Exploring the Role of Interviewee Cognitive Capacities on Impression Management in Face-to-Face and Virtual Interviews

Benjamin Moon[1*], Stephanie J. Law[2], Joshua S. Bourdage[1], Nicolas Roulin[3], and Klaus G. Melchers[4]

[1]Department of Psychology, University of Calgary

[2]Shopify

[3]Department of Psychology, Saint Mary's University

[4]Institute of Psychology and Education, Ulm University

In press in *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*

Author Note

Benjamin Moon 0000-0002-9248-9776

Joshua S. Bourdage 0000-0003-3552-1028

Nicolas Roulin 0000-0003-2797-7359

Klaus G. Melchers 0000-0003-4211-6450

This study was funded by the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada (#435-2015-0566). The authors declare that they have no conflict of interest.

Correspondences concerning this article should be addressed to Benjamin Moon, University of Calgary, 2500 University Dr. NW, Calgary, Canada T2N1N4. Email: benjamin.moon@ucalgary.ca.

Abstract

Interviewees' use of impression management (IM) in job interviews is clearly related to individual differences such as personality. However, research has paid less attention to how interviewee cognitive capacities (i.e., cognitive ability and executive functions) influence IM use, even though interviewees' cognitive capacities and IM are theoretically linked. The current research aimed to address this research gap through two studies. In Study 1, 166 undergraduate business students participated in mock face-to-face interviews with real recruiters. In Study 2, 294 job-seeking participants recruited through Prolific completed a mock asynchronous video interview. Overall, cognitive ability was negatively related to deceptive IM while perceived incongruency (i.e., a gap between desired and perceived current impressions conveyed to others) was positively related to deceptive IM in both studies. Furthermore, cognitive ability and working memory updating, but not inhibition and shifting nor incongruency, were negatively related to honest IM in Study 2. Additionally, in both studies the relations between personality traits and interview IM were generally in line with findings from prior research. Overall, our findings provide a more comprehensive understanding of how interview IM relates to interviewee individual differences and interview performance in different forms of job interviews.

Keywords: impression management, cognitive ability, executive functions, job interview, asynchronous video interview, personality

Practitioner Points

- While interviewee personality traits have shown to highly influence their use of impression management in job interviews, the role of their cognitive capacities was less clear.
- Across two studies in face-to-face (Study 1) and asynchronous video interview (Study 2) settings, applicants lower in cognitive ability used more deceptive IM, and more honest IM in Study 2.
- The role of executive functions was more limited, and the relations between deceptive or honest IM and interviewee personality traits generally aligned with prior research.
- Organizations should design interviews so that a greater number of interviewees feel comfortable using honest IM, in order to even out opportunities for applicants to succeed and thereby improve the fairness of interviews.

Exploring the Role of Interviewee Cognitive Capacities on Impression Management in Face-to-Face and Virtual Interviews

Impression management (IM) describes a class of behaviors aimed to influence how one is perceived by others (Leary & Kowalski, 1990). In job interviews, interviewees commonly use a variety of IM tactics to influence interviewers' judgements of their performance and ultimately to obtain more positive outcomes (e.g., getting hired; Bourdage et al., 2018; Levashina & Campion, 2006). IM tactics are crucial to explore in interviews because the high-stakes nature of the setting motivates interviewees to frequently use these tactics (Ellis et al., 2002; Levashina & Campion, 2007). Specifically, IM tactics identified in interviews differentially predict interview outcomes, such that honest IM tactics (particularly honest self-promotion) are associated with greater interview success than deceptive IM tactics (Ho et al., 2021; Levashina et al., 2014). Furthermore, interviewee individual differences (with a particular past focus on interviewees' personality) are associated with the use of IM tactics (Bourdage et al., 2018, 2020; Melchers et al., 2020).

However, research has paid considerably less attention to the role of interviewee cognitive capacities, even though cognitive ability is theoretically proposed to influence interviewees' perceived capacity (and therefore decision) to use certain IM tactics (Levashina & Campion, 2006). Accordingly, our understanding of the role of cognitive bases of interviewee IM is incomplete in multiple ways. First, while prior research exploring cognitive ability and deceptive IM suggests that interviewees higher in cognitive ability use less deceptive IM because they perceive higher chances of receiving job offers (i.e., perceive lower incongruency between their true impressions and desired impressions they wish to convey; Buehl & Melchers, 2017; Levashina et al., 2009), this underlying theoretical rationale has not been tested empirically.

Second, research has not investigated relations between interviewee cognitive capacities and honest IM, which has generally garnered less attention than its deceptive counterpart (Bourdage et al., 2018). This is noteworthy because relevant theories suggest that deception (DePaulo et al., 1985; Vrij et al., 2008; Walczyk et al., 2014) and deceptive IM (Levashina & Campion, 2006) are cognitively demanding, whereas these theoretical links have not been established for honest IM. Our understanding of the role of the cognitive bases of interviewee IM is also incomplete because the role of specific executive functions is unknown, even though these variables are important for effectively using deliberate self-presentation behaviors, particularly with deception more broadly (Battista et al., 2021; Baumeister, 2002; Vohs et al., 2005). The distinction between cognitive ability and executive functions is crucial, because whereas cognitive ability is defined as a general mental capability allowing individuals to process complex information and to solve problems (Gottfredson, 1997; Schmidt, 2002), executive functions refer to the ways in which individuals specifically coordinate and control this mental capacity (Chan et al., 2021; Salthouse, 2005). Overall, these relations are important to explore to learn which interviewees use IM as an attempt to improve their interview performance and to better understand the underlying cognitive bases of interview IM.

Therefore, the current paper contributes to the interview IM literature by focusing on how interviewee cognitive ability and executive functions (i.e., working memory updating, inhibition, and shifting) influence honest and deceptive IM, and ultimately interview performance. Additionally, we aimed to replicate previous findings between HEXACO personality traits, IM, and interview performance (Bourdage et al., 2018, 2020; Powell et al., 2021), and also test the role of perceived incongruency (i.e., the discrepancy between the impression an individual desires to make based on their image of the ideal applicant, and the impression they perceive

they currently convey to others; Higgins, 1987), which had previously served as the rationale for explaining relations between numerous individual differences and deceptive IM, including cognitive ability. This will allow an enhanced theoretical understanding of the relative importance of a variety of individual differences (e.g., cognitive versus personality variables) in explaining IM. In doing so, we conducted two studies that explored these relations in traditional face-to-face interviews as well as asynchronous video interviews (AVIs; Lukacik et al., 2022), where the role of either applicant cognition or personality (in terms of predicting both IM and interview performance) has been less frequently explored. Indeed, given novel elements of the virtual interview setting that may impact one's ability to use IM (Lukacik et al., 2022), it is unclear if the same individual differences drive IM behavior and subsequent interview performance in AVI settings. Consequently, the current paper expands our current understanding on how interviewee cognition and personality influence the use of honest and deceptive IM and interview performance in a variety of interview modalities.

Importance of Distinguishing Honest vs. Deceptive IM Tactics

Earlier research on interview IM has focused on three types of IM tactics that interviewees use in job interviews: self-promotion (i.e., self-focused behaviors to convey an impression of being qualified and competent), ingratiation (i.e., other-focused behaviors to demonstrate liking or similar values to the interviewer or organization), and defensive tactics (i.e., justifying or distancing from negative events in one's past; Ellis et al., 2002; Levashina & Campion, 2006). Furthermore, most prior studies have focused on deceptive forms of these IM tactics (i.e., portraying them inaccurately) rather than on honest forms, even though these researchers acknowledged that the ways in which interviewees use IM can be honest or deceptive (Levashina & Campion, 2006). For instance, and as noted by Weiss and Feldman (2006),

interviewees for an occupation requiring programing skills may engage in honest self-promotion by highlighting the skills that they actually possess. In contrast, interviewees who claim programming skills that they do not have would be using a deceptive form of self-promotion (i.e., image creation; Levashina & Campion, 2007). However, until Bourdage et al.'s (2018) publication of an honest IM scale, major barrier to conducting research on honest IM was the lack of a valid scale measuring this form of IM.

More recently, studies investigating both honest and deceptive IM have shown positive, although low to moderate correlations between honest and deceptive IM (Bourdage et al., 2018, 2020; Roulin & Bourdage, 2017). This is not surprising, as both types of IM tactics are rooted in a motivation to influence one's self-presentation, so that some interviewees may wish to use both IM tactics more indiscriminately to maximize the effectiveness of their IM use (Bourdage et al., 2020; Leary & Kowalski, 1990). Nevertheless, the distinction between honest and deceptive IM tactics is important for the following reasons: First, the two types of IM tactics are differentially related to interview outcomes, such that honest IM tactics are usually positively related to interview performance (Bourdage et al., 2018, 2020; but see Basch et al., 2021, for an exception), whereas deceptive IM tactics are ineffective at influencing interview outcomes (Ho et al., 2021) or even lead to more negative outcomes (Bourdage et al., 2020). Furthermore, interviewees vary in the extent to which they are comfortable with using honest or deceptive IM tactics. While honest IM tactics are perceived to be socially acceptable, deceptive IM tactics are generally considered to be unethical among interviewers (Jansen et al., 2012; Roulin et al., 2015) and interviewees (Bill et al., 2020). Additionally, in line with research suggesting that personality traits influence individuals' comfort with using more manipulative and/or unethical behaviors (Fletcher, 1990; Heck et al., 2018), interviewees' personality traits differentially

predict the use of honest or deceptive IM tactics. For example, interviewees higher in extraversion or conscientiousness are more likely to use honest IM, whereas those lower in these two traits (Bourdage et al., 2020; Powell et al., 2021), lower in honesty-humility, or higher in the Dark Triad (Bill et al., 2020; Roulin & Bourdage, 2017) use more deceptive IM. In short, distinguishing between different forms of IM is important because they are differentially associated with applicant characteristics and interview performance.

The Role of Interviewee Cognitive Capacities in Deceptive and Honest IM

According to Levashina and Campion's (2006) theoretical model, IM usage depends on factors associated with interviewees' capacity, willingness, and opportunity to use these tactics. Cognitive ability should increase interviewees' capacity to use deceptive IM tactics. Activation-decision-construction action theory (Walczyk et al., 2014) states that deceptive behavior as a whole is cognitively demanding on individuals' short-term memory, as a result of engaging in several behaviors at the same time (e.g., deliberately distorting the truth, trying to ensure responses are believable to the interviewer). This proposition has been supported by research suggesting that deceptive responses elicit longer response times (Suchotzki et al., 2017), greater physiological arousal such as increased heart rate (Riggio & Friedman, 1983), and increased brain activity (Langleben et al., 2002; Spence et al., 2001). In addition, interviewees higher in cognitive ability are likely to have greater knowledge of the interview process and of the target job (Hunter, 1986; Levashina & Campion, 2006) and are also more likely to understand the evaluation criteria that are used in an interview (Huffcutt et al., 1996; Kleinmann et al., 2011; Melchers et al., 2009). For these reasons, researchers speculated that interviewees higher in cognitive ability can increase their performance by using deceptive IM—although whether they naturally do so is a different question (Buehl & Melchers, 2017; Levashina & Campion, 2006).

Overall, the limited research to date seems to indicate that cognitive ability is negatively correlated with deceptive IM use in job interviews (Buehl & Melchers, 2017). Furthermore, previous research also investigated whether cognitive ability impacts the effectiveness of deceptive IM behavior, with mixed findings. On the one hand, Buehl et al. (2019) found that interviewees higher in cognitive ability were able to increase interview performance and also used more deceptive IM when instructed to answer as in a selection interview in which they wanted to succeed. On the other hand, this was not the case when interviewees freely used deceptive IM without specific instructions (Buehl & Melchers, 2017, Study 1), which is more reflective of interviewees' use of deceptive IM in real job interviews. Similarly, research in a biodata context revealed that interviewees high in cognitive ability overall were less likely to fake, but if they did fake, they were more effective (Levashina & Campion, 2009). Together, these findings suggest that interviewees higher in cognitive ability could (if needed) use deceptive IM more effectively. Yet, the association with cognitive ability is primarily that interviewees lower in cognitive ability are more willing to use deceptive IM, potentially because they feel the need to distort their responses to compensate for a lack of qualifications and to attempt to increase their chances of obtaining a job offer (Buehl & Melchers, 2017; Ferris et al., 2001). Given this, there is a difference between associations with IM use and effectiveness.

Nevertheless, some important issues on the role of interviewee cognitive capacities on IM require investigation. First, research has not investigated how cognitive capacities influence the use of honest IM tactics. While interviewees using honest IM may still have to monitor the behaviors and reactions of the interviewer, and thereby experience cognitive demands, many of the taxing behaviors associated with deceptive IM (e.g., distorting their responses and monitoring to ensure that distorted responses to different questions are aligned with each other)

do not pertain to honest IM (Bourdage et al., 2018; Roulin & Bourdage, 2017). Lastly, while research has investigated general cognitive ability in the interview IM context, the specific interviewee cognitive capacities underlying honest and deceptive IM are unclear. We believe that exploring specific elements of cognitive capacities (i.e., executive functions) may provide a more nuanced understanding of interviewee cognitive capacities and IM.

Study Hypotheses

Interviewee Cognitive Ability and IM

Cognitive ability is one of the most robust predictors of job knowledge and job performance (Hunter, 1986; Sackett et al., 2022; Schmidt, 2002). Accordingly, interviewees lower in cognitive ability may be more willing to use deceptive IM in order to make up for greater deficiencies concerning skills and qualifications that are required for the target job (Buehl & Melchers, 2017; Levashina & Campion, 2006). Furthermore, interviewees lower in cognitive ability may also be less likely to fake more selectively (and instead fake more indiscriminately) because they possess lower knowledge about the target job as well as its selection context (Levashina & Campion, 2006; Levashina et al., 2009). Therefore, we predict that cognitive ability will negatively relate to deceptive IM use. To the contrary, we predict that cognitive ability will positively relate to honest IM use, because interviewees higher in cognitive ability will have greater skills and experiences to draw upon when responding to interview questions (Huffcutt et al., 1996), are better at determining what sorts of abilities are being assessed (Kleinmann et al., 2011), and have more capacity to articulate these abilities.

> Hypothesis 1: Cognitive ability will be a) negatively related to deceptive IM and b) positively related to honest IM.

Interviewee Executive Functions and IM

Additionally, in Study 2 we aim to expand our understanding on the role of interviewee cognitive capacities by exploring how interviewees' specific executive functions relate to honest and deceptive IM. Whereas cognitive ability refers to an individuals' general capability of processing information, executive functions direct the use of cognitive ability by making self-directed decisions pertaining to planning, attention, and reasoning (Salthouse, 2005; Banich, 2009; Miyake et al., 2000). Executive functions consist of three components (Chan et al., 2021; Friedman & Miyake, 2017; Miyake et al., 2000): working memory (WM) updating (i.e., the capacity to hold and update information for immediate processing), inhibition (i.e., the extent to which an individual can suppress a response), and shifting (i.e., the ability to be flexible and shift attention towards different tasks or schemata). As noted by Chan et al. (2021), prior research has shown positive but non-redundant relationships between cognitive ability and WM updating, whereas inhibition and shifting are generally unrelated to cognitive ability (e.g., Friedman et al., 2006; Friedman & Miyake, 2017).

Although research on executive functions in organizational settings is scarce, these variables can help employees perform more effectively across most jobs beyond the effects of cognitive ability (Chan et al., 2021). In particular, employees higher in inhibition may be less likely to behave impulsively at the cost of long-term organizational success, whereas those higher in shifting may be more flexible and efficient in their decision-making (Culbertson et al., 2013). This is noteworthy because current measures of cognitive ability insufficiently assess a wide variety of tasks associated with executive functions (Friedman et al., 2006; Salthouse & Davis, 2006). Furthermore, executive functions predict organizational outcomes that do not involve general intelligence (e.g., coping with job demands and stressors; Chan et al., 2021; Lemonaki et al., 2021).

Overall, we predict that executive functions (i.e., WM updating, shifting, and inhibition) will be positively related to deceptive IM. Considering how deception in general is taxing on WM (Walczyk et al., 2014), interviewees lower in WM updating may have greater difficulty manipulating and distorting their responses (e.g., exaggerating a situation that occurred in the past, adding fabricated details to the response) in reaction to interview questions, and thereby may be less willing to use deceptive IM. Furthermore, interviewees lower in shifting will be less effective at monitoring different behaviors that are integral to successfully using deceptive IM (e.g., how the interviewees themselves present their responses, monitoring the extent to which the interviewer finds their responses believable; Van't Veer et al., 2014). Additionally, suppressing truthful responses is thought to be a critical process for generating and communicating deceptive responses because deception is more deliberate and often not a normative, common behavior among individuals, and therefore, some extent of inhibitory control is thought to be required to effectively use deception (Buller & Burgoon, 1996; Debey et al., 2015; Sip et al., 2008; Walcyk et al., 2014). Therefore, interviewees lower in inhibition may be poorer at suppressing truthful responses, which is a critical process underlying deceptive responses (Sip et al., 2008; Walczyk et al., 2014).

Hypothesis 2: a) WM updating, b) shifting, and c) inhibition will be positively related to deceptive IM.

In addition, we predict that executive functions will positively relate to *honest* IM, because while honest IM does not involve deception, it is still a deliberate, conscious act aimed to influence impressions (Leary & Kowalski, 1990). Even though honest accounts of skills and experiences are likely to come from the long-term memory (which is unlimited; Vrij et al., 2008; Walczyk et al., 2014), interviewees lower in WM updating are likely to have greater difficulty

holding these accounts, linking them to interview questions, and determining when to convey them. In terms of shifting, the ability to switch attention between various behaviors and responses is also important for honest IM because interviewees have to still monitor whether their responses are successful at influencing their impressions conveyed to the interviewer (Leary & Bolino, 2017; Leary & Kowalski, 1990). Therefore, interviewees lower in shifting may be less willing to use honest IM. Lastly, interviewees lower in inhibition may experience greater difficulty timing honest responses in a strategic manner aimed to influence their impressions.

Hypothesis 3: a) WM updating, b) shifting, and c) inhibition will be positively related to honest IM.

Interviewee Personality and IM

Numerous studies demonstrate that personality plays a prominent role in predicting IM tactics (e.g., Bourdage et al., 2018, 2020; Powell et al., 2021; and see Melchers et al., 2020, for a review). In the current study, we aimed to replicate these past findings pertaining to honesty-humility (i.e., the tendency to be sincere, modest, and fair in dealing with others), extraversion (i.e., the tendency to seek social settings and be highly expressive), and conscientiousness (i.e., the tendency to be disciplined, deliberate and detail-oriented) from the HEXACO model of personality (Lee & Ashton, 2018). Our goal was to a) gain a better understanding of the relative importance of personality and cognitive capacities, b) investigate if the same traits driving IM in face-to-face interviews also do so in virtual interviews, and c) further examine the mediating role of IM on the personality-performance associations, something that has received preliminary, but not robustly replicated, support.

Individuals lower in honesty-humility are more willing to manipulate and exploit others for their own gain (Ashton & Lee, 2014; Holden et al., 2014; Zettler & Hilbig, 2010), and

accordingly, honesty-humility has been negatively linked to a more indiscriminate use of IM tactics (Bourdage et al., 2018, 2020; Buehl & Melchers, 2017; Roulin & Bourdage, 2017). Therefore, we predict that honesty-humility will negatively relate to both deceptive and honest IM. Furthermore, interviewees lower in conscientiousness are less likely to possess skills and qualifications for the target job (Barrick & Mount, 1991; Levashina & Campion, 2006), and will therefore be more willing to distort and fabricate responses during the job interview (Bourdage et al., 2018; Lester et al., 2015). In line with past findings, we predict that conscientiousness will negatively relate to deceptive IM. Finally, interviewees higher in extraversion prefer using behaviors that are considered more socially acceptable and may have more capability to express their true fit and abilities (Ashton & Lee, 2007; Bourdage et al., 2020). In line with these findings, we predict that extraversion will positively relate to honest IM.

Hypothesis 4: a) Honesty-humility and b) conscientiousness will be negatively related to deceptive IM.

Hypothesis 5: a) Honesty-humility will be negatively related and b) extraversion will be positively related to honest IM.

Interviewee Perceived Incongruency and IM

Leary and Kowalski's (1990) two-component model of IM states that a major determinant of individuals' motivation to use IM is the perceived incongruency (or discrepancy) between their true self and the impression that they wish to convey. Similarly, self-presentation theory suggests that experiencing greater incongruency will elicit more negative emotions and thereby motivate individuals to address the discrepancy by using IM (Higgins, 1987). This rationale has served as the basis to explain relations between numerous interviewee individual differences (e.g., cognitive ability, extraversion) and different forms of IM, particularly deceptive

IM (Bourdage et al., 2020; Buehl & Melchers, 2017; Levashina & Campion, 2006). However, the underlying role of incongruency has never been empirically tested in the interview context. In the current study, we focus on interviewees' perceived incongruency in terms of how their *true* personality differs from the *ideal* personality profile they believe the organization is looking for. As such, we predict that interviewees who perceive a greater incongruency will be more motivated to use deceptive IM tactics to convey impressions that are different from their true selves but closer to the perceived ideal profile, in order to "close the gap" (Levashina & Campion, 2007). For instance, if interviewees lower in conscientiousness perceive that the organization seeks to hire an employee higher in the trait (i.e., higher incongruency), they may use deceptive IM by exaggerating or fabricating past behaviors that may appear highly conscientious to the interview or the organization (e.g., effectively planning or organizing and monitoring an event with multiple elements to coordinate). On the other hand, interviewees who perceive a smaller incongruency will engage in more honest IM as they believe they are similar enough to the ideal profile, and thus can convey an impression that is closer to their true selves (Bourdage et al., 2018; Charbonneau et al., 2021).

Hypothesis 6: Incongruency will be a) positively related to deceptive IM and b) negatively related to honest IM.

Summary and Proposed Mediation with Interview Performance

In summary, we predict that cognitive ability, executive functions, honesty-humility, and incongruency will relate to both deceptive and honest IM, whereas conscientiousness will be related to deceptive IM and extraversion to honest IM. While there are many potential paths between these individual differences and interview performance, at a broad level, we investigate whether their associations with honest and deceptive IM have implications for interview

performance (i.e., whether interview IM mediates relationships between individual differences and interview performance). We posit this as a research question given that previous research has found conflicting evidence as to whether IM serves as a mechanism by which individual differences relate to interview performance (e.g., Bourdage et al., 2020).

Research Question 1: Does deceptive IM mediate the relationships between a) cognitive ability, b) WM updating, c) shifting, d) inhibition, e) honesty-humility, f) conscientiousness, and g) incongruency and interview performance?

Research Question 2: Does honest IM mediate the relationships between a) cognitive ability, b) WM updating, c) shifting, d) inhibition, e) honesty-humility, f) extraversion, and g) incongruency and interview performance?

Study 1

Study 1 used a face-to-face interview setting with real interviewers from various organizations to explore how interview IM is related to interviewee cognitive ability (Hypothesis 1), personality (Hypotheses 4 and 5), incongruency (Hypothesis 6), and whether interview IM mediates the relationships between these predictors and interview performance (Research Questions 1 and 2).

Method

Participants and Procedure

Participants (N = 166, 61.2% female) were undergraduate students at a Canadian business school who had an average age of 21.92 years (SD = 3.38). Of the participants, 52.4% were employed at the time of the interview, and the average work experience was 2.40 years (SD = 2.06). The participants took part in a practice interview program organized by the career center. These practice interviews were conducted face-to-face by professional recruiters from

various organizations (N = 69, 66.0% female), who had an average age of 33.36 years (SD = 7.55) and an average interviewing experience of 5.84 years (SD = 4.40).

The interview lengths, types of questions asked, as well as the assessed constructs differed depending on the interviewer, as they each asked questions that were relevant for entry level jobs at their organizations. Despite being practice interviews, some of the interviews led to invitations for real follow-up interviews or job offers/co-op opportunities based on participants' performance, and participants often chose the organization to practice with based on a desire to work for this organization in the future. This provided a relatively realistic situation where the interviewees were highly motivated to perform (Bourdage et al., 2020).

After completing the practice interview, participants were asked to complete a questionnaire about the interview and individual differences. This was done in a separate room from where the interviews were conducted, without the interviewer present. Participants were informed that their responses would not impact performance ratings on their practice interview. Separately, interviewers provided performance ratings for each interviewee.

Measures

Unless indicated otherwise, all items were answered on 5-point scales ranging from 1 = *strongly disagree* to 5 = *strongly agree*.

Cognitive Ability. Cognitive ability was measured using the 16-item International Cognitive Ability Resource (ICAR; Condon & Revelle, 2014). The ICAR measures cognitive ability through four types of items: 1) three-dimensional rotation, 2) letter and number series, 3) matrix reasoning, and 4) verbal reasoning. Participants' number of correct responses were divided by the total number of items contained in the ICAR (i.e., 16), which reflects the percentage of correct responses on the ICAR.

Personality. Honesty-humility (α = .80), extraversion (α = .77), and conscientiousness (α = .81) were assessed using self-reports on the corresponding items from the 100-item version of the HEXACO-PI-R (Lee & Ashton, 2004).

Incongruency. Incongruency was assessed using six items based on each of the six HEXACO personality traits. Specifically, participants were asked to indicate what they considered their "true" score and the "ideal" score they wished to convey to the interviewer for each personality trait. Response options ranged from 0 (low end of the trait) to 100 (high end of the trait). An overall incongruency score was calculated by taking the sum of the absolute differences between an individual's true and ideal scores across the six traits (i.e., raw difference scores; Burns & Christiansen, 2011). Furthermore, we calculated incongruency for each of the HEXACO traits using raw difference scores as well as regression-adjusted difference scores. Regression-adjusted difference scores do not contain secondary autocorrelations seen with raw difference scores (Burns & Christiansen, 2011). We determined correlations between the trait-specific incongruency scores and honest or deceptive IM, which we report in Supplemental Materials S2.

Honest and Deceptive IM. Honest IM (α = .95) was measured using the 29-item Honest IM Scale (Bourdage et al., 2018), which comprises of three dimensions: 1) honest self-promotion, 2) honest ingratiation, and 3) honest defensive tactics. Deceptive IM (α = .96) was measured using a shortened 32-item version of the Interview Faking Behavior Scale (Levashina et al., 2007), which comprises of four dimensions: 1) slight image creation, 2) extensive image creation, 3) image protection, and 4) deceptive ingratiation. Response options for both honest and deceptive IM ranged from 1 = *to no extent,* 2 = *to a little extent,* 3 = *to a moderate extent,* 4 = *to a considerable extent,* to 5 = *to a great extent*.

Overall Interview Performance. The interviewers assessed interview performance (α = .92) using three items from Bourdage et al. (2020; e.g., "Overall, based on the interview, I would evaluate this candidate positively").

Results

Means, standard deviations, and variable intercorrelations are presented in Table 1. Overall, the base rates for deceptive and honest IM use were 34% and 90% respectively (calculated using the percentage of interviewees with mean use at or above 2.0, as done in Bourdage et al., 2018, or Melchers et al., 2020). Furthermore, the mean scores for both IM tactics indicate that interviewees on average used deceptive IM to a little extent (M = 2.03, SD = 0.79), whereas they used honest IM to a moderate extent (M = 3.18, SD = 0.85). The lower base rates and mean scores for deceptive IM compared to honest IM is reflective of the findings seen in the broader interview IM literature, and within the ranges seen in more recent studies (most of which used the measures implemented in the current study; Amaral et al., 2019; Basch et al., 2021; Bill & Melchers, 2023b; Bourdage et al., 2018, 2020; Roulin & Bourdage, 2017; also see Table 1 in Melchers et al., 2020).[1]

Antecedents of Interview IM

Cognitive Ability. Supporting Hypothesis 1a, cognitive ability was negatively related to overall deceptive IM (r = -.24, p = .002), but in contrast to Hypothesis 1b, not to honest IM (r = .06, p = .473).

Personality. Supporting Hypotheses 4a and 4b, honesty-humility (r = -.35, p < .001) and conscientiousness (r = -.43, p < .001) were negatively related to deceptive IM. Furthermore,

[1] Descriptive statistics and base rates for individual IM tactics (e.g., honest self-promotion, honest ingratiation) for both Studies 1 and 2 can be found in the Supplemental Materials S1.

supporting Hypotheses 5a and 5b, honesty-humility was also negatively related (r = -.25, p = .001), and extraversion was positively related to honest IM (r = .19, p = .018).

Incongruency. Supporting Hypothesis 6a, incongruency was positively related to deceptive IM (r = .21, p = .006), but in contrast to Hypothesis 6b, it was unrelated to honest IM (r = .07, p = .377).

Although our hypothesis was about incongruence at an overall level, we conducted exploratory analyses to see if incongruence on particular traits were particularly important. The findings with trait-specific incongruency scores (both using raw difference scores or regression-adjusted difference scores) indicated that none of them were significantly related to honest IM, in line with findings with the composite incongruency score. However, at the trait-specific level, incongruency in honesty-humility (r_{RDS} = .38, p < .001; r_{RADS} = .36, p < .001), emotionality (r_{RDS} = .18, p = .023; r_{RADS} = .20, p = .010), and conscientiousness (r_{RDS} = .22, p = .005; r_{RADS} = .21, p = .008) were positively associated with deceptive IM (see Supplemental Materials S2).

Interview IM as a Mediator Between Interviewee Individual Differences and Interview Performance

We tested a single path analytic model that included the individual difference variables of interest, deceptive and honest IM, as well as interview performance (see Table 2). The model used the MLR estimator and cluster-robust standard error to account for interviewer nesting. We also used 95% bias-corrected accelerated bootstrap confidence intervals (BCI) to test for the indirect effect, using 5000 iterations (Hayes & Scharkow, 2013; Preacher & Selig, 2012). According to the path-analytic model, honest IM was positively related to interview performance (β = .22, p = .021), but deceptive IM was not (β = -.15, p = .143). In line with this, deceptive IM did not mediate relationships between any individual difference variable and interview

performance. However, honest IM significantly mediated the relationships between honesty-humility (indirect effect = -.053, 95% BCI [-.125, -.010]) and extraversion (indirect effect = .040, 95% BCI [.005, .121]) and interview performance, but not for cognitive ability or incongruency. Specifically, interviewees lower in honest-humility (β = -.24, p < .001) and higher in extraversion (β = .18, p = .034) used more honest IM, which in turn was positively related to interview performance (β = .22, p = .021).

Discussion

Overall, Study 1 provides a more comprehensive understanding of the nomological network around interview IM tactics in the following ways: First, we demonstrated that the role of interviewees' cognitive ability for interview IM is more limited than previously theorized. Although cognitive ability was negatively related to deceptive IM (in line with Buehl & Melchers, 2017, Study 1), no significant relations were found for honest IM. Moreover, while cognitive ability negatively correlated with deceptive IM, this was no longer significant after accounting for the role of personality. Additionally, we replicated findings around several important personality predictors of honest and deceptive IM, adding to the robustness of those findings in the literature. Specifically, honesty-humility was negatively related to both honest and deceptive IM, which further supports the notion that low honesty-humility is associated with more indiscriminate use of manipulative behaviors (Bourdage et al., 2015; Lee et al., 2013; Wiltshire et al., 2014). Additionally, extraversion was positively related to honest IM, whereas conscientiousness was negatively related to deceptive IM. Furthermore, we investigated a novel antecedent, incongruency, which has been previously proposed (but untested) as a theoretical mechanism driving IM (Buehl & Melchers, 2017; Levashina et al., 2009). We found that interviewees' perceived incongruency between their true characteristics and the desired

characteristics they wished to convey to the interviewer was positively related to deceptive IM, and specifically incongruency pertaining to honesty-humility, emotionality and conscientiousness at the trait-level. Finally, we found that those low in honesty-humility and high in extraversion performed better in interviews through their use of honest IM, replicating an initial finding by Bourdage et al. (2020), a study that had important measurement limitations.

Despite these contributions of Study 1, there are also a number of limitations. Notably, while the findings of Study 1 provide a more comprehensive and nuanced insight into the role of interviewee cognitive ability for interview IM, it did not explore how specific aspects of interviewee cognitive capacities (i.e., executive functions) influence the use of these tactics. As mentioned earlier, investigating more specific cognitive capacities can shed further light on the cognitive mechanisms underlying interview IM. In addition, we did not have control over factors such as the behavior of the interviewer or the content of the interview. Given this, in Study 2, we investigated the associations between cognitive variables, IM, and interview performance in a more standardized interview setting using asynchronous video interviews (AVIs). In addition to providing a standardized forum to investigate these relationships, this provides an opportunity to understand individual difference predictors and IM in an interview modality that is rapidly being adopted but has received relatively little investigation, thereby improving our knowledge of interviewee behavior and outcomes in AVIs (Dunlop et al., 2022; Lukacik et al., 2022).

Study 2

Study 2 used an AVI setting to replicate the Study 1 findings for Hypotheses 1 and 4 to 6 (i.e., relations between interviewee IM and cognitive ability, personality, and incongruency). Additionally, Study 2 tested for relations between interviewee IM and executive functions

(Hypotheses 2 and 3), as well as whether interviewee IM mediates the relationships between these predictors and interview performance (Research Questions 1 and 2).

AVIs are an increasingly common type of digital interviews in selection, in which interviewees record video responses to interview questions without any interactions with a live interviewer (e.g., Basch et al., 2021; Dunlop et al., 2022). As a result, AVIs help organizations better standardize interview questions and how they are delivered, which can increase interview reliability and validity (Dunlop et al., 2022; Lukacik et al., 2022). However, the greater standardization and a lack of a live interviewer is likely to lower social presence (i.e., the extent to which a medium is perceived as sociable and personal when used to interact with others, or *presence as social richness*; Lombard & Ditton, 1997) and therefore potentially restrict the use of certain IM tactics (e.g., honest and deceptive ingratiation; Basch et al., 2020; Lukacik et al., 2022). Indeed, social presence theory (Lombard & Ditton, 1997; Short et al., 1976) suggests that interpersonal communication is less effective under lower social presence. Accordingly, the relations between interviewee individual differences and their IM use may not fully generalize from face-to-face interviews to AVIs. For instance, interviewees lower in cognitive ability may be more willing to use deceptive IM to make up for greater deficiencies and skills in face-to-face interviews (Buehl & Melchers, 2017; Levashina & Campion, 2006). This may be less likely the case in AVIs if interviewees perceive that deceptive IM is more risky and less effective in an AVI setting, because they will be unable to observe social cues during the interview that indicate whether their use of deceptive IM is believable (e.g., changes in interviewers' tone, non-verbal reaction such as facial expressions, verbal responses; Buller & Burgoon, 1996). Similarly, interviewees higher in cognitive ability may be better at determining which abilities are being assessed and how they are being assessed (and therefore be more likely to use honest IM;

Kleinmann et al., 2011). However, this ability may be more compromised in AVIs because of anxiety from experiencing lower social presence, as well as from the lack of familiarity with the setting (and particularly the technology associated with AVIs; Lukacik et al., 2022; Roulin et al., 2023). For these reasons, while the setting of an AVI represents an opportunity to conduct a more controlled study of our hypotheses, it also provides a valuable opportunity to increase our understanding of how interviewee cognition, as well as individual differences as a whole, influence the use of IM in job interviews.

Method

Participants and Procedure

The study comprised of two timepoints, which were separated by approximately one week. At Time 1, participants completed a mock AVI, and subsequently completed items pertaining to their behaviors and attitudes in the interview. At Time 2, participants completed a survey on their personality and completed several cognitive tests.

Time 1. Participants who were currently job-seeking and living in either Canada, the United States, or the United Kingdom were recruited via Prolific. Participants were asked to imagine that they were applying for a position of an assistant brand manager, and they were subsequently given a job description, which also provided a list of qualifications that the fictitious organization was looking for (see Supplemental Materials S3). Participants were also told that the top eight performers would receive a bonus equivalent to $38 USD to provide a motivation for high performance.

Participants then completed a mock interview consisting of six questions (traditional interview questions and past behavior questions; see Supplemental Materials S3 for the interview questions and the rating scales, and S4 for example responses to one of the interview questions)

through an AVI platform, where they were given 30 seconds to read and prepare for each interview question. Participants were given a maximum of five minutes to answer each question, although we recommended participants to provide responses closer to two to three minutes. Four of the interview questions assessed the following competencies relevant to the position: time-management/prioritization, social media skill, customer service/stakeholder management, and perseverance/accountability. While the AVI format was selected to allow for standardization of experience and questions across participants, we selected a configuration that would more closely approximate a face-to-face job interview (e.g., shorter preparation time, no opportunity to re-record) to better compare to Study 1.

After the AVI, participants completed items about their behaviors and attitudes pertaining to the interview they just completed. They were compensated an amount equivalent to $5.50 USD for a 30-45-minute study. Participants' interview performance was evaluated by two raters who were extensively trained undergraduate research assistants. The raters evaluated each interview question based on a descriptively-anchored rating scale.

Time 2. Approximately one week later, participants were asked to complete a personality inventory and several cognitive tasks. Participants were compensated another $5.50 USD, and the study took approximately 30-minutes.[2]

We only kept participants in the final sample when they completed Time 1 and Time 2. Furthermore, participants who answered *disagree* or *strongly disagree* to "I answered all items honestly" were excluded from the analysis. The final sample consisted of 294 participants (from

[2] We also note that we measured these variables at Time 2 (despite being antecedents) as we found in past data collections that participants are much more likely to drop off from the study at Time 2 if this is when the video takes place (i.e., hesitation to participate happens at this stage). By moving this to Time 1, we had much less drop off and viewed this as a minor risk given that all of the individual differences we measured are stable over short and medium time periods (Ashton & Lee, 2016; Ronnlund et al., 2005).

an initial $N = 369$). Approximately half of the participants were female (52.4%), with an average age of 30.56 years ($SD = 10.85$). Of the participants, 63.2% were currently employed at the time of the study. Among those currently employed, participants had an average of 3.84 years of work experience in their current position ($SD = 5.17$). Participants had a mean of 3.52 ($SD = 1.12$) to a motivation check item (i.e., "I was motivated to do well in this interview", 1 = *strongly disagree*, 5 = *strongly agree*), indicating that participants were relatively well motivated to perform well in the interview.

Measures

At Time 1, we measured incongruency, honest IM (α = .94), and deceptive IM (α = .95), and at Time 2, we measured cognitive ability, all using the same scales as in Study 1. Additionally, we measured the following variables:

Personality (Time 2). Honesty-humility (α = .76), extraversion (α = .81), and conscientiousness (α = .77) were assessed using the 10-item versions of each scale from the HEXACO-PI-R-60 (Ashton & Lee, 2009; 1 = *strongly disagree,* 5 = *strongly agree*).

Executive Functions (Time 2). The three executive functions (i.e., WM updating, shifting, and inhibition) were measured using a well-validated cognitive assessment battery from von Bastian et al. (2016), which in turn were modelled after Miyake et al. (2000). The tasks were delivered through a Java-based platform called Tatool. WM updating was assessed using the letter keep-track task, where a set of five boxes with letters were presented and participants were asked to memorize these letters. Afterwards, the boxes were randomly updated with new letters, and participants were subsequently asked to recall the most recent letter for each of the boxes. Shifting was assessed using the animacy/size task. An object or animal was presented, and participants were asked to classify it based on its animacy and size. Inhibition was measured

using a task similar to the Stroop task. Participants were provided with a string of either numbers or symbols, and they were subsequently asked to count the number of displayed characters. Furthermore, participants were given an equal number of congruent trials, incongruent trials, and neutral trials. In congruent trials, the number of characters was equal to the number displayed (e.g., 4444). In incongruent trials, the number of characters was not equal from the number displayed (e.g., 33). Finally, in neutral trials, the characters displayed were symbols (e.g., ##).

Interview Performance. The interview consisted of six questions. Interview performance was measured using 5-point descriptively-anchored rating scales that contained descriptions of interviewee responses at each level. The ratings from the six questions were subsequently aggregated into a single score ($\alpha = .73$).

Prior to rating interview performance, two raters underwent a frame-of-reference training coordinated by the first author that lasted approximately four hours. In the training, the raters were first familiarized with the scales. They then rated the interview performance of two participants, provided rationales for their ratings, and any rating discrepancies were discussed and addressed. After the training, both raters evaluated the interview performances of nine common participants and had a good interrater reliability of ICC(2,2) = .90. The remaining participants were then allocated separately for each rater to evaluate. There were no significant differences in the mean interview performance ratings of the raters, $t(246) = 0.23$, $p = .822$, $d = .03$.

Results

Means, standard deviations, and variable intercorrelations are shown in Table 3. Among the executive function variables, only working memory was positively related to cognitive ability ($r = .38$, $p < .001$), which aligns with findings in prior studies (see the review by Chan et al.,

2021). Overall, the base rates for deceptive and honest IM use were 35% and 78% respectively (again calculated using the percentage of interviewees with mean use at or above 2.0). Furthermore, the mean scores for both IM tactics indicate that interviewees on average used deceptive IM to a little extent (M = 1.83, SD = 0.66), whereas they used honest IM a moderate extent (M = 2.61, SD = 0.74), based on the scale anchors. Although these findings indicate a slightly lower prevalence of both IM tactics compared to Study 1, they are still reflective of the broader IM literature surrounding interviewee IM use.

Antecedents of Interview IM

Cognitive Ability. Consistent with Study 1 and supporting Hypothesis 1a, cognitive ability was negatively related to deceptive IM (r = -.12, p = .044), but contrary to Hypothesis 1b and unlike in Study 1, also negatively related to honest IM (r = -.13, p = .032).

Executive Functions. Contrary to Hypotheses 2a-c, neither WM updating (r = -.08, p = .173), nor shifting (r = .03, p = .580), nor inhibition (r = -.10, p = .096) were related to deceptive IM. Also contrary to Hypotheses 3a, WM updating was negatively related to honest IM (r = -.19, p = .002), and contrary to Hypotheses 3b and 3c, shifting (r = .03, p = .643) and inhibition (r = -.09, p = .143) were unrelated to honest IM.

Personality. Supporting Hypotheses 4a and 4b and consistent with Study 1, honesty-humility (r = -.36, p < .001) and conscientiousness (r = -.24, p < .001) were negatively related to deceptive IM. Contrary to Hypothesis 5a and unlike in Study 1, honesty-humility was unrelated to honest IM (r = -.04, p = .449). Supporting Hypothesis 5b, and consistent with Study 1, extraversion was positively related to honest IM (r = .18, p = .002).

Incongruency. Furthermore, consistent with Study 1 and supporting Hypothesis 6a, incongruency was positively related to deceptive IM (r = .17, p = .004), but contrary to Hypothesis 6b, and consistent with Study 1, not related to honest IM (r = -.01, p = .859).

Similar to Study 1, the findings with trait-specific incongruency scores (using raw difference scores or regression-adjusted difference scores) indicated that none of them were significantly related to honest IM, in line with findings with the composite incongruency score. However, the findings with deceptive IM contained some differences. Only the incongruency scores for emotionality (r_{RDS} = .17, p = .003; r_{RADS} = .16, p = .007) was positively associated with deceptive IM using raw difference scores or regression-adjusted difference scores. Furthermore, for trait-specific incongruency scores using raw-difference scores, those for honesty-humility (r_{RDS} = .17, p = .004) and extraversion (r_{RDS} = .14, p = .021) were positively related to deceptive IM (see Supplemental Materials S2).

Interview IM as a Mediator Between Interviewee Individual Differences and Interview Performance

Similar to Study 1, we tested a single path analytic model that included the individual difference variables of interest, deceptive and honest IM, as well as interview performance (see Table 4). According to the path-analytic model, and in line with Study 1, honest IM was positively related to interview performance (β = .20, p = .003), but deceptive IM was not (β = -.04, p = .574). Furthermore, deceptive IM did not mediate relationships between any individual difference variable and interview performance. However, honest IM significantly mediated the relationships between WM updating (indirect effect = -.030, 95% BCI [-.081, -.002]), extraversion (indirect effect = .038, 95% BCI [.010, .088]), and interview performance, but not for cognitive ability, shifting, inhibition, honesty-humility, conscientiousness or incongruency.

Specifically, interviewees lower on WM updating (β = -.15, p = .025) and higher on extraversion (β = .20, p = .003) used more honest IM, which in turn was positively related to interview performance (β = .20, p = .003).

Discussion

Study 2 aimed to (a) replicate the findings from Study 1 in an AVI setting and (b) explore how specific aspects of interviewee cognitive capacities (i.e., executive functions) relate to honest and deceptive IM. Although Study 2 replicated many of the findings from Study 1, there were also important differences to note (see Table 5 for a summary of hypotheses, research questions, and their findings). Specifically, in contrast to Study 1 we found that cognitive ability was negatively related to honest IM, and honesty-humility was not related to honest IM. Additionally, Study 2 provides additional insights into how specific aspects of interviewee cognitive capacities (i.e., executive functions) influence the use of honest and deceptive IM. Specifically, we found that the relations between executive functions and honest IM were only limited to WM updating (and in the opposite direction of our hypothesis), whereas the executive functions were unrelated to deceptive IM. Furthermore, even though we used a different interview format (i.e., an AVI) that was more standardized in terms of target occupation (i.e., assistant brand manager), delivery of interview (as the interview questions were delivered through text without live evaluators) and method of evaluating interview performance (i.e., descriptively-anchored rating scales) than in Study 1, we also found evidence that honest IM predicts interview performance and mediates the relationship between certain individual differences and performance. Specifically, interviewees lower on working memory and (consistent with Study 1) higher on extraversion performed better in AVIs through their use of honest IM. In short, this demonstrates that despite having many unique features, similar types of

IM behaviors are effective in AVIs and are used by the those with largely similar characteristics as in face-to-face interviews.

General Discussion

A growing body of research suggests that interviewee individual differences, particularly personality traits, predict honest and deceptive IM in job interviews (Melchers et al., 2020). However, our understanding on the role of interviewee cognitive capacities was lacking in the following ways: First, while honest and deceptive IM differ in the extent to which they are cognitively demanding (Levashina & Campion, 2006; Walczyk et al., 2014) and differentially influence interview outcomes (Bourdage et al., 2018; Ho et al., 2021), research had not investigated the role of cognitive ability on honest IM use. Furthermore, although executive functions play a key role for assisting with job performance (Chan et al., 2021) and are important for effectively using deliberate self-presentation behaviors (Baumeister, 2002; Vohs et al., 2005), it has been unclear how they influence interviewees' IM use. We aimed to address these gaps using two studies in a face-to-face interview setting with real recruiters, as well as in a novel, but increasingly common setting of AVIs. In doing so, we also aimed to replicate prior findings exploring relations between HEXACO personality traits and honest and deceptive IM (e.g., Bill & Melchers, 2023a; Bourdage et al., 2018, 2020; Powell et al., 2021), and add to the literature on the impact of honest IM.

The main contribution of the two studies is that they provide a more comprehensive understanding on the role of interviewee cognitive capacities in predicting interview IM. Although prior literature has speculated that interviewees lower in cognitive ability may be more likely to use deceptive IM to make up for greater discrepancies in skills and qualifications to present themselves more favorably (Levashina & Campion, 2006), the relationship has not been

robustly tested (Buehl et al., 2019; Buehl & Melchers, 2017). Overall, we found a negative relationship between cognitive ability and deceptive IM in both face-to-face interviews and AVIs. Additionally, we found that the relationship between cognitive ability and honest IM differs depending on the interview setting, such that interviewees lower in cognitive ability used more honest IM in AVIs (Study 2) but not in face-to-face interviews (Study 1). This is important to highlight because research has rarely explored how interviewees' use of IM differs in face-to-face interviews and AVIs (Basch et al., 2020). However, the negative relationship in Study 2 was small in magnitude (r = -.13) and is worthy of replication in future studies. Nevertheless, even though interviewees lower in cognitive ability tend to have less relevant skills and experiences to draw upon in their responses, it is plausible that they are more likely to highlight them more prominently (i.e., use honest IM) in AVIs as there may be more preparation time before they have to start recording their answers (cf. Dunlop et al., 2022) and thus allows interviewees to prepare their responses more extensively (Basch et al., 2021; Lukacik et al., 2022).

The current study also highlights that interviewee executive functions play a more limited role for predicting IM use compared to cognitive ability. Previously, executive functions had seldom been explored in the context of selection, even though these variables have been theoretically linked to deception and faking (Walczyk et al., 2014), as well as to organizational outcomes such as job performance (Lemonaki et al., 2021; Chan et al., 2021). However, many of our findings were contrary to predictions. First, we only found a significant relationship between WM updating and honest IM, such that interviewees lower on WM updating used more honest IM. This unique finding is noteworthy because it is the only executive function that overlaps substantially with general cognitive ability, given that employees cannot solve problems that they cannot store in their WM (Friedman & Miyake, 2017; Nisbett, 2009). It is plausible that

interviewees lower in WM updating are more likely to rely on their long-term memory stores to recall past skills and work-related experiences truthfully, because they may be less able to manipulate and distort responses in more limited WM stores. Nevertheless, considering the small magnitude of the relationship (r = -.19), future research is needed to determine whether the relationship holds in other job interview contexts and replicates in other studies.

Second, unlike cognitive ability, none of the executive functions were related to deceptive IM. We attribute these findings to an important way in which executive functions differ from cognitive ability (Chan et al., 2021). Specifically, executive functions are better predictive of performing well in tasks that are more fluid and unstructured, which does not necessarily characterize deceptive IM, particularly in a more structured interview setting. Indeed, deception always involves carrying out the same tasks simultaneously (e.g., retrieving and distorting honest responses, conveying the distorted response; Walczyk et al., 2014). Furthermore, having higher executive functions helps prevent individuals from enacting impulsive behaviors and decisions (Chan et al., 2021; Moutier & Houde, 2003). Because deceptive IM is considered to be deliberate (Levashina & Campion, 2006) and interviewees can prepare deceptive responses to common interview questions well in advance (Schudlik et al., 2021), executive functions may be less relevant for predicting deceptive IM use. Overall, the limited findings pertaining to executive functions suggest that the role of interviewee cognition for shaping IM use is primarily driven by their general mental capacity, and less so their ability to coordinate and control this mental capacity.

In terms of applicant personality, and mostly in line with findings from prior studies with face-to-face interviews (Bill & Melchers, 2023a; Bourdage et al., 2018, 2020; Buehl & Melchers, 2017; Law et al., 2016; Powell et al., 2021), we found that conscientiousness was negatively

related to deceptive IM, whereas extraversion was positively related to honest IM across both face-to-face interviews (Study 1) and AVIs (Study 2). Overall, it is evident that interviewee personality has a more prominent role for shaping IM use in job interviews than applicant cognitive capacity, as we found that executive functions had a more limited role in influencing interview IM use. Furthermore, our path-analysis models indicated that the paths between cognitive ability and honest or deceptive IM were nonsignificant after accounting for personality, and the magnitudes of the correlations pertaining to the hypothesized personality traits were almost always larger than those with cognitive ability, and significantly so for numerous comparisons.[3] These comparisons further highlight the importance of exploring interview IM use as a function of personality trait expression, given how its underlying motivation is the desired image that applicants seek to portray (Bourdage et al., 2020; Hogan & Holland, 2003). However, we must note that honesty-humility was negatively related to honest IM in Study 1 but not in Study 2. Interviewees lower in honesty-humility may be less willing to manipulate others indiscriminately through IM tactics in AVIs as it is a more unfamiliar setting for conveying impressions (i.e., limiting the trait expression for honesty-humility).

Finally, the current study is the first to demonstrate that interviewees who perceive greater incongruency between their true personality and what the organization is looking for are more likely to use deceptive IM. This is noteworthy because incongruency had often been used (but never tested) to explain why interviewee individual differences (e.g., cognitive ability, extraversion) influence IM use (Levashina & Campion, 2006). Furthermore, our finding is in line

[3] We compare these correlations using Lenhard and Lenhard (2014)'s calculator. In Study 1, the correlation between conscientiousness and deceptive IM was significantly larger than that between cognitive ability and deceptive IM (p = .018), and the correlation between honesty-humility and honest IM was significantly larger than that between cognitive ability and honest IM (p = .026). Similarly, in Study 2, the correlation between honesty-humility and deceptive IM was significantly larger than that between cognitive ability and deceptive IM (p < .001).

with self-discrepancy theory, which suggests that individuals wish to close discrepancies between their true selves and how they convey themselves to others (Higgins, 1987). Nevertheless, exploring these relations using trait-specific incongruency scores (see Supplemental Materials S2) indicated that these relations are driven by perceptions of incongruencies for certain traits over others. While the patterns of these findings differed to an extent across interview settings (i.e., Studies 1 and 2) and for Study 2, incongruency scores using raw difference scores versus regression-adjusted difference scores, these relations were primarily driven by emotionality and honesty-humility (for raw difference scores only) in both studies. Although more research is needed to determine what drives these differences, it is plausible that differences in target occupations or interview format (e.g., in-person interviews vs. AVIs) shape how interviewees are motivated or are able to use deceptive IM to close these discrepancies. For instance, interviewees may be more willing to use deceptive IM to close these discrepancies for more job-relevant traits, and the interview questions may be more likely to evaluate job-relevant traits, thereby providing greater opportunities to use these tactics (Levashina & Campion, 2006; Tett & Simonet, 2021). Furthermore, our findings raise the importance for researchers to carefully determine how to operationalize incongruency scores in interview research, as the use of certain approaches over others can lead to different conclusions.

Limitations and Future Directions

We would like to note some limitations of the current study, as well as potential lines for future research arising from these limitations. Notably, Study 1 used a sample of undergraduate student interviewees and Study 2 used student raters to evaluate participants' interview performances instead of actual interviewers (as in Study 1). The use of student interviewees in Study 1 is especially noteworthy because younger interviewees are more prone to using

deceptive IM (Levashina & Peck, 2017; Melchers et al., 2020), and some of the differences in the findings across our studies may be attributable to interviewee characteristics (e.g., age, work experience), and not the interview setting. However, the relations between interviewee individual differences and interview IM are unlikely to be influenced using student samples because these relationships are generally similar regardless of the age of the sample (Bourdage et al., 2015, 2018; Melchers et al., 2020). Similarly, ratings of interview performance (especially in structured interviews) are unrelated to raters' age or interviewing experience (Maurer, 2002; Roulin, 2016). Furthermore, to ensure that there was sufficient agreement in the ratings we extensively trained the raters and provided descriptively-anchored rating scales (cf. Melchers et al., 2011). Nevertheless, future studies may wish to compare differences in these relationships of interest using more similar samples across face-to-face interviews and AVIs to better understand the role of interviewee individual differences and interview contexts on IM.

Practical Implications

Overall, the findings of the current study have important practical implications for organizations. First, deceptive IM was unrelated to interview performance ratings in both studies (in line with prior meta-analytic findings; Ho et al., 2021), which might be initially reassuring to organizations, given that deceptive IM has been described as a threat to the validity of interviews (e.g., Levashina et al., 2014). However, we still recommend organizations to design interviews to prevent its use and effectiveness for the following reasons: Notably, interviewees lower in cognitive ability, which is one of the most robust predictors of employee performance (Nye et al., 2022; Schmidt, 2002), used more deceptive IM in both studies. These findings add to a growing list of undesirable interviewee traits associated with deceptive IM use (Bourdage et al., 2020; Levashina & Campion, 2006; Melchers et al., 2020). Furthermore, even though deceptive

IM is considered to be unethical and unfair to more honest interviewees (Levashina & Campion, 2007), most interviewees use deceptive IM at least to some extent and interviewers cannot detect deceptive IM (Roulin et al., 2015). So far, increasing interview structure by using more sophisticated interview questions (e.g., situational and past behavior questions) seems to be a promising avenue to dissuade interviewees from using deceptive IM and to reduce the effects of IM on interview performance ratings (Barrick et al., 2009; Bill & Melchers, 2023b) as deceptive IM is still considered to be unethical and unfair to more honest interviewees (Bourdage et al., 2018; Levashina & Campion, 2007). Additionally, given how perceived incongruency was positively related to deceptive IM in both studies, organizations may wish to steer away from creating job ads that signal potentially unnecessary extreme levels of certain traits that could drive individuals to feel as if they need to fake. Nevertheless, the present finding associated with interview performance may be reassuring to organizations as it lowers concerns that preventing deceptive IM use is required to ensure higher-quality interviews.

In terms of honest IM, organizations may also wish to design interviews so that a greater number of interviewees feel comfortable using honest IM, in order to even out opportunities for applicants to succeed and thereby improve the fairness of interviews. For instance, given the past demonstrated effectiveness of preparation (Schudlik et al., 2021), an organization may provide applicants tips on how to honestly and appropriately convey themselves, and encourage their use to interviewees in the form of preparation materials prior to the interview. In the case of AVIs, organizations may provide practice interview questions to interviewees to make them feel more prepared to use honest IM in their actual interview (Roulin et al., 2023). Additionally, organization may wish to convey signals to interviewees prior to and during the interviews that they value honesty and ethical workplace behaviors (e.g., emphasizing higher ethical standards

or discouraging knowledge hiding when providing job descriptions; Wang et al., 2023). This is because the findings of both studies support the notion that some applicants are more comfortable using honest IM than others, and that this provides an advantage to those candidates (Bourdage et al., 2020). Additionally, the relations between honest or deceptive IM and interview performance across both studies indicate that the behaviors leading to success in face-to-face interviews are similar to those in more standardized AVIs (even when a more structured performance rating process was used in the latter). Therefore, interviewees in AVIs should use behaviors that would also lead to success in face-to-face interviews (e.g., honest IM), which is noteworthy because interviewees generally have less experience in AVIs than face-to-face interviews (Basch et al., 2021; Langer et al., 2020), and therefore may be less certain of which types of behaviors to use in AVIs.

References

Amaral, A. A., Powell, D. M., & Ho, J. L. (2019). Why does impression management positively influence interview ratings? The mediating role of competence and warmth. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, *27*(4), 315-327. https://doi.org/10.1111/ijsa.12260

Anglim, J., Lievens, F., Everton, L., Grant, S. L., & Marty, A. (2018). HEXACO personality predicts counterproductive work behavior and organizational citizenship behavior in low-stakes and job applicant contexts. *Journal of Research in Personality*, *77*, 11-20. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrp.2018.09.003

Ashton, M. C., & Lee, K. (2016). Age trends in HEXACO-PI-R self-reports. *Journal of Research in Personality*, *64*, 102-111. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrp.2016.08.008

Ashton, M. C., & Lee, K. (2007). Empirical, theoretical, and practical advantages of the HEXACO model of personality structure. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, *11*(2), 150-166. https://doi.org/10.1177/1088868306294907

Ashton, M. C., & Lee, K. (2009). The HEXACO–60: A short measure of the major dimensions of personality. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, *91*(4), 340-345. https://doi.org/10.1080/00223890902935878

Ashton, M. C., Lee, K., & De Vries, R. E. (2014). The HEXACO honesty-humility, agreeableness, and emotionality factors: A review of research and theory. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, *18*(2), 139-152. https://doi.org/10.1177/1088868314523838

Banich, M. T. (2009). Executive function: The search for an integrated account. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, *18*(2), 89-94. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8721.2009.01615.x

Barrick, M. R., & Mount, M. K. (1991). The Big Five personality dimensions and job

performance: A meta-analysis. *Personnel Psychology*, *44*(1), 1-26. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.1991.tb00688.x

Basch, J. M., Melchers, K. G., Kegelmann, J., & Lieb, L. (2020). Smile for the camera! The role of social presence and impression management in perceptions of technology-mediated interviews. *Journal of Managerial Psychology, 35*(4), 285-299. https://doi.org/10.1108/JMP-09-2018-0398

Basch, J. M., Brenner, F. S., Melchers, K. G., Krumm, S., Dräger, L., Herzer, H., & Schuwerk, E. (2021). Good things need time: The role of preparation time in asynchronous video interviews. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment, 29*(3-4), 378-392. https://doi.org/10.1111/ijsa.12341

Battista, F., Curci, A., Mangiulli, I., & Otgaar, H. (2021). What can we remember after complex denials? The impact of different false denials on memory. *Psychology, Crime & Law*, *27*(9), 914-931. https://doi.org/10.1080/1068316X.2020.1865956

Baumeister, R. F. (2002). Ego depletion and self-control failure: An energy model of the self's executive function. *Self and Identity*, *1*(2), 129-136. https://doi.org/10.1080/152988602317319302

Baumeister, R. F., & Hutton, D. G. (1987). Self-presentation theory: Self-construction and audience pleasing. In *Theories of Group Behavior* (pp. 71-87). Springer.

Bennett, R. J., & Robinson, S. L. (2000). Development of a measure of workplace deviance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *85*(3), 349-360. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.85.3.349

Bill, B., & Melchers, K. G. (2023a). Thou shalt not lie! Exploring and testing countermeasures against faking in selection interviews. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment,*

31(1), 22-44. https://doi.org/10.1111/ijsa.12402

Bill, B., & Melchers, K. G. (2023b, August). *Are traditional interviews more prone to effects of impression management than structured interviews*. Paper presented at the 83rd annual meeting of the Academy of Management, Boston, MA, USA.

Bill, B., Melchers, K. G., Buehl, A.-K., & Wank, S. (2020). An investigation of situational and dispositional antecedents of faking intentions in selection interviews. *Frontiers in Psychology, 11*, Article 2034. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2020.02034

Bolino, M. C., & Turnley, W. H. (1999). Measuring impression management in organizations: A scale development based on the Jones and Pittman taxonomy. *Organizational Research Methods*, *2*(2), 187-206. https://doi.org/10.1177/109442819922005

Bolino, M. C., Kacmar, K. M., Turnley, W. H., & Gilstrap, J. B. (2008). A multi-level review of impression management motives and behaviors. *Journal of Management*, *34*(6), 1080-1109. https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206308324325

Bourdage, J. S., Roulin, N., & Tarraf, R. (2018). "I (might be) just that good": Honest and deceptive impression management in employment interviews. *Personnel Psychology*, *71*(4), 597-632. https://doi.org/10.1111/peps.12285

Bourdage, J. S., Schmidt, J., Wiltshire, J., Nguyen, B., & Lee, K. (2020). Personality, interview performance, and the mediating role of impression management. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, *93*(3), 556-577. https://doi.org/10.1111/joop.12304

Bourdage, J. S., Wiltshire, J., & Lee, K. (2015). Personality and workplace impression management: Correlates and implications. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *100*(2), 537-546. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0037942

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

effectiveness of faking behavior in interviews. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *8*, Article 686. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2017.00686

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*(1), 107-124. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10869-018-9531-3

Buller, D. B., & Burgoon, J. K. (1996). Interpersonal deception theory. *Communication Theory*, *6*(3), 203-242. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2885.1996.tb00127.x

Burns, G. N., & Christiansen, N. D. (2011). Methods of measuring faking behavior. *Human Performance*, *24*(4), 358-372. https://doi.org/10.1080/08959285.2011.597473

Chan, T., Wang, I., & Ybarra, O. (2021). Leading and managing the workplace: The role of executive functions. *Academy of Management Perspectives*, *35*(1), 142-164. https://doi.org/10.5465/amp.2017.0215

Charbonneau, B. D., Reed, M., & Powell, D. M. (2021). Self-verification behavior as an employment interview tactic. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, *29*(3-4), 393-411. https://doi.org/10.1111/ijsa.12349

Condon, D. M., & Revelle, W. (2014). The International Cognitive Ability Resource: Development and initial validation of a public-domain measure. *Intelligence*, *43*, 52-64. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.intell.2014.01.004

Culbertson, S. S., Huffcutt, A. I., & Goebl, A. P. (2013). Introduction and empirical assessment of executive functioning as a predictor of job performance. *Psych Journal*, *2*(2), 75-85. https://doi.org/10.1002/pchj.20

Debey, E., Ridderinkhof, R. K., De Houwer, J., De Schryver, M., & Verschuere, B. (2015). Suppressing the truth as a mechanism of deception: Delta plots reveal the role of response

inhibition in lying. *Consciousness and Cognition*, *37*, 148-159. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.actpsy.2015.06.007

DePaulo, B. M., Stone, J. I., & Lassiter, G. D. (1985). Telling ingratiating lies: Effects of target sex and target attractiveness on verbal and nonverbal deceptive success. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *48*(5), 1191-1203. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.48.5.1191

Dunlop, P. D., Holtrop, D., & Wee, S. (2022). How asynchronous video interviews are used in practice: A study of an Australian-based AVI vendor. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment, 30*(3), 448-455. https://doi.org/10.1111/ijsa.12372

Ellis, A. P., West, B. J., Ryan, A. M., & DeShon, R. P. (2002). The use of impression management tactics in structured interviews: A function of question type? *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *87*(6), 1200-1208. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.87.6.1200

Ferris, G. R., Witt, L. A., and Hochwarter, W. A. (2001). Interaction of social skill and general mental ability on job performance and salary. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 86*(6), 1075–1082. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.86.6.1075

Fletcher, C. (1990). The relationships between candidate personality, self-presentation strategies, and interviewer assessments in selection interviews: An empirical study. *Human Relations*, *43*(8), 739-749. https://doi.org/10.1177/001872679004300803

Friedman, N. P., & Miyake, A. (2017). Unity and diversity of executive functions: Individual differences as a window on cognitive structure. *Cortex*, *86*, 186-204. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cortex.2016.04.023

Friedman, N. P., Miyake, A., Corley, R. P., Young, S. E., DeFries, J. C., & Hewitt, J. K. (2006). Not all executive functions are related to intelligence. *Psychological Science, 17*(2), 172–

179. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9280.2006.01681.x

Heck, D. W., Thielmann, I., Moshagen, M., & Hilbig, B. E. (2018). Who lies? A large-scale reanalysis linking basic personality traits to unethical decision making. *Judgment and Decision Making*, *13*(4), 356. https://doi.org/10.1017/S1930297500009232

Henle, C. A., Dineen, B. R., & Duffy, M. K. (2019). Assessing intentional resume deception: Development and nomological network of a resume fraud measure. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, *34*(1), 87-106. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10869-017-9527-4

Higgins, E. T. (1987). Self-discrepancy: a theory relating self and affect. *Psychological Review*, *94*(3), 319-340. https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-295X.94.3.319

Higgins, C. A., & Judge, T. A. (2004). The effect of applicant influence tactics on recruiter perceptions of fit and hiring recommendations: a field study. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *89*(4), 622. https://doi.org/doi/10.1037/0021-9010.89.4.622

Ho, J. L., Powell, D. M., & Stanley, D. J. (2021). The relation between deceptive impression management and employment interview ratings: A meta-analysis. *Canadian Journal of Behavioral Science*, *53*(2), 164-174. https://doi.org/10.1037/cbs0000223

Hogan, J., & Holland, B. (2003). Using theory to evaluate personality and job-performance relations: A socioanalytic perspective. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *88*(1), 100-112. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.88.1.100

Holden, C. J., Zeigler-Hill, V., Pham, M. N., & Shackelford, T. K. (2014). Personality features and mate retention strategies: Honesty–humility and the willingness to manipulate, deceive, and exploit romantic partners. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *57*, 31-36. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2013.09.018

Huffcutt, A. I., Roth, P. L., & McDaniel, M. A. (1996). A meta-analytic investigation of

cognitive ability in employment interview evaluations: Moderating characteristics and implications for incremental validity. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 81*(5), 459-473. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.81.5.459

Hunter, J. E. (1986). Cognitive ability, cognitive aptitudes, job knowledge, and job performance. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, *29*(3), 340-362. https://doi.org/10.1016/0001-8791(86)90013-8

Jansen, A., König, C. J., Stadelmann, E. H., & Kleinmann, M. (2012). Applicants' self-presentational behavior. *Journal of Personnel Psychology, 11*(2), 77-85. https://doi.org/10.1027/1866-5888/a000046

Judge, T. A., Bono, J. E., & Locke, E. A. (2000). Personality and job satisfaction: The mediating role of job characteristics. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *85*(2), 237. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.85.2.237

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*(2), 128-146. https://doi.org/10.1177/2041386610387000

Konovsky, M. A., & Cropanzano, R. (1991). Perceived fairness of employee drug testing as a predictor of employee attitudes and job performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *76*(5), 698-707. http://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.76.5.698

Langer, M., König, C. J., & Hemsing, V. (2020). Is anybody listening? The impact of automatically evaluated job interviews on impression management and applicant reactions. *Journal of Managerial Psychology, 35*(4), 271-284. https://doi.org/10.1108/JMP-03-2019-0156

Langleben, D. D., Schroeder, L., Maldjian, J. A., Gur, R. C., McDonald, S., Ragland, J. D., ... & Childress, A. R. (2002). Brain activity during simulated deception: An event-related functional magnetic resonance study. *Neuroimage*, *15*(3), 727-732. https://doi.org/10.1006/nimg.2001.1003

Leary, M. R., & Kowalski, R. M. (1990). Impression management: A literature review and two-component model. *Psychological Bulletin*, *107*(1), 34-47. https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.107.1.34

Lee, K., & Ashton, M. C. (2004). Psychometric properties of the HEXACO personality inventory. *Multivariate Behavioral Research*, *39*(2), 329-358. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327906mbr3902_8

Lee, K., Ashton, M. C., Wiltshire, J., Bourdage, J. S., Visser, B. A., & Gallucci, A. (2013). Sex, power, and money: Prediction from the Dark Triad and honesty–humility. *European Journal of Personality*, *27*(2), 169-184. https://doi.org/10.1002/per.1860

Lemonaki, R., Xanthopoulou, D., Bardos, A. N., Karademas, E. C., & Simos, P. G. (2021). Burnout and job performance: A two-wave study on the mediating role of employee cognitive functioning. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, *30*(5), 692-704. https://doi.org/10.1080/1359432X.2021.1892818

Lenhard, W. & Lenhard, A. (2014). *Hypothesis Tests for Comparing Correlations*. Available: https://www.psychometrica.de/correlation.html. Bibergau (Germany): Psychometrica. https://doi.org/10.13140/RG.2.1.2954.1367

Levashina, J., & Campion, M. A. (2006). A model of faking likelihood in the employment interview. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, *14*(4), 299-316. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2389.2006.00353.x

Levashina, J., & Campion, M. A. (2007). Measuring faking in the employment interview: development and validation of an interview faking behavior scale. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *92*(6), 1638-1656. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.92.6.1638

Levashina, J., Hartwell, C. J., Morgeson, F. P., & Campion, M. A. (2014). The structured employment interview: Narrative and quantitative review of the research literature. *Personnel Psychology*, *67*(1), 241-293. https://doi.org/10.1111/peps.12052

Lombard, M., & Ditton, T. (1997). At the heart of it all: The concept of presence. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, *3*(2), Article JCMC321. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1083-6101.1997.tb00072.x

Lukacik, E. R., Bourdage, J. S., & Roulin, N. (2022). Into the void: A conceptual model and research agenda for the design and use of asynchronous video interviews. *Human Resource Management Review*, *32*(1), 1-15. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.hrmr.2020.100789

Maurer, S. D. (2002). A practitioner-based analysis of interviewer job expertise and scale format as contextual factors in situational interviews. *Personnel Psychology, 55*(2), 307-327. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.2002.tb00112.x

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*(4), 355–374. https://doi.org/10.1080/08959280903120295

Melchers, K. G., Lienhardt, N., von Aarburg, M., & Kleinmann, M. (2011). Is more structure really better? A comparison of frame-of-reference training and descriptively anchored rating scales to improve interviewers' rating quality. *Personnel Psychology, 64*(1), 53–87. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.2010.01202.x

Melchers, K. G., Roulin, N., & Buehl, A.-K. (2020). A review of applicant faking in selection interviews. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment, 28*(2), 123-142. https://doi.org/10.1111/IJSA.12280

Miyake, A., Friedman, N. P., Emerson, M. J., Witzki, A. H., Howerter, A., & Wager, T. D. (2000). The unity and diversity of executive functions and their contributions to complex "frontal lobe" tasks: A latent variable analysis. *Cognitive Psychology*, *41*(1), 49-100. https://doi.org/10.1006/cogp.1999.0734

Moutier, S., & Houdé, O. (2003). Judgement under uncertainty and conjunction fallacy inhibition training. *Thinking & Reasoning*, *9*(3), 185-201. https://doi.org/10.1080/13546780343000213

Peck, J. A., & Levashina, J. (2017). Impression management and interview and job performance ratings: A meta-analysis of research design with tactics in mind. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *8*, Article 201. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2017.00201

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. https://doi.org/10.1080/08959285.2011.580808

Pletzer, J. L., Oostrom, J. K., Bentvelzen, M., & de Vries, R. E. (2020). Comparing domain- and facet-level relations of the HEXACO personality model with workplace deviance: A meta-analysis. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *152*, Article 109539. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2019.109539

Plomin, R. (1999). Genetics and general cognitive ability. *Nature*, *402*(Suppl 6761), C25-C29. https://doi.org/10.1038/35011520

Powell, D. M., Bourdage, J. S., & Bonaccio, S. (2021). Shake and fake: The role of interview anxiety in deceptive impression management. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, *36*(5), 829-840. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10869-020-09708-1

Riggio, R. E., & Friedman, H. S. (1983). Individual differences and cues to deception. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *45*(4), 899-915. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.45.4.899

Rönnlund, M., Nyberg, L., Bäckman, L., & Nilsson, L. G. (2005). Stability, growth, and decline in adult life span development of declarative memory: cross-sectional and longitudinal data from a population-based study. *Psychology and Aging*, *20*(1), 3-18. https://psycnet.apa.org/doi/10.1037/0882-7974.20.1.3

Roulin, N. (2016). Individual differences predicting impression management detection in job interviews. *Personnel Assessment and Decisions*, *2*(1), 1-11. https://doi.org/10.25035/pad.2016.001

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*(2), 395-444. https://doi.org/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*, Article 29. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2017.00029

Roulin, N., & Pham, L. K. A., Bourdage, J. S. (2023). Ready? Camera rolling… action! Examining interviewee training and practice opportunities in asynchronous video interviews. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, *145*, Article 103912.

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2023.103912

Sackett, P. R., Zhang, C., Berry, C. M., & Lievens, F. (2022). Revisiting meta-analytic estimates of validity in personnel selection: Addressing systematic overcorrection for restriction of range. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 107*(11), 2040–2068. https://doi.org/10.1037/apl0000994

Salthouse, T. A. (2005). Relations between cognitive abilities and measures of executive functioning. *Neuropsychology*, *19*(4), 532. https://doi.org/10.1037/0894-4105.19.4.532

Salthouse, T. A., & Davis, H. P. (2006). Organization of cognitive abilities and neuropsychological variables across the lifespan. *Developmental Review*, *26*(1), 31-54. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dr.2005.09.001

Schmidt, F. L. (2002). The role of general cognitive ability and job performance: Why there cannot be a debate. *Human Performance*, *15*(1-2), 187-210. https://doi.org/10.1207/S15327043HUP1501&02_12

Schudlik, K., Reinhard, M. A., & Müller, P. (2021). Prepared to fake? The relationship between applicants' job interview preparation and faking. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, *29*(1), 29-54. https://doi.org/10.1111/ijsa.12317

Sip, K. E., Roepstorff, A., McGregor, W., & Frith, C. D. (2008). Detecting deception: the scope and limits. *Trends in cognitive sciences*, *12*(2), 48-53. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tics.2007.11.008

Spence, S. A., Farrow, T. F., Herford, A. E., Wilkinson, I. D., Zheng, Y., & Woodruff, P. W. (2001). Behavioral and functional anatomical correlates of deception in humans. *Neuroreport*, *12*(13), 2849-2853.

Suchotzki, K., Verschuere, B., Van Bockstaele, B., Ben-Shakhar, G., & Crombez, G. (2017).

Lying takes time: A meta-analysis on reaction time measures of deception. *Psychological Bulletin*, *143*(4), 428-453. https://doi.org/10.1037/bul0000087

Van't Veer, A., Stel, M., & van Beest, I. (2014). Limited capacity to lie: Cognitive load interferes with being dishonest. *Judgment and Decision Making*, *9*(3), 199-206. https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.2351377

Vohs, K. D., Baumeister, R. F., & Ciarocco, N. J. (2005). Self-regulation and self-presentation: regulatory resource depletion impairs impression management and effortful self-presentation depletes regulatory resources. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *88*(4), 632-637. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.88.4.632

Von Bastian, C. C., Souza, A. S., & Gade, M. (2016). No evidence for bilingual cognitive advantages: A test of four hypotheses. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General*, *145*(2), 246-258. https://doi.org/10.1037/xge0000120

Vrij, A., Mann, S. A., Fisher, R. P., Leal, S., Milne, R., & Bull, R. (2008). Increasing cognitive load to facilitate lie detection: The benefit of recalling an event in reverse order. *Law and Human Behavior*, *32*(3), 253-265. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10979-007-9103-y

Walczyk, J. J., Harris, L. L., Duck, T. K., & Mulay, D. (2014). A social-cognitive framework for understanding serious lies: Activation-decision-construction-action theory. *New Ideas in Psychology*, *34*, 22-36. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.newideapsych.2014.03.001

Wang, J., Tian, S., Wang, Y., Guo, Y., Wei, X., Zhou, X., & Zhang, Y. (2023). The relationship between perceptions of leader hypocrisy and employees' knowledge hiding behaviors: Testing a moderated mediation model. *Psychology Research and Behavior Management* (Online Advance Publication).

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*(4), 1070-1086. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.0021-9029.2006.00055.x

Wiltshire, J., Bourdage, J. S., & Lee, K. (2014). Honesty-humility and perceptions of organizational politics in predicting workplace outcomes. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, *29*(2), 235-251. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10869-013-9310-0

Zettler, I., & Hilbig, B. E. (2010). Honesty-humility and a person-situation interaction at work. *European Journal of Personality*, *24*(7), 569-582. https://doi.org/10.1002/per.757

Table 1

Descriptive Statistics, Internal Consistency Reliabilities, and Intercorrelations of Study Variables (Study 1)

	Variable	*M*	*SD*	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1	Honesty-humility	3.38	0.58	(.80)							
2	Extraversion	3.37	0.55	-.08	(.77)						
3	Conscientiousness	3.63	0.60	.21**	.34**	(.81)					
4	Cognitive ability	0.44	0.22	.20*	.13	.19*	–				
5	Incongruency	65.75	53.98	-.14	-.27**	-.19*	.03	–			
6	Honest IM	3.18	0.85	-.25**	.19*	.06	.06	.07	(.95)		
7	Deceptive IM	2.03	0.79	-.35**	-.05	-.43**	-.24**	.21**	.54**	(.96)	
8	Interview performance	3.97	0.99	.04	.12	.11	.09	-.01	.14	-.04	(.92)

Note. $N = 166$. IM = impression management.

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

Table 2

Results of the Path Model Between Interviewee Individual Differences and Interview Performance (Study 1)

Variable	Deceptive IM	Honest IM	Interview performance	Indirect effect through deceptive IM (95% BCI)	Indirect effect through honest IM (95% BCI)
Cognitive Ability	-.14	.07	.02	.021 (-.004, .082)	.016 (-.012, .071)
Honesty-Humility	-.21**	-.24**	.06	.032 (-.009, .099)	**-.053 (-.125, -.010)**
Extraversion	.12	.18*	.08	-.018 (-.080, .005)	**.040 (.005, .121)**
Conscientiousness	-.37**	.04	-.03	.055 (-.019, .152)	.009 (-.023, .070)
Incongruency	.14	.09	.02	-.021 (-.088, .004)	.020 (-.007, .080)
Deceptive IM			-.15		
Honest IM			.22*		

Note. IM = impression management. 95% BCI = 95% bootstrapped confidence intervals using 5000 iterations. Bolded indirect effects indicate 95% BCI that exclude 0 (i.e., significant mediation).

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

Table 3

Descriptive Statistics, Internal Consistency Reliabilities, and Intercorrelations of Study Variables (Study 2)

	Variable	*M*	*SD*	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
1	Honesty-humility	3.45	0.63	(.76)										
2	Extraversion	3.19	0.68	.13*	(.81)									
3	Conscientiousness	3.66	0.58	.29**	.34**	(.77)								
4	Cognitive ability	0.45	0.24	.16**	-.03	.04	–							
5	Incongruency	83.38	81.63	-.16**	-.07	-.10	.00	–						
6	WM updating	0.65	0.18	.13*	.01	.07	.38**	-.05	–					
7	Shifting	0.20	0.15	-.05	-.08	-.06	.05	-.01	-.12*	–				
8	Inhibition	0.08	0.10	.09	-.05	-.05	.03	.03	.11	-.08	–			
9	Honest IM	2.61	0.74	-.04	.18**	.02	-.13*	-.01	-.19**	.03	-.09	(.94)		
10	Deceptive IM	1.83	0.66	-.36*	-.02	-.24**	-.12*	.17**	-.08	.03	-.10	.38**	(.95)	
11	Interview performance	2.94	0.68	.08	.02	.02	.14*	-.03	.23**	-.05	-.05	.14*	-.03	(.73)

Note. $N = 294$. IM = impression management, WM = working memory. Values in parentheses represent Cronbach's alphas.

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

Table 4

Results of Path Model Between Interviewee Individual Differences and Interview Performance (Study 2)

Variable	Deceptive IM	Honest IM	Interview performance	Indirect effect through deceptive IM (95% BCI)	Indirect effect through honest IM (95% BCI)
Cognitive ability	-.04	-.06	.01	.001 (-.005, .023)	-.012 (-.049, .013)
WM updating	.00	-.15*	.22**	.000 (-.013, .012)	**-.030 (-.081, -.002)**
Shifting	-.00	.03	-.07	.000 (-.010, .015)	.005 (-.017, .034)
Inhibition	-.10	-.06	-.08	.004 (-.009, .025)	-.010 (-.049, .017)
Honesty-humility	-.29**	.02	.08	.011 (-.025, .067)	.004 (-.024, .038)
Extraversion	.09	.20**	.03	-.004 (-.035, .007)	**.038 (.010, .088)**
Conscientiousness	-.16*	-.06	-.04	.006 (-.014, .040)	-.012 (-.050, .016)
Incongruency	.13*	.02	-.00	-.005 (-.037, .012)	.003 (-.021, .034)
Deceptive IM			-.04		
Honest IM			.20**		

Note. IM = Impression management, WM = working memory. 95% BCI = 95% bootstrapped confidence intervals using 5000 iterations. Bolded indirect effects indicate 95% BCI that exclude 0 (i.e., significant mediation).

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

Table 5

Summary of Hypotheses

	Hypothesis	Study 1	Study 2
H1	a) Cognitive ability will be negatively related to deceptive IM.	Supported	Supported
	b) Cognitive ability will be positively related to honest IM.	Not supported	Not supported[a]
H2	a) WM updating, b) Shifting, and c) Inhibition will be positively related to deceptive IM.		Not supported
H3	a) WM updating will be positively related to honest IM.		Not supported[a]
	b) Shifting and c) Inhibition will be positively related to honest IM.		Not supported
H4	a) Honesty-humility will be negatively related to deceptive IM.	Supported	Supported
	b) Conscientiousness will be negatively related to deceptive IM.	Supported	Supported
H5	a) Honesty-humility will be negatively related to honest IM.	Supported	Not supported
	b) Extraversion will be positively related to honest IM.	Supported	Supported
H6	a) Incongruency will be positively related to deceptive IM.	Supported	Supported
	b) Incongruency will be negatively related to honest IM.	Not supported	Not supported
RQ1	Does deceptive IM mediate the relationships between a) cognitive ability, b) WM updating, c) shifting, d) inhibition, e) honesty-humility, f) conscientiousness, and g) incongruency and interview performance?	No mediation found	No mediation found
RQ2	Does honest IM mediate the relationships between a) cognitive ability, b) WM updating, c) shifting, d) inhibition, e) honesty-humility, f) extraversion, and g) incongruency and interview performance?	Mediation found for e, f	Mediation found for b, f

Note. [a] Contrary direction to hypothesis.

Supplemental Materials Section for *Exploring the Role of Interviewee Cognitive Capacities on Impression Management in Face-to-Face and Virtual Interviews*

Supplemental Materials S1

Descriptive Statistics and Base Rates for Individual IM Tactics

	Study 1		Study 2	
	M (SD)	**Base Rate**	**M (SD)**	**Base Rate**
Honest Self-Promotion	3.49 (0.93)	93.4%	3.23 (0.85)	93.8%
Honest Ingratiation	3.20 (1.02)	85.5%	2.37 (0.94)	65.9%
Honest Defensive	2.84 (0.90)	80.7%	2.25 (0.85)	57.8%
Deceptive Slight Image Creation	2.15 (0.94)	48.2%	1.92 (0.75)	38.9%
Deceptive Extensive Image Creation	1.64 (0.83)	21.7%	1.61 (0.76)	26.3%
Deceptive Ingratiation	2.40 (0.90)	65.1%	1.95 (0.85)	42.1%
Deceptive Image Protection	1.96 (0.87)	41.0%	1.84 (0.81)	38.4%

Note. Base rates indicate proportion of participants with values 2 (*To a little extent*) or greater for each individual IM tactic.

Supplemental Materials S2

Correlations between Incongruency for Specific HEXACO Traits and Interview IM

	Study 1		Study 2	
Trait Incongruency	**Deceptive IM**	**Honest IM**	**Deceptive IM**	**Honest IM**
Raw Difference Scores				
Honesty-Humility	.38**	.08	.17**	.01
Emotionality	.18*	.11	.17**	-.02
Extraversion	.04	.07	.14**	.04
Agreeableness	.06	-.04	.11	.02
Conscientiousness	.22**	.08	.07	-.09
Openness	.05	-.04	.09	-.04
Regression-Adjusted Difference Scores				
Honesty-Humility	.36**	.02	.09	.04
Emotionality	.20*	.03	.16**	.11
Extraversion	.01	-.05	.03	.07
Agreeableness	.10	-.07	.01	.09
Conscientiousness	.21**	-.01	-.00	-.05
Openness	.08	-.09	-.03	-.05

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

Supplemental Materials S3

Job Description, Interview Questions and Corresponding Rating Scales (Study 2)

At Jacks & Winter, we are at the forefront of innovative branding and marketing. Our mission is to provide our clients with a superior tailored experience and unparalleled success. We strive to make the impossible, possible. Do you have what it takes to succeed in this constantly changing, fast-paced environment? We are looking for passionate, driven, and talented individuals to join our elite Canadian marketing team as Assistant Brand Managers.

As an Assistant Brand Manager, you will act as a business leader to drive growth on your clients' brand through strategies & executions that have national impact. Just like any entrepreneur or general manager, you will be responsible for multiple key drivers of business performance:

- Shape and execute strategic business plans for your brand, garnering consensus through senior management
- Uncovering analytical insights about the category, competitor & retail customers that drive business recommendations
- Make marketing investment recommendations to drive profitable growth
- Collaborate with internal partners, including sales, regulatory, finance, supply, demand planning & global marketing teams to effectively execute against local business plans
- Successfully delivering monthly and annual consumption performance analysis
- Conduct consumer research to uncover insights that shape in-market activations
- Craft marketing communications (e.g., TV, digital, print, sampling, professional, etc.) and claims with external agency partners

Within the role, you will be provided the opportunity for strong learning & development, growing your skills through both formal and on-the-job training, with the intention of driving conversion to a full-time permanent role for those who exceed expectations during their three-month probationary period.

Qualifications:

- We are looking for individuals who are excited to tackle a challenge, seek ways to improve and learn, and who solve problems effectively.
- The role is dynamic and fast paced, so time management, prioritization, and thriving through ambiguity are key abilities you possess.
- Strategy and data are at the core of everything we do, so strong critical thinking and analytical skills are required.
- Excellent written and oral communication skills, with an ability to thrive under pressure.
- Demonstrate performance-focused approach to decision-making and take active ownership and accountability for understanding the consumer to uncover growth opportunities.

1. **Why do you think you would be a good fit with Jacks and Winter? What can you bring to this position as an Assistant Brand Manager?**

Assessed Competency: Not linked on purpose

1 – Presents a mediocre response where the person did not seem to read the job description
2 – Presents a response where the person read the job description, but provided very little detail
3 – Presents a typical response where the person has read the job description, and included some details
4 – Presents an above average response where the person has read the job description, and included some details that integrated both personal factors, organizational, and positional factors
5 – Presents an excellent response where the person has read the job description, and has described personal factors and how they compliment the organizational and positional factors

2. **Tell me about a time when you had to perform multiple tasks in parallel, and how you managed them? What were the tasks? How did you decide which one to do first, and what was the outcome?**

Assessed Competency: Time management/Prioritization

1 – Presents a normal sales situation with no (or very minor) time management challenge to overcome
2 – Presents a situation where the person was slightly challenged in performing multiple tasks, did the bare minimum to overcome the difficulties, or was not successful (e.g., Two 'competing' tasks in which one of the time pressures was not critical so they decided to do the critical task first)
3 – Presents a situation where the person was challenged in performing multiple tasks, made considerable efforts to overcome the difficulties, and was partially successful (e.g., several competing tasks, tried to revise timelines and discussed needs with people involved, one or more projects still suffered as a result)
4 – Presents a situation with a complex challenge in performing multiple tasks, the person made significant efforts to overcome the difficulties, and was presumably successful but did not confirm with team or other stakeholders (e.g., several competing tasks of higher complexity, determined which tasks could be completed first, used strategies like time blocking to be more efficient, discussed needs with people who were related to projects, deadlines met but did not check back in for feedback on how to manage it better to avoid the situation next time.
5 – Presents a situation with a complex challenge in performing multiple tasks, the person made significant efforts to overcome the difficulties, and was completely successful. (e.g., Several competing tasks of higher complexity, determined which tasks could be completed first, used strategies like time blocking to be more efficient, discussed needs with people who were related to projects, deadlines met, and checked back in for feedback on how to avoid this situation next time.)

3. **What would you say is your greatest weakness and what is your greatest strength?**

Assessed Competency: Not linked on purpose

1 – Did not disclose any weakness only focused on stereotypical strengths (e.g., work too hard)
2 – Disclosed a very minor weakness and focused on stereotypical strengths (e.g., work too hard)
3 – Disclosed a typical weakness and focused on strengths (e.g., perfectionistic)
4 – Disclosed authentically a weakness and strengths (e.g., speaking up)
5 – Disclosed authentically a weakness, and described steps they are taking to overcome it, and strengths

4. **How often do you publish your own social media content on a monthly basis? What kind of content do you publish? How did you get involved with it initially? How big is your audience?**

Assessed Competency: Social media skill

1 – The person does not publish their own social media content
2 – The person publishes their own content, but is very limited
3 – The person publishes their own content at a regular cadence
4 – The person publishes their own content frequently, and described how they relate to their content.
5 – The person publishes their own content frequently, and described how they are passionate about the type of content

5. **Can you give me an example of how you dealt with negative comments or an upset customer? What was the context, the problem, and your approach?**

Assessed Competency: Customer service/Stakeholder management

1 – Has not encountered negative comments or an upset customer
2 – Presents a situation where the person dealt with negative comments or an upset customer with a minor issue that was easily resolved
3 – Presents a situation where the person dealt with negative comments or an upset customer with a problem that was not very complex or the outcome and how they helped was unexceptional or normal, expected behaviour
4 – Presents a situation where the person went above and beyond to deal with negative comments or an upset customer with a challenging problem, with a positive outcome
5 – Presents a situation where the person went above and beyond to deal with negative comments or an upset customer with a particularly challenging issue, leading to a positive outcome directly tied to the interaction

6. **We have all had job tasks that were not that enjoyable. Describe a time when you were required to perform a job task that you really disliked. What, if anything, did you do about it? Why did you do that?**

Assessed Competency: Perseverance/Accountability

1 – Did not do the task and ignored the task
2 – Presents a situation where the person tried to ask someone else to perform the job task they disliked.
3 – Presents a situation where the person tried to discuss with others if they could switch tasks
4 – Presents a situation where the person tried using personal methods to make an undesirable task more interesting before discussing with others if they could switch tasks
5 – Presents a situation where the person tried using personal methods to make a very undesirable task more interesting, discussed with others if they could switch tasks

Supplemental Materials S4

Sample Participant Responses for Each Rating (Question 2, Study 2)

Question 2: Tell me about a time when you had to perform multiple tasks in parallel, and how you managed them? What were the tasks? How did you decide which one to do first, and what was the outcome?

1 – Presents a normal sales situation with no (or very minor) time management challenge to overcome

Example 1: *I had to lift slabs at school, which was classed as college work. And at the same time, one of the blocks, well keeping my peers in order. And I've done that by taking the time, giving people orders to do --not orders, but things that they had to do.*

Example 2: *So in my previous job I was assigned as a team leader and we had to reach a certain goal by the end of the day. So I had to speak to people, explain the procedure, break down things that we were going to do during the day and make sure I assigned people to everything. That is my part because you have to be by example when being a leader. So I made sure I lay down everything to them, broke down things so they don't stand, and set targets which were actually meant to be.*

2 – Presents a situation where the person was slightly challenged in performing multiple tasks, did the bare minimum to overcome the difficulties, or was not successful (e.g., Two 'competing' tasks in which one of the time pressures was not critical so they decided to do the critical task first)

Example 1: *A time that I had to perform multiple tasks in parallel and how interesting was… when I was working in a post office and I had customers, and the postman came to collect the post-- Before then I had to do things such as deal with admin, back office admin, deal with getting all the posts together before the post, making them as much as possible, and also dealing with customers and balancing everything else, making sure everyone was done on time, no one was annoyed, and everything like that. And umm… yeah, and sometimes it was very difficult trying not to annoy people, trying to make sure everything was done on time and everyone's not annoyed, and sometimes it was difficult. But I managed to do it and be under control and try not to let everything get on top of me, which was tough at times, but I'm actually finished though.*

Example 2: *So performing multiple tasks and how they're managed, multiple tasks at the same time, that is pretty much an everyday performance for me. We're managing multiple groups of people, getting multiple different things done every day. It's something that is kind of like breathing. Stepping into one situation, solving problems, or coaching, teaching, getting with people in a very fast-paced and customer-centric environment. It is something that we work primarily within every concept, whether it's as a general manager running a restaurant, as a district manager operating a multiple of restaurants… this is something that I've done and lived with pretty much every day.*

3 – Presents a situation where the person was challenged in performing multiple tasks, made considerable efforts to overcome the difficulties, and was partially successful (e.g., several competing tasks, tried to revise timelines and discussed needs with people involved, one or more projects still suffered as a result)

Example 1: *Multitasking is pretty much part of any role in any organization today. I've always held multiple roles, worn multiple hats in the roles that I've played. I've been the Chief Technology Officer as well as the Head of Product Management, and so the demands on those two jobs are always different and they occur at the same time. So prioritization is important, but at the same time moving both the requirements of both of those roles forward is also important.*

So the way I do that is, that is obviously, if there is a customer specific requirement that comes in, that gets the highest priority because you don't want the customers to be waiting for resources to get allocated or any of the internal reasons why you're not responding to the customer. So that is the customer facing issues always get the highest priority. And then the second ones are the ones where, you know, maybe if you don't respond in time, things get blocked and therefore delays occur. You want to deal with those issues as quickly as possible. And then you have to save enough time to think about the more strategic issues. So prioritization, it's pretty much on a daily basis. You look at the issues in front of you and you decide which ones get your attention first, but you always try to address all of them each day.

Example 2: *So through my job experience, so three years of working as a customer assistant with Tesco, a lot of job responsibilities would fall on you at the same time. So a lot of the time we were short staff. So basically I'd be, you know, the front house, the first face that people would see when they walked into the building. So I would basically have to not only deal with customers who wanted returns, refunds, exchanges, but I would also have to deal with complaints or even praise, and as well as having to manage between customer service desk and the kiosk. So a lot of the times, someone from the kiosk which sells tobacco and scratch cards and bits, they'd maybe have to go on break. So I'd not only have to manage my desk at the front, but I'd also have to go and manage the cigarette counter as well. So I'd have to run between station to station.*

That was really challenging, but I'm so grateful for that experience because now, if I have more than one thing to do at once, I just go straight into the mindset from there and I'm able just to-- so I find that prioritizing is key. So for instance, if I had someone come to my desk at customer service and someone go to kiosk, I would deal with the customer-- the person at customer services. And because the person at Kiosk arrives second, I'd go to them and help them and kind of bounce between. So I'd have to swap a lot between getting into that mindset of, right, how can I help this customer improve their experience with Tesco today? How can I help them resolve their issue to, right, I need to go and serve them and help them know which cigarette they want or help them with the lottery and bits. And so it's very different. And I found that that really gave me the ability to be able to sort of switch my mindset a lot so I could go from one idea to the next idea and really just balance all of those different ideas all at once and being able to swap between like those different roles. As well like-- so a lot of times maybe if I had a complaint maybe they'd want to speak to a manager so I'd have to call the duty manager, explain the issue to them, get them down, explain the situation again, get the customer to explain it to the duty

manager and it was a lot of go-- go between and just back and forth. But you have to be good at relaying information to be able to do that. And I was, which is why I felt really confident doing it. And it was definitely a job that I did enjoy doing. So I am grateful for the amount of multitasking skills that it did teach me.

4 – Presents a situation with a complex challenge in performing multiple tasks, the person made significant efforts to overcome the difficulties, and was presumably successful but did not confirm with team or other stakeholders (e.g., several competing tasks of higher complexity, determined which tasks could be completed first, used strategies like time blocking to be more efficient, discussed needs with people who were related to projects, deadlines met but did not check back in for feedback on how to manage it better to avoid the situation next time.

Example 1: *Well, that's an excellent question. I actually do have a very good example of having to perform multiple tasks in parallel. When I was working in registration at a busy hospital emergency room, we had an unplanned software downtime due to a power outage. All of our software programs were non-functional, and this was on a Sunday where we could not get IT to come and help us very quickly. We had patients piling up who needed to be seen and registered. We were trying to locate our downtime protocols.*

Like I said, it was unplanned. And I was the senior person working at that time. So it's quite a stressful event, but it ended up being--- I felt a very successful day where we were able to take control. I did assume his leadership position. I gave people jobs to do and I delegated tasks. The way that I decided what was most important was basically based upon safety number one, getting patients registered as quickly as possible. And then paperwork that could wait and wasn't safety related was put secondary. And then further paperwork that needed to be moved on to nurses and doctors was probably made second to safety. And then some things could wait until we had IT or supervisor come and then we could go back and put everything in. But we pulled together as a team. I was able to lead the team effectively and delegate the tasks. And I believe the outcome of the event was as good as it possibly could be in that there was very little delay in patient care and at the end of the day, all of the necessary paperwork had been completed by our team. So that would be the example I would give. Thank you.

Example 2: *Thank you. So at one of my previous roles, I had a dual--- dual roles to fulfill. I was an accounts payable clerk and I was also the administrative assistant to the general manager. So that has encompassed having multiple tasks on a daily basis in fulfilling these two roles, which had been merged in one for my benefit. Actually, I was hired to do the two. That was the first time that this had been done in the company. So I would have accounts related roles where I reported to the finance manager and of course administrative tasks roles such as managing his emails, managing meetings, the stationery and of course reconciling accounts and all of the other accounts payables roles, including making payments and payroll.*

And the way I would decide what to do first is of course, looking at the deadlines that I had set, whatever needed to be accomplished by certain days and setting a to-do list every morning based on my deadlines, doing it on a weekly basis and of course on a daily basis as well. And just using that as a guide to complete my tasks really. And so the outcome was that it was actually very successful because I'll be working in tandem with a deadline. And of course, as the need arises,

making adjustments to that as is something that happens when you work, you know, something comes up and you have to adjust what you've previously scheduled.

5 – Presents a situation with a complex challenge in performing multiple tasks, the person made significant efforts to overcome the difficulties, and was completely successful. (e.g., Several competing tasks of higher complexity, determined which tasks could be completed first, used strategies like time blocking to be more efficient, discussed needs with people who were related to projects, deadlines met, and checked back in for feedback on how to avoid this situation next time.)

Example 1: *Performing multiple tasks in parallel. So this is something that I will admit is challenging, but it's something that I've also worked very hard at and found success at. So the role that came to mind when I was asked this question was when I was at the Canadian Economy Institute. So I was appointed to head the communications committee. And at that point, we had very little in terms of public facing communications. We had a seminar, we give educational seminars to condominium owners about best practices and what the law is and sort of panels, experts and things like that. So we had a high quality educational product, but the problem was we weren't reaching enough people with it. So when I took over a communications committee, we had a number of competing priorities and very little time and resources to do it. It's a nonprofit organization and we had only about 40 bucks in the bank when I took over, and we really needed to get everything going quickly at the same time or the whole group was going to fold. So some of those priorities included coming up with a publication, a paper publication, a digital publication, we could sort of get some awareness, recruiting high-level experts to come to our panels as well as communicating to our members in a more timely manner. At that point, we were just doing some mail outs and we really needed to connect with them on social media. And so I think what we did was we had weekly meetings, we needed to keep engaged, and we needed to think about how we could have the most impact the fastest so that we could build a team that could go on and do our other priorities.*

So the strategy we had in this case was to focus on our Twitter and social media first, to really through very little time spent writing our message, reach a high number of people. Through that, we were able to create a buzz, and then we were able to recruit some really talented individuals to the team, who then were able to help us with our publication and with building a website, a number of the things that fell along the way. So everything kind of came together. So making those decisions about what's going to be the most bang for your buck, in a sense, was what led us to experience success. And staying worried about it, obviously keeping a list, keeping track of who has assigned what, making sure that you lead by example, being the hardest working member of the team to inspire other people to take on the tasks that they're given with the same level of enthusiasm, which then leads to overall success for everyone.

Example 2: *So this reminds me of the time when I was an IT analyst. And unfortunately, what we have to do is we have multiple cases sent our way to resolve within pretty much the same time period. And we have to either delegate or we have to multitask on each issue that we've been provided with. So in this situation, I had to resolve a problem with something to do with what the company presents on their website. Basically, we help with the output on a customer's website.*

So I had to help with that and in addition, with another client, I had to work on an issue with the calculations that were taking place in the back end of their system. So, yeah, I basically decided to allocate 30 minutes to each issue so that both of them would have an equal amount of my time, and progress could be communicated to the customer, so that a perception of work being done on each issue would be apparent. And as a result that, (I) managed to keep the customer happy and we were able to resolve the issues within an appreciable amount of time.