A review of applicant faking in selection interviews

Klaus G. Melchers

Universität Ulm, Germany

Nicolas Roulin

Saint Mary's University, Halifax, Canada

Anne-Kathrin Buehl

Universität Ulm, Germany

Author Note

Klaus Melchers and Anne-Kathrin Buehl, Institut für Psychologie und Pädagogik, Universität Ulm, Germany. Nicolas Roulin, Department of Psychology, Saint Mary's University Halifax, Canada. Anne-Kathrin Buehl is now working at Carl Zeiss AG, Oberkochen, Germany.

All three authors contributed equally to this manuscript.

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Klaus Melchers, Institut für Psychologie und Pädagogik, Universität Ulm, Albert-Einstein-Allee 41, D-89069 Ulm, Germany, e-mail: klaus.melchers@uni-ulm.de

Abstract

Interviews are commonly used for selection but research on interview faking only gained

momentum relatively recently. We review both theoretical and empirical work on prevalence,

antecedents, processes, and effects of interview faking. Most applicants fake at least to some

degree. Personality (e.g., Conscientiousness, Honesty-humility, the Dark Triad) and attitudes

towards faking substantially correlate with faking behaviors. Research concerning applicants'

ability, interview structure components, or contextual factors is limited. Furthermore, the

impact of faking on interview ratings is mixed and effects on criterion-related validity are not

consistently negative. Finally, the detection of faking seems hardly possible and there are

limited options available to reduce interview faking. Throughout our review, we describe

important gaps and derive suggestions and propositions for future research.

Keywords: faking, selection interviews, impression management, socially desirable

responding, personnel selection

A review of applicant faking in selection interviews

Since faking is a common phenomenon in personnel selection (Donovan, Dwight, & Hurtz, 2003) there is a long history of research on faking in personality tests (e.g., Birkeland, Manson, Kisamore, Brannick, & Smith, 2006; Viswesvaran & Ones, 1999). Furthermore, the examination of impression management tactics that are used by job applicants in employment interviews is not new (e.g., Gilmore & Ferris, 1989; Stevens & Kristof, 1995). However, it is only in the last decade that we have observed a growing interest in the examination of applicant faking in employment interviews (Bourdage, Roulin, & Levashina, 2017). The long reluctance of prior research to investigate interview faking might seem surprising given its' practical implications. Indeed, the vast majority of applicants use faking tactics in interviews but applicants also vary in the extent to which they engage in faking (e.g., Levashina & Campion, 2007). As such, faking can potentially change their rank order, impact who gets hired, and thus represent a possible threat to the criterion-related validity of interviews. The turnaround point concerning interview faking research is probably the publication of Levashina and Campion's (2006) theoretical model of applicant faking in interviews and of their subsequent scale to measure faking in interviews (Levashina & Campion, 2007).

Over a decade later, we believe that enough theoretical and empirical work has been accumulated over recent years to warrant a first review. This review makes a number of important contributions to the literature. First, we identify issues for which sufficient data was available and consensus has been reached. Second, we identify relevant limitations of previous research as well as important but still unanswered questions for which more research is needed. Third, we discuss possible reasons for diverging findings in certain areas and describe the necessary research to gain insights into the reasons for these findings. Fourth, we provide suggestions for future theoretical work and put forth specific propositions and research questions that may guide future empirical research. Finally, we inform practitioners

on factors that promote or prevent faking, and on the usefulness and suitability of existing measures to prevent or to detect faking in interviews.

Structure of this Review and Identification of Relevant Research

Our aim is to review the existing literature on applicant faking in employment interviews to answer the following questions: (1) What is faking in interviews? (2) How common is it? (3) What are its key antecedents? (4) Does it matter? (5) Can anything be done to detect it?

To answer these questions, we conducted an extensive literature research. We began by searching electronic databases such as PsycINFO/PsycARTICLES, Web of Science, and Google Scholar for studies that included the keywords "applicant faking", "Interview faking", or "deceptive impression management". Furthermore, we checked reference lists of identified papers as well as relevant recent reviews on personnel selection in general (Ryan & Ployhart, 2014; Sackett & Lievens, 2008) and regarding interviews (Levashina, Hartwell, Morgeson, & Campion, 2014; Macan, 2009). After eliminating non-interview results (e.g., faking in personality tests or in the workplace) and non-journal publications (i.e., dissertations, conference presentations), we identified 36 peer-reviewed empirical articles with a total of 51 studies that dealt explicitly with faking in interviews. We also identified 12 non-empirical articles (i.e., reviews about interviews in general, theoretical models, editorials) that discussed interview faking. Furthermore, this review also covers additional relevant research concerning impression management or self-presentation in interviews and regarding faking in general to the extent to which it is relevant for interview faking.

What is Faking in Interviews?

Faking, Impression Management, and Socially Desirable Responding

Researchers in both the personality testing and the interview domain have proposed or used many different definitions and conceptualizations of faking. For the present review, we mainly draw on Levashina and Campion (2007), who defined faking as "conscious distortions

of answers to the interview questions in order to obtain a better score on the interview and/or

create favorable perceptions" (p. 1639). This definition (like the vast majority of faking

research) is focused on faking "good". Faking "bad", that is applicants' attempts to decrease

their chances of being hired by presenting themselves as worse than they really are, exists but

is a rare phenomenon in personnel selection. Faking "bad" can happen when applicants are

encouraged or required to apply for undesirable jobs (e.g., to continue receiving

unemployment benefits) or in the case of assessments for compulsory military service (e.g.,

Boss, König, & Melchers, 2015).

    In addition, faking has sometimes been assimilated with concepts like impression

management (IM) or social desirability. However, we argue that they should be clearly

distinguished in the interview context. IM has been defined as trying to create a particular

impression in someone's mind (Leary & Kowalski, 1990). In the personality literature, the

terms IM and faking have been used interchangeably. This is because a response to a

personality inventory item can either be completely honest (e.g., responding "3" when

applicants truly believe that their actual level is 3 out of 5) or deceptive (e.g., responding "4"

or "5"). However, in the interview context, IM and faking are related but distinct constructs.

IM can be represented as a continuum of influence tactics going from complete honesty and

modesty in the way applicants present themselves to outright lying about their qualities (cf.

Bourdage, Roulin, & Tarraf, 2018; Levashina & Campion, 2007): The lower part of the

continuum can be defined as honest IM (i.e., applicants using varying amounts of IM tactics

to create a positive impression but relying on facts and truthful descriptions of their traits or

qualities). The upper part of the continuum can be considered as deceptive IM (i.e., applicants

using more or less deceptive forms of IM tactics to create a positive impression) with slightly

deceptive tactics being closer to honest IM and extremely deceptive tactics being closer to

outright lies. In interviews, faking thus only incorporates deceptive forms of IM, while in

personality inventories, faking is equivalent to IM.

Another related construct is socially desirable responding (SDR). Social desirability is defined as "the tendency to give answers that make the respondent look good" (Paulhus, 1991, p. 17). In the personality literature, SDR is usually described as comprising two facets: self-deception, which involves an involuntary enhancement of positive qualities and denial of negative qualities about oneself that is not necessarily aimed for an audience, and impression management, which involves giving inflated statements that are explicitly aimed at an audience (Paulhus, 1991). Although faking and SDR are conceptually related, SDR is defined as a stable trait that should (theoretically) not vary across situations. In contrast, and although there is evidence that applicants engage in faking in a somewhat consistent way across interviews (Roulin & Bourdage, 2017), interview faking (or interview IM in general as described in the previous paragraph) is situation-specific that is, targeted to a specific job or a unique interview situation (Levashina & Campion, 2006). Moreover, SDR has been described as an inadequate way to capture applicant faking (Burns & Christiansen, 2011; Griffith & Peterson, 2008). The distinction between faking and SDR becomes clearer when looking at the measures: An example item for SDR is "I never swear" (Paulhus, 1991) whereas an example item for faking is "during the interview, I distorted my answers based on the comments or reactions of the interviewer" (Levashina & Campion, 2007). Empirically, relationships between interview faking and SDR tend to be only small, with non-significant correlations for Paulhus' measure of self-deception and only modest but significant for Paulhus' IM measure (Levashina & Campion, 2007).

Taxonomy and Measurement

There is a wide range of faking behaviors that interviewees can use and that are included in Levashina and Campion's (2007) taxonomy and 54-item measure of interview faking behaviors (i.e., the IFB scale). Levashina and Campion considered various sources of information and used qualitative and quantitative approaches. In their taxonomy, they distinguished assertive techniques, defensive tactics, and ingratiation. Assertive techniques

can be seen as applicants' deceptive attempts to create a positive impression by highlighting experiences, skills, or opinions. They can be further divided into slight image creation (i.e., applicants' attempts to stretch the truth by exaggerating skills, abilities, and work experiences) and extensive image creation (i.e., inventing – or borrowing from others – work experiences, skills, or accomplishments). Defensive tactics are used by applicants to protect their image of being the ideal person for the job and include hiding weaknesses and insufficient skills or masking negative events and experiences in their work history. Finally, deceptive ingratiation is used to appear more attractive or likeable, by pretending to conform to the interviewer's and/or organization's values, beliefs, opinions, or attitudes or insincerely praising the interviewer or organization.

Given that Levashina and Campion (2007) derived the IFB items partly from the general IM literature, their faking tactics are related to more general forms of IM tactics. However, this literature did not distinguish honest from deceptive IM (e.g., Stevens & Kristof, 1995). Specifically, slight and extensive image creation are conceptually similar to assertive IM tactics such as self-promotion. Image protection is similar to defensive IM tactics such as image repair. Deceptive ingratiation is similar to other-focused IM tactics. As mentioned above, all those tactics are on a continuum that goes from complete honesty and modesty in the way applicants present themselves to outright lying about their qualities. Furthermore, for observers it is hardly possible to decide whether a specific IM tactic is honest or dishonest. For instance, applicants who tell interviewers "I am fluent in four languages: English, Spanish, French, and Chinese Mandarin" could be using honest self-promotion (if they actually speak those four languages fluently), slight image creation (if they speak four languages, but only two of them fluently), or extensive image creation (if they do not speak Spanish and French at all). This is why, in response to several authors noting the importance of differentiating honest from deceptive IM (e.g., Levashina et al., 2014), Bourdage et al. (2018) recently developed and validated a self-report measure that specifically captures the

honest side of IM. They also showed that honest IM and deceptive IM or faking are

correlated, but empirically distinct.

Other studies have captured faking using different items and the randomized response

technique (RRT, see König, Hafsteinsson, Jansen, & Stadelmann, 2011; König, Wong, &

Cen, 2012). The RRT involves respondents using a randomization device (e.g., rolling dices

or flipping a coin) before answering each dichotomous faking item (i.e., reporting engaging or

not in the faking behavior). Depending on the randomization result, respondents are instructed

to simply endorse the item (e.g., if the die shows 1 or 2) or to report their actual behavior

(e.g., if the die shows 3, 4, 5, or 6). Researcher can then estimate faking frequencies after a

statistical correction for the base rate of instructed endorsements. This technique has both

advantages (e.g., the incorporation of a random component adds a layer of protection for

respondents and facilitates their honest reporting of faking) and disadvantages (e.g., it is more

complex to score and interpret, and one cannot analyze the data on the individual level but

only on group level). Because of these differences, it is difficult to compare findings from

studies using the IFB vs. an RRT operationalization of faking.

Theoretical Models of Applicant Faking

Even though there are many different conceptualizations describing the factors that

influence applicant faking in general (e.g., Ellingson & McFarland, 2011; Goffin & Boyd,

2009; Griffith, Lee, Peterson, & Zickar, 2011; Marcus, 2009; McFarland & Ryan, 2000, 2006;

Mueller-Hanson, Heggestad, & Thornton, 2006; Roulin, Krings, & Binggeli, 2016; Salgado,

2016; Snell, Sydell, & Lueke, 1999; Tett & Simonet, 2011) there is just one model that is

specifically tailored to faking in interviews (Levashina & Campion, 2006). In this model,

Levashina and Campion consider faking as a function of capacity, willingness, and

opportunity. Capacity to fake comprises skills like verbal skills, social skills, or cognitive

ability. It enables applicants to distort their answers to maximize their interview performance.

Willingness is influenced by applicants' motivation and personality but can also be fostered

by situational aspects like perceptions of unfair treatment during the interview. Opportunity to fake comprises characteristics of the interview type and format that can enable or hinder applicants' faking like, for example, the type of interview (structured vs. unstructured) or question (past-behavioral vs. situational). Levashina and Campion's model is a multiplicative model, so that all factors must be present at least to some extent for faking to occur. It predicts the likelihood to fake. However, it does not differentiate between faking behavior (e.g., the use of a certain kind of faking behavior) and faking success (e.g., a good interview rating or a job offer). In addition, Levashina and Campion's model differs from the several models derived from the Theory of Planned Behavior (e.g., McFarland & Ryan, 2000; 2006; Mueller-Hanson et al., 2006) that focus on intentions to fake as the direct antecedent of faking behaviors.

All faking models consider characteristics of the individual (e.g., ability, personality, motivation) and the situation (e.g., selection method, use of a faking warning, applicants' personal situation) as antecedents of faking. Interestingly, some models (e.g., Ellingson & McFarland, 2011; Marcus, 2009; McFarland & Ryan, 2000; Roulin et al., 2016) also take contextual factors into account, like the attractiveness of the organization, while other models exclude such factors (e.g., Levashina & Campion, 2006; Salgado, 2016). Snell et al.'s (1999) model, for example, includes the importance of the outcome for applicants' or their perception of others' faking behavior. Furthermore, while most models consider the role of applicants' abilities (e.g., to analyze the interview situation and adapt their behavior to job requirements), some consider these abilities as antecedents of faking (e.g., Snell et al., 1999) whereas others depict them as moderating the relationship between faking motivation or intentions and actual faking behavior (e.g., McFarland & Ryan, 2000).

Levashina and Campion's (2006) model remains relatively silent on the impact of faking on construct- or criterion-related validity. In contrast, McFarland and Ryan (2000) assumed that faking may influence applicants' scores, but also impact the reliability, factor

structure, and validity of selection instruments. However, they failed to clarify the specific nature of the effects. In contrast, making predictions about the influence of faking on test scores and validity is a strength of the theory of self-presentation by Marcus (2009). His model suggests that the effects of faking on criterion-related validity can range from negative to neutral to positive depending on the specific situation (see below). Furthermore, Salgado (2016) recently predicted a negative effect of faking on both the reliability and criterion-related validity of selection instruments. Specifically, he assumes that faking should increase the mean but decrease the standard deviation of applicants' scores on a selection procedure. Thereby, faking leads to a homogenization of scores and a reduction of systematic variance.

Finally, Roulin et al. (2016) proposed a dynamic model of applicant faking. They suggested that applicants' motivation to fake will be stronger when they perceive that they face an intense competition to obtain the job, which derives from perceived competition on the job market, the competitive culture of the organization, and individual-level competitive worldviews. They also describe faking as an adaptive mechanism, so that the success or failure of faking and the interpretation of this success or failure by applicants will ultimately impact faking attempts in subsequent interviews.

Discussion and Future Research Directions

Levashina and Campion's (2007) taxonomy and measure offer a precise answer to our first question ("What is faking in interviews?"): Faking is neither SDR nor general IM but corresponds to the deceptive side of IM. Therefore, it is important to separate honest IM, which represents behavior that is accepted and expected by recruiters (Jansen, König, Stadelmann, & Kleinmann, 2012) and that can contribute to criterion related-validity (Kleinmann & Klehe, 2011), from deceptive IM (Bourdage et al., 2018; Levashina & Campion, 2006, 2007; Levashina et al., 2014). However, the measurement and operationalization of faking still requires additional attention. For instance, although Levashina and Campion (2007) demonstrated the factor structure of their measure (i.e., the

IFB), subsequent studies often only used a subsample of the IFB items instead of the entire scale. Existing studies have also focused on either a general faking score or the four faking factors (e.g., extensive image creation), but have largely ignored the sub-facets (e.g., borrowing, inventing). The detailed IFB structure thus needs to be confirmed. Furthermore, Bourdage et al. (2018) recently proposed a short version (i.e., the IFB-S), with 16 items instead of the full 54 items, but more research is needed to confirm the strengths and weaknesses of the short scale as compared to the complete scale.

Interestingly, Levashina and Campion's (2007) taxonomy and the IFB only focus on verbal forms of faking. However, in the general IM literature, studies have also incorporated non-verbal behaviors such as smiling or making eye contact as possible forms of IM (Barrick, Shaffer, & DeGrassi, 2009). Furthermore, a recent qualitative study on interviewer IM revealed a considerable range of non-verbal IM tactics that interviewers use deliberately to create a positive image on applicants (Wilhelmy, Kleinmann, König, Melchers, & Truxillo, 2016). Accordingly, it is possible that applicants also use non-verbal behaviors deceptively (e.g., fake smile or laugh), and future research could explore this form of faking. This leads to our first research question:

Research Question 1: What are non-verbal forms of interview faking?

In addition, the different faking models predict when applicants are more or less motivated to fake but they do not differentiate specific faking behaviors. A possible reason could be that most faking models were developed for the domain of personality testing where applicants have fewer degrees of freedom on how to fake in comparison to interviews. However, the more deceptive forms of faking might only be used when applicants perceive a higher need to do so, for example, when they perceive more competition with others or if previous attempts using honest IM have not led to the desired outcome (Roulin et al., 2016).

Most faking models are also heavily focused on individual difference antecedents of faking but pay much less attention to external or situational factors that encourage or

discourage faking (e.g., competition on the job market, economic conditions). However, as suggested by Ellingson (2012, p. 19), it is possible that "people fake only when they need to fake". Accordingly, models should consider contextual or situational factors more explicitly that make it more or less likely that applicants try to fake.

Interestingly, most of the faking models have not been empirically tested directly and comprehensively (for an exception, see McFarland & Ryan, 2006). However, many key elements of these models have been examined in separate studies, and the key findings are discussed in the following sections. A final limitation concerning most faking models is how surprisingly silent they are about the effects of faking on validity. As noted above, only two of these models (Marcus, 2009; Salgado, 2016) make predictions about the effects on criterion-related validity. However, their predictions are also inconsistent with each other because they assume different processes. Furthermore, they do not distinguish between different performance criteria, such as task performance, extra-role behavior, or counterproductive work behavior. This leads to the following research question:

Research Question 2: What are the processes through which faking affects criterion-related validity for different criteria?

How Common is Faking in Interviews?

Faking in selection interviews is rather common. Table 1 shows faking prevalence rates reported in various studies. Weiss and Feldman (2006) found that 81% of applicants admitted telling at least one lie in their last interview, with an average of 2.19 lies per interview. And across three samples, Levashina and Campion (2007) found that 93% to 99% of undergraduate job applicants had used at least one faking tactic during their most recent interview. However, more recent studies reported lower prevalence rates with both real job applicants and students (Bourdage et al., 2018; Roulin, Bangerter, & Levashina, 2014).

Although most people fake during interviews, faking tactics close to lying such as extensive image creation are used less frequently than less severe tactics such as slight image

creation. This is in line with results from Jansen et al. (2012) who found that applicants primarily used those faking and IM tactics that are expected by interviewers, such as honest self-promotion. More generally, evidence suggests that applicants engage in more honest IM than in faking (Amaral, Powell, & Ho, 2019; Bourdage et al., 2018).

Discussion and Future Research Directions

Extant research suggests that the answer to our second question ("How common is faking in interviews?") is that a substantial proportion of applicants do fake. However, the majority of studies are based on student samples (Levashina & Campion, 2007; Weiss & Feldman, 2006), and studies including more experienced applicants report somewhat lower use of faking (Bourdage et al., 2018; Roulin et al., 2014). Yet, more research is needed to investigate faking prevalence for applicants with differing levels of qualification, under differing economic conditions, or from different industries. Indeed, faking models suggest that people are less motived to fake when they do not see a need to do so (Ellingson, 2012; Roulin et al., 2016). For instance, applicants with more work experience have had opportunities to accumulate more skills, qualifications, or professional accomplishments, which they can rely on when answering interview questions. In contrast, less experienced applicants might be more likely to rely on faking to compensate for their lack of qualifications. Taken together, this leads to the following propositions:

Proposition 1: Although faking is prevalent among applicants, it is still less common than honest IM.

Proposition 2: Faking is less common among more qualified applicants than among less qualified applicants, but more likely when the economy or industry is facing difficult times.

An important limitation of research on the prevalence of faking concerns how faking data is collected. Specifically, the common use of self-reports might over- or underestimate the true prevalence of faking estimates because applicants might not honestly report dishonest

behaviors, especially in a high-stakes selection context. Thus, correct prevalence estimates may require the use of alternative approaches to measure faking. One option could be to include a few interview questions about seemingly job-relevant but made-up content to potentially identify applicants who fake, similar to the bogus items approach in biodata research (e.g., Levashina, Morgeson, & Campion, 2009). Another way could be to use measures that help dealing with the problem of social desirable responding such as the randomized response technique (e.g., Jansen et al., 2012).

What are the Antecedents of Faking in Interviews?

Extant research has dealt with five major categories of factors that influence the intention to fake and occurrence of faking in interviews: applicant characteristics, interview format, interviewers' behaviors, culture, and contextual factors.

Applicant Characteristics

As noted above, most theories of faking suggested that applicants' personality, beliefs/attitudes, and skills influence faking. Accordingly, most of the empirical research that we found dealt with applicant characteristics (see Table 2 for an overview).

Several studies examined personality and the Big Five traits. Although findings are not always consistent, conscientiousness and agreeableness are usually negatively related to faking whereas extraversion and neuroticism are usually positively related to faking (Buehl & Melchers, 2017, Study 1; Lester, Anglim, & Fullarton, 2015; Roulin & Bourdage, 2017; Roulin & Krings, 2016, Study 2). However, most correlations between faking and the Big Five are rather weak, with correlations for conscientiousness being the highest at around .30. In addition to the Big Five, the Dark Triad, which is comprised of Psychopathy, Narcissism, and Machiavellianism (Paulhus & Williams, 2002), is linked to faking. Recent evidence suggests that higher scores on the Dark Triad dimensions are related to more faking in interviews (Roulin & Bourdage, 2017; Roulin & Krings, 2016, Study 1) with correlations ranging from medium to high. Similarly, Honesty-Humility from the HEXACO model of

personality (Ashton & Lee, 2007) is consistently negatively associated with faking (Bourdage et al., 2018, Study 4; Buehl & Melchers, 2017, Study 1; Law, Bourdage, & O'Neill, 2016; Roulin & Bourdage, 2017). This is also true for integrity as a similar personality construct (Levashina & Campion, 2007, Study 4).

Studies have also explored the relationship between self-monitoring and faking, but the existing results are inconsistent. Whereas Weiss and Feldman (2006) found that the number of lies in an interview did not correlate with self-monitoring, Levashina and Campion (2007, Study 4), Hogue, Levashina, and Hang (2013), or Roulin and Bourdage (2017) found small positive correlations between self-monitoring and several self-reported faking tactics.

Aside from personality, applicants' beliefs and attitudes have also been associated with faking. Roulin and colleagues (Bourdage et al., 2018, Study 4; Roulin & Bourdage, 2017; Roulin & Krings, 2016, Studies 1 and 2) found strong relationships between applicants' competitive worldviews and faking (both with intentions to fake and self-reported faking) during interviews. In addition, and in line with the theory of planned behavior (Ajzen, 1991), several studies (Buehl & Melchers, 2017, Study 1; Dürr & Klehe, 2018; Lester et al., 2015) found that positive attitudes towards faking correlated with faking intentions as well as faking behavior. Furthermore, and also in line with the theory of planned behavior, Dürr and Klehe as well as Lester et al. also found that subjective norms as well as perceived behavioral control were associated with faking intentions in the interview.

As noted above, faking models vary in the role attributed to abilities (e.g., Marcus, 2009; McFarland & Ryan, 2000; Snell et al., 1999): direct antecedent of faking vs. moderating the relationship between faking intentions and faking vs. moderating the relationship between faking and interview performance. However, there is hardly any research on the impact of abilities and the available evidence is mixed. Specifically, two studies by Buehl and Melchers (2017) found no support for a moderating effect of interviewees' abilities. This was true both for self-reported faking behavior in previous selection interviews

and for improvements in performance in an interview simulation (i.e., in a selection vs. an honest condition). Furthermore, with regard to direct effects, Buehl and Melchers (2017) found a negative relationship between cognitive ability and self-reported faking in previous interviews, but no correlation between cognitive ability and self-reported faking in a simulated interview. However, cognitive ability was positively related with improvements in interview performance (in a selection condition relative to an honest condition), which is in line with arguments that ability is relevant for successful faking when applicants are highly motivated to present themselves positively (e.g., Levashina & Campion, 2006). Similarly, Buehl, Melchers, Macan, and Kühnel (2019) found that interviewees' ability to identify the criteria (ATIC, cf. Kleinmann et al., 2011) assessed in the interview was positively related to performance improvements. As such, preliminary evidence suggests that a good understanding of the relevant performance criteria might be necessary to fake effectively. However, more research using direct measures of faking is still required to fully understand the mechanisms at play.

Studies examining other applicant characteristics, like education, professional qualifications, employment status, or demographic variables (e.g., age, sex), are scarce. Furthermore, the results that we could extract from the literature stem from studies that were usually not set up to investigate these characteristics, but generally measured them as potential control variables (see Table 3). Three studies in two papers reported correlations between the level of education or employment status and faking intentions or behavior (Bourdage et al., 2018, Study 5; Roulin & Krings, 2016, Studies 1 and 2): Individuals' level of education or their GPA seem to have little effect on faking, even though one study found that more educated individuals reported slightly lower faking intentions (Roulin & Krings, 2016, Study 1). Two of those studies also reported that individuals who were employed were slightly less inclined to fake. In addition, while more studies report relationships between demographic variables and faking, correlations were rather small and often not significant.

The only consistent findings seem to be that age is negatively related to faking and that men tend to fake slightly more than women (see Table 3).

Interview Format

We were only able to identify five relevant studies that dealt with the type of question, interview structure, interview modality, and warnings as potentially relevant situational factors that influence faking in interviews.

Research on IM in general suggests that other-focused IM tactics are used somewhat more often with situational interview (SI) questions, whereas self-promotion and defensive IM tactics are more often used with past behavior description interview (PBDI) questions (Levashina et al., 2014). Specifically for faking, Van Iddekinge, Raymark, and Roth (2005) suggested larger faking effects for SI vs. PBDI questions because answers to SI questions cannot be verified. In line with this, Levashina and Campion (2007, Study 6) found more faking in SI than PBDI questions. In contrast, however, Bourdage et al. (2018, Study 5) found that applicants faked less when SI questions were used (vs. not used), but found no difference for PBDI questions. They also generally did not find more faking on less-job related questions (e.g., about strengths and weaknesses or personal preferences). Furthermore, Levashina and Campion (2007, Study 6) found that follow-up questions increased the occurrence of faking, suggesting that probing might not be a suitable way to determine the truthfulness of applicants' answers.

Theoretical models of faking (Levashina & Campion, 2006; Roulin et al., 2016) argue that more structured interview formats should reduce applicants' opportunity to fake. In addition, a meta-analysis on the relationship between IM and interview performance found larger correlations for unstructured than for structured interviews (Barrick et al., 2009), but this research did not differentiate honest from deceptive IM. Furthermore, Swider et al. (2011) found no significant correlation between the duration of the rapport-building phase at the beginning of the interview and interviewees' use of faking. And Bourdage et al. (2018, Study

5) found that neither using a panel of interviewers nor conducting longer interviews influenced faking use.

Research on personality inventories suggests that warning applicants that the organization can determine the truthfulness of their responses and punish those who faked can be an effective means to reduce faking (e.g., Dwight & Donovan, 2003; Fan et al., 2012). However, only one study investigated warnings in interviews: Law et al. (2016) found that identification warnings (i.e., telling interviewees that the organization can identify how truthful their responses are) moderately but significantly reduced self-reported faking. In contrast, moral warnings (i.e., telling interviewees that being honest is the right thing to do) or the combination of both warning types did not reduce faking. Thus, overall, the effectiveness of warnings seems to be limited to methods requiring to emphasize the potential risks associated with faking. Furthermore, even though Law et al. found that warnings did not impact procedural justice perceptions or performance anxiety, warnings might have potential negative effects on other applicant reaction variables that were not investigated in their study.

Interviewer Characteristics

There is hardly any research on interviewer characteristics that considered whether interviewers have an impact on interviewees' faking and this research also found hardly any effects. Specifically, Bourdage et al. (2018, Study 5) only found more deceptive ingratiation (but no difference for other faking tactics) when interviewing with the potential supervisor vs. an HR professional.

Culture

In a recent study with participants from 31 different countries, Fell, König, and Kammerhoff (2016) found cross-cultural differences in attitudes toward faking in interviews. They divided intentions to fake into mild vs. severe faking (i.e., conceptually similar to slight vs. extensive image creation) and examined relationships with GLOBE cultural dimensions. Intentions to fake had significant negative relationships with uncertainty avoidance (but only

for mild faking) and gender egalitarianism, but positive relationships with power distance and in-group collectivism.

In addition, there are a few studies about reported faking in specific countries: U.S. applicants generally tended to fake more than European applicants (who were from Iceland and Switzerland), and slightly more than Chinese applicants (König et al., 2012). A follow-up study by Husain, Dayan, Pathak, Langer, and König (2019) reported faking in the United Arab Emirates to be slightly lower than in the U.S. or China, but slightly higher than in the European countries. However, these studies were based on the RRT, and did not examine different types of faking. Roulin and Krings (2016, Study 2) found more faking (measured as a combination of slight and extensive image creation) in Germany and Spain than in Switzerland and Greece. Bourdage et al. (2018, Study 5) found more extensive image creation (but no difference for other faking tactics) for U.S. than Canadian applicants. And Schilling, Roulin, Obschonka, and König (in press) recently found significant regional differences when comparing faking intentions across the largest 50 Metropolitan Statistical Areas of the United States, and showed that these differences could be partly explained by regional difference in counscientiouness or competititve worldviews.

Contextual Factors

In line with faking models that consider organizational attractiveness as an antecedent of applicants' motivation to fake (e.g., Marcus, 2009), Buehl and Melchers (2018) found that students reported higher faking intentions in admission interviews for more attractive study programs, but competition (i.e., the selection ratio) did not influence faking. In contrast, Ho, Powell, Barclay, and Gill (2019) found a positive relationship between perceptions of the competition for the job and faking intentions. However, we found no studies that investigated the impact of actual competition on the labor market or other relevant factors such as economic conditions on faking in interviews.

Discussion and Future Research Directions

Previous research examining which antecedents influence the extent of faking in interviews (our third question) mainly focused on applicant characteristics, even though there is also some evidence about the influence of culture, interviewer characteristics, interview format, or contextual factors. So far research has only approached consensus about the role of some personality factors and attitudes. For personality, negative correlations of moderate size were usually found for conscientiousness, but correlations were less systematic and usually considerably lower for the other Big Five factors. In addition, there is a negative relationship for honesty-humility, and positive relationships for the Dark Triad and competitive worldviews and all these correlations are consistent and strong. In contrast, only limited evidence has been accumulated for other applicant characteristics. For instance, less educated, unemployed, younger, and male applicants seem to be more prone to faking. Yet, correlations are usually small and based on a limited number of studies suffering from limitations such as range restriction (e.g., for age), relying on student samples, or online panels. Thus, there is a clear need for more research on these factors. Although there is some research examining the role of cultural dimensions or comparing faking across countries, results are largely inconsistent and more research, including all types of faking, should be conducted. In addition, Tables 2 and 3 highlight that the relationship between several antecedents and faking vary depending on which type of faking behavior is examined (e.g., extensive image creation vs. deceptive ingratiation). As such, research using only a general measure of faking might obfuscate the true relationships. We thus encourage future research to measure (and report effects for) all forms of faking. Furthermore, given that several faking models suggest that applicants' abilities should moderate the relationship between faking intentions and faking behavior or actual interview performance, more research is definitely needed to clarify the role of abilities.

Research on situational antecedents of faking in interviews is still at a fledgling stage, and there is a long road ahead before we understand their actual impact. Future research

should especially explore how to make interviews less prone to faking. For instance, our knowledge about the role played by interview structure components in reducing faking opportunities and thus preventing faking behaviors is very limited, with only a handful of studies looking at question type, probing, panel interviews, or interview duration. However, there is no evidence regarding other aspects of structure, and it is also well known that many organizations still use relatively unstructured interviews (e.g., Highhouse, 2008), Thus, future studies could investigate the impact of question consistency (i.e., asking the same questions in the same order), using descriptively-anchored rating scales, or interviewer training, on faking behavior and its effect on ratings of applicants' interview performance. Based on the general IM and interview structure literatures (e.g., Barrick et al., 2009; Levashina et al., 2014), we expect that structure components should help to decrease the effects of faking behavior:

Proposition 3: Increasing the structure of the interview reduces applicant faking and its effects on interview performance ratings.

More research is also needed concerning the role technology plays. Applicants' performance is often lower in technology-mediated than in face-to-face interviews (Blacksmith, Willford, & Behrend, 2016) and Blacksmith et al. proposed that applicants' use of IM might be impaired in technology-mediated interviews. However, other aspects of faking might be encouraged in these interviews. As an example, asynchronous video interviews involve applicants video-recording their response to interview questions via an online platform so that these can be evaluated at a later time. Some features of the online platforms include offering applicants time to prepare their responses before answering or allowing them to re-record their responses multiple times. This might make it easier to engage in self-focused faking tactics, such as slight or extensive image creation. In contrast, applicants talk to their webcam and not to an actual interviewer. This means that there is no target for other-oriented tactics like deceptive ingratiation, which might reduce such behaviors. It also eliminates feedback that applicants receive about the appropriateness of their responses (such

as interviewers' probing, nodding, or smiling), which makes it more difficult to estimate whether they should engage in more or less faking on subsequent questions. Given all this, we suggest the following research question for future research:

Research Question 3: What influence do technology-mediated interviews have on applicant faking?

Further, more research is needed to examine the benefits and drawbacks of different forms of warnings against faking. Law et al. (2016) found that only one of two types of warnings reduced faking, but it is unclear why. More research is also needed about potential consequences on applicants' reactions, for instance perceptions of interpersonal treatment (e.g., Gilliland & Steiner, 2012). Warnings could make candidates feel more uncomfortable, which may negatively impact their ability to perform (Feeney, McCarthy, & Goffin, 2015). Warnings combined with announcements of negative consequences for those who are caught lying could also backfire and damage the recruitment function of the interview. All in all, it seems rather early to provide organizations with viable recommendations to prevent faking, making this issue a relevant topic for future research:

Research Question 4: How effective are different types of warnings for reducing faking in interviews and how do applicants react to such warnings?

In addition, more insight is also needed on contextual factors beyond interview format and content that can influence the occurrence of faking behavior. For instance, labor market characteristics (e.g., the availability of alternative job openings) or the attractiveness of a given job have been discussed in theoretical models (Roulin et al., 2016), but have only received preliminary empirical testing (see Buehl & Melchers, 2018; Ho et al., 2019). As mentioned above, it is possible that "people fake only when they need to fake" (Ellingson, 2012, p. 19). Therefore, we suggest:

Proposition 4: Contextual factors such as attractiveness of a job or labor market characteristics influence applicant faking.

Does Faking in Interviews Matter?

Faking and Interview Outcomes

Even though some suggestions have been put forth to prefer alternative selection procedures to interviews because of the latter's potential for faking (Koenig et al., 2013), the extant research examining whether and how faking influences actual interview outcomes like interview performance ratings or interview success (e.g., receiving a job offer or an invitation for the next round of selection) reports mixed results (Table 4). Studies that investigated relationships between self-reported faking and outcomes in actual interviews found correlations that ranged from small and negative to null to moderate and positive (Amaral et al., 2019; Bourdage et al., 2018, Study 5; Buehl & Melchers, 2017, Study 1; Levashina & Campion, 2007, Study 5; Roulin et al., 2014). In addition, four studies examined relationships between self-reported faking and interview performance in mock interviews: two studies found small to moderate positive correlations (Buehl & Melchers, 2017, Study 2; Ingold, Kleinmann, König, & Melchers, 2015) and two others found negative correlations (Bourdage et al., 2018, Study 4; Swider et al., 2011).

In addition, four experimental studies compared IM and interview performance in two conditions: interviewees instructed to answer honestly vs. instructed to put their best foot forward. We note that these studies generally refer to a faking condition/manipulation, and we include them here because they provide valuable evidence for the *potential* effects of faking. However, we caution the reader that the "put your best foot forward" manipulation may not only trigger faking, but also honest IM. As such, differences in performance between an honest and a "best foot forward" condition can be due to honest IM, faking, or a combination of both[1].

---

[1] We thank an anonymous reviewer for highlighting this.

Concerning the results from these experimental studies, Allen, Facteau, and Facteau (2004) found no difference between interview ratings in an honest vs. two different "best foot forward" conditions. In contrast, Van Iddekinge et al. (2005) as well as Buehl et al. (2019) found significantly higher interview ratings in a "best foot forward" vs. an honest condition, with moderate to large effects. Finally, Peeters and Lievens (2006) used a similar design to Van Iddekinge et al. and Buehl et al., but did not report results for performance differences between an honest vs. a "best foot forward" condition. However, they looked into differences in the use of IM tactics (albeit without distinguishing between honest vs. dishonest IM) and found that individuals in the "best foot forward" condition used more self-focused IM (e.g., self-promotion) and more other-focused IM (e.g., ingratiation) than individuals in the honest condition.

Interestingly, Van Iddekinge et al.'s (2005) interview was designed to target specific personality dimensions, allowing for comparisons with the corresponding dimensions measured via a self-reported personality inventory completed under the same two conditions. Mean differences between the honest and the "best foot forward" condition were three times larger for the personality inventory than for the interview. This suggests that although interviews can be successfully faked, they are probably harder to fake than personality tests. Furthermore, the divergent findings from Allen et al. (2004) vs. Van Iddekinge et al. (2005) or Buehl et al. (2019) point towards potential boundary conditions of faking effectiveness: The three interviews targeted rather different aspects – Allen et al.'s interview targeted organizational citizenship behavior whereas Van Iddekinge et al.'s targeted personality and Buehl et al.'s targeted academic and study-related behavior. Alternatively, differences in the experimental treatment may have contributed to the diverging results. Both Van Iddekinge et al. and Buehl et al. went to considerable lengths to create an application-like atmosphere whereas Allen et al. just asked participants to imagine being interviewed for an attractive job.

Furthermore, only Buehl et al. used a within-subjects designs whereas the other studies used between-subjects designs.

Faking and Interview Validity

A highly relevant practical question is whether faking influences the validity of interviews. Unfortunately, research examining the effect of faking on the construct- and criterion-related validity of selection interviews is scarce. Van Iddekinge et al. (2005) found that the construct-related validity of their structured interview was worse in the "best foot forward" condition than in the honest condition, which is comparable to findings on faking in personality tests (Schmit & Ryan, 1993). However, Van Iddekinge et al.'s findings may not generalize to other interviews because of their unusual focus on personality. Moreover, the level of construct validity in their honest condition was unusually high, as compared to other selection interview research (e.g., Melchers et al., 2009).

Only two studies investigated the effects of faking on criterion-related validity directly. Ingold, Kleinmann, König, and Melchers (2015) found a non-significant correlation ($r = .15$) between self-reported faking measured after a mock job interview and ratings of in-role performance by supervisors. Buehl et al. (2019) manipulated faking, with psychology students completing a mock interview designed to predict academic performance once in an honest condition (i.e., instructed to answer honestly) and once in a "best foot forward" condition (i.e., instructed to present themselves in the best possible way, as if they had applied for an attractive graduate program). They found that academic performance was better predicted in the "best foot forward" condition whereas citizenship behavior was better predicted in the honest condition. They argued that applicants' abilities (e.g., cognitive ability or the ability to identify the selection criteria) are necessary for both successful faking in interviews and task performance (cf. Ingold, Kleinmann, König, Melchers, & Van Iddekinge, 2015, for ATIC; and Schmidt & Hunter, 2004, for cognitive ability) and therefore contribute to criterion-related validity. In contrast, information obtained in the honest condition allows

for a better prediction of citizenship behavior, which is more strongly associated with personality and motivation in comparison to abilities.

In addition, the meta-analysis by Huffcutt et al. (2004) offers indirect evidence for the potential effect of faking on criterion-related validity. They compared interview criterion-related validity for predicting job performance with two designs: concurrent (i.e., with job incumbents) vs. predictive (i.e., with applicants, and thus interviewees who were more prone to faking). Interviews from both designs predicted job performance, but criterion-related validity was higher for concurrent than predictive designs. In contrast to Buehl et al. (2019), this suggests that interviews are better predictors of performance when they are less prone to faking (i.e., from concurrent designs) but that interviews are still predictive when applicants can fake. However, there might also be other reasons for the differences such as the passage of time between the interview and measurement in the criterion in predictive designs or better job knowledge by incumbents (cf. Van Iddekinge & Ployhart, 2008).

Discussion and Future Research Directions

Although practically very important, our fourth question ("Does faking in interviews matter?") is the one that has received the least attention so far. The experimental studies by Van Iddekinge et al. (2005) and by Buehl et al. (2019) indicate that applicants can improve their interview scores. However, in both studies it is unclear whether the better performance ratings were due to honest IM, faking, or a combination of both. Furthermore, both studies certainly lack external validity and their generalizability is potentially limited. Evidence from correlational studies examining faking in actual interviews is more mixed. It is also unclear whether the null findings from high-stakes interviews (e.g., Bourdage et al., 2018, Studies 4 and 5; Roulin et al., 2014) represent evidence that faking is unrelated to interview outcomes or whether they are due to applicants misreporting faking. This is an important issue for future research. More generally, we clearly need more field studies with high-stakes interviews that examine faking/IM effectiveness in interviews. A potential way to conduct such studies

would be to compare data from a high-stakes selection situation with a more honest condition, for example as part of a validation study in which interview data from employees are specifically collected for research purposes so that interviewees can be encouraged to answer honestly. Furthermore, following the example of Roulin and Bourdage (2017), it is possible to clearly separate the interview from questioning applicants about their actual faking behavior. Nevertheless, given that research on faking in personality tests revealed more faking in the lab (instructions to fake vs. to respond honestly) than in the field (applicants vs. incumbents, see Birkeland et al., 2006; and Viswesvaran & Ones, 1999), we propose a similar effect for interviews:

Proposition 5: Faking has stronger effects on interview performance in simulated interviews and/or following instructions in experimental studies than in high-stakes selection interviews.

Furthermore, all the studies that looked at actual improvements in a "best foot forward" condition relative to an honest condition used highly structured interviews that were clearly job- or task-related. However, it remains unclear whether faking also leads to higher performance in less structured interviews with less-job related questions (e.g., about leisure activities, general strengths and weaknesses, personal goals):

Research Question 5: Does the level of interview structure moderate the relationship between applicant faking and interview performance?

The studies by Ingold, Kleinmann, König, and Melchers (2015) and by Buehl et al. (2019) provide initial evidence concerning the effects of faking on criterion-related validity. However, whether the small positive relationship they found generalize to high-stakes selection interviews must be determined. Because cognitive ability or ATIC are likely to play a role in successful interview faking and are also predictive of task performance (Ingold, Kleinmann, König, Melchers, et al., 2015; Schmidt & Hunter, 2004), faking could contribute to the prediction of task performance. In contrast, applicants usually fake to compensate for a

lack of qualification or fit, and thus faking should negatively impact criterion-related validity (e.g., Levashina et al., 2014). In addition, Buehl et al.'s (2019) findings suggest that faking can impair the prediction of citizenship behavior. And, because faking is associated with the Dark Triad or low Honesty-Humility, it seems likely that faking also impairs the prediction of other contextual performance criteria such as counterproductive work behavior. This would be in line with recent findings suggesting that applicants who fake on personality tests are more likely to engage in deviant or counterproductive work behaviors (O'Neill et al., 2013; Peterson, Griffith, Isaacson, O'Connell, & Mangos, 2011). Accordingly, we propose:

Research Question 6: How does faking affect interview criterion-related validity for predicting task performance?

Proposition 6: Faking impairs interview criterion-related validity for predicting contextual performance.

In addition, it would also be interesting to explore the effects of honest IM vs. faking, but also of various types of faking tactics, on criterion-related validity. For instance, honest IM should theoretically contribute positively to validity because it provides interviewers with more accurate job-relevant information about applicants (Bourdage et al., 2018). In contrast, the more severe forms of faking (e.g., extensive image creation) could potentially harm validity because interviewers collect made-up information about applicants' qualifications (e.g., Levashina & Campion, 2007). The impact of less severe forms of faking (e.g., slight image creation) might sit somewhere in between. As such, the positive findings from studies using the "best foot forward" condition described above could have been due to the manipulation triggering mostly honest IM or slight image creation, rather than extensive image creation. Accordingly, we propose the following research question:

Research Question 7: How do different IM and faking tactics influence criterion-related validity?

Can We Detect Faking in Interviews?

Decades of empirical research on lie detection in the deception literature suggest that people are generally not effective lie detectors. For instance, meta-analytic results revealed an average of 54% correct lie-truth judgments, which represent a very marginal improvement over the 50% chance level (e.g., Bond & DePaulo, 2006). Furthermore, research conducted in both social and forensic psychology has failed to identify relevant individual differences in lie detection (Bond & DePaulo, 2008). Importantly, although there are some valid cues or indicators of deception, people tend to rely on the wrong ones (DePaulo et al., 2003). For instance, both lay people and professionals such as police officers often rely on invalid non-verbal cues such as gaze aversion or fidgeting and ignore valid verbal cues such as vagueness or contradictions (Vrij, Granhag, & Porter, 2010).

Examination of interview faking detection is still in its infancy, but the evidence accumulated so far is generally aligned with deception detection research: Interviewers have difficulties to detect faking and effective strategies to improve faking detection have yet to be validated and implemented. For example, Culbertson, Weyhrauch, and Waples (2016, Study 2) found that ratings of interviewees' performance differed based on raters' perceptions of truthfulness but these perceptions were largely inaccurate. Furthermore, Reinhard, Scharmach, and Müller (2013) conducted an experimental study with participants attempting to detect deception (descriptions of true vs. invented job experiences) in recorded mock interviews. Participants' accuracy was 52.39%, that is, only slightly better than chance level (i.e., 50%). However, this might still be an overestimation of faking detection, as applicants are not just honest or deceptive, but can use a variety of faking tactics. In line with this, Roulin, Bangerter, and Levashina (2015) conducted a series of five experimental studies investigating interviewers' ability to detect various forms of honest IM and faking tactics and found that most of the time interviewers failed in detecting faking. For instance, interviewers correctly detected only 12 to 19% of faking tactics used by interviewees. Moreover, in a field

study, Roulin et al. (2014) found no significant correlation between applicants' self-reported use of faking tactics and interviewers' perception of faking.

In addition, interviewers' experience and interviewer characteristics do not help to detect faking. For example, Roulin et al. (2015, Study 1) found no relationship between years of experience and detection abilities even though their participants had an average of 9.6 years of experience as interviewers. Furthermore, they found no difference in detection between complete novices (e.g., students) and experienced interviewers. Similarly, in Reinhard et al.'s (2013) study, experienced interviewers did not outperform novices at faking detection. Additionally, Roulin (2016) recently explored individual differences associated with faking detection and found that interviewers who scored high in both trust and cognitive abilities were better faking detectors, whereas a combination of low trust and low abilities was deterring detection. However, the average faking detection score was just above chance level and individual differences explained only a small part of variance in detection. And Roulin and Ternes (2019, Study 3) found that individuals higher on emotional intelligence paid more attention to interviewees' non-verbal behaviors, but were not better at faking detection.

A possible consequence of these findings is to search for more viable strategies to help detect faking. A first strategy involves utilizing the right cues to identify faking. For instance, building on cues to deception that were identified by general research on lie detection (DePaulo et al., 2003), Schneider, Powell, and Roulin (2015) examined which micro- and macro-level cues were associated with interview faking. Fakers showed less non-verbal behaviors (e.g., less smiling) and more unstrained verbal behavior (e.g., more speaking errors) than non-fakers. Furthermore, overall fakers appeared to be less anxious. However, correlations between cues and faking behaviors were small. Similarly, Culbertson, Weyhrauch, and Waples (2016, Study 1) compared the occurrence of verbal cues for individuals asked to lie vs. to respond honestly. They found significant differences between honest and deceptive answers for 11 of the 14 cues that were considered (e.g., implausibility,

uncooperativeness) but again most of these differences were small. And Roulin and Powell (2018) examined the potential value of Criterion-Based Content Analysis (CBCA), an approach used to predict deception in legal proceedings, as a potential set of valid cues of faking. They tested the value of a set of 14 CBCA cues (e.g., logical structure, quantity of details, contextual embedding) in two studies. CBCA could act as a valid cue to faking when (a) interviewees freely engaged in faking (but not when instructed to fake), (b) an overall CBCA indicator was used (and not individual CBCA cues), and interviewees' responses contained story features (i.e., a series of events associated with one unique episode in the past, and characterized by a unity of time or action). Of practical importance, Roulin and Powell's analyses highlighted that CBCA-based assessments of faking/honesty could reach up to 63.4% accuracy, much higher than the accuracy reached by interviewers. Yet, their studies were based on mock interviews.

A second strategy involves changing interview design aspects such as the type of interview question or the interview medium. However, this strategy seems to have no consequences for the ability to detect faking. Roulin et al. (2015, Study 2) found that interviewers were better at correctly identifying honest IM with situational questions, but no such effect was found with faking. Similarly, the interview medium does not seem to make a difference either. Ferrán-Urdaneta, and Storck (1997) found no difference in the ability to detect faking between face-to-face and video-conference interviews. Finally, a third strategy involves warning interviewers that applicants might fake. However, Toris and DePaulo (1984) found that interviewers who received such a warning were not more accurate in their judgements of deception.

Discussion and Future Research Directions

Despite some preliminary evidence for the potential value of content-based techniques, existing research has not found any definitive effective strategy to detect faking, and thus the answer to our fifth question ("Can we detect faking in interviews?") is currently

"no". Some valid cues of faking (such as less smiling, less silences, and more speaking errors) have been identified, but effects are usually only small (e.g., Culbertson et al., 2016; Schneider et al., 2015). Analyzing the content of applicants' answers (e.g., with the CBCA approach) appears to be a more promising approach (Roulin & Powell, 2018). Yet, future research is needed to systematically examine the application of content-based techniques in high-stakes selection contexts and to explore whether interviewers could be trained to use such techniques or whether automatic computer-based coding could be applied.

Proposition 7: Training based on content-based lie detection strategies is a viable strategy to help interviewers deal with faking.

Conclusive Comments

Since the starting point of systematic research on faking in interviews, there has been a fair amount of theoretical and empirical research. We organized our review of this research vis-à-vis five core questions: (1) What is faking in interviews? (2) How common is it? (3) Which are its antecedents? (4) Does it matter? (5) Can we detect it?

In a nutshell, the existing literature quite extensively covers the first three questions, although there still are some grey areas. For instance, our knowledge of the prevalence of faking in practice is largely based on students, young applicant, or online samples. And, the research on faking antecedents focusses largely on individual differences (e.g., personality), while empirical work examining situational factors is scarce despite several theoretical models discussing them. As an example, there is very limited evidence about how interview structure influences faking and about the impact of different structure components. Similarly, while the attractiveness of a given job or labor market characteristics (e.g., unemployment, availability of alternative job openings) have been discussed in theoretical models (Roulin et al., 2016), empirical examination is still very limited. Applicants' ability to fake and the factors that could influence it, such as cognitive ability, social skills, or the ability to identify

the constructs being measured (e.g., Melchers, Bösser, Hartstein, & Kleinmann, 2012;

Oostrom, Melchers, Ingold, & Kleinmann, 2016), has also not been extensively examined.

Our knowledge about the fourth question is limited for two reasons. First, only a

handful of studies examined how faking impacts interview performance, and results are

mixed and confounded by study designs. Second, there is limited work (both theoretical and

empirical) discussing the impact of interview faking on criterion-related validity, and whether

faking is differently associated with task vs. contextual performance. We argue that faking

can potentially contribute to the prediction of task performance, especially when abilities

(e.g., cognitive ability) are relevant for both faking effectiveness and successful performance.

However, faking to compensate a lack of qualifications (especially the use of extensive image

creation) might impair the prediction of task performance. And the fact that that faking is

related to "darker" personality traits (i.e., low honesty-humility, high Machiavellianism)

suggests that it could negatively impact predictions of contextual performance. Finally,

although several studies have examined our fifth question in the last few years, the

accumulated evidence depicts a quite bleak image of organizations' (and interviewers')

success in their attempts to detect (or deal with) faking.

In addition, our review identified new propositions and research questions that should

encourage future research and help interview faking research progress further (see Table 5 for

a summary). Our review also highlights several practical implications (see Table 6 for a

summary of recommendations for practitioners). But for this field to move forward and have

an even bigger practical impact, one must reconsider the way studies are designed and

conducted. For instance, examining the prevalence of interview faking in high-stakes

selection contexts may require the development and validation of alternative approaches to

measure faking (in addition to simple self-reports that may scare respondents in such

contexts), similar to the use of over-claiming measures in knowledge tests (e.g., Bing,

Kluemper, Davison, Taylor, & Novicevic, 2011) or bogus items in biodata research (e.g.,

Levashina et al., 2009). Alternatively, a clearer understanding of why and how applicants fake may require researchers to conduct experimental studies and examine (and measure) faking at the level of the interview question (vs. the entire interview). For instance, the use of asynchronous video interviews may facilitate a more precise and systematic reporting of faking by research participants (e.g., by re-watching their responses and reporting when they faked, how much they faked, and what tactics they used).

Longitudinal studies are necessary to examine the impact of faking on workplace outcomes. In addition, as noted above, such research should not only focus on predicting job performance, but also consider other relevant outcomes, such as counterproductive work behavior, absenteeism, turnover, or citizenship behavior. For instance, research on faking in personality tests suggests that fakers tend to engage in more counterproductive work behavior once hired (O'Neill et al., 2013), but we do not know whether this also applies to faking in interviews.

More than a decade after Levashina and Campion's (2006, 2007) seminal work on the antecedents and types of faking tactics used by applicants in employment interviews, we believe that this review serves both as a comprehensive summary of the accumulated knowledge about interview faking and as a roadmap for future research. Given this active field of research, we are looking forward to the new insights that lie ahead of us.

References

Ajzen, I. (1991). The theory of planned behavior. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 50*, 179-211. doi:10.1016/0749-5978%2891%2990020-T

Allen, T. D., Facteau, J. D., & Facteau, C. L. (2004). Structured interviewing for OCB: Construct validity, faking, and the effects of question type. *Human Performance, 17*, 1-24. doi:10.1207/S15327043HUP1701_1

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*, 315-327. doi:10.1111/ijsa.12260

Ashton, M. C., & Lee, K. (2007). Empirical, theoretical, and practical advantages of the HEXACO model of personality structure. *Personality and Social Psychology Review, 11*, 150-166. doi:10.1177/1088868306294907

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

Bing, M. N., Kluemper, D., Davison, H. K., Taylor, S., & Novicevic, M. (2011). Overclaiming as a measure of faking. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 116*, 148-162. doi:10.1016/j.obhdp.2011.05.006

Birkeland, S. A., Manson, T. M., Kisamore, J. L., Brannick, M. T., & Smith, M. A. (2006). A meta-analytic investigation of job applicant faking on personality measures. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment, 14*, 317-335. doi:10.1111/j.1468-2389.2006.00354.x

Blacksmith, N., Willford, J. C., & Behrend, T. S. (2016). Technology in the employment interview: A meta-analysis and future research agenda. *Personnel Assessment and Decisions, 2*, 12-20. doi:10.25035/pad.2016.002

Bond, C. F., & DePaulo, B. M. (2006). Accuracy of deception judgments. *Personality and Social Psychology Review, 10*, 214-234. doi:10.1207/s15327957pspr1003_2

Bond, C. F., & DePaulo, B. M. (2008). Individual differences in judging deception: Accuracy and bias. *Psychological Bulletin, 134*, 477-492. doi:10.1037/0033-2909.134.4.477

Boss, P., König, C. J., & Melchers, K. G. (2015). Faking good and faking bad among military conscripts. *Human Performance, 28*, 26-39. doi:10.1080/08959285.2014.974758

Bourdage, J. S., Roulin, N., & Levashina, J. (2017). Editorial: Impression management and faking in job interviews. *Frontiers in Psychology, 8: 1294*, 1-4. doi:10.3389/fpsyg.2017.01294

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*, 597-632. doi:10.1111/peps.12285

Buehl, A.-K., & Melchers, K. G. (2017). Individual difference variables and the occurrence and effectiveness of faking behavior in interviews. *Frontiers in Psychology, 8: 686*, 1-15. doi:10.3389/fpsyg.2017.00686

Buehl, A.-K., & Melchers, K. G. (2018). Do attractiveness and competition influence faking intentions in selection interviews? *Journal of Personnel Psychology, 17*, 204-208. doi:10.1027/1866-5888/a000208

Buehl, A.-K., Melchers, K. G., Macan, T., & Kühnel, J. (2019). Tell me sweet little lies: How does faking in interviews affect interview scores and interview validity? *Journal of Business and Psychology, 34*, 107-124. doi:10.1007/s10869-018-9531-3

Burns, G. N., & Christiansen, N. D. (2011). Methods of measuring faking behavior. *Human Performance, 24*, 358-372. doi:10.1080/08959285.2011.597473

Culbertson, S. S., Weyhrauch, W. S., & Waples, C. J. (2016). Behavioral cues as indicators of deception in structured employment interviews. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment, 24*, 119-131. doi:10.1111/ijsa.12135

DePaulo, B. M., Lindsay, J. J., Malone, B. E., Muhlenbruck, L., Charlton, K., & Cooper, H. (2003). Cues to deception. *Psychological Bulletin, 129*, 74-118. doi:10.1037/0033-2909.129.1.74

Donovan, J. J., Dwight, S. A., & Hurtz, G. M. (2003). An assessment of the prevalence, severity, and verifiability of entry-level applicant faking using the randomized response technique. *Human Performance, 16*, 81-106.

Dürr, D., & Klehe, U.-C. (2018). Using the theory of planned behavior to predict faking in selection exercises varying in fidelity. *Journal of Personnel Psychology, 17*, 155-160. doi:10.1027/1866-5888/a000211

Dwight, S. A., & Donovan, J. J. (2003). Do warnings not to fake reduce faking? *Human Performance, 16*, 1-23. doi:10.1207/S15327043HUP1601_1

Ellingson, J. E. (2012). People fake only when they need to fake. In M. Ziegler, C. MacCann, & R. D. Roberts (Eds.), *New perspectives on faking in personality assessment* (pp. 19-33). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Ellingson, J. E., & McFarland, L. A. (2011). Understanding faking behavior through the lens of motivation: An application of VIE theory. *Human Performance, 24*, 322-337. doi:10.1080/08959285.2011.597477

Fan, J., Gao, D., Carroll, S. A., Lopez, F. J., Tian, T. S., & Meng, H. (2012). Testing the efficacy of a new procedure for reducing faking on personality tests within selection contexts. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 97*, 866-880. doi:10.1037/a0026655

Feeney, J. R., McCarthy, J. M., & Goffin, R. (2015). Applicant anxiety: Examining the sex-linked anxiety coping theory in job interview contexts. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment, 23*, 295-305. doi:10.1111/ijsa.12115

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*, 65-85. doi:10.1007/s10869-015-9407-8

Ferrán-Urdaneta, C., & Storck, J. (1997). Truth or deception: The impact of

videoconferencing on job interviews. *Proceedings of the International Conference on

Information Systems, 18*, 183-196.

Gilliland, S. W., & Steiner, D. D. (2012). Applicant reactions to testing and selection. In N.

Schmitt (Ed.), *The Oxford handbook of personnel assessment and selection* (pp. 629-

666). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

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

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

doi:10.1177/014920638901500405

Goffin, R. D., & Boyd, A. C. (2009). Faking and personality assessment in personnel

selection: Advancing models of faking. *Canadian Psychology/Psychologie

canadienne, 50*, 151-160. doi:10.1037/a0015946

Griffith, R. L., Lee, L. M., Peterson, M. H., & Zickar, M. J. (2011). First dates and little white

lies: A trait contract classification theory of applicant faking behavior. *Human

Performance, 24*, 338-357. doi:10.1080/08959285.2011.597475

Griffith, R. L., & Peterson, M. H. (2008). The failure of social desirability measures to

capture applicant faking behavior. *Industrial and Organizational Psychology, 1*, 308-

311. doi:10.1111/j.1754-9434.2008.00053.x

Highhouse, S. (2008). Stubborn reliance on intuition and subjectivity in employee selection.

Industrial and Organizational Psychology: Perspectives on Science and Practice, 1,

333-342.

Ho, J. L., Powell, D. M., Barclay, P., & Gill, H. (2019). The influence of competition on

motivation to fake in employment interviews. *Journal of Personnel Psychology, 18*,

95-105. doi:10.1027/1866-5888/a000222

Hogue, M., Levashina, J., & Hang, H. (2013). Will I fake it? The interplay of gender,

Machiavellianism, and self-monitoring on strategies for honesty in job interviews.

Journal of Business Ethics, 117, 399-411. doi:10.1007/s10551-012-1525-x

Huffcutt, A. I., Conway, J. M., Roth, P. L., & Klehe, U.-C. (2004). Evaluation and

comparison of the situational and behavior description interview formats.

International Journal of Selection and Assessment, 12, 262-273. doi:10.1037/0021-

9010.86.5.897

Husain, Z., Dayan, M., Pathak, R. D., Langer, M., & König, C. J. (2019). How much self-

presentation behavior do applicants from the united arab emirates exhibit?

International Journal of Selection and Assessment, 26, 191-195.

doi:10.1111/ijsa.12225

Ingold, P. V., Kleinmann, M., König, C. J., & Melchers, K. G. (2015). Shall we continue or

stop disapproving of self-presentation? Evidence on impression management and

faking in a selection context and their relation to job performance. *European Journal

of Work and Organizational Psychology, 24*, 420-432.

doi:10.1080/1359432X.2014.915215

Ingold, P. V., Kleinmann, M., König, C. J., Melchers, K. G., & Van Iddekinge, C. H. (2015).

Why do situational interviews predict job performance? The role of interviewees'

ability to identify criteria. *Journal of Business and Psychology, 30*, 387-398.

doi:10.1007/s10869-014-9368-3

Jansen, A., König, C. J., Stadelmann, E. H., & Kleinmann, M. (2012). Applicants' self-

presentational behavior: What do recruiters expect and what do they get? *Journal of

Personnel Psychology, 11*, 77-85. doi:10.1027/1866-5888/a000046

Kleinmann, M., Ingold, P. V., Lievens, F., König, C. J., Melchers, K. G., & Jansen, A. (2011).

A different look at why selection procedures work: The role of candidates' ability to

identify criteria. *Organizational Psychology Review, 1*, 128-146.

doi:10.1177/2041386610387000

Kleinmann, M., & Klehe, U.-C. (2011). Selling oneself: Construct and criterion-related

validity of impression management in structured interviews. *Human Performance, 24*,

29-46. doi:10.1080/08959285.2010.530634

Koenig, T. W., Parrish, S. K., Terregino, C. A., Williams, J. P., Dunleavy, D. M., & Volsch,

J. M. (2013). Core personal competencies important to entering students' success in

medical school: What are they and how could they be assessed early in the admission

process? *Academic Medicine, 88*, 603-613. doi:10.1097/ACM.0b013e31828b3389

König, C. J., Hafsteinsson, L. G., Jansen, A., & Stadelmann, E. H. (2011). Applicants' self-

presentational behavior across cultures: Less self-presentation in Switzerland and

Iceland than in the United States. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment,

19*, 331-339. doi:10.1111/j.1468-2389.2011.00562.x

König, C. J., Wong, J., & Cen, G. (2012). How much do Chinese applicants fake? .

International Journal of Selection and Assessment, 20, 247-250. doi:10.1111/j.1468-

2389.2012.00596.x

Law, S. J., Bourdage, J., & O'Neill, T. A. (2016). To fake or not to fake: Antecedents to

interview faking, warning instructions, and its impact on applicant reactions. *Frontiers

in Psychology, 7: 1771*, 1-13. doi:10.3389/fpsyg.2016.01771

Leary, M. R., & Kowalski, R. M. (1990). Impression management: A literature review and

two-component model. *Psychological Bulletin, 107*, 34-47. doi:10.1037/0033-

2909.107.1.34

Lester, C., Anglim, J., & Fullarton, C. (2015). Individual differences in intention to fake job

interviews: Personality, self-monitoring, and the theory of planned behaviour.

Australasian Journal of Organisational Psychology, 8: e8, 1-11.

doi:10.1017/orp.2015.7

Levashina, J., & Campion, M. A. (2006). A model of faking likelihood in the employment

interview. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment, 14*, 299-316.

doi:10.1111/j.1468-2389.2006.00353.x

Levashina, J., & Campion, M. A. (2007). Measuring faking in the employment interview:

Development and validation of an interview faking behavior scale. *Journal of Applied

Psychology, 92*, 1638-1656. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.92.6.1638

Levashina, J., Hartwell, C. J., Morgeson, F. P., & Campion, M. A. (2014). The structured

employment interview: Narrative and quantitative review of the research literature.

Personnel Psychology, 67, 241-293. doi:10.1111/peps.12052

Levashina, J., Morgeson, F. P., & Campion, M. A. (2009). They don't do it often, but they do

it well: Exploring the relationship between applicant mental abilities and faking.

International Journal of Selection and Assessment, 17, 271-281. doi:10.1111/j.1468-

2389.2009.00469.x

Macan, T. (2009). The employment interview: A review of current studies and directions for

future research. *Human Resource Management Review, 19*, 203-218.

doi:10.1016/j.hrmr.2009.03.006

Marcus, B. (2009). 'Faking' from the applicant's perspective: A theory of self-presentation in

personnel selection settings. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment, 17*,

417-430. doi:10.1111/j.1468-2389.2009.00483.x

McFarland, L. A., & Ryan, A. M. (2000). Variance in faking across noncognitive measures.

Journal of Applied Psychology, 85, 812-821. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.85.5.812

McFarland, L. A., & Ryan, A. M. (2006). Toward an integrated model of applicant faking

behavior. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 36*, 979-1016. doi:10.1111/j.0021-

9029.2006.00052.x

Melchers, K. G., Bösser, D., Hartstein, T., & Kleinmann, M. (2012). Assessment of

situational demands in a selection interview: Reflective style or sensitivity?

International Journal of Selection and Assessment, 20, 475-485.

doi:10.1111/ijsa.12010

Melchers, K. G., Klehe, U.-C., Richter, G. M., Kleinmann, M., König, C. J., & Lievens, F. (2009). "I know what you want to know": The impact of interviewees' ability to identify criteria on interview performance and construct-related validity. *Human Performance, 22*, 355–374. doi:10.1080/08959280903120295

Mueller-Hanson, R. A., Heggestad, E. D., & Thornton, G. (2006). Individual differences in impression management: An exploration of the psychological processes underlying faking. *Psychology Science, 48*, 288-312.

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

Oostrom, J. K., Melchers, K. G., Ingold, P. V., & Kleinmann, M. (2016). Why do situational interviews predict performance? Is it saying how you would behave or knowing how you should behave? *Journal of Business and Psychology, 31*, 279-291. doi:10.1007/s10869-015-9410-0

Paulhus, D. L. (1991). Measurement and control of response bias. In J. P. Robinson, P. R. Shaver, & L. S. Wrightsman (Eds.), *Measures of personality and social psychological attitudes*. San Diego, CA: Academic Press.

Paulhus, D. L., & Williams, K. M. (2002). The Dark Triad of personality: Narcissism, Machiavellianism and psychopathy. *Journal of Research in Personality, 36*, 556-563. doi:10.1016/S0092-6566%2802%2900505-6

Peeters, H., & Lievens, F. (2006). Verbal and nonverbal impression management tactics in behavior description and situational interviews. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment, 14*, 206-222. doi:10.1111/j.1468-2389.2006.00348.x

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

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

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

Reinhard, M. A., Scharmach, M., & Müller, P. (2013). It's not what you are, it's what you

 know: Experience, beliefs, and the detection of deception in employment interviews.

 Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 43, 467-479. doi:10.1111/j.1559-

 1816.2013.01011.x

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

 interviews. *Personnel Assessment and Decisions, 2*, 1-11. doi:10.25035/pad.2016.001

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

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

 163. doi:10.1108/JMP-10-2012-0295

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

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

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

Roulin, N., & Bourdage, J. S. (2017). Once an impression manager, always an impression

 manager? Antecedents of honest and deceptive impression management use and

 variability across multiple job interviews. *Frontiers in Psychology, 8: 29*, 1-13.

 doi:10.3389/fpsyg.2017.00029

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

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

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

Roulin, N., Krings, F., & Binggeli, S. (2016). A dynamic model of applicant faking.

 Organizational Psychology Review, 6, 145-170. doi:10.1177/2041386615580875

Roulin, N., & Powell, D. M. (2018). Identifying applicant faking in job interviews:

 Examining the role of criterion-based content analysis and storytelling. *Journal of*

 Personnel Psychology, 17, 143-154. doi:10.1027/1866-5888/a000207

Roulin, N., & Ternes, M. (2019). Is it time to kill the detection wizard? Emotional

 intelligence does not facilitate deception detection. *Personality and Individual*

 Differences, 137, 131-138. doi:10.1016/j.paid.2018.08.020

Ryan, A. M., & Ployhart, R. E. (2014). A century of selection. *Annual Review of Psychology,*

 65, 693-717. doi:10.1146/annurev-psych-010213-115134

Sackett, P. R., & Lievens, F. (2008). Personnel selection. *Annual Review of Psychology, 59*,

 419-450. doi:10.1146/annurev.psych.59.103006.093716

Salgado, J. F. (2016). A theoretical model of psychometric effects of faking on assessment

 procedures: Empirical findings and implications for personality at work. *International*

 Journal of Selection and Assessment, 24, 209-228. doi:10.1111/ijsa.12142

Schilling, M., Roulin, N., Obschonka, M., & König, C. J. (in press). Do you fake more

 because of your neighbors? A multi-level study on regional and individual predictors

 of faking intentions across the U.S. *Journal of Business and Psychology*.

Schmidt, F. L., & Hunter, J. (2004). General mental ability in the world of work:

 Occupational attainment and job performance. *Journal of Personality and Social*

 Psychology, 86, 162-173. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.86.1.162

Schmit, M. J., & Ryan, A. M. (1993). The Big Five in personnel selection: Factor structure in

 applicant and nonapplicant populations. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 78*, 966-974.

Schneider, L., Powell, D. M., & Roulin, N. (2015). Cues to deception in the employment

 interview. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment, 23*, 182-190.

 doi:10.1111/ijsa.12106

Snell, A. F., Sydell, E. J., & Lueke, S. B. (1999). Towards a theory of applicant faking:

 Integrating studies of deception. *Human Resource Management Review, 9*, 219-242.

Stevens, C. K., & Kristof, A. L. (1995). Making the right impression: A field study of

applicant impression management during job interviews. *Journal of Applied

Psychology, 80*, 587-606. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.80.5.587

Swider, B. W., Barrick, M. R., Harris, T. B., & Stoverink, A. C. (2011). Managing and

creating an image in the interview: The role of interviewee initial impressions. *Journal

of Applied Psychology, 96*, 1275. doi:10.1037/a0024005

Tett, R. P., & Simonet, D. V. (2011). Faking in personality assessment: A "multisaturation"

perspective on faking as performance. *Human Performance, 24*, 302-321.

doi:10.1080/08959285.2011.597472

Toris, C., & DePaulo, B. M. (1984). Effects of actual deception and suspiciousness of

deception on interpersonal perceptions. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology,

47*, 1063-1073.

Van Iddekinge, C. H., & Ployhart, R. E. (2008). Developments in the criterion-related

validation of selection procedures: A critical review and recommendations for

practice. *Personnel Psychology, 61*, 871-925. doi:10.1111/j.1744-6570.2008.00133.x

Van Iddekinge, C. H., Raymark, P. H., & Roth, P. L. (2005). Assessing personality with a

structured employment interview: Construct-related validity and susceptibility to

response inflation. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 90*, 536-552. doi:10.1037/0021-

9010.90.3.536

Viswesvaran, C., & Ones, D. S. (1999). Meta-analyses of fakability estimates: Implications

for personality measurement. *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 59*, 197-

210.

Vrij, A., Granhag, P. A., & Porter, S. (2010). Pitfalls and opportunities in nonverbal and

verbal lie detection. *Psychological Science in the Public Interest, 11*, 89-121.

doi:10.1177/1529100610390861

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

Wilhelmy, A., Kleinmann, M., König, C. J., Melchers, K. G., & Truxillo, D. M. (2016). How and why do interviewers try to make impressions on applicants? A qualitative study. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 101*, 313-332. doi:10.1037/apl0000046

Table 1. Prevalence of Faking in Interviews

Source	Operationalization of Faking				
	Lying	Slight image creation	Extensive image creation	Image protection	Deceptive ingratiation
Bourdage et al. (2018, Study 4)		55%	17%	40%	67%
Bourdage et al. (2018, Study 5)		48%	39%	49%	69%
Dürr & Klehe (2018)		53%	35%	49%	76%
Levashina & Campion (2007, Study 3)		99%	92%	96%	99%
Levashina & Campion (2007, Study 5)		95%	80%	86%	95%
Levashina & Campion (2007, Study 6)		85%	65%	87%	77%
Roulin et al. (2014)		44%	21%	40%	70%
Weiss & Feldman (2006)	81%				

Table 2. Personality and Attitudinal Correlates of Interview Faking

| Personality and Attitudinal Variable | N | Operationalization of Faking | | | | | | Source |
		Intention vs. Behavior	General faking or lying	Slight image creation	Extensive image creation	Image protec-tion	Deceptive ingratia-tion	
Big Five								
Conscientiousness	224	Behavior		-.18	-.35	-.19	-.13	Bourdage et al. (2018, Study 4)
	222	Behavior	-.04					Buehl & Melchers (2017, Study 1)
	313	Intention	-.17					Lester et al. (2015)
	80	Behavior		-.31	-.34	-.20	-.18	Roulin & Bourdage (2017)
	4851	Intention	-.27					Schilling et al. (in press)
C – Competence	206	Behavior	-.36					Roulin & Krings (2016, Study 2)
C – Order	206	Behavior	-.29					Roulin & Krings (2016, Study 2)
C – Dutifulness	206	Behavior	-.35					Roulin & Krings (2016, Study 2)
C – Achievement Striv.	206	Behavior	-.24					Roulin & Krings (2016, Study 2)
C – Self-discipline	206	Behavior	-.30					Roulin & Krings (2016, Study 2)
C – Deliberation	206	Behavior	-.04					Roulin & Krings (2016, Study 2)
Extraversion	224	Behavior		-.24	-.27	-.28	-.12	Bourdage et al. (2018, Study 4)
	222	Behavior	.04					Buehl & Melchers (2017, Study 1)
	313	Intention	-.01					Lester et al. (2015)
	80	Behavior		.15	.04	.20	.21	Roulin & Bourdage (2017)
	59	Behavior	.30					Weiss & Feldman (2006)
Agreeableness	224	Behavior		.03	-.02	.02	.00	Bourdage et al. (2018, Study 4)
	222	Behavior	-.11					Buehl & Melchers (2017, Study 1)
	80	Behavior		-.13	-.03	-.10	-.12	Roulin & Bourdage (2017)
Openness	224	Behavior		-.01	-.12	-.10	-.01	Bourdage et al. (2018, Study 4)
	222	Behavior	.02					Buehl & Melchers (2017, Study 1)
	80	Behavior		.05	.09	.04	-.07	Roulin & Bourdage (2017)
Neuroticism	224	Behavior		.13	.02	.08	.14	Bourdage et al. (2018, Study 4)
	222	Behavior	.13					Buehl & Melchers (2017, Study 1)

	313	Intention	.19					Lester et al. (2015)
	80	Behavior		-.11	-.01	.05	-.01	Roulin & Bourdage (2017)
Honesty/Integrity								
Honesty-Humility	224	Behavior		-.19	-.02	-.15	-.25	Bourdage et al. (2018, Study 4)
	222	Behavior	-.40					Buehl & Melchers (2017, Study 1)
	466	Intention		-.17	-.15	-.16	-.22	Ho et al. (2019)
	173	Behavior		-.17	-.27	-.20	-.27	Law et al. (2016)
	80	Behavior		-.39	-.25	-.30	-.36	Roulin & Bourdage (2017)
Integrity	156	Behavior		-.21/-.35[a]	-.21/-.36	-.25/-.31	-.24/-.27	Levashina & Campion (2007, Study 4)
Dark Triad								
Machiavellianism	125	Intention		.10/.23[b]	.13/.26	.16/.35	.30/.37	Hogue et al. (2013)
	156	Behavior		.33	.23	.35	.40	Levashina & Campion (2007, Study 4)
	508	Intention	.45					Roulin & Krings (2016, Study 1)
	80	Behavior		.43	.31	.26	.17	Roulin & Bourdage (2017)
Narcissism	508	Intention	.33					Roulin & Krings (2016, Study 1)
	80	Behavior		.26	.23	.23	.17	Roulin & Bourdage (2017)
Psychopathy	508	Intention	.39					Roulin & Krings (2016, Study 1)
	80	Behavior		.37	.30	.15	.09	Roulin & Bourdage (2017)
Others								
Competitive worldviews	224	Behavior		.16	.18	.20	.17	Bourdage et al. (2018, Study 4)
	80	Behavior		.46	.39	.30	.22	Roulin & Bourdage (2017)
	508	Intention	.50					Roulin & Krings (2016, Study 1)
	206	Behavior	.46					Roulin & Krings (2016, Study 2)
	4851	Intention	.49					Schilling et al. (in press)
Competitiveness	206	Behavior	.03					Roulin & Krings (2016, Study 2)
Core self-evaluations	222	Behavior	-.16					Buehl & Melchers (2017, Study 1)
	80	Behavior		-.09	-.17	.08	.10	Roulin & Bourdage (2017)
Self-monitoring	108	Behavior	-.11					Buehl & Melchers (2017, Study 2)
	125	Intention		.20/.28	.12/.17	.12/.21	.40/.44	Hogue et al. (2013)
	313	Intention	.24					Lester et al. (2015)
	156	Behavior		.21	.05	.16	.29	Levashina & Campion (2007, Study 4)
	80	Behavior		.18	.10	.13	.17	Roulin & Bourdage (2017)

	59	Behavior	-.12					Weiss & Feldman (2006)
Self-efficacy	112	Behavior				.11	-.02	Swider et al. (2011)
Religiosity	4851	Intention	-.12					Schilling et al. (in press)
Attitudes	222	Behavior	.58					Buehl & Melchers (2017, Study 1)
	86	Behavior		.43	.42	.33	.24	Dürr & Klehe (2018)
	313	Intention	.57					Lester et al. (2015)
Subjective norms	86	Behavior		.20	.26	.09	.02	Dürr & Klehe (2018)
	313	Intention	.51					Lester et al. (2015)
Perceived behavioral control	86	Behavior		.34	.32	.21	-.01	Dürr & Klehe (2018)
	313	Intention	.48					Lester et al. (2015)

Note. [a] Levashina & Campion (2007) used two different integrity tests (the first covering opinions about others' dishonest behavior and the second covering admission of participants' own dishonesty and wrongdoing), [b] Hogue et al. (2013) provided correlations separately for men/women.

Table 3. Correlations between Demographic Variables and Faking Intentions or Faking Behavior

Variable	Sample			Operationalization of Faking					Source
	Type	N	Intention vs. Behavior	General faking or lying	Slight image creation	Extensive image creation	Image protect-tion	Deceptive ingratia-tion	
Level of education	O	508	Intention	-.08					Roulin & Krings (2016, Study 1)
	O	206	Behavior	-.04					Roulin & Krings (2016, Study 2)
	O	751	Behavior		.04	.03	.03	.04	Bourdage et al. (2018, Study 5)
Employment status	O	508	Intention	-.17					Roulin & Krings (2016, Study 1)
	O	206	Behavior	-.12					Roulin & Krings (2016, Study 2)
Age	A	117	Behavior		-.10	-.08		-.07	Amaral et al. (2019)
	S	224	Behavior		-.09	-.03	-.02	-.12	Bourdage et al. (2018, Study 4)
	O	751	Behavior		-.33	-.33	-.27	-.20	Bourdage et al. (2018, Study 5)
	S	119	Intention	-.19					Buehl & Melchers (2018)
	S	86	Behavior		-.28	-.32	-.09	-.24	Dürr & Klehe (2018, Low fidelity)
	S	86	Behavior		-.19	-.24	-.11	-.12	Dürr & Klehe (2018, High fidelity)
	S	775	Intention		-.10	-.03	-.07	-.13	Ho et al. (2019)
	S	173	Behavior		-.01	-.15	-.03	-.08	Law et al. (2016)
	O	508	Intention	-.20					Roulin & Krings (2016, Study 1)
	O	206	Behavior	-.09					Roulin & Krings (2016, Study 2)
	A	164	Behavior		-.18	-.01	-.13	-.09	Roulin et al. (2014)
	O	4851	Intention	-.23					Schilling et al. (in press)
Sexr[a]	A	117	Behavior		.01	.01		-.12	Amaral et al. (2019)
	S	751	Behavior		-.03	.02	.08	.00	Bourdage et al. (2018, Study 4)
	O	751	Behavior		.30	.33	.30	.24	Bourdage et al. (2018, Study 5)
	S	119	Intention	.15					Buehl & Melchers (2018)
	S	86	Behavior		.33	.23	.12	-.01	Dürr & Klehe (2018, Low fidelity)
	S	86	Behavior		.15	.16	.22	.00	Dürr & Klehe (2018, High fidelity)
	S	775	Intention		.01	.06	.05	.02	Ho et al. (2019)
	S	156	Behavior		.04	.02	.15	.05	Levashina & Campion (2007, Study 4)
	S	85	Behavior		.19	.14	.27	.26	Levashina & Campion (2007, Study 5)
	O	508	Intention	.20					Roulin & Krings (2016, Study 1)
	O	206	Behavior	-.11					Roulin & Krings (2016, Study 2)

A	164	Behavior		.11	.06	.15	.09	Roulin et al. (2014)
O	4851	Intention	.18					Schilling et al. (in press)
S	112	Behavior				.09	.08	Swider et al. (2011)

Note. S = Students, A = Applicants; O = Online sample. [a] Positive correlations for sex indicate higher levels of faking for men than women.

Table 4. Relationship Between Faking and Interview Performance/Success

N	Operationalization of Faking					Source
	General faking or lying	Slight image creation	Extensive image creation	Image protection	Deceptive ingratiation	
Correlational results (*r*s)						
117		.11	-.01		-.02	Amaral et al. (2019)
224		.02	-.03	-.01	.06	Bourdage et al. (2018, Study 4)
751		-.10	-.09	-.12	-.09	Bourdage et al. (2018, Study 5)
222	-.03					Buehl & Melchers (2017, Study 1)
108	.19					Buehl & Melchers (2017, Study 2)
92	.20					Ingold et al. (2015)
85		.11	.25	.05	.01	Levashina & Campion (2007, Study 5)
164		.04	.08	.04	-.05	Roulin et al. (2014)
112		-.11	-.19			Swider et al. (2011)
Mean differences from experimental studies (*d*s)						
124	-0.23					Allen et al. (2000, Realistic faking condition)
125	0.09					Allen et al. (2000, Faking and disclosure condition)
111	1.49					Buehl et al. (2019)
143	0.54					Van Iddekinge et al. (2005)

Table 5. Summary of Propositions and Research Questions About Interview Faking

Theme	Propositions	Research Questions
What is faking?		1. What are non-verbal forms of interview faking? 2. What are the processes through which faking affects criterion-related validity for different criteria?
How common is faking?	1. Although faking is prevalent among applicants, it is still less common than honest IM. 2. Faking is less common among more qualified applicants than among less qualified applicants, but more likely when the economy or industry is facing difficult times.	
Antecedents of faking?	3. Increasing the structure of the interview reduces applicant faking and its effects on interview performance ratings. 4. Contextual factors such as attractiveness of a job or labor market characteristics influence applicant faking.	3. What influence do technology-mediated interviews have on applicant faking? 4. How effective are different types of warnings for reducing faking in interviews and how do applicants react to such warnings?
Does faking matter?	5. Faking has stronger effects on interview performance in simulated interviews and/or following instructions in experimental studies than in high-stakes selection interviews. 6. Faking impairs interview criterion-related validity for predicting contextual performance.	5. Does the level of interview structure moderate the relationship between applicant faking and interview performance? 6. How does faking affect interview criterion-related validity for predicting task performance? 7. How do different IM and faking tactics influence criterion-related validity?
Can we detect faking?	7. Training based on content-based lie detection strategies is a viable strategy to help interviewers deal with faking.	

Table 6. Summary of Practical Recommendations for Practitioners About Interview Faking

Dos	Don'ts
• Understand that applicants *can* fake and that most applicants *do* fake (at least to some extent) • Consider that applicants fake partly because of their personality, values, or attitudes but also take cultural differences or contextual factors (e.g., attractiveness of the job, competition) into account • Increase the degree of interview structure (e.g., use of standardized and job-related questions) • When trying to assess the veracity of applicants' responses, train interviewers to focus on content and rely on a combination of indicators (e.g., level of details, plausibility)	• Ask follow-up questions as an attempt to reduce faking • Use warning (unless ready to deceive applicants about the possibility to detect faking) • Rely on interviewers' intuition, experience, or abilities (e.g., emotional intelligence) to try to detect when/how applicants fake • Rely on non-verbal behaviors to identify whether applicants are honest or faking