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Faking is a well-researched topic in the field of Industrial and Organizational psychology, especially with regard to personality measures. However, faking in the employment interview has not been researched to the same extent. The current study aims to contribute to this relatively limited area of research by investigating the predictors and outcomes of applicant faking in the employment interview. Faking behavior in other aspects of the application process were also examined. Participants (final N=134) completed three surveys, with one-week lags between each survey. This study found that participants who scored high on measures of Machiavellianism, Competitive Worldview (CW), Neuroticism, and status seeking were more likely to fake in the employment interview and in general. A relative weights analysis identified Machiavellianism and CW as the most important predictors of faking. In addition, faking behavior was found to predict both Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB) and Counterproductive Work Behavior (CWB). Faking predicted CWB above and beyond predictor variables, which suggests that faking and CWB are two related but separate events that occur throughout the selection and employment process. Implications for both theory and practice, as well as study limitations, are also discussed.
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INTRODUCTION

Applicant faking during the employee selection process presents a number of problems for both researchers and practitioners. To start, faking can inhibit the validity of selection procedures such as personality tests and employment interviews (Levashina & Campion, 2006, 2007; Mueller-Hanson, Heggestad, & Thornton, 2003; Roulin, 2016; Roulin, Krings, & Binggeli, 2015). For instance, several researchers have argued that faking may contribute to the weak relationships found between personality test scores and job performance (see Goffin & Boyd, 2009). There are also a number of other negative workplace outcomes associated with applicant faking. Stewart, Darnold, Zimmerman, Parks, and Dustin (2010) found that applicants who distorted their responses on a personality test were ranked higher than applicants who did not distort their responses and were subsequently more likely to be selected for the job. In addition, applicant faking is positively related to counterproductive work behavior and poor job performance (Donovan, Dwight, & Schneider, 2014; Peterson, Griffith, Isaacson, O’Connell, & Mangos, 2011).

Faking is a well-researched topic in the realm of personnel selection, especially with regard to personality measures (e.g., Goffin & Boyd, 2009; Raymark & Tafero, 2009; Viswesvaran & Ones, 1999). Faking in the employment interview, however, has not been researched to the same extent (see Levashina & Campion, 2007; Roulin et al., 2015). Levashina and Campion (2007) define faking in the employment interview as “deceptive [impression management] or the conscious distortions of answers to the interview questions in order to obtain a better score on the interview and/or otherwise create favorable perceptions” (p. 1639). Applicants fake in order to better present themselves to the interviewers in the hopes that they will receive an employment offer. Research has found that response distortion (such as faking) is
used by many applicants in the employment interview and can impact the validity of this selection procedure (Barrick, Shaffer, and DeGrassi, 2009; Ellis, West, Ryan, & DeShon, 2002; Levashina & Campion, 2007). While general response distortion in interviews has been studied to a modest extent, the research that focuses specifically on faking is extremely limited.

The current study addresses this issue by investigating the relationships between several proposed characteristics of applicant faking and specific types of interview faking behavior, as well as faking behavior in the overall application. In addition, I also measured several proposed outcomes of applicant faking. Before I discuss interview faking behavior, however, a review of the literature on general applicant response distortion is needed.

**Faking and Similar Constructs**

Because the different styles of response distortion are very similar to one another, I will first outline the various distinctions amongst them before focusing specifically on faking. Throughout the research literature, researchers often use terms such as impression management (IM) and socially desirable responding (SDR) to refer to faking. While impression management, socially desirable responding and faking all fall under the broad category of response distortion, it is important to understand that these terms refer to three distinct constructs. Many researchers mistakenly use these terms interchangeably because of conceptual similarity and inconsistent construct definitions. Indeed, as Levashina and Campion (2007) point out, “conflicting definitions have made it unclear as to how faking is similar to or different from impression management and social desirability” (p. 1638). In order to set the scope of this thesis, I will delineate these constructs below before focusing on applicant faking, the construct of interest in the current study.
Much of the confusion amongst these terms can be attributed to the conflicting definitions for impression management. The definition of impression management is dependent on which camp of research one subscribes to. According to personality researchers, IM is a deceptive component of SDR and is defined as “conscious response distortion on self-report personality inventories, usually in an effort to present a positive image to an intended audience” (Berry, Page, & Sackett, 2007, p. 95). However, organizational researchers conceptualize IM differently. Schlenker defined IM as a “conscious or unconscious attempt to control the images that are projected in […] social interactions” (1980, as cited in Ellis et al., 2002, p. 1200). Research on IM in the employment interview (as opposed to personality inventories) has subscribed to this conceptualization of impression management (e.g., Ellis et al., 2002; Levashina & Campion, 2007; Stevens & Kristof, 1995; Van Iddekinge, McFarland, & Raymark, 2007). Given that this thesis pertains to the employment interview, I will follow the conceptualization of IM set forth by organizational researchers.

From the point of view of organizational researchers, IM is not always deceptive, nor is it always intentional. In the employment interview, an applicant can engage in IM without being dishonest. For example, the applicant may frequently smile at the interviewer or cite previous accomplishments from past occupations in order to impress the interviewer. Assuming that these accomplishments are not fabricated, this IM tactic would not be considered deceptive. However, if the applicant invented and/or embellished these accomplishments, then they have engaged in deceptive IM, which is equivalent to faking. According to Levashina and Campion (2007), faking is defined as “deceptive IM or the conscious distortion of answers to the interview questions in order to obtain a better score on the interview and/or otherwise create favorable impressions” (p. 1639). Herein lies the key distinction between faking and other forms of IM:
while other impression management tactics can be deceptive or honest, faking is always deceptive. Furthermore, IM is not necessarily intentional. During the interview, the applicant may engage in IM behaviors such as smiling and laughing frequently without ever being aware of it (Leary & Kowalksi, 1990). Faking, however, is a conscious behavior and as such is always intentional. Therefore, faking can be considered as a subset of IM tactics that involves deceptive and conscious behavior.

Faking should also be distinguished from socially desirable responding, which is “generally defined as the tendency for subjects to respond to personality test items in a manner that consistently presents the self in a favorable light” (Holden & Fekken, 1989, p. 181). In the personality literature, SDR is made up of two components: impression management and self-deceptive enhancement (Paulhus, 1984; Zerbe & Paulhus, 1987). As previously mentioned, it is important to remember that this conceptualization of IM (i.e., as a conscious and deceptive form of SDR) differs from the conceptualization given by organizational researchers. In direct contrast with IM (which is also sometimes referred to as “other-deception”), self-deceptive enhancement “refers to a relatively more unconscious type of response distortion” (Berry et al., 2007, p. 95) in that the applicant actually believes their distorted responses to be true (Zerbe & Paulhus, 1987).

There are three key distinctions between faking and SDR. One distinction is that people who present themselves in a socially desirable way may actually behave in socially desirable ways (e.g., Holden & Fekken, 1989; McCrae & Costa, 1983), while people who are faking present themselves as having particular skills or experience that they do not actually have. In other words, applicants who respond in a socially desirable way may or may not be telling the truth, while applicants who fake, by definition, are always being dishonest. The second distinction is that SDR involves emphasizing characteristics that are generally socially desirable, while faking
specifically involves job-related credentials and experiences. This is also where IM and SDR diverge from one another: IM is more specific than SDR, whether it is conceptualized as a component of SDR or as a separate construct entirely. Furthermore, social desirability is made up of both voluntary response distortion and involuntary self-deception (Roulin et al., 2015), while faking involves just voluntary response distortion. That is, applicants who fake are aware that they are faking. On the other hand, applicants who respond in a socially desirable manner may be unconsciously deceiving themselves without attempting to deceive others.

Faking, impression management, and socially desirable responding are certainly similar constructs, but it is important to distinguish them from one another. Faking is a more focused construct than impression management or socially desirable responding, and therefore it should be conceptualized and measured differently. The main difference between faking and other forms of response distortion is that faking is *always* conscious and deceptive, while IM and SDR include both conscious and unconscious behavior that may be honest or deceptive. For the remainder of this thesis, I will be focusing specifically on faking in the application process. However, because these constructs are conceptually similar to faking, past research on IM and SDR can contribute to the predictions of the current study. Therefore, I will broaden the discussion to include IM and SDR when it is relevant.

**Prevalence of Faking**

A substantial amount of research indicates that applicants are capable of faking. Meta-analyses have found that people can increase their scores on measures of personality and integrity when they are instructed to fake (e.g., Alliger & Dwight, 2000; Viswesvaran & Ones, 1999). Although this “fake-good” method has been considered ineffective for instilling experimental realism (see Ellingson & McFarland, 2011; Griffith, Chmielowski, & Yoshita,
2007), it provides a useful procedure for assessing individuals’ faking capabilities. While a number of studies have investigated applicants’ ability to fake, fewer have attempted to examine the actual prevalence of faking (Donovan, Dwight, & Hurtz, 2003). In addition, the overall findings from these studies are inconclusive (Marcus, 2009). For example, researchers have found base rates of faking ranging from 14% (Dunnette, McCartney, Carlson, & Kirchner, 1962) to 99% (Levashina & Campion, 2007). Jansen, König, Stadelmann, and Kleinmann (2012) found that most applicants engage in behaviors deemed appropriate by HR recruiters. For example, between 97% and 99% of applicants reported that they had indicated their interest in the job position and the company (an appropriate behavior), while no applicants lied about their relevant knowledge or experience (an inappropriate behavior). However, Levashina and Campion (2007) found that between 58% and 88% of applicants admitted they engaged in such inappropriate behaviors.

There is also evidence that suggests that there may be a variance in faking prevalence across different selection procedures. In one study, McFarland and Ryan (2000) discovered that biodata, conscientiousness, and integrity measures were more “fakable” than other measures, such as openness. Across the overall selection procedure, Donovan et al. (2003) found that roughly half of the participants engaged in some sort of response distortion.

Finally, the frequency of response distortion has also been found to vary across different cultures. König and colleagues studied the prevalence of self-presentation behaviors in China, Switzerland, Iceland, and the United States. The researchers found that self-presentation (i.e., “I exaggerated my work experience to make myself look more impressive than I really am”) was most prevalent in the US and China. These behaviors were relatively uncommon among the
Swiss and Icelandic samples (König, Hafsteinsson, Jansen, & Stadelmann, 2011; König, Wong, & Cen, 2011).

Outcomes of Faking

Applicant faking produces a number of undesirable consequences that concern both researchers and practitioners. First and foremost, faking has been shown to inhibit the validity of various selection procedures, including personality tests, biodata measures, and employment interviews (e.g., Levashina & Campion, 2006, 2007; Levashina, Morgeson, & Campion, 2012; McFarland & Ryan, 2000; Mueller-Hanson et al., 2003; Roulin et al., 2015). There is an ongoing debate in the personality literature regarding the extent to which faking impacts the validity of personality measures. While several researchers do not believe that faking inhibits the validity of personality inventories, a number of studies have found evidence to the contrary (e.g., Ellingson, Sackett, & Hough, 1999; Rosse, Stecher, Miller, & Levin, 1998; Topping & O’Gorman, 1997). Both construct and criterion-related validity can be harmed by response distortion. For example, Ellingson et al. (1999) found that when applicants responded to a personality measure in a socially desirable way, the factor structure of the personality test was compromised, which impacts its construct validity. Topping & O’Gorman (1997) employed a similar strategy to assess faking by assigning participants to one of two conditions: honest, and “fake good”. Each participant completed a self-report personality measure, the NEO Five Factor Inventory. As a criterion measure, participants also had an other-rating of their personality, which was given by a family member or a close friend who completed the same personality measure. The researchers found significant correlations for all five personality factors between honest and other-ratings ranging from .49 to .60. However, only two of the five correlations between fake good and other-ratings were significant, which indicates that faking can have a significant impact on the
criterion-related validity of personality tests. Other research has found that faking can harm the validity of employment interviews (Levashina & Campion, 2007) and situational judgment tests (Peeters & Lievens, 2005) as well.

Job candidates fake in order to obtain a higher score on the application. Therefore, it is reasonable to assume that applicants who fake successfully are more likely to be selected for employment. Indeed, McFarland and Ryan (2000) report that faking on a personality test or a biodata measure can increase an applicant’s score by up to one standard deviation. Mueller-Hanson et al. (2003) found that applicants who faked on a personality measure were more likely to be selected than applicants who did not fake. In addition, as the application process became more selective, the percentage of honest applicants who were selected decreased. Faking can also have an impact on the ranking of applicants. According to Stewart and colleagues (2010), “individuals who do not significantly distort on personality tests are indeed harmed by others distorting and moving ahead of them in the top-down distribution […] these results demonstrate there is a reason to be concerned about the justness of outcomes for individuals” (p. 628).

Response distortion also affects the outcomes of employment interviews. For instance, interviewers gave higher ratings of perceived applicant-job fit to applicants who engaged in self-promoting impression management tactics than those who did not engage in such tactics (Kristof-Brown, Barrick, & Franke, 2002). Other research has found that applicants who engaged in impression management were perceived as more likable by the interviewer (Kacmar & Carlson, 1999) and were also more likely to receive a job offer than “honest” applicants (Gilmore & Ferris, 1989; Stevens & Kristof, 1995).

Beyond simply selecting dishonest job candidates, applicant faking has also been linked to several other negative selection outcomes. In a study of undergraduate students, Mueller-
Hanson et al. (2003) found that participants who faked on a self-report measure of achievement motivation scored lower on a performance task than participants who did not fake. These results have been replicated in an organizational setting. Donovan, Dwight, and Schneider (2014) assessed the goal orientations of a sample of newly hired sales employees who worked for a pharmaceutical company. These new employees were required to attend a training simulation in order to develop their skills for the sales position. The researchers found that employees who faked on the measure of goal orientation demonstrated lower training performance than employees who did not fake. In another study of real job applicants, Peterson, Griffith, Isaacson, O’Connell, and Mangos (2011) found that faking on a Conscientiousness scale predicted employee engagement in counterproductive work behavior. These findings are clearly relevant for employers, as their organization’s performance can suffer as a result of hiring dishonest applicants.

**Who Fakes?**

While findings regarding the prevalence of faking are somewhat inconsistent, they do highlight a need for us to better understand applicant faking. In order to do so, researchers have begun to focus on *who* engages in faking. Several studies have found relationships between faking behavior and a variety of personality variables. Specifically, applicants who score low on measures of integrity and conscientiousness and high on measures of neuroticism, Machiavellianism, and openness to ideas are more likely to fake on personality inventories, integrity tests, and bio-data inventories than other applicants (McFarland & Ryan, 2000; Mueller-Hanson, Heggestad, & Thornton, 2006; Raymark & Tafero, 2009). Researchers have also examined the cognitive characteristics of applicants who engage in faking behavior on personality and bio-data inventories. The results of these studies revealed positive relationships
between applicant faking and characteristics such as cognitive ability, ability to identify criteria (ATIC), and knowledge of the constructs being measured in the selection procedure (König, Melchers, Kleinmann, Richter, & Klehe, 2007; Levashina, Morgeson, & Campion, 2009; Raymark & Tafero, 2009; Tett, Freund, Christiansen, Fox, & Coaster, 2012).

**Interview Faking**

Applicant faking is prevalent and affects both researchers and employers. As such, the literature is replete with studies concerning faking, impression management, and socially desirable responding in the selection procedure. Researchers have designed methods for detecting and controlling for response distortion, and there is a multitude of manuscripts that propose models of the faking process. Response distortion is a popular topic for organizational researchers, especially with regard to personality inventories and other non-cognitive measures used in personnel selection. However, the research on response distortion in the interview is quite limited relative to distortion in other aspects of the selection procedure. Furthermore, much of this research concerns impression management rather than faking (see Levashina, Hartwell, Morgeson, & Campion, 2014). In order to address this current gap in the research, this thesis focuses exclusively on applicant faking in the employment interview.

While there are conceptual differences between faking and impression management, research on impression management in the employment interview has made several findings that are important in this discussion of faking behavior. In a study that administered structured interviews to participants, Ellis and colleagues (2002) found that almost all applicants engaged in some form of impression management. These researchers also found that assertive IM tactics (such as self-promotion) are used more often than defensive IM tactics (such as image protection). Of the assertive tactics, more applicants engaged in self-promotion than ingrati
which is consistent with the previous work of Kleinmann and Klehe (2011) and Stevens and Kristof (1995). While impression management in the interview is indeed quite common, several researchers have found that it is not easy for interviewers to identify when applicants are managing their impressions (Roulin, Bangerter, & Levashina, 2013). When impression management is detected, interviewers are better at identifying honest IM than deceptive IM (Roulin, Bangerter, & Levashina, 2015). Researchers have found that applicants who engage in deceptive IM often restrain their facial expressions (i.e., they smile less often) while engaging in more verbal behaviors (which can lead to making more errors while speaking; Schneider, Powell, & Roulin, 2015). Several studies have examined the individual differences of interviewers. Roulin (2016) found that people who have a combination of low cognitive ability and high generalized trust in others are particularly ineffective at detecting applicant impression management. Other characteristics that can influence the effects of applicant IM include interviewer affectivity and concerns about the applicant (i.e., Chen, Yang, & Lin, 2010; Tsai, Huang, Wu, & Lo, 2010). In a recent meta-analysis, Barrick et al. (2009) found a moderate, positive relationship between applicant IM and interview scores. In addition, the findings of this meta-analysis revealed that interview structure moderated the effect of IM on interview scores; specifically, the relationship between IM and interview scores was stronger in a low-structure interview ($r = .27$) than in a high-structure interview ($r = .17$).

A handful of researchers have specifically targeted faking in the employment interview. Because faking and impression management are conceptually distinct, they cannot be measured with the same devices. Levashina and Campion (2007) were the first researchers to create a faking scale specifically for the employment interview. Through the development and validation of their Interview Faking Behavior (IFB) scale, Levashina and Campion identified four main
factors of interview faking behavior: extensive image creation, slight image creation, image protection, and ingratiation. Extensive and slight image creation both involve tactics that applicants use in order to create favorable impressions during the interview. Extensive image creation consists of socially inappropriate behaviors, such as inventing or borrowing stories from other people, and is the factor that is most similar to lying. Slight image creation is milder than extensive image creation and involves behaviors such as embellishing one’s job-related credentials. Image protection is used defensively by applicants in order to protect their images, and is made up of omitting, masking, and distancing behaviors. Lastly, applicants engage in ingratiation in order to evoke interpersonal liking and attraction between the interviewer(s) and themselves. This factor of faking behavior involves opinion conforming and interviewer/organization enhancing. Examples of these behaviors are provided in their respective sections below.

Levashina and Campion (2007) posit that humans are incapable of accurately detecting deception in the employment interview, which highlights our need for self-report measures of interview faking in order for us to better understand this faking behavior. They also point out that their Interview Faking Behavior scale is not to be used as a selection device; instead, it should be used as a tool for improving the selection procedure. In order for us to better understand this method of deceptive responding, we must first identify the applicant characteristics (predictors) of interview faking behavior. In turn, this knowledge will allow us to improve the selection process. Few studies have used Levashina and Campion’s Interview Faking Behavior scale (c.f. Hogue et al., 2013; Roulin et al., 2013; Swider, Barrick, Harris, & Stoverink, 2011), and only one study (Hogue et al., 2013) examined the relationships between predictors and interview faking (the other two examined impression management, not faking). However, Hogue and
colleagues (2013) only investigated three predictors of applicants’ intentions towards faking: gender, Machiavellianism, and self-monitoring. Clearly, further investigation into the applicant characteristics of interview faking is needed. Similarly, we must also investigate the outcomes of interview faking. Previous research has identified two undesirable outcomes of hiring applicants who faked on a measure of personality: poor job performance (Donovan et al., 2014) and counterproductive work behavior (Peterson et al., 2011). However, the consequences of hiring applicants who faked in the employment interview are not yet known. The current study will attempt to rectify this by investigating the organizational consequences associated with hiring interview fakers.
THE CURRENT STUDY

The current study makes several contributions to the research on applicant faking. First, it focuses on interview faking, which is under-researched in comparison to other selection methods such as personality inventories. Second, it focuses exclusively on faking instead of other forms of response distortion (i.e., IM and SDR). These are distinct constructs that must be assessed separately from one another, and very few studies have investigated faking rather than impression management or socially desirable responding. Third, it examines several proposed predictors of interview faking. Since the publication of Levashina and Campion’s (2007) Interview Faking Behavior scale, only a handful of studies have identified predictors of interview faking (i.e., Hogue et al., 2013; Roulin & Bourdage, 2017; Roulin & Krings, 2016). The current study will attempt to replicate past results and explore several new variables. Fourth, this study also examines two proposed outcomes of interview faking which have not yet been studied. Finally, I measure general applicant faking, which allows me to compare the two types of faking and examine any differences between them.

I propose several predictors and outcomes of interview faking for the current study. I expect that some personal characteristics will be related to multiple dimensions of faking, while other predictors will correspond to specific factors of interview faking. I also expect that interview faking will be related to a number of organizational outcomes. The faking dimensions, related personal characteristics, and organizational outcomes are discussed in detail below.

Dimensions of Faking Behavior

Image creation. Levashina and Campion (2007) initially proposed a three-factor model of their Interview Faking Behavior scale, made up of image creation, image protection, and
ingratiation. However, the results of an exploratory factor analysis split image creation into two factors: extensive and slight image creation.

**Extensive image creation.** The authors found that extensive image creation behaviors were “semantically closer to lying” (Levashina & Campion, 2007, p.1642), and these behaviors are constructing, inventing, and borrowing. Constructing consists of building stories by combining different work experiences in order to create a better answer (i.e., “I told stories that contained both real and fictional work experiences’”), while inventing is simply making up facts (i.e., “I claimed that I have skills that I do not have”). Borrowing involves answering interview questions by using others’ work experiences and/or accomplishments as your own.

**Slight image creation.** In comparison to extensive image creation, slight image creation represents behaviors that are considered mild forms of faking (Levashina & Campion, 2007): embellishing, tailoring, and fit enhancing. Embellishing is simply enhancing one’s answers by exaggerating experiences and/or accomplishments. Tailoring consists of modifying one’s interview answers in order to fit the specific job position or the interview context (i.e., “I distorted my work experience to fit the interviewer’s view of the position”). Lastly, applicants engage in fit enhancing by answering in a manner that creates the impression that they are a good fit for the organization.

**Image protection.** After an applicant has used assertive tactics to create an image of a favorable candidate, they engage in defensive tactics in order to protect this image (Levashina & Campion, 2007). These defensive tactics are made up of omitting, masking, and distancing behaviors. Omitting is the conscious exclusion of specific information in order to improve one’s answers (i.e., “When asked directly, I did not mention my true reason for quitting my previous job”). Masking consists of disguising or concealing certain information in order to improve
interview answers (i.e., “When asked directly, I did not mention some problems that I had in past jobs”). Lastly, applicants can distance themselves from negative past events or experiences in order to protect their image (i.e., “I tried to suppress my connection to negative events in my work history”).

**Ingratiation.** The fourth and final factor in Levashina and Campion’s (2007) Interview Faking Behavior scale is ingratiation, which is the process by which the applicant evokes interpersonal liking between the interviewer and themselves. This factor is made up of opinion conforming and interviewer/organization enhancement. Applicants may conform their opinions to match those held by the interviewer or the organization (e.g., “I tried to adjust my answers to the interviewer’s values and beliefs”). Interviewer or organization enhancement consists of insincerely complimenting the interviewer/organization, such as laughing at an interviewer’s joke when it is not funny. By conforming their opinions and enhancing the image of the interviewer and/or the organization, the applicant hopes to gain a favorable perception in the eyes of the interviewer.

**Proposed Predictors of Interview Faking**

Here, I present a number of variables that I believe will predict applicant engagement in interview faking. While all of these variables are hypothesized to predict overall interview faking, I also expect that several of these predictors will predict one factor of interview faking stronger than the other factors. In each of these instances, additional hypotheses are given to specify the relationship. By following this procedure, I aim to contribute empirical evidence that can be used to examine the construct validity of the Interview Faking Behavior scale.

**Competitive worldviews.** One individual difference variable that has received very little attention in the organizational literature is Competitive Worldviews (CWs). This construct is
defined as “the belief that the social world is a competitive jungle characterized by a ruthless, amoral struggle for resources and power in which might is right and winning is everything” (Duckitt, Wagner, du Plessis, & Birum, 2002, p. 78). Those with strong CWs believe that the world is a brutal place where one has to be ruthless in order to get ahead. Several researchers have found that applicants with Competitive Worldviews (CWs) are more likely to fake in the employment interview (Roulin & Bourdage, 2017; Roulin & Krings, 2016), and Roulin and Krings (2016) found that CWs predicted faking above and beyond competitiveness, a similar (but distinct) construct. However, these researchers only utilized the Slight and Extensive Image Creation subscales of the IFB scale, while the current study examines all four factors of interview faking.

Hypothesis 1: Competitive Worldviews will predict overall interview faking.

Machiavellianism. People high in Machiavellianism tell more lies in everyday social interactions (Kashy & DePaulo, 1996) and are more willing to be dishonest during an interview (Fletcher, 1990) than those low in this trait. Indeed, several researchers have found that Machiavellianism is significantly correlated with all four factors of interview faking (Hogue et al., 2013; Levashina & Campion, 2007). In both of these studies, the researchers found that Machiavellianism was most strongly related to Ingratiation. Because Machiavellianism has already been shown to correlate significantly with the Interview Faking Behavior scale, I am including this measure in the present study in order to assess the generalizability of these findings.

Hypothesis 2a: Machiavellianism will predict overall interview faking.

Hypothesis 2b: Machiavellianism will have a stronger relationship with Ingratiation than with the other factors of interview faking.
**Over-claiming.** One method of self-enhancement is over-claiming, which is the “tendency to claim knowledge about nonexistent items” (Paulhus, Harms, Bruce, & Lysy, 2003, p. 891). Phillips and Clancy (1972) conducted the first known study that empirically assessed over-claiming. In this study, the researchers asked participants about their usage of a variety of new products, movies, and books. In fact, none of these items were real; thus, the participants who scored high on this measure were called over-claimers (Phillips & Clancy, 1972). However, these researchers did not conceptualize over-claiming as a variable. Rather, they used over-claiming as a method for understanding different explanations for socially desirable responding.

Randall and Fernandes (1991) were the first researchers to use over-claiming as a predictor variable. Using a modified version of the over-claiming items created by Phillips and Clancy (1972), they found that over-claiming was positively related to social desirability and impression management. Building upon this, Paulhus et al. (2003) developed the Over-Claiming Questionnaire (OCQ), which consists of 150 items divided into 10 different categories, including historical names and events, authors and characters, and physical science. Each category consists of 15 items, 3 of which do not exist: these items are known as foils. Respondents rate their familiarity with each item on a Likert scale, which ranges from 1 (“never heard of it”) to 5 (“very familiar”; Paulhus et al., 2003). A respondent engages in over-claiming if they rate any degree of knowledge on a foil item (i.e., any response above ‘1’). Participants are then scored for accuracy and response bias according to signal detection analysis. Response bias on the OCQ is positively correlated with narcissism ($r = .35$) and self-deceptive enhancement ($r = .30$), while response accuracy is positively correlated with IQ ($r = .52$; Paulhus et al., 2003).

While there is very little research examining the relationship between over-claiming and faking, one study has found evidence that supports the use of the OCQ in this context. Bing,
Kluemper, Davison, Taylor, and Novicevic (2011) found that controlling for over-claiming improved the predictive validity of a self-report measure of achievement motivation. The authors suggest that measuring over-claiming may quite possibly assess the degree to which a respondent attempts to fake their responses.

_Hypothesis 3a:_ Over-claiming will predict overall interview faking.

An over-claiming applicant creates the impression that they possess certain knowledge that they do not actually have. This is similar to several image creation tactics involved in interview faking behavior, especially Embellishing and Inventing. While Extensive Image Creation and Slight Image Creation are two distinct factors, they share similar correlations with several variables (i.e., socially desirable responding, honesty, and trustworthiness; Levashina & Campion, 2007). Therefore, I believe that over-claiming will be similarly related to both factors of image creation. Because over-claiming is more closely related to image creation than Image Protection or Ingratiation, I believe that over-claiming scores will have stronger correlations with Extensive and Slight Image Creation than with the other two factors.

_Hypothesis 3b:_ Over-claiming will have stronger relationships with Extensive Image Creation and Slight Image Creation than with Image Protection or Ingratiation.

**Personality traits.** I believe that the Big Five personality traits will predict overall interview faking. A number of researchers have found that these variables predict engagement in IM and faking (e.g., Bourdage, Wiltshire, & Lee, 2015; McFarland & Ryan, 2000; Raymark & Tafero, 2009). Applicants who are conscientious are less likely to fake because they are “generally responsible and rule abiding” (McFarland & Ryan, 2000, p.814). On the other hand, individuals who are high in Neuroticism may be more willing to fake because they are so concerned with how they are perceived by others, while those high in Openness to Experience
are more willing to try new things (such as faking) than those low in Openness (McFarland & Ryan, 2000; Raymark & Tafero, 2009). The current study employed the mini-IPIP, developed by Donnellan, Oswald, Baird, and Lucas (2006), which includes Intellect/Imagination instead of Openness to Experience. Because many personality researchers consider these two traits to be relatively interchangeable (e.g., John & Srivastava, 1999), I believe that the ideas regarding Openness will also apply to Intellect/Imagination. Past researchers have also proposed that Extraversion and Agreeableness predict IM (e.g., Bourdage et al., 2015; Kristof-Brown et al., 2002; Van Iddekinge et al., 2007), based on the idea that individuals who are sociable, tolerant, and good-natured will be more likely to form and maintain positive impressions through tactics such as self-presentation and ingratiation.

Hypothesis 4a: Agreeableness, Extraversion, Intellect/Imagination, and Neuroticism will predict overall interview faking.

Hypothesis 4b: Conscientiousness will be negatively related to overall interview faking.

Self-monitoring. The limited research utilizing the IFB scale has identified one construct that relates to one factor of image creation and not the other: self-monitoring. People who self-monitor “regulate their self-presentation by tailoring their actions in accordance with immediate situational cues” (Lennox & Wolfe, 1984, p. 1349). Those high in self-monitoring are highly aware of social cues and use these cues to behave in a socially acceptable manner. During the job interview, applicants high in self-monitoring are likely to present a more positive image of themselves than those low in self-monitoring (Hogue et al., 2013; Levashina & Campion, 2006). Because self-monitoring is guided by an understanding of what is considered to be socially appropriate behavior, applicants who self-monitor during the interview are likely to engage in subtle forms of faking, as opposed to more extreme behaviors such as lying (e.g., Hogue et al.,
2013; Turnley & Bolino, 2001). Consistent with these theories, both Levashina and Campion (2007) and Hogue et al. (2013) found that self-monitoring was significantly and positively correlated with Slight Image Creation, but not with Extensive Image Creation. Self-monitoring also predicted Image Protection and Ingratiation, and its strongest correlation was with Ingratiation in both studies. Based on these findings, I propose the following hypotheses:

_Hypothesis 5a:_ Self-monitoring will predict overall interview faking.

_Hypothesis 5b:_ Self-monitoring will have a stronger relationship with Ingratiation than with the other factors of interview faking.

_Hypothesis 5c:_ Self-monitoring will not predict Extensive Image Creation.

**Status seeking.** Status seeking involves the desire to obtain respect and admiration from others (Anderson, Hildreth, & Howland, 2015). Highhouse, Brooks, and Wang (2016) found that status seeking was related to applicant self-presentation tactics, including ingratiation and faking. I believe the current research will generalize these results in the context of interview faking.

_Hypothesis 6:_ Status seeking will predict overall interview faking.

**Faking in the Interview and in General**

I contend that applicants who report faking in the employment interview will report faking in other parts of the application process as well. Therefore, I believe that general applicant faking will be positively correlated with interview faking. I will also explore the relationships between general applicant faking and the proposed characteristics to determine if interview faking and general applicant faking share similar antecedents.

_Hypothesis 7:_ There will be a positive relationship between general applicant faking and interview faking.

**Proposed Outcomes of Interview Faking**
I am also interested in the outcomes of interview faking. Specifically, I will be investigating the validity of overall interview faking in predicting two forms of extra-role performance behavior: counterproductive work behavior and organizational citizenship behavior. These behaviors are considered to be “extra-role” because they are not formally recognized by the organization as task performance, but still relate to the overall performance of the employee (Sackett, Berry, Wiemann, & Laczo, 2006).

**Counterproductive work behavior.** Peterson and colleagues (2011) note that because faking is a form of deception, it is possible that it may be associated with other deviant organizational behaviors. Indeed, these researchers found that applicant faking on a measure of Conscientiousness predicted later engagement in counterproductive work behavior after the applicants were hired. Counterproductive work behavior (CWB) consists of behavior that harms or is intended to harm the organization and/or stakeholders of the organization, including clients, coworkers, and supervisors (Spector & Fox, 2005). These behaviors include abusing coworkers, stealing supplies from the workplace, and intentionally performing unsatisfactory work (Spector et al., 2006). Beyond the immediate harm they cause the organization, these behaviors often lead to substantial financial losses as well. For example, Bennett and Robinson (2000) reported that the national costs of workplace theft reach as high as $120 billion each year.

It is likely that applicants who fake during selection and employees who engage in deviant behavior in the workplace share similar traits. One particular trait that comes to mind is Machiavellianism. In their model of applicant faking, Roulin and colleagues (2015) suggest that those high in Machiavellianism will be more motivated (and, therefore, more likely) to fake, and research on interview faking has found this to be the case (Hogue et al., 2013; Levashina & Campion, 2007). With regard to CWB, O’Boyle, Forsyth, Banks, and McDaniel (2012) suggest
that Machiavellians are “less constrained by the desire to abide by the normative requirements of fair social exchange and thus more likely to engage in interpersonal forms of CWB, such as mistreatment of coworkers and betrayal” (p. 559). In their meta-analysis of the Dark Triad, these same researchers found that Machiavellianism predicted CWB, with an unreliability-corrected correlation of .25.

Both theory and empirical evidence suggest that those who fake during the application process are likely to continue engaging in undesirable behavior in the form of counterproductive behavior at work. Given these findings, I believe that interview faking will predict later engagement in CWB.

_Hypothesis 8:_ Overall interview faking will be positively related to CWB.

**Organizational citizenship behavior.** Another form of extra-role/non-task behavior is organizational citizenship behavior (OCB), which is “individual behavior that in the aggregate promotes the effective functioning of the organization” (Organ, 1997, p. 86). Unlike CWB, which harms the organization, OCB is helpful and contributes to the effectiveness of the organization.

The link between applicant impression management and OCB is not yet understood. As it stands, research has only examined OCB in relation to incumbent impression management, as opposed to applicant faking. For example, several researchers have found that employees who were motivated to impress and look better than their colleagues were more likely to engage in OCB (Grant & Mayer, 2009; Kim, Dyne, Kamdar, & Johnson, 2013; Takeuchi, Bolino, & Lin, 2015). This would seem to suggest that interview faking would be positively related to OCB. However, applicant impression management is not equivalent to incumbent impression management, and there is currently no research that examines the connection between these two.
contexts of impression management. As such, it would be incorrect to assume that the outcomes of impression management are predicted similarly across separate contexts. Indeed, the very definition of interview faking indicates that the applicant is being dishonest. Therefore, it follows that a deceptive applicant who claims to engage in helpful organizational behavior will not actually engage in such behavior should they be hired for the job. Based on the aforementioned research, I propose the following hypothesis:

*Hypothesis 9:* Overall interview faking will be negatively related to OCB.
METHODS

Participants

The data for this survey were collected over the course of three separate time points. Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Lee, and Podsakoff (2003) note that predictor and criterion variables should be measured at separate time points in order to reduce common method bias. Therefore, the predictor variables were assessed at time one, the faking variables were assessed at time two, and the outcome variables were assessed at time three. Participants were recruited through Amazon Mechanical Turk (mTurk). This study was limited to US citizens who were currently employed, over the age of 18, and who had a job interview within the past four months. One week after the first survey was completed, these participants were notified that a second survey was available to them on mTurk. Only those who completed the first survey were able to participate in the second survey. One week after the second survey was completed, participants were notified that the third and final survey was available to them on mTurk. Only participants who had completed the first two surveys were granted access to the third survey.

After data collection, the three data files were merged into one file by matching the time 1, time 2, and time 3 data to each participant. This link was made possible by requesting each participant to provide his or her Mechanical Turk Worker ID number before completing each survey. Cases were excluded from data analyses based on response patterns and elapsed survey time. I included several attention checks in each survey (four in the first survey, three in the second, and two in the third survey). Participants who failed more than one attention check in the first or second surveys were excluded from the analyses; those who failed either attention check in the third survey were also removed. Finally, participants who finished the surveys in an unreasonable amount of time were excluded. Huang and colleagues (2012) state that, although
response time cutoff scores are difficult to justify, it is “unlikely for participants to respond to survey items faster than the rate of 2 s per item” (p. 106). For the present research, it was highly unlikely for a conscientious participant to complete any of the three surveys in less than two minutes.

Data screening occurred at the aggregate level. However, it was possible to track the rate of attrition over the course of the three studies. For the first study, 277 participants returned surveys with usable data. This number dropped to 174 for the second study. The final sample consisted of 134 participants. The majority of participants were female (55.2%), with a median age of 32. The sample was predominantly white (73.9%), followed by African American (9.7%) and Hispanic/Latino (8.2%). The majority of participants held a Bachelor’s degree or higher (65.7%). Sales was the most common occupation held by participants (14.9%), followed by business and finances (11.2%). Over half (51.5%) of participants indicated that they were offered the job that they interviewed for, and 43% currently work at the job. It is worth noting that almost half of the participants skipped the item that asked if they currently work at the job they interviewed for.

Measures

**Time one measures.** The following predictor measures were administered in the first wave. The order of these measures was counterbalanced.

**Big Five traits.** The Big Five personality traits were measured with the 20-item mini-IPIP scale, developed by Donnellan et al. (2006). This scale measures Extraversion, Agreeableness, Conscientiousness, Neuroticism, and Intellect/Imagination. Each personality trait is assessed with four items, with responses ranging from 1 = *strongly disagree* to 5 = *strongly agree.*
Competitive worldviews. Competitive Jungle Social World View scale (Duckitt et al., 2002). This 20-item scale assesses the strength of one’s competitive worldviews. Responses are rated on a 5-point Likert-type scale ranging from strongly disagree to strongly agree. Example items include “winning is not the first thing; it’s the only thing” and “money, wealth, and luxury are what really count in life”. In Roulin and Krings’ (2016) study, this scale showed adequate reliability ($\alpha = .90$).

Machiavellianism. Machiavellian Personality Scale (MPS; Dahling, Whitaker, & Levy, 2009). This 16-item measure consists of four sub-scales: Distrust of Others, Desire for Status, Desire for Control, and Amorality. The items are rated on a 5-point Likert scale. The reliability of the MPS in its validation study was .84 (Dahling et al., 2009).

Over-claiming. Over-Claiming Questionnaire (OCQ; Paulhus, 2005). The OCQ is a measure of self-reported knowledge. It consists of 150 items grouped into 10 different categories. Examples of categories include physical sciences, fine arts, and books and poems. Within each category, respondents indicate their level of familiarity with each item by rating familiarity on a Likert scale ranging from 1 (“never heard of it”) to 7 (“very familiar”). Each category is made up of 15 items, and 3 of these items are foils (i.e., they do not exist). A respondent is considered to be over-claiming if they indicate any level of knowledge about a foil item. The researchers calculate an accuracy score by subtracting the proportion of false alarms (number of foils that were rated higher than ‘1’) from the proportion of hits (number of real items that were rated higher than ‘1’). A bias score is calculated by adding these two proportions. The test-retest correlations of a preliminary study indicated adequate reliability ($r = .76$ and $.80$ for accuracy and bias scores, respectively; Paulhus et al., 2003). In order to reduce the number of
items presented to participants, the current study administered a shorted version of the OCQ that consists of four 15-item subscales (as opposed to ten subscales in the overall measure).

**Self-monitoring.** Revised Self-Monitoring Scale (Lennox & Wolfe, 1984). This scale consists of 13 items that assess self-monitoring across two dimensions: ability to modify self-presentation, and sensitivity to expressive behavior of others. A sample item from the first dimension is, “I have the ability to control the way I come across to people, depending on the impression I wish to give them.” A sample item from the second dimension is, “I am often able to read people’s true emotions correctly through their eyes.” All responses are rated on a 6-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (*always false*) to 6 (*always true*). Lennox and Wolfe (1984) reported a reliability coefficient of .75 for the entire scale.

**Status seeking.** Status Seeking Scale (Highhouse et al., 2016). The status seeking scale used in the Highhouse et al. study consists of four items in response to the stem: “When I am at work…” An example item is, “…I want people to envy me.” Responses are rated on a five-point Likert scale ranging from “strongly disagree” to “strongly agree”. Reliability coefficients ranged from .86 to .89 across three studies (Highhouse et al., 2016).

**Demographic items.** Several demographic items were also included. In addition to the aforementioned screening items pertaining to age and US citizenship, participants indicated their gender, ethnicity, level of education, employment status, and occupational category.

**Time two measures.** The following measures were assessed at time two. The order of these measures was counterbalanced.

**General applicant faking.** To measure the extent to which participants fake in the application process in general, I utilized 25 items adapted from scales developed by Donovan, Dwight, and Hurtz (2003) and König, Hafsteinsson, Jansen, and Stadelmann (2011). An example
item is: “When applying for the job, I exaggerated my work experiences to make myself look more impressive than I really am.” Responses are rated on the same 5-point Likert scale as used in the IFB scale.

**Interview faking.** Interview faking was assessed with the Interview Faking Behavior scale (IFB; Levashina & Campion, 2007). The scale assesses four factors of faking behavior: Extensive Image Creation, Slight Image Creation, Image Protection, and Ingratiation. The IFB consists of 54 items representing various interview strategies, with responses rated on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (“to no extent”) to 5 (“to a very great extent”). Respondents are asked to rate the extent to which they used each interview strategy in their last employment interview. Coefficient alphas for the four factors ranged from .90 to .95 in the initial studies (Levashina & Campion, 2007).

**Demographic items.** Participants were asked to indicate if they are currently employed at the job about which they answered interview faking items, and if they have had any previous experience as an interviewer.

**Time three measures.** The following outcome variables were measured at time three. The order of these measures was counterbalanced.

**Counterproductive work behavior.** CWB was measured with Spector et al.’s (2006) Counterproductive Work Behavior Checklist (CWB-C). This scale assesses the self-reported frequency of certain workplace behaviors with 32 items across five dimensions of CWB: abuse, production deviance, sabotage, theft, and withdrawal. Responses range from 1 = *never* to 5 = *every day*. An example of a production deviance item is, “purposely did your work incorrectly.”

**Organizational citizenship behavior.** Organizational citizenship behavior was measured with the Organizational Citizenship Behavior Checklist (OCB-C; Fox, Spector, Goh, Bruursema,
PREDICTORS AND OUTCOMES OF INTERVIEW FAKING BEHAVIOR

The OCB-C is a 20-item scale that measures the frequency of organizational citizenship behaviors performed by employees, who are asked “How often have you done each of the following things on your present job?” and check off such behaviors as picking up meals for coworkers and volunteering for extra work assignments. Test-takers respond on a five-point scale from 1 (never) to 5 (every day).

Procedure

The current study followed a three-wave design. In the first wave of the study, a survey was posted on mTurk as a Human Intelligence Task (HIT). Mechanical Turk workers who were qualified and willing to participate clicked on a survey link provided in the HIT, which redirected them to a Qualtrics survey. The survey began with a consent form. Participants who consented then completed screening questions to ensure they were US citizens over the age of 18 who had a job interview within the past four months. Participants then completed the time 1 measures, which included the proposed predictors of interview faking as well as several demographic questions (described below). The order of these measures was counterbalanced. Participants who completed the first survey were compensated $1.15 for their time.

The second wave of the study took place one week after the data from the first survey was collected. A message was sent to all of the participants from the first wave notifying them that they were eligible to complete the second survey. This message provided participants with search terms for the second survey (note: due to qualification restrictions, a survey link could not be provided to participants). This second survey was only available to mTurk workers who completed the first survey. As with the first survey, willing participants were taken to the Qualtrics survey, where they were presented with a consent form and the time two measures, which included a measure of interview faking behavior and a measure of general applicant
faking in the employment process. Participants who completed the second survey were compensated $0.50 for their time.

The third and final wave of the study took place one week after the data from the second survey was collected. Participants were notified in the same manner as outlined above. Those who were willing to participate were presented with a consent form and then completed the organizational outcome measures. Participants who completed this final survey were compensated $0.80.
RESULTS

The means, standard deviations, and reliabilities of the measures used in the study are reported in Table 1. Base rates of interview faking behaviors are presented in Table 2. These base rates are consistent with those reported by Levashina and Campion (2007). The intercorrelations among the predictor variables are presented in Table 4. All of the measures demonstrated adequate reliability, with the exception of the Production Deviance subscale of the CWB scale ($\alpha = .596$).

Hypothesis Testing

The current study proposed three sets of hypotheses, which are summarized in Table 3. All hypotheses were tested with bivariate correlations. The results of these hypothesis tests are detailed below. It is worth noting that these results differ depending on the sample being used. Most notably, self-monitoring and interview faking were significantly correlated with one another when using the larger sample (N=174) of Time 1 and Time 2 participants. However, as reported below, self-monitoring did not predict interview faking when the final sample (which consisted of participants from all three time points; N=134) was used.

Predicting faking behavior. The first set of hypotheses pertained to the relationships between predictor variables and faking behavior. Table 5 displays the correlations between predictor variables and the Interview Faking Behavior scale. The first hypothesis posited that Competitive Worldview (CW) would predict overall interview faking. This hypothesis was supported, with CW predicting total IFB score at $r = .27, p < .01$. As can be seen in Table 5, CW had stronger correlations with the Slight and Extensive Image Creation factors, with correlations of .32 and .34, respectively ($p$’s < .01). Although CW predicted overall interview faking, it did
not have a statistically significant correlation with the Ingratiation \((r = .12)\) factor of the IFB scale.

The second hypothesis was partially supported. Hypothesis 2a posited that Machiavellianism would predict overall IFB, which it did \((r = .36, p < .01)\); thus, this hypothesis was supported. Hypothesis 2b posited that Machiavellianism would have a stronger correlation with Ingratiation than with the other factors of interview faking. This hypothesis was not supported. While Machiavellianism had significant correlations with each of the four factors of the IFB scale, its strongest relationship was with Slight Image Creation \((r = .38, p < .01)\), not Ingratiation \((r = .27, p < .01)\). The difference between these two correlations was significantly different \((z = 2.31, p < .05)\). These results differ from the findings of past research (Hogue et al., 2013; Levashina & Campion, 2007).

Hypothesis 3a stated that over-claiming, as measured by bias on the Over-Claiming Questionnaire (OCQ), would predict overall interview faking. This hypothesis was not supported \((r = .08, n.s.)\). In fact, OCQ bias did not predict any of the factors of the IFB scale – thus, hypothesis 3b (which posited that over-claiming would have stronger correlations with Extensive Image Creation and Slight Image Creation than with Image Protection or Ingratiation) was also not supported.

The fourth hypothesis was weakly supported. Hypothesis 4a stated that Agreeableness, Extraversion, Intellect/Imagination, and Neuroticism would positively correlate with overall interview faking. Out of these four personality traits, only Neuroticism was significantly correlated with IFB scores \((r = .17, p < .05)\). Hypothesis 4b stated that the relationship between Conscientiousness and overall IFB scores would be negative. This hypothesis was not supported \((r = -.12, n.s.)\).
Hypothesis 5 was partially supported. Hypothesis 5a posited that self-monitoring would predict overall interview faking, which was not the case ($r = .13, n.s.$). Hypothesis 5b stated that self-monitoring would have a stronger correlation with Ingratiation than with the other factors of the IFB scale. In fact, Ingratiation was the only factor of the IFB scale that had a significant bivariate correlation with self-monitoring ($r = .26, p < .01$), which provides some support for this hypothesis. Lastly, hypothesis 5c stated that self-monitoring would not predict Extensive Image Creation, and this was also supported ($r = .07, n.s.$).

Finally, I hypothesized that status seeking would predict overall interview faking. Hypothesis 6 was supported ($r = .26, p < .01$). As can be seen in Table 5, status seeking was most strongly related to Slight Image Creation ($r = .32, p < .01$), and it did not predict Image Protection ($r = .14, n.s.$).

**Interview faking and faking in general.** Hypothesis 7 predicted that interview faking and general applicant faking would be positively related to one another. As can be seen in Table 6, this hypothesis was supported. The correlation between overall interview faking and general applicant faking was strong and positive ($r = .83, p < .01$). Among IFB subscales, general applicant faking was most strongly correlated with Slight Image Creation ($r = .85, p < .01$) and most weakly correlated with Ingratiation ($r = .65, p < .01$).

**Outcomes of faking.** The final set of hypotheses related to the outcomes of interview faking. Hypothesis 8 predicted a positive relationship between overall interview faking and CWB. This hypothesis was supported ($r = .42, p < .01$). As can be seen in Table 7, overall IFB scores were most strongly predictive of Withdrawal behavior ($r = .45, p < .001$). Furthermore, the results of a hierarchical regression indicated that interview faking predicted CWB above and beyond individual difference variables. Table 8 displays the results of this analysis. Individual
difference variables that had significant bivariate correlations with CWB were entered at step one, and IFB was entered at step two. As can be seen in the table, interview faking explained an additional 12% of the variance in CWB above and beyond these individual difference variables \([F (1,125) = 26.97, p < .001]\).

Hypothesis 9 posited that overall interview faking would be negatively related to OCB. Interestingly, this hypothesis was not supported \((r = .25, p < .01)\). All four factors of interview faking were positively correlated with OCB, with the strongest correlation existing between Ingratiation and OCB \((r = .31, p < .001)\). The relationship between OCB and CWB was positive \((r = .26, p < .01)\), which is consistent with past research that administered the same OCB and CWB scales used in the current study (Fox et al., 2011).

**Additional Analyses**

In addition to the above hypothesis tests, I conducted several exploratory analyses. These additional analyses consisted of assessing the relative importance of the predictors of interview faking, comparing the predictors and outcomes of interview faking to general faking, and examining the factor structure of the IFB scale. These analyses are explained in detail below.

**Relative importance of the predictors.** In order to assess the relative importance of the predictor variables, I first conducted a multiple regression analysis on the predictor variables that had significant bivariate correlations with overall interview faking. These predictors included Neuroticism, status seeking, CW, and Machiavellianism. I also included self-monitoring in this analysis because it contributed to the overall prediction of faking when it was included in the regression analysis, and it was a significant bivariate predictor in the smaller \((N=134)\) sample. I next conducted a relative weight analysis (Johnson, 2000) on these variables using RWA-Web (Tonidandel & LeBreton, 2014). The results of this analysis are presented in Table 9. 95%
confidence intervals for the individual relative weights (Johnson, 2004) and all corresponding significance tests were based on bootstrapping with 10,000 replications, which is the recommended method of Tonidandel and colleagues (2009). The weighted linear combination of the five predictor variables explained about 17% of the variance in interview faking ($R^2 = .166$).

After examining the relative weights (see column “RW” in Table 9), one can see that two of the variables explained a statistically significant amount of variance in interview faking, as none of the 95% confidence intervals for the significance tests contained zero. Machiavellianism was the most important variable (RW = .06), followed by CW (RW = .03). The 95% CIs for Neuroticism, self-monitoring, and status seeking contained zero, indicating that their respective relative weights were not significant.

The relative weight results differ somewhat from the results of the multiple regression analysis. In the multiple regression analysis, Neuroticism, status seeking, and CW did not provide statistically significant incremental prediction, holding the remaining two variables constant. However, the relative weight analysis found that CW did offer significant incremental prediction, while Neuroticism and status seeking did not. According to Tonidandel and colleagues (2009), this lack of agreement is not uncommon. In a traditional multiple regression, when predictor variables are correlated, they may not yield a significant incremental relationship even when they yield a significant bivariate relationship (Tonidandel & LeBreton, 2015). Relative weights, on the other hand, “are focused on explaining which predictors are explaining non-trivial variance in [the] outcomes (even in the presence of additional, correlated predictors)” (p.215). Therefore, the combined results presented in Table 9 suggest that self-monitoring, status seeking, and Neuroticism explain significant variance in interview faking, but the correlations between these and other variables lead to them explaining trivial incremental variance. Out of
these five predictor variables, Machiavellianism accounted for 39% of the variance in interview faking, and CW accounted for 20%.

The nature of faking. I also wanted to determine if the nature of the relationships for predictor and outcome variables was different depending on the manner of faking – that is, did interview faking have different relationships with predictors and outcomes when compared to general applicant faking?

For the most part, variables that predicted interview faking also predicted general applicant faking. However, there were several variables that predicted general faking, but not interview faking. Over-claiming bias ($r = .19, p < .05$), Conscientiousness ($r = -.21, p < .01$), and Agreeableness ($r = -.18, p < .05$) all predicted general applicant faking, but did not predict interview faking. With the exception of these three variables, general applicant faking and interview faking shared the same predictors, and the predictive relationships were generally stronger for general applicant faking than they were for overall interview faking (see Table 5).

With regard to the outcome variables, both interview faking and general faking predicted OCB in a similar manner ($r = .25$ for both faking measures). However, total CWB was predicted more strongly by general faking ($r = .52$) than it was by overall interview faking ($r = .42$). This was also the case with the various CWB subscales, with the sole exception being Withdrawal. The results of a multiple regression analysis indicate that this difference is statistically significant, with general faking explaining an additional 9% of the variance in total CWB scores over interview faking [$F (1, 132) = 15.71, p < .001$]. Together, the two faking scales accounted for about 27% of the variance in CWB.
DISCUSSION

The current study made several contributions to the research literature. First, it focused on faking in the context of the employment interview, which is not nearly as well-researched as faking on other selection devices (i.e., personality tests). Second, it identified several predictors and outcomes of interview faking, which will allow us to further study the impact of faking and how to predict it. Finally, the current study compared two different types of faking to each other in order to assess similarities and differences among relationships with key variables.

Predictors of Faking

The results of the current study indicate that interview faking can be predicted by a number of individual difference variables. Specifically, the current study found that Neuroticism and status seeking predicted engagement in interview faking behavior. Although the effect sizes were small (r’s = .17 and .26, respectively), these results contribute to our understanding of the types of people who engage in interview faking. In addition, the findings that Machiavellianism and CW predicted interview faking corroborate the results of past research (Hogue et al., 2013; Levashina & Campion, 2007; Roulin & Bourdage, 2017; Roulin & Krings, 2016). Hogue et al. (2013) and Levashina and Campion (2007) investigated the association between Machiavellianism and faking and found that Machiavellianism was most strongly related to the Ingratiation subscale of the IFB – however, this was not the case in the current study. Roulin and Krings (2016) used items from the IFB scale in their study, but only for the Extensive and Slight Image Creation subscales. The correlation between CW and these two factors of interview faking were consistent with the results of Roulin and Krings (2016). Unlike the findings of past research (Hogue et al., 2013; Levashina & Campion, 2007), self-monitoring did not predict overall interview faking in the current study. Self-monitoring was a significant predictor of interview
ingratiation, however \((r = .26, p < .01)\). While Ingratiation was the only factor of interview faking that had a significant bivariate correlation with self-monitoring in the current study, previous studies found that self-monitoring had its strongest predictive relationship with this factor (Hogue et al., 2013; Levashina & Campion, 2007). Thus, the results of the current study partially support these past findings.

Of the predictor variables, Machiavellianism and CW had the strongest bivariate relationships with interview faking, and they were the only predictors of faking with significant relative weights in a relative importance analysis. Taken together, these results suggest that applicants who are manipulative, competitive, neurotic, and striving to attain high status are more likely to fake in the interview. Many of these variables also predicted applicant faking in general, as shown in Table 5. Several variables (over-claiming bias, Agreeableness, Conscientiousness) predicted general applicant faking, but not interview faking. There is no clear explanation for this finding, and so this discrepancy may be important to investigate in future research.

Neuroticism was the only Big Five trait found to predict interview faking \((r = .17, p < .05)\). Neuroticism \((r = .19)\), Agreeableness \((- .18)\), and Conscientiousness \((- .21)\) predicted faking in general, albeit to a minor degree. These correlations are trivial when compared to the other predictors of faking, especially CW and Machiavellianism. Many organizations measure the Big Five personality traits of their applicants during the selection procedure, especially Conscientiousness, because they have been linked to a number of organizational outcomes (Hurtz & Donovan, 2000; Schmidt & Hunter, 1998). However, the results of the current study suggest that organizations must go beyond the Big Five in order to predict applicant faking. The predictive validities of these traits were weak, and variables such as Machiavellianism, CW, and
status seeking demonstrated stronger relationships with faking. Indeed, the results displayed in Table 11 demonstrate the substantial incremental validity of other individual difference variables over the Big Five in predicting interview faking. As can be seen in the table, the Big Five variables explain about 6% of the variance in interview faking, while the other four individual difference variables (Machiavellianism, CW, self-monitoring, and status seeking) explain an additional 15% of the variance in faking. Therefore, organizations that are concerned about applicant faking should consider measuring individual difference variables other than just the Big Five traits.

The current study posited that response bias on the Over-Claiming Questionnaire (OCQ) would predict interview faking. Response bias on the OCQ is calculated by summing the proportion of “hits” (the number of real items that were rated as familiar) and the proportion of “false alarms” (the number of foils that were rated as familiar). This bias value captures one’s proclivity for claiming familiarity with a variety of words, both real and fake. The results of the current study found that response bias was not significantly related to interview faking ($r = .08$, n.s.). Interestingly, OCQ response bias did predict general applicant faking ($r = .19$, $p < .05$). This may be due to the effects of the different contexts of application faking. It is one thing for an applicant to claim knowledge that they do not actually have (i.e., response bias) on their résumé, but it is an entirely different thing to claim such knowledge in an interview. During an employment interview, the consequences of the applicant’s behaviors are more immediate than in submitting a résumé online. Because the interview is a social interaction, the applicant must be ready and able to back up their statements immediately – if the applicant is not prepared to deceive their interviewer face-to-face, then they may be less likely to engage in such behavior.
In contrast to response bias is response accuracy, which is calculated by subtracting the proportion of false alarms from the proportion of hits. Paulhus, Harms, and colleagues (2003; 2004) have found that accuracy on the OCQ is strongly related to cognitive ability and may in fact be used as a proxy for intelligence. In the current study, accuracy on the OCQ was negatively correlated with interview faking ($r = -0.29$), which is consistent with the findings of Levashina and colleagues (2009). These researchers suggest that applicants with high cognitive ability will be less likely to fake because a) they do not feel the need to fake, given their high mental abilities; b) they believe that the potential negative consequences of being caught faking outweigh any potential benefits; or c) they only fake on select items that they believe to be more important for the job, and as such their faking scores are lower than they would be if they had faked on all items. It is important to note that the current study only utilized four of the ten OCQ subscales, which considerably reduced the number of foil items administered to the participants (i.e., 12 foil items instead of the normal 30). This may have influenced the results of the current study.

**Outcomes of Faking**

The current study also identified two outcomes of faking: OCB and CWB. As expected, applicant faking was positively related to counterproductive behavior at work. Of the four dimensions of interview faking, Extensive Image Creation had the strongest correlation to overall CWB ($r = 0.49, p < .01$). It makes sense that the most severe form of interview faking predicted CWB to a greater degree than the other, milder forms of faking. Interview faking and CWB both represent negative behaviors that take place across two separate dimensions of work: pre- and post-employment. The finding that undesirable behavior during the application process
can predict future undesirable behavior if the applicant is later employed is an important one for practitioners to understand.

The current study also predicted that OCB would be negatively related to applicant faking. Surprisingly, this hypothesis was not supported. Instead, faking in the interview and in general were both positively associated with organizational citizenship. In other words, the more an applicant faked, the more likely they were to engage in both helpful and harmful extra-role behaviors at work. Counter to what was originally hypothesized, this finding indicates that applicant IM and incumbent IM might share similar outcomes. Due to previous findings that OCB is related to incumbent IM – and that it may in fact be a form of incumbent IM – one can speculate that a positive relationship between applicant IM and incumbent IM may be responsible for the positive relationship between applicant IM and OCB. Further research on this topic must be conducted before any conclusions can be drawn, however. The relationship between OCB and CWB was positive \( r = .26, p < .01 \), which is consistent with the work of Fox and colleagues (2011). These researchers found evidence for a positive relationship between measures of OCB and CWB when OCB items measure helpful behaviors rather than the absence of CWB, and when both measures utilize frequency response format instead of agreement. Using the same measures that were administered in the current study, these researchers found a weak, positive correlation between OCB and CWB \( r = .11, p < .05 \). Therefore, the fact that the current study found a weak, positive correlation between these two constructs is not surprising.

**Implications**

The findings of the current study have several important implications for the field of organizational psychology. First of all, the current study identified several individual difference variables that predicted interview faking. Of these variables, the results of multiple regression
and relative weight analyses indicated that Machiavellianism and CW were the most important variables in predicting interview faking. These findings are important for both researchers and practitioners, as they now know the variables that have been shown to predict interview faking. This information can be used to generate future research on faking and to potentially screen out applicants who show a proclivity to fake in the interview.

Second, the present research demonstrated that interview faking is associated with deviant work behavior, making it a point of concern for practitioners. Many researchers have examined faking in selection and although many agree that it is a common occurrence, a substantial amount of researchers disagree on its impact. For example, several researchers believe that response distortion on personality measures does not reduce its criterion-related validity (Barrick & Mount, 1996; Hogan, Hogan, & Roberts, 1996). The findings of the current study suggest that faking in the employment interview can lead to CWB, which can subsequently result in disastrous consequences for the organization. One might argue that faking and CWB are both simply negative outcomes of the same negative traits (i.e., Machiavellianism, CW, Neuroticism). However, the results of a hierarchical regression analysis (Table 8) demonstrated that interview faking predicted CWB above and beyond individual difference variables. This indicates that faking and CWB are not simply the direct outcomes of individual traits; rather, these behaviors are related but separate events that occur throughout the selection and employment process. Interestingly, faking was positively associated with citizenship behavior in the workplace. While the strength of this relationship is weaker than the relationship between faking and CWB, it is still significant and must be considered. More research is needed in order to examine the generalizability of this finding.
Finally, the current study found that interview faking and general applicant faking are similar to one another, both in terms of their predictors and their outcomes. Both forms of faking were strongly related to one another \( r = .79 \) and shared many of the same predictors, although the correlations were generally stronger for general application faking than for interview faking. They also shared similar predictive validities with OCB and CWB, although general faking predicted CWB above and beyond interview faking \( \Delta R^2 = .09 \); see Table 10. This is to be expected, as the general applicant faking items pertained to faking in several selection devices beyond the interview, such as the resume and personality tests. On the other hand, the 9% increase in predictive validity for general faking over interview faking is somewhat small, indicating that faking during the interview may be more important in predicting CWB than faking in other aspects of the application. However, this conclusion is unsubstantiated, given that the current study did not directly assess other specific forms of faking (i.e., personality test, integrity test, etc.).

**Limitations and Future Directions**

There were a number of limitations to the current study. The primary limitation was the sample of participants. First, the sample suffered from attrition between the first and final time points, dropping from 277 to 134 participants (48%). While a sample of 134 participants is large enough to accurately estimate bivariate correlations and multiple regressions (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007), a larger sample size would have been preferable. One interesting consequence of this small sample size is that the relationship between self-monitoring and interview faking was not significant in the larger sample consisting of time 1 and time 2 participants, but it was significant when using the smaller sample that consisted of participants from all three time points. Given that the non-significant relationship between self-monitoring and interview faking
found in the current study was different from past research (Hogue et al., 2013; Levashina & Campion, 2007), a larger sample may have led to different findings. In addition, the sample consisted entirely of Amazon mTurk workers. While many procedures were undertaken in order to ensure that the final sample consisted of the most reliable and conscientious responses, there is no denying that the nature of this sampling method can lead to concerns about the generalizability of the findings.

Another limitation of the current study was the use of self-report data. Self-report data can be influenced by a number of factors, including response bias, which was the topic of the current study. However, considering this study was conducted on mTurk and not in an actual organization, it is unlikely that participants’ responses were biased to a significant degree. Participants were assured that their information would remain confidential, and there was no way for the researcher to identify the participants (with the exception of the participants who emailed the researcher with questions, in which case their name and email address were displayed to the researcher. However, these interactions were minimal and the researcher did not record any personally identifying information). In addition, response distributions of the measures used in the study were similar to those reported in the literature. A third limitation was method bias, as many of the measures included in the current study used the same or similar response scales (i.e., five-point Likert scales). This limitation was alleviated somewhat by splitting up the study into three time points. This way, participants did not have to answer a large amount of similar items all at once.

The results of this study have generated more research questions and thus many ideas for future research. Future research efforts could be directed at investigating the positive correlation between faking and OCB. Was this just a product of the sample, or can this result be replicated?
Recall that both interview faking and faking in general predicted OCB, which indicates that this relationship likely exists at the broader level of applicant faking instead of being specific to the scales used in the current study.

In addition, researchers should examine how the constructs studied here may fit into a larger model. Several researchers (e.g., Goffin & Boyd, 2009; Levashina & Campion, 2006; Roulin et al., 2015) have proposed models of applicant faking involving latent constructs such as ability to fake, motivation to fake, and opportunity to fake. However, none of these models have been empirically tested. Researchers could use the results of the current study to work towards testing a model of applicant faking. Researchers could also test a simple model consisting of predictors of faking, faking, and outcomes of faking, using the variables included in the current study.
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APPENDIX A

Measures

A. Mini-IPIP (Donnellan et al., 2006)

The following statements pertain to your personality. Please indicate how accurately each statement describes you.

1. Am the life of the party
2. Don't talk a lot
3. Talk to a lot of different people at parties
4. Keep in the background
5. Sympathize with others' feelings
6. Am not interested in other people's problems
7. Feel others' emotions
8. Am not really interested in others
9. Get chores done right away
10. Often forget to put things back in their proper place
11. Like order
12. Make a mess of things
13. Have frequent mood swings
14. Am relaxed most of the time
15. Get upset easily
16. Seldom feel blue
17. Have a vivid imagination
18. Am not interested in abstract ideas
19. Have difficulty understanding abstract ideas
20. Do not have a good imagination

Very inaccurate = 1
Moderately inaccurate = 2
Neither accurate nor inaccurate = 3
Moderately accurate = 4
Very accurate = 5

B. Competitive Jungle Social World View scale (Duckitt et al., 2002)

Please indicate the degree to which you agree or disagree with each of the following items.

1. Winning is not the first thing; it’s the only thing.
2. The best way to lead a group under one’s supervision is to show them kindness, consideration, and treat them as fellow workers, not as inferiors.
3. If one has power in a situation, one should use it however one has to in order to get one’s way.
4. If it’s necessary to be cold-blooded and vengeful to reach one’s goals, then one should do it.
5. Life is not governed by the “survival of the fittest.” We should let compassion and moral laws be our guide.
6. Money, wealth and luxury are what really count in life.
7. It is better to be loved than to be feared.
8. It is much more important in life to have integrity in your dealings with others than to have money and power.
9. It’s a dog-eat-dog world where you have to be ruthless at times.
10. Charity (i.e., giving somebody something for nothing) is admirable not stupid.
11. You know that most people are out to “screw” you, so you have to get them first when you get the chance.
12. All in all it is better to be humble and honest than important and dishonest.
13. My knowledge and experience tells me that the social world we live in is basically a competitive “jungle” in which the fittest survive and succeed, in which power, wealth, and winning are everything, and might is right.
14. Honesty is the best policy in all cases.
15. There is really no such thing as “right” and “wrong”. It all boils down to what you can get away with.
16. Do unto others as you would have them do unto you, and never do anything unfair to someone else.
17. One of the most useful skills a person should develop is how to look someone straight in the eye and lie convincingly.
18. Basically people are objects to be quietly and coolly manipulated for one’s own benefit.
19. One should give others the benefit of the doubt. Most people are trustworthy if you have faith in them.
20. We can make a society based on unselfish cooperation, sharing and people generously helping each other, and NOT on competition and acquisitiveness.

Strongly disagree = 1
Disagree = 2
Neither agree nor disagree = 3
Agree = 4
Strongly agree = 5

C. Machiavellian Personality Scale (Dahling et al., 2009)

Please indicate the degree to which you agree or disagree with each of the following items.

1. I am willing to be unethical if I believe it will help me succeed.
2. I am willing to sabotage the efforts of other people if they threaten my own goals.
3. I would cheat if there was a low chance of getting caught.
4. I believe that lying is necessary to maintain a competitive advantage over others.
5. The only good reason to talk to others is to get information that I can use to my benefit.
6. I like to give the orders in interpersonal situations.
7. I enjoy being able to control the situation.
8. I enjoy having control over other people.
9. Status is a good sign of success in life.
10. Accumulating wealth is an important goal for me.
11. I want to be rich and powerful someday.
12. People are only motivated by personal gain.
13. I dislike committing to groups because I don't trust others.
14. Team members backstab each other all the time to get ahead.
15. If I show any weakness at work, other people will take advantage of it.
16. Other people are always planning ways to take advantage of the situation at my expense.

*Strongly disagree = 1*

*Disagree = 2*

*Neither agree nor disagree = 3*

*Agree = 4*

*Strongly agree = 5*

D. Over-Claiming Questionnaire (Paulhus, 2005) [shortened version]

*For the following questions, please rate your familiarity with each item by clicking the circle that corresponds to the appropriate number. The numbers range from 1 to 5, with 1 corresponding to the lowest level of familiarity ("Never heard of it") and 5 corresponding to the highest level of familiarity ("Very familiar").*

Historical Names and Events

1. Napoleon
2. Robespierre
3. El Puente
4. My Lai
5. The Lusitania
6. Ronald Reagan
7. Prince Lorenzo
8. The Luddites
9. Neville Chamberlain
10. Vichy Government
11. Queen Shattuck
12. Bay of Pigs
13. Torquemada
14. Wounded Knee
15. Clara Barton
Fine Arts

1. Mozart
2. a cappella
3. Pullman paintings
4. art deco
5. Paul Gauguin
6. Mona Lisa
7. La Neige Jaune
8. Mario Lanza
9. Verdi
10. Vermeer
11. Jackson Howell
12. Grand Pooh Bah
13. Botticelli
14. harpsichord
15. dramatis personae

Physical Sciences

1. Manhattan Project
2. planets
3. nuclear fusion
4. cholarine
5. atomic number
6. hydroponics
7. alloy
8. plate tectonics
9. photon
10. ultra-lipid
11. centripetal force
12. plates of parallax
13. nebula
14. particle accelerator
15. satellite

Life Sciences

1. mammal
2. adrenal gland
3. sciatica
4. insulin
5. meta-toxins
6. intestine
7. bio-sexual
8. meiosis
9. ribonucleic acid
10. electrocardiograph
11. amniotic sac
12. hemoglobin
13. retroplex
14. antigen
15. recessive trait

Never heard of it = 1
Somewhat familiar = 3
Very familiar = 5

E. Revised Self-Monitoring Scale (Lennox & Wolfe, 1984)

Please indicate the degree to which each of the following statements is true for you.

1. In social situations, I have the ability to alter my behavior if I feel that something else is called for.
2. I have the ability to control the way I come across to people, depending on the impression I wish to give them.
3. When I feel that the image I am portraying isn’t working, I can readily change it to something that does.
4. I have trouble changing my behavior to suit different people and different situations.
5. I have found that I can adjust my behavior to meet the requirements of any situation I find myself in.
6. Even when it might be to my advantage, I have difficulty putting up a good front.
7. Once I know what the situation calls for, it’s easy for me to regulate my actions accordingly.
8. I am often able to read people’s true emotions correctly through their eyes.
9. In conversations, I am sensitive to even the slightest change in the facial expression of the person I’m conversing with.
10. My powers of intuition are quite good when it comes to understanding others’ emotions and motives.
11. I can usually tell when others consider a joke to be in bad taste, even though they may laugh convincingly.
12. I can usually tell when I’ve said something inappropriate by reading it in the listener’s eyes.
13. If someone is lying to me, I usually know it at once from that person’s manner of expression.

Always true = 1
Generally true = 2
Somewhat true = 3
Somewhat false = 4
Generally false = 5
Always false = 6
F. Status Seeking Scale (Highhouse et al., 2016)

When I am at work...

1. …I want people to envy me.
2. …I want to have a high-status reputation.
3. …I want to be impressive.
4. …I want to be seen as a person of importance.

Strongly disagree = 1
Disagree = 2
Neither agree nor disagree = 3
Agree = 4
Strongly agree = 5

G. General Applicant Faking items (adapted from Donovan et al., 2003 and König et al., 2011)

Please think about the last time you applied for a job. Which of the following strategies did you use during the application process? Rate the extent to which you used each strategy by selecting the appropriate response choice.

1. I overemphasized or exaggerated my positive attributes during the application process (e.g., hardworking, detail orientation, efficiency).
2. I outright fabricated or made up information about myself when applying for the job so as to maximize the chances of me getting hired for the job.
3. When applying for the job, I exaggerated my work experiences to make myself look more impressive than I really am.
4. When applying for the job, I listed awards or distinctions on my resume or application form that I did not actually receive.
5. When applying for the job, I claimed to have experience that I didn’t actually have.
6. When applying for the job, I inflated a past pay rate to get a larger starting salary/pay at the new job.
7. When applying for the job, I claimed to have knowledge that I did not have.
8. When applying for the job, I inflated a past pay rate to appear more impressive.
9. When applying for the job, I exaggerated my past work or performance evaluations to make myself look like a better employee.
10. When applying for the job, I exaggerated my skills to my benefit.
11. When applying for the job, I exaggerated qualities or characteristics of myself such as dependability and reliability.
12. When applying for the job, I overstated my ability to get along with management.
13. When applying for the job, I gave false opinions.
14. When applying for the job, I gave a false age in order to gain employment.
15. When applying for the job, I tried to portray myself as more agreeable (trusting, empathetic, cooperative) than I really am.
16. When applying for the job, I fabricated or made up some of my educational accomplishments.
17. When applying for the job, I claimed to have more education than I actually did.
18. When applying for the job, I overstated the excellence of my attendance record at previous jobs.
19. When applying for the job, I gave responses on a test or questionnaire that were completely false or made up.
20. When applying for the job, I exaggerated my positive characteristics or traits on a test or a questionnaire to make myself look better than I actually am.
21. When applying for the job, I tended to deemphasize or “play down” what some might consider my negative attributes.
22. When applying for the job, I exaggerated the content and responsibility of my previous jobs.
23. When nominating references, I selected individuals that I knew would portray me more positively than I deserve.
24. When applying for the job, I pretended to be more interested in the job than I really was.
25. When applying for the job, I handed in faked certificates or documents.

To no extent = 1
To a little extent = 2
To a moderate extent = 3
To a considerable extent = 4
To a very great extent = 5

H. Interview Faking Behavior scale (Levashina & Campion, 2007)

Please think about the last employment interview that you had. What strategies from the list below did you use during your last interview? Rate the extent to which you used each strategy by selecting the appropriate response choice.

1. I told fictional stories prepared in advance of the interview to best present my credentials.
2. I fabricated examples to show my fit with the organization.
3. I made up stories about my work experiences that were well developed and logical.
4. I constructed fictional stories to explain the gaps in my work experiences.
5. I told stories that contained both real and fictional work experiences.
6. I combined, modified and distorted my work experiences in my answers.
7. I used made-up stories for most questions.
8. I claimed that I have skills that I do not have.
9. I made up measurable outcomes of performed tasks.
10. I promised that I could meet all job requirements (e.g., working late or on weekends), even though I probably could not.
11. I misrepresented the description of an event.
12. I stretched the truth to give a good answer.
13. I invented some work situations or accomplishments that did not really occur.
14. I told some “little white lies” in the interview.
15. My answers were based on examples of job performance of other employees.
16. When I did not have a good answer, I borrowed work experiences of other people and made them sound like my own.
17. I used other people’s experiences to create answers when I did not have good experiences of my own.
18. I said that it would take less time to learn the job than I knew it would.
19. I exaggerated my future goals.
20. I exaggerated my responsibilities on my previous jobs.
21. I exaggerated the impact of my performance in my past jobs.
22. During the interview, I distorted my answers based on the comments or reactions of the interviewer.
23. During the interview, I distorted my answers to emphasize what the interviewer was looking for.
24. I distorted my answers based on the information about the job I obtained during the interview.
25. I distorted my work experience to fit the interviewer's view of the position.
26. I distorted my qualifications to match qualifications required for the job.
27. I tried to find out about the organization's culture and then use that information to fabricate my answers.
28. I enhanced my fit with the job in terms of attitudes, values, or beliefs.
29. I inflated the fit between my values and goals and values and goals of the organization.
30. I inflated the fit between my credentials and needs of the organization.
31. I tried to use information about the company to make my answers sound like I was a better fit than I actually was.
32. When asked directly, I tried to say nothing about my real job-related weaknesses.
33. I tried to avoid discussion of job tasks that I may not be able to do.
34. I tried to avoid discussing my lack of skills or experiences.
35. When asked directly, I did not mention my true reason for quitting previous job.
36. I did not reveal my true career intentions about working with the hiring organization.
37. When asked directly, I did not mention some problems that I had in past jobs.
38. I did not reveal requested information that might hurt my chances of getting a job.
39. I covered up some “skeletons in my closet”.
40. I tried to suppress my connection to negative events in my work history.
41. I clearly separated myself from my past work experiences that would reflect poorly on me.
42. I tried to convince the interviewer that factors outside of my control were responsible for some negative outcomes even though it was my responsibility.
43. I tried to adjust my answers to the interviewer’s values and beliefs.
44. I tried to agree with the interviewer outwardly even when I disagree inwardly.
45. I tried to find out the interviewer’s views and incorporate them in my answers as my own.
46. I tried to express the same opinions and attitudes as the interviewer.
47. I tried to appear similar to the interviewer in terms of values, attitudes, or beliefs.
48. I tried to express enthusiasm or interest in anything the interviewer appeared to like even if I did not like it.
49. I did not express my opinions when they contradicted the interviewer's opinions.
50. I tried to show that I shared the interviewer’s views and ideas even if I did not.
51. I laughed at the interviewer’s jokes even when they were not funny.
52. I exaggerated the interviewer's qualities to create the impression that I think highly of him/her.
53. I exaggerated my positive comments about the organization.
54. I complimented the organization on something, however insignificant it may actually be to me.

*To no extent = 1*
*To a little extent = 2*
*To a moderate extent = 3*
*To a considerable extent = 4*
*To a very great extent = 5*

I. Counterproductive Work Behavior Checklist (Spector et al., 2006)

*How often have you done each of the following things on your present job?*

1. Purposely wasted your employer’s materials/supplies
2. Purposely did your work incorrectly
3. Came to work late without permission
4. Stayed home from work and said you were sick when you weren’t
5. Purposely damaged a piece of equipment or property
6. Purposely dirtied or littered your place of work
7. Stolen something belonging to your employer
8. Started or continued a damaging or harmful rumor at work
9. Been nasty or rude to a client or customer
10. Purposely worked slowly when things needed to get done
11. Taken a longer break than you were allowed to take
12. Purposely failed to follow instructions
13. Left work earlier than you were allowed to
14. Insulted someone about their job performance
15. Made fun of someone’s personal life
16. Took supplies or tools home without permission
17. Put in to be paid for more hours than you worked
18. Took money from your employer without permission
19. Ignored someone at work
20. Blamed someone at work for an error you made
21. Started an argument with someone at work
22. Stole something belonging to someone at work
23. Verbally abused someone at work
24. Made an obscene gesture (such as the finger) to someone at work
25. Threatened someone at work with violence
26. Threatened someone at work, but not physically
27. Said something obscene to someone at work to make them feel bad
28. Did something to make someone at work look bad
29. Played a mean prank to embarrass someone at work
30. Looked at someone at work’s private mail/property without permission
31. Hit or pushed someone at work
32. Insulted or made fun of someone at work

Never = 1
Once or twice = 2
Once or twice per month = 3
Once or twice per week = 4
Every day = 5

J. Organizational Citizenship Behavior Checklist (Fox et al., 2011)

How often have you done each of the following things on your present job?

1. Picked up meal for others at work.
2. Took time to advise, coach, or mentor a co-worker.
3. Helped a co-worker learn new skills or shared job knowledge.
4. Helped new employees get oriented to the job.
5. Lent a compassionate ear when someone had a work problem.
6. Lent a compassionate ear when someone had a personal problem.
7. Changed vacation schedule, work days, or shifts to accommodate co-worker’s needs.
8. Offered suggestions to improve how work is done.
9. Offered suggestions for improving the work environment.
10. Finished something for a co-worker who had to leave early.
11. Helped a less capable co-worker lift a heavy box or other object.
12. Helped a co-worker who had too much to do.
13. Volunteered for extra work assignments.
14. Took phone messages for an absent or busy co-worker.
15. Said good things about your employer in front of others.
16. Gave up meals and other breaks to complete work.
17. Volunteered to help a co-worker deal with a difficult customer, vendor, or co-worker.
18. Went out of the way to give a co-worker encouragement or express appreciation.
19. Decorated, straightened up, or otherwise beautified common work space.
20. Defended a co-worker who was being "put-down" or spoken ill of by other co-workers or supervisors.

Never = 1
Once or twice = 2
Once or twice per month = 3
Once or twice per week = 4
Every day = 5
APPENDIX B

HSRB Approval Form

Thank you for your submission of Revision materials for this project. The Bowling Green State University Human Subjects Review Board has determined this project is exempt from IRB review according to federal regulations AND that the proposed research has met the principles outlined in the Belmont Report.

Note that an amendment may not be made to exempt research because of the possibility that proposed changes may change the research in such a way that it is no longer meets the criteria for exemption. A new application must be submitted and reviewed prior to modifying the research activity, unless the researcher believes that the change must be made to prevent harm to participants. In these cases, the Office of Research Compliance must be notified as soon as practicable.

To facilitate your review, we administratively reviewed the amendment request and found that the proposed changes will not change the exempt status of your project. You can implement these changes.

We will retain a copy of this correspondence within our records. If you have any questions, please contact Kristin Hagemyer at 419-372-7716 or khagemy@bgsu.edu. Please include your project title and reference number in all correspondence with this committee.

This letter has been electronically signed in accordance with all applicable regulations, and a copy is retained within Bowling Green State University Human Subjects Review Board’s records.
APPENDIX C

Data Tables

Table 1
Descriptive Statistics of Study Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>α</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Time One Measures</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCQ - Hit Percentage</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCQ - False Alarm Percentage</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.823</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Machiavellianism</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>.908</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competitive Worldview</td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.932</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-monitoring</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.896</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status Seeking</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>.858</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extraversion</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>.880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreeableness</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.787</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conscientiousness</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>.760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neuroticism</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>.846</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intellect</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>.778</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Time Two Measures</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Interview Faking</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>.983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extensive Image Creation</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.958</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slight Image Creation</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>.961</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Image Protection</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>.946</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ingratiation</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>.963</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Applicant Faking</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>.963</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Time Three Measures</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Citizenship Behavior</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.919</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counterproductive Work Behavior</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.966</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abuse</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.962</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Production Deviance</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.596</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sabotage</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.830</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theft</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Withdrawal</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.809</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: N=134. With the exception of the OCQ, all scale means and standard deviations have been converted to a 5-point scale.
Table 2

*Base Rates of Interview Faking Behaviors*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Faking Behavior</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Item Mean</th>
<th>Base Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ext. Image Creation</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>83.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constructing</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>63.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inventing</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>82.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borrowing</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>38.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slight Image Creation</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>84.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Embellishing</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>76.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tailoring</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>73.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fit Enhancement</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>73.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Image Protection</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>82.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Omitting</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.01</td>
<td>73.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masking</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>68.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distancing</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ingratiation</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>90.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opinion Conforming</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>83.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other-Enhancing</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>84.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Faking</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>96.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: N=174*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Hypothesis Statement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Set One</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>CW will be positively related to overall IFB.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Machiavellianism will be positively related to overall IFB.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>b) Machiavellianism will have strongest relationship with Ingratiation subscale of IFB.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Over-claiming will predict overall IFB.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>b) Over-claiming will have stronger relationships with EIC, SIC than other IFB subscales.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Agreeableness, Extraversion, Intellect, &amp; Neuroticism will be positively related to overall IFB.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>b) Conscientiousness will be negatively related to overall IFB.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Self-monitoring will be positively related to overall IFB.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>b) Self-monitoring will have a stronger relationship with Ingratiation subscale of IFB.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Self-monitoring will not predict EIC.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Status seeking will be positively related to overall IFB.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Set Two</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Interview faking will be positively related to general applicant faking.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Set Three</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Overall IFB will be positively related to CWB.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Overall IFB will be negatively related to OCB.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: CW = Competitive Worldview, IFB = Interview Faking Behavior Scale, EIC = Extensive Image Creation, SIC = Slight Image Creation, CWB = Counterproductive Work Behavior, OCB = Organizational Citizenship Behavior*
Table 4

*Intercorrelations Among Predictor Variables*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mach.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comp. World.</td>
<td>.77**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-monitoring</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.19*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status Seeking</td>
<td>.54**</td>
<td>.43**</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extra.</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.22**</td>
<td>.18*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree.</td>
<td>-.35**</td>
<td>-.45**</td>
<td>.32**</td>
<td>-.23**</td>
<td>.20**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consc.</td>
<td>-.23**</td>
<td>-.33**</td>
<td>.24**</td>
<td>-.18*</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.29**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neuro.</td>
<td>.18*</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>-.19*</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>-.18*</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>-.39**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intellect</td>
<td>-.15*</td>
<td>-.16*</td>
<td>.20**</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.19*</td>
<td>.36**</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCQ – Acc.</td>
<td>-.35**</td>
<td>-.39**</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.16*</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCQ - Bias</td>
<td>.16*</td>
<td>.25**</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-.54**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: N=174. *p < .05, **p < .01.*
### Table 5

**Correlations Between Predictor Variables and Faking Behavior**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Overall Interview Faking</th>
<th>Ext. Image Creation</th>
<th>Slight Image Creation</th>
<th>Image Protection</th>
<th>Ingratiation</th>
<th>Gen. Applicant Faking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comp. World</td>
<td>.27**</td>
<td>.34**</td>
<td>.32**</td>
<td>.17*</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.39**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mach.</td>
<td>.36**</td>
<td>.35**</td>
<td>.38**</td>
<td>.28**</td>
<td>.27**</td>
<td>.41**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCQ – Acc.</td>
<td>-.29**</td>
<td>-.35**</td>
<td>-.28**</td>
<td>-.20**</td>
<td>-.23**</td>
<td>-.43**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCQ – Bias</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.19*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree.</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>-.19*</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.18*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consc.</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.21**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extra.</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.18*</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intellect</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neuro.</td>
<td>.17*</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.20**</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.19*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-monitoring</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.26**</td>
<td>-.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status Seeking</td>
<td>.26**</td>
<td>.27**</td>
<td>.32**</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.20**</td>
<td>.29**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: N=174. * p < .05, ** p < .01.*
Table 6  
**Correlations Among Faking Measures**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>EIC</th>
<th>SIC</th>
<th>IP</th>
<th>ING</th>
<th>IFB total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extensive Image Creation</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slight Image Creation</td>
<td>.82**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Image Protection</td>
<td>.71**</td>
<td>.77**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ingratiation</td>
<td>.68**</td>
<td>.78**</td>
<td>.77**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IFB total</td>
<td>.89**</td>
<td>.93**</td>
<td>.90**</td>
<td>.89**</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Faking</td>
<td>.79**</td>
<td>.85**</td>
<td>.70**</td>
<td>.65**</td>
<td>.83**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: N=174. * p < .05, ** p < .01. EIC = Extensive Image Creation, SIC = Slight Image Creation, IP = Image Protection, ING = Ingratiation
### Table 7
**Correlations Between Faking and Job Performance**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>OCB</th>
<th>CWB Total</th>
<th>Production Deviance</th>
<th>Sabotage</th>
<th>Theft</th>
<th>Withdrawal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IFB</td>
<td>.25**</td>
<td>.42**</td>
<td>.38**</td>
<td>.38**</td>
<td>.32**</td>
<td>.27**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EIC</td>
<td>.23**</td>
<td>.49**</td>
<td>.45**</td>
<td>.43**</td>
<td>.39**</td>
<td>.34**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIC</td>
<td>.17*</td>
<td>.40**</td>
<td>.34**</td>
<td>.37**</td>
<td>.32**</td>
<td>.28**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IP</td>
<td>.19*</td>
<td>.32**</td>
<td>.30**</td>
<td>.31**</td>
<td>.26**</td>
<td>.17*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ING</td>
<td>.31**</td>
<td>.32**</td>
<td>.28**</td>
<td>.27**</td>
<td>.19*</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen. Faking</td>
<td>.25**</td>
<td>.52**</td>
<td>.48**</td>
<td>.48**</td>
<td>.48**</td>
<td>.39**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: N=134. *p < .05, **p < .01. IFB = Overall Interview Faking Behavior, EIC = Extensive Image Creation, SIC = Slight Image Creation, IP = Image Protection, ING = Ingratiation, OCB = Organizational Citizenship Behavior*
Table 8

Results of Hierarchical Regression Demonstrating Incremental Validity of Interview Faking Beyond Individual Difference Variables in Predicting CWB

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE B</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>R^2</th>
<th>Adj. R^2</th>
<th>ΔR^2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCQ - Bias</td>
<td>9.697*</td>
<td>2.734</td>
<td>0.278*</td>
<td>0.308</td>
<td>0.270</td>
<td>0.308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Machiavellianism</td>
<td>0.245</td>
<td>0.141</td>
<td>0.020</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comp. World.</td>
<td>0.081</td>
<td>0.131</td>
<td>0.079</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreeableness</td>
<td>-0.143</td>
<td>0.380</td>
<td>-0.033</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conscientiousness</td>
<td>-0.464</td>
<td>0.371</td>
<td>-0.112</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neuroticism</td>
<td>0.287</td>
<td>0.282</td>
<td>0.084</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intellect</td>
<td>-0.848*</td>
<td>0.317</td>
<td>-0.211*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 2</strong></td>
<td>10.561*</td>
<td>2.495</td>
<td>0.302*</td>
<td>0.431</td>
<td>0.394</td>
<td>0.123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCQ - Bias</td>
<td>0.024</td>
<td>0.135</td>
<td>0.020</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Machiavellianism</td>
<td>0.094</td>
<td>0.120</td>
<td>0.091</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comp. World.</td>
<td>-0.189</td>
<td>0.346</td>
<td>-0.044</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreeableness</td>
<td>-0.444</td>
<td>0.338</td>
<td>-0.107</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conscientiousness</td>
<td>0.108</td>
<td>0.259</td>
<td>0.032</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neuroticism</td>
<td>-1.173*</td>
<td>0.296</td>
<td>-0.293*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intellect</td>
<td>0.126*</td>
<td>0.024</td>
<td>0.400*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: N=134. *p < .01
Table 9  
**Summary of Multiple Regression and Relative Importance Analyses on Predictor Variables**  
Criterion = Interview Faking \( [R^2 = .166, F(5,168) = 6.682, p < .01] \)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor Variable</th>
<th>b</th>
<th>( \beta )</th>
<th>RW</th>
<th>CI - Lower</th>
<th>CI - Upper</th>
<th>RS - RW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Neuroticism</td>
<td>6.06</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.0289</td>
<td>-.0034</td>
<td>.0908</td>
<td>13.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-monitoring</td>
<td>8.82*</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.0215</td>
<td>-.0046</td>
<td>.0944</td>
<td>12.94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status Seeking</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.0252</td>
<td>-.0004</td>
<td>.0865</td>
<td>15.17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comp. World.</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.0331*</td>
<td>.0025</td>
<td>.0935</td>
<td>19.96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Machiavellianism</td>
<td>16.06*</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.0642*</td>
<td>.0167</td>
<td>.1324</td>
<td>38.73%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: N=174. *p < .01
Table 10
Results of Hierarchical Regression Demonstrating Incremental Validity of General Faking Beyond Interview Faking in Predicting CWB

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE B</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>Adj. R²</th>
<th>ΔR²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview Faking</td>
<td>.179</td>
<td>.173</td>
<td>.179</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.134*</td>
<td>.025</td>
<td>.424*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview Faking</td>
<td>.267</td>
<td>.256</td>
<td>.088</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>.039</td>
<td>.027</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Faking</td>
<td>.343*</td>
<td>.087</td>
<td>.495*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: N=134. *p < .01
Table 11
Results of Hierarchical Regression Demonstrating Incremental Validity of Individual Difference Variables Beyond the Big Five in Predicting Interview Faking

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE B</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>Adj. R²</th>
<th>ΔR²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Step 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extraversion</td>
<td>-4.558</td>
<td>3.155</td>
<td>-0.113</td>
<td>.061</td>
<td>.033</td>
<td>.061</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreeableness</td>
<td>-5.407</td>
<td>4.591</td>
<td>-0.099</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conscientiousness</td>
<td>-3.377</td>
<td>4.477</td>
<td>-0.064</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neuroticism</td>
<td>5.348</td>
<td>3.681</td>
<td>0.120</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intellect</td>
<td>6.132</td>
<td>3.957</td>
<td>0.126</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extraversion</td>
<td>-8.458*</td>
<td>3.062</td>
<td>-0.210*</td>
<td>.212</td>
<td>.169</td>
<td>.152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreeableness</td>
<td>-0.167</td>
<td>4.740</td>
<td>-0.003</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conscientiousness</td>
<td>-2.457</td>
<td>4.303</td>
<td>-0.046</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neuroticism</td>
<td>4.083</td>
<td>3.514</td>
<td>0.092</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intellect</td>
<td>5.961</td>
<td>3.688</td>
<td>0.122</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Machiavellianism</td>
<td>15.455*</td>
<td>7.651</td>
<td>0.246*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CW</td>
<td>5.377</td>
<td>8.287</td>
<td>0.079</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status Seeking</td>
<td>4.374</td>
<td>4.013</td>
<td>0.092</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-monitoring</td>
<td>10.331*</td>
<td>4.413</td>
<td>0.186*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: N=174. *p < .05