviews)
<b><i>Focused questions</i></b>
<b><i>(1) Preparation for interview</i></b>
Can you describe your preparation for the video interview? (Step-by-step process; practising, possible notes, setting the scene, appearance etc)
How do your preparations differ compared to a face-to-face interview?
What factors do you believe are most important in a video interview? (Technology, setting, appearance, lighting etc.)
<b><i>(2) Interview</i></b>
How did technology work during the interview?
How would you describe communication and interaction during the interview? (Small talk, joking, pauses)
How would you describe body language during the interview? (Eye contact, facial expression)
Do you feel like you presented yourself as you planned?
Were you able to manage possible obstacles? (Breaking connection, interruption in the background)
<b><i>(3) Evaluation of outcome</i></b>
In your opinion, how did the video tools affect your interview performance?
Do you believe, the employer would have got a different impression in a face-to-face interview?
Do you believe, you would have been able to manage the evaluation and impression differently in a face-to-face interview?
<b><i>(4) Impression</i></b>
What factors were important regarding your impression of the employer? (Interaction, background, lighting, audio etc.)
How impression of an employer correlate with reality? (if interview lead to a job offer)
In your opinion, do you think the employer should have done something different regarding the interview method, and why? (Better setting, audio etc)
<b><i>(5) Experience</i></b>
How do you feel like using video tools in the future?
What is your opinion on the benefits and disadvantages of video interviews?
Next time, would you do something differently in a video interview process?
Any other thoughts on video tools and recruitment that could give insight on the topic?

## Appendix B

### Interview guide – Recruiters

<b><i>Initial open questions</i></b>
What is your job role now and how long you have been in this position?
Do you have experience with different video tools? (Job ads, asynchronous and synchronous videos, training, onboarding etc)
How does your current organization utilize videos?
Have you noticed a change in their use? What kind?
<b><i>Focused questions</i></b>
<i>(1) Preparation for interview</i>
Does your organization have specific practices for interviews and the use of videos in them? (Preparation, practice, setting, appearance, which tools etc).
Does everyone conduct interviews the same way?
Can you describe your preparation for the video interview? (step-by-step)
How do your preparations differ compared to a face-to-face interview?
<i>(2) Interview</i>
Are difficulties with technology common and how do they affect the interview?
How would you describe communication during the interview compared to a face-to-face interview? (Small talk, joking, pauses)
How would you describe body language compared to face-to-face interviews? (Eye contact, facial expression)
Does the interview proceeding differ from the face-to-face interview? (Same number of questions, same questions?)
<i>(3) Impressions and evaluation of the applicant</i>
What factors were important regarding your impression of the applicant? (Interaction, background, lighting, audio etc.)
In your opinion, how do video tools affect applicants' interview performance? (if problems with technology, or applicant with little practice with the method?)
Do you believe, the overall impression can be different in a face-to-face interview?
In your opinion, what types of applicants stand out in video interviews?
How video interview method affects the evaluation of applicants' skills? (Soft skills?)
In your opinion, can some applicant groups be at disadvantage?
<i>(4) Experience</i>
Have the interviews been successful?
How do you feel like using video tools in the future?
Will your company increase the use of video interviews and/or other video tools in recruitment?
What is your opinion on the benefits and disadvantages of video interviews?
What factors do you believe are most important in a video interview? (Technology, setting, appearance, lighting etc.)
In your opinion, what will be the trends regarding video interviews in the future?
Any other thoughts on the topic?