Running head: INTERVIEW IMPRESSION MANAGEMENT

"I (Might Be) Just That Good": Honest and Deceptive Impression Management in Employment

Interviews

Joshua S. Bourdage

University of Calgary

Nicolas Roulin

Saint Mary's University

Rima Tarraf

Western University

ABSTRACT

Applicant use of impression management (IM) tactics plays a central role in employment interviews. IM includes behaviors intended to create an impression of competence, likability, and avoid negative impressions. Applicants can influence interviewers' impressions using both honest and deceptive IM, but measurement of IM has yet to distinguish these two constructs. The goal of the present research was to develop a self-report Honest Interview Impression Management (HIIM) measure, and use this to investigate differential antecedents and consequences of honest and deceptive IM. We report the results of five independent studies (total $N=1,470$ interviewees). Studies 1-3 detail the creation of a self-report measure of honest IM. Studies 4 and 5 utilize this measure to understand the relations between honest and deceptive IM, and their antecedents and consequences. Results demonstrate that honest and deceptive IM are positively related but distinct constructs that have unique antecedents (i.e., age, individual differences, attitudes, situational, and target characteristics) and differentially impact interview outcomes and ratings. Finally, we present a short measure of honest and deceptive IM to be used for time-sensitive data collection.

Keywords: Impression Management; Interview Faking; Employment Interviews; Personnel Selection; Self-Presentation

"I (Might Be) Just That Good": Honest and Deceptive Impression Management in Employment

Interviews

Among the selection methods organizations use, the job interview is perhaps the most

universal (Huffcutt & Culbertson, 2011). Studies aimed at understanding the dynamics

underlying the job interview have found that a critically important factor is interviewee use of

impression management (IM), which can have a substantial impact on how interviewees are

evaluated (Barrick, Shaffer, & DeGrassi, 2009; Higgins, Judge, & Ferris, 2003).

IM describes a broad class of self-presentation behaviors individuals use to influence the

impressions others have of them (Leary & Kowalski, 1990).[1] IM is particularly relevant to the

interview context. Rosenfeld (1997) notes that "while impression management phenomena occur

in many social and organizational situations, the 'high stakes' nature of the employment

interview makes it a setting particularly ripe for impression management behaviors" (p.802).

Accordingly, Ellis, West, Ryan, and DeShon (2002) note that because applicants are generally

trying to obtain a positive evaluation from interviewers, "one would expect IM in interviews to

be fairly pervasive" (p. 1201). IM is therefore a fundamental mechanism through which

applicants attempt to influence interviewers' perceptions of them. Accordingly, IM behavior

plays a central role in reviews of the interview literature (Levashina, Hartwell, Morgeson, &

Campion, 2014; Posthuma, Morgeson, & Campion, 2002). To this end, studies have identified

the types of IM behaviors applicants use, such as emphasizing one's qualifications and

---

[1] Although the term "impression management" is often used in the personality or social desirability literatures, this is a very different term than the interview IM literature. While IM can refer to intentional distortion in both literatures, the personality literature most often uses IM in reference to scales meant to covertly identify those who are lying/exaggerating on those questions, and potentially partial these people out. In the interview literature, measures of IM are self-report measures of self-presentation behavior (typically for research purposes), asking individuals about behaviors they have used to influence others. As such, the use of the term "IM scale" should not be confused between the personality and interview literatures.

describing one's skills and abilities attractively (Kristof-Brown, Barrick, & Franke, 2002; Stevens & Kristof, 1995), flattering the interviewer (Ellis et al., 2002; Higgins & Judge, 2004), and exaggerating or even making up one's qualifications (Levashina & Campion, 2007). Many IM tactics are used a great deal in the interview, with some studies showing an average of 37.25 tactics used per interview and that 97.5% of applicants use at least one tactic to promote themselves (Ellis et al., 2002). Moreover, meta-analyses show that IM behaviors can impact interview outcomes (Barrick et al., 2009; Higgins et al., 2003). In short, interview IM is common, important, and critical to understanding applicant behavior during the interview.

Despite the emphasis on IM in the literature, one area that has arisen repeatedly is the importance of distinguishing *honest* from *deceptive* IM (e.g., Ellis et al., 2002; Jansen, König, Stadelmann, & Kleinmann, 2012; Leary & Kowalski, 1990; Levashina & Campion, 2006, 2007; Levashina et al., 2014; Rosenfeld, 1997; Roulin, Bangerter, & Levashina, 2014, 2015; Schlenker & Weigold, 1992; Weiss & Feldman, 2006). To illustrate this distinction using one form of common IM behavior (i.e. self-promotion), a recent review of the interview literature by Levashina et al. (2014) states: "When applicants describe and emphasize the skills and experiences that they possess in their employment interviews, these behaviors are labeled as self-focused or self-promotion IM tactics (Ellis et al., 2002; Kristof-Brown, Barrick, & Franke, 2002; Tsai et al., 2005). On the other hand, some applicants may describe and emphasize skills and experiences that they do not possess (e.g., "I made positive events I was responsible for appear better than they actually were," Higgins & Judge, 2004, p. 632). These behaviors have also been labeled as self-focused or self-promotion IM. The first example does not illustrate a bias but rather represents an honest IM or the means by which job applicants describe their true job-related credentials during a short interaction with an interviewer. However, the second example

represents deceptive IM or faking and does illustrate a bias that should be controlled (p.19-20)".

As such, the distinction between honest and deceptive IM can inform an important question

about IM: whether IM behaviors bring bias into interview decisions and should be controlled

(Posthuma et al., 2002), or whether they simply indicate preparation, motivation, social skills,

and situationally-appropriate behaviors (Rosenfeld, 1997).

Unfortunately, measurement of applicant IM has often mixed honest and deceptive IM

items into a single scale (e.g., Higgins & Judge, 2004) or has used coders to identify IM – which

is problematic because coders are typically poor at identifying which IM behavior is rooted in

truthful versus deceptive information (Roulin et al., 2014, 2015; Stevens & Kristof, 1995).

Moreover, meta-analyses examining the effects of IM have often combined measures assessing

honest and deceptive IM, and coder-rated IM, making it difficult to understand the effects of IM

on interview outcomes (Barrick et al., 2009). Finally, although honest and deceptive IM may

have different antecedents, this is obfuscated by confounding honest and deceptive IM. As we

propose below, honest and deceptive IM may have different motivational roots, and convey

different information about the applicant. Given these issues, a recent review of the IM literature

(Bolino, Long, & Turnley, 2016) has called for more research into honest versus deceptive IM,

while the most recent major review of the interview literature (Levashina et al., 2014) identified

the creation of a self-report measure of honest IM as a top priority.

The present paper consists of five studies that contribute to the literature in several key

ways. First, we develop and validate a self-report measure of honest IM for the interview context

(the Honest Interview Impression Management – or HIIM - scale). Second, we examine several

antecedents of both honest and deceptive IM by bringing together two theoretical frameworks:

Ferris and Judge's (1991) political influence perspective - which highlights how the

characteristics of the actor, situation, and target influence IM use - and Levashina and Campion's (2006) IM/faking model - which specifies how antecedents of IM impact applicants' willingness, capacity, and opportunity to use IM. Through this, we investigate new antecedents and correlates of deceptive IM, and the factors that differentiate honest from deceptive IM. For instance, we identify who is most likely to engage in various types of IM, and situational and target factors that increase/decrease honest vs. deceptive IM use. Third, we examine how honest and deceptive IM impact interview outcomes and ratings. Fourth, given the logistical challenges of collecting interview data, we validate a shortened measure of our honest IM measure (HIIM-S), and a shortened measure of Levashina and Campion's (2007) deceptive IM measure (IFB-S). As such, in addition to developing a scale for honest IM, this paper aims to increase our understanding of the antecedents and consequences of honest *and* deceptive IM, enhance theoretical understanding of IM and its practical outcomes, and offer new tools for researchers.

The Construct Space of IM and the Honest/Deceptive Distinction

Construct Domain of IM. Applicants are motivated to create a positive impression on the interviewer, and IM are the behaviors applicants use to do so. Within this space, a number of different behaviors have been identified. The three most common groupings for these behaviors are self-promotion, ingratiation, and defensive IM. Several frameworks (e.g., Ellis et al., 2002; Levashina & Campion, 2006) and empirical studies (e.g., Van Iddekinge, McFarland, & Raymark, 2007) have focused on these three classes of behaviors, although ingratiation and self-promotion have received the most attention (e.g., Bolino, Kacmar, Turnley, & Gilstrap, 2008; Bolino et al., 2016). Self-promotion refers to self-focused behaviors designed to give the impression that one is competent, qualified, and possesses the positive attributes necessary to perform the job. Ingratiation includes "other-focused" behaviors, such as complimenting and

flattering the interviewer, laughing at their jokes, and trying to demonstrate similar values to the organization or interviewer. Self-promotion is aimed at creating a perception of competence and person-job fit, whereas ingratiation aims to make the applicant appear likable and increase person-organization fit (Kristof-Brown et al., 2002).

Both ingratiation and self-promotion are classified as "assertive" IM, as they attempt to proactively manage impressions. However, Tedeschi and Melburg (1984) emphasize that individuals may also engage in more reactive "defensive" IM. For instance, individuals may justify a negative mark on their records, or make an excuse for why such negative marks are not their fault (e.g. a very strict professor, a very low class average). Defensive IM is used less often than self-promotion or ingratiation (Ellis et al., 2002), but can still be used strategically, such as when negative concerns are raised by the interviewer (Tsai, Huang, Wu, & Lo, 2010).

The Honest/Deceptive IM Distinction. Although under-investigated, there is recognition that the theoretical domain of interview IM includes both honest and deceptive tactics (e.g., Ellis et al., 2002; Jansen et al., 2012; Leary & Kowalski, 1990; Levashina & Campion, 2006, 2007; Levashina et al., 2014; Rosenfeld, 1997; Roulin et al., 2014, 2015; Schlenker & Weigold, 1992; Weiss & Feldman, 2006). For instance, Weiss and Feldman (2006, p.1071) describe the content domain of IM as "encompass[ing] a multidimensional domain that includes a number of discrete tactics in which such tactics can be employed honestly or deceptively." In other words, IM behaviors may vary in the degree of truth they are built upon.

As an example, if interviewers ask job applicants to describe their skills in HTML programming, applicants can refrain from engaging in IM or even "undersell" their ability and be modest, and respond by simply stating that they know HTML and can use this programming language. If they decide to engage in IM, they may emphasize that they are experts in HTML

and mention examples of programming done in the past several years. In the IM literature, this would generally be labeled "self-promotion". Yet, it could be that they are (a) using an honest self-promotion tactic (i.e., they are indeed skilled at and experienced in HTML programming), (b) using a slightly deceptive image creation tactic (i.e., they only have a basic understanding of HTML programming but embellished it), or (c) using an extremely deceptive image creation tactic (i.e., they actually have no knowledge about HTML programming).

Organizations would probably prefer to face situation (a), but may end up facing (b) or (c). This example is tied to the debate about whether IM threatens or enhances interview validity. For instance, while Ellis et al. (2002) describe "truthful" IM as potentially providing valuable input to interviewers, Levashina et al. (2014) describe deceptive IM as contaminating the interview. In other words, honest IM may allow interviewers to make more informed decisions by providing accurate, job-related information, whereas deceptive IM may mislead interviewers into making inaccurate decisions. Indeed, interviewers consider honest IM as appropriate but deceptive IM as inappropriate (Jansen et al., 2012). Yet, the measurement of IM has often confounded these two constructs. As a result, we have limited knowledge about the differential impact of these two sides of IM, the characteristics of those who use each type of IM, and the types of interviews that promote or constrain each of these types of behaviors.

The Measurement of IM. A recent review identified the confounding of measurement of honest and deceptive IM as a major barrier (Levashina et al., 2014). Common measures such as Higgins and Judge's (2004) include items that refer to deceptive IM (e.g., *I made positive events I was responsible for appear better than they actually were*), and honest IM (e.g., *I discussed non-job-related topics about which the recruiter and I share similar opinions*), while other questions are ambiguous to the nature of the IM (e.g., *I praised the organization*). Mixing these

could be problematic if honest and deceptive IM are conveying different information, differentially impacting outcomes, and are engaged in by different types of individuals. Indeed, meta-analyses on IM (Barrick et al., 2009; Higgins et al., 2003) are often based on studies that do not distinguish these components, so the true nature of the impact of IM may be obfuscated. Moreover, many measures do not adequately tap the content domain of IM, as they miss important IM behaviors, such as defensive or "protective" IM.

In an initial attempt to clarify measurement, Levashina and Campion (2007) created a measure of deceptive IM, called the Interview Faking Behavior Scale. This scale measures four dimensions of deceptive IM: slight image creation, extensive image creation, image protection, and deceptive ingratiation. This work has stimulated much subsequent work. Yet, this paper, as well as a follow up review (Levashina et al., 2014), identified the development of a self-report measure of honest IM as a top priority to advance interview research. Although some studies have examined the honest/deceptive IM distinction using videos or signal detection methods (Roulin et al., 2015), self-report measures are necessary to study IM behavior in many research settings. Valid self-reports are particularly important given that research indicates that observers have a difficult time recognizing honest and deceptive IM (Roulin et al., 2015). Thus, one goal of the present study is to rigorously develop an Honest IM scale. Such a measure, combined with the use of Levashina and Campion's (2007) deceptive IM measure, will allow researchers to gain a more nuanced understanding of IM, its nature, and its consequences. As such, the first phase of this research is to develop a measure of honest interview IM. Following this, we present the results of two studies to investigate antecedents and consequences of honest and deceptive IM.

Study 1: Item Generation and Content Validation for the Honest Interview IM Scale

The purpose of Study 1 was to investigate the construct domain of honest IM, generate items tapping this domain, and validate these items using subject matter experts (SMEs).

Method

We conducted a comprehensive examination of the IM theory and literature to understand the potential construct space and types of IM behaviors that interviewees may use in the interview and workplace contexts. These were used to write items that captured this content space, had a clear honest component to them, and were intended to manage impressions.[2]

First, we thoroughly examined the behaviors included in three prominent scales of interview IM: (1) the Stevens and Kristof (1995) scale, (2) the Interview Faking Behavior scale (Levashina & Campion, 2007), and (3) the Higgins and Judge (2004) measure. Within the Stevens and Kristof measure, the self-promotion items have been used in several studies (e.g., Jansen et al., 2012; Kristof-Brown et al., 2002) and seem to tap honest IM, including "during the interview I demonstrated my knowledge and expertise", and "I described my skills and abilities in an attractive way". On the other hand, while some ingratiation items seemed to indicate honest ingratiation, such as "I discussed interests I shared in common with the interviewer" others were ambiguous, such as "I complimented the interviewer or organization". Where possible, we adapted existing items to clarify honest IM (e.g. "I complimented the organization on accomplishments or qualities that I found impressive"). Similarly, because Levashina and Campion's (2007) deceptive IM scale was derived from a comprehensive review of interview IM behaviors, we examined each behavior and determined whether it could be adapted to an

---

[2] While both verbal and non-verbal IM can play important roles (e.g., Barrick et al., 2009), we focused on verbal IM in the present study for two reasons. First, research has shown notably low reliabilities for self-report measurement of non-verbal IM (e.g., Stevens & Kristof, 1995). This may be due to the unconscious nature of many non-verbal behaviors. As such, coder or observer ratings have typically been used for non-verbal IM (Peeters & Lievens, 2006). Second, many non-verbal behaviors (e.g., dressing professionally, having good posture, and making eye contact) are not necessarily honest or deceptive.

"honest" variant. For instance, the deceptive IM item "I tried to agree with the interviewer outwardly even when I disagree inwardly" led to the development of the honest IM item "When I agreed with the interviewer's opinions or points, I made sure to let him/her know".

We also examined existing measures designed to capture various IM behaviors in the workplace, such as the Measure of Ingratiatory Behaviors in Organizational Settings (MIBOS; Kumar & Beyerlein, 1991), the IM-5 scale (Bolino & Turnley, 1999), the Impression Management by Association (IMAS; Andrews & Kacmar, 2001), and Wayne and Ferris' (1990) three-factor IM measure. We examined these scales for behaviors that applied or could be adapted to the interview context, and determined ways that these behaviors could be clarified to distinguish them as "honest" attempts at IM. For example, we adapted the IMAS scale item "bring[ing] up past experiences with well-known previous employers to make others aware of my competence" (Andrews & Kacmar, 2001, p. 150) by changing the referent to the "interviewer" to create an honest self-promotion item. Altogether, we generated 78 items. As described above, we believed that honest IM behaviors could best be classified into three categories: (1) Honest Self-Promotion (e.g., I described my skills and abilities in an attractive way), (2) Honest Ingratiation (e.g., I complimented the organization on accomplishments or qualities that I found impressive), and (3) Honest Defensive IM (e.g., I recounted to the interviewer steps I had taken to prevent the recurrence of negative events or occurrences in my past). These categories closely mirror their "deceptive" counterparts in the Interview Faking Behavior Scale (Levashina & Campion, 2007). Moreover, we included items to tap facets of each IM tactic that have been identified in the literature, such as apologies, excuses, and justifications within defensive IM (e.g., Tsai et al., 2010), and other-enhancement (verbally praising another person) and opinion conformity (endorsement of the attitudes and values held

by the target) within ingratiation. Our goal was to assess the higher order factors, but we also explored the existence of sub-factors.

Consistent with the scale development process suggested by Hinkin (1998), we conducted a content validity assessment on this initial pool of items. We asked nine SMEs to examine our 78 items alongside the items from the deceptive IM scale (Levashina & Campion, 2007). The nine SMEs consisted of seven graduate students and two professors from industrial/organizational psychology.

These SMEs were asked to sort each item into one of seven categories (i.e. honest self-promotion, deceptive self-promotion, honest ingratiation, deceptive ingratiation, honest defensive tactics, deceptive defensive tactics, and "not sure/can't be categorized"). Definitions of each construct were provided. We also asked for qualitative feedback to identify confusing items, and suggestions on how to improve them.

Results

Consistent with recommendations by Hinkin (1998), we retained items with a 75% or higher agreement among the SMEs. Using this criterion, 17 honest self-promotion items, 19 honest ingratiation items, and 13 honest defensive items were retained, for a total of 49 items. These 49 items comprised our item pool to be used in Study 2.

Study 2: Validation and Refinement Using Exploratory Factor Analysis

The purpose of this study was to investigate the factor structure and psychometric properties of the preliminary Honest IM scale.

Method

An exploratory factor analysis (EFA) was conducted on a sample of U.S. participants who had completed a job interview within the last 12 months. A total of 285 participants were

recruited via Amazon Mechanical Turk, which allows for the collection of reliable data, and

reaches samples that are significantly more diverse than typical American college samples

(Buhrmester, Kwang, & Gosling, 2011; Landers & Behrend, 2015; Paolacci, Chandler, &

Ipeirotis, 2010). Participants completed an online questionnaire in exchange for USD $2.

The average age of participants was 32.55 years ($SD = 10.23$). The sample was

reasonably gender-balanced (44.91% female, 54.74% male, .35% missing), and mostly White

(72.98%, with 8.07% Black, 6.67% Hispanic, and 8.07% Asian). Participants were mostly

employed (49.5%) versus unemployed (38.60%), and some were students (11.93%). The

majority were interviewing for entry-level full-time positions (50.18%), followed by mid-

management full-time jobs (25.61%), part-time jobs (15.09%), and seasonal or temporary jobs

(4.91%).

Participants were asked to think about their most recent job interview, and to rate their

use of each of the 49 honest IM behaviors on a 1 (*to no extent*) to 5 (*to a very great extent*) scale.

Results and Discussion

The items were subjected to an initial principal axis factor analysis. Because the extracted

factors were expected to be correlated, a Promax rotation was used. In determining the most

representative factor structure, we examined eigenvalues, the scree plot, and the interpretability

of the factors. Based on the eigenvalues, results of this initial EFA indicated that there were 7

factors with an eigenvalue above 1. However, the scree plot indicated that 3 factors fit the data

best. When evaluating the factor loadings, it became clear that the first three factors described

the three factors that we had hypothesized, with most of the items making up factor 1 comprised

of Honest Self-Promotion items, factor 2 comprised of Honest Defensive IM items, and factor 3

comprised of many Honest Ingratiation items. Examination of factors 4 through 7 did not yield

any clearly meaningful reason for the groupings. These factors were made up of items mixed from multiple scales, with lower primary loadings (i.e. in the .40s and .50s), and high cross factor loadings (i.e. above .30). Results of a parallel analysis also showed that three factors was the appropriate number of factors to retain, as only three factors had eigenvalues greater than those generated by the parallel analysis for the average and the 95th percentile eigenvalues (Hayton, Allen, & Scarpello, 2004).

Based on these criteria, we determined that our data could best be described by the first three factors, which accounted for 50.81% of the total variance. As such, we retained items that exhibited high loadings primarily on one of the first three factors, that fit with the other items on the factor theoretically, and that had low cross loadings (i.e., less than or equal to .30). This resulted in retention of 32 items in total, including 14 self-promotion items, 8 honest ingratiation items, and 10 honest defensive items. These items can be found in Appendix A.

We then subjected these 32 items to a further EFA. Again, we ran a Principal axis analysis with a Promax rotation. The results of this analysis can be found in Table 1. It can be seen that all of the items loaded on the expected factor, and none of the items had cross-loadings above .30. As such, we retained these 32 items for the HIIM scale.

In addition, some theory predicts sub-factors to each type of IM, such as other-enhancement, fit enhancement, and opinion conformity within ingratiation, and apologies, excuses, and justifications within defensive IM. We explored this by conducting descended EFAs within our three factors, using maximum likelihood factor analysis (consistent with Levashina & Campion, 2007). In each descended EFA, only one factor emerged in terms of both

eigenvalues and the scree plot, with no sub-factors, and all items loading highly on the single higher-order factor. These results indicate that the HIIM is best understood by three factors.[3]

Inspection of the means and standard deviations for these items revealed substantial variability in how often different individuals use these behaviors. In other words, while many use honest IM, the use of honest IM is not universal. Finally, inter-factor correlations were small to moderate (ranging from .26 to .56), and internal consistency reliabilities ranged from .89 to .94.

Study 3: Confirmatory Factor Analysis of the Honest IM Scale

The goal of Study 3 was to conduct a confirmatory factor analysis on the HIIM scale to examine item-level fit, and to test the three-factor solution versus a competing one-factor model.

Method

To test the overall fit of the proposed factor structure of the HIIM scale, we collected data from a sample of 210 undergraduate students who had completed a job interview within the last 6 months. All students were recruited from a Canadian business school. They completed a 20-minute online questionnaire in exchange for course credit.

The average age of participants was 22.07 years ($SD = 4.14$). The sample was gender-balanced (52.4% female), and mostly composed of White (61.4%) or Asian (25.7%) students. Students were interviewing for a variety of jobs, including entry-level full-time (28.6%), part-time (28.6%), seasonal or temporary (23.8%), and mid-management jobs (8.1%).

Results and Discussion

Using M*plus* 6.11 (Muthén & Muthén, 2011), a model examining the three hypothesized factors of the honest IM scale was compared to a model specifying a single latent factor. As each item on the honest IM scale was rated on a 1 to 5 Likert scale, the indicators were of an ordered-

---

[3] Results from the descended EFAs can be obtained from the authors upon request.

categorical nature. As such, a robust weighted least squares estimator, WLSMV (mean- and variance-adjusted weighted least squares) estimation was used (Lubke & Muthén, 2004).

Based on the results of studies one and two, the model was specified with items loading onto each indicator's respective latent trait factor. We examined several fit indices to assess the goodness of fit of the model to the data including the chi-square test, the root mean square error of approximation (RMSEA), and the comparative fit index (CFI).

The three-factor solution is shown in Table 2. For the three-factor solution, the CFA showed a good fit to the data and were in alignment with the cut-off rules-of-thumb commonly cited (e.g., Hu & Bentler, 1999 - CFI > .90, RMSEA < .08). Specifically, $\chi^2 (461) = 1,140.35$, $p < .01$, $\chi^2/\text{df} = 2.47$, CFI = .91, and RMSEA = .08 (with a 90% Confidence Interval ranging from .08 to .09).

We compared the fit of this model to a single factor model of honest IM. Fit indices showed that the single factor model demonstrated poorer fit to the data: $\chi^2 (464) = 2,262.40$, $p < .001$, $\chi^2/\text{df} = 4.88$, CFI = .75, RMSEA = .14 (90% CI was .13-.14). In addition, the hypothesized three-factor model provided a superior fit: $\Delta\chi^2 (3) = 250.01$, $p < .001$.[4]

Within the three-factor solution, each item loaded significantly onto the hypothesized factor. Factor loadings were all above .50, with an average loading of .75 for the honest self-promotion items, .78 for the honest ingratiation items, and .61 for the honest defensive items. The factor inter-correlations in this sample were moderate, ranging from .40-.57 (consistent with inter-factor correlations for other IM measures; Higgins & Judge, 2004; Higgins & Judge, 2004; Levashina & Campion, 2007), which suggests that the factors are distinct. Internal consistency reliabilities ranged from .83 (Honest Defensive IM) to .92 (Honest Self-Promotion). Finally, the

---

[4] χ^2 values reported are estimated using the $\Delta\chi^2$ test through the DIFFTEST function (Asparouhov & Muthén, 2006).

means and SDs indicate that applicants tended to report using all forms of honest IM, with the

mean usage across all items close to the midpoint (3.20), and substantial deviation around the use

of honest IM.

Study 4: Preliminary Nomological Network Around Honest and Deceptive IM

The measure of honest IM created in the previous three studies allows us to disentangle

honest from deceptive IM, begin to understand IM using a more unified approach, and examine

the extent to which the honest/deceptive IM difference is an important one. The following two

studies examine relationships between honest and deceptive IM, and the antecedents (i.e., actor,

situational, and target) and consequences (i.e., interviewer ratings) of honest and deceptive IM.

Relationship between Honest and Deceptive IM

An important step in demonstrating the utility of the HIIM measure involves examining

how the three honest IM tactics relate to the already established four deceptive IM tactics

(Levashina & Campion, 2007). There is conceptual and practical overlap between these two

forms of IM, as the goals of both honest and deceptive behaviors are to create positive

impressions of oneself, such as to be perceived as competent, qualified, and likable. We expect

that although honest and deceptive IM are distinct constructs with unique nomological networks,

they should be positively related to one another. For instance, in engaging in self-promoting

behaviors, an applicant may start with honestly describing their qualities or experience (honest

self-promotion) and then add on exaggerated facts (slight image creation). Similarly, an applicant

trying to demonstrate fit may flatter the organization on both things they find admirable (honest

ingratiation) and things they do not (deceptive ingratiation). This is consistent with Levashina

and Campion's (2007) proposal that applicants may start with the truth but then add on or

subtract untruthful information. We therefore hypothesize that conceptually similar honest and deceptive IM tactics will be positively related (Hypothesis 1; H1).

Antecedents of Honest and Deceptive IM: Theory and Organizing Framework

In Studies 4 and 5, we examine several antecedents of both honest and deceptive IM. In determining the choice of antecedents and the nature of these relationships, we bring together two theoretical frameworks that should inform how (or why) different antecedents trigger different IM tactics. First, we classify antecedents according to Ferris and Judge's (1991) political influence perspective, which proposes that influence behaviors (i.e., IM) should vary based on characteristics of the (1) actor (i.e., applicant), (2) situation, and (3) target. In addition, in order to explain why and how various factors within these categories predict IM, we utilize Levashina and Campion's (2006) model of interview faking, which specifies that antecedents of IM operate by impacting applicants' willingness to use IM, capacity to use IM, and opportunity to use IM. Although this model was originally devised to understand deceptive IM, we believe that it can be further expanded to understand antecedents of honest IM. Integrating these two approaches, *actor characteristics* include applicants' individual differences in personality, attitudes, or experiences, which impact their willingness to use honest and/or deceptive IM. It also incorporates personality traits, knowledge, skills, or abilities, that make applicants more or less capable of using those IM tactics. *Situational characteristics* include the type or format of the interview, the kind of questions asked, and features of the job or hiring organizations. These create more or less opportunities for applicants to use honest (and deceptive) IM tactics, but also modulates the risks associated with deceptive IM use. Finally, *target characteristics* include interviewer characteristics, type, and number of interviewers, which can impact applicants' willingness or opportunities to use various IM tactics.

In Study 4, we focus on actor characteristics that can make applicants more or less willing (e.g., honesty-humility or motivation) or capable (e.g., conscientiousness or interview training) to engage in honest vs. deceptive IM tactics. Investigating individual difference and attitudinal antecedents of honest and deceptive IM can provide a portrait of *who* is most likely to engage in each class of behavior, and therefore the nature and consequences of each type of IM. We argue that honest and deceptive IM likely have differential individual difference antecedents, and these can inform us about the fundamental similarities and differences between these two types of IM and their potential impact. If honest IM is desirable and deceptive IM undesirable, as some have suggested (e.g., Rosenfeld, 1997), then those engaging in honest IM should possess job-relevant qualifications and traits, and represent a true fit with the organization, while those who fake should be poor candidates with undesirable traits.

Actor Characteristics Impacting the Willingness to Use IM

Honesty-Humility. Individuals high on Honesty-Humility value sincerity and fairness, prefer interpersonal relations to be genuine rather than based on manipulation, and are unwilling to take advantage of other individuals for personal gain (Ashton, Lee, & de Vries, 2014). Individuals low in Honesty-Humility or modesty and related traits have been found to be more willing and more likely to engage in deceptive IM (Buehl & Melchers, 2017; Law, Bourdage, & O'Neill, 2016; Levashina & Campion, 2007). As such, we predict Honesty-Humility to be negatively related to deceptive IM (H2). Yet, even honest forms of IM involve putting one's best foot forward (Kleinmann & Klehe, 2010), describing oneself attractively, and being somewhat immodest, which may not sit well with extremely humble individuals. Given that a core component of Honesty-Humility is the "Humility" component (i.e. these individuals tend to be

more modest), it is also possible that, but unclear if, Honesty-Humility will be associated with honest IM (Research Question 1; RQ1).

Competitive Worldviews. Applicants also vary in competitive worldviews: the extent to which they view the world as a competitive jungle (Duckitt, Wagner, Du Plessis, & Birum, 2002). Recent theoretical (Roulin, Krings, & Binggeli, 2016) and empirical (Roulin & Krings, 2016) work demonstrates that the more applicants see the world as being characterized by a ruthless struggle for scarce resources, the more willing they are to use deceptive IM. Although there is no theory about the association between Competitive Worldviews and honest IM, we argue that perceived competition is primarily pressuring applicants who already use IM to go a step further and exaggerate their qualifications to outperform other candidates. We thus expect Competitive Worldviews to be positively related only to deceptive IM (H3).

Attraction and Motivation. Theoretical (Levashina & Campion, 2006) and empirical (Stevens, 1997) work highlights that IM behavior is effortful, and emerges when applicants are motivated or perceive the outcome to be desirable. Stevens (1997) notes, "If applicants perceive jobs as attractive or expect interviews to lead to job offers, they may have increased motivation to manage recruiter impressions by making themselves appear competent and likable" (p.949). These authors found a positive correlation between job desirability and ingratiation behaviors, although conclusions are somewhat limited, as they relied on observer and coder ratings of IM. Similarly, we hypothesize that applicants will be more willing to use honest IM when they have high attraction to the organization they are interviewing with (H4), and when they are motivated to do well (H5). On the other hand, the relationship with deceptive IM is less clear. Applicants may be willing to fake to try to appear more positive, but may also be hesitant to exaggerate or make up qualifications, since the truth may be exposed if they are hired. In essence, a positive

relationship between these factors and deceptive IM hinges on applicants believing faking will help them do well and get hired, something we do not know. As such, the association between deceptive IM and attraction (RQ2) and motivation (RQ3) is treated in an exploratory fashion.

Perceived Difficulty and Procedural Justice. Two variables that may be associated with the willingness to use IM are perceived difficulty and procedural justice. Difficulty refers to the perceived ease of the interview (such as the extent to which the applicant understands and is able to come up with good answers to the questions), whereas procedurally just interviews are ones the applicant perceives to be fair, job-relevant, and provide chances to demonstrate their qualifications. We predict that applicants will engage in more honest IM when they perceive the interview to be less difficult (H6a) and more procedurally just (H6b), as they should be more willing to rely on their true qualifications for the job (and should perceive an increased capacity to do so). On the other hand, theoretical work indicates that candidates may be more willing to use deceptive IM when they perceive the interview/selection process to be difficult (Roulin et al., 2016; Tett & Simonet, 2011) or less fair (Levashina & Campion, 2006), as they may feel a need to compensate for perceived lack of qualifications in a difficult interview, or turn to deception as a reaction to perceiving unfair treatment. Consistent with this, we hypothesize that deceptive IM will be positively related to difficulty (H7a), and negatively to procedural justice (H7b).

Actor Characteristics Impacting the Capacity to Use IM

Conscientiousness. We predict that Conscientiousness will be positively related to honest IM (H8a) but negatively related to deceptive IM (H8b). Because they tend to be better job performers (Barrick & Mount, 1991), conscientious applicants may have more truthful positive experiences to draw on, leading to increased capacity to use honest self-promotion. Similarly, due to their increased diligence and preparation, highly conscientious applicants may prepare

more for the interview, including finding out about the organization, so they can point out where they fit in, leading to an increased capacity to use honest ingratiation. On the other hand, we predict Conscientiousness will be negatively related to deceptive IM. As Levashina and Campion (2006) postulate, those high on Conscientiousness likely feel less need to fake, as they have greater job knowledge and have spent more time preparing.

Extraversion. Past research has found Extraversion to positively relate to self-promotion use (Kristof-Brown et al., 2002), number of lies told for self-promoting purposes (Weiss & Feldman, 2006), and workplace ingratiation (Bourdage, Wiltshire, & Lee, 2015). According to Weiss and Feldman (2006), individuals high in Extraversion are sociable and place greater emphasis on gaining the acceptance of others. This increased understanding of social interaction should make them more capable of engaging in IM – both honest and deceptive. On the other end, Kacmar, Delery, and Ferris (1992) note that those low on Extraversion may be less comfortable, and intimidated by, the interview setting, leading them to be less comfortable using IM. We believe Extraversion will be positively related to honest (H9a) and deceptive (H9b) IM.

Interview Training. Many applicants use interview training to try and improve their interview skills. Kristof-Brown et al. (2002) found interview training to positively relate to self-promotion (using items focused mostly on honest self-promotion). These authors note that training could make applicants more capable of highlighting their qualifications to make a positive impression. Given the student sample in the present study, we believe that the interview training that students would receive (i.e. from their career center) would emphasize fostering a positive impression using honest means, but would not encourage applicants to be dishonest. As such, we hypothesize interview training will be positively related only to honest IM (H10).

Interviewer Ratings

Applicant IM is considered a direct antecedent of interview performance, and is one of several important factors that impact how applicants are evaluated by interviewers, and HR decisions. Indeed, individual studies (e.g., Gilmore & Ferris, 1989; Kristof-Brown et al., 2002; Stevens & Kristof, 1995) and meta-analyses (e.g., Barrick et al., 2009; Higgins et al., 2003) have highlighted a positive relationship between IM and interview performance, with the most recent meta-analytic evidence by Levashina et al. (2014) demonstrating uncorrected sample-weighted mean relationships ranging from .12 (defensive IM) to .26 (self-promotion) with interview ratings. However, many of the studies used measures that confound honest and deceptive IM, obfuscating these findings.

In the present study, we investigate three performance criteria: interviewers' perceptions of person-organization (P-O) and person-job (P-J) fit, as well as their overall hiring recommendations. Previous research suggests that P-O fit and P-J fit are the two primary evaluative criteria impacted by IM (Higgins & Judge, 2004; Kristof-Brown et al., 2002). Higgins and Judge (2004) postulate that "the heightened perceptions of similarity brought about by ingratiation should have a positive effect on recruiter perceptions of P-O fit" (p.625). On the other hand, effective self-promotion should lead interviewers to believe applicants have the knowledge, skills, and abilities to perform the job (i.e. P-J fit). Research that has used self-reports of measures containing more honest IM (e.g., Stevens & Kristof, 1995) has demonstrated positive relationships with interviewer ratings of performance. As many interviewers accept and promote honest IM (Jansen et al., 2012), applicants engaging in more honest IM should receive more positive recommendations from interviews. As such, we expect that honest IM will be positively related to interviewer ratings of hirability, P-O fit, and P-J fit (H11a, 11b, and 11c), In contrast, research has found inconsistent results regarding the impact of deceptive IM on

interview ratings (Buehl & Melchers, 2017; Levashina & Campion, 2007; Roulin et al., 2014; Swider, Barrick, Harris, & Stoverink, 2011). Given this, we treat the relationships between various forms of deceptive IM and interview ratings of hirability, P-O fit, and P-J fit as a research question (RQ4).

Method

      Participants and Procedure. The sample for the present study was 224 senior business students, each being interviewed by professional interviewers with organizations that utilize co-operative education or internship students in a Canadian university. These were students at a different university from Study 3. Interviewees were 22.22 years old on average ($SD = 4.36$), fairly even split in terms of gender (52.20% female), and were typically in the third year of their degree ($M_{year} = 3.35$) which is when these students apply for co-op positions. 29.91% of the applicants had received previous interview training, and 70.09% had not. This primary sample allowed us to examine the relationships between actor characteristics and honest and deceptive IM. In terms of the outcome variables, we had a smaller subset of participants. Specifically, we obtained interviewer-rated hirability for 168 individuals, and P-O fit and P-J fit ratings for 129.

      Interviews were conducted by professional interviewers from organizations in a variety of industries, such as accounting, oil and gas, and marketing. In total, 59 interviewers were included in the present sample. The average age of interviewers was 34.38 ($SD = 11.56$), 77.97% were female, and the mean years of experience conducting interviews was 8.20 ($SD = 7.04$).

      Procedurally, interviewees examined an online list of the available companies, and signed up to interview with their desired organization. Students arrived on their scheduled interview day, and underwent a 45-minute employment interview. Interviewers conducted interviews in the manner of their choosing, as they would for a typical entry level job at their organization. After

leaving their interview, interviewees were approached by a member of the research team and

asked to participate in the study, with the guarantee that their responses would be confidential.

Additionally, interviewers completed a measure of interview performance for each interviewee.

Although the interviews were conducted as part of a "practice" interview program, several

applicants received follow up interviews as a result of their practice interview. The high fidelity

nature of the situation was reflected in several components, such as the high means to the

questions "I was motivated to do well in this interview," ($M = 4.37$ out of 5), "I took this

interview seriously" ($M = 4.20$ out of 5), as well as the experience level of interviewers.

Measures. *Personality*. Personality was measured using self-reports on the 100-item

HEXACO-PI-R (Lee & Ashton, 2004). The HEXACO-PI-R has been used in hundreds of

studies (see hexaco.org), and measures Honesty-Humility, Emotionality, Extraversion,

Agreeableness, Conscientiousness, and Openness to Experience, each using 16 items measured

on a 5-point Likert scale from 1 (*Strongly Disagree*) to 5 (*Strongly Agree*). The internal

consistency reliabilities ranged from .78 (Honesty-Humility) to .85 (Extraversion).

Competitive Worldviews. We used the 20-item Competitive World View scale (Duckitt et

al., 2002). An example item is "it's a dog-eat-dog world where you have to be ruthless at times".

Responses were indicated on a 5-point rating scale, from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 5 (*strongly

agree*). The internal consistency reliability for this scale was .86.

Attraction and Motivation. Attraction was measured with the items "I am attracted to the

organization that I interviewed with", and "The organization I interviewed with would be one of

my top choices as an employer." The alpha for this scale was .88. Motivation to perform well

was measured with a 5-point scale on the item: "I was motivated to do well in this interview."

Procedural Justice. This was measured using 5 items adapted from Chapman and Zweig (2005), based on Gilliland's (1993) model of procedural justice in selection. Sample items are "the questions asked during the interview were appropriate", and "the interview measured content relevant to the type of job I would have been interviewing for." The alpha was .73.

Perceived Difficulty. We used 4-items adapted from Chapman and Zweig (2005). Sample items are: "I had difficulty coming up with good answers to the interviewer's questions" and "the interview was difficult". Internal consistency reliability was .70.

Honest IM. Self-reports of honest self-promotion, honest defensive IM, and honest ingratiation were gathered using the 32-item HIIM measure developed in Studies 1 through 3. Responses were made on a 5-point Likert scale from 1 (*To No Extent*) to 5 (*To A Very Great Extent*). All three factors had acceptable internal consistency reliabilities, at .92 (honest self-promotion), .86 (honest ingratiation), and .82 (honest defensive IM).

Deceptive IM. The four factors of deceptive IM were measured using 33 items from the interview faking behavior scale (Levashina & Campion, 2007). Due to space constraints, we were unable to include all 54-items, so after consulting with one of the authors of the scale, we chose a subset on the basis of factor loadings and content coverage, such that each sub-facet was represented by at least two items. Overall, we measured the four main factors of slight image creation (7 items), extensive image creation (9 items), image protection (8 items), and deceptive ingratiation (9 items). Responses were made on a 5-point scale from 1 (*To No Extent*) to 5 (*To a Very Great Extent*). The internal consistency reliabilities ranged from .82 to .86.

Interviewer Ratings. Ratings of interview performance were provided by the interviewers. After the interview had concluded, they rated the interviewee on several questions. For hirability, given that these were practice interviews, we asked "If you were hiring for your

organization, how would you rank this candidate: (1) Yes Hire, (2) May Hire, (3) Probably Not, and (4) Definitely Not." Responses were reverse coded prior to analysis.

P-O fit and P-J fit were each measured using the scales from Higgins and Judge (2004), which each include two items. A sample P-O fit item is: "This applicant is a good match or fit with my organization and its current employees" and a sample P-J fit item is "This applicant possesses the necessary knowledge, skills, and abilities to perform the duties of the position they interviewed for". Internal consistency reliabilities for P-O fit and P-J fit were .82 and .82.

Results

Measurement Model. We conducted a series of CFAs to test the measurement model for IM. Given that the ratio of sample size and total item numbers can impair fit indices and may be associated with biased parameter estimates, we created three-item parcels for each IM variable (i.e., honest self-promotion, ingratiation, defensive IM, slight image creation, extensive image creation, image protection, and deceptive ingratiation) following the item-to-construct balance method (Williams, Vandenberg, & Edwards, 2009). Results of three competing models showed that a seven-factor solution comprising three honest IM scales and four deceptive IM scales best fit the data, χ^2 (168) = 259.39, p < .001, CFI = .97, TLI = .96, RMSEA = .05 (90% CI was .04-.06). A model combining all items into one factor and a second model which only distinguished between honest and deceptive IM demonstrated poorer fit, χ^2 (189) = 1664.97, p < .001, CFI = .54, TLI =.49, RMSEA = .19 (90% CI was .18-.20) and χ^2 (188) = 906.76, p < .001, CFI = .78, TLI = .75, RMSEA = .13 (90% CI was .12-.14) respectively.

Convergence of Honest and Deceptive IM. Results suggested that the honest IM dimensions were correlated with, but unique from deceptive IM. First, honest self-promotion correlated at an average of .23 with the four deceptive IM tactics. Importantly, honest self-

promotion correlated at .29 with slight image creation ($p < .01$), and -.03 with extensive image

creation (*ns*), which are the corresponding "deceptive" scales. Honest ingratiation had an average

correlation of .37 with the deceptive IM scales, and the strongest correlate was with its

counterpart, deceptive ingratiation ($r = .61, p < .01$). Finally, the average correlation of honest

defensive IM with deceptive IM was .29, with the strongest correlation being with its deceptive

counterpart, image protection ($r = .38, p < .01$). Together, these results suggest that, consistent

with H1, the honest IM scales correlate modestly with deceptive IM. Correlations of honest and

deceptive IM with the remaining study variables are in Table 3.[5]

Actor Characteristics Impacting the Willingness to Use IM. Honesty-Humility was

not significantly negatively correlated with any of the three *honest* IM behaviors. However,

Honesty-Humility was negatively correlated with all four types of deceptive IM, including slight

image creation ($r = -.19, p < .01$), extensive image creation ($r = -.20 \ p < .01$), image protection ($r

= -.15, p < .05$), and deceptive ingratiation ($r = -.25, p < .01$), supporting H2.

Similarly, competitive worldviews positively correlated with all four deceptive IM

tactics, including slight image creation ($r = .16, p < .05$), extensive image creation ($r = .18, p

< .01$) image protection ($r = .20, p < .01$), and deceptive ingratiation ($r = .17, p < .05$), but did not

correlate significantly with honest IM behaviors, thus providing support for H3.

Consistent with H4 and H5, attraction to the organization and motivation to do well

positively correlated with all three honest IM behaviors, with respective correlations for

attraction and motivation with honest self-promotion ($r = .23$ and $r = .26$), ingratiation ($r = .28$

and $r = .14$), and defensive IM ($r = .15$ and $r = .26$). In addition, attraction was positively related

---

[5] We focus this table on the key correlations between IM and other study variables. However, for a full correlation table between all study variables, please see the Online Supplement.

to deceptive ingratiation ($r = .14$, $p < .05$), but not the other deceptive IM tactics. Conversely, motivation to do well negatively correlated with extensive image creation ($r = -.21$, $p < .01$).

For the hypotheses surrounding interview difficulty and procedural justice, results indicated that interview difficulty was associated with decreased honest self-promotion ($r = -.25$, $p < .01$) and honest defensive IM ($r = -.14$, $p < .05$), but increased levels of all four deceptive IM tactics (rs from .15 to .31). This provides support for H6a and H7a. Conversely, while higher procedural justice was associated with increased levels of all three honest IM behaviors (rs from .15 to .30), lower procedural justice was only associated with increased levels of extensive image creation ($r = -.16$, $p < .01$). Together, this supports H6b and partially supports H7b.

Actor Characteristics Impacting the Capacity to Use IM. Conscientiousness was positively related to honest self-promotion ($r = .15$, $p < .05$) and marginally to honest ingratiation ($r = .13$, $p = .05$). Conversely, Conscientiousness was negatively related to three of the four deceptive IM behaviors, including slight image creation ($r = -.18$, $p < .01$), extensive image creation ($r = -.35$, $p < .01$), and image protection ($r = -.19$, $p < .01$). As such, H8a and 8b received some support. Consistent with H9a, Extraversion was positively related to honest self-promotion ($r = .17$, $p < .05$) and honest ingratiation ($r = .16$, $p < .05$). Contrary to H9b, Extraversion had the opposite relationship with some of the deceptive IM tactics, such that it was negatively related to slight image creation ($r = -.24$, $p < .01$), extensive image creation ($r = -.27$, $p < .01$), and image protection ($r = -.28$, $p < .01$). Individuals who had received interview training were more likely to use all three honest IM behaviors (rs = .21, .16, and .16 for honest self-promotion, ingratiation, and defensive respectively). This provides support for H10a. In addition, although interview training was expected to be unassociated with deceptive IM use, previous interview training was positively associated with image protection ($r = .18$, $p < .01$).

IM and Interviewer Ratings. On the whole, honest IM demonstrated relationships with several of the interviewer-rated variables, while deceptive IM did not. For instance, honest self-promotion ($r = .25$, $p < .01$), ingratiation ($r = .20$, $p < .01$), and defensive IM ($r = .18$, $p < .05$) all positively correlated with hirability. In addition, honest self-promotion and honest ingratiation both were correlated with interviewer perceptions of P-O fit ($r = .27$ and $r = .19$, respectively) and P-J fit ($r = .25$ and $r = .22$, respectively). Together, these results support H11 a-c.[6]

Discussion

The present study was aimed at furthering our understanding of honest IM and deceptive IM, the relationship between these components of IM, and how they relate to actor characteristics and interviewers' ratings. Studies to date have typically used measures that confound these aspects of applicant use of IM, and so this study informs our understanding of the full range of applicant verbal IM behavior, with clear measurement of a myriad of tactics.

As expected, inter-measure correlations and CFA suggest that honest IM is positively correlated, but not redundant with deceptive IM. This can be explained in several ways. First, some forms of deceptive IM may require honest IM as a baseline. For instance, in order to use slight image creation (exaggerating one's accomplishments) one may begin by accurately describing their qualifications and experience (i.e. honest self-promotion), but then expand to exaggerate these accomplishments, consistent with the idea that deceptive IM may involve adding or subtracting information from the truth (Levashina & Campion, 2007). Similarly,

---

[6] In addition to P-O fit, P-J fit, and hirability, the Career Centre utilized a behavioral rating form that asked interviewers to rate various behaviors (e.g., *demonstrated knowledge of the company, pointed out work-related skills*). These ratings were positively related to all three forms of honest IM (*r*s typically in the .10s and .20s), but uncorrelated with deceptive IM. We did not include these in the present study as the items were not theoretically derived, were range restricted, and demonstrated extremely high item inter-correlations, such that raters did not appear to distinguish between behaviors. However, at the suggestion of a reviewer, we note that this behavioral data is available from the authors upon request, such as for future meta-analytic efforts.

applicants striving to appear likable may highlight qualities of the interviewer or organization they genuinely find appealing (honest ingratiation), as well as those they do not (deceptive ingratiation). On the other hand, extensive image creation (the most blatant form of faking) was not correlated with honest IM.

Despite positive correlations between the two measures, our findings highlight a very different pattern of antecedents and outcomes of honest versus deceptive IM, and the importance of distinguishing between these various IM tactics. In terms of actor characteristics, we focused on a number of individual differences and attitudes that we believed would impact the willingness and capacity to use honest and deceptive IM. We found that deceptive IM seems to be driven by many negative personality traits, including lower levels of Honesty-Humility, Conscientiousness, Extraversion, and high Competitive Worldviews. These findings point to the importance of identifying and deterring deceptive IM, as individuals low in Conscientiousness, for instance, tend to be worse performers once on the job (Barrick & Mount, 1991) and those low in Honesty-Humility engage in a variety of negative behaviors such as counterproductive work behaviors (O'Neill, Lewis, & Carswell, 2011).

Contrasting this, the profile of individuals engaging in honest IM seems to be markedly different. Although the effect sizes for personality with honest IM were somewhat smaller, honest IM was associated with high Conscientiousness and Extraversion. Those high in Extraversion, who are more socially astute and aware, may simply be more capable to find and voice their fit and qualities during the interview. Whereas previous studies hypothesized Extraversion to be positively related to IM (Kristof-Brown et al., 2002; Levashina & Campion, 2006), this seems to apply only to honest IM. In addition, more Conscientious individuals use

more honest self-promotion. These individuals may have more experience to draw on, or may be more prepared for the interview.

Finally, Competitive Worldviews was correlated with the use of deceptive IM, but not with honest IM. This supports the idea that high-Competitive Worldviews applicants engage in faking as a way to deal with perceived competition (Roulin & Krings, 2016; Roulin et al., 2016). However, this relationship does not extend to honest IM. This suggests that high-Competitive Worldviews individuals may not see honest IM as enough to outperform other applicants.

A very interesting set of relationships emerged between interview training and IM, such that individuals who reported having previous interview training used more of all three honest IM tactics, but also used more image protection (deceptive defensive IM). As such, training seems to recognize and coach individuals to engage in honest IM. Although we expected training would not be associated with increased faking, it is perhaps not surprising that those who were trained also minimized or omitted weaknesses, or concealed negative aspects on their record.

Other actor characteristics, such as attitudes and motivation, also differentiate honest from deceptive IM, and play a key role in predicting both sets of behaviors. Individuals who were attracted to the particular organization as an employer, and those who were motivated to do well were more likely to engage in honest IM. Moreover, although attraction related positively to using deceptive ingratiation, motivation and attraction did not increase deceptive IM. As such, consistent with Rosenfeld's (1997) suggestion, some IM may actually just be representing a motivated, interested applicant rather than a deceptive one. Finally, applicants who were motivated to do well reported less extensive image creation, possibly indicating that many applicants view the use of extensive image creation as damaging to their chances at doing well.

In sum, our findings indicate that honest and deceptive IM, although positively correlated, are associated with very different stable and attitudinal actor characteristics. Honest IM seems to be associated with trained, motivated, interested applicants who are high on traits such as Extraversion and Conscientiousness, and in an interview they perceive as fair. In contrast, applicants may not necessarily view deceptive IM as desirable, but rather engage in this behavior in response to perceiving the interview as too difficult and unfair, or lacking the training, interpersonal comfort (i.e., extraversion), and preparation (i.e., conscientiousness) that would allow them to do well through more legitimate means. Given this, a critical question is the extent to which each of these types of IM are effective in influencing an interviewer's perceptions.

In this respect, the results are generally encouraging. All three honest IM behaviors were positively correlated with interviewer ratings of hirability, and honest self-promotion and ingratiation were positively related to interviewer ratings of P-O and P-J fit. On the other hand, none of the deceptive IM behaviors impacted interviewer-rated criteria. At face value, this is positive, as it indicates that honest IM leads to better outcomes, whereas deceptive IM does not. However, the magnitude of relationships between honest IM and these criteria is certainly not high enough to indicate that honest IM is heavily rewarded. Second, whereas on the whole, deceptive IM may not help performance and evaluations, it does not seem to hurt either. This is consistent with findings that interviewers tend to be poor at detecting and differentiating honest and deceptive IM, but seem to be somewhat better at detecting honest IM (Roulin et al., 2015). In addition, the effects of honest IM on the outcomes were consistent with the meta-analytic observed effect sizes for these three classes of IM reported by Levashina et al. (2014). For example, the correlations of honest self-promotion, ingratiation, and defensive IM with hirability

in our study were .25, .20, and .18, whereas the meta-analytic effect sizes for IM in general were .26, .13, and .12 for these self-promotion, ingratiation, and defensive IM. This indicates that the honest IM scale relates to interview ratings in expected magnitudes and directions, supporting the overall validity of the measure. Second, it points to the notion that past meta-analytic effect sizes are more indicative of the impact of honest IM than deceptive IM.

In sum, the present study utilized the newly created honest IM measure and administered this alongside the deceptive IM measure, to enhance our understanding of both honest and deceptive IM, their commonalities, and their distinctiveness. The use of a high fidelity sample allowed us to examine personality in relation to IM in a situation where we could be more confident of the honesty of the survey responses. Study 5 builds on and expands these findings.

Study 5: Validating Short IM Scale and Additional Antecedents and Consequences

Study 5 was designed to tackle three goals: (1) to validate shorter versions of the honest IM scale (HIIM-S) and the deceptive IM scale (IFB-S), (2) to expand the nomological network around honest and deceptive IM by investigating additional actor, target, and situational antecedents, and (3) to gain a more nuanced examination of how IM influences outcomes.

Validation of Shortened Honest and Deceptive IM Scales

A major practical issue for researchers interested in examining applicant IM during employment interviews is the length of existing measures. For instance, Levashina and Campion's (2007) original IFB scale involved 54 items. Including such an extensive measure is difficult in studies asking applicants to complete a survey right after an exhausting interview, particularly if they have multiple interviews. As a result, most studies to date (e.g., Ingold, Kleinmann, König, & Melchers, 2015; Roulin et al., 2014; Swider et al., 2011) have only used inconsistent subsets of items from the IFB scale, without clear evidence of the validity of such

shortened measures. The researchers' task becomes even more daunting for those interested in capturing both honest and deceptive forms of IM. We foresee that using a full-length measure including both the HIIM and the IFB would be challenging in some cases. As such the first objective of Study 5 was to create and validate a short measure of applicant IM that (a) adequately captures both the honest and deceptive sides of IM, (b) demonstrates strong psychometric properties (e.g., high reliability, convergence with the full scales); and (c) is brief enough to be used in future interview IM research with limited time.

As an initial step, we selected the four items with the highest loadings (but low cross-loadings) for each of the three honest IM factors from Study 2 and the four deceptive IM factors from Levashina and Campion's (2007) study (while ensuring coverage of the various facets for each deceptive IM factor). We submitted our 12-item HIIM-S to both EFAs (using data from Study 2) and CFAs (using data from Study 3), and further explored internal consistency (using data from Study 4). We also submitted our 16-item IFB-S to CFA and explored internal consistency (using data from Study 4). For the sake of brevity, we provide readers with detailed explanations and results in an online supplement. The outcome is a 28-item Short IM scale (see Appendix B) with 12 honest and 16 deceptive items that demonstrates high convergent validity (e.g., correlations between the short and full scale all rs > .85) and reliability (αs for the short scales ranged from .68 to .87 across the three studies). In the present study, we further validate the shortened versions of the IM scales using original data.

Actor, Target, and Situational Antecedents of Honest and Deceptive IM

In the previous study, we examined actor characteristics as antecedents of both types of IM. However, IM theory (Ferris & Judge, 1991) indicates that there are two additional types of antecedents: situational characteristics and target characteristics. Like our Study 4, most of the

interview IM research has been focused on actor characteristics, such as personality traits. However, we have substantially less knowledge of situational characteristics such as interview type (Ellis et al., 2002; Lievens & Peeters, 2008), and only small studies looking at target characteristics such as interviewer experience (Delery & Kacmar, 1998). In Study 5, we thus examine antecedents taken from all three classes described above, selected due to their potential impact on willingness, capacity, and opportunity to use IM. Because we rely on survey data, we chose to focus on antecedents that can be objectively reported by interviewees, in order to alleviate potential common-method variance issues. Whereas actor characteristics tell us about the nature of each IM tactic and who is most likely to engage in it, situational and target antecedents can inform how to increase or decrease the use of different types of IM behavior.

Actor characteristics impacting willingness and capacity to use IM. In Study 4, because we used student interviewees, variables such as age or work experience were range restricted. In the present study, use of a more diverse sample allowed examination of the impact of interviewee age and in-role experience on IM use. We argue that age and relevant in-role experience should impact IM use. Applicants usually rely on deceptive IM as a way to compensate for a lack of qualifications and better resemble the profile of an ideal job candidate (Marcus, 2009). Because applicants who are older or with more in-role experience are likely to possess more job-related knowledge and qualifications, they may experience a decreased need (and thus a decreased willingness) to engage in deceptive IM. In contrast, they should be more capable of using honest IM such as honest self-promotion. Because of this, applicants with more extensive experience should be less willing to engage in both forms of defensive IM to justify or hide their lack of qualifications. Conversely, those who are younger or have less experience should be more willing to use deceptive IM, for instance making up answers to behavioral

questions for which they will have little to draw on. Moreover, they would likely have to engage in greater image protection, such as hiding weaknesses or lack of experience in their resume. Overall, we predict age and in-role experience will be positively related to honest self-promotion (H12a), but negatively to honest defensive IM (H12b) and all forms of deceptive IM (H12c).

Target characteristics impacting opportunity and willingness to use IM. We contrast IM use towards two common types of interviewers: (a) HR professionals (i.e., recruiters or HR staff) and (b) future direct supervisors. As compared to HR professionals, future supervisors are more knowledgeable about the job and the required qualifications. Applicants interviewing with future supervisors may thus have more opportunity to use honest self-promotion tactics (to highlight their true knowledge, skills, and abilities), or honest ingratiation (to highlight similar values or experiences). However, attempting to use deceptive IM may be perceived as a riskier strategy. Since applicants would have to work with the supervisor (but not HR staff), it is more likely that deceptive IM would be found out in the long term, as the supervisor would see that they embellished their qualifications. This should make applicants less willing to use deceptive IM with future supervisors. We thus expect that applicants interviewing with a future supervisor will engage in more honest IM (H13a), but less deceptive IM (H13b).

In addition, we investigate the impact of panel versus one-on-one interviews. Using panels is an important feature of structured interviews (Campion, Palmer, & Campion, 1997; Levashina et al., 2014), and structuring the interview has been presented as a way to make IM (and especially deceptive IM) more complex for applicants (Levashina & Campion, 2006; Roulin et al., 2016). For instance, it may be more difficult to ingratiate when facing multiple interviewers, who may have conflicting views. Applicants may also worry that deceptive IM may be easier to detect by multiple interviewers, because they are more likely to notice

inconsistencies in applicants' responses. We thus expect that the use of panel interviews will be negatively associated with both honest IM (H14a) and deceptive IM (H14b).

Situational characteristics impacting opportunity to use IM. A recent review of the literature (Levashina et al., 2014) highlighted the lack of studies examining which structure components impact IM use. We thus propose to examine several key interview structure features.

Interview Duration. First we focus on interview duration. Campion et al. (1997) note that longer interviews should lead to higher validity, as they are able to gather more information by asking more questions. On the one hand, interview length could be positively related to honest IM use, as it provides more opportunity for applicants to, for instance, highlight their strengths. Consistent with this, Levashina and Campion (2006) have theorized that longer interviews may create more opportunities to fake, but may also be more difficult to fake, as they give more chances for applicants to slip up and be detected. Overall, we expect interview duration to be positively related to honest IM (H15), but are unsure as to the relation with deceptive IM (RQ5).

Question Type. Another key component of interview structure involves asking "better" (i.e., sophisticated and job-relevant) questions (Campion et al., 1997; Levashina et al., 2014). Two common question types fit this definition: past behavioral questions and situational questions. In addition, proponents of structured interviews suggest refraining from asking resume-based questions, as well as questions about applicants' preferences or self-reported qualities (Campion et al., 1997). Overall, past research (as summarized by Levashina et al., 2014) indicates self-focused (e.g. self-promotion) and defensive IM are used more with past-behavioral than situational questions, whereas other-focused tactics are used more with situational than past-behavioral questions. These results have two main limitations. First, they only compare the two types of "better" questions, but fail to explore differences with interviews

not relying on those two question types. Second, they typically do not differentiate between honest and deceptive IM. In the present study, we examine the effect of using both sophisticated and less-sophisticated questions on honest and deceptive IM. All the question types described above are likely to offer opportunities for applicants to use honest IM. For instance, both past behavioral questions and questions based on the resume request applicants to describe previous job-related experiences, which facilitate highlighting one's qualifications using tactics such as honest self-promotion. However, more sophisticated questions (i.e., behavioral and situational ones) should theoretically be more complex, less transparent, and thus be more difficult to fake (Levashina & Campion, 2006). As such, we expect that relying on "better" (i.e., past-behavioral or situational) questions will increase honest IM use (H16a) but reduce deceptive IM use (H16b), whereas relying on less sophisticated questions (i.e., resume-based or about preferences) will increase both honest IM (H16c) and deceptive IM (H16d) use.

A Nuanced Examination of Honest and Deceptive IM Impact on Interview Outcomes

In Study 4, we found positive relationships between honest IM use and interviewers' ratings. A key distinction between honest and deceptive IM is that honest IM should help interviewers make a valid assessment of the applicant, whereas deceptive IM can bias assessment (Levashina & Campion, 2006; Posthuma et al., 2002). The fact that deceptive IM was unrelated (rather than negatively related) to interviewer-ratings is consistent with work indicating that interviewers on their own are unlikely to be able to detect deceptive IM during the interview and effectively eliminate fakers (Roulin et al., 2015). However, organizations have several ways (although imperfect) to verify applicants' information or responses after the interview and eliminate fakers before the final hiring decision, such as using reference or background checking (Levashina & Campion, 2009). Because applicants in this study were invited for a real job

interview, there were four possible outcomes: (1) they were successful at the interview, moved to the next stage of the selection process, and ultimately obtained a job offer; (2) they succeeded at the interview, moved to the next stage of the selection process, but subsequently were eliminated and did not get a job offer (e.g., because they failed the verification stage); (3) they were eliminated after the interview stage; or (4) they were still waiting on the interview decision at the time of data collection. Given the arguments presented above, we propose to specifically examine the first two potential outcomes. More precisely, we expect applicants who engage in honest IM would be more likely to succeed in the interview and ultimately obtain a job offer (H17a), but applicants who engage in deceptive IM to be more likely to succeed in the interview but eliminated during the post-interview verification stage (H17b). This will speak to the overall impact of IM and the utility of additional hiring methods.

Method

  Participants and Procedure. Participants in this study included 751 individuals who had completed a job interview in the past 6 months. Individuals were recruited from within North America using Crowdflower, an online data collection platform similar to Mechanical Turk (Peer, Brandimarte, Samat, & Acquisti, 2017). The average age of respondents was 32.48 ($SD =$ 10.97), 48.9% were women, 58.3% were university educated, and the majority were Caucasian (66.8%), followed by Asian (9.6%), Hispanic/Latino (9.1%), Black/African-American (6.1%), Native/Aboriginal (4.1%) and Middle-Eastern (2.3%). In order to reduce memory decay, we asked participants to think back to their most recent job interview. We only retained participants who had completed an interview in the six months prior to the study, and had high memory levels of this interview (i.e., remembered who they talked to during the job interview, what questions they were asked, and how they responded). Participants were compensated $1 USD.

Measures. *IM.* Participants completed the 28-item self-report measure of the HIIM-S

and IFB-S described above (see also Appendix B).

Applicant characteristics. We measured in-role experience by asking for the number of

years of in-role experience the interviewee had. We asked "How much experience did you have

for the type of job (i.e., number of years in similar roles)?" On average, participants had 5.14

years (*SD* = 6.20) of experience. Participants also reported their age, gender, and ethnicity.

Target characteristics. Applicants reported whether the interview was conducted by one

interviewer (i.e., a one-on-one interview) or multiple interviewers (i.e., a panel interview). They

also described the nature of the person interviewing them, more specifically if the interviewer (or

at least one of the interviewers) would potentially be their supervisor if they were successful (vs.

only HR managers or professional interviewers).

Situational characteristics. Participants also reported the interview duration (coded as 1

= less than 30 minutes, 2 = between 30 and 45 minutes, 3 = between 45 minutes and one hour, 4

= between one and 1.5 hours, and 5 = more than 1.5 hours). Finally, we asked individuals to

"check" if the interviewer(s) asked any of the following types of questions (with the first two

being unsophisticated questions, and the last two sophisticated ones): Questions about general

qualities and preferences (e.g. "what is your greatest strength?", "do you prefer to work alone or

in a team?"), the content of their resume (e.g., "I see that you worked for company ABC, please

tell me more about it"), past-behavioral questions (e.g. "tell me about a time when you…") and

situational questions (e.g. "imagine that the following occurs at work, what would you do...").

Interview outcome. Applicants reported the outcome of this selection process. We

provided four potential options: (1) My interview was successful and I ultimately received a job

offer from the organization, (2) My interview was successful, I continued to the next step of the

selection process, but I ultimately did NOT receive a job offer, (3) My interview was unsuccessful and I was eliminated from the selection process (or never heard back from the organization), and (4) I am still waiting on the outcome of my last interview.

Results

Psychometric properties of the HIIM-S and IFB-S. All of the shortened scales had acceptable reliabilities. Across the two scales, internal consistency reliability scores ranged from .85 (honest ingratiation) to .93 (extensive image creation). In terms of factor inter-correlations, these were higher than they were in the longer scales. For instance, the correlation between slight and extensive image creation is .86, and the average correlation between deceptive image protection and the other three deceptive tactics is .80. Within the HIIM-S, the correlations are moderate, but less extreme, with an average inter-correlation of .55 between honest IM scales. Importantly, honest self-promotion was uncorrelated with slight and extensive image creation (.05 and -.05, respectively). Honest ingratiation correlated .56 with deceptive ingratiation, and honest defensive IM correlated .46 with image protection.

Correlations were used to test H12 and H15 (see Table 4) while multivariate analyses of variance (i.e., MANOVA) were used to test H13, H14, H16, and H17 - see Table 5).

Actor characteristics impacting willingness and capacity to use IM. Correlation results confirmed that older and more experienced applicants engage in more honest self-promotion, whereas younger applicants engage in more honest defensive IM and deceptive IM to compensate for lack of qualifications. Specifically, age and in-role experience were positively associated with use of honest self-promotion (both rs = .26, $p < .01$), supporting H12a. In contrast, age (but not experience) was negatively related with the use of honest defensive IM ($r = -.16$, $p < .01$), providing partial support for H12b. Moreover, both age (rs = -.20 to -.33, ps < .01)

and in-role experience (rs = -.08 to -.18, ps < .05) were negatively related to all four deceptive IM behaviors (supporting H12c).

Target characteristics impacting opportunity and willingness to use IM. MANOVA results showed that applicants engaged in more honest IM when interviewing with a future direct supervisor (vs. only an HR professional). More precisely, they used more honest self-promotion (M = 3.88, SD = .80 vs. M = 3.44, SD = 1.23, F = 34.02, p < .01), more honest ingratiation (M = 3.27, SD = .90 vs. M = 2.87, SD = 1.09, F = 27.68, p < .01), and more honest defensive IM (M = 2.86, SD = 1.08 vs. M = 2.61, SD = 1.16, F = 8.50, p < .01), providing support for H13a. However, applicants did not engage in less deceptive IM when interviewing with supervisors (and used more deceptive ingratiation). Thus, H13b was not supported. Contrary to H14a and b, we found no difference in honest or deceptive IM use between panel and one-on-one interviews.

Situational characteristics impacting opportunity to use IM. Results indicated that interview duration was positively related to the use of all three forms of honest IM (rs = .09 to .16, p <.05), supporting H15. Conversely, duration was not related to deceptive IM use.

Regarding question type, MANOVA results revealed that applicants engaged in more of some forms of honest IM when asked sophisticated questions than when such questions were not used, supporting H16a. Specifically, applicants used more honest self-promotion when asked past behavioral (M = 3.85, SD = .90 vs. M = 3.60, SD = 1.06, F = 11.79, p < .01) or situational questions (M = 3.88, SD = .94 vs. M = 3.60, SD = 1.01, F = 14.92, p < .01) than when they were not. Results suggested that applicants used less deceptive IM (except for deceptive ingratiation) when asked situational questions than when such questions were not used. For instance, applicants used less extensive image creation (M = 1.79, SD = 1.05 vs. M = 2.07, SD = 1.17, F =

11.53, $p < .01$). However, we found no difference for past behavioral questions. As such, H16b

was only partially supported.

MANOVA results also showed that applicants engaged in more honest IM when asked

less-sophisticated questions than when such questions were not used, supporting H16c. For

example, applicants used more honest self-promotion when asked questions based on their

resume ($M = 3.90$, $SD = .89$ vs. $M = 3.45$, $SD = 1.09$, $F = 36.25$, $p < .01$) or questions about their

qualities or preferences ($M = 3.85$, $SD = .87$ vs. $M = 3.36$, $SD = 1.21$, $F = 35.78$, $p < .01$).

However, we generally found no evidence that less-sophisticated questions led to more deceptive

IM use. The only exception was deceptive ingratiation, which was used more when resume-

based questions were asked ($M = 2.59$, $SD = 1.04$ vs. $M = 2.37$, $SD = 1.06$, $F = 7.56$, $p < .01$).

Therefore, H16d was largely unsupported by our data.

Interview outcomes. We compared IM used by applicants who were successful in their

interviews and ultimately got a job offer vs. those who were successful in their interview but

were eliminated during the verification process with a MANOVA (based on $N = 574$). Results

indicated that applicants who ultimately got a job offer engaged in more honest self-promotion

than those who were eliminated during the verification process ($M = 3.85$, $SD = .92$ vs. $M = 3.68$,

$SD = .93$, $F = 3.92$, $p < .05$). However, we found no difference in the use of honest ingratiation

or honest defensive IM. As such, H17a received partial support. In sharp contrast, we found

extensive support for H17b. Indeed, applicants eliminated during the verification process

engaged in more deceptive IM than those who ultimately received a job offer. As an example,

applicants eliminated during the post-interview verification stage used more extensive image

creation ($M = 2.20$, $SD = 1.16$) than those who eventually received an offer ($M = 1.87$, $SD =$

1.16, $F = 10.66$, $p < .01$).

Discussion

Study 5 had three main objectives: (1) to validate a shortened measure of both honest and deceptive IM, (2) to explore additional antecedents of honest and deceptive IM use, and (3) to examine the impact of honest vs. deceptive IM on interview success and final job offers.

In complement to our re-analysis of data from Studies 2-4, the results from Study 5 provided evidence for the validity and reliability of the short HIIM and IFB measures. As such, we provide IM researchers with a set of shortened measures that are both practical (i.e., short enough to be used in interview field studies) and psychometrically sound. As compared to the longer versions of the scales (i.e., data from Study 4), we found larger inter-correlations within each scale (especially for the IFB-S) but smaller correlations between the HIIM-S and the IFB-S. This suggests that these shorter versions are appropriate to distinguish honest from deceptive IM, but may be less effective at differentiating between specific deceptive tactics[7].

Findings from Study 5 also highlight important differences regarding the characteristics associated with honest and deceptive IM use. Regarding actor characteristics, we found that older and more experienced applicants were more likely to use honest self-promotion to highlight their qualifications, whereas less-experienced applicants were more likely to use defensive tactics and deceptive IM to compensate for their limited qualifications. This is consistent with theoretical models of faking, suggesting that applicants fake as a strategy to appear more qualified for the job (Levashina & Campion, 2006; Marcus, 2009).

Regarding target characteristics, we found that applicants used more honest IM tactics when interviewing with a potential future supervisor than when only HR professionals were

---

[7] We also conducted an additional study with 101 business students who participated in two or more interviews and completed the HIIM-S and IFB-S after each interview to evaluate the temporal stability of the measures. Results are reported in an online supplement, and demonstrate good evidence for the temporal stability of the two measures.

involved. Because supervisors have more technical job-knowledge, applicants may have more opportunity to engage in self-promotion to highlight their abilities. Similarly, consistent with the motivational nature of honest IM found in Study 4, because applicants will be interacting regularly with supervisors (but not so much with HR professionals), engaging in honest ingratiation can represent a good way to start a professional relationship. Yet, we found no difference in deceptive IM use, suggesting that applicants are not more worried about being "caught" by a supervisor than an HR professional. We also found no difference in IM use between one-on-one and panel interviews. Although panel interviews have been suggested as a way to make faking more complex for applicants in theoretical models (Levashina & Campion, 2006; Roulin et al., 2016), our findings suggest that their actual impact may be more limited, although further study should absolutely follow up on this in a more nuanced way.

Regarding situational characteristics, although previous research has highlighted the potential of structured interviews to limit deceptive IM use (e.g., Levashina & Campion, 2006; Levashina et al., 2014) we found that structure features had a larger impact on honest IM than deceptive IM use. For instance, making the interview longer or using unsophisticated questions led applicants to engage in more honest IM, but such features were unrelated to deceptive IM use. Only using situational interview questions (but not past behavioral ones) was associated with lower deceptive IM use. These findings differ from Levashina and Campion (2007), who found that applicants engaged in more faking when asked situational questions than when asked past-behavioral questions. However, they manipulated the type of question asked by interviewers, whereas we directly asked applicants to report the type questions they were asked (and many applicants were asked both situational and past behavioral questions). Levashina and Campion (2006) proposed that situational questions are less verifiable and may thus create more

opportunities to fake. Yet, it is also possible that situational questions, with their focus on hypothetical situations, limit the opportunity to share made-up qualifications, and the necessity to engage in defensive tactics (as the questions are future oriented rather than past oriented).

Finally, the findings for interview outcomes were of both theoretical and practical relevance. We found that applicants who were more successful in the long run, in that they succeeded at the interview and were offered a job, used more honest self-promotion. However, those who succeeded at the interview but were ultimately rejected by the organization relied more on deceptive IM. This suggests that the positive effects of using deceptive IM observed in past research (Levashina & Campion, 2007) may be short-lived, perhaps because applicant deception was uncovered during the reference or background checking stage. If deceptive IM is a threat to interview validity (Posthuma et al., 2002), and because interviewers are usually unable to detect deceptive IM during the interview (Roulin et al., 2015), our findings also emphasize the important role of the verification stage prior to making final decisions. Sole reliance on the interview could lead to hiring an individual who has engaged in deceptive IM.

General Discussion

The construct of IM has played a central role in the understanding of applicant interview behavior (Levashina et al., 2014; Posthuma et al., 2002). Despite this interest, the research on applicant IM has been hindered by confounding honest and deceptive IM, despite theoretical recognition of the importance of distinguishing these two sides of IM (e.g., Ellis et al., 2002; Jansen et al., 2012; Leary & Kowalski, 1990; Levashina & Campion, 2006, 2007; Levashina et al., 2014; Rosenfeld, 1997; Roulin et al., 2014, 2015; Schlenker & Weigold, 1992; Weiss & Feldman, 2006). Consistent with this, the most recent review of the interview literature called for an honest IM scale (Levashina et al., 2014) and the most recent review of the IM literature called

for more work on the honest/deceptive IM distinction (Bolino et al., 2016). We believe that the creation of a measure of honest IM will stimulate further research on interview IM in the same way that the development of a measure of deceptive IM (Levashina & Campion, 2007) has stimulated interview faking research.

The present set of five studies begins by developing and validating a self-report honest IM measure. Following this, we included two additional studies designed to illustrate the importance of distinguishing honest from deceptive IM tactics. We included a wide array of antecedents (such as individual differences, interview training, attitudes, situational variables and target variables) and investigated the impact on interviewer ratings and interview outcomes.

Overall, we propose that, at a broad level, our current understanding of the construct domain of verbal applicant IM can be captured by seven factors: honest self-promotion, honest ingratiation, honest defensive IM, slight image creation, extensive image creation, image protection, and deceptive ingratiation. The results of our CFAs support this model. These factors capture the behaviors examined in existing frameworks of IM behavior, and both assertive and defensive behaviors. This is consistent with the idea that "impression management encompasses a multidimensional domain that includes a number of discrete tactics in which such tactics can be employed honestly or deceptively" (Weiss & Feldman, 2006, p. 1071) and that a unified view of IM must include honest and deceptive IM (Levashina & Campion, 2007).

From a psychometric perspective, the newly created honest IM scales demonstrated strong internal consistency reliabilities, generally above .80, and in most cases above .90. Moreover, although factor inter-correlations were moderate, they suggest that the honest IM factors are distinct from one another, a fact supported by the CFAs we report demonstrating best fit for models where honest and deceptive IM are separate.

These scales were also theoretically and empirically distinct from their deceptive IM counterparts. In all studies, we demonstrated that honest and deceptive IM were generally positively correlated (with some exceptions), although not high enough to suggest redundancy. Indeed, we expect that honest and deceptive IM should be positively correlated in many cases, as they may build upon one another, or have some common antecedents. However, the form of IM that is most distinct from honest IM is extensive image creation, which includes fabricating stories and qualifications, and is the most blatant and most theoretically distinct from honest IM.

Finally, we developed a short measure of both honest IM and deceptive IM. Using the full versions of both scales (86 items together) presents several practical difficulties to interview researchers in certain settings, such as having applicants complete the scale for multiple interviews. Researchers attempting to measure only deceptive IM have typically used piecemeal versions of the IFB (Ingold et al., 2015; Roulin et al., 2014; Swider et al., 2011), and so the creation of a standardized, reliable 28-item measure that captures all 7 types of IM (3 honest tactics and 4 deceptive tactics) should stimulate further research. Although the full measures may offer better construct coverage, these shortened measures can be useful in certain situations.

Honest and Deceptive IM

Using these newly created scales, we highlight the differences in nomological network between honest and deceptive IM. In their own way, many of these findings inform our understanding of a central issue surrounding IM: whether IM is a relatively pervasive, normative set of applicant behaviors demonstrated by qualified, experienced applicants (Ellis et al., 2002; Rosenfeld, 1997), or whether IM has the potential to contaminate the interview and/or is something that should be controlled (Levashina et al., 2014; Posthuma et al., 2002). On the one hand, our findings are in line with that of more recent research (Law et al., 2016; Roulin &

Krings, 2016) that deceptive IM appears to be engaged in by applicants that possess traits that would be undesirable if hired, such as low levels of Honesty-Humility and Conscientiousness, and high Competitive Worldviews.

On the other hand, whereas honest IM has higher mean levels of use, it is clear from the descriptive statistics that not all applicants utilize honest IM. Indeed, applicants who are older, more experienced, have had interview training, and are high in traits such as Conscientiousness and Extraversion are those more likely to utilize honest IM. The flip side of this is that those who are more introverted, less experienced and conscientious, or younger, may have less to draw on and be less capable of utilizing honest IM. In addition, honest (versus deceptive) IM seems to be particularly influenced by applicants' motivation to do well and attraction to the organization. Taken together, our findings suggest that honest IM may be indicative of well-prepared, conscientious, motivated applicants. In this regard, honest IM may be less of an issue that needs to be controlled and may in some cases be encouraged, although this reinforces the idea that certain individuals (e.g., those lower on Extraversion) may be at a disadvantage in the interview.

In terms of when honest and deceptive IM will be encouraged versus discouraged, the findings across our studies inform this as well, and once again demonstrate different patterns of relationships. Deceptive IM seems to be used when applicants find the interview to be difficult, and extensive image creation is associated with interviews that applicants perceive as unfair, consistent with a retaliatory approach suggested by Levashina and Campion (2006). In contrast, fair interviews seem to elicit more honest IM, further highlighting the importance of utilizing questions with appropriate, relevant content.

We also found that honest and deceptive IM are differentially associated with question type. Specific question types are proposed to impact IM by influencing the opportunity to use

IM. While some studies have looked at situational and behavioral questions (e.g., Ellis et al., 2002; Lievens & Peeters, 2008), these have typically not distinguished between honest and deceptive IM (for an exception, see Levashina & Campion, (2007). While situational and target characteristics impacted honest IM, relatively few factors reduced the amount of deceptive IM. Although it may be premature based on the single-item nature of the responses here, the use of interview faking may be more determined by characteristics of the actor than of the situation, whereas how the interview is conducted may have particular importance for eliciting honest IM.

Practically, these findings further point to the importance of using "sophisticated" questions, such as past-behavioral and situational questions. Past studies have found that situational and behavioral questions can increase the use of self-promotion and ingratiation (e.g., Ellis et al., 2002), but have not distinguished between honest and deceptive IM. The findings in the present study clarify the value of these two types of questions, showing that past-behavioral questions increased the use of honest IM without increasing deceptive IM, while situational questions increased honest IM and decreased use of some deceptive IM.

Outcomes of IM

This investigation of antecedents indicates that, consistent with our expectations, honest and deceptive IM convey different information to interviewers, and the success of each has differential implications for who will be hired. As such, to truly understand the impact of IM, one needs to differentiate between honest and deceptive IM. In Study 4, we found that only honest IM impacted interviewer ratings of hirability, P-O fit and P-J fit. This is encouraging, as it indicates that the overall reported impact of IM (e.g., Barrick et al., 2009) seems to be mostly due to honest IM but not deceptive IM. However, the fact that deceptive IM had neither positive nor negative impact on interview performance, while encouraging, also means that these

individuals were not punished. In addition, it is possible that the effectiveness of IM may depend on additional factors, such as who is using the IM ((i.e. some may be more effective, as has been found in the workplace context; Harris, Kacmar, Zivnuska, & Shaw, 2007; Treadway, Ferris, Duke, Adams, & Thatcher, 2007), or the target, as some interviewers may be more susceptible to IM than others.

In Study 5, we delved more in depth into these relationships, and found that the nature of the IM-performance relationship may be somewhat more complex. Deceptive IM was more prominent among applicants who performed well in the interview, but were eliminated at a later stage, and thus did not receive a job offer. In contrast, honest IM was more prevalent among those who did well in the job interview, and received a job offer. This is encouraging, in that those who use honest IM appear to be more successful on the whole. Yet, it also points out that organizations should be wary of relying solely on the job interview, and should follow up with subsequent steps to identify and eliminate those who engage in deceptive IM. Although our study did not identify what methods led to elimination from the selection process, future research could investigate these, such as reference checks, background checks, or follow up questions.

Base Rates

In Table 6, we report the percentage of candidates who used each of the IM tactics we measured in each study, as well as the means and standard deviations. A few observations become clear. First, the use of all forms of IM is not constant across all individuals. There is a reasonable standard deviation around each of the IM tactics, consistent with the notion that there are many actor, target, and situational characteristics that impact one's willingness, opportunity, and capability to use various forms of IM.

Second, honest IM seems to be used by a greater percentage of applicants and with greater frequency than does deceptive IM. As Ellis et al. (2002) note, if we consider IM to also include honest IM, IM can be viewed as quite a normative and pervasive behavior. Within deceptive IM, more applicants reported using slight image creation (48 to 55% in Studies 4-5) and deceptive ingratiation (66% to 69%) than the other two deceptive tactics. Extensive image creation was the least used IM tactic. However, 17% to 39% of applicants used at least some extensive image creation in Studies 4-5. As such, this tactic should be a cause for concern, given that interviewers are likely poor at recognizing deceptive IM (Roulin, 2016; Roulin et al., 2015).

Limitations and Future Directions

Although informative, there are a number of limitations of this set of studies. First, two of our samples are composed of students and two others relied on online crowdsourcing sampling methods. However, we utilized a variety of different methods across the studies to ensure the external validity of our findings. In Studies 2, 3, and 5 we relied on respondents who had recently participated in a real job interview, and eliminated those who reported limited memory of their interview. Although Study 4 relied on a student sample and practice interviews, they were senior business students, and all interviews were conducted by professional interviewers.

A second limitation and consideration is the timing and method of measurement of certain variables. For instance, measurement of antecedents relied on self-reports. As such, it would be helpful to determine if some of the more modest relationships, such as the personality correlates of honest IM, generalize to peer reports of personality. Moreover, attitudes such as attraction and motivation were measured after the interview, and these may have been impacted by perceived performance or other factors during the interview. Future research should more firmly establish the causal nature of these relationships. Similarly, difficulty and procedural

justice were self-report, and therefore needed to be measured after the interview. It would be interesting to more objectively and experimentally manipulate these components to see their impact. Additionally, in investigating situational and target antecedents in Study 5, we relied on self-reports of the most recent interview. Although we eliminated those who reported poor memory of their recent interview, there may still have been memory errors. In addition, we relied on dichotomous items asking whether or not certain types of questions were used, but question use likely exists on a continuum (Chapman & Zweig, 2005). Future research could use experimental designs to examine the impact of question type on honest vs. deceptive IM use. Such an approach has been useful in past research (Van Iddekinge et al., 2007). Future research could also investigate additional suggested antecedents such as probing techniques and follow up questions (Levashina & Campion, 2006). Finally, future research could investigate if IM effectiveness depends on individual differences of the user. There is some initial investigation involving deceptive IM (Buehl & Melchers, 2017), but none for honest IM.

Finally, future research should examine whether applicants who engaged in honest or deceptive forms of IM behave differently once hired, attain different levels of work performance, or are more likely to turn over. Despite the limited empirical evidence available, recent studies suggest that applicants using deception when completing personality tests are more likely to engage in deviant or counterproductive behaviors at work (O'Neill et al., 2013; Peterson, Griffith, Isaacson, O'Connell, & Mangos, 2011), while some researchers have argued that the use of self-promotion and ingratiation in interviews may be positively related to work performance (Kleinmann & Klehe, 2010). As such, given the fundamental differences observed here, honest and deceptive IM may have differential long term implications that are worthy of investigating.

References

Andrews, M. C., & Kacmar, K. M. (2001). Discriminating among organizational politics, justice, and support. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 22*, 347-366. doi:10.1002/job.92

Ashton, M. C., Lee, K., & de Vries, R. E. (2014). The HEXACO Honesty-Humility, Agreeableness, and Emotionality factors: A review of research and theory. *Personality and Social Psychology Review, 18*, 139-152. doi:10.1177/1088868314523838

Asparouhov, T., & Muthén, B. O. (2006). Robust chi-square difference testing with mean and variance adjusted test statistics. *Mplus Webnote #10*. Retrieved from http://www.statmodel.com/examples/webnote.shtml#web10.

Barrick, M. R., & Mount, M. K. (1991). The big five personality dimensions and job performance: A meta-analysis. *Personnel Psychology, 44*, 1-26. doi:10.1111/j.1744-6570.1991.tb00688.x

Barrick, M. R., Shaffer, J. A., & DeGrassi, S. W. (2009). What you see may not be what you get: Relationships among self-presentation tactics and ratings of interview and job performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 94*, 1394-1411. doi:10.1037/a0016532

Bolino, M. C., Kacmar, K. M., Turnley, W. H., & Gilstrap, J. B. (2008). A multi-level review of impression management motives and behaviors. *Journal of Management, 34*, 1080-1109. doi:10.1177/0149206308324325

Bolino, M. C., Long, D., & Turnley, W. (2016). Impression management in organizations: Critical questions, answers, and areas for future research. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior, 3*, 377-406. doi:10.1146/annurev-orgpsych-041015-062337

Bolino, M. C., & Turnley, W. H. (1999). Measuring impression management in organizations: A

    scale development based on the Jones and Pittman taxonomy. *Organizational Research*

    Methods, 2, 187-206. doi:10.1177/109442819922005

Bourdage, J. S., Wiltshire, J., & Lee, K. (2015). Personality and impression management:

    Correlates and implications. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 100*, 537-546.

    doi:10.1037/a0037942

Buehl, A.-K., & Melchers, K. G. (2017). Individual difference variables and the occurrence and

    effectiveness of faking behavior in interviews. *Frontiers in Psychology, 8.*

    doi:10.3389/fpsyg.2017.00686

Buhrmester, M., Kwang, T., & Gosling, S. D. (2011). Amazon's Mechanical Turk: A new source

    of inexpensive, yet high-quality, data? *Perspectives on Psychological Science, 6*, 3-5.

    doi:10.1177/1745691610393980

Campion, M. A., Palmer, D. K., & Campion, J. E. (1997). A review of structure in the selection

    interview. *Personnel Psychology, 50*, 655-702. doi:10.1111/j.1744-6570.1997.tb00709.x

Chapman, D. S., & Zweig, D. I. (2005). Developing a nomological network for interview

    structure: Antecedents and consequences of the structured selection interview. *Personnel*

    Psychology, 58, 673-702. doi:10.1111/j.1744-6570.2005.00516.x

Delery, J. E., & Kacmar, K. M. (1998). The influence of applicant and interviewer characteristics

    on the use of impression management. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 28*, 1649-

    1669. doi:10.1111/j.1559-1816.1998.tb01339.x

Duckitt, J., Wagner, C., Du Plessis, I., & Birum, I. (2002). The psychological bases of ideology

    and prejudice: Testing a dual process model. *Journal of Personality and Social*

    Psychology, 83, 75. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.83.1.75

Ellis, A. P. J., West, B. J., Ryan, A. M., & DeShon, R. P. (2002). The use of impression

management tactics in structured interviews: A function of question type? *Journal of*

Applied Psychology, 87, 1200-1208. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.87.6.1200

Ferris, G. R., & Judge, T. A. (1991). Personnel/human resources management: A political

influence perspective. *Journal of Management, 17*, 447-488.

doi:10.1177/014920639101700208

Gilliland, S. W. (1993). The perceived fairness of selection systems: An organizational justice

perspective. *Academy of Management Review, 18*, 694-734. doi:10.2307/258595

Gilmore, D. C., & Ferris, G. R. (1989). The effects of applicant impression management tactics

on interviewer judgments. *Journal of Management, 15*, 557-564.

doi:10.1177/014920638901500405

Harris, K. J., Kacmar, K. M., Zivnuska, S., & Shaw, J. D. (2007). The impact of political skill on

impression management effectiveness. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 92*, 278-285.

Hayton, J. C., Allen, D. G., & Scarpello, V. (2004). Factor retention decisions in exploratory

factor analysis: A tutorial on parallel analysis. *Organizational Research Methods, 7*, 191-

205. doi:doi:10.1177/1094428104263675

Higgins, C. A., & Judge, T. A. (2004). The effect of applicant influence tactics on recruiter

perceptions of fit and hiring recommendations: A field study. *Journal of Applied*

Psychology, 89, 622-632. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.89.4.622

Higgins, C. A., Judge, T. A., & Ferris, G. R. (2003). Influence tactics and work outcomes: A

meta-analysis. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 24*, 89-106. doi:10.1002/job.181

Hinkin, T. R. (1998). A brief tutorial on the development of measures for use in survey

questionnaires. *Organizational Research Methods, 1*, 104-121.

Hu, L., & Bentler, P. M. (1999). Cutoff criteria for fit indexes in covariance structure analysis: Conventional criteria versus new alternatives. *Structural Equation Modeling, 6*, 1-55. doi:10.1080/10705519909540118

Huffcutt, A. I., & Culbertson, S. S. (2011). Interviews *APA Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology* (Vol. 2: Selecting and developing members for the organization, pp. 185-203). Washington, D.C.: American Psychological Association.

Ingold, P. V., Kleinmann, M., König, C. J., & Melchers, K. G. (2015). Shall we continue or stop disapproving of self-presentation? Evidence on impression management and faking in a selection context and their relation to job performance. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology, 24*, 420-432. doi:10.1080/1359432X.2014.915215

Jansen, A., König, C. J., Stadelmann, E. H., & Kleinmann, M. (2012). Applicants' self-presentational behavior: What do recruiters expect and what do they get? *Journal of Personnel Psychology, 11*, 77-85. doi:10.1027/1866-5888/a000046

Kacmar, K. M., Delery, J. E., & Ferris, G. R. (1992). Differential effectiveness of applicant impression management tactics on employment interview decisions. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 22*, 1250-1272. doi:10.1111/j.1559-1816.1992.tb00949.x

Kleinmann, M., & Klehe, U. C. (2010). Selling oneself: Construct and criterion-related validity of impression management in structured interviews. *Human Performance, 24*, 29-46. doi:10.1080/08959285.2010.530634

Kristof-Brown, A. L., Barrick, M. R., & Franke, M. (2002). Applicant impression management: Dispositional influences and consequences for recruiter perceptions of fit and similarity. *Journal of Management, 28*, 27-46. doi:10.1177/014920630202800103

Kumar, K., & Beyerlein, M. (1991). Construction and validation of an instrument for measuring ingratiatory behaviors in organizational settings. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 76*, 619. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.76.5.619

Landers, R. N., & Behrend, T. S. (2015). An inconvenient truth: Arbitrary distinctions between organizational, Mechanical Turk, and other convenience samples. *Industrial and Organizational Psychology: Perspectives on Science and Practice, 8*.

Law, S. J., Bourdage, J. S., & O'Neill, T. A. (2016). To fake or not to fake: Antecedents to interview faking, earning instructions, and its impact on applicant reactions. *Frontiers in Psychology, 7*. doi:10.3389/fpsyg.2016.01771

Leary, M. R., & Kowalski, R., M. (1990). Impression management: A literature review and two-component model. *Psychological Bulletin, 107*, 34-47. doi:10.1037/0033-2909.107.1.34

Lee, K., & Ashton, M. C. (2004). Psychometric properties of the HEXACO Personality Inventory. *Multivariate Behavioral Research, 39*, 329-358. doi:10.1207/s15327906mbr3902_8

Levashina, J., & Campion, M. A. (2006). A model of faking likelihood in the employment interview. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment, 14*, 299-316. doi:10.1111/j.1468-2389.2006.00353.x

Levashina, J., & Campion, M. A. (2007). Measuring faking in the employment interview: Development and validation of an interview faking behavior scale. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 92*, 1638-1656. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.92.6.1638

Levashina, J., & Campion, M. A. (2009). Expected practices in background checking: Review of the human resource management literature. *Employee Responsibilities and Rights Journal, 21*, 231-249. doi:10.1007/s10672-009-9111-9

Levashina, J., Hartwell, C. J., Morgeson, F. P., & Campion, M. A. (2014). The structured employment interview: Narrative and quantitative review of the research literature. *Personnel Psychology, 67*, 241-293. doi:10.1111/peps.12052

Lievens, F., & Peeters, H. (2008). Interviewers' sensitivity to impression management tactics in structured interviews. *European Journal of Psychological Assessment, 24*, 174-180. doi:10.1027/1015-5759.24.3.174

Lubke, G. H., & Muthén, B. O. (2004). Applying multigroup confirmatory factor models for continuous outcomes to Likert scale data complicates meaningful group comparisons. *Structural Equation Modeling, 11*, 514-534. doi:10.1207/s15328007sem11404_2

Marcus, B. (2009). 'Faking' from the applicant's perspective: A theory of self-presentation in personnel selection settings. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment, 17*, 417-430. doi:10.1111/j.1468-2389.2009.00483.x

Muthén, L. K., & Muthén, B. O. (2011). *Mplus 6.11. [Computer program]*. Los Angeles: Muthén & Muthén.

O'Neill, T. A., Lee, N. M., Radan, J., Law, S. J., Lewis, R. J., & Carswell, J. J. (2013). The impact of "non-targeted traits" on personality test faking, hiring, and workplace deviance. *Personality and Individual Differences, 55*, 162-168. doi:10.1016/j.paid.2013.02.027

O'Neill, T. A., Lewis, R. J., & Carswell, J. J. (2011). Employee personality, justice perceptions, and the prediction of workplace deviance. *Personality and Individual Differences, 51*, 595-600. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2011.05.025

Paolacci, G., Chandler, J., & Ipeirotis, P. G. (2010). Running experiments on amazon mechanical turk. *Judgment and Decision Making, 5*, 411-419. doi:10.2139/ssrn.1626226

Peer, E., Brandimarte, L., Samat, S., & Acquisti, A. (2017). Beyond the Turk: Alternative

platforms for crowdsourcing behavioral research. *Journal of Experimental Social

Psychology, 70*, 153-163. doi:10.1016/j.jesp.2017.01.006

Peterson, M. H., Griffith, R. L., Isaacson, J. A., O'Connell, M. S., & Mangos, P. M. (2011).

Applicant faking, social desirability, and the prediction of counterproductive work

behaviors. *Human Performance, 24*, 270-290. doi:10.1080/08959285.2011.580808

Posthuma, R. A., Morgeson, F. P., & Campion, M. A. (2002). Beyond employment interview

validity: A comprehensive narrative review of recent research and trends over time.

Personnel Psychology, 55, 1-81. doi:10.1111/j.1744-6570.2002.tb00103.x

Rosenfeld, P. (1997). Impression management, fairness, and the employment interview. *Journal

of Business Ethics, 16*, 801-808. doi:1023/A:1017972627516

Roulin, N. (2016). Individual differences predicting impression management detection in job

interviews. *Personnel Assessment and Decisions, 2*, 1-11.

Roulin, N., Bangerter, A., & Levashina, J. (2014). Interviewers' perceptions of impression

management in employment interviews. *Journal of Managerial Psychology, 29*, 141-163.

doi:10.1108/JMP-10-2012-0295

Roulin, N., Bangerter, A., & Levashina, J. (2015). Honest and deceptive impression management

in the employment interview: Can it be detected and how does it impact evaluations?

Personnel Psychology, 68, 395-444. doi:10.1111/peps.12079

Roulin, N., & Krings, F. (2016). When winning is everything: The relationship between

competitive worldviews and job applicant faking. *Applied Psychology: An International

Review, 65*, 643-670. doi:10.1111/apps.12072

Roulin, N., Krings, F., & Binggeli, S. (2016). A dynamic model of applicant faking. *Organizational Psychology Review, 6*, 145-170. doi:10.1177/2041386615580875

Schlenker, B. R., & Weigold, M. F. (1992). Interpersonal processes involving impression regulation and management. *Annual Review of Psychology, 43*, 133-168.

Stevens, C. K. (1997). Effects of preinterview beliefs on applicants' reactions to campus interviews. *The Academy of Management Journal, 40*, 947-966.

Stevens, C. K., & Kristof, A. L. (1995). Making the right impression: A field study of applicant impression management during job interviews. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 80*, 587-606. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.80.5.587

Swider, B. W., Barrick, M. R., Harris, T. B., & Stoverink, A. C. (2011). Managing and creating an image in the interview: The role of interviewee initial impressions. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 96*, 1275-1288. doi:10.1037/a0024005

Tedeschi, J. T., & Melburg, V. (1984). Impression management and influence in the organization. *Research in the Sociology of Organizations, 3*, 31-58.

Tett, R. P., & Simonet, D. V. (2011). Faking in personality assessment: A "multisaturation" perspective on faking as performance. *Human Performance, 24*, 302-321. doi:10.1080/08959285.2011.597472

Treadway, D. C., Ferris, G. R., Duke, A. B., Adams, G. L., & Thatcher, J. B. (2007). The moderating role of subordinate political skill on supervisors' impressions of subordinate ingratiation and ratings of subordinate interpersonal facilitation. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 92*, 848-855. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.92.3.848

Tsai, W.-C., Huang, T.-C., Wu, C.-Y., & Lo, I.-H. (2010). Disentangling the effects of applicant defensive impression management tactics in job interviews. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment, 18*, 131- 140. doi:10.1111/j.1468-2389.2010.00495.x

Van Iddekinge, C. H., McFarland, L., & Raymark, P. H. (2007). Antecedents of impression management use and effectiveness in a structured interview. *Journal of Management, 33*, 752-773. doi:10.1177/0149206307305563

Williams, L. J., Vandenberg, R. J., & Edwards, J. R. (2009). Structural equation modeling in management research: a guide for improved analysis. *The Academy of Management Annals, 3*, 543-604. doi: 10.1080/19416520903065683

Wayne, S. J., & Ferris, G. R. (1990). Influence tactics, affect, and exchange quality in supervisor-subordinate interactions: A laboratory experiment and field study. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 75*, 487-499. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.75.5.487

Weiss, B., & Feldman, R. S. (2006). Looking good and lying to do it: Deception as an impression management strategy in job interviews. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 36*, 1070-1086. doi:10.1111/j.0021-9029.2006.00055.x

Table 1. *Means, Standard Deviations, and Exploratory Factor Analysis of the Honest IM Scale (Study 2)*

			Pattern Coefficients		
Item	***M***	***SD***	**Honest Self-Promotion**	**Honest Defensive**	**Honest Ingratiation**
HSPROM3	4.16	.90	**.82**	-.02	-.16
HSPROM5	3.83	1.01	**.82**	.00	.02
HSPROM11	4.04	.88	**.80**	.03	-.18
HSPROM9	3.84	1.03	**.80**	-.04	.04
HSPROM15	4.14	.90	**.79**	.02	-.15
HSPROM4	3.95	1.07	**.78**	-.07	-.01
HSPROM12	4.07	.93	**.77**	.07	-.14
HSPROM7	3.82	.97	**.75**	-.01	.11
HSPROM13	3.94	.99	**.74**	.03	-.06
HSPROM8	3.87	.96	**.70**	.00	.03
HSPROM16	3.62	1.09	**.64**	-.03	.22
HSPROM17	3.85	1.08	**.64**	-.03	.15
HSPROM2	3.81	1.06	**.60**	-.13	.18
HSPROM6	3.17	1.21	**.50**	.09	.18
HDEFIM2	2.49	1.21	.04	**.76**	-.02
HDEFIM8	2.59	1.24	.09	**.71**	.01
HDEFIM3	2.72	1.20	.05	**.70**	.08
HDEFIM5	2.28	1.21	-.08	**.70**	-.05
HDEFIM1	2.42	1.27	.11	**.69**	-.14
HDEFIM13	2.30	1.13	-.01	**.67**	.02
HDEFIM11	2.36	1.14	-.04	**.65**	-.03
HDEFIM10	2.04	1.16	-.20	**.61**	.10
HDEFIM7	2.58	1.31	.06	**.61**	.01
HDEFIM6	2.27	1.14	-.09	**.59**	.13
HINGRT3	2.67	1.18	-.18	-.03	**.92**
HINGRT5	3.10	1.22	-.04	.04	**.83**
HINGRT12	2.87	1.18	-.14	.02	**.82**
HINGRT9	2.92	1.18	-.02	-.02	**.75**
HINGRT7	3.22	1.12	.19	.00	**.60**
HINGRT14	3.39	1.06	.19	.02	**.57**
HINGRT16	3.26	1.21	.22	.10	**.52**
HINGRT11	3.31	1.07	.30	.02	**.47**
Alpha coefficient			.94	.89	.90
Scale Means (SD)			3.87 (.76)	2.40 (.86)	3.09 (.89)

Note. HSPROM = honest self-promotion, HINGRT = honest ingratiation, and HDEFIM = honest defensive. Analysis is based on *N* = 285. Interfactor correlations are in the range from .27-.54. Boldface values indicate that the item loads on the factor. Principal axis factor analysis with promax rotation.

Table 2. Three Factor Solution Confirmatory Factor Analysis of the Honest IM Scale (Study 3)

Items	*M*	*SD*	Honest Self-Promotion	Honest Ingratiation	Honest Defensive
HSPROM11	3.82	1.01	0.76		
HSPROM15	4.06	0.90	0.70		
HSPROM12	3.99	0.93	0.66		
HSPROM13	3.77	1.02	0.71		
HSPROM3	4.00	0.90	0.76		
HSPROM8	3.76	0.94	0.76		
HSPROM4	3.93	0.96	0.77		
HSPROM6	3.08	1.36	0.59		
HSPROM17	3.80	0.97	0.75		
HSPROM5	3.70	0.89	0.87		
HSPROM7	3.71	1.03	0.84		
HSPROM16	3.44	1.12	0.87		
HSPROM2	3.67	1.12	0.68		
HSPROM9	3.70	1.06	0.83		
HINGRT3	2.58	1.11		0.74	
HINGRT14	3.24	1.03		0.76	
HINGRT9	3.11	1.01		0.68	
HINGRT11	3.32	1.08		0.75	
HINGRT7	3.13	1.03		0.86	
HINGRT5	2.99	1.15		0.86	
HINGRT12	2.92	1.11		0.84	
HINGRT16	3.22	1.18		0.77	
HDEFIM5	2.58	1.16			0.54
HDEFIM10	2.01	1.15			0.62
HDEFIM1	2.49	1.16			0.57
HDEFIM11	2.44	1.11			0.57
HDEFIM2	2.64	1.10			0.57
HDEFIM6	2.39	1.15			0.61
HDEFIM7	2.53	1.19			0.50
HDEFIM3	3.20	1.15			0.85
HDEFIM8	2.88	1.15			0.71
HDEFIM13	2.37	1.12			0.54
Alpha coefficient			0.92	0.91	0.83
Scale Means (SD)			3.73 (.73)	3.06 (.85)	2.55 (.72)

Note. N = 210. All factor loadings are standardized and significant at *p* < .001. Interfactor correlations ranged from 40-.57.

Table 3. *Means, Standard Deviations, Internal Consistency Reliabilities, and Correlations Between Variables and IM for Study 4*

	M	SD	Alpha	Honest Ingratiation	Honest Self-Promotion	Honest Defensive IM	Deceptive Ingratiation	Slight Image Creation	Extensive Image Creation	Image Protection
Demographics										
Age	22.22	4.36	-	-.05	-.01	-.09	-.12	-.09	-.03	-.02
Gender	1.52	.50	-	-.17*	-.16*	-.13*	.00	.03	-.02	-.08
Interview Training	1.30	.46	-	.16*	.21**	.16*	.11	.09	.00	.18**
GPA	3.25	.35	-	.11	.07	-.03	.02	-.02	-.02	-.07
Personality										
Honesty-Humility	3.34	.53	.78	-.08	-.01	-.03	-.25**	-.19**	-.20**	-.15*
Emotionality	3.29	.58	.82	.05	.07	.09	.14*	.13	.02	.08
Extraversion	3.60	.53	.85	.16*	.17*	.04	-.12	-.24**	-.27**	-.28**
Agreeableness	3.08	.50	.79	.08	.15*	.10	.00	.03	-.02	.02
Conscientiousness	3.76	.47	.79	.13	.15*	.08	-.13	-.18**	-.35**	-.19**
Openness	3.30	.60	.80	.12	.11	.08	-.01	-.01	-.12	-.10
Competitive W.Views	2.21	.51	.86	.03	-.03	.07	.17**	.16*	.18**	.20**
Attitudes										
Attraction	3.60	1.11	.88	.28**	.23**	.15*	.14*	.09	-.03	.10
Motivation	4.37	.79	-	.14*	.26**	.26**	-.05	-.09	-.21**	-.05
Interview Difficulty	2.08	.69	.70	-.08	-.25**	-.14*	.15*	.24**	.31**	.23**
Procedural Justice	4.46	.53	.73	.15*	.30**	.17*	-.05	-.04	-.16*	-.06
Interviewer-Ratings										
PO Fit	3.86	.83	.82	.19*	.27**	.11	.12	.04	-.01	.04
PJ Fit	3.92	.85	.82	.22*	.25**	.14	.09	-.02	-.04	-.02
Hirability	3.30	.71	-	.20**	.25**	.18*	.06	.02	-.03	-.01

*Note. N = 224 for analyses involving demographics, personality, attitudes, and IM, N = 168 for analyses with Hirability, and N = 129 for analyses with P-O fit and P-O fit. * p < .05, ** p < .01. Full correlations for all variables in online supplement.*

Table 4. *Means, Standard Deviations, Internal Consistency Reliabilities, and Correlations among Main Variables for Study 5*

	M	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
1. Age	32.48	10.97										
2. Male	.51	.50	-.20**									
3. Black	.06	.24	-.08*	.06								
4. Latino	.09	.29	-.16**	.14**	-.08*							
5. Asian	.10	.29	-.06	-.07*	-.08*	-.10**						
6. Living in the U.S.	.72	.45	-.15**	.03	.14**	.06	-.08*					
7. University education	.63	.48	-.04	.14**	-.02	.09*	.12**	.04				
8. Experience in role	5.14	6.20	.51**	-.08*	-.03	-.09*	-.09*	-.09*	-.06			
9. Supervisor as interviewer	.67	.47	.04	-.02	-.01	-.06	.02	-.04	-.02	.11**		
10. Panel Interview	1.33	.47	.05	-.04	-.04	-.07*	.15**	-.11**	.14**	.04	.02	
11. Interview duration	1.84	.90	.06	.07	-.04	.00	.11**	-.06	.19**	.09*	.10**	.32**
12. Questions based on resume	.64	.48	.02	-.02	-.05	.09*	.06	-.08*	.06	.10**	.10**	-.02
13. Preference Questions	.76	.43	.06	-.04	.08*	.07	-.01	-.09*	-.06	.08*	.06	.01
14. Past-behavioral questions	.54	.50	.02	-.03	-.02	-.08*	.00	-.11**	-.07	.02	.07	.21**
15. Situational questions	.49	.50	.03	-.13**	-.06	-.06	-.01	-.04	-.03	-.02	.03	.16**
16. Honest self-promotion	3.74	.99	.26**	-.13**	-.09*	.07	-.13**	-.14**	-.07	.26**	.21**	.00
17. Honest ingratiation	3.14	.98	-.02	.08*	-.05	.14**	-.07	-.06	.03	.06	.19**	.03
18. Honest defensive IM	2.78	1.11	-.16**	.17**	-.01	.09*	-.02	-.04	.00	-.05	.11**	.03
19. Slight image creation	2.11	1.08	-.33**	.30**	-.05	.15**	.00	.04	.04	-.18**	.03	-.01
20. Extensive image creation	1.93	1.12	-.33**	.33**	-.03	.13**	-.05	.07*	.03	-.17**	.04	-.04
21. Deceptive ingratiation	2.51	1.05	-.20**	.24**	-.10**	.18**	-.03	-.02	.04	-.08*	.08*	-.01
22. Image protection	2.12	1.06	-.27**	.30**	-.05	.15**	-.06	.05	.03	-.13**	.03	-.06
23. Job offer	.59	.49	-.09*	-.04	.05	.00	-.05	.02	-.03	-.01	.14**	-.06
24. Eliminated verification	.26	.44	.04	.03	.00	.03	.09*	.00	.05	-.02	-.10**	.01*

Table 4. *Correlations among Main Variables for Study 5 (Continued)*

	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23
11. Interview duration													
12. Questions based on resume	.10**												
13. Questions about preferences	.02	.02											
14. Past-behavioral questions	.10**	.00	.13**										
15. Situational questions	.08*	.06	.15**	.32**									
16. Honest self-promotion	.09*	.22**	.21**	.12**	.14**	(.90)							
17. Honest ingratiation	.16**	.17**	.16**	.11**	.12**	.62**	(.85)						
18. Honest defensive IM	.10**	.09*	.11**	.13**	.11**	.36**	.66**	(.88)					
19. Slight image creation	.06	.02	-.05	.00	-.09*	.05	.37**	.45**	(.91)				
20. Extensive image creation	.03	.01	-.09*	-.04	-.12**	-.01	.33**	.47**	.86**	(.93)			
21. Deceptive ingratiation	.07	.10**	.01	.03	-.02	.27**	.56**	.45**	.77**	.70**	(.87)		
22. Image protection	.03	.06	-.04	-.02	-.11**	.07*	.35**	.46**	.84**	.84**	.73**	(.88)	
23. Job offer	-.07	-.01	.11**	.03	.09*	.13**	.04	-.01	-.10*	-.09*	-.09*	-.12**	
24. Eliminated verification	.12**	.06	.00	-.05	-.02	-.04	.06	.08*	.14**	.13**	.12**	.14**	-.72**

Note: $N = 751$; * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$. Internal consistency reliabilities are in parentheses on diagonal.

Table 5. *Honest and Deceptive IM Use Depending on Interview Characteristics (Study 5)*

| | | Means (SD) | | | | | | |
		Self-promotion	Honest Ingratiation	Honest Defensive	Slight image creation	Extensive image creation	Deceptive Ingratiation	Image protection
Interviewer status	Supervisor ($n = 505$)	3.88 (.80)	3.27 (.90)	2.86 (1.08)	2.13 (1.08)	1.96 (1.13)	2.57 (1.02)	2.14 (1.06)
	Not supervisor ($n = 246$)	3.44 (1.23)	2.87 (1.09)	2.61 (1.16)	2.05 (1.08)	1.87 (1.10)	2.39 (1.10)	2.07 (1.06)
	F-value	34.02**	27.68**	8.50**	0.89	1.08	4.74*	0.91
Interview format	Panel ($n = 246$)	3.73 (1.07)	3.18 (1.03)	2.83 (1.14)	2.09 (1.10)	1.86 (1.12)	2.50 (1.11)	2.03 (1.08)
	One-on-one ($n = 505$)	3.74 (.95)	3.12 (.96)	2.75 (1.10)	2.12 (1.07)	1.97 (1.13)	2.52 (1.02)	2.16 (1.05)
	F-value	0.00	0.66	0.87	0.08	1.35	0.06	2.67
Past behavioral question	Yes ($n = 402$)	3.85 (.90)	3.24 (.91)	2.91 (1.07)	2.11 (1.08)	1.89 (1.09)	2.54 (1.03)	2.09 (1.05)
	No ($n = 349$)	3.60 (1.06)	3.02 (1.05)	2.63 (1.14)	2.11 (1.08)	1.98 (1.15)	2.47 (1.06)	2.14 (1.08)
	F-value	11.79**	9.46**	12.52**	0.00	1.32	0.76	0.30
Situational question	Yes ($n = 368$)	3.88 (.94)	3.26 (.92)	2.91 (1.08)	2.01 (1.03)	1.79 (1.05)	2.49 (1.03)	2.00 (1.02)
	No ($n = 383$)	3.60 (1.01)	3.02 (1.03)	2.66 (1.13)	2.20 (1.12)	2.07 (1.17)	2.53 (1.07)	2.23 (1.10)
	F-value	14.92**	10.99**	9.18**	6.15*	11.53**	0.20	8.38**
Resume-based question	Yes ($n = 481$)	3.90 (.89)	3.27 (.93)	2.86 (1.10)	2.12 (1.08)	1.95 (1.12)	2.59 (1.04)	2.17 (1.05)
	No ($n = 270$)	3.45 (1.09)	2.92 (1.05)	2.65 (1.12)	2.09 (1.09)	1.92 (1.13)	2.37 (1.06)	2.03 (1.05)
	F-value	36.25**	21.95**	6.00**	0.19	0.11	7.56**	2.74
Preference-based question	Yes ($n = 570$)	3.85 (.87)	3.23 (.93)	2.85 (1.10)	2.08 (1.07)	1.88 (1.09)	2.51 (1.04)	2.10 (1.07)
	No ($n = 181$)	3.36 (1.21)	2.86 (1.09)	2.56 (1.11)	2.21 (1.12)	2.11 (1.20)	2.50 (1.08)	2.19 (1.06)
	F-value	35.78**	19.32**	9.78**	2.01	6.09*	0.05	0.94
Interview outcome	Job offer ($n = 400$)	3.85 (.92)	3.19 (.96)	2.80 (1.12)	2.04 (1.08)	1.87 (1.16)	2.44 (1.05)	2.02 (1.05)
	Elimin. verif. ($n = 174$)	3.68 (.93)	3.25 (.90)	2.95 (1.03)	2.39 (1.08)	2.20 (1.16)	2.73 (1.00)	2.38 (1.08)
	F-value	3.92*	0.50	2.31	12.81**	10.66**	9.21**	13.49**

Note: "Elim. verif." = Eliminated during the verification phase after a successful interview. * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$

Table 6.

Base Rate of IM Behaviors Across Five Studies

Types of IM	Percentage of candidates using IM behaviors				Means and (standard deviations) of candidates' IM use			
	S2	S3	S4	S5	S2	S3	S4	S5
Honest self-promotion	98.95	99.05	97.32	93.48	3.87 (.76)	3.73 (.73)	3.73 (.75)	3.74 (.99)
Honest ingratiation	89.12	90.48	94.20	87.08	3.09 (.89)	3.06 (.85)	3.37 (.84)	3.14 (.98)
Honest defensive IM	65.96	81.43	91.07	74.03	2.40 (.86)	2.55 (.72)	3.05 (.78)	2.78 (1.11)
Slight image creation			55.36	48.47			2.11 (.76)	2.11 (1.08)
Extensive image creation			16.96	39.28			1.45 (.58)	1.93 (1.12)
Deceptive ingratiation			66.52	69.11			2.38 (.84)	2.51 (1.05)
Image protection			40.18	49.40			1.93 (.71)	2.12 (1.06)

N = 285, 210, 224, and 751 for studies 2, 3, 4, and 5, respectively. Base rates calculated based on percentage of candidates with mean usage at or above 2.0.

Appendix A

Honest Impression Management Scale

Item number	Honest Self-Promotion
HSPROM11	I made sure to let the interviewer know about my job credentials.
HSPROM15	I let the interviewer know how my qualifications were well-suited for the position.
HSPROM12	I demonstrated to the interviewer genuine ways that I was a good performer in my previous job.
HSPROM13	I made the interviewer aware of all the responsibilities I had on my previous jobs.
HSPROM3	I made sure the interviewer was aware of my skills and abilities.
HSPROM8	I described my skills and abilities in an attractive way.
HSPROM4	I let the interviewer know how my previous work experiences were relevant to the position.
HSPROM6	I brought up my past experience with other well-known previous employers to make the interviewer aware of my competence.
HSPROM17	I showed the interviewer how I felt I could be a valuable addition to the organization.
HSPROM5	I made the interviewer aware of the accomplishments I'd had at my previous job.
HSPROM7	I made sure to recount my areas of expertise
HSPROM16	I looked for opportunities to make the interviewer aware of my success at previous jobs.
HSPROM2	I promoted the skills and abilities that I thought most relevant to the position.
HSPROM9	I brought up my past work experience to make the interviewer aware of my competence.
	Honest Ingratiation
HINGRT3	I tried to find out the values or opinions the interviewer and I shared in common, and was vocal about these.
HINGRT14	I let the interviewer know about those values of the organization that I shared.
HINGRT9	When the interviewer expressed views that I shared, I focused on incorporating these into my answers.
HINGRT11	When I agreed with the interviewer's opinions or points, I made sure to let him/her know.
HINGRT7	I did my best to convey the values, attitudes, or beliefs that I felt me and the interviewer shared.
HINGRT5	I found out about values and goals that I shared with the organization, and made sure to emphasize them.
HINGRT12	I discussed interests I shared in common with the recruiter.
HINGRT16	I complimented the organization on accomplishments or qualities that I found impressive.
	Honest Defensive
HDEFIM5	I shared my past regrets about how I handled certain situations, and how I would improve in the future

HDEFIM10	I made sure to highlight the situations that led to the negative concerns brought up (e.g. my poor grade was due to circumstances beyond my control).
HDEFIM1	I gave the interviewer an honest account of why I lacked control over past negative events that came up during the interview.
HDEFIM11	I admitted to those negative concerns raised by the interviewer that I felt were fair criticisms or points.
HDEFIM2	I recounted to the interviewer steps I had taken to prevent the recurrence of negative events or occurrences in my past.
HDEFIM6	When I felt the negative concern or event was not as bad as it looked, I made sure to let the interviewer know (e.g. a low grade was one of the highest in the class).
HDEFIM7	I gave honest reasons why negative concerns raised or past negative events were not entirely my fault (e.g. I had lazy group members on a project for this group, or a difficult professor).
HDEFIM3	I described how I had taken corrective action to repair the negative consequences of past events or occurrences.
HDEFIM8	I gave reasons why I felt I benefited positively from a negative event I was responsible for.
HDEFIM13	I accepted responsibility for negative concerns, but told the interviewer when I didn't think that concern was critical.

Appendix B

Short IM Scale

	Honest IM – Self-promotion
HSPROM11	I made sure to let the interviewer know about my job credentials
HSPROM3	I made sure the interviewer was aware of my skills and abilities
HSPROM5	I let the interviewer know how my qualifications were well-suited for the position
HSPROM9	I brought up my past work experience to make the interviewer aware of my competence
	Honest IM – Ingratiation
HINGRT3	I tried to find out the values or opinions the interviewer and I shared in common, and was vocal about these
HINGRT5	I found out about values and goals that I shared with the organization, and made sure to emphasize them
HINGRT9	When the interviewer expressed views that I shared, I focused on incorporating these into my answers
HINGRT12	I discussed interests I shared in common with the interviewer
	Honest IM – Defensive
HDEFIM1	I gave the interviewer an honest account of why I lacked control over past negative events that came up during the interview
HDEFIM2	I recounted to the interviewer steps I had taken to prevent the recurrence of negative events or occurrences in my past
HDEFIM5	I shared my past regrets about how I handled certain situations, and how I would improve in the future
HDEFIM8	I gave reasons why I felt I benefited positively from a negative event I was responsible for
	Deceptive IM – Slight Image Creation
ICEMB4	I exaggerated my responsibilities on my previous jobs
ICTAI7	I distorted my answers based on the comments or reactions of the interviewer
ICTAI8	I distorted my answers to emphasize what the interviewer was looking for
ICFIT14	I inflated the fit between my values and goals and the values and goals of the organization
	Deceptive IM – Extensive Image Creation

ICCON18	I told fictional stories prepared in advance of the interview to best present my credentials
ICCON20	I made up stories about my work experiences that were well developed and logical
ICINV31	I invented some work situations or accomplishments that did not really occur
ICBOR34	When I did not have a good answer, I borrowed work experiences of other people and made them sound like my own

Deceptive IM – Ingratiation

INCON55	I tried to find out the interviewer's views and incorporate them in my answers as my own
INCON56	I tried to express the same opinions and attitudes as the interviewer
INCON57	I tried to appear similar to the interviewer in terms of values, attitudes, or beliefs
INENH64	I complimented the organization on something, however insignificant it may actually be to me

Deceptive IM – Image Protection

IPOMI42	When asked directly, I did not mention my true reason for quitting previous jobs
IPMAS46	When asked directly, I did not mention some problems I had in past jobs
IPMAS49	I covered up some "skeletons in my closet"
IPDIS51	I clearly separated myself from my past work experiences that would reflect poorly on me.

"I (Might Be) Just That Good": Honest and Deceptive Impression Management in

Employment Interviews - Online Supplement

Part A: HIIM-S and IFB-S Validation

We present here the detailed process for validation of the short version of the honest and deceptive IM scales (with key results summarized in the Supplementary Table 1). As a first step, we worked on a shortened version of the HIIM scale. We thus reviewed the EFA results from Study 2 and selected the four items with the highest loadings for each factor. We then conducted a new EFA with those 12 items, using a principal axis extraction and promax rotation. As expected, a 3-factor solution emerged, explaining 68% of the variance, and with all items loading onto the expected three factors (with all loadings > .65 and all cross loading < .15|). All three short honest IM measures exhibited good reliabilities (αs > .79) and strong correlations with the full scales (rs > .92), suggesting convergent validity. Next, we subjected this 12-item honest measure to a CFA using Study 3 data. The 3-factor model did fit the data well (e.g., χ^2 (51) = 112.12, χ^2/df = 2.20, CFI = .97, TLI = .96, $RMSEA$ = .08 with a 90% Confidence Interval ranging from .057 to .095), and significantly better than a 1-factor model (e.g., χ^2 (54) = 456.52, χ^2/df = 8.45, CFI = .80, TLI = .76, $RMSEA$ = .19 with a 90% Confidence Interval ranging from .173 to .205). In addition, χ^2 difference testing (Anderson & Gerbing, 1988; Bagozzi & Phillips, 1982) also demonstrated that the hypothesized three-factor model provided a superior fit to the data: $\Delta\chi^2$ (3) = 142.22, p < .001. Again, the three short IM measures exhibited acceptable reliabilities (αs > .68) and strong correlations with the full scales (rs > .86). Finally, we used the data from Study 4 to test (or confirm) the reliability. All three measures demonstrated good reliabilities (αs > .77) and strong correlations with the full scales (rs > .90).

As a second step, we developed a shortened version of a deceptive IM (i.e., IFB) scale. We examined Levashina and Campion's (2007) exploratory factor analysis results to identify items with high loadings and low cross-loadings. We also limited the number of items to four per IM type and strived to cover all sub-facets with at least one item. We submitted this 16-item short measure to a confirmatory factor analysis using Study 4 data. The 4-factor model did fit the data well (e.g., χ^2 (98) = 170.04, χ^2/df = 1.74, CFI = .97, TLI = .97, $RMSEA$ = .06 with a 90% Confidence Interval ranging from .043 to .071), and significantly better than a 1-factor model (e.g., χ^2 (104) = 478.52, χ^2/df = 4.60, CFI = .85, TLI = .83, $RMSEA$ = .13 with a 90% Confidence Interval ranging from .115 to .138). In addition, χ^2 difference testing also demonstrated that the four-factor model provided a superior fit to the data: $\Delta\chi^2$ (6) = 181.09, p < .001. All four measures demonstrated good reliabilities (αs > .68) and strong correlations with the longer scales (rs > .90). Note that due to space constraints in Study 4, we only started with a 35-item measure from the IFB and not the full scale (which was also chosen based on factor loadings and content coverage of all facets).

Finally, we further examined the short scale discriminant validity, by comparing correlations between honest and deceptive IM with the short (vs. full) scales. Results suggest that those relationships were similar for the short versus long versions of the scale. For instance, honest and deceptive ingratiation correlated at r = .67 for the short vs. .61 for the long measures. Similarly, honest defensive IM and image protection correlated at .29 for the short versions and .38 for the long versions, while the honest self-promotion and slight image creation measures correlated at r = .20 vs. .29 for the short versus long versions. In short, the result of the re-analysis of the data of Studies 1-4 yielded a shortened version of interview IM, consisting of 28-

items, with 4 items tapping each of the three factors of Honest IM and each of the four factors of

deceptive IM. This scale can be found in Appendix B of the main paper.

Part B: Examining the Temporal Stability of Honest and Deceptive IM

In Studies 1-5, we showed that the HIIM measure demonstrated convergent and divergent validity, as well as internal consistency (both with the full and the shortened versions). Another important psychometric property of a new measure is its temporal stability. This is relevant because the existing IM literature has usually focused on applicants use in one specific interview, ignoring how stable or variable IM use is over time. The objective of this supplement is to examine the temporal stability of honest and deceptive IM (using the HIIM-S and the IFB-S).

Both Study 4 and previous research (e.g., Kacmar et al., 1992; Levashina & Campion, 2007) highlighted that IM use is influenced by stable individual differences, such as personality traits, integrity, or competitive worldviews. Therefore, one should expect some level of consistency in applicants' behavior across interviews. Yet, both our Studies 4 and 5 and past research (e.g., Levashina et al., 2014; Van Iddekinge et al., 2007) also suggest that applicants' use of IM tactics is influenced by situational factors, such as the type of interview questions, the level of structure, the behavior of the interviewer, or the applicant's attraction or motivation in that particular interview. In other words, while we should expect reasonable convergence from one interview to the next, IM use may differ across interviews, as individual's specific willingness, opportunity, or capacity to use IM changes. Adaptations of IM use across interviews are likely to be particularly necessary for ingratiation tactics, which involves flattering the interviewer or praising the organization (Chen, Lee, & Yeh, 2008).

Methods

Participants and Procedure. The sample was composed of 101 senior business students involved in the co-operative education program in a Canadian university. They participated in (at least) two interviews for three-months-long job placements with local organizations. Interviews

lasted between 30 minutes and one hour and interviewees completed the IM measures

immediately after each interview. For the present study, we present IM data for their first two

interviews (with an average of 2.86 days between interviews). Interviewees were 20.39 years old

on average (SD = 1.39), mostly female (64%), Caucasian (54%), Asian (32%), or Black (6%),

were typically in the third year of their degree (M_{year} = 2.87), and had participated in an average

of 8.68 (SD = 6.75) job interviews prior to the study. All participants interviewed with

professional interviewers from local organizations from a variety of industries. We obtained

demographic information from a subsample of 64 of these interviewers. They were 34.02 years

old on average (SD = 8.31), mostly female (77%), and had extensive experience conducting job

interviews (i.e., M= 203.03 interviews conducted in their career, SD = 356.59).

Measures. Participants completed the same self-reports of the short IM measures – the

HIIM-S and IFB-S (total of 28 items) - after each interview. Reliability coefficients were similar

for both interviews and *alphas* ranged from .68 to .89.

Results & Discussion

To examine the temporal stability of IM use, we report the correlations between

interviewees' use of the three honest and four deceptive IM tactics across their first two

interviews (Supplementary Table 2). We observed strong and significant correlations for both

honest and deceptive IM tactics (r = .60, p < .01 for honest self-promotion, r = .40, p < .01 for

honest ingratiation, and r = .71, p < .01 for honest defensive IM, r = .81, p < .01 for slight image

creation, r = .80, p < .01 for slight image creation, r = .62, p < .01 for deceptive ingratiation, and

r = .75, p < .01 for image protection).

In summary, we explored the temporal stability of the shortened versions of the HIIM

and IFB measures. As anticipated, we observed strong test-retest reliability for all measures

across two interviews conducted by different interviewers from different organizations.

However, interviewees were more consistent in their use of self-focused and defensive IM (and

especially image creation tactics) than in their use of other-focused tactics (and especially honest

ingratiation). Our results suggest that interviewees tend to have a strategy to self-promote and

defend their image (both using honest and deceptive tactics) that they apply quite consistently

across interviews. In contrast, ingratiation is oriented towards the interviewer and/or the hiring

organization (Stevens & Kristof, 1995), interviewees may thus need to adapt the tactics they use

when facing a different interviewer or interviewing for a different job and organization. In

particular, the lowest convergence was observed for honest ingratiation, which makes sense

given that this type of IM can only happen when the applicant actually finds the interviewer or

organization desirable or a good fit, for instance. Similarly, it may be easier to praise some

interviewers than others (Chen et al., 2008). The way interviewers behave or conduct the

interview may influence the opportunity to ingratiate (Van Iddekinge et al., 2007). Overall, there

appears to be temporal stability in honest and deceptive IM use, but that this varies by tactic.

Part C: Full Correlation Table for Study 4

In the main document, to conserve journal space and focus the reader on key variables, we focused the correlation table for Study 4 (Table 3) on the correlations between the main study variables (in rows) and the seven IM tactics (in columns). However, for any future meta-analytic efforts, and reader information, we provide the full correlation table here (Supplementary Table 3).

References Used in this Supplement

Anderson, J. C., & Gerbing, D. W. (1988). Structural equation modeling in practice: A review and recommended two-step approach. *Psychological Bulletin, 103*, 411-423. doi:10.1037/0033-2909.103.3.411

Bagozzi, R. P., & Phillips, L. W. (1982). Representing and testing organizational theories: A holistic construal. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 27*, 459-489. doi:10.2307/2392322

Chen, C.-H. V., Lee, H.-M., & Yeh, Y.-J. Y. (2008). The antecedent and consequence of person-organization fit: Ingratiation, similarity, hiring recommendations and job offer. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment, 16*, 210-219. doi:10.1111/j.1468-2389.2008.00427.x

Kacmar, K. M., Delery, J. E., & Ferris, G. R. (1992). Differential effectiveness of applicant impression management tactics on employment interview decisions. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 22*, 1250-1272. doi:10.1111/j.1559-1816.1992.tb00949.x

Levashina, J., & Campion, M. A. (2007). Measuring faking in the employment interview: Development and validation of an interview faking behavior scale. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 92*, 1638-1656. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.92.6.1638

Levashina, J., Hartwell, C. J., Morgeson, F. P., & Campion, M. A. (2014). The structured employment interview: Narrative and quantitative review of the research literature. *Personnel Psychology, 67*, 241-293. doi:10.1111/peps.12052

Stevens, C. K., & Kristof, A. L. (1995). Making the right impression: A field study of applicant impression management during job interviews. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 80*, 587-606. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.80.5.587

Van Iddekinge, C. H., McFarland, L., & Raymark, P. H. (2007). Antecedents of impression

management use and effectiveness in a structured interview. *Journal of Management, 33*,

752-773. doi:10.1177/0149206307305563

Supplementary Table 1.

Descriptive Statistics, Reliability, and Correlations for the Short vs. Full IM Scales

	Honest IM			Deceptive IM			
	Self-promotion	Ingratiation	Defensive	Slight image creation	Extensive image creation	Ingratiation	Image protection
Reliability (α)							
Study 2							
Full scale	.94	.90	.89	-	-	-	-
Short scale	.85	.87	.79	-	-	-	-
Study 3							
Full scale	.92	.91	.83	-	-	-	-
Short scale	.81	.85	.68	-	-	-	-
Study 4							
Full scale	.92	.86	.82	.82	.86	.86	.82
Short scale	.80	.77	.77	.74	.76	.79	.68
Mean (*SD*)							
Study 2							
Full scale	3.87 (.76)	3.09 (.89)	2.40 (.86)	-	-	-	-
Short scale	4.04 (.76)	2.89 (1.01)	2.45 (.96)	-	-	-	-
Study 3							
Full scale	3.73 (.73)	3.06 (.85)	2.55 (.72)	-	-	-	-
Short scale	3.90 (.77)	2.90 (.91)	2.64 (.82)	-	-	-	-
Study 4							
Full scale	3.73 (.75)	3.37 (.84)	3.05 (.78)	2.11 (.76)	1.45 (.58)	2.38 (.84)	1.93 (.71)
Short scale	3.94 (.79)	3.27 (.92)	3.28 (.98)	2.02 (.83)	1.41 (.64)	2.65 (.98)	1.69 (.71)
Correlations between short and full scale							
Study 2	.92**	.95**	.94**	-	-	-	-
Study 3	.92**	.96**	.86**	-	-	-	-
Study 4	.91**	.94**	.91**	.95**	.94**	.92**	.90**

Note: $N = 285$ (Study 2), 210 (Study 3), and 224 (Study 4). The "full" scale deceptive IM for Study 4 was measured with 7, 9, 11, and 8 items for the four subscales respectively. * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$

Supplementary Table 2.

IM Use and Temporal Stability across Two Interviews

| | Honest IM | | | Deceptive IM | | | |
	Self-promotion	Ingratiation	Defensive	Slight image creation	Extensive image creation	Deceptive ingratiation	Image protection
Interview 1							
M	4.09	3.57	2.77	2.20	1.38	3.04	1.55
SD	.67	.77	1.02	1.05	.61	.94	.70
Reliability (α)	.80	.75	.81	.87	.76	.82	.68
Interview 2							
M	4.20	3.59	2.87	2.12	1.40	3.15	1.57
SD	.72	.92	1.12	1.07	.61	.97	.74
Reliability (α)	.89	.85	.89	.89	.78	.84	.75
Correlation 1-2	.60**	.40**	.71**	.81**	.80**	.62**	.75**

Note: $N = 101$; * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$

Supplementary Table 3. *Full Intercorrelations of Study Variables for Study 4*

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
1. Age	-												
2. Gender	-.27**	-											
3. Interview Training	.05	-.16*	-										
4. GPA	.12	-.11	.05	-									
5. Honesty-Humility	.26**	.08	.01	-.02	-								
6. Emotionality	-.22**	.45**	.00	.20**	.07	-							
7. Extraversion	.07	-.20**	.03	-.09	-.10	-.25**	-						
8. Agreeableness	.14*	-.15*	-.02	-.12	.22**	-.15*	.21**	-					
9. Conscientiousness	.02	.01	-.08	.06	.18**	-.09	.16*	.02	-				
10. Openness	.19**	-.10	.22**	.04	-.04	-.07	.26**	.15*	.10	-			
11. Competitive W.Views	-.18**	-.19**	-.03	-.17*	-.53**	-.16*	-.06	-.15*	-.13	-.08	-		
12. Attraction	.03	.05	-.05	-.07	.07	.05	-.05	.00	.08	.07	-.12	-	
13. Motivation	.06	-.01	.08	.03	.15*	.02	.10	.13	.24**	.20**	-.14*	.32**	-
14. Interview Difficulty	-.14*	.14*	-.12	.03	-.10	.06	-.17*	-.08	-.21**	-.08	.09	-.11	-.36**
15. Procedural Justice	.00	.06	.09	.02	.13*	.04	.06	.05	.21**	.10	-.14*	.32**	.34**
16. PO Fit	.03	.10	-.01	.07	.05	.16	-.03	.02	-.07	-.06	-.03	.20*	.02
17. PJ Fit	.11	.05	.12	.19*	.06	.28**	-.09	-.06	-.04	-.02	-.03	.17	.12
18. Hirability	.03	.02	.17*	-.01	.08	.12	.00	-.02	-.08	-.01	-.01	.14	.15*
19. Honest Ingratiation	-.05	-.17*	.16*	.11	-.08	.05	.16*	.08	.13	.12	.03	.28**	.14*
20. Honest Self-Promotion	-.01	-.16*	.21**	.07	-.01	.07	.17*	.15*	.15*	.11	-.03	.23**	.26**
21. Honest Defensive IM	-.09	-.13*	.16*	-.03	-.03	.09	.04	.10	.08	.08	.07	.15*	.26**
22. Deceptive Ingratiation	-.12	.00	.11	.02	-.25**	.14*	-.12	.00	-.13	-.01	.17**	.14*	-.05
23. Slight Image Creation	-.09	.03	.09	-.02	-.19**	.13	-.24**	.03	-.18**	-.01	.16*	.09	-.09
24. Extensive Image Cr.	-.03	-.02	.00	-.02	-.20**	.02	-.27**	-.02	-.35**	-.12	.18**	-.03	-.21**
25. Image Protection	-.02	-.08	.18**	-.07	-.15*	.08	-.28**	.02	-.19**	-.10	.20**	.10	-.05

Note. N = 224 for analyses involving demographics, personality, attitudes, and IM, *N = 168 for analyses with Hirability, and N = 129* for analyses with P-O fit and P-O fit. * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$.

Supplementary Table 3 Continued. *Full Intercorrelations of Study Variables for Study 4*

	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25
14. Interview Difficulty	-											
15. Procedural Justice	-.23**	-										
16. PO Fit	-.09	.02	-									
17. PJ Fit	-.11	-.06	.72**	-								
18. Hirability	-.32**	.15*	.62**	.64**	-							
19. Honest Ingratiation	-.08	.15*	.19*	.22*	.20**	-						
20. Honest Self-Promotion	-.25**	.30**	.27**	.25**	.25**	.69**	-					
21. Honest Defensive IM	-.14*	.17*	.11	.14	.18*	.52**	.55**	-				
22. Deceptive Ingratiation	.15*	-.05	.12	.09	.06	.61**	.39**	.37**	-			
23. Slight Image Creation	.24**	-.04	.04	-.02	.02	.38**	.29**	.26**	.67**	-		
24. Extensive Image Cr.	.31**	-.16*	-.01	-.04	-.03	.13	-.03	.15*	.47**	.68**	-	
25. Image Protection	.23**	-.06	.04	-.02	-.01	.38**	.27**	.38**	.64**	.67**	.63**	-

Note. N = 224 for analyses involving demographics, personality, attitudes, and IM, *N = 168 for analyses with Hirability, and N = 129* for analyses with P-O fit and P-O fit. * *p* < .05, ** *p* < .01.