Shall we Continue or Stop Disapproving of Self-Presentation? Evidence on Impression Management and Faking in a Selection Context and their Relation to Job Performance

Currently in press in *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*

Pia V. Ingold and Martin Kleinmann

Universität Zürich

Cornelius J. König

Universität des Saarlandes

Klaus G. Melchers

Universität Ulm

Author Note

Pia Ingold and Martin Kleinmann, Psychologisches Institut, Universität Zürich, Switzerland, Cornelius König, Fachrichtung Psychologie, Universität des Saarlandes, Germany, Klaus Melchers, Institut für Psychologie und Pädagogik, Universität Ulm, Germany

The study reported in this paper was supported by a grant from the Swiss National Science Foundation (Grant 100014-124449). We thank Lissandra Niederberger and Thomas Duttwiler who helped collecting the data of this study and Anne Jansen for her advice on the data collection.

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Pia Ingold, Arbeits-und Organisationspsychologie, Universität Zürich, Binzmühlestrasse 14/12, CH-8050 Zürich, Switzerland. E-Mail: p.ingold@psychologie.uzh.ch

Abstract

The self-presentation tactics of candidates during job interviews and on personality inventories have been a focal topic in selection research. Guided by the cross-situational theory of Marcus (2009), the current study examined self-presentation across these two selection devices. Specifically, we examined whether candidates who use impression management (IM) tactics during an interview show more faking on a personality inventory, and whether the relation to job performance is similar for both forms of self-presentation. Data were collected in a simulated selection process with an interview under applicant conditions and a personality inventory that was administered under applicant conditions and thereafter for research purposes. Because all participants were employed, we were also able to collect job performance ratings from their supervisors. Candidates who used IM in the interview also showed more faking in a personality inventory. Importantly, faking was positively related to supervisors' job performance ratings, but IM was unrelated. Hence, this study gives rise to arguments for a more balanced view of self-presentation.

Keywords: Self-presentation, faking, impression management, interviews, personality inventories, supervisor's job performance ratings

Shall we Continue or Stop Disapproving of Self-Presentation? Evidence on Impression Management and Faking in a Selection Context and their Relation to Job Performance

Interviews and personality inventories are among the most popular selection devices employed for personnel selection in various countries (Chan & Kuok, 2011; König, Klehe, Berchtold, & Kleinmann, 2010; Ryan, McFarland, Baron, & Page, 1999; Zibarras & Woods, 2010). Their use is supported by empirical research that shows that these devices can predict job performance (Barrick & Mount, 1991; Huffcutt & Arthur, 1994). In both of these devices, past research has considered candidates' self-presentation (cf. Sackett & Lievens, 2008), which relates to their attempts to control images of their self (Goffman, 1959; Schlenker, 1980). Heated debates revolve around the effects of self-presentation on personnel selection practices and, in particular, on the criterion-related validity of selection devices (i.e. to what extent these devices predict supervisor's job performance ratings). Despite a large number of studies on self-presentation in interviews and personality inventories, it is unclear how self-presentation tendencies interrelate across selection devices. Furthermore, the potential effect of self-presentation on the criterion-related validity of selection procedures is also a source of debate. Therefore, this study focuses on candidates' self-presentation in both of these devices. This is crucial as both interviews and personality inventories aim at predicting job performance, and self-presentation has often been interpreted as detrimental for this prediction.

Even though these two selection devices have sufficient levels of validity, both have been criticized because they allow applicants to present themselves too positively. With regard to interviews, self-presentation has often been termed *impression management* and sometimes, *faking* (e.g., Ellis, West, Ryan, & DeShon, 2002; Levashina & Campion, 2007; Stevens & Kristof, 1995; Van Iddekinge, McFarland, & Raymark, 2007) and has been described as interviewees' attempts to convey a positive image (Schlenker, 1980). With regard to personality inventories, this self-presentation has mostly been referred to as *faking*

(e.g., Christiansen & Goffin, 1994; McFarland & Ryan, 2000; Tett & Simonet, 2011; Viswesvaran & Ones, 1999) and has been described as candidates' conscious distortion of their attributes (e.g., McFarland & Ryan, 2006). In the following, we use the term faking to refer to self-presentation on personality inventories and the term impression management (IM) to refer to self-presentation in interviews.

Although self-presentation in the interview and self-presentation on personality inventories are typically described with different labels (IM vs. faking), we argue that they are two behavioral expressions of the same motivation to get the job, a motive that is induced by the selection situation. This is in line with the cross-situational model on self-presentation which covers self-presentation across selection procedures (Marcus, 2009). In other words, even though IM and faking are typically covered by different research lines, they can be understood as two types of self-presentation that are similar, and thus share variance when both occur as part of one selection process. For this reason, in line with Marcus (2009) and social psychology research (Goffman, 1959; Schlenker, 1980), we define self-presentation across selection devices as conscious or unconscious tendencies to present a favorable image of oneself.

Up to now, two separate lines of research have shed light on self-presentation during the interview and in personality inventories (e.g., Berry & Sackett, 2009; Christiansen & Goffin, 1994; Ellis et al., 2002; McFarland & Ryan, 2000; Peeters & Lievens, 2006; Van Iddekinge et al., 2007). Both of these lines of research have considered the same crucial issue: whether self-presentation affects performance on the selection procedure. We posit that it is necessary to combine the two research lines to enhance our understanding of self-presentation across selection procedures. In addition, this will also allow for a better examination of the consequences of self-presentation across different procedures. This might lead to a better understanding of how candidates' self-presentation is influenced by the format of the selection devices. Specifically, the degree to which candidates' self-presentation is cross-

situationally consistent is unknown, and thus, it also remains unclear how self-presentation on personality inventories relates to self-presentation in interviews. This relates to models on faking and IM (e.g., Marcus, 2009; McFarland & Ryan, 2006; Snell, Sydell, & Lueke, 1999) that have not yet been empirically tested across procedures. Furthermore, there has been very little research (see Marcus, 2009; Van Iddekinge, Raymark, & Roth, 2005) that focused on the similarity between these types of self-presentation. To address this gap, we will – on a theoretical level – illustrate the similarity of faking and IM as two types of self-presentation, and then empirically examine whether candidates who use IM tactics in an interview are also more likely to fake a personality inventory.

Moreover, a major contribution of this study lies in its examination of the relation between self-presentation and job performance. This has been a highly disputed question for both interviews and personality inventories, and the available research (Blickle, Momm, Schneider, Gansen, & Kramer, 2009; Hough, 1998; Kleinmann & Klehe, 2011; Peterson, Griffith, Isaacson, O'Connell, & Mangos, 2011) does not allow definitive answers due to inconsistent results or the use of proxy criterions. Therefore, it is necessary to provide empirical answers to this debated topic and we, therefore, conduct pioneer work by examining how both forms of self-presentation relate to supervisor's ratings of employee job performance. This will expand our knowledge on the beneficial or detrimental effects of self-presentation on validity and provide practical implications for efforts aimed at preventing or lowering the effects of self-presentation.

Self-Presentation Across Selection Procedures

It is a common fear – especially among practitioners – that self-presentation can bias selection results (Robie, Tuzinski, & Bly, 2006), and previous research shows that both interviews and personality inventories do indeed allow candidates to present themselves positively. Concerning interviews, a growing body of research has dealt with verbal IM during the interview process (e.g., Ellis et al., 2002; Kleinmann & Klehe, 2011; Kristof-

Brown, Barrick, & Franke, 2002; Levashina & Campion, 2007; McFarland, Ryan, & Kriska, 2002; Peeters & Lievens, 2006; Stevens & Kristof, 1995; Tsai, Chen, & Chiu, 2005; Van Iddekinge et al., 2007). Studies on verbal IM suggest that applicants can employ several IM tactics to raise their ratings (Barrick et al., 2009). These include, for example, self-focused (e.g., describing their competencies) or other-focused tactics (e.g., flattering the interviewer, Kacmar, Delery, & Ferris, 1992; Tedeschi & Melburg, 1984) and honest (i.e., giving truthful accounts about themselves) or deceptive tactics (i.e., distorting their accounts, Leary & Kowalski, 1990; Levashina & Campion, 2007). Taken together, this research has shown that IM can indeed influence interview outcomes (Barrick, Shaffer, & DeGrassi, 2009), and that many interviewees use IM (Levashina & Campion, 2007). Similarly, concerning personality inventories, an enormous body of research on faking in personality inventories has been published (e.g., Berry & Sackett, 2009; Birkeland, Manson, Kisamore, Brannick, & Smith, 2006; Christiansen & Goffin, 1994; Griffith, Chmielowski, & Yoshita, 2007; McFarland & Ryan, 2000; Rosse, Stecher, Miller, & Levin, 1998; Sackett, 2011; Viswesvaran & Ones, 1999; Ziegler, MacCann, & Roberts, 2011b). This literature illustrates that faking is quite common (e.g., Griffith et al., 2007) and that faking influences personality inventory scores (e.g., McFarland & Ryan, 2000; McFarland, Ryan, & Ellis, 2002; Viswesvaran & Ones, 1999). This means that individuals with elevated scores due to faking are more likely to be found among those applicants with high scores (e.g., Griffith et al., 2007).

In recent years, several researchers have developed theoretical models on candidates' self-presentation (e.g., Levashina & Campion, 2006; McFarland & Ryan, 2006; Snell et al., 1999; Tett & Simonet, 2011) that have provided a theoretical underpinning of self-presentation research. Despite these important contributions, there is a lack of integrative or broader models that consider self-presentation across selection contexts. Given that candidates in a selection process commonly face several selection procedures and thus have several chances to provide a good impression, integrative models are important for an in-depth

understanding of self-presentation behaviors. For instance, when candidates take part in an interview and also fill in a personality inventory, impression management and faking are different behavioral manifestations of self-presentation. Specifically, IM refers to candidates' behaviors (e.g., self-promotion) to make a good impression and has therefore often been measured by coding interviewees' actual behavior on the basis of interview recordings or by self-reports that are completed by interviewees after an interview (Levashina & Campion, 2007; Peeters & Lievens, 2006; Van Iddekinge et al., 2007). Faking refers to elevated scores in comparison to a self-report for non-applicant purposes and has therefore often been operationalized using means of difference scores that can be computed from scores when candidates fill in the personality inventory twice under different conditions (i.e. a once filled in for an application and afterwards for non-evaluative purposes) (Ellingson, Sackett, & Connelly, 2007; Griffith et al., 2007; McFarland & Ryan, 2000; Peterson, Griffith, & Converse, 2009). Self-presentation across selection devices has been considered in Marcus's (2009) integrative cross-situational theory of self-presentation in selection contexts. This theory focuses on the applicants' view of self-presentation as a means to gain a job offer. Accordingly, candidates' self-presentation (e.g., IM in the interview, faking on the personality inventory) is influenced by candidates' resources, that is their analytical skills, behavioral skills, and their motivation. Furthermore, the relevance of these resources may depend on the specific selection device, which is located as an external influence in the model.

According to this theory, candidates' analytical skills may facilitate their self-presentation in both interviews and personality inventories. Concerning IM, candidates' analytical skills are important to identify what behaviors are relevant in the interview, hence to analyze whether self-promoting is appropriate and on which dimensions candidates are being evaluated by interviewers (cf. Kleinmann et al., 2011). Similarly, analytical skills are important for faking as candidates need to recognize which items are important for the job they are applying for (e.g., Tett & Simonet, 2011). Hence, the shared relevance of resources,

as determined by selection devices, should increase the amount of shared variance between faking and IM.

A further resource for self-presentation relates to candidates' behavioral skills. Candidates' behavioral skills are of particular importance to very interactive selection procedures, such as interviews. Thus, behavioral skills may be more relevant for candidates' IM (Levashina & Campion, 2006) in the interactive interview (e.g., Huffcutt, Van Iddekinge, & Roth, 2011). For faking, on the other hand, behavioral skills have been considered less crucial as candidates just fill in the report and do not perform relevant behaviors (Marcus, 2009). As the relevance of behavioral skills differs for IM and faking, this may decrease the degree of shared variance between faking and IM.

Concerning their motivation, Marcus (2009) assumes that candidates have an initial motivation when applying for the job and this motivation may change after a reappraisal while being in the selection process. Candidates' motivation can be influenced by situational variables such as the attractiveness of the organization and the need for a job, as well as by dispositional variables such as self-monitoring and the candidates' self-concept. It follows that the motivation should be similar for the selection devices that candidates face within one selection process and that this motivation similarly influences candidates' self-presentation during these procedures. Hence, in an interview, it can influence the extent to which candidates employ IM tactics and in a personality inventory, it can influence the degree to which candidates elevate their scores.

Taken together, when this theory is applied to a selection process with an interview and a personality inventory, we assume that candidates find themselves in a situation that induces a motivation to provide a good impression on both selection devices they face and that their analytical skills may help them to convey this impression in both devices. If an interview is used, applicants can use different IM tactics to elevate their scores (Barrick et al.,

2009) and if a personality inventory is used, applicants can try to convey a favorable impression by elevating their scores.

Despite the importance of integrating research lines on self-presentation across selection context, this central aspect of Marcus's (2009) model has not yet been tested empirically. Accordingly, in line with the cross-situational theory of self-presentation (Marcus, 2009) we argue that faking and IM are two types of self-presentation that share variance when both occur as part of one selection procedure as they are both behavioral expressions of the motivation and the analytical skills for self-presentation. Hence, we posit the following hypothesis as a first step to test the cross-situational theory of self-presentation:

> Hypothesis 1: Candidates who show more IM in an interview also show more faking in a personality inventory.

Self -Presentation and Criterion-Related Validity

The effects of IM and faking on criterion-related validity is a highly disputed topic. On the one hand, self-presentation might bias true scores, present error variance, and might therefore harm validity (e.g., Anderson, 1991; Burns & Christiansen, 2011; Tett & Christiansen, 2007). In line with this, evidence from personality testing has shown that faking changes the rank-order of candidates, because not all of them are faking to the same degree (e.g., Rosse et al., 1998). This gives rise to concerns that self-presentation negatively affects selection decisions. On the other hand, self-presentation has also been considered as an expression of social effectiveness, and thus may contribute to the prediction of job performance if the job requires socially effective behavior (Dipboye, Macan, & Shahani-Denning, 2012; Hogan, Barrett, & Hogan, 2007; Morgeson et al., 2007). In a similar vein, it has been argued that self-presentation may be a form of people's reaction to social demands (Ziegler, MacCann, & Roberts, 2011a) or socially adequate behavior as the company expects the candidates to put their best foot forward (Jansen, König, Stadelmann, & Kleinmann, 2012; Marcus, 2009). Following these favorable views on self-presentation, candidates who behave

in a socially effective manner in a selection situation might also show more social effective behaviors on the job, which in turn might lead to a more positive perception of their performance on the job. This is even more important, given that job performance ratings are usually obtained from supervisors who may also be influenced by candidates self-presentation tactics on the job. Consequently, self-presentation would not add error variance to the predictor, and might even contribute to the criterion-related validity of a selection procedure. The idea is that the same mechanism applies to both IM and faking such that both forms of self-presentation reflect skills and motivation that are relevant for achieving high performance ratings in selection settings and on the job.

To date, notwithstanding divergent conceptual views of self-presentation, the empirical evidence regarding its impact on criterion-related validity is sparse and inconsistent. This is true for research on both personality inventories and interviews, hence faking and IM, respectively. With regard to IM, there is little evidence on the role of IM for the criterion-related validity of interviews. In fact, it has never been tested with criterion data. The only test for the relation of IM in the interview and job performance has been conducted with a proxy criterion by Kleinmann and Klehe (2011), who found that interviewees' self-promotion predicted performance in assessment center exercises, which was used as a proxy criterion of job performance. This finding supports the position that self-presentation does not represent error variance. Further indirect support for a positive relation of self-presentation and supervisor-rated job performance stems from related research on self-presentation on the job. Self-presentation on the job is argued to contribute to positive job performance ratings by employees' supervisors. The rationale follows that employees utilize self-presentation to enhance their chances for positive evaluations, pay increases, and other rewards (Higgins, Judge, & Ferris, 2003), and this may influence supervisors' perceptions of their employees' job performance. Accordingly, meta-analytic research shows that employee's self-presentation on the job (i.e. outside the selection situation) is positively related to supervisors'

evaluations of their employees (Barrick et al., 2009; Higgins et al., 2003), and thus is a form of socially effective behavior on the job.

Within the personality literature, we know of only two studies (Blickle et al., 2009; Peterson et al., 2011) that have addressed the criterion validity concern in a design with supervisor ratings of job performance or counterproductive work behavior data, and their findings are mixed. In the study by Peterson et al. (2011), faking had a negative impact on the criterion-related validity of applicants' conscientiousness scores as predictors of counterproductive work behaviors, because the amount of faking was related to self-reported counterproductive work behaviors. In contrast, Blickle et al. (2009) found that applicants' personality scores correlated more strongly with task-based job performance, leadership, and contextual performance than honest personality scores from a second group; thus, the criterion-related validity was higher under applicant conditions, suggesting that faking contributes to validity. In a similar vein, Hough (1998) has also provided support for the position that faking does not negatively impact the criterion-related validity. Specifically, this study examined applicants' and incumbents' data from a personality inventory and on an Unlikely Virtue scale to evaluate the effects of two strategies to deal with faking. The results indicate that neither removing applicants with seemingly distorted scores (as suggested by the scores on the Unlikely Virtue scales) from the applicant pool nor correcting an individual's score (based upon the Unlikely Virtue score on the Unlikely Virtue scales) affects the criterion-related validity (Hough, 1998).

Since we have argued that faking and IM are two manifestations of self-presentation, it follows that the direction of the relation to job performance should be the same. Based upon the reasoning that self-presentation can be a form of socially effective behavior that is positively related to job performance (as supported by research on self-presentation on the job and by initial findings of a positive relation of impression management in interviews and AC performance), we assume that IM is positively related to job performance as rated by

supervisors. Specifically, IM is supposed to not only help to create a positive impression in the interview, but also on the job, as supervisors' ratings of candidates' job performance do also reflect candidates' resources (e.g., behavioral skills, motivation, Marcus, 2009) that help to fulfill their tasks and to create a positive impression on the job. Analogously, we posit that faking (i.e. as a form of self-presentation that raises personality inventory scores) is positively related to supervisor's ratings of candidates' job performance. The reasoning for faking is that candidates that manage to convey a positive impression in the selection situation can achieve positive supervisor ratings given that candidates' resources that help them to self-present (e.g., analytical skills, motivation, Marcus, 2009) are important for their task requirements and their self-presentation on the job.

Hypothesis 2: Candidates' impression management in an interview correlates positively with supervisory ratings of their job performance.

Hypothesis 3: Candidates' faking on a personality inventory correlates positively with supervisory ratings of their job performance.

In summary, we assume that self-presentation is a common response triggered by a selection procedure with an interview and a personality inventory, so that candidates' self-presentation in one procedure is related to candidates' self-presentation in the other procedure. Furthermore, we examine the relation of self-presentation and supervisory ratings of job performance, which is a key concern of personnel selection research and practice.

Method

Setting

The present study was embedded within a research paradigm of a simulated selection process that has been successfully employed in other studies (e.g., Barrick et al., 2012; Jansen et al., 2013). Participants usually perceive the applicant setting as realistic, report nervousness and try to perform their best. This setting enabled us to conduct the interviews and administer

a personality inventory under standardized, yet ecologically valid applicant conditions, to video-tape participants' answers in the interviews, but also to collect data on supervisors' ratings of their employees' job performance because participants all held (at least part-time) jobs. Furthermore, this setting allowed candidates to fill out some additional measures for research purposes (the self-report of IM and the personality inventory on a second occasion for research purposes). This means that the setting made it possible for us to use a within-subjects-design to measure personality twice. Among the existing designs for faking studies, within-subjects designs have often been viewed as ideal (Peterson et al., 2011; Ryan & Boyce, 2006).

Participants

Participants (N = 92; 40 males and 52 females; mean age = 29.3, SD = 4.5) were contacted with the help of the administrative departments of several Swiss universities and in collaboration with the career services of the universities. E-mails and advertisements were sent to masters and doctoral students who were currently or would soon be applying for a new job. They were offered to participate in a selection training program in which the simulated selection process was embedded. To cover expenses and to increase their motivation participants paid a fee (approximately 30 €).

As a precondition, people were only allowed to participate if they were currently or had very recently been employed, and agreed to allow us to contact their supervisor via e-mail (in Switzerland, most students have part-time jobs due to the high living costs). The average work experience of participants was 2.8 years (SD = 2.2). About 49% of the participants worked in the research and education sector, 10% in the banking and insurance sector, 10% in the industrial sector, 9% in the service sector, 5% in the media and communication sector, 3% in health services, and 2% in sales and distribution.

Around the time of the selection simulation, participants' supervisors were sent a link to an online questionnaire in which they were asked to evaluate participants' job performance

and to answer a few demographic questions. Interviewers had no access to participants' job performance ratings and supervisors were not informed about participants' performance and impression management in the selection simulation.

Procedure

As part of the selection training program, participants were first told to imagine applying for a job as a management trainee in a company, and a job advertisement was handed to them. Participants were informed that the highest performing participants of the day would win a sum of approximately 65€ and they agreed to be video-taped for research purposes. Participants were also told that they would receive extensive feedback on their performance at the end of the training. Presentation of selection devices were counter-balanced, with half of the participants being interviewed first, whereas the other half first filled in the personality inventory under applicant conditions (i.e. filling it out while imagining applying for the trainee job).

After completing the interview and the personality inventory, participants were informed that all of the following measures were used for research purposes only and were not a part of the simulated selection process. They were asked to fill in a self-report on their IM during the interview. In the end, participants filled in the same personality inventory with an instruction to answer honestly and that it was for research purposes only (i.e. as opposed to the applicant condition). Finally, they filled in a few demographic items and items on the authenticity of the selection setting.

Measures

Structured interview. The structured interview consisted of twelve questions (six past behavior-related and six situational questions) and was conducted by panels consisting of two trained interviewers. Based upon previous interview studies with comparable samples that indicated the relevance of these dimensions for job performance (Melchers et al., 2009; Peeters & Lievens, 2006), we chose interview questions for three dimensions: Assertiveness,

Organizing Behaviors, and Persistence (see Appendix for an example for an interview question for each dimension).

The interviewers were social and industrial/organizational psychology masters students who had participated in a half day of frame-of-reference training (Roch, Woehr, Mishra, & Kieszczynska, 2012; Woehr & Huffcutt, 1994). On each selection training day, interviewers were provided with an additional 30-minute introductory session on the interview training and their requirements as interviewers. For each question, the two interviewers rated participants' performance on 5-point scales ranging from 1 (*poor performance)* to 5 (*excellent performance)* for which descriptive anchors were provided for poor, medium, and excellent answers. The average inter-rater reliability (ICC 1) was .88.

Personality Inventory and Difference scores. Personality was measured with three scales from the Achievement Motivation Inventory (AMI, Schuler & Prochaska, 2000a; Schuler & Prochaska, 2000b). As we were interested in the cross-situational consistency of self-presentation, it was important that we used three scales from the AMI that corresponded to the interview dimensions so that candidates' standing on the construct should be comparable for interviews and personality inventories.

The AMI measures several job-relevant personality constructs on a 7-point scale from 1 (*I fully disagree*) to 7 (*I fully agree)* and is an established criterion-valid inventory that has also been used on samples from other countries (e.g., Woo, Gibbons, & Thornton, 2007). For the present study, we used the German scales for Dominanz (which corresponds to Assertiveness), Selbstkontrolle (which corresponds to Organizing Behaviors), and Beharrlichkeit (which corresponds to Persistence). Each scale consists of 10 items. Sample items for Assertiveness are "I manage to get my way even against resistance" and "As a member of a club, exerting influence would not be of high importance to me" (reverse-scored). Sample items for Organizing Behaviors are "Before I begin with a task, I always make a work schedule" and "There are so many small tasks to do that sometimes I simply

don't do any at all" (reverse-scored). Sample items for Persistence are "My acquaintances would consider it typical of me to overcome all difficulties" and "It's difficult for me to keep up efforts for a long time" (reverse-scored). The internal consistency reliability estimates (coefficient alpha) for the three scales in the applicant condition were .83 for Assertiveness, .70 for Organizing Behaviors, and .79 for Persistence, and in the research condition .80 for Assertiveness, .60 for Organizing Behaviors, and .80 for Persistence.

We calculated difference scores for all participants on all three scales by taking the individuals' score from the applicant condition and subtracting the individuals' score from the research condition. Hence, each participant had three difference scores. For all difference scores, a positive score indicated that a higher score was obtained in the applicant condition.

Impression Management. Verbal IM was measured with a self-report questionnaire for candidates directly after the interview and by trained coders on the basis of the videos. The self-report questionnaire was adapted from a scale by Levashina and Campion (2007) that measures verbal impression management with eleven items on a 5-point scale from 1 (*I fully disagree)* to 5 (*I fully agree*). Each item corresponded to one of the eleven subscales of the self-report questionnaire by Levashina and Campion (2007). Sample items are "I have covered something up in order to be able to give better interview responses" and "I have adapted interview responses so that they fit the job better**"**. The internal consistency reliability estimate (coefficient alpha) was .71. For the video-coding of interviewees' verbal IM behavior, two video-coders (two additional industrial/organizational psychology masters students that had not been employed as interviewers in the selection training) rated interviewees' verbal IM on the same scale with eleven items adapted to the video-coders' perspective analogously to the self-report that was used. Example items include,"The interviewee has covered something up in order to be able to give better interview responses" and "The interviewee has adapted interview responses so that they fit the job better**".** Video-coders had participated in a day-long frame-of-reference training on verbal IM tactics (Roch

et al., 2012; Woehr & Huffcutt, 1994) before starting the coding. At the beginning of this training, video-coders learned about the verbal IM tactics (definition, common taxonomies, and examples for IM in the interview) and the questionnaire they had to fill in. They were then provided with several videotaped examples of verbal IM tactics from former studies and individually filled in the questionnaires on IM for each candidate in each video. Afterwards, their ratings were discussed together with the first author of this study until a consensus on the rating was reached. After completing the training, 10% of the videos from the present were rated by both raters (ICC1 = .95). Video-coders did not have access to candidates' interview and job performance data.

Job performance. Around the time of the simulated AC, participants' supervisors were asked to evaluate participants' job performance in an online questionnaire and were informed that these ratings were exclusively used for research purposes and not revealed to their employees. Supervisors had no knowledge of their employees' performance scores in the selection simulation. We measured in-role performance on a 7-point scale ranging from 1 (*not at all*) to 7 (*absolutely)* using five items from Williams and Anderson (1991), in their German translation from Staufenbiel and Hartz (2000) and five items from Bott, Svyantek, Goodman, and Bernal (2003) in their German translation from Jansen et al. (2013)**.** Items were rated on a 7-point scale ranging from 1 **(***not at all)* to 7 **(***absolutely)*. Due to the fact that the two sets of items were highly correlated (r = .85), we computed a composite average score across all items. Coefficient alpha of the combined scale was .94. Example items are "The employee fulfills all the requirements of the job" and "The employee demonstrates expertise in all job-related tasks".

Descriptive variables. In order to check for the authenticity of the selection setting, candidates answered the following items after the interview: "Were you able to behave like an applicant in the interview?" and "Did you behave as if being in a real interview" on a scale from 1 (*I fully agree**)*** to 4 (*I fully disagree).* Analogously, they answered two adapted items

for the personality inventory under applicant conditions on a scale from 1 *(I fully agree*) to 4 (*I fully disagree*) after filling in the personality inventory.

Moreover, we collected data on candidate's motivation for the interview and the personality inventory. This enabled us to check two issues: First, whether the participants were motivated in the training, and second, whether there was interindividual variance in motivation. To measure candidate's motivation to perform well in the interview, we used an adapted version of a scale from Jansen, König, Kleinmann, and Melchers (2012) with a scale from 1 (*I fully agree*) to 7 (*I fully disagree).* To measure candidate's motivation to perform well on the personality inventory administered under applicant conditions, we used the motivation scale from the Test Attitude Survey by Arvey, Strickland, Drauden, and Martin (1990) in a German version translated by Jansen, König, Kleinmann et al. (2012) with a scale from 1 (*I fully agree)* to 7 = (*I fully disagree)*. Coefficient alpha was .87 for the interview motivation and .85 for the personality inventory motivation. Furthermore, candidates filled in one item asking about the length of their work experience.

Results

Preliminary Analyses

Our descriptive data indicated that participants behaved as if in a real interview and personality inventory (item means ranging between 1.61 and 2.08 on a scale from 1 (*I fully agree*) to 4 (*I totally disagree*). Moreover, the motivation to perform well that should arise from a well simulated applicant setting was apparent for the interview (M = 6.07 on a scale from 1 (*I totally disagree)* to 7 (*I fully agree*) as well as for the personality inventory under applicant conditions (M = 5.81 on the same scale from 1 to 7), and these motivation scores showed interindividual variance (for the interview, SD = 0.79; for the personality inventory SD = 0.86) that should enable interindividual variance in self-presentation behavior and that would also be expected from an actual applicant sample. In addition, the sample had more than two years of work experience (M = 2.8 years, SD = 2.2).

Table 1 shows correlations, means, and standard deviations of variables. The interview was criterion valid, $r = .22$, $p < .05$, and two of the personality dimensions assessed in the applicant condition also correlated with job performance, Persistence, $r = .30$, $p < .01$, Organizing Behaviors, $r = .20$, $p < .05$. The third dimension showed a correlation in the expected direction, Assertiveness, $r = .14$, but did not reach significance ($p = .18$).

In order to examine faking in a within-subject design, we followed common procedure (e.g., McFarland & Ryan, 2000) and calculated difference scores to assess individual faking tendency (see also Thomas & Zumbo, 2012). Specifically, we determined difference scores for all three personality scales by subtracting the scores in the research condition from the scores in the selection condition. When we compared the mean-difference between the applicant and the research condition, we found effect sizes that were similar to those reported in previous studies (Viswesvaran & Ones, 1999): $d = .70$, $d = .75$, and $d = .84$ for Assertiveness, Persistence, and Organizing Behaviors, respectively.

With regard to IM, both measures of IM correlated positively with interview performance, $r = .35$, $p < .01$, for self-reported IM and $r = .20$, $p < .05$, for video-coded IM. These results are in line with previous findings (Barrick et al., 2009). Furthermore, the self-reported IM measure and the video-coded IM measure correlated positively with each other, $r = .21$, $p < .05$. In summary, the results of our preliminary analysis were in line with previous research.

Test of Hypotheses

Hypothesis 1 stated that candidates who show more IM in an interview also show more faking in a personality inventory. We tested this hypothesis separately for self-reported IM and video-coded IM. The self-report IM scores correlated significantly with the difference scores for the personality inventory (Persistence, $r = .37$, Assertiveness, $r = .28$, Organizing Behaviors, $r = .33$, all ps $< .01$). Similarly, the video-coded IM scores also correlated positively with the difference scores (Persistence, $r = .21$, $p < .05$, and Organizing

Behaviors, $r = .26$, $p < .05$, and positively but not significantly with Assertiveness, $r = .10$, $p = .33$). Thus, our data generally supported Hypothesis 1. That is, IM and faking are related, and this was true for both self-reported and observed IM.

Hypothesis 2 stated that candidates' IM in an interview correlates positively with supervisory ratings of job performance. Again, we tested this hypothesis separately for self-reported IM and video-coded IM. The correlation between self-reported IM in the interview and job performance was in the expected direction but failed to reach significance, $r = .15$, $p = .15$. The correlation of video-coded IM with job performance suggested that IM as rated by external coders and job performance was unrelated, $r = .01$, $p = .91$. Hence, although the results with self-reported IM suggested a small positive relationship, Hypothesis 2 was not supported as there was no significant relationship for either measure of IM and job performance.

Hypothesis 3 stated that candidates' faking on a personality inventory correlates positively with supervisory job performance ratings. The data showed that job performance correlated positively with the difference score of the personality dimensions Persistence, $r = .28$, $p < .01$, and Organizing Behaviors, $r = .26$, $p < .01$, but not with the difference score for Assertiveness, $r = .07$, $p = .47$. Hence, the relationship between faking and job performance seemed to be predominantly positive, thus providing support for Hypothesis 3.

Discussion

This study links two lines of research on self-presentation and thereby sheds light on self-presentation across selection procedures with a focus on the question of how self-presentation relates to job performance as rated by supervisors. One major contribution of this study was that we examined the cross-situational consistency of candidates' self-presentation using a within-subjects design. Theoretically, we argued that taking part in a selection process that contains several different procedures should generally motivate self-presentation and that candidates' self-presentation in one procedure should thus be related to their self-presentation

on another selection device. Empirically, our results showed that there was indeed some cross-situational consistency of self-presentation, as IM in the interview was related to faking on the personality inventory. For two of the three difference scores, this was true regardless of the operationalization of IM (i.e., participants' self-reported or externally coded IM), which removes the possibility that this effect was only due to same-source bias. In summary, the results provide support for Marcus's (2009) cross-situational theory of self-presentation, as we could show that self-presentation is to some extent consistent across selection devices.

A second central contribution of this study is that it extends research on self-presentation by providing an answer to how self-presentation is related to job performance as perceived by supervisors. This is important given that the prediction of candidates' job performance is the primary aim of personnel selection. On the whole, results from this study indicate that self-presentation is not negatively related to job performance, as there was no negative correlation between self-presentation and supervisor-rated job performance.. Rather, the results suggest a positive relationship for self-presentation (faking and self-reported IM). This is an important finding that gives rise to empirically-based arguments for a more positive view of self-presentation. Accordingly, these results foster the argumentation that self-presentation can be understood as a form of socially adequate behavior that also serves as a skill on the job, thereby contributing to job performance rating (as argued by Dipboye et al., 2012; Hogan et al., 2007; Klehe, Kleinmann, Niess, & Grazi, 2014; Kleinmann & Klehe, 2011). This is especially true for the personality inventory, as difference scores were found to be positively related to job performance (i.e., two out of three difference scores were criterion-valid), whereas both IM measures were not significantly related to job performance. For the self-report on IM, however, the relationship indicated a trend in the hypothesized direction (r = .15, p =.15). Descriptively, this is in line with the reasoning that faking and IM are two manifestations of self-presentation and that the direction of the relationship to job performance should therefore be the same (i.e., either both negative or both positive). Despite

hints for a positive relation of self-presentation and job performance ratings from this study, we do not argue that self-presentation per se is positive as we are aware that further research needs to further investigate the mechanisms that underlie this effect. Considering research on self-presentation on the job and the current findings, it is also plausible that self-presentation is positively related to supervisor-perceived job performance ratings as candidates that present themselves positively in selection situations might similarly apply self-presentation on the job and this, in turn, may also influence supervisors' perceptions of their employees' job performance.

Related to this, even though the direction of the relation with job performance was descriptively the same for both forms of self-presentation, our study suggests potential differences between the two forms of self-presentation in the relation to job performance. One explanation for this finding might relate to differences in resources of self-presentation as suggested in self-presentation models (Levashina & Campion, 2006; Marcus, 2009). According to these models, the format of the selection device, or in other words, the opportunity for self-presentation that these devices offer plays a role for self-presentation. Hence, one reason for this finding might be due to the format of the selection devices we used. There were probably fewer opportunities for self-presentation during a very structured interview as compared to the opportunity for self-presentation in a personality inventory with a Likert-scale. Accordingly, the range for self-presentation might therefore be restricted in the interview (but not in the personality inventory) and thus affect the size of the correlation with job performance. Related to this, the range for self-presentation in the interview might also have been restricted due to cultural norms for interpersonal situations in Switzerland, given that recent research has pointed out that Swiss use less self-presentation (König, Hafsteinsson, Jansen, & Stadelmann, 2011) and indeed, our data show that the reported impression management ranges on the lower end of the scale ($M_{\text{self-report}} = 1.94$ and $M_{\text{video-coded}} = 1.67$). At the same time, job performance ratings were skewed in the opposite direction ($M = 5.87$ on a

scale from 1 to 7), and as such, this might also have lowered the relation of IM and job performance. To look into this idea in more detail, future research could, for example, vary the opportunity for self-presentation in the interview and personality inventory to enhance our understanding of the effect on the criterion-related validity of self-presentation and concerning cultural influences, examine the relation to job performance additionally in countries that tend to show self-presentation to a greater extent, such as for instance the USA or China (cf. König, Wong, & Cen, 2012).

Finally, this study contributed to the IM literature by showing that the different operationalizations of IM from the two sources (self-ratings vs. video-coders) showed a significant, but moderate agreement, $r = .21$, $p < .05$. This result is comparable to meta-analytic results on the relation between self-reports and supervisor reports on job performance (Heidemeier & Moser, 2009), $r = .22$, and shows an expected size given that the available information deviates on which raters rely for their judgments. External raters of IM can, when compared to supervisors that rate their employees' performance, only rely on observable behaviors (i.e., in this case, the answers provided by the interviewees) to judge the extent of impression management in answers. In contrast, candidates can also make use of their information about introspective processes to answer the question of whether they employed impression management. With regard to IM self-reports, candidates were not motivated to distort their answers on the IM self-report, as it was collected only for research purposes, and thus they likely reported IM behaviors based upon both given answers and internal information (i.e., as only they know what they thought). Accordingly, this might have lowered the agreement with external raters that only rely on interviewees' answers. As another possibility, the moderate correlation might indicate that effective impression managers cannot be detected. Support for this can be drawn from a study illustrating that interviewers had difficulties in recognizing candidates' IM (Roulin, Bangerter, & Levashina, 2013). This would be in line with the argument from the field of IM on the job that one should rely on

self-reports of IM (Bolino & Turnley, 1999) so that research on IM on the job has mainly employed self-reports. Hence, capable impression managers might be so effective that there is only some degree of agreement to be expected between self-reports and non-self-reports of IM. Thus, we agree with Stevens and Kristof (1995) that it is crucial to consider the perspectives of persons evaluating IM and the access to information they have.

Limitations

Some limitations of this study should be considered. First, for feasibility reasons, we used a shortened version of Levashina and Campion's scale (2007) with only eleven items. This shortened version did not allow a distinction between the original subscales. We refrained from using all the 54 items from Levashina and Campion's scale as it would have been too cumbersome for candidates in an applicant training setting. Nevertheless, our measure had good internal consistency reliability, and the correlation with interview performance was what can be expected for the scale. This is in line with a recent study that also successfully used a shortened measure (Roulin, Bangerter, & Levashina, in press).

Second, our setting was a simulated setting as opposed to an actual applied setting, and thus candidates had to imagine that they had applied for a job. However, this setting allowed us to collect data from four different sources: from the candidates, from candidates' supervisors, from trained interviewers, and from trained video-coders. This is certainly a strength of this study as it diminishes concerns about same-source-biases. In addition, this setting allowed for the collection of honest answers on the IM self-report and personality inventory as participants were not afraid to influence their chances of a job offer by responding honestly on these two measures. Furthermore, the descriptive data showed that candidates behaved as if in a real selection setting, were motivated to perform well on both the interview and personality inventory under applicant conditions, and the sample had sufficient work experience.

Future Research

In consideration of the current study's findings, we suggest avenues for future research that advance greater understanding of self-presentation across selection procedures and its relation to job performance. Specifically, these recommendations include further investigation of self-presentation across selection devices, the relation of self-presentation to job performance with a focus on different criteria, and a macro-perspective on situational influences on self-presentation.

First, we need further research that sheds light on the nature of the shared and unshared variance of self-presentation across selection devices. Although we found that both forms of self-presentation share variance, the effect size also highlighted that there is unshared variance between faking and IM that should be considered. Continuing this line of research is important as the reasons underlying shared and unshared variance are twofold: First, these two forms of self-presentation have been operationalized differently (difference scores vs. behavior or self-reports) in the two strands of research which might impact their relation. Second, conceptually it has been argued that impression management is supposed to require more behavioral skills than faking (Levashina & Campion, 2006). For this reason, we believe that further research needs to examine how the measurement of self-presentation influences the relationship and how the antecedents of self-presentation (such as social effectiveness, general mental ability, and personality) relate to these two different forms of self-presentation. This may hopefully provide insights for further comprehensive research on models for self-presentation with antecedents of these behaviors (cf. Marcus, 2009; McFarland & Ryan, 2006), thereby extending knowledge from the few former studies on self-presentation across selection devices (McFarland, Ryan, & Kriska, 2003; Van Iddekinge et al., 2005).

Second, we advocate future research on the relation of self-presentation and job performance that focuses on the criterion job performance. Specifically, we believe that the

present understanding of the association of self-presentation and job performance could be extended by including a) job performance ratings from other sources (i.e. clients and coworkers as from 360 degree-feedback) that differ in the degree to which self-presentation on the job can be exerted on them, b) objective measures of job performance when applicable, and as well as job performance ratings that center on different forms of job performance such as adaptive performance (Griffin, Neal, & Parker, 2007; Griffin, Parker, & Mason, 2010) and extra-role behavior (Organ, 1988) given that these work behaviors require more adaptive and social components than task-based performance.

Third, we suggest to broaden the perspective of situational influences on self-presentation from existing micro-perspectives (e.g., test instructions, transparency of selection devices) to an embedding macro-perspective (e.g., labor force, industry, and economic conditions). Concerning economic influences, it seems highly necessary to examine whether candidates' self-presentation becomes more prevalent under certain economic conditions (e.g., unemployment vs. full employment) and potential implications for the prediction of job performance. This relates to findings by Griffith, Piccone, and Lee (2013) that showed the percentage of false claims in applications increased when unemployment increased. We look forward to further research that acknowledges this macro-perspective as complementary to existing self-presentation models.

Practical Implications

IM and faking should not be viewed as isolated issues. Rather, it should be acknowledged that candidates' self-presentation shows consistency across these two selection devices, which are often used during the same selection process. Thus, candidates who fake are also more likely to use IM tactics in an interview and, depending on the context, this might be interpreted as socially adequate behavior in both devices.

Related to this, self-presentation was not negatively related to job performance in our study, which is clearly of interest to practitioners. Specifically, as faking was positively

related to supervisors' ratings of job performance, the present results diminish concerns (Robie et al., 2006) about faking. Furthermore, IM in the interview also did not relate negatively to job performance, and it would be highly relevant to attempt to replicate these results in a fully applied setting. This is because it is critical to better understand whether candidates would truly report their IM, and also to gain insight into how far the reported and video-coded IM affects the relation to job performance. We recommend further research in applied settings with further selection devices and criterion data from different sources to shed more light on this crucial topic.

References

Anderson, N. (1991). Decision making in the graduate selection interview: An experimental investigation. *Human Relations, 44*, 403-417. doi:10.1177/001872679104400407

Arvey, R. D., Strickland, W., Drauden, G., & Martin, C. (1990). Motivational components of test taking. *Personnel Psychology, 43*, 695-716. doi:10.1111/j.1744-6570.1990.tb00679.x

Barrick, M. R., Dustin, S., Giluk, T., Stewart, G., Shaffer, J., & Swider, B. (2012). Candidate characteristics driving initial impressions during rapport building: Implications for employment interview validity. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 85*, 330-352. doi:10.1111/j.2044-8325.2011.02036.x

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

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

Berry, C. M., & Sackett, P. R. (2009). Faking in personnel selection: Tradeoffs in performance versus fairness resulting from two cut-score strategies. *Personnel Psychology, 62*, 833-863. doi:10.1111/j.1744-6570.2009.01159.x

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

Blickle, G., Momm, T., Schneider, P. B., Gansen, D., & Kramer, J. (2009). Does acquisitive self-presentation in personality self-ratings enhance validity? Evidence from two

experimental field studies. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment, 17,* 142-153. doi:10.1111/j.1468-2389.2006.00354.x

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

Bott, J. P., Svyantek, D. J., Goodman, S. A., & Bernal, D. S. (2003). Expanding the performance domain: Who says nice guys finish last? *International Journal of Organizational Analysis, 11*, 137-152. doi:10.1108/eb028967

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

Chan, S. H., & Kuok, O. M. (2011). A study of human resources recruitment, selection, and retention issues in the hospitality and tourism industry in Macau. *Journal of Human Resources in Hospitality and Tourism, 83*, 421-441. doi:10.1080/15332845.2011.588579

Christiansen, N. D., & Goffin, R. D. (1994). Correcting the 16PF for faking: Effects on criterion-related validity and individual hiring decisions. *Personnel Psychology, 47*, 847-860. doi:10.1111/j.1744-6570.1994.tb01581.x

Dipboye, R. L., Macan, T. H., & Shahani-Denning, C. (2012). The selection interview from the interviewer and applicant perspective: Can't have one without the other. In N. Schmitt (Ed.), *The Oxford handbook of personnel assessment and selection* (pp. 323-353). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Ellingson, J. E., Sackett, P. R., & Connelly, B. S. (2007). Personality assessment across selection and development contexts: Insights into response distortion. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 92*, 386-395. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.92.2.386

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*, 1200-1208. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.87.6.1200

Goffman, E. (1959). *The presentation of self in everyday life*. New York, NY: Doubleday.

Griffin, M. A., Neal, A., & Parker, S. K. (2007). A new model of work role performance in uncertain and interdependent contexts. *Academy of Management Journal, 50*, 327-347.

Griffin, M. A., Parker, S. K., & Mason, C. M. (2010). Leader vision and the development of adaptive and proactive performance: A longitudinal study. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 95*, 174-182. doi:10.1037/A0017263

Griffith, R. L., Chmielowski, T., & Yoshita, Y. (2007). Do applicants fake? An examination of the frequency of applicant faking behavior. *Personnel Review, 36*, 341-357. doi:10.1108/00483480710731310

Griffith, R. L., Piccone, K., & Lee, L. M. (2013, May). *When the going gets rough….lie: Unemployment and resume fraud.* Paper presented at the 16th congress of the European Association of Work and Organizational Psychology, Münster, Germany.

Heidemeier, H., & Moser, K. (2009). Self-other agreement in job performance ratings: A meta-analytic test of a process model. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 94*, 353-370. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.94.2.353

Higgins, C. A., Judge, T. A., & Ferris, G. R. (2003). Influence tactics and work outcomes: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 24*, 89-106. doi:10.1002/job.181

Hogan, J., Barrett, P., & Hogan, R. (2007). Personality measurement, faking, and employment selection. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 92,* 1270-1285. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.92.5.1270

Hough, L. M. (1998). Effects of intentional distortion in personality measurement and evaluation of suggested palliatives. *Human Performance, 11*, 209-244. doi:10.1080/08959285.1998.9668032

Huffcutt, A. I., & Arthur, W. (1994). Hunter and Hunter (1984) revisited: Interview validity for entry-level jobs. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 79*, 184-190. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.79.2.184

Huffcutt, A. I., Van Iddekinge, C. H., & Roth, P. L. (2011). Understanding applicant behavior in employment interviews: A theoretical model of interviewee performance. *Human Resource Management Review, 21*, 353-367. doi:10.1016/j.hrmr.2011.05.003

Jansen, A., König, C. J., Kleinmann, M., & Melchers, K. G. (2012). The interactive effect of impression motivation and cognitive schema on self-presentation in a personality inventory. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 1932-1957. doi:10.1111/j.1559-1816.2012.00925.x

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

Jansen, A., Melchers, K. G., Lievens, F., Kleinmann, M., Brändli, M., Fraefel, L., et al. (2013). Situation assessment as an ignored factor in the behavioral consistency paradigm underlying the validity of personnel selection procedures. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 98*, 326-341. doi:10.1037/a0031257

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

Klehe, U.-C., Kleinmann, M., Niess, C., & Grazi, J. (2014). Impression management during assessment centers: Artificial behavior or much ado about nothing? *Human Performance, 27*, 1-24. doi:10.1080/08959285.2013.854365

Kleinmann, M., Ingold, P. V., Lievens, F., Jansen, A., Melchers, K. G., & König, C. J. (2011). A different look at why selection procedures work: The role of candidates' ability to

identify criteria. *Organizational Psychology Review, 1*, 128-146. doi:10.1177/2041386610387000

Kleinmann, M., & Klehe, U.-C. (2011). Selling oneself: Construct and criterion-related validity of impression management in structured interviews. *Human Performance, 24*, 29-46. doi:10.1080/08959285.2010.530634

König, C. J., Hafsteinsson, L. G., Jansen, A., & Stadelmann, E. H. (2011). Applicants' self-presentational behavioral behavior across cultures: Less self-presentation in Switzerland and Iceland than in the US. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment, 19*, 331-339. doi:10.1111/j.1468-2389.2011.00562.x

König, C. J., Klehe, U.-C., Berchtold, M., & Kleinmann, M. (2010). Reasons for being selective when choosing personnel selection procedures. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment, 18*, 17-27. doi:10.1111/j.1468-2389.2010.00485.x

König, C. J., Wong, J., & Cen, G. (2012). How much do Chinese applicants fake? *International Journal of Selection and Assessment, 20*, 247-250. doi:10.1111/j.1468-2389.2012.00596.x

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

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

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

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

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

McFarland, L. A., & Ryan, A. M. (2000). Variance in faking across noncognitive measures. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 85,* 812-821. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.85.5.812

McFarland, L. A., & Ryan, A. M. (2006). Toward an integrated model of applicant faking behavior. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 36,* 979-1016. doi:10.1111/j.0021-9029.2006.00052.x

McFarland, L. A., Ryan, A. M., & Ellis, A. (2002). Item placement on a personality measure: Effects on faking behavior and test measurement properties. *Journal of Personality Assessment, 78,* 348-369. doi:10.1207/S15327752JPA7802_09

McFarland, L. A., Ryan, A. M., & Kriska, S. D. (2002). Field study investigation of applicant use of influence tactics in a selection interview. *Journal of Psychology, 136,* 383–398. doi:10.1080/00223980209604165

McFarland, L. A., Ryan, A. M., & Kriska, S. D. (2003). Impression management use and effectiveness across assessment methods. *Journal of Management, 29,* 641-661. doi:10.1016/S0149-2063(03)00030-8

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

Morgeson, F. P., Campion, M. A., Dipboye, R. L., Hollenbeck, J. R., Murphy, K., & Schmitt, N. (2007). Reconsidering the use of personality tests in personnel selection contexts. *Personnel Psychology, 60*, 683-729. doi:10.1111/j.1744-6570.2007.00089.x

Organ, D. W. (1988). A restatement of the satisfaction-performance hypothesis. *Journal of Management, 14*, 547-557. doi:10.1177/014920638801400405

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

Peterson, M. H., Griffith, R. L., & Converse, P. D. (2009). Examining the role of applicant faking in hiring decisions: Percentage of fakers hired and hiring discrepancies in single- and multiple-predictor selection. *Journal of Business and Psychology, 24*, 373-386. doi:10.1007/s10869-009-9121-5

Peterson, M. H., Griffith, R. L., Isaacson, J. A., O'Connell, M. S., & Mangos, P. M. (2011). Applicant faking, social desirability, and the prediction of counterproductive work behaviors. *Human Performance, 24*, 270-290. doi:10.1080/08959285.2011.580808

Robie, C., Tuzinski, C. A., & Bly, P. R. (2006). A survey of assessor beliefs and practices related to faking. *Journal of Managerial Psychology, 21*, 669-681. doi:10.1108/02683940610690204

Roch, S. G., Woehr, D. J., Mishra, V., & Kieszczynska, U. (2012). Rater training revisited: An updated meta-analytic review of frame-of-reference training. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 85*, 370-395. doi:10.1111/j.2044-8325.2011.02045.x

Rosse, J. G., Stecher, M. D., Miller, J. L., & Levin, R. A. (1998). The impact of response distortion on preemployment personality testing and hiring decisions. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 83*, 634-644. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.83.4.634

Roulin, N., Bangerter, A., & Levashina, J. (2013, May). *Do you see what I see: Interviewers' perceptions of applicant impression management in high-stakes employment interviews.* Paper presented at the 28th Annual Conference of the Society of Industrial and Organizational Psychology, Houston.

Roulin, N., Bangerter, A., & Levashina, J. (in press). Interviewers' perceptions of impression management in employment interviews. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*.

Ryan, A. M., & Boyce, A. S. (2006). What do we know and where do we go? Practical directions for faking research. In M. H. Peterson & R. L. Griffith (Eds.), *A closer examination of applicant faking behavior* (pp. 357-371). Greenwich, CT: Information Age.

Ryan, A. M., McFarland, L., Baron, H., & Page, R. (1999). An international look at selection practices: Nation and culture as explanations for variability in practice. *Personnel Psychology, 52,* 359-391.

Sackett, P. R. (2011). Integrating and prioritizing theoretical perspectives on applicant faking of personality measures. *Human Performance, 24*, 379-385. doi:10.1080/08959285.2011.597478

Sackett, P. R., & Lievens, F. (2008). Personnel selection. *Annual Review of Psychology, 59,* 419-450. doi:10.1146/annurev.psych.59.103006.093716

Schlenker, B. R. (1980). *Impression management*. Monterey, CA: Brooks/Cole.

Schuler, H., & Prochaska, M. (2000a). *Das Leistungsmotivationsinventar (LMI) [Achievement Motivation Inventory]*. Göttingen, Germany: Hogrefe.

Schuler, H., & Prochaska, M. (2000b). Entwicklung und Konstruktvalidierung eines berufsbezogenen Leistungsmotivationstests [Development and construct validation of a job-related achievement motivation test]. *Diagnostica, 46,* 61-72. doi:10.1026//0012-1924.46.2.61

Snell, A. F., Sydell, E. J., & Lueke, S. B. (1999). Towards a theory of applicant faking: Integrating studies of deception. *Human Resource Management Review, 9,* 219-242. doi:10.1016/S1053-4822(99)00019-4

Staufenbiel, T., & Hartz, C. (2000). Organizational Citizenship Behavior: Entwicklung und erste Validierung eines Meßinstruments [Organizational citizenship behavior: Development and validation of a measurement instrument]. *Diagnostica, 46,* 73-83. doi:10.1026//0012-1924.46.2.73

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

Tedeschi, J., & Melburg, V. (1984). Impression management and influence tactics in organizations. In S. Bacharach & E. J. Lawler (Eds.), *Research in the sociology of organizations* (Vol. 3, pp. 31-58). Greenwich, CT: JAI.

Tett, R. P., & Christiansen, N. D. (2007). Personality tests at the crossroads: A response to Morgeson, Campion, Dipboye, Hollenbeck, Murphy, and Schmitt (2007). *Personnel Psychology, 60,* 967-993. doi:10.1111/j.1744-6570.2007.00098.x

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

Thomas, D. R., & Zumbo, B. D. (2012). Difference scores from the point of view of reliability and repeated-measures ANOVA: In defense of difference scores for data analysis. *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 72,* 37-43. doi:10.1177/0013164411409929

Tsai, W.-C., Chen, C.-C., & Chiu, S.-F. (2005). Exploring boundaries of the effects of applicant impression management tactics in job interviews. *Journal of Management, 31,* 108-125. doi:10.1177/0149206304271384

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

Van Iddekinge, C. H., Raymark, P. H., & Roth, P. L. (2005). Assessing personality with a structured employment interview: Construct-related validity and susceptibility to response inflation. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 90,* 536-552. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.90.3.536

Viswesvaran, C., & Ones, D. S. (1999). Meta-analyses of fakability estimates: Implications for personality measurement. *Educational and psychological measurement, 59,* 197-210. doi:10.1177/00131649921969802

Williams, L. J., & Anderson, S. E. (1991). Job satisfaction and organizational commitment as predictors of organizational citizenship and in-role behaviors. *Journal of Management, 17,* 601-617. doi:10.1177/014920639101700305

Woehr, D. J., & Huffcutt, A. I. (1994). Rater training for performance-appraisal: A quantitative review. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 67,* 189-205. doi:10.1111/j.2044-8325.1994.tb00562.x

Woo, S. E., Gibbons, A. M., & Thornton, G. C. (2007). Latent mean differences in the facets of achievement motivation of undergraduate students and adult workers in the US. *Personality and Individual Differences, 43,* 1687-1697. doi:10.1016/j.paid.2007.05.006

Zibarras, L. D., & Woods, S. A. (2010). A survey of UK selection practices across different organization sizes and industry sectors. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 83,* 499-511. doi:10.1348/096317909X425203

Ziegler, M., MacCann, C., & Roberts, R. D. (2011a). Faking: Knowns, unknowns, and points of contention. In M. Ziegler, C. MacCann & R. D. Roberts (Eds.), *New perspectives on faking in personality assessment* (pp. 3-16). New York: Oxford University Press.

Ziegler, M., MacCann, C., & Roberts, R. D. (Eds.). (2011b). *New perspectives on faking in personality assessments*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Appendix

Sample Interview Question for each dimension:

Persistence

Imagine you're finding the first months at your new job very difficult. The tasks you're assigned are very demanding and you think your boss isn't entirely satisfied with your work. Please describe briefly how you would behave in this situation.

Assertiveness

Please imagine the following situation. You are presenting your newest idea for a project to your boss and other work colleagues. You've invested a lot of time in generating and elaborating on the ideas. One colleague immediately questions the potential execution of the project and starts having private conversations. Please describe briefly how you would behave in this situation.

Organizing Behaviors

Please imagine the following situation. You come back to your job after vacation. You discover a stack of unopened letters on your desk and there are over 100 unread emails in your email inbox. There are already some meetings with clients planned for today. These meetings will take about an hour each. Furthermore, your boss wants to speak to you urgently about an issue. He has sent you details about it via email. Please describe briefly how you would behave in this situation.

Table 1

Descriptive Statistics and Intercorrelations of Study Variables (N = 92)

		M	*SD*	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
1	Impression management (video-coded)	1.67	0.53												
2	Impression management (self-report)	1.94	0.52	.21*											
3	Difference score Assertiveness	0.40	0.56	.10	.28**										
4	Difference score Persistence	0.48	0.62	.21*	.37**	.46**									
5	Difference score Organizing Behaviors	0.57	0.68	.26*	.33**	.51**	.72**								
6	Assertiveness applicant score	5.35	0.71	.13	.00	.12	.20*	.25**							
7	Assertiveness research condition score	4.96	0.85	.04	-.16	-.56**	-.14	-.13	.76**						
8	Persistence applicant score	5.67	0.69	.09	.12	.07	.32**	.22*	.60**	.45**					
9	Persistence research condition score	5.20	0.77	-.09	-.14	-.31**	-.52**	-.39**	.38**	.52**	.64**				
10	Organizing behaviors applicant score	5.64	0.56	.20	.16	.18	.25**	.28**	.40**	.21*	.58**	.32**			
11	Organizing behaviors research condition score	5.07	0.75	-.07	-.15	-.32**	-.46**	-.69**	.07	.27**	.24*	.59**	.50**		
12	Interview score	3.68	0.43	.35**	.20*	.25**	.10	.17	.20*	.00	.16	.06	.24*	.03	
13	Job performance (supervisor-rating)	5.87	0.98	.01	.15	.07	.28**	.26**	.14	.05	.30**	.03	.20*	-.08	.22*

**$p < .01$, *$p < .05$ (two-tailed)