

**Investigating impression management use in asynchronous video interviews across 10
countries**

René Arseneault*

Department of Management
Université of Laval

Nicolas Roulin

Department of Psychology
Saint Mary's University

In Press in *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*

*Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to René Arseneault,
Department of Business Management, 2325 Rue de l'Université, Québec, QC G1V 0A6.

Rene.arseneault@fsa.ulaval.ca

The data that support the findings of this study are available from the corresponding author, R.A., upon reasonable request.

This research was made possible by the David Sobey Center Research Grant #20-005 and SSHRC Insight Grant # 435-2021-1115.

We would like to thank Khoi Anh Pham Le, Qui Tran, Mahboobe Sahebi, Zhixin Liu, Xinyue Liu, Brittany Houson, Mehak Tekchandani, Farbod Rad, and Marie-Paule Laforge for their help as research assistants in this study.

Abstract

This cross-cultural study investigates how interviewees from 10 culturally-distinct countries differ in their use of impression management (IM) tactics in asynchronous video interviews (AVIs), and the relationship(s) between those tactics and interview performance. A total of 582 participants from ten countries (India, Canada, South Africa, Poland, Spain, Iran, Germany, Chile, Philippines, China) completed an 8-question AVI for a mock position as a manager in a bank. We drew upon GLOBE's cultural framework to predict and explain observed differences in self-reported IM use and performance. We used multi-level modelling to test our hypotheses. Interviewees from our ten countries differed slightly in their IM use for various tactics, but IM use was seldom related to GLOBE cultural dimensions. Partially consistent with previous in-person interview research, honest IM tactics (e.g., self promotion) were positively, but deceptive tactics (e.g., extensive image creation) negatively, associated with interview performance. This research is the first to investigate cross-cultural IM differences in AVIs, thus addressing a critical gap in the selection literature at a time when many organizations conduct interviews virtually to save costs, streamline the hiring process, or simply conduct most of their activities remotely.

Keywords: cross-cultural, GLOBE, asynchronous video interviews, impression management, selection

Introduction

Global staffing continues to be an important area of research in international human resource management (Collings & Isichei, 2018). Rapid changes in technology, increasing globalization, and the COVID-19 pandemic have all disrupted traditional channels through which recruitment and selection activities take place. For example, recruiters are being replaced with AI systems (Claus, 2019), as organisations move away from traditional face-to-face (FTF) interviews in favor of web-based technologies that can efficiently screen candidates (McColl & Michelotti, 2019; Van Gramberg et al., 2014). Further, the COVID-19 pandemic has fueled this technological disruption in HR activities by dramatically impacting traditional hiring processes and increasing the need for innovative solutions. Technological advancements in online videoconferencing (i.e., Zoom, Skype, Teams) have facilitated additional opportunities to connect with a global labor market (Tippins, 2015), leading to a rise in employers looking for talents beyond geographical boundaries (Banks et al., 2019). Both expatriates and organizations, have benefited from such technological advancements by seeing their options for prospective employers and potential talent pool, respectively, dramatically increase.

One emerging screening/selection tool is the asynchronous video interview (AVI), also known as digital or on-demand interview, which typically involves applicants reading or listening to pre-recorded questions and then video-recording their responses. Even prior to the pandemic, AVIs were growing in popularity as a digital interview tool (HireVue, 2021). The benefits of using AVIs are numerous (Brenner et al., 2016), making them an attractive option for organizations to use in their selection process. Organizations such as Disney and Carnival Cruise Line (among others) are increasingly using AVIs to capitalize on their cost, time, and scheduling benefits (Gorman et al., 2018; Lukacik et al., 2022). Applicants can equally benefit from AVIs

by reaching markets and job opportunities that were otherwise geographically unattainable. However, new technologies can also introduce new challenges. For example, hiring managers' perceived abilities to assess a candidate's personality, character, and organisational fit through video technology has been noted as more difficult than in traditional FTF interviews (McColl & Michelotti, 2019). With the added complexity of cultural differences encountered via expanding recruitment borders, it is becoming more important to investigate AVIs through a cross-cultural lens. Such investigations could provide hiring managers and HR professionals with a better understanding of the complex dynamics, and often unintended consequences, of introducing new selection tools (i.e., AVIs).

The vast majority of AVI research has focused on comparing applicants' reactions or attitudes towards AVIs vs. traditional face to face (FTF) interviews (Basch et al., 2020; Basch et al., 2021) or examining 'how' AVIs differ from FTF interviews (Langer et al., 2017; Lukacik et al., 2022; Ryan & Derous, 2019). Yet, very little research exists exploring cross-cultural factors that could affect how applicants from different cultures experience AVIs (but see Griswold et al., 2021 for a rare exception). This is surprising, given that one of the largest benefits of AVI technology is its ability to reach applicants from all over the world.

In addition, a central element in interview research has been applicants' use of impression management (IM), that is, the tactics used to positively influence interviewers' ratings of performance and indirectly chances of receiving employment offers (Barrick et al., 2009; Horverak et al., 2013). The intersection of AVIs and IM tactics is likely to create new dynamics than those found in FTF interviews (Lukacik et al., 2022). Moreover, Arseneault and Roulin (2021) recently proposed a theoretical model to systematically predict how cultural dimensions could influence interviewees' use of IM in interviews, and how such differences could impact

interview outcomes. Given the importance of IM effectiveness on interview outcomes (Barrick et al., 2009) and the growing popularity of AVIs in practice, both employers and applicants from around the world would benefit from better understanding whether this emerging selection tool favors and/or creates barriers for some cultures over others.

The present study contributes to the literatures on cross-cultural impression management (hereafter referred to as ‘CCIM’) and AVIs in the following important ways: First, we build upon existing research investigating CCIM within the interview context (i.e., Fell et al., 2016; Sandal et al., 2014) and empirically test theoretical propositions from a recent model predicting CCIM differences in job interviews (Arseneault & Roulin, 2021). We rely on the GLOBE cultural framework (House et al., 2004) to predict and test differences in self-reported IM tactic use of participants from 10 culturally distinct countries. Second, while previous CCIM studies (i.e., Fell et al., 2016; Fell & König 2016; Sandal et al., 2014) focused on a small number of IM tactics, our research incorporates seven IM types – including both honest and deceptive behaviors – that have been identified as central to influencing behavior in the interview context (e.g., Bourdage et al., 2018; Levashina & Campion, 2007). Third, our study also expands on existing CCIM research by not only exploring which tactics interviewees from different cultures use, but also how these IM tactics influence interview performance ratings, thus adding a cross-cultural element to the literature on interview IM and performance (e.g., Barrick et al., 2009). Finally, our study is the first to examine CCIM within an AVI context thus integrating the CCIM and AVI literatures.

What are AVIs?

AVIs are conducted without live interaction. Typically, a company invites potential candidates to read written interview questions (or watch a video-recording on someone asking

the questions) and to digitally record their answers (Brenner et al., 2016; Chamorro-Premuzic et al., 2016). Those videos are later reviewed and rated by hiring managers or, in some cases, automatically assessed using artificial intelligence. AVIs can have efficiency and cost-saving benefits (see Mejia & Torres, 2018; Stone et al., 2015), as well as weaknesses. For example, AVIs are viewed as more transactional and impersonal (Guchait et al., 2014), creepier (Langer et al., 2017) and less ‘fair’ (Basch et al., 2021; Basch et al., 2020) than traditional interviews. Due to the inability to dynamically interact with an interviewer in AVIs, applicants may be less capable of employing certain IM tactics (i.e., ingratiation, opinion conformity) and complete the entire interview without receiving any live feedback (i.e., interviewer behavioral cues) on their performance. In addition, recent research has called for studies investigating how cultural differences manifest themselves in AVIs (Lukacik et al., 2022). The present study addresses this gap by exploring CCIM behaviors and their relationship(s) to interview performance in an AVI context.

Importance of IM in interviews

IM describes efforts by an actor to create, maintain, protect, or otherwise alter an image held by a target audience (Bozeman & Kacmar, 1997). IM can be classified as assertive or defensive, with assertive further broken down into self- and other-focused behaviors (Bolino et al., 2008). Self-focused IM includes self-promotional behavior(s) such as self-enhancements, entitlements and boasting one’s image. Other-focused IM includes behaviors aimed at a target audience such as flattery, opinion conformity and other forms of ingratiation. Defensive IM, is the least researched among all forms and includes providing excuses and justifications when one’s image is being damaged (Tsai et al., 2010). Applicants tend to use self-focused IM considerably more than the other two forms of IM, and self-focused tactics have thus received

the most attention in the literature (Kacmar et al., 1992; Melchers et al., 2020; Stevens & Kristof, 1995). In addition, researchers have also distinguished between honest and deceptive forms of IM (Bourdage et al., 2018; Levashina & Campion, 2007). For instance, applicants can highlight their actual/true experiences and qualifications (i.e., honest self-promotion), exaggerate them (slight image creation), or completely make them up (extensive image creation). While earlier research suggested that IM tactics are associated with positive interview outcomes (e.g., Barrick et al., 2009; Levashina et al., 2014), more recent evidence shows that not all tactics result in positive evaluations, for example honest tactics are more beneficial than deceptive ones (Ho et al., 2021). In sum, there are several tactics applicants can employ in an interview to win a favourable rating from the interviewer(s). However, most research in this area was conducted using North American or Western European samples.

CCIM research has found that people tend to self-enhance or present themselves in ways that are congruent with the norms and values in their culture (Sedikides et al., 2003; Bye et al., 2011; Sandal et al., 2014). As such, applicants from various cultures present images of themselves considered to be ideal according to their cultural standards. Understanding how IM use differs within an AVI context, therefore, has similar implications to FTF interviews, where discrimination and subconscious biases related to cultural distance may be present (Huffcutt et al., 2011; Manroop et al., 2013; Arseneault & Roulin, 2023).

Cross-cultural IM Use in AVIs

We draw upon a recent CCIM model (Arseneault & Roulin, 2021) which combines the cultural elements from the GLOBE framework (House et al., 2004) and various CCIM empirical studies, to systematically predict how cultural differences translate into IM tactic use in an AVI context. Importantly, that model integrates Levashina and Campion's (2007) and Bourdage et

al.'s (2018) typologies to explain how IM is associated with eight of GLOBE's cultural dimensions (uncertainty avoidance, power distance, humane orientation, performance orientation, in-group collectivism, assertiveness, gender egalitarianism, and future orientation; House et al., 2004). Arseneault and Roulin (2021), built their CCIM model on GLOBE practice scores (i.e., current policies and practices - how things *are*) and not value scores (i.e., cultural norms and values - how things *should be*; see Brewer & Venaik, 2010), because what matters is how culture shapes actual behaviors in an interview context. Arseneault and Roulin's (2021) model predicts the impact of GLOBE's cultural dimensions on both honest and deceptive forms of three broad types of IM tactics (self-focused, other-focused, and defensive). We provide below a brief summary of their propositions related to six core types of applicant IM behaviors (see Arseneault & Roulin, 2021, for a thorough discussion), how they connect to the broader CCIM literature, and their relevance in the specific context of AVIs.

Honest Self-focused IM. Honest self-focused IM tactics include applicants highlighting their true qualifications, skills, or experiences (Bourdage et al., 2018). Past CCIM work has explored how various cultural dimensions could be associated with such behaviors. For instance, individuals from individualistic cultures rely on self-focused IM to demonstrate their uniqueness and independence (Lalwani et al., 2006; Triandis & Suh, 2002). But people from countries high on humane orientation (e.g., Nordic) refrain from highlighting their skills and qualifications (Silvera & Seger, 2004; Thomsen et al., 2007). In job interviews, applicants from regions higher on in-group collectivism, assertiveness, and power distance, but lower on gender egalitarianism (i.e., Ghana, Turkey, or Southeast Asia vs. Germany or Norway) tend to use more self-promotion tactics (Bye et al., 2011, 2014; Sandal & Endresen, 2002). Self-presentation efforts are also positively related to performance orientation (i.e., individual excellence; Sandal et al.,

2014). Arseneault and Roulin (2021) have summarized this literature and proposed that interviewees from cultures high in performance orientation and power distance but low in in-group collectivism, humane orientation, and gender egalitarianism would engage in more honest self-focused IM. For our first hypothesis, we predict:

Hypothesis 1: The cultural dimensions of a) performance orientation, and b) power distance are expected to be positively related to the use of honest self-focused IM, while c) in-group collectivism, d) humane orientation, and e) gender egalitarianism are expected to be negatively related to honest self-focused IM.

Honest other-focused IM. Honest other-focused IM tactics includes honestly ingratiating the interviewer or organization using various forms of opinion conforming, truthful flattery, or other enhancement (Bourdage et al., 2018). The asynchronous nature of AVIs should restrict opportunities for applicants to ingratiate the interviewer (e.g., Lukacik et al., 2022). However, AVIs can include an introductory video presenting the company or use videos of an interviewer asking questions (vs. text-based questions) to provide more information about the organization and introduce a “target” to ingratiate. Other-focused IM has been extensively studied in face-to-face interviews (Barrick et al., 2009; Bourdage et al., 2018; Levashina et al., 2014), but very little cross-cultural research exists, especially in AVIs. In general, ingratiation tactics are preferred in individualistic than in collectivistic cultures (Branzei, 2002; Schermerhorn & Bond, 1991). In job interviews in collectivistic cultures (e.g., China), directly flattering or ingratiating the interviewer should be avoided (Bilbow, 1998). Arseneault and Roulin (2021) also noted that other-focused IM should be valued by applicants from low-assertiveness cultures, who prefer to “get along” with and enhance (vs. being confrontational with) a target, and high humane orientation cultures, who are generous, caring, and kind to others

(House et al., 2004). In summary, Arseneault and Roulin's (2021) suggested that interviewees from cultures high in humane orientation and gender egalitarianism but lower in assertiveness, power distance and in-group collectivism would engage in more honest other-focused IM. We therefore predict:

Hypothesis 2: The cultural dimensions of a) humane orientation, and b) gender egalitarianism are expected to be positively related to the use of honest other-focused IM, while c) assertiveness, d) in-group collectivism, and e) power distance are expected to be negatively related to honest other-focused IM.

Honest defensive IM. Honest defensive IM tactics include image repair behaviors such as apologies, excuses, and justifications (Bourdage et al., 2018). Importantly, in AVIs, applicants would likely only have to use such tactics if questions are directed at surfacing their weaknesses or explaining how they faced difficult situations (e.g., failures, negative feedback) in the past (Lukacik et al., 2022). We thus specifically included such questions in our study. Honest defensive IM should be more prevalent in countries high in individualism but low in power distance, because they value freedom of expression, broadmindedness, and equality (Hofstede, 1980; House et al., 2004) thus making individuals more comfortable admitting and communicating negative qualities. Indeed, individuals from high-individualism and low-power distance cultures (i.e., U.S. vs. Japan, China, or Korea) show a higher propensity to apologize for and justify character weaknesses (Barnlund & Yoshioka, 1990; Guan et al., 2009). Arseneault and Roulin (2021) also noted that regions higher in gender egalitarianism (e.g., Scandinavia, Anglo) should value honesty and sincerity over face-saving and should be more comfortable engaging in honest defensive IM. Overall, they proposed that interviewees from cultures high in

gender egalitarianism but lower in power distance and in-group collectivism would engage in more honest defensive IM.

Hypothesis 3: The cultural dimension of a) gender egalitarianism is expected to be positively related to the use of honest defensive IM, while b) in-group collectivism, and c) power distance are expected to be negatively related to honest defensive IM.

Deceptive self-focused IM. Deceptive self-focused IM is a form of faking, where applicants deceptively promote their qualifications, skills, or experiences (Bourdage et al., 2018; Levashina & Campion, 2007). It includes two types of tactics: slight image creation (embellishing, tailoring, or fit enhancing), and extensive image creation (constructing, inventing, or borrowing). Some research has investigated cross-cultural differences in applicant faking. For example, Fell and König (2016) examined applicants' faking on personality tests across 43 countries, finding positive associations between faking and uncertainty avoidance, future orientation, and assertiveness, but negative associations with in-group collectivism and humane orientation. Applicants from high performance orientation cultures seemed to also engage in more deceptive self-focused IM, because it allows them to stand out in competitive environments (König & Hafsteinsson, 2011). Applicants from high power distance societies also have more positive attitudes toward faking, for instance to impress a person of power such as an interviewer (Fell et al., 2016). Building on this literature, Arseneault and Roulin (2021) proposed that interviewees from cultures high in performance orientation, power distance, assertiveness, future orientation, in-group collectivism and uncertainty avoidance but low in humane orientation and gender egalitarianism would engage in more deceptive self-focused IM.

Hypothesis 4: The cultural dimensions of a) performance orientation, b) assertiveness, c) future orientation, d) in-group collectivism, e) power distance, and f) uncertainty avoidance are

expected to be positively related to the use of deceptive self-focused IM, while g) humane orientation, and h) gender egalitarianism are expected to be negatively related to deceptive self-focused IM.

Deceptive other-focused IM. Deceptive other-focused IM tactics include expressing values or beliefs that are aligned with those held by the interviewer or organizations even if one does not truly agree with those, as well as insincerely praising the interviewer or hiring organization (Levashina & Campion, 2007). Fell et al. (2016) found that applicants' attitudes towards such tactics were more positive in cultures high on power distance or in-group collectivism, but low on gender egalitarianism. Arseneault and Roulin (2021) largely proposed that these relationships would translate to actual deceptive other-focused IM behaviors.

Hypothesis 5: The cultural dimensions of a) in-group collectivism, and b) power distance are expected to be positively related to the use of deceptive other-focused IM, while c) gender egalitarianism is expected to be negatively related to deceptive other-focused IM.

Deceptive defensive IM. Deceptive defensive IM tactics include image protection behaviors such as distancing oneself from negative events or experiences, masking one's lack of qualifications, and omitting elements that could hurt one's chances to be hired (Bourdage et al., 2018; Levashina & Campion, 2007). Individuals from collectivistic cultures show stronger tendencies to attribute failures to external causes to meet role expectations (Kim & Nam, 1998), and rely on self-protective or 'face-saving' behaviors in communication to maintain in-group social status (Merkin et al., 2014). In addition, Fell et al. (2016) found that attitudes towards "mild" forms of interview faking were more positive in cultures higher in power distance and uncertainty avoidance. Finally, Taylor et al. (2015; 2017) found that denials were more prevalent in higher power distance, collectivism, and performance orientated culture (i.e., Arab and

Pakistani but not in White British populations). Overall, Arseneault and Roulin (2021) argued that interviewees from cultures high in in-group collectivism, power distance, and uncertainty avoidance but lower in gender egalitarianism would engage in more deceptive defensive IM.

Hypothesis 6: The cultural dimensions of a) in-group collectivism, b) power distance, and c) uncertainty avoidance are expected to be positively related to the use of deceptive defensive IM, while d) gender egalitarianism is expected to be negatively related to deceptive defensive IM.

IM use and Interview Performance

It is important to consider how interviewees' use of IM tactics is related to interview performance in an AVI context and across cultures. Research on the relationship between IM use and interview performance is almost entirely based on FTF interviews. For example, initial FTF IM research found that using IM in general was an effective strategy, with self-focused tactics being more strongly associated with performance ratings than other-focused or defensive tactics (e.g., Barrick et al., 2009; Levashina et al., 2014). Other work suggests that honest self-promotion and ingratiation both tend to be positively related to interview outcomes (Amaral et al., 2019; Bourdage et al., 2018). A recent review (Melchers et al., 2020) reported relationships between deceptive IM tactics use and interview performance ranging from positive to negative. And, a meta-analysis found that the overall relationship was close to zero (Ho et al., 2021). Interestingly, only two studies have explored the IM tactics – performance relationship in AVIs. One German study (Basch et al., 2021) found no relationship for any form of IM, whereas a North-American one found a positive effect of honest IM but no effect for deceptive IM on interview performance ratings (Roulin et al., 2023). Yet, such studies did not include cross-cultural samples, which is relevant given that the cultural distance between interviewers and interviewees can significantly impact how performance evaluations are assigned (Arseneault &

Roulin, 2023). Despite the likelihood of subjective evaluator biases and based on the overall IM-performance literature, we predict that interviewees using more honest IM tactics will (generally) be evaluated more positively. But, given the inconsistent findings for deceptive IM, we pose an open research question:

H7: Honest a) self-focused, b) other-focused, and c) defensive IM will be positively associated with interview performance in AVIs.

Research Question: What is the relationship between deceptive IM tactics (i.e., deceptive self-focused, other-focused, and defensive IM) and interview performance in AVIs?

Methods

Participants

We originally recruited a total of 660 participants from Canada (68), Spain (65), Poland (73), India (69), South Africa (70), Iran (62), Germany (56), Chile (71), Philippines (58), and China (68). Several videos/responses were unusable due to various reasons, most commonly being poor video/audio quality. Participants who skipped or failed to respond to at least three of our eight interview questions were also excluded. After data clean-up, our final sample consisted of 582 participants. The majority of participants were recruited using the Prolific or the Respondent research platforms. However, we also relied on personal academic networks for two countries (i.e., Iran, China). Demographic filters included nationality (of the target country), current country of residence (of the target country) and ethnicity (i.e., only used to recruit Black participants for the South African sample). We also explicitly stated in our study invitations that participants required a minimum upper-intermediate English proficiency to complete the study, given that all interviews were completed in English. Participants that met these criteria were

invited via a URL link to a proprietary AVI platform. All participants were offered an equivalent of approximately \$10-15 USD (i.e., Prolific uses British pounds; Respondent uses USD\$) as financial compensation for successful completion of the study. In addition, to encourage participants to do their best in the AVI (and engage in IM), the top 10% performers in each country were offered an additional financial incentive (equivalent to approximately doubling their base compensation). Table 1 describes key demographic information for our samples across all 10 countries.

Table 1 – Participant Demographics

Country	Male	Female	Total	Age <i>M (SD)</i>	Work Experience	Number of job interviews	Time abroad (years)
Canada	35	29	64	30.7 (11.5)	11.9 (10.3)	11.7 (13.5)	0.6 (2.0)
Chile	36	22	58	26.3 (5.4)	3.7 (4.9)	4.2 (5.7)	1.1 (2.4)
China	37	21	59	26.2 (7.4)	4.5 (5.5)	6.9 (7.4)	6.6 (7.3)
Germany	26	25	51	27.3 (6.2)	5.8 (6.8)	6.4 (8.3)	2.7 (4.8)
India	48	12	60	28.7 (5.8)	6.4 (4.1)	8.3 (7.4)	1.3 (2.9)
Iran	24	28	52	29.3 (5.5)	6.3 (4.6)	3.2 (2.9)	0.4 (1.5)
Philippines	17	36	53	29.2 (6.6)	8.1 (5.9)	9.6 (9.3)	4.1 (7.9)
Poland	35	27	62	24.2 (5.6)	4.3 (4.5)	4.5 (5.9)	0.7 (2.1)
South Africa	32	33	65	29.7 (6.7)	7.3 (6.1)	6.1 (5.1)	2.0 (4.1)
Spain	32	26	58	28.9 (8.5)	7.3 (7.5)	7.1 (9.3)	1.8 (3.0)

Procedure & Interview

Participants were presented with instructions about the interview process and on how to record their interview responses on the AVI platform. They first read a job description for a management trainee position in a multinational bank. They then watched a short-pre-recorded video of the primary investigator, posing as the interviewer, introducing the position and hiring organization, and providing instructions on how to record interview responses. Participants subsequently watched videos of the interviewer asking a series of eight past-behavioral interview questions and video-recorded their responses to each of them. Past-behavioral questions rely on the general principle of decades of psychological research that the best predictor of future

behaviour is past behaviour (Janz, 1982). Questions can be found in the online supplement (Interview Questions) and included three questions aimed at surfacing self-focused IM (e.g., *Tell me about a time when you had to go above and beyond the call of duty in order to get a job done*”), two questions for other-focused IM (“*How does the company culture of being a diverse and global team fit with your values?*”), and three questions targeting defensive IM (“*Can you describe a situation where you received a negative evaluation from your supervisor at work or in school? What was the reason for the evaluation, and how did you handle it?*”). At the end of the interview, participants completed the IM measures and various demographic information including age, gender, work experience, number of interviews, and time living abroad.

Measures

GLOBE scores. We used GLOBE’s societal practices scores (House et al. 2004), extracted from the GLOBE Project website for each of our countries. Germany (West) societal practice scores were used, given at the time GLOBE research was conducted, they divided their sample into Germany (West) and Germany (East). Argentina practice scores were used as proxy for Chile, since GLOBE has no data specific to Chile. Argentina is the country most similar to Chile politically, religiously, and ethnically (Tiano, 1986); as Chile was once connected to Argentina (Tulchin, 2010).

Impression Management. Participants completed a 28-item self-report measure of Honest and Deceptive Impression Management (HIIM-S and IFB-S; Bourdage et al., 2018). Items captured the extent to which various IM tactics were used during their AVI on a 5-point Likert scale (*not at all to all the time*). Sample items of honest IM include honest self-focused IM ($\alpha = .68$; “*I made sure to let the interviewer know about my job credentials*”), honest other-focused IM ($\alpha = .70$; “*I discussed interests I shared in common with the interviewer*”), honest

defensive IM ($\alpha = .62$; “*I gave reasons why I felt I benefited positively from a negative event I was responsible for*”). Deceptive IM included the two types of deceptive self-focused IM - slight image creation ($\alpha = .74$; “*I distorted my answers to emphasize what the interviewer was looking for*”) and extensive image creation ($\alpha = .84$; “*I told fictional stories prepared in advance of the interview to best present my credentials*”), deceptive other-focused IM ($\alpha = .70$; “*I tried to express the same opinions and attitudes as the interviewer*”), and deceptive defensive IM ($\alpha = .73$; “*When asked directly, I did not mention my true reason for quitting previous jobs*”). A complete listing of all reliability coefficients for each measure and country can be found in the online supplement. It is worth noting that these coefficients vary substantially from country to country. We discuss this further in the results section, where we examine the broader issue of measurement invariance across countries.

Interview performance. We developed interview behavior anchored rating scales (BARS) for scoring each applicant’s video responses. BARS have been demonstrated as an effective tool for reducing assimilation effects on selection interview ratings (Lubbe & Nitsche, 2019). Each BARS was developed to evaluate a core competency assessed in the question and related to the job description. For example, the question “*Tell me about a school or work situation where you made a memorable mistake and explain how you handled it?*” assessed resilience and the ability to demonstrate personal growth/learning from past failures. Each BARS captured on how well interviewees demonstrated these competencies on a 1 to 5 scale (see online supplement - BARS). A group of 10 coders (i.e., undergraduate and graduate students in psychology, from a variety of ethnic and cultural backgrounds) were recruited and trained on how to use the BARS (i.e., including practicing scoring on a sample of videos). Two to three coders were then assigned to evaluating the videos for each country. Each coder also scored all

videos for a few extra participants, to have ten participants double-coded in each country to evaluate inter-rater agreement. Intraclass correlation coefficients (ICC(1)) were calculated for each of the eight questions (on data from 55 participants) and ranged from acceptable (.69 for Q8) to excellent (.94 for Q1).¹

Results

Data Quality Checks

We reviewed our data for the presence of univariate and multivariate outliers. We used both Cook's and Mahalanobis' distance, with z-scores of +/- 3.29 as our cut-off point to identify potential outliers (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2013). Participants flagged as outliers under both approaches (i.e., both Cook and Mahalanobis) were investigated. We identified some data entry issues (e.g., a participant reporting being 3 years old; a 25-year-old with 20 years of work experience). Beyond those issues, 7 participants were identified as potential outliers, but we did not find evidence of data error or misrepresentation (i.e., acquiescence, central tendency, disacquiescence) that would justify removing any further participants. We also run our analyses with vs. without those potential outliers, but the results did not change. We thus kept them in the analyses reported below.

Measurement Invariance Testing

Before comparing IM use across countries and examining how IM use is related to GLOBE cultural dimensions, we examined the measurement equivalence of the honest and deceptive IM measures across countries. We followed the recommendations from the

¹ Data was collected and coded in phases because of the time and resources necessary to recruit participants and availability of raters. Overall, 55 participants were double scored to compute ICC across the entire sample, including 10 for the first five countries combined (Canada, Poland, Spain, India, and South Africa), 10 for Philippines, 10 for Chile, 10 for China, 10 for Germany, and 5 for Iran.

measurement literature (i.e., Marsh et al., 2009) and analyzed increasingly restricted models to check configural, metric, and scalar measurement equivalence. First, we tested a model for configural invariance by imposing no constraints except that the same items should significantly load on the same latent variables (i.e., IM tactics) across the ten countries. We tested models for honest and deceptive IM separately, since those are based on different measures (i.e., HIM-S vs. IFB-S). Fit indices were poor for both the honest IM (RMSEA = .101, CFI = .816, TFI = .762) and the deceptive IM models (RMSEA = .119, CFI = .806, TFI = .762). To be comprehensive, we then tested metric invariance by imposing constraints so that the factor loadings/coefficients were equivalent across countries. Again, we tested each model separately. Fit indices were again poor for both the honest IM (RMSEA = .098, CFI = .789, TFI = .775) and the deceptive IM models (RMSEA = .118, CFI = .781, TFI = .766). Finally, we tested scalar invariance by imposing constraints on the factor loadings and intercepts. Fit indices for the honest IM (RMSEA = .112, CFI = .677, TFI = .706) and deceptive IM (RMSEA = .119, CFI = .748, TFI = .762) models were poor. More detailed fit indices for each model can be found in our Online Supplement. These results suggest that the IM measures (or some of their items), which were developed and tested in Western countries, might not work exactly in the same way across cultures.

Further analyses using Wald tests showcased that the invariance issues might be caused by specific items. For instance, for honest IM, lack of invariance was observed for only 3 of 12 items - two honest self-focused IM items (e.g., “I made sure to let the interviewer know about my job credentials”) and one defensive IM item (“I gave reasons why I felt I benefited positively from a negative event I was responsible for”). For deceptive IM, this was the case for only 4 (out of 16) items – two extensive image creation (e.g., “When I did not have a good answer, I

borrowed work experiences of other people and made them sound like my own”), one deceptive ingratiation (“I tried to appear similar to the interviewer in terms of values, attitudes, or beliefs”), and one deceptive defensive IM item (“I covered up some *skeletons in my closet*”). The wording of many of those problematic items was long, complex, or included idioms that non-native speakers might struggle with, which might explain the lack of invariance overall. Yet, this also means that the vast majority of our items functioned equivalently across our ten countries. Overall, it is important to interpret the country differences in IM use presented in the next section with caution, because they could be caused by interviewees responding to the same IM measures somewhat differently.

IM Use Across Countries

Table 2 summarizes correlations among study variables. Table 3 presents the descriptive statistics (Means and SDs) for the use of all seven IM tactics across our 10 countries. Before moving to our formal hypotheses testing, a few preliminary observations can be made. First, interviewees overall engaged more often in honest IM than deceptive IM in their AVIs, with honest self-focused IM ($M = 3.60$) and honest defensive IM ($M = 3.37$) being the most prevalent tactics, whereas the extensive form of deceptive self-focused IM ($M = 1.70$) and deceptive defensive IM ($M = 1.81$) were used more infrequently. Interviewees used both honest ($M = 2.92$) and deceptive ($M = 2.54$) other-focused tactics somewhat sparsely, which can be expected given the one-way nature of AVIs and the absence of a “target” beyond the videos of the interviewer asking the questions. Second, the means in Table 3 highlight similar patterns, and thus limited variability of IM use, across countries. For instance, the mean use of honest self-focused IM ranged from 3.36 (in Chile) to 4.00 (in Iran), and the mean use of extensive deceptive self-focused IM ranged from 1.35 (in the Philippines) to 1.91 (in Poland). Across all IM tactics,

country differences in means were systematically smaller than 0.70 points (on a 1-5 scale). In contrast, we see substantial SDs within countries for the various IM tactics (ranging from .56 for honest self-focused IM in Iran, to 1.10 for extensive deceptive self-focused IM in Germany), providing initial evidence that there might be more variability within than between countries. This might limit the possibility for our country-level predictors (i.e. cultural dimensions) to explain meaningful portions of variance in IM use. We will circle back to that in our discussion.

Cultural Dimensions and IM Use

Because of the nested nature of the data, with interviewees ($n = 582$; level 1) nested within countries ($n = 10$; level 2), we used multi-level modeling to examine the relationships between cultural dimensions and IM use (Hypotheses 1-6). We created and tested comparative models following the general process suggested by Hox et al. (2018): We started with null/empty models (M0 - with random intercepts). These models also allowed us to also test the amount of variance explained at the country level (via ICCs, which ranged from .01 to .07). We then included fixed effects for level-2 predictors (i.e., GLOBE practice scores) with randomly varying intercepts (M1). Results for these M1 models are presented in Table 4. For all IM measures, except deceptive other-focused IM, the Chi-square difference tests for log likelihood showed that M1 provided better fit than M0 (see bottom part of Table 4). We used maximum likelihood (ML) estimators.

Table 2.
Correlations Among Main Study Variables.

	M	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
1 Age	28.1	7.43											
2 Years of work experience	6.59	6.69	.87**										
3 Number of interviews	7.21	8.58	.33**	.34**									
4 Years living abroad	2.17	4.79	.15**	.11*	.15**								
5 Interview performance	2.98	0.92	.04	.05	.16**	.16**							
6 Honest self-focused	3.60	0.79	.04	.05	.09*	-.01	.14**						
7 Honest other-focused	2.92	0.90	-.12**	-.14**	-.04	-.08	.07	.49**					
8 Honest defensive	3.37	0.83	-.02	.00	.02	-.06	.15**	.41**	.37**				
9 Deceptive self-focused (slight)	2.03	0.88	-.18**	-.17**	.01	-.05	-.10*	.11**	.32**	.00			
10 Deceptive self-focused (extensive)	1.70	0.94	-.10*	-.11**	-.06	-.08	-.16**	.07	.20**	-.01	.64**		
11 Deceptive other-focused	2.54	0.89	-.12**	-.14**	-.02	-.07	-.07	.29**	.60**	.19**	.59**	.48**	
12 Deceptive defensive	1.81	0.82	-.13**	-.15**	-.05	-.09*	-.14**	.13**	.29**	.02	.62**	.59**	.51**

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$.

Table 3.
Means and Standard Deviations for Impression Management Use and Interview Performance Across 10 Countries

	Honest self-focused	Honest other-focused	Honest defensive	Deceptive self-focused (slight)	Deceptive self-focused (extensive)	Deceptive other-focused	Deceptive defensive	Interview performance
Canada	3.40 (.87)	2.55 (.93)	3.23 (.87)	1.96 (.94)	1.46 (.81)	2.44 (.91)	1.59 (.69)	3.18 (.82)
Chile	3.36 (.80)	2.99 (.90)	3.27 (.86)	2.14 (.80)	1.83 (1.03)	2.51 (.95)	1.83 (.79)	3.00 (.83)
China	3.72 (.77)	3.11 (.93)	3.49 (.83)	1.94 (.91)	1.82 (.89)	2.64 (.83)	1.86 (.92)	3.62 (.62)
Germany	3.39 (.65)	2.71 (.84)	3.36 (.74)	2.29 (.84)	1.86 (1.10)	2.46 (.81)	1.78 (.77)	2.87 (.58)
India	3.98 (.73)	3.25 (.89)	3.81 (.70)	2.00 (1.02)	1.68 (.97)	2.85 (.99)	1.85 (1.03)	2.75 (.93)
Iran	4.00 (.56)	3.13 (.93)	3.14 (.75)	2.15 (.91)	1.83 (.94)	2.44 (.83)	1.93 (.80)	2.91 (.80)
Philippines	3.78 (.84)	3.11 (.83)	3.59 (.84)	1.84 (.72)	1.35 (.70)	2.51 (.90)	1.74 (.75)	3.64 (.74)
Poland	3.48 (.72)	2.91 (.84)	3.10 (.74)	2.31 (.82)	1.91 (1.03)	2.67 (.81)	2.06 (.81)	2.51 (.70)
South Africa	3.45 (.82)	2.86 (.90)	3.52 (.91)	1.64 (.66)	1.40 (.75)	2.42 (.97)	1.65 (.74)	3.20 (.86)
Spain	3.45 (.79)	2.62 (.78)	3.13 (.74)	2.12 (.94)	1.87 (.96)	2.47 (.80)	1.85 (.80)	2.65 (.74)
Full Sample	3.60 (.79)	2.92 (.90)	3.37 (.83)	2.03 (.88)	1.70 (.94)	2.54 (.89)	1.81 (.82)	2.98 (.92)

Hypothesis 1 predicted that honest self-focused IM would be *positively* related to (a) performance orientation and (b) power distance, but *negatively* related to (c) humane orientation, (d) in-group collectivism, and (e) gender egalitarianism. Results showed that the use of honest self-focused IM was significantly *negatively* associated with assertiveness ($b = -.55$, $SE = .22$, $p = .01$), marginally *positively* associated with performance orientation ($b = .40$, $SE = .23$, $p = .08$), whereas all the other GLOBE dimensions were not significant. In other words, applicants from less assertive and more performance-oriented cultures/countries engaged in more honest self-promotion. These findings provide some support for H1a, but no support for H1b-e.

Hypothesis 2 predicted that honest other-focused IM would be *positively* related to (a) humane orientation and (b) gender egalitarianism, but *negatively* related to (c) assertiveness, (d) in-group collectivism, and (e) power distance. Results showed that honest other-focused IM was significantly *positively* associated with in-group collectivism only ($b = .27$, $SE = .12$, $p = .03$). So, applicants from more collectivistic cultures/countries engaged in more honest ingratiation, flattery, etc., which was opposite to H2d (and overall H2 was not supported).

Hypothesis 3 predicted that honest defensive IM would be *positively* related to (a) gender egalitarianism, but *negatively* related to (b) in-group collectivism and (c) power distance. Results showed that honest defensive IM was significantly *positively* associated with future orientation ($b = .61$, $SE = .18$, $p = .001$) and in-group collectivism ($b = .31$, $SE = .11$, $p = .005$), but *negatively* associated with performance orientation ($b = -.81$, $SE = .24$, $p = .001$). So, applicants from more future-oriented and collectivistic, but less performance-oriented cultures/countries engaged in more image repair, justification, etc. Therefore, H3 was not supported.

Hypothesis 4 predicted that deceptive self-focused IM would be *positively* related to (a) performance orientation, (b) assertiveness, (c) future orientation, (d) in-group collectivism, (e)

power distance, and (f) uncertainty avoidance, but *negatively* related to (g) humane orientation and (h) gender egalitarianism. We examined that separately for slight and extensive forms of the tactic. Results showed that none of the GLOBE dimensions were associated with extensive image creation. This could be because it was the least used tactic in our samples, and there was thus very limited variance to explain. However, slight image creation was significantly *positively* associated with power distance ($b = .37$, $SE = .16$, $p = .02$), but *negatively* associated with humane orientation ($b = -.37$, $SE = .17$, $p = .04$). So, applicants from cultures/countries with higher power distance, but less humanistic engaged in more embellishment, exaggeration, etc. Those two effects are consistent with H4e and g, but H4a-d, f, and h received no support.

Hypothesis 5 predicted that deceptive other-focused IM would be *positively* related to (a) in-group collectivism and (b) power distance, but *negatively* related to (c) gender egalitarianism. Results showed that none of those dimensions were related with deceptive other-focused IM, thus providing no support for H5. However, this tactic was significantly *negatively* associated with assertiveness ($b = -.69$, $SE = .26$, $p = .008$), and marginally *positively* associated with future orientation ($b = .35$, $SE = .20$, $p = .08$). Thus, applicants from less assertive but more future-oriented cultures/countries engaged in more deceptive ingratiation, flattery, etc.

Finally, Hypothesis 6 predicted that deceptive defensive IM would be *positively* related to (a) in-group collectivism, (b) power distance, and (c) uncertainty avoidance, but *negatively* related to (d) gender egalitarianism. Results showed that deceptive defensive IM was significantly *negatively* associated with humane orientation only ($b = -.33$, $SE = .17$, $p = .05$). So, applicants from more humanistic cultures/countries engaged in less image protection (e.g., hiding or distancing themselves from past mistakes/failures). H6 was thus not supported.²

² We note that we originally explored country differences in IM use via an alternative approach. This involved computing a predicted score for each IM tactic for each country based on Arseneault and Roulin's (2021)

Table 4.
Multilevel Models with Country-level GLOBE Scores Predicting Interviewees' Impression Management Tactics Use

	Honest Self-focused	Honest Other-focused	Honest Defensive	Deceptive Self-focused (Slight)	Deceptive Self-focused (Extensive)	Deceptive Other-focused	Deceptive Defensive
(Intercept)	3.25 (2.29)	2.82 (2.65)	3.00 (2.40)	2.01 (2.58)	4.64 (2.76)	5.69 (2.65)	2.57 (2.41)
Country-level GLOBE score							
Performance Orientation	0.40 [†] (0.23)	-0.18 (0.27)	-0.81** (0.24)	0.29 (0.26)	0.11 (0.28)	-0.41 (0.27)	0.13 (0.25)
Assertiveness	-0.55* (0.22)	-0.25 (0.26)	-0.19 (0.23)	-0.41 (0.26)	-0.28 (0.27)	-0.69** (0.26)	-0.37 (0.24)
Future Orientation	0.23 (0.17)	0.10 (0.20)	0.61** (0.18)	-0.04 (0.20)	-0.23 (0.21)	0.35 [†] (0.20)	0.01 (0.18)
Humane Orientation	-0.23 (0.16)	0.00 (0.18)	0.02 (0.16)	-0.37* (0.17)	-0.28 (0.19)	-0.27 (0.18)	-0.33* (0.17)
In-Group Collectivism	0.16 (0.11)	0.27* (0.12)	0.31** (0.11)	-0.08 (0.12)	-0.01 (0.13)	0.15 (0.12)	0.13 (0.11)
Gender Egalitarianism	-0.06 (0.17)	-0.05 (0.19)	-0.03 (0.17)	0.23 (0.19)	-0.11 (0.20)	0.09 (0.19)	0.14 (0.18)
Power Distance	0.18 (0.14)	-0.02 (0.17)	-0.06 (0.15)	0.37* (0.16)	0.03 (0.17)	-0.00 (0.17)	0.07 (0.15)
Uncertainty Avoidance	-0.15 (0.13)	0.08 (0.15)	0.21 (0.13)	-0.02 (0.14)	0.02 (0.15)	0.03 (0.15)	-0.00 (0.13)
Model fit indices							
AIC	1343.83	1499.90	1389.20	1468.81	1546.41	1497.23	1414.58
-2 Log Likelihood	1321.83	1477.90	1367.20	1446.81	1524.41	1475.23	1392.58
χ^2 (fixed effects vs. null model)	24.73**	14.05 [†]	22.97**	19.60*	19.76*	12.45	13.41 [†]
ICC (based on null model)	0.07	0.05	0.06	0.03	0.03	0.01	0.01

Note. $N = 578$. Multilevel models based on maximum likelihood (ML) estimators. Values are unstandardized estimates (with standard errors in parentheses) based on models including level-2 fixed effects (country-level GLOBE practice scores), with randomly varying intercepts. None of the models with randomly varying slopes demonstrated better fit, and are thus not presented here. ** $p < .01$, * $p < .05$, [†] $p < .10$.

IM Use and Interview Performance Ratings

We also used a multi-level approach with ML estimators to test Hypothesis 7 and explore RQ1. We first created a null model (M0 - with only random intercepts), which highlighted a substantial portion of variance in performance at the country level ($ICC = .17$). We then tested a M1 model with fixed effects for level-1 predictors (IM use) and randomly varying intercepts. The Chi-square difference tests for log likelihood showed that M1 provided better fit than M0 ($\chi^2 = 45.37, df = 8, p < .001$). We also explored two alternative models. M2 included level-2 means of predictors (i.e., country-level IM means) with randomly varying intercepts, to examine if the effects of IM did compound across countries. However, there was no improvement in model fit between M2 and M1 ($\Delta\chi^2 = 7.99, df = 7, p = .33$) and none of the country-level IM means were significant predictors of performance. Finally, M3 included randomly varying intercepts and slopes for IM use. This allowed us to test if the effect of IM on performance varied across countries. However, M3 also did not outperform M1 in terms of model fit ($\Delta\chi^2 = 2.14, df = 7, p = .95$). M1 was thus used to test H7 and RQ1, and results are presented in Table 5.

Table 5.
Multilevel Models with Impression Management Tactics Use Predicting Interview Performance

Variable	b	SE	β	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>
(Intercept)	2.58	0.21		12.19	<.001
Honest Self-focused	0.13	0.05	0.12	2.55	.01
Honest Other-focused	0.04	0.05	0.04	0.75	.46
Honest Defensive	0.07	0.04	0.07	1.52	.13
Deceptive Self-focused (Slight)	0.10	0.06	0.10	1.80	.07
Deceptive Self-focused (Extensive)	-0.09	0.05	-0.10	-1.99	.05
Deceptive Other-focused	-0.08	0.06	-0.09	-1.51	.13
Deceptive Defensive	-0.10	0.03	-0.09	-1.81	.07

Note. $N = 578$. Multilevel model based on the maximum likelihood (ML) estimator - including level-1 fixed effects (IM use), with randomly varying intercepts. $AIC = 1332.79$, $-2 \text{ Log Likelihood} = 1312.79$, χ^2 (vs. null model) = 45.37, $p < .001$. $ICC = 0.17$ (based on null model). Models with level-2 means of predictors (i.e., country-level IM means) or with randomly varying slopes did not demonstrate better fit (or any significant effects) and are thus not presented here.

We found a significant positive effect of honest self-focused IM ($b = .13$, $SE = .05$, $p = .01$) and a significant negative effect of extensive deceptive self-focused IM ($b = -.09$, $SE = .05$, $p < .05$) on interview performance. In addition, two relationships approached significance: slight deceptive self-focused IM ($b = .10$, $SE = .06$, $p = .07$) and deceptive defensive IM ($b = -.10$, $SE = .05$, $p = .07$). However, interview performance was unrelated to honest or deceptive other-focused IM and to honest defensive IM. Overall, these results provide support for H7a, highlighting the benefits of using honest self-promotion in an AVI context for applicants from various cultures. In contrast, we found no support for H7bc, with positive but weak and non-significant effects for the other forms of honest IM. Regarding RQ1, the effects of deceptive tactics were small and inconsistent.³

Discussion

Main Findings and Theoretical Contributions

This study investigated cross-cultural differences in IM use and relationships between IM use and interview performance, across 10 countries in an AVI context. Our research is the first to empirically test the key propositions from Arseneault and Roulin's (2021) recent CCIM model based on the GLOBE framework. It expands on initial cross-cultural work examining simple attitudes toward interview IM in general (e.g., Fell et al., 2016), or comparisons limited to a few countries (e.g., Bye et al., 2014) and/or a small number of IM behaviors (e.g., Sandal et al., 2014). It is also one of the rare attempts to examine IM use in AVI context, which is both conceptually and practically important since the way interviewees behave and perform likely

³ We also conducted simple regression analyses without taking into account the nested/multilevel nature of the data. We report the results in the Online Supplement. The results were largely similar to those presented here, showing a significant positive effect for honest self-focused IM and a significant negative effect for extensive deceptive self-focused IM. The main difference is that the positive effect for honest defensive IM became stronger and significant.

differs in AVIs vs. FTF (or even video conference) interviews (Lukacik et al., 2022).

Importantly, it goes beyond initial AVIs studies (Basch et al., 2021; Roulin et al., 2023), which only reported honest vs. deceptive IM use in general, by examining IM use and associations with performance for seven types of IM tactics. In summary, to the best of our knowledge, this study represents the first examination of how interviewees use a comprehensive set of honest and deceptive IM tactics derived from prior IM work (e.g., Bourdage et al., 2018; Levashina & Campion 2007) across a large number of cultures and incorporating novel technologies. We discuss our findings, and how they connect with (and contribute to) the existing literature on interview IM and CCIM below.

Self-focused IM. Overall, we found only limited support for the predicted cultural differences in interviewees' use of honest and deceptive self-focused IM, which were derived from Arseneault and Roulin's (2021) CCIM model. Instead of large cultural differences, we did find evidence of a common cross-cultural understanding for the importance of honestly self-promoting in an AVI context. Indeed, honest self-focused IM (alongside honest defensive IM) was consistently the most employed IM tactic across all 10 countries. This finding is aligned with Lukacik et al.'s (2022) prediction that AVIs may encourage interviewees to engage in higher levels of self-promotion (than normally found in FTF interviews) to compensate for the limited opportunities to employ other-focused tactics given the absence of a live interviewer.

Among the few significant relationships between cultural dimensions and IM use, and confirming Arseneault and Roulin's (2021) predictions, interviewees from countries higher on performance orientation engaged in more honest-self focused IM. Yet, we did not find evidence for their other predictions for this tactic (e.g., about power distance or collectivism), and assertiveness was unexpectedly negatively associated with its use. This could be because the

confrontational and aggressive component of the assertiveness GLOBE dimension are less compatible with interviewees' attempts to honestly highlight their qualifications (but more compatible with deceptive attempts).

When it comes to deceptive IM tactics, we found that interviewees from countries with more power distance, but less humanistic cultures engaged in more slight image creation (i.e., embellishment, exaggeration), consistent with Arseneault and Roulin's (2021) predictions. However, none of the other expected relationships (e.g., with uncertainty avoidance or gender egalitarianism) were observed. Our findings therefore partly differ from previous empirical CCIM research. For instance, Fell et al. (2016) found attitudes toward faking (conceptualized largely as deceptive self-focused IM) to be more negative in cultures higher on uncertainty avoidance and gender egalitarianism, but more positive in cultures higher on power distance and in-group collectivism. But countries such as India, China, and the Philippines (i.e., high power distance and in-group collectivism) were amongst the lowest in deceptive self-focused IM use in our study (while Poland or Germany engaged slightly more in such tactics). It could be that faking intentions do not always translate into actual behaviors, or that cultural factors have less importance in very-structured AVIs than in FTF interviews.

The limited relationships between GLOBE dimensions and self-focused IM use also suggest that additional factors beyond culture may be at play. For instance, past CCIM research showed that socio-economic factors may also influence IM behaviors (König et al., 2021). In our study, the three countries with the highest levels of honest self-focused IM (i.e., India, Iran, and the Philippines) also have the lowest GDP per capita. In socioeconomic conditions where resources (e.g., jobs) are scarce, only those who can present their qualifications in a positive light can 'stand out' from the crowd. Yet, our findings suggest that interviewees aim to achieve this by

relying on honest tactics. Indeed, interviewees from those three countries did not engage in more deceptive self-focused IM than their counterparts from other countries. And, overall, interviewees from all countries engaged in more honest than deceptive self-focused IM, which is consistent with past FTF interview research (e.g., Bourdage et al., 2018). It is also aligned with predictions from previous theoretical models of faking that more structured interview formats should reduce applicants' opportunity to fake (Levashina & Campion, 2006; Roulin et al., 2016).

In line with previous FTF literature (Barrick et al., 2009; Bourdage et al., 2018; Ho et al., 2021) and some recent AVI work (Roulin et al., 2023), we found that the more interviewees engaged in honest self-focused IM, the higher the interview performance ratings they received. However, when similar IM tactics are used deceptively, our findings suggest that they may lead to negative evaluations. That said, this was especially true for extensive image creation, while slight image creation was somewhat positively related to performance. These findings are thus only partly consistent with the overall null relationship from Ho et al.'s (2021) meta-analysis. The slight differences might be due to the cross-cultural nature of the data, the AVI context, the use of a structured evaluation system (i.e., with standardized BARS), or a combination of such factors. In addition, interviewees engage in more deceptive self-focused tactics when they perceive that they are less qualified for the job and/or find the interview more difficult (Bourdage et al., 2018). Because many of our participants likely had little prior experience working in the financial sector and/or as a manager, they may have found the questions difficult, struggled to identify relevant work experiences to demonstrate their fit for the job they interviewed for (i.e., management trainee in an international bank), and thus felt pressured to engage deceptively to compensate for their limited qualifications. Yet, they might not have been able to do so

effectively enough to achieve high performance ratings. Future research is necessary to disentangle these effects.

Other-focused IM. Overall, we found no support for the predicted cultural differences in interviewees' use of honest and deceptive other-focused IM derived from Arseneault and Roulin's (2021) CCIM model. However, some GLOBE dimensions significantly predicted other-focused IM use. For example, we found that applicants from more collectivistic cultures engaged in more honest-other focused IM (whereas we predicted the opposite). Specifically, India, China, Iran, and the Philippines, reported the highest levels of use (with means ranging from 3.11 to 3.25). This finding could be explained by the same reasons described within our earlier discussion of how socioeconomic factors (perhaps more so than cultural values) may have played a role in motivating participants to use honest ingratiation or other-enhancement tactics to 'stand out' (König et al., 2021). We also found that assertiveness was negatively associated with deceptive other-focused IM use, again something we did not predict. It could be that attempts to deceptively praise the interviewer or highlight similarities with the hiring organizations is viewed as a way to fake without being very assertive, aggressive, or confrontational, and thus more acceptable in low-assertiveness countries. However, we need to emphasize that the means for all countries were extremely similar for deceptive other-focused IM, ranging from 2.42 (South Africa) to 2.85 (India), suggesting that culture perhaps plays a smaller-than-expected role in how interviewees deceptively try to ingratiate, at least in an AVI context.

Interestingly, although interviewees engaged in other-focused IM less than in self-focused IM, they still did use such tactics (e.g., means were 2.92 for honest and 2.54 for deceptive, which are largely similar to past FTF research, such as Bourdage et al., 2018). This is likely the result of including a video introduction and recordings of an interviewer asking the

questions (vs. written questions), which is consistent with propositions from Lukacik et al. (2022) that including such AVI design elements can increase social presence and thus provide a target for the applicant to ingratiate. Basch et al. (2020) reported that social presence and intentions to use IM were lower in AVIs than other traditional interview forms, but our findings demonstrate that video materials can help re-introduce some form of social presence in AVIs and help with using other-focused IM.

However, other-focused IM use was largely unrelated to interview performance in an AVI context, which differs from research in FTF interviews (Barrick et al., 2009; Levashina et al., 2014; Bourdage et al., 2018). There could be several explanations for that finding. First, past meta-analyses show that other-focused IM has a much smaller association with interview performance in structured interviews ($r = .13$ in Levashina et al., 2014) than in interviews more broadly ($r = .20$ in Barrick et al., 2009). AVIs are very structured interviews by nature (Lukacik et al., 2022). For example, similar to highly structured FTF interviews, AVIs offer no opportunity for rapport-building between the interviewer and the interviewee, also restrict probing, and applicants cannot ask questions (while most FTF interviews offer an opportunity for this at the end). In addition, in our study interview performance was rated using BARS. Such standardized rating scales focus on assessing whether interviewees possessed specific job-relevant skills and competences (i.e., person-job fit), which likely further limited the potential impact of ingratiation attempts that are often used to emphasize person-organization fit (see Kristof-Brown et al., 2002). If interviewees' ability to effectively use other-focused IM is job-relevant, for instance when recruiting employees for positions where effective ingratiation use may be highly sought after (i.e., sales, consulting), our findings suggest that other rating criteria must be used, or AVIs might not be the ideal medium. Second, effective other-focused IM is

customized to the interviewer's preferences and adapted based on interviewers' reactions. However, despite the presence of information about the interviewer in the introduction video, interviewees could not directly ingratiate the interviewer nor saw the interviewer's reactions to their IM attempts. For instance, some interviewees might have tried to praise the interviewer (or organization), but without any feedback from the interviewer, they might have been less confident – and ultimately less effective.

Defensive IM. Overall, our hypothesized predictions for both honest and deceptive forms of IM were not supported. However, we did find significant differences in their use across countries and associations with some GLOBE dimensions. First, we found that applicants from more future-oriented and collectivistic, but less performance-oriented cultures/countries engaged in more honest defensive IM (i.e., image repair, justification). This finding is somewhat intuitive, in that applicants from performance-oriented cultures could view taking responsibility for their mistakes/failures as a sign of weakness. In contrast, future-oriented and collectivistic cultures that rely on team harmony and cohesion, may find it more acceptable/expected to reflect on one's recent failures, and learn from one's mistakes to do better in the future. This line of thinking also supports why humane orientation (i.e., being fair and altruistic in order to be rewarded by members of a collective) was negatively associated with deceptive defensive IM.

Overall, we found that interviewees regularly engaged in defensive IM, which was expected given that several questions were designed to elicit such behaviors (e.g., talking about a past experience receiving a negative evaluation). Yet, interviewees relied on honest tactics (i.e., overall $M = 3.37$ across countries) much more so than deceptive ones ($M = 1.81$). This confirms Melchers et al.'s (2020) proposition that faking is less common than honest IM also in an AVI context. In addition, we found that honest and deceptive defensive IM had somewhat opposite

(but also weak) relationships with interview performance. Honestly acknowledging one's weaknesses and taking responsibility for one's past mistakes was very weakly (and non-significantly) associated with higher performance ratings, whereas downplaying or hiding such weakness or mistakes was weakly (and just non-significantly) associated with lower ratings. Like for self-focused IM, these results are broadly aligned with past work for in-person interviews, which has generally found weak positive effects for honest, but no effect for deceptive defensive IM (e.g., Bourdage et al., 2018; Ho et al., 2021). However, the smaller effects for defensive honest IM could be explained by the fact that interviewees' attempts to take responsibility for or justify past issues might not have been enough to demonstrate competencies such as resilience or perseverance in our study.

Practical Implications

Organizations currently engaged in (or aspiring to engage in) cross-cultural recruitment and selection using virtual technologies can benefit from our research findings in the following ways. AVIs can overcome the challenges of recruiting applicants from various time-zones, and it is clear from our research that linguistically proficient English speakers (in addition to other languages) can be found almost anywhere. Further, our research demonstrates that applicants from all over the world recognize the importance of honestly self-promoting, and likely possess the capability of highlighting their skills and abilities in AVIs. Despite some initial concerns that AVIs could be particularly prone to applicant faking (e.g., Lukacik et al., 2022), our findings suggest that they appear to rather facilitate honest IM from interviewees. Thus, HR professionals or hiring managers seeking structured interview approaches would benefit from exploring AVI use. However, it is important for practitioners to also understand the limitations of AVIs. Given their asynchronous structured nature, it is very difficult (if not impossible) for interviewees to

engage in rapport building or effectively demonstrate other interpersonal skills. This could reduce the value of AVIs to assess such skills, for instance for positions that require interpersonal savvy-ness. For example, positions that fall under a sales, consulting, or even conflict resolution domain may require other-focused skills (i.e., ingratiation, opinion conformity, empathy) that applicants are restricted from using in AVIs. Organisations interested in using AVIs as a selection tool for such jobs might need to consider complementing them with live interviews or other tools.

Our findings also have several implications for job seekers/applicants from various cultures. First, technology has made it possible to reach geographic job markets that were previously unattainable. The mock position created in this study recruited participants from 10 countries for a position located in North America. For those job seekers who are inexperienced with virtual recruiting platforms, our findings also shed some light on the behavioral strategies they can employ to improve their interview evaluations. For example, they have a wide array of impression management tactics, from honest to deceptive, self-focused to other-focused, at their disposal. But our findings shows that not all of these tactics are similarly associated with interview performance ratings. For instance, applicants should be encouraged to focus their effort on honest self-focused, but avoid deceptive tactics, to succeed in AVIs.

Limitations and Future Research Directions

This research has several limitations and associated directions for future research. First, although we made efforts to design our AVI to be as realistic as possible (provide a job description, use job-relevant questions, provide a video introduction to the company and interviewer), participants were aware that the interview was for research purposes, thus creating a ‘low stakes’ interview in comparison to that of a real job application. These low stakes may

have affected participants' motivation to engage in IM (and especially deceptive tactics) or to perform (although the financial bonus for top performance might have helped). In addition, our participants came from various educational and socio-economic backgrounds, meaning that they varied in their level of qualifications for the (mock) position, and many would not necessarily have applied for a similar position in real life. Our findings should thus be replicated with actual job applicants completing high-stakes interviews for a job they chose to apply for.

Second, all interviews were conducted in English. This allowed us to collect data (i.e., IM use, performance ratings) in a convenient manner, that were easily comparable across countries. However, issues related to measurement invariance, and lower internal consistency reliabilities for some IM tactics in some countries, suggest that the HIIM-S / IFB-S scales were interpreted differently cross-culturally overall. Although invariance issues were largely caused by a few specific items (as highlighted by the Wald tests), this also means that the vast majority of our items functioned equivalently across our ten countries. However, we encourage future CCIM researchers to revisit some items and/or develop and validate IM measures that are truly equivalent and comparable across cultures.

Third, for some interviewees (e.g., from Canada and to some extent South Africa or India), they could engage in IM in their first language (or at least an official language of their home country), whereas others were interviewing in their second (or perhaps even third or more) language. This means that our findings about cross-cultural IM differences are limited to IM use in English, and some of the observed cross-cultural differences (or lack thereof) could have been impacted by the language skills of some individuals. For instance, König et al. (2012) reported higher deceptive IM use in Chinese vs. Western-European applicants, which was not replicated in our study. This could be because Chinese interviewees found it more difficult to

embellish their responses or to deceptively praise the organization when speaking in English than in Chinese. Overall, future research should translate (and validate) existing IM measures in various languages and replicate our findings with participants completing their interview in their first language.

Fourth, we observed somewhat lower internal consistency reliabilities for some of our IM measures ($\alpha = .68$ for honest self-focused; $\alpha = .62$ for honest defensive), but those were largely caused by particularly low reliabilities for specific IM tactics in specific countries (e.g., honest self-focused IM in Iran or honest defensive IM in India). In line with previous two points, it is possible that some items were more difficult to interpret/understand for non-native English speakers.

Fifth, we made efforts to use AVI design features that could facilitate other-focused IM tactics *use*, which was largely successful (as discussed earlier). Yet, we encourage future AVI research to explore design features that could help with other-focused IM *effectiveness*. This could, for instance, involve using longer video introductions that include several organizational culture elements, as well as divulging personal information of the interviewer (e.g., about their background, values, expertise). We also used the same interviewer (i.e., a North American White male in his 30s) in our videos across all countries. But research could examine whether using an interviewer whose background (i.e., culture, ethnicity, gender, age) matches the interviewees' could help using other-focused IM more effectively. Future research may also benefit from adapting existing IM measures to ensure that they are 'tailored' to an AVI context.

Sixth, we only explored IM use in 10 countries, and relied on somewhat small samples across countries. We selected countries to cover as many GLOBE cultural clusters as possible, but this resulted in relying on one country for some large regions/clusters. For example, South

Africa does not fully represent the African continent (or the Sub-Saharan Africa GLOBE cluster – and it is sometimes attached to the Anglo cluster too), nor does Chile the Latin America region/cluster. Future cross-cultural research could explore additional countries that substantially differ from one another in terms of cultural values to determine whether differences in AVIs exist. More generally, we hope to see additional IM research in an AVI context that includes both mono and cross-cultural studies.

Finally, it is important to acknowledge that our predictions and analyses rely on GLOBE scores from a large cross-cultural survey that is over 20 years old (House et al., 2004). While these scores have been used extensively in cross-cultural research, there is also evidence that cultural values are not static but change over time (e.g., Varnum & Grossmann, 2017) and there are global changes in cultural beliefs and values (Inglehart, 2020). As such GLOBE scores might need to be updated (or confirmed) and CCIM predictions and empirical work adjusted accordingly.

Conclusion

This study examined IM use by participants from 10-culturally distinct countries completing an AVI for a mock bank management associate position. We drew upon the GLOBE cultural framework and previous CCIM models to predict country-level differences. Although our hypotheses were mostly unsupported, we did find evidence to support that applicants from all countries recognized the importance to self-promote in an AVI. Honest (but not deceptive) self-focused IM were beneficial for AVI performance ratings, while other-focused tactics were not, perhaps because of the absence of live feedback in AVIs or the highly structured nature of the evaluation. Deceptive tactics were used the least, and negatively correlated with interview performance. Our research shows that organizations looking to expand their geographical talent

pool(s) could rely on AVIs to evaluate interviewees from all around the world while facilitating honest (but perhaps limiting) deceptive IM. Equally, job seekers who are unfamiliar with AVI technology can gain valuable insights into behavioral strategies that may lead to higher evaluations, and indirectly job offers.

References

- Amaral, A. A., Powell, D. M., & Ho, J. L. (2019). Why does impression management positively influence interview ratings? The mediating role of competence and warmth. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 27(4), 315-327. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ijsa.12260>
- Arseneault, R., & Roulin, N. (2021). A theoretical model of cross-cultural impression management in employment interviews. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 29(3–4), 352–366. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ijsa.12348>
- Arseneault, R., & Roulin, N. (2023). Examining discrimination in asynchronous video interviews: Does cultural distance based on country-of-origin matter?. *Applied Psychology*, 73(1), 185-214. <https://doi.org/10.1111/apps.12471>
- Banks, G. C., Woznyj, H. M., Wesslen, R. S., Frear, K. A., Berka, G., Heggestad, E. D., & Gordon, H. L. (2019). Strategic recruitment across borders: An investigation of multinational enterprises. *Journal of Management*, 45(2), 476-509. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206318764295>
- Barnlund, D. C., & Yoshioka, M. (1990). Apologies: Japanese and American styles. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 14, 193–206. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0147-1767\(90\)90005-H](https://doi.org/10.1016/0147-1767(90)90005-H)
- 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(6), 1394–1411. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0016532>
- Basch, J. M., Melchers, K. G., Kegelmann, J., & Lieb, L. (2020). Smile for the camera! The role of social presence and impression management in perceptions of technology-mediated interviews. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 35(4), 285–299. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JMP-09-2018-0398>
- Basch, J. M., Melchers, K. G., Kurz, A., Krieger, M., & Miller, L. (2021). It takes more than a good camera: Which factors contribute to differences between face-to-face interviews and videoconference interviews regarding performance ratings and interviewee perceptions? *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 36(5), 921–940. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10869-020-09714-3>

- 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(6), 1080–1109. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206308324325>
- Bourdage, J. S., Roulin, N., & Tarraf, R. (2018). “I (might be) just that good”: Honest and deceptive impression management in employment interviews. *Personnel Psychology*, 71(4), 597–632. <https://doi.org/10.1111/peps.12285>
- Bozeman, D. P., & Kacmar, K. M. (1997). A cybernetic model of impression management processes in organizations. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 69(1), 9–30. <https://doi.org/10.1006/obhd.1996.2669>
- Branzei, O. (2002). Cultural explanations of individual preferences for influence tactics in cross cultural encounters. *International Journal of Cross Cultural Management*, 2(2), 203–218. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1470595802002002873>
- Brenner, F. S., Ortner, T. M., & Fay, D. (2016). Asynchronous video interviewing as a new technology in personnel selection: The applicant’s point of view. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 7, 863. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2016.00863>
- Brewer, P., & Venaik, S. (2010). GLOBE practices and values: A case of diminishing marginal utility? *Journal of International Business Studies*, 41(8), 1316–1324.
- Bye, H. H., Horverak, J. G., Sandal, G. M., Sam, D. L., & van de Vijver, F. J. (2014). Cultural fit and ethnic background in the job interview. *International Journal of Cross Cultural Management*, 14(1), 7–26. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1470595813491237>
- Bye, H. H., Sandal, G. M., van de Vijver, F. J. R., Sam, D. L., Çakar, N. D., & Franke, G. H. (2011). Personal values and intended self-presentation during job interviews: A cross-cultural comparison. *Applied Psychology*, 60(1), 160–182. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1464-0597.2010.00432.x>
- Chamorro-Premuzic, T., Winsborough, D., Sherman, R. A., & Hogan, R. (2016). New talent signals: Shiny new objects or a brave new world? *Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, 9(3), 621–640. <https://doi.org/10.1017/iop.2016.6>
- Claus, L. (2019). HR disruption—Time already to reinvent talent management. *BRQ Business Research Quarterly*, 22(3), 207–215. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.brq.2019.04.002>
- Collings, D. G., & Isichei, M. (2018). The shifting boundaries of global staffing: Integrating global talent management, alternative forms of international assignments and non-

- employees into the discussion. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 29(1), 165–187. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09585192.2017.1380064>
- Fell, C. B., & König, C. J. (2016). Cross-cultural differences in applicant faking on personality tests: A 43-nation study. *Applied Psychology*, 65(4), 671–717. <https://doi.org/10.1111/apps.12078>
- Fell, C. B., König, C. J., & Kammerhoff, J. (2016). Cross-cultural differences in the attitude toward applicants' faking in job interviews. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 31(1), 65–85. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10869-015-9407-8>
- Gorman, C. A., Robinson, J., & Gamble, J. S. (2018). An investigation into the validity of asynchronous web-based video employment-interview ratings. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research*, 70(2), 129. <https://doi.org/10.1037/cpb0000102>
- Griswold, K. R., Phillips, J. M., Kim, M. S., Mondragon, N., Liff, J., & Gully, S. M. (2021). Global differences in applicant reactions to virtual interview synchronicity. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 33(15), 2991–3018. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09585192.2021.1917641>
- Guan, X., Park, H. S., & Lee, H. E. (2009). Cross-cultural differences in apology. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 33(1), 32–45. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijintrel.2008.10.001>
- Guchait, P., Ruetzler, T., Taylor, J., & Toldi, N. (2014). Video interviewing: A potential selection tool for hospitality managers – A study to understand applicant perspective. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 36, 90–100. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhm.2013.08.004>
- HireVue. (2021). HireVue customers conduct over 1 million video interviews in just 30 days. <https://www.globenewswire.com/newsrelease/2021/10/19/2316607/0/en/HireVue-customers-conductover-1-million-video-interviews-in-just-30-days.html>
- Ho, J. L., Powell, D. M., & Stanley, D. J. (2021). The relation between deceptive impression management and employment interview ratings: A meta-analysis. *Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science / Revue Canadienne Des Sciences Du Comportement*, 53, 164–174. <https://doi.org/10.1037/cbs0000223>
- Hofstede, G. (1980). Culture and organizations. *International Studies of Management & Organization*, 10(4), 15–41. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/40396875>

- Horverak, J. G., Bye, H. H., Sandal, G. M., & Pallesen, S. (2013). Managers' evaluations of immigrant job applicants: The influence of acculturation strategy on perceived person-organization fit (P-O fit) and hiring outcome. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 44(1), 46–60. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022022111430256>
- House, R., Hanges, P. J., Javidan, M., Dorfman, P. W., & Gupta, V. (Eds.). (2004). *Culture, leadership, and organizations: The GLOBE study of 62 societies*. Sage publications.
- Hox, J. J., Moerbeek, M., & Van De Schoot, R. (2018). The Basic Two-Level Regression Model. In J. J. Hox, M. Moerbeek, & R. Van De Schoot, *Multilevel Analysis* (3rd ed., pp. 8–26). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315650982-2>
- Huffcutt, A. I., Van Iddekinge, C. H., & Roth, P. L. (2011). Understanding applicant behavior in employment interviews: A theoretical model of interviewee performance. *Human Resource Management Review*, 21(4), 353–367. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.hrmr.2011.05.003>
- Janz, T. (1982). Initial comparisons of patterned behavior description interviews versus unstructured interviews. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 67(5), 577–580. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.67.5.577>
- 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(16), 1250–1272. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1559-1816.1992.tb00949.x>
- Kim, J. Y., & Nam, S. H. (1998). The concept and dynamics of face: Implications for organizational behavior in Asia. *Organization Science*, 9, 522–534. <https://doi.org/10.1287/orsc.9.4.522>
- König, C. J., & Hafsteinsson, L. G. (2011). Applicants' self-presentational behavior across cultures: Less self-presentation in Switzerland and Iceland than in the United States (SSRN Scholarly Paper No. 1960377). <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2389.2011.00562.x>
- König, C. J., Langer, M., Fell, C. B., Pathak, R. D., Bajwa, N. ul H., Derous, E., Geißler, S. M., Hirose, S., Hülshager, U., Javakhishvili, N., Junges, N., Knudsen, B., Lee, M. S. W., Mariani, M. G., Nag, G. C., Petrescu, C., Robie, C., Rohorua, H., Sammel, L. D., ... Ziem, M. (2021). Economic predictors of differences in interview faking between

- countries: Economic inequality matters, not the state of economy. *Applied Psychology*, 70(3), 1360–1379. <https://doi.org/10.1111/apps.12278>
- König, C. J., Wong, J., & Cen, G. (2012). How much do chinese applicants fake? *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 20(2), 247–250. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2389.2012.00596.x>
- Kristof-Brown, A., Barrick, M. R., & Franke, M. (2002). Applicant impression management: Dispositional influences and consequences for recruiter perceptions of fit and similarity. *Journal of Management*, 28(1), 27–46. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0149-2063\(01\)00131-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0149-2063(01)00131-3)
- Lalwani, A. K., Shavitt, S., & Johnson, T. (2006). What is the relation between cultural orientation and socially desirable responding?. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 90(1), 165. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.90.1.165
- Langer, M., König, C., & Krause, K. (2017). Examining digital interviews for personnel selection: Applicant reactions and interviewer ratings. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 25. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ijsa.12191>
- Levashina, J., & Campion, M. A. (2006). A model of faking likelihood in the employment interview. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 14, 299–316. <https://doi.org/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(6), 1638–1656. <https://doi.org/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(1), 241–293. <https://doi.org/10.1111/peps.12052>
- Lubbe, D., & Nitsche, A. (2019). Reducing assimilation and contrast effects on selection interview ratings using behaviorally anchored rating scales. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 27. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ijsa.12230>
- Lukacik, E.-R., Bourdage, J. S., & Roulin, N. (2022). Into the void: A conceptual model and research agenda for the design and use of asynchronous video interviews. *Human Resource Management Review*, 32(1), 100789. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.hrmr.2020.100789>

- Manroop, L., Boekhorst, J. A., & Harrison, J. A. (2013). The influence of cross-cultural differences on job interview selection decisions. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 24(18), 3512–3533.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/09585192.2013.777675>
- Marsh, H. W., Muthén, B., Asparouhov, T., Lüdtke, O., Robitzsch, A., Morin, A. J., & Trautwein, U. (2009). Exploratory structural equation modeling, integrating CFA and EFA: Application to students' evaluations of university teaching. *Structural Equation Modeling: A Multidisciplinary Journal*, 16, 439–476. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10705510903008220>
- McColl, R., & Michelotti, M. (2019). Sorry, could you repeat the question? Exploring video-interview recruitment practice in HRM. *Human Resource Management Journal*, 29(4), 637–656. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1748-8583.12249>
- Mejia, C., & Torres, E. N. (2018). Implementation and normalization process of asynchronous video interviewing practices in the hospitality industry. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 30(2), 685–701. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJCHM-07-2016-0402>
- Melchers, K. G., Roulin, N., & Buehl, A.-K. (2020). A review of applicant faking in selection interviews. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 28(2), 123–142.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/ijsa.12280>
- Merkin, R., Taras, V., & Steel, P. (2014). State of the art themes in cross-cultural communication research: A systematic and meta-analytic review. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 38, 1–23. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijintrel.2013.10.004>
- Roulin, N., Krings, F., & Binggeli, S. (2016). A dynamic model of applicant faking. *Organizational Psychology Review*, 6(2), 145–170.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/2041386615580875>
- Roulin, N., Wong, O., Langer, M., & Bourdage, J. S. (2023). Is more always better? How preparation time and re-recording opportunities impact fairness, anxiety, impression management, and performance in asynchronous video interviews. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 32(3), 333–345. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1359432X.2022.2156862>

- Ryan, A. M., & Derous, E. (2019). The unrealized potential of technology in selection assessment. *Revista de Psicología Del Trabajo y de Las Organizaciones*, 35(2), 85–92. <https://doi.org/10.5093/jwop2019a10>
- Sandal, G. M., & Endresen, I. M. (2002). The sensitivity of the CPI good impression scale for detecting ‘faking good’ among Norwegian students and job applicants. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 10(4), 304–311. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-2389.00220>
- Sandal, G. M., van de Vijver, F., Bye, H. H., Sam, D. L., Amponsah, B., Cakar, N., Franke, G. H., Ismail, R., Kjellsen, K., Kosic, A., Leontieva, A., Mortazavi, S., & Tien-Lun Sun, C. (2014). Intended self-presentation tactics in job interviews: A 10-country study. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 45(6), 939–958. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022022114532353>
- Schermerhorn, J. R., & Bond, M. H. (1991). Upward and downward influence tactics in managerial networks: A comparative study of Hong Kong Chinese and Americans. *Asia Pacific Journal of Management*, 8(2), 147–158. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01731937>
- Sedikides, C., Gaertner, L., & Toguchi, Y. (2003). Pancultural self-enhancement. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 84(1), 60–79. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.84.1.60>
- Silvera, D. H., & Seger, C. R. (2004). Feeling good about ourselves: Unrealistic self-evaluations and their relation to self-esteem in the United States and Norway. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 35(5), 571–585. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022022104268389>
- 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(5), 587–606. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.80.5.587>
- Stone, D. L., Deadrick, D. L., Lukaszewski, K. M., & Johnson, R. (2015). The influence of technology on the future of human resource management. *Human Resource Management Review*, 25(2), 216–231. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.hrmr.2015.01.002>
- Tabachnick, B. G., & Fidell, L. S. (2013). *Using Multivariate Statistics* (6th ed). Pearson Education UK. <https://public.ebookcentral.proquest.com/choice/publicfullrecord.aspx?p=5138876>

- Taylor, P. J., Larner, S., Conchie, S. M., & Menacere, T. (2017). Culture moderates changes in linguistic self-presentation and detail provision when deceiving others. *Royal Society Open Science*, 4(6), 170128. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rsos.170128>
- Taylor, P. J., Larner, S., Conchie, S. M., & Van der Zee, S. (2014). Cross-cultural deception detection. *Detecting Deception: Current Challenges and Cognitive Approaches*, 175-201. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118510001.ch8>
- Thomsen, L., Sidanius, J., & Fiske, A. P. (2007). Interpersonal leveling, independence, and self-enhancement: A comparison between Denmark and the US, and a relational practice framework for cultural psychology. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 37(3), 445–469. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ejsp.366>
- Tiano, S. (1986). Authoritarianism and political culture in Argentina and Chile in the Mid-1960's. *Latin American Research Review*, 21(1), 73–98. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0023879100021877>
- Tippins, N. T. (2015). Technology and assessment in selection. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior*, 2(1), 551–582. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-orgpsych-031413-091317>
- Triandis, H. C., & Suh, E. M. (2002). Cultural influences on personality. *Annual review of psychology*, 53(1), 133-160. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.psych.53.100901.135200>
- 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(2), 131–140. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2389.2010.00495.x>
- Tulchin, J. S. (2010). The strategic culture of Chile. *Revista Del CESLA. International Latin American Studies Review*, 2(13), 433–438.
- Van Gramberg, B., Teicher, J., & O'Rourke, A. (2014). Managing electronic communications: A new challenge for human resource managers. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 25(16), 2234–2252. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09585192.2013.872166>