Journal of Applied Psychology
2007, Vol. 92, No. 6, 1638–1656

0021-9010/07/$12.00 DOI: 10.1037/0021-9010.92.6.1638

Measuring Faking in the Employment Interview: Development and Validation of an Interview Faking Behavior Scale

Julia Levashina
Indiana University Kokomo

Michael A. Campion
Purdue University

An Interview Faking Behavior (IFB) scale is developed and validated in 6 studies (N = 1,346). In Study 1, a taxonomy of faking behavior is delineated. The factor structure of a measure is evaluated and refined (Studies 2 and 3). The convergent and discriminant validity of the measure is examined (Study 4). The IFB scale consists of 4 factors (Slight Image Creation, Extensive Image Creation, Image Protection, and Ingratiation) and 11 subfactors (Embellishing, Tailoring, Fit Enhancing, Constructing, Inventing, Borrowing, Masking, Distancing, Omitting, Conforming, and Interviewer Enhancing). A study of actual interviews shows that scores on the IFB scale are related to getting a 2nd interview or a job offer (Study 5). In Study 6, an experiment is conducted to test the usefulness of the new measure for studying methods of reducing faking using structured interviews. It is found that past behavior questions are more resistant to faking than situational questions, and follow-up questioning increases faking. Finally, over 90% of undergraduate job candidates fake during employment interviews; however, fewer candidates engage in faking that is semantically closer to lying, ranging from 28% to 75%.

Keywords: Interview Faking Behavior scale, taxonomy of faking behavior, faking during structured interviews, base rates of faking in job interviews

Faking or intentional response distortion has been discussed and studied extensively in the literature on personality measures (Comrey & Backer, 1975; Furnham, 1986; Stark, Chernyshenko, Chan, Lee, & Drasgow, 2001). However, few empirical studies have explored faking in the employment interview (e.g., Fletcher, 1990). The purpose of this article was threefold. First, we offer a conceptual definition of faking and develop a taxonomy of faking behaviors in the employment interview (Study 1). Second, we develop a measure of faking behaviors from the proposed taxonomy, evaluate the factor structure of the measure (Studies 2 and 3), examine the convergent and discriminant validity of the new scale against other measures (Study 4), and examine the criterion-related validity of the new scale (Study 5). Finally, we conduct an experimental study to test the usefulness of the new scale for conducting research on interview faking (Study 6).

Definitional Issues

The present conceptual foundation for faking is provided by the overlapping constructs of social desirability responding and impression management (Leary & Kowalski, 1990; Levin & Zickar, 2002). Conflicting definitions have made it unclear as to how faking is similar to or different from impression management and social desirability.

Faking and Social Desirability

Social desirability is generally defined as the tendency for people to present themselves in a socially favorable light (Edwards, 1957; Holden & Fekken, 1989). For example, respondents may create a good-citizen image by emphasizing socially desirable personal characteristics with respect to the current social norms and standards (e.g., Zerbe & Paulhus, 1987) or create an ideal self-image by claiming good traits and denying negative ones (e.g., Furnham, 1990; Isaksen & Davis, 1979). Traditionally, most research on faking in personality measures equated faking with socially desirable responding (SDR; Ellingson, Smith, & Sackett, 2001; Ones & Viswesvaran, 1998). Individuals who scored high on the SDR scales and whose self-report measures correlated highly with the SDR scales were assumed to be "faking good." However, this conceptualization of faking is not fully appropriate in the context of the employment interview. First, during the employment interview, candidates would try to fake the selection instrument in order to gain a specific job by presenting themselves as having necessary job-related credentials rather than simply emphasizing socially desirable personal characteristics. Second, deception is not necessarily present in SDR (e.g., Holden & Fekken, 1989). People might score high on SDR in the interview when they have the tendency to actually behave in socially desirable ways.

Faking and Impression Management

There is probably even more confusion with the definition of impression management (IM) and its relation to faking. This confusion stems from the fact that IM has been defined differently in the personality literature than in the literature on social behaviors in organizations. In the framework of personality research, IM

Julia Levashina, School of Business, Indiana University Kokomo; Michael A. Campion, Krannert Graduate School of Management, Purdue University.

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Julia Levashina, School of Business, Indiana University Kokomo, 2300 South Washington Street, Kokomo, IN 46904-9003. E-mail: jlevashi@iuk.edu

has been conceptualized as one of the two components of SDR (Paulhus, 1984). According to this tradition, *IM* equates to faking and refers to the intentional distortion of responses to create a favorable impression. It is distinguished from self-deception or unintentional distortion of responses. Self-deception is manifested in socially desirable, positively biased self-descriptions that the respondents actually believe to be true. Many researchers (e.g., Zerbe & Paulhus, 1987) have argued that self-deception will not vary as a function of social factors such as publicity or presence of extrinsic rewards. IM, however, is a situation-induced temporary state to present oneself in a positive (or otherwise appropriate) way. Thus, if faking in the employment interview is affected by social and situational variables, then it is more likely that the behavior is motivated by IM rather than by ego protection (Morrison & Bies, 1991). Consequently, faking should be linked with the intentional distortion or IM component of social desirability only.

On the contrary, an established tradition in the literature on social behaviors in organizations is to define IM as a negotiation of the interpretations attached to behaviors in social settings (Gilmore, Stevens, Harrell-Cook, & Ferris, 1999; Schlenker, 1980). According to this tradition, IM is not necessarily deceptive or intentional. Some researchers would argue that faking is a part of IM; others believe that they are two separate constructs. For example, Baumeister (1982, 1989) argued that there are two kinds of IM: "pleasing the audience," which involves conforming to others' preferences and changing one's behavior and appearance depending on the others' expectations, and "self-construction," which is motivated by the self-presenter's own values and involves constructing an identity that fits one's own personal ideas and desires. In the employment interview context, Gilmore et al. (1999) defined self-presentation as attempts to influence *self-relevant* images; thus, IM is distinguished from misrepresentation.

The employment interview research has adapted the view of the literature on social behaviors in organizations on IM, defining it as a conscious or unconscious attempt to influence images during interaction (e.g., Ellis, West, Ryan, & DeShon, 2002; McFarland, Ryan, & Kriska, 2003). The issue of whether IM is deceptive or not has not been studied, despite Gilmore and Ferris's (1989) call to investigate deceptive IM in the interview. Moreover, observation has been recommended and used primarily as the method to study IM during the employment interview (e.g., Stevens & Kristof, 1995). However, this methodology does not allow us to measure deceptive IM tactics because intent cannot be observed directly.

To unify these two views on IM, we need to include both honest and deceptive IM. Not all of IM that occurs in the employment interview is deceptive. Although some forms of IM used in the employment interview could be honest and necessary to accurately present and highlight one's attributes and credentials (e.g., clear articulation of job-related credentials), there are others that involve deceptive behaviors and intentional misrepresentation (e.g., stating nonexisting achievements) and constitute faking (Fletcher, 1989, 1990). Job candidates may use IM tactics to look good without being untruthful, or they may use them and be dishonest and untruthful.

Expanding the Definition of Faking in the Employment Interview

In the present study, we integrate two distinctions from the personality literature (intentional distortion vs. unintentional distortion) and the literature on social behaviors (dishonest vs. honest IM) into our definition. We define *faking in the employment interview* as deceptive IM 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.

There are two main implications of this conceptualization of faking. First, candidates may engage in faking to meet the requirements of the interview question and to make a positive impression on the interviewer. For example, to answer a past behavior question that asks the candidate to describe a specific situation (e.g., "Give me an example of a job or project where problems were a regular occurrence"), candidates without such past experience may invent the situation by describing a nonexistent one. Second, a central component of this perspective is the treatment of information. Information could be added or subtracted from the perceived truth or information could be invented (Hopper & Bell, 1984; Knapp & Comadena, 1979).

Information can be added to the perceived truth in many ways. Job candidates might answer interview questions having in mind the image of an ideal candidate for the job or an ideal job incumbent. They might exaggerate their job-related credentials or past achievements. Information can also be omitted or taken away from what is perceived as the truth. Omission occurs when job candidates intentionally omit some aspects of the requested information that might decrease their score in the interview or make a negative impression of the candidate. For example, a job candidate may have left a previous job for multiple reasons, such as a perceived lack of opportunity for career progression, conflict with a supervisor, and job burnout, but mentioned only one reason during an interview, such as lack of opportunity, and intentionally omitted the other two due to the possible negative impression they might create. Finally, information can be invented, and applicants might present information that is verifiably false (Levin & Zickar, 2002). This approach equates faking with *lying*, defined as completely untrue verbal statements. For instance, lying would occur if job candidates claimed to have a master's degree when they only took classes but never graduated. Thus, a wider view on faking should be adopted and include not only lying but also pretense, concealment, exaggeration, and so forth.

Study 1: Identification of Faking Behaviors

Our identification of faking behaviors was driven by three sources. First, we performed a review of the literature on IM and influence behaviors in organizations (e.g., Ellis et al., 2002; Giacalone & Rosenfeld, 1989; Kipnis, Schmidt, & Wilkinson, 1980; Kristof-Brown, Barrick, & Franke, 2002; Kumar & Beyerlein, 1991; Tedeschi & Melburg, 1984). Research was focused on three groups of IM behaviors. First, assertive tactics were used by the applicants to acquire and promote favorable impressions by portraying themselves as a particular type of person with particular beliefs, opinions, knowledge, and experience. Second, defensive tactics were used to protect images. Third, ingratiation was used to evoke interpersonal liking and attraction between interviewers and themselves.

Second, we conducted content analysis of popular press books on preparing for the employment interview (e.g., Drake, 1997; Medley, 1993; Sincoff & Goyer, 1984) to identify recommended lay strategies on how to improve performance in the employment interview, how to deal with questions asked about weaknesses and work-related conflicts, and how to fake successfully during an interview without lying. Palmer, Campion, and Green (1999) argued that many job seekers use how-to books to train themselves in interview preparation.

Third, we conducted a qualitative study using semistructured interviews with 35 job candidates. The classification of IM behaviors was used to develop questions for the interview. Thirty candidates were first-year master's of business administration students who were interviewing with companies for internship positions at the time and had an average of six recent employment interviews. Five participants were doctoral students who were in the job market at the time and had completed an average of seven recent employment interviews.

The three sources identified 125 faking behaviors. These items were analyzed by five judges, doctoral students from psychology and management departments. The judges reviewed the items for clarity, appropriateness, and content validity. Thirty behaviors were eliminated. Then, the authors sorted the remaining 95 items in terms of the purpose of the faking behaviors into three groups: image creation (faking in order to create an image of a good candidate), image protection (faking in order to protect an image of a good candidate), and ingratiation (faking in order to gain a favorable interviewer's perception). Of these 95 items, 52 were related to image creation, 21 to image protection, and 22 items to ingratiation. The item composition was consistent with the finding in the IM literature that job candidates used more assertive tactics than defensive tactics in the interview (e.g., Stevens & Kristof, 1995). Next, the authors sorted these faking behaviors into several subcategories within each group. Consensus among the coders was used as the criterion for assigning a given behavior to a category. To refine the assignment of items to subcategories, three coders (doctoral students from a management department) independently back-translated the 95 behaviors into the three categories and 11 subcategories. The degree of agreement between the coders was used as a criterion to retain the behavior for further analysis. Items were removed if at least one rater disagreed with the other two raters. The rater disagreement was uniform across categories. This procedure resulted in the elimination of 31 items, leaving a pool of 64 items for the initial test instrument.

The developed taxonomy suggests that candidates might fake in order to create an image of a good candidate, protect an image of a good candidate, or ingratiate. The subcategories of embellishing, tailoring, fit enhancing, constructing, inventing, and borrowing could be used to create an image of a good candidate. The subcategories of omitting, masking, and distancing could be used to defend an image of a good candidate. Finally, the subcategories of opinion conforming and interviewer/organization enhancing could be used to ingratiate or to gain favor with the interviewer to improve the appearance of a good candidate. The proposed taxonomy of faking behaviors and the Interview Faking Behavior (IFB) scale are shown in the Appendix.

Study 2: Validation and Refinement of the IFB Scale Using Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA)

The purpose of this study was to validate and refine the factor structure of the IFB scale.

Method

The IFB scale was developed on the basis of the taxonomy of faking behaviors proposed in Study 1. The 64-item IFB scale was administered to 260 senior-level undergraduate students (36% women) of a large university located in the midwestern United States who were in the job market and had several job interviews. Respondents were asked to describe, on a 5-point scale, the degree to which they had used each behavior in their employment interviews. The 5-point scale had the following anchors: 5 = *to a very great extent*, 4 = *to a considerable extent*, 3 = *to a moderate extent*, 2 = *to a little extent*, and 1 = *to no extent* (Bass, Cascio, & O'Connor, 1974). To ensure that respondents answered the instrument honestly, no names were collected. Respondents were asked to be honest about this topic. They were assured that the researchers would have no way of connecting their answers back to them, their answers would be used for research purposes only, and they would not be used to evaluate them.

EFA. The means and standard deviations for the IFB scale are presented in Table 1. The item-total correlations ranged from 0.39 to 0.68.[1] All items met the standard criteria of 0.30 (Nunnally & Bernstein, 1994) and were retained. Scores obtained on the IFB scale were initially factor analyzed with the maximum likelihood extraction method and oblique factor rotation (promax). We used oblique rotation because the factors were expected to be correlated. To determine the number of "meaningful" factors to retain, we used four criteria: Kaiser criterion (Kaiser, 1960), the scree test (Cattell, 1966), percentage of variance accounted for, and interpretability. On the basis of the first three criteria, four factors were retained. Four items with cross-loadings were eliminated. The four high cross-loadings could have occurred due to chance, and although future research could determine whether the cross-loadings would replicate, dropping the items in the present study improves scale discriminability while leaving enough items remaining for reliable scales.

A subsequent factor analysis with maximum likelihood method and the same oblique rotation was conducted on the remaining 60 items. Four factors were retained on the basis of the described criteria. The rotated factors accounted for 63% of the variance. Factors, percentages of variance explained, factor loadings, communalities, and reliability statistics are presented in Table 1. The extracted four factors demonstrated a simple structure, meaning that most of the variables had relatively high factor loadings on only one factor and near-zero loadings for the other factors. The extracted four-factor solution was consistent with the proposed taxonomy of faking behaviors. The only difference was that the hypothesized factor Image Creation had divided into two factors: Factor 1 and Factor 4. Factor 1, which was named Extensive Image Creation, reflected faking behaviors that were closer to pure forms

[1] Table with item-total correlations for the IFB scale is available from Julia Levashina upon request.

Table 1
Means, Standard Deviations, and Exploratory Factor Analysis of the IFB Scale

Item	*M*	*SD*	Factor pattern (standardized regression coefficients)				h^2
			Extensive image creation	Ingratiation	Image protection	Slight image creation	
ICCON18	1.56	0.93	**0.77**	0.02	−0.13	0.13	0.63
ICCON19	1.80	1.07	**0.77**	0.16	−0.19	0.05	0.62
ICCON20	1.67	1.05	**0.87**	0.02	−0.14	0.04	0.71
ICCON21	1.55	0.97	**0.81**	−0.01	−0.01	−0.03	0.62
ICCON22	1.85	1.09	**0.77**	0.14	−0.02	−0.07	0.61
ICCON23	1.91	1.06	**0.65**	0.13	−0.07	0.15	0.60
ICCON24	1.35	0.81	**0.84**	−0.01	−0.09	−0.02	0.63
ICINV25	1.48	0.78	**0.52**	−0.06	0.20	−0.02	0.37
ICINV26	1.68	0.85	**0.46**	−0.02	0.29	0.11	0.50
ICINV27	1.38	0.80	**0.71**	−0.22	0.16	0.00	0.53
ICINV28	1.97	1.08	**0.36**	0.18	0.22	−0.05	0.33
ICINV29	1.71	0.93	**0.64**	−0.03	0.28	−0.04	0.61
ICINV30	2.20	1.09	**0.45**	0.03	0.26	0.16	0.53
ICINV31	1.63	1.03	**0.85**	0.02	0.01	−0.04	0.70
ICINV32	1.84	1.09	**0.66**	−0.01	0.12	0.07	0.58
ICBOR33	1.52	0.88	**0.56**	−0.03	0.23	−0.06	0.43
ICBOR34	1.43	0.87	**0.66**	−0.10	0.12	0.04	0.49
ICBOR35	1.47	0.88	**0.64**	−0.12	0.18	0.03	0.51
INCON53	2.51	1.07	0.09	**0.60**	−0.01	0.13	0.52
INCON54	2.32	1.11	0.22	**0.62**	0.04	0.04	0.61
INCON55	2.45	1.07	−0.01	**0.62**	0.00	0.15	0.50
INCON56	2.49	1.06	0.10	**0.78**	−0.08	0.02	0.63
INCON57	2.66	1.06	0.08	**0.73**	0.00	0.05	0.63
INCON58	2.72	1.15	0.06	**0.73**	0.00	−0.06	0.52
INCON59	2.42	1.14	−0.04	**0.59**	0.13	0.02	0.43
INCON60	2.35	1.09	0.09	**0.73**	0.08	0.01	0.67
INENH61	3.14	1.24	−0.22	**0.62**	0.14	−0.08	0.36
INENH62	2.69	1.14	−0.06	**0.56**	0.14	0.04	0.40
INENH63	2.99	1.15	−0.11	**0.65**	0.16	0.03	0.50
INENH64	2.98	1.19	−0.13	**0.56**	0.09	0.11	0.39
IPOMI37	2.11	1.11	0.10	0.07	**0.40**	−0.06	0.22
IPOMI38	2.23	1.13	0.03	0.02	**0.50**	0.13	0.35
IPOMI39	2.45	1.18	−0.03	0.05	**0.48**	0.12	0.31
IPOMI40	2.54	1.17	−0.09	0.29	**0.46**	0.02	0.39
IPOMI41	2.15	1.17	0.10	0.24	**0.40**	−0.06	0.33
IPOMI42	1.68	1.08	0.14	0.02	**0.54**	−0.04	0.38
IPMAS44	2.29	1.17	0.11	0.15	**0.33**	0.00	0.23
IPMAS46	1.92	1.06	0.21	0.14	**0.56**	−0.16	0.48
IPMAS47	2.18	1.21	0.09	0.25	**0.41**	0.00	0.39
IPMAS48	2.91	1.21	−0.06	0.27	**0.44**	0.08	0.40
IPMAS49	1.80	1.11	0.09	−0.01	**0.63**	−0.03	0.43
IPDIS50	1.99	1.06	−0.08	0.03	**0.82**	0.04	0.67
IPDIS51	2.08	1.11	−0.04	0.06	**0.74**	0.08	0.62
IPDIS52	2.00	1.08	0.04	0.02	**0.70**	0.10	0.61
ICBOR36	1.80	0.89	0.27	−0.01	**0.46**	0.07	0.44
ICEMB2	2.30	0.98	0.14	−0.14	0.23	**0.36**	0.30
ICEMB3	2.27	1.15	0.05	−0.04	0.15	**0.32**	0.23
ICEMB4	2.57	1.16	0.13	−0.11	0.08	**0.57**	0.38
ICEMB5	2.42	1.10	0.18	−0.04	0.13	**0.49**	0.42
ICEMB6⁻	3.04	1.14	−0.08	0.02	0.20	**0.44**	0.28
ICTAI7	2.59	1.02	−0.05	0.00	0.02	**0.70**	0.45
ICTAI8	3.02	1.03	−0.03	0.12	−0.08	**0.68**	0.47
ICTAI9	2.74	1.03	0.00	0.19	−0.17	**0.68**	0.52
ICTAI10	2.44	1.12	0.09	0.03	−0.01	**0.63**	0.46
ICTAI11	2.33	1.09	0.08	−0.01	0.00	**0.64**	0.46
ICTAI12	2.39	1.18	0.05	0.24	−0.02	**0.43**	0.39
ICFIT13	2.52	1.03	−0.04	0.13	0.06	**0.41**	0.28
ICFIT14	2.35	1.02	0.07	0.09	0.02	**0.50**	0.39
ICFIT15	2.36	1.05	0.05	0.04	0.07	**0.59**	0.48
ICFIT17	2.63	1.13	−0.02	0.16	0.12	**0.54**	0.50
% of Variance (rotated solution)			22.78	14.39	13.14	11.17	
Alpha coefficient			0.95	0.92	0.91	0.90	

Note. The first two letters in each variable name correspond to three big groups of faking behaviors (IC = image creation, IN = ingratiation, and IP = image protection); the following letters correspond to 11 subfactors of faking behaviors: CON = conforming, INV = inventing, BOR = borrowing, CON = opinion conforming, ENH = interviewer or organization enhancing, OMI = omitting, MAS = masking, DIS = distancing, EMB = embellishing, TAI = tailoring, and FIT = fit enhancing). Numbers correspond to the item number in the instrument. For example, IPOMI38 is the item number 38 in Image Protection, Omission. Analysis is based on $N = 260$. Interfactors correlations are in the range from 0.39 to 0.55. IFB = Interview Faking Behavior h^2 = item communalities at extraction. Boldface values indicate that the item loads on the factor.

of lying and deception and contained items that measured Constructing, Inventing, and Borrowing of experiences or accomplishments (e.g., "I claimed that I have skills that I do not have"). Factor 4, named Slight Image Creation, reflected mild types of faking and was composed of items that measured Embellishing, Tailoring, and Fit Enhancing (e.g., "I exaggerated my responsibilities on my previous jobs"). Factor 2 was identical to the hypothesized Ingratiation Factor (e.g., "I tried to show that I shared the interviewer's views and ideas even if I did not"). Finally, Factor 3 was almost the same as the hypothesized Image Protection factor (e.g., "When asked directly, I did not mention some problems that I had in past jobs") with one exception. One item (image creation-embellishing 6) that was hypothesized to reflect the Image Creation factor showed higher factor loadings on Factor 3. The internal consistency reliability for Factor 1, Factor 2, Factor 3, and Factor 4 were 0.95, 0.92, 0.91, and 0.90, respectively. Interfactor correlations ranged from 0.39 to 0.55.

Descended EFA. The first EFA extracted four factors that corresponded to higher order factors in our hypothesized taxonomy of faking behaviors. At the same time, we believe that the hypothesized 11 subcategories are meaningful in terms of measuring specific types of faking behaviors. Thus, we performed *descended* EFA, meaning that we conducted the factor analysis within each category to see whether the hypothesized subcategories would emerge.

We again used the maximum likelihood method and oblique factor rotation (promax) and the same four criteria to determine the number of factors to retain. Six items were eliminated because they had high cross-loadings. EFA was repeated for the factors after the items with cross-loadings were eliminated. The final results are shown in Tables 2-5.

Factor analysis of Factor 1 (Extensive Image Creation) resulted in a three-factor solution that mirrored the hypothesized three factors: Constructing, Inventing, and Borrowing. EFA of Factor 2 (Ingratiation) resulted in a two-factor solution that was identical with the hypothesized two factors: Opinion Conforming and Interviewer/Organization Enhancing. EFA of Factor 3 (Image Protection) resulted in a three-factor solution. The first factor (Distancing) was composed of all the items hypothesized to assess the Distancing factor (e.g., "I clearly separated myself from my past work experiences that would reflect poorly on me") and one item that was intended to assess the Masking factor ("I covered up some skeletons in my closet"). The second factor was similar to the hypothesized Omitting factor. Finally, the third factor (Masking) had three items that were intended to measure Masking and one item that was intended to measure Omitting ("When asked directly, I did not mention my true reason for quitting my previous job"). Analysis of Factor 4 (Slight Image Creation) resulted in a three-factor solution that corresponded with the hypothesized factors: Tailoring, Fit Enhancing, and Embellishing.

Table 2
Descended EFA of Extensive Image Creation

Item	Factor pattern (standardized regression coefficients)			h^2
	Constructing	Inventing	Borrowing	
ICCON18	**0.82**	−0.02	0.04	0.69
ICCON19	**0.77**	0.08	−0.04	0.65
ICCON20	**0.79**	0.08	0.04	0.76
ICCON21	**0.62**	−0.06	0.33	0.66
ICCON22	**0.65**	0.26	−0.05	0.66
ICCON23	**0.67**	0.24	−0.11	0.63
ICCON24	**0.79**	−0.08	0.14	0.68
ICINV25	0.04	**0.44**	0.22	0.38
ICINV26	0.13	**0.56**	0.10	0.50
ICINV28	−0.12	**0.53**	0.24	0.38
ICINV29	0.04	**0.75**	0.10	0.73
ICINV30	0.07	**0.82**	−0.08	0.65
ICINV31	0.32	**0.52**	0.13	0.73
ICINV32	0.21	**0.60**	0.09	0.64
ICBOR33	0.09	0.22	**0.49**	0.49
ICBOR34	0.01	0.05	**0.89**	0.82
ICBOR35	0.03	0.09	**0.82**	0.82
% of variance[a]	14.61	10.99	12.07	
Alpha coefficient	0.93	0.89	0.87	

Note. The first two letters in each variable name correspond to three big groups of faking behaviors (IC = image creation), and the following letters correspond to 3 of 11 subfactors of faking behaviors: CON = conforming, INV = inventing, and BOR = borrowing. Analysis is based on $N = 260$. Interfactors correlations are $r_{\text{Factor1 – Factor2}} = 0.66$; $r_{\text{Factor1 – Factor3}} = 0.57$; and $r_{\text{Factor2 – Factor3}} = 0.56$. EFA = exploratory factor analysis; h^2 = item communalities at extraction. Boldface values indicate that the item loads on the factor.
[a] Rotated solution.

Summary of the Results of the EFA of the IFB Scale

The factor analysis suggested a hierarchical factor structure of faking with four factors and 11 subfactors. On the basis of the IM research, we hypothesized that there were three factors. The factor analysis suggested that there were four factors. Two of them (Image Protection and Ingratiation) were identical to the hypothesized factors, and they were represented by the hypothesized subfactors. Two other factors represented the hypothesized Image Creation factor. Content analysis of the subfactors that loaded on the two emerging factors revealed the conceptual difference between them. Extensive Image Creation represented socially less appropriate behaviors (e.g., borrowing experiences of others, inventing job-related credentials), which are semantically closer to lying. Slight Image Creation represented mild forms of faking (e.g., embellishing job-related credentials). The items with cross-loadings were removed, leaving 54 items in our instrument. Finally, internal consistencies of factors and subfactors were adequate.

Study 3: Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) of the IFB Scale

We next tested the scale using CFA and a new sample of job applicants. In Study 3, the hypothesized taxonomy of faking was compared with the results of the EFA. Six models were compared with each other to identify the model that best fits the data. The first model was the hypothesized model with one third-order general factor (Faking), three factors (Image Creation, Image Protection, and Ingratiation), and 11 subfactors. The second model was a variation of the hypothesized model, with three factors and 11 subfactors but no general factor (Faking). The third model was a model derived from the EFA with four factors: Slight Image Creation, Extensive Image Creation, Image Protection, and Ingra-

tiation. The fourth model was derived from descended EFA. It had four factors (Slight Image Creation, Extensive Image Creation, Image Protection, and Ingratiation), and 11 subfactors. The fifth model was a variation of the fourth model, in which the variances in four factors were explained by one more general third-order factor (Faking). Finally, the sixth model had one first-order general factor (Faking).

Sample and Procedure

To perform CFA, new independent data were collected. The new sample consisted of 589 undergraduate students (40% women) from a large midwestern university, who were in the job market and had several job interviews. As in the previous study, respondents were asked to describe on the same 5-point scale used in Study 1 the extent to which they had used each behavior in their interviews. Also, to ensure that respondents answered the instrument honestly, no names were collected. Respondents were told that their answers would be used for research purposes.

Analysis

CFA is sensitive to the violation of multivariate normality. In our study, we assumed that the departure from normality was not very extensive. The decision was based on the examination of frequency distributions and kurtosis and skewness of item-level data.[2] The analysis of distributions revealed that we had two types of distributions: an approximation of univariate normal and the Poisson distributions. Items that had the Poisson distribution were transformed by using a log function (Rummel, 1970). After the transformation, the kurtosis and skewness of all items did not exceed 1.5, indicating that the normality assumption was not violated (Kline, 1998). Maximum likelihood estimation has been recommended for use with ordered categorical data when item-level characteristics are approximately normal (DiStefano, 2002; Dolan, 1994). CFA with maximum likelihood estimation was performed using AMOS 5.0 (Arbuckle, 2003). To assess model fit, five recommended measures were used: the chi-square/*df* ratio, root mean residuals (RMRs), comparative fit index (CFI), Tucker-Lewis Index (TLI), and root-mean-square error of approximation (RMSEA) (e.g., Marsh, Balla, & Hau, 1996; Maruyama, 1998). The chi-square/*df* and RMR provide information about how closely the model fit compares with a perfect fit. Generally, values of chi-square/*df* that are less than 3 and values of RMR that are less than 0.05 are interpreted as indicating a good fit of a model to the data (e.g., Kelloway, 1998; Kline, 1998). CFI, TLI, and RMSEA are relative indexes that are used to compare the fit of different models with the same data set. For both, CFI and TLI values exceeding .90 are indicative of a good fit to the data (Bentler & Bonett, 1980). Finally, RMSEA values of .05 or less indicate close fit between the model and the sample data (e.g., Bentler, 1990). Simulation studies have found that RMSEA does not appear to be affected by sample size or model size and was recommended for use with ordered categorical data (DiStefano, 2002).

Table 3
Descended EFA of the Ingratiation Factor

Item	Factor pattern (standardized regression coefficients): Opinion conforming	Factor pattern (standardized regression coefficients): Interviewer or organization enhancing	h^2
INCON53	**0.73**	0.00	0.53
INCON54	**0.68**	0.12	0.58
INCON55	**0.73**	0.01	0.55
INCON56	**0.91**	−0.08	0.76
INCON57	**0.84**	0.01	0.71
INCON58	**0.68**	0.09	0.53
INCON59	**0.44**	0.27	0.41
INCON60	**0.64**	0.24	0.64
INENH61	−0.02	**0.74**	0.52
INENH62	−0.03	**0.86**	0.72
INENH63	0.12	**0.77**	0.71
INENH64	0.10	**0.68**	0.55
% of variance[a]	12.04	8.31	
Alpha coefficient	0.92	0.87	

Note. The first two letters in each variable name correspond to three big groups of faking behaviors (IN = ingratiation), and the following letters correspond to 2 of 11 subfactors of faking behaviors: CON = conforming and ENH = interviewer or organization enhancing. Analysis is based on $N = 260$. Interfactors correlations are $r_{\text{Factor1 – Factor 2}} = 0.58$. EFA = exploratory factor analysis; h^2 = item communalities at extraction. Boldface values indicate that the item loads on the factor.
[a] Rotated solution.

Table 4
Descended EFA of the Image Protection Factor

Item	Factor pattern (standardized regression coefficients): Distancing	Masking	Omitting	h^2
IPDIS50	**0.86**	0.04	0.00	0.79
IPDIS51	**0.83**	0.02	0.03	0.74
IPDIS52	**0.61**	0.11	0.13	0.60
IPMAS49	**0.52**	0.22	−0.04	0.44
IPMAS44	−0.07	**0.46**	0.25	0.30
IPMAS46	0.22	**0.63**	−0.02	0.58
IPMAS47	0.12	**0.58**	0.06	0.47
IPOMI42	0.21	**0.54**	−0.03	0.46
IPOMI37	−0.03	0.24	**0.45**	0.31
IPOMI38	0.16	−0.12	**0.82**	0.68
IPOMI39	−0.05	0.11	**0.75**	0.66
% of variance[a]	7.89	4.20	5.34	
Alpha coefficient	0.87	0.75	0.76	

Note. The first two letters in each variable name correspond to three big groups of faking behaviors (IP = image protection), and the following letters correspond to 3 of 11 subfactors of faking behaviors: DIS = distancing, MAS = masking, and OMI = omitting. Analysis is based on $N = 260$. Interfactors correlations are $r_{\text{Factor1 – Factor2}} = 0.55$; $r_{\text{Factor1 – Factor3}} = 0.63$; and $r_{\text{Factor2 – Factor3}} = 0.46$. EFA = exploratory factor analysis; h^2 = item communalities at extraction. Boldface values indicate that the item loads on the factor.
[a] Rotated solution.

Results

The measures of fit for the different models are in Table 6. Models 4 and 5 provided the best fit to the data when compared

[2] Data are available from Julia Levashina upon request.

Table 5
Descended EFA of the Slight Image Creation Factor

Item	Factor pattern (standardized regression coefficients)			h^2
	Tailoring	Fit enhancing	Embellishing	
ICTAI7	**0.77**	−0.04	0.01	0.57
ICTAI8	**0.81**	−0.09	0.03	0.62
ICTAI9	**0.78**	0.02	−0.03	0.60
ICTAI10	**0.55**	0.15	0.08	0.48
ICTAI11	**0.43**	0.24	0.11	0.43
ICTAI12	**0.49**	0.25	−0.06	0.39
ICFIT13	−0.12	**0.82**	0.02	0.60
ICFIT14	0.04	**0.80**	0.00	0.66
ICFIT15	0.21	**0.56**	0.09	0.55
ICFIT17	0.25	**0.53**	0.05	0.53
ICEMB2	0.13	0.11	**0.33**	0.25
ICEMB3	−0.13	0.18	**0.56**	0.35
ICEMB4	0.11	−0.07	**0.79**	0.68
ICEMB5	0.04	−0.02	**0.84**	0.74
% of variance[a]	6.78	5.71	5.92	
Alpha coefficient	0.85	0.83	0.78	

Note. The first two letters in each variable name correspond to three big groups of faking behaviors (IC = image creation), and the following letters correspond to 3 of 11 subfactors of faking behaviors: TAI = tailoring, FIT = fit enhancing, and EMB = embellishing. Analysis is based on $N = 260$. Interfactors correlations are $r_{\text{Factor1 – Factor2}} = 0.52$; $r_{\text{Factor1 – Factor3}} = 0.56$; and $r_{\text{Factor2 – Factor3}} = 0.45$. EFA = exploratory factor analysis; h^2 = item communalities at extraction. Boldface values indicate that the item loads on the factor.
[a] Rotated solution.

with the other models investigated. The sixth model and the third model that were derived from EFA and had four first-order correlated factors were the worst fitting models. Also, a nested comparison of Model 3 and Model 4 indicates that the higher order four factors alone are not empirically sufficient, and subfactors are important, $\chi^2(586, N = 589) = 3{,}666$, $p < .01$. These results support our decision to perform descended factor analysis. Because Models 4 and 5 were nested models, chi-squares could be compared to test what model provided a better statistical fit to the data. Although fit indexes of Model 4 were slightly better than those of Model 5, the difference in chi-squares, $\chi^2(2, N = 589) = 4$, $p > .2$, showed that Model 5 fits no worse than Model 4 (e.g., Kline, 1998) and was preferred on the grounds of parsimony and theory. The results of the CFA provided strong support for the multidimensional nature of faking during the interview. CFA supported the concepts of a total faking score as well as four scales and 11 subscales.

Study 4: Convergent and Discriminant Validity and Test–Retest Reliability of the IFB Scale

If the IFB scale is measuring meaningful constructs, then it should demonstrate convergent and discriminant validity by a predictable pattern of relationships with other variables within the "nomological network" (Cronbach & Meehl, 1955). To build the nomological network, we used findings and recent developments in the integrity testing, IM, and deception literature. Although alternative measures of faking during the employment interview were not available, we assessed the correlation between our measure and measures of SDR and IM. At the beginning of this article, we argued that faking, SDR, and IM are overlapping constructs but cannot be used interchangeably. Thus, we expected that the IFB scale would be moderately correlated with measures of SDR and IM (Hypothesis 1).

Overt integrity tests mainly consist of two parts (Sackett & Wanek, 1996). One part includes measures of theft attitudes. People who believe that others engage in dishonest behaviors tend to behave fraudulently themselves. The other part refers to the assessment of one's own honesty and admissions of theft and other wrongdoing. Therefore, we argue that people who think that others are untruthful will engage more in faking during the employment interview, but people who value honesty will engage less in faking (Hypothesis 2).

The findings in the deception literature suggest that Machiavellianism and self-monitoring should predict faking in the employment interview. People who self-monitor more fully consider characteristics of the social situation in presenting themselves to others and vary their actual behavior in response to subtle changes in social norms (Snyder, 1974; Snyder & Monson, 1975). At the same time, people high in Machiavellianism, who believe that others can be manipulated, are particularly likely to engage in strategic self-presentation to influence others (Christie & Geis, 1970). They tend to tell more everyday lies (e.g., Kashy & DePaulo, 1996). Thus, we expect that high-self-monitoring people will engage more often in faking during the employment interview

Table 6
Alternative Models and Significance Test

Model	χ^2	*df*	χ^2 *df*	RMR	CFI	TLI	RMSEA (90% CI)
Model 1	4,809	1938	2.5	0.074	0.873	0.868	0.050 (0.048, 0.052)
Model 2	4,809	1938	2.5	0.074	0.873	0.868	0.050 (0.048, 0.052)
Model 3	6,665	1946	3.4	0.057	0.791	0.784	0.064 (0.063, 0.066)
Model 4	2,999	1360	2.2	0.049	0.917	0.913	0.045 (0.043, 0.047)
Model 5	3,003	1362	2.2	0.050	0.915	0.911	0.046 (0.044, 0.048)
Model 6	11,379	1952	5.8	0.087	0.583	0.569	0.091 (0.089, 0.092)

Note. Analysis is based on $N = 589$. Model 1 has one third-order factor (Faking), three factors (Image Creation, Image Protection, and Ingratiation), and 11 subfactors. Model 2 has 11 subfactors. Model 3 has four factors (Slight Image Creation, Extensive Image Creation, Image Protection, and Ingratiation). Model 4 has four factors and 11 subfactors. Model 5 has a third-order factor (Faking), four factors, and 11 subfactors. Model 6 has one first-order factor (Faking). Absolute indexes: χ^2/df = normed chi-square; RMR = root-mean-residuals. Relative indexes: CFI = comparative fit index; TLI = Tucker-Lewis Index. Fit Indexes for comparing nonnested models: RMSEA = root-mean-square error of approximation.

(Hypothesis 3). Scores on the Machiavellianism scale can be expected to correlate with scores on the IFB scale (Hypothesis 4).

Discriminant validity refers to the extent to which there are negligible relationships between measures of unrelated constructs. The findings in the deception literature suggest that there are no gender differences in the use of deceptive behaviors. Women and men tend to tell the same amount of lies (DePaulo, Epstein, & Wyer, 1993; DePaulo, Kashy, Kirkendol, Wyer, & Epstein, 1996; Tyler & Feldman, 2004). Thus, we expect negligible correlations between gender and our measure (Hypothesis 5). The findings in the research on cheating advocate that there is no correlation between ethnicity and cheating (Cizek, 1999). Moreover, Topp (2001) found no relation between ethnicity and IM. Thus, we expected no relationship between ethnicity and our measure (Hypothesis 6). Also, research on cheating revealed that there is a slight to moderate negative correlation between cheating and grade point average (GPA; Cizek, 1999). Students with lower grades are more likely to report and engage in cheating, whereas students with a higher GPA are less likely to do either. Recently, Higgins and Judge (2004) reported only a slight negative correlation between GPA and self-promotion tactics and no correlation between GPA and ingratiation during the employment interview. Thus, we expected slight negative or zero correlations between GPA and the IFB scale and its subscales (Hypothesis 7). Finally, at the beginning of this article, we argued that faking does not relate to the self-deception component of SDR. Thus, we expect an insignificant correlation between a measure of self-deception and our measure (Hypothesis 8).

Method

Participants. The data were collected from a new sample of 156 undergraduate students (39% women) who were in the job market for either permanent full-time or temporary internship positions and had on average four employment interviews.

Measures. To measure *social desirability*, we used the Social Desirability Scale (SDS) developed by Crowne and Marlowe (1960). To measure *IM* and *self-deception* (SD) we used the Balanced Inventory of Desirable Responding-7 (BIDR-7; Paulhus, 1991). To measure *the attitude towards honesty* of other people, we used the Trustworthiness scale (Wrightsman, 1964). We used seven items from the Trustworthiness scale that ask specifically about opinions on whether other people usually behave dishonestly. Because items in the Trustworthiness scale ask about dishonest behaviors of other people in everyday life, we developed three additional items that asked specifically about the likelihood of faking of other people during an interview ("Given a chance, most people would try to fake during the employment interview"; "People usually tell the truth during the employment interview, even when they know they would be better off by lying"; "Most people are honest during the employment interview"). These items composed what we called the Interview Trustworthiness scale. To measure personal *honesty*, we used the Honesty scale (Scott, 1965), which includes 20 items (e.g., "Always representing one's own true thoughts and feelings honestly"). There is relatively strong evidence for the construct validity of the scale (e.g., Braithwaite & Scott, 1991). To measure *self-monitoring*, we used the Self-Monitoring scale (Snyder, 1974). To measure *Machiavellianism*, we used the Machiavellianism scale developed by Allsopp, Eysenck, and Eysenck (1991). The items in this scale measure the respondent's own behavior rather than attitudes toward Machiavellian behaviors, as in the original Machiavellianism scale developed by Christie and Geis (1970). The *ethnicity* variable had six categories: American Indian or Alaska Native, Asian or Pacific Islander, Black, Hispanic, White, and "other." *Gender* was coded as female = 1, male = 0. To measure *GPA*, we asked respondents to indicate current cumulative GPA as it was reported on their most recent official grade report.

Procedure. Undergraduate students who were in the job market were recruited to participate in this study for extra credit in a college course. Participants completed all measures except for the IFB scale at the beginning of the 16-week semester, and the IFB scale was completed at the end of that semester. This helped reduce common method variance. The participation in this study was voluntary and anonymous. Each participant was assigned a random anonymous number that he or she had to put on two forms.

Results and Discussion

The convergent and discriminant validity correlations are reported in Table 7. Hypothesis 1 stated that our measure would be significantly correlated with a measure of SDR and a measure of IM. The IFB scale and all four of its subscales were moderately correlated with the Social Desirability scale, with *r*s ranging from $-.18$ to $-.29$ (ps $< .05$). Also, the IFB scale and its subscales were moderately correlated with the IM scale of the BIDR-7, with *r*s ranging from .16 to .31 (ps $< .05$). Therefore, the IFB scale showed convergent validity, and Hypothesis 1 was supported.

Hypothesis 2 stated that the IFB scale and its subscales would be positively correlated with a measure of attitude toward other people's dishonesty and negatively correlated with an assessment of one's own honesty. The IFB scale and its subscales were positively correlated with the Trustworthiness scale (*r*s ranging from .21 to .27, ps $< .01$), indicating that participants who believed that others behave dishonestly engaged more often in faking during an interview. Also, the IFB scale and its subscales correlated with the Interview Trustworthiness scale (*r*s ranging from .18 to .26, ps $< .05$). As expected, we obtained negative significant correlations (*r*s ranging from $-.39$ to $-.27$, ps $< .001$) between the Honesty scale and our measure, meaning that people who value honesty tend not to engage in faking behaviors. Thus, Hypothesis 2 was supported.

Hypotheses 3 and 4 stated that the IFB scale and its subscales would be positively correlated with measures of self-monitoring and Machiavellianism. The Self-Monitoring scale correlated significantly with the IFB scale and its subscales (*r*s ranging from .16 to .29, ps $< .05$), except for the Extensive Image Creation subscale. This later finding is consistent with research that found that self-monitoring and success at deception, defined as lying, were unrelated (e.g., Miller, DeTurck, & Kalbfleisch, 1983; Riggio, Tucker, & Throckmorton, 1987). This result provides a preliminary explanation of the existing paradox that although self-monitoring is theoretically linked to deception ability, empirical research has failed to support this link. On the basis of the findings from past research and our study, it could be concluded that self-monitoring does not relate to deception, defined as lying, but relates to other types of deception (e.g., exaggeration, omitting). The IFB scale was significantly correlated with the Machiavellian-

Table 7
Convergent and Discriminant Validity Correlations of the IFB Scale and Measures of Related Constructs[a]

Measure (and *M*/*SD*)	Alpha coefficient	Slight image creation	Extensive image creation	Image protection	Ingratiation	Faking
SDS (15.24/4.85)	.73	−.29***	−.18*	−.26***	−.23**	−.29***
BIDR-7 (9.23/4.68)	.78	.27***	.14	.19*	.31****	.27***
BIDR-7_SD (1.35/1.91)	.70	.14	.05	.07	.16*	.12
BIDR-7-IM (7.89/3.68)	.72	.27***	.16*	.21**	.31****	.28***
Honesty scale (8.96/4.18)	.80	−.35****	−.36****	−.31****	−.27***	−.39****
Trustworthiness scale (27.77/4.88)	.75	.21**	.21**	.25***	.24**	.27***
Interview Trustworthiness scale (10.17/4.00)	.78	.20**	.24**	.23**	.18*	.26***
Self-Monitoring scale (12.26/3.56)	.63	.21**	.05	.16*	.29***	.21**
Machiavellianism scale (10.19/5.15)	.84	.33****	.23**	.35****	.40****	.38****
Gender[a] (0.39/0.49)		−.04	−.02	−.15	−.05	−.07
GPA (3.26/0.35)		−.02	−.07	−.07	−.02	−.05
White (n = 115)		−.16*	−.24**	−.14	−.02	−.18*
Asian (n = 27)		.17*	.23**	.13	.03	.18*
Hispanic (n = 8)		.00	.08	.00	−.07	.00
Black (n = 3)		−.04	−.08	−.03	.07	−.03

Note. N = 156. IFB = Interview Faking Behavior; SDS = Social Desirability Scale; BIDR-1 = Balanced Inventory of Desirable Responding -7; GPA = grade point average.
* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$. **** $p < .0001$.
[a] 1 = female, 0 = male.

ism scale (rs ranging from .23 to .40, ps < .01). Therefore, Hypotheses 3 and 4 were supported.

Hypothesis 5 stated that the IFB scale would not be related to gender. Accordingly, neither the IFB scale nor its subscales were correlated with gender, and Hypothesis 5 was supported. Hypothesis 6 stated that there would be no relationship between faking and ethnicity. We found the predicted pattern of relationships between ethnicity and Image Protection and Ingratiation. However, White candidates tend to engage less often in Slight and Extensive Image Creation, whereas Asian candidates report more of these behaviors. Thus, Hypothesis 6 was partially supported. Hypothesis 7 stated that the IFB scale would be insignificantly related to GPA. Neither the IFB scale nor its subscales were correlated with GPA. Thus, Hypothesis 7 was supported. Finally, Hypothesis 8 stated that the IFB scale would not be related to self-deception. We found the predicted pattern of relationships between self-deception and the IFB scale and its subscales except for Ingratiation. Therefore, Hypothesis 8 was partially supported.

In addition to the reported internal consistency reliability, test–retest reliability was also assessed. Retest reliability shows the extent to which scores on a measure can be generalized over different occasions and the degree to which the latent construct determines observed scores over time (Nunnally & Bernstein, 1994). We administered the IFB scale twice at 1-month intervals to 70 undergraduate students (44% women, 56% men) with an average of four recent job interviews. Test–retest reliabilities for the IFB total score, Slight Image Creation, Extensive Image Creation, Image Protection, and Ingratiation were .87, .82, .84, .71, and .83, respectively. These results confirm the stability of responses to the instrument.

Study 5: The Effect of Candidate Faking Behaviors on Interview Outcomes

The main purpose of this study was to provide a criterion-related validity study of the IFB scale by examining whether interviewee faking behaviors affect outcomes of actual employment interviews. Research on IM found a positive link between IM behaviors (e.g., ingratiation, self-promotion) and interview outcomes such as perceived applicant suitability (Stevens & Kristof, 1995), perceived applicant fit and similarity (Kristof-Brown et al., 2002), and perceived fit and hiring recommendations (Higgins & Judge, 2004). Therefore, we hypothesize that faking behaviors, as measured by the IFB scale, will correlate with getting another interview or job offer.

Method

Participants and procedure. The data were collected from a new sample of 85 undergraduate students (48% women) who were in the job market for either permanent full-time or temporary internship positions. The students were recruited to participate in this study for extra credit in a college course. Participants were asked to complete the IFB scale on the basis of their interview within 24 hr after the interview. We also measured several control variables at that time. Finally, students wrote the name of the interviewing company and a password that they must remember to claim their extra credit and to indicate the outcome of that interview at the end of the semester. The participation in this study was voluntary and anonymous.

Measures. The measure of faking was the IFB scale. The measure of interview outcome was scored 1 if they were invited for the next round of interviews with the company or received a job offer and scored 0 otherwise. Several control variables were also collected. Because applicant quality and interviewing skills might affect the outcomes of the interview, we asked applicants to indicate the number of previous employment interviews that they had. Participants were asked to indicate their current cumulative GPA as it was reported on their most recent official grade report. Also, the round of the interview (first, second, etc.) was collected. Finally, gender was coded as female = 1, male = 0.

Analysis and Results

The means, standard deviations, and correlations are shown in Table 8. Because the outcome variable was dichotomous, hierarchical logistic regression analysis was used to test the hypothesis (see Table 9). Variables were entered into the regression in two steps (Step 1 = control variables [number of employment interviews, interview round, GPA, and gender], Step 2 = four types of faking behaviors [Slight Image Creation, Extensive Image Creation, Image Protection, and Ingratiation]). The Step 1 model chi-square is significant, indicating that the model with only the control variables fits significantly better than does a model containing only the constant. For Step 2, the chi-square model improvement, $\chi^2(4, N = 85) = 13.36$, $p < .05$, indicates that faking behaviors did improve the model. The same conclusion can be made by considering two other indicators. Pseudo R^2 (Aldrich & Nelson, 1984) was improved from 0.23 to 0.39. Akaike's information criterion was decreased from 112 to 107, indicating a better model fit at Step 2 (Greene, 1990).

The logistic regression analysis uses Wald statistics (that is conceptually equivalent to the *t* tests reported in the ordinary least squares regressions; Greene, 1990) to test significance of individual variables in the model. This test indicates that Extensive Image Creation was a positive significant predictor of the interview outcome (Wald = 8.81, $p < .01$), and Image Protection was a negative predictor that approached significance (Wald = 3.29, $p = .069$). Therefore, our hypothesis was partially supported. Thus, the results indicate that the probability of having a positive interview outcome increases when an interviewee engages in Extensive Image Creation or does not engage in Image Protection.

Further analyses illustrate the practical impact of faking in the interview. If an interviewee had two employment interviews, a first round interview, did not engage in either Extensive Image Creation or Image Protection, then the probability of receiving a next interview or job offer was 0.31. However, if the interviewee engaged in Extensive Image Creation to a little extent, then the probability of a positive interview outcome rose to 0.77. However, if the interviewee engaged in Image Protection to a little extent, then the probability of a positive interview outcome fell to 0.11. The results are similar to the findings in the literature on influence tactics showing that interviewee influence attempts have a significant impact on recruiters' judgments (e.g., Gilmore & Ferris, 1989; Higgins & Judge, 2004; Kristof-Brown et al., 2002). At the same time, the estimates of the probability values from the logistic analysis should be considered with caution. They might be different if other variables that impact interview outcomes were included in an equation.

Study 6: The Use of the IFB Scale for Studying Methods of Reducing Faking in the Employment Interviews

In this section, we report on an experimental study of two factors that are important aspects of structured interviews and likely to influence faking in the interview. On the basis of a review of the literature on faking in personality tests and the literature on deception, we proposed a model of faking during the employment interview and developed 19 testable propositions for when people would fake during the interview (Levashina & Campion, 2006). In this study, we tested two propositions. This study also demonstrated how the IFB scale might be used in future research.

> *Hypothesis 1:* Candidates will engage more in faking when answering situational questions than when answering past behavioral questions during a structured interview.
>
> *Hypothesis 2:* Candidates will engage more in faking when there is no follow-up questioning during a structured interview.

Method

Participants and interviewers. A new sample of 151 undergraduate students (25% women) who were enrolled in a management career course voluntarily participated in this study. One of the requirements of this course was to have an interview for a grade and to prepare for the postgraduation job search process. Six interviewers, graduate students with either concentrations or past work experience in human resource management, participated in the interview process. All interviewers had experience in conducting interviews (on average 50 interviews).

Study design. A 2 × 2 between-subjects design with factors of question type (past behavioral vs. situational) and follow-up ques-

Table 8
Means, Standard Deviations, and Intercorrelations Among Study 5 Variables

Variable	*M* (*SD*)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
1. Number of employment interviews	3.49 (2.73)	—									
2. Interview round	1.21 (0.41)	.04	—								
3. GPA	3.41 (0.69)	.04	−.07	—							
4. Gender[a]	0.48 (0.50)	−.22*	.02	.08	—						
5. Slight image creation	2.22 (0.83)	.18	.03	−.09	−.19	(0.93)					
6. Extensive image creation	1.62 (0.74)	.08	.05	−.12	−.14	.71**	(0.96)				
7. Image protection	1.91 (0.77)	.04	.07	−.08	−.27*	.78**	.67**	(0.90)			
8. Ingratiation	2.63 (0.96)	.06	.08	−.10	−.26*	.62**	.48**	.62**	(0.95)		
9. Faking	2.09 (0.71)	.10	.07	−.12	−.26*	.90**	.82**	.89**	.82**	(0.98)	
10. Interview outcome	0.51 (0.50)	.31**	.28**	−.04	−.13	.11	.25*	.01	.05	.12	

Note. $N = 85$. Reliabilities are on the diagonal in parentheses. GPA = grade point average.
[a] 1 = female, 0 = male.
* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$.

Table 9
Results of a Logistic Regression of Interview Outcome[a]

Variable	Step 1			Step 2		
	B (*SE*)	Wald	*p*	*B* (*SE*)	Wald	*p*
Constant	−2.17 (1.44)	2.26	.133	−3.34 (1.83)	3.32	0.068
Number of employment interviews	0.26 (0.12)	5.67	.017	0.33 (0.14)	5.69	0.017
Interview round	1.49 (0.64)	5.45	.020	1.63 (0.68)	5.77	0.016
GPA	−0.09 (0.33)	0.08	.783	0.02 (0.34)	0.01	0.951
Gender[b]	−0.32 (0.48)	0.44	.505	−0.50 (0.56)	0.78	0.381
Slight image creation				−0.19 (0.59)	0.10	0.747
Extensive image creation				2.08 (0.70)	8.81	0.003
Image protection				−1.22 (0.67)	3.29	0.069
Ingratiation				−0.04 (0.37)	0.01	0.912
−2 log likelihood χ^2		101.72			88.37	
AIC		111.72			106.37	
Model χ^2		16.10**			29.46***	
Pseudo R^2		0.23			0.39	

Note. $N = 85$. GPA = grade point average; AIC = Akaike's information criterion. Values in the last four rows describe the model fit at step 1 or step 2.
[a] Interview outcome was coded as 1 if an interviewee was invited for the next round of interviews with the company or received a job offer, and coded as 0 otherwise. [b] 1 = female, 0 = male.
** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$.

tioning (presence vs. absence) was used. Each participant was randomly assigned to the type of interview. All interviews consisted of 14 questions. Four questions were the same in each interview (e.g., "Why did you choose to major in_?"), and there were either 10 past behavioral or 10 situational questions, depending on the condition. The 10 questions were designed to assess 10 competencies deemed essential to most jobs that undergraduate students might be interviewing for in the future (e.g., oral communication, ability to influence and persuade, leadership). Two parallel questions were written (one past behavioral and one situational) to address each competency. For example, the past behavioral question asked the participants to "Describe a time when you had a good idea, but there was opposition to it. How did you persuade others to 'see things your way?'" The parallel situational question was "Suppose you have a great idea, but there is opposition to it among your colleagues. What would you do to persuade your colleagues to 'see things your way?'" In interviews with follow-up questioning, interviewers asked at least one of the following standardized probing questions after each interview question: "Why?", "Could you please elaborate?", "Please explain in more detail", "What do you mean?", "Tell me why you did that?" In interviews with no follow-up questioning, all prompting was prohibited.

Procedure and measures. Before any of the interviews began, the six interviewers participated in a 1-hr training session. The interviewers were instructed how to administer the different types of interviews. Interviewers were kept blind to the hypotheses of the study.

To recruit participants, the author made an announcement in the class asking students to voluntarily participate in a study by completing an instrument (the IFB scale) after their mock interviews. Students were told that the purpose of the study was to examine different behaviors that could be used to impress interviewers and to increase scores on the interview. It is important to emphasize that at no point were participants instructed to fake mock interviews, but rather they were told to use this opportunity to better prepare themselves for their real future employment interviews. Also, it was explained to participants that their participation would be completely anonymous, no names would be recorded, and neither the researcher nor the course instructor would be able to link their responses on the instrument back to them.

All interviews were conducted in an interview room in one of the university career centers during a 3-month period. Students signed up for their mock interviews according to their availability. Different interview types (past behavioral with follow-up, situational with follow-up, past behavioral with no follow-up, and situational with no follow-up) were assigned in a way that all four types were conducted each week for 1 day each, and all six interviewers conducted approximately the same number of each interview. Students were unaware of the type of interview they would have or about the different interviews. One interviewer conducted each interview. Within each interview, four nonbehavioral questions were asked first and then the 10 past behavioral or situational questions were asked next, with the order of the items randomized across participants. After the interview, interviewees returned to the orientation room to complete the IFB scale, seal it in a provided envelope, and put it in a special box. This box was emptied by Julia Levashina after each day. Cumulative GPA and gender were measured as controlled variables. Two subscales (Fit Enhancing and Interviewer or Organization Enhancing) were removed from the IFB scale because the mock interview was not job or organization specific.

Results

All types of faking behaviors were regressed on gender and GPA. Both variables were found to be insignificant predictors of

faking. Thus, they were not included as control variables in the subsequent analysis. To test the major hypotheses, data on faking behaviors were analyzed by a two-way analysis of variance (ANOVA), with the following between-subjects factors: question type (past behavioral–situational) and follow-up questioning (follow-up–no follow-up). An unbalanced two-way ANOVA was used due to an unequal number of observations per condition. The means and standard deviations of reported faking behaviors across different conditions are presented in Table 10. The two-way ANOVA revealed that there were statistically significant differences in the extent to which candidates engage in faking behaviors among the four types of interview (all F ratios were significant at $p < .01$), and the interaction between question type and follow-up questioning was insignificant (see Table 10). Therefore, the main effects could be interpreted.

Hypothesis 1 stated that applicants would engage more often in all types of faking behaviors when answering situational questions rather than past behavioral questions. The main effect of question type was significant, indicating that participants engaged more in total faking behaviors, Slight Image Creation, and Ingratiation when answering situational questions than past behavioral questions (see Table 10). However, the effect of question type was insignificant for Extensive Image Creation and Image Protection. Thus, Hypothesis 1 was mostly supported.

Hypothesis 2 stated that applicants would engage more often in all types of faking when there was no follow-up questioning during structured interviews. As shown in Table 10, a main effect of follow-up questioning was significant for all types of faking behaviors (ps $< .01$). Follow-up questioning did not decrease faking as it was hypothesized but actually significantly increased all types of faking behaviors (see Table 10). Therefore, Hypothesis 2 was not supported. However, the strong opposite finding is very important both theoretically and practically.

Although the interaction effect between question type and follow-up questioning was not significant, we performed multiple comparisons of means of all types of faking behaviors across the four interview conditions. A Tukey-Kramer test was used because of unequal group sizes. The means and standard deviations are reported in Table 10. This test revealed that the means of all types of faking behaviors in two conditions (past behavioral interviews with follow-up questioning and situational interviews with no follow-up questioning) were not significantly different from each other, whereas the means of all types of faking behaviors in situational interviews with follow-up questioning were significantly greater (all t ratios were significant at ps $< .01$) than the means for past behavioral interviews with no follow-up questioning.

Table 10
Means and Standard Deviations of Faking Behaviors Across Different Conditions

Faking behavior	Question type					Follow-up questioning					Interaction									
	Past behavioral ($n = 76$)		Situational ($n = 75$)			Follow-up ($n = 81$)		No follow-up ($n = 70$)			Past behavioral				Situational					
											No follow-up ($n = 38$)		Follow-up ($n = 38$)		No follow-up ($n = 32$)		Follow-up ($n = 43$)			
	M	SD	M	SD	F (1, 147)	M	SD	M	SD	F (1,147)	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	F (1,147)
Total	1.62	0.60	1.83	0.60	4.35*	1.91	0.64	1.52	0.50	15.91**	1.41	0.39	1.83	0.70	1.65	0.59	1.98	0.57	0.20
Slight image creation	1.69	0.63	2.01	0.71	7.16**	2.05	0.71	1.62	0.58	15.18**	1.51	0.51	1.89	0.68	1.75	0.63	2.19	0.71	0.13
Extensive image creation	1.36	0.57	1.41	0.55	0.15	1.52	0.63	1.22	0.41	10.97**	1.17	0.27	1.54	0.71	1.28	0.53	1.50	0.56	0.40
Image protection	1.69	0.70	1.86	0.73	1.76	1.95	0.77	1.58	0.60	10.14**	1.46	0.47	1.92	0.81	1.71	0.71	1.97	0.74	0.75
Ingratiation	1.73	0.91	2.08	0.86	5.01*	2.12	0.91	1.66	0.84	9.42**	1.50	0.76	1.97	0.98	1.85	0.90	2.25	0.80	0.06

Note. $N = 151$.
* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$.

Discussion

Main findings. This study focused on the issue of faking in the employment interview. Following established psychometric procedures for scale development (e.g., Nunnally & Bernstein, 1994), six separate studies were conducted. Study 1 involved item generation. On the basis of the three sources, we identified and proposed a taxonomy of faking behaviors. The identified faking behaviors were converted into the IFB scale. Study 2 involved evaluation of the proposed taxonomy of faking behaviors and item reduction through EFA of data collected from ($N = 260$) under-

graduate job candidates. Study 3 described a CFA of data collected from a new sample ($N = 589$) to confirm the factor structure. Study 4 provided preliminary convergent and discriminant validity evidence for the IFB scale using a separate sample ($N = 156$) of undergraduate job candidates. Also, test–retest reliability was assessed on a separate sample ($n = 70$) of job candidates. Study 5 described a criterion-related study using a new sample ($N = 85$) to show that the IFB scale relates to actual interview outcomes. Finally, Study 6 described a study using the new measure for studying methods of reducing faking during structured interviews ($N = 151$).

The first four studies showed that faking construct was represented by four factors (Slight Image Creation, Extensive Image Creation, Image Protection, and Ingratiation) and 11 subfactors (Embellishing, Tailoring, Fit Enhancing, Constructing, Inventing, Borrowing, Masking, Distancing, Omitting, Opinion Conforming, and Interviewer or Organization Enhancing). This structure of faking is useful because of conceptual, empirical, and practical reasons. Conceptually, when candidates engage in Slight Image Creation, they exaggerate, but they are still close to the truth. When candidates engage in Extensive Image Creation, they invent information (e.g., they lie). When candidates engage in Image Protection, they intentionally omit job-related information. Finally, when job candidates insincerely ingratiate, they are trying to make interviewers like them and give them a better score on the interview regardless of their performance. Empirically, the results of the EFA and CFA indicate that faking is a multidimensional construct. It is likely that different variables would predict the likelihood of engaging in different faking behaviors. For example, if candidates do not know the job requirements, then they would not be able to tailor but would be able to exaggerate. In addition, results from the criterion-related study indicate that different faking factors impact the interview outcome in different ways. Practically, there are statistically significant differences in the means of job candidate faking behavior. Undergraduate job candidates use significantly more ingratiation, followed by slight image creation, image protection, and extensive image creation (see Table 11). Thus, this structure gives practitioners useful information about different types of faking behavior and the likelihood of their occurrence.

Study 5 showed that faking behaviors affect interview outcomes. Particularly, Extensive Image Creation increases the probability of getting another interview or job offer, whereas Image Protection decreases the probability. Study 6 showed that past behavioral interviews were more resilient to faking compared with situational interviews. This is practically important because even though applicants may want to fake, there may be ways to interview that constrain faking. One of the most interesting findings was that follow-up questioning increased faking in both situational and past behavioral structured interviews. We hypothesized the opposite effect by assuming that probing would be a response verification mechanism that would inhibit faking. Informal debriefing with participants revealed that follow-up questioning was perceived not as response verification but rather as a cue signaling what types of answers were important and critical. Finally, this study showed that past behavioral interviews with no follow-up questioning were the most resilient to faking, whereas situational interviews with follow-up questions were the least resilient to faking. These studies show that the scale demonstrated content validity, consistent factor structure, reliabilities above the recommended level for new scales, convergent and discriminant validity, criterion-related validity, and initial empirical evidence of interview methods of reducing faking.

Base rate of faking behaviors. Table 11 provides the percentages, means, and standard deviations of undergraduate candidates' use of faking behaviors. The table shows data obtained in Studies 3, 5, and 6. In Study 3, undergraduate candidates were asked to report faking behaviors on the basis of all employment interviews

Table 11
Base Rate of Faking Behaviors Across Three Studies

	Percentage of candidates using faking behaviors			Means and (standard deviations) of job candidates' faking behavior use		
Type of faking behavior	Study 3 ($n = 589$)	Study 5 ($n = 85$)	Study 6 ($n = 151$)	Study 3 ($n = 589$)	Study 5 ($n = 85$)	Study 6 ($n = 151$)
Slight image creation	99.49	95.29	85.43	2.49 (0.74)	2.22 (0.83)	1.85 (0.69)
Embellishing	96.10	85.88	72.19	2.39 (0.86)	2.05 (0.91)	1.65 (0.67)
Tailoring	96.60	91.76	72.85	2.56 (0.84)	2.29 (0.94)	2.05 (0.93)
Fit enhancing	94.57	90.59		2.52 (0.89)	2.30 (0.92)	
Extensive image creation	91.85	80.00	64.9	1.68 (0.72)	1.62 (0.74)	1.38 (0.56)
Constructing	71.31	63.51	51.66	1.71 (0.85)	1.66 (0.86)	1.42 (0.71)
Inventing	88.12	74.71	58.28	1.82 (0.76)	1.81 (0.81)	1.43 (0.58)
Borrowing	42.95	34.12	27.81	1.50 (0.81)	1.38 (0.76)	1.30 (0.65)
Image protection	95.76	85.88	86.75	2.09 (0.74)	1.91 (0.77)	1.78 (0.72)
Omitting	85.40	74.12	78.81	2.28 (0.93)	2.06 (1.00)	2.16 (0.96)
Masking	84.21	82.35	59.60	2.01 (0.84)	1.87 (0.84)	1.58 (0.77)
Distancing	75.21	58.82	60.00	1.99 (0.91)	1.78 (0.93)	1.59 (0.79)
Ingratiation	98.64	95.29	77.48	2.76 (0.87)	2.63 (0.96)	1.90 (0.90)
Opinion conforming	96.26	95.29	77.48	2.56 (0.91)	2.52 (0.95)	1.90 (0.90)
Interviewer or organization enhancing	96.60	91.76		2.97 (1.02)	2.73 (1.08)	
Total	99.49	98.82	93.38	2.25 (0.63)	2.09 (0.71)	1.73 (0.61)

Note. Data for the percentage of candidates using Fit enhancing are not available for study 6 because of the nature of mock interview.

they have had, whereas in Studies 5 and 6, undergraduate candidates were asked to report faking behaviors after an actual interview and mock interview, respectively. Results of all studies are consistent and indicate that undergraduate job candidates engage more in Ingratiation and Slight Image Creation and engage less in Image Protection and Extensive Image Creation. On the basis of the results of Study 5, a dependent sample multivariate t test (similar to T^2 test for equality of treatments in a repeated measures design) indicates that there are significant differences in the means of types of these faking behaviors used ($p < .001$).

Base rates in multiple studies show that over 90% of undergraduate job candidates fake during employment interviews; however, fewer candidates engage in faking behaviors that are semantically closer to lying, ranging from 28% to 75%. On the basis of the results of Study 5, 95% of undergraduate candidates engage in Slight Image Creation and Ingratiation during their actual employment interviews. They use all types of faking that comprise these two factors (e.g., 86% of undergraduate job candidates embellish, 91% engage in fit enhancing). However, fewer candidates engage in Extensive Image Creation (80%) or Image Protection (86%) during actual employment interviews, and they tend to be more selective in the use of different types of faking that comprise these two factors (e.g., 64% of undergraduate candidates engage in Constructing, 75% engage in Inventing, and 34% engage in Borrowing). Also, undergraduate job candidates who engage in Extensive Image Creation tend to engage in all other types of faking so that the impact of Slight Image Creation is being overcome by the extreme cases.

At the same time, there are some differences in the base rates of faking behaviors across different studies. The percentages and means of faking in Study 6 are much lower than in Study 3 and Study 5. This could be due to at least two reasons (Levashina & Campion, 2006). First, the structured interviews that were used in Study 6 may provide less opportunity for job candidates to engage in faking behaviors. Second, motivation to engage in faking may be lower in mock employment interviews (see Study 6) than in actual employment interviews (see Study 5).

Theoretical and practical implications. There are theoretical as well as practical implications of this research. First, this is the first study that directly investigated faking during employment interviews. A number of studies have been devoted to the issue of detection of deception in different contexts (e.g., interviews, court testimonies, interpersonal interactions). The main finding of this research is that humans cannot detect deception accurately (e.g., DePaulo, Stone, & Lassiter, 1985). Therefore, self-report measures of faking behaviors are needed to understand, predict, and prevent faking during employment interviews. Second, the IFB scale provides a conceptually useful framework for understanding factors of interview behavior. The IFB scale is developed to be used to improve the selection process and not as a selection device. Third, this study examined two assumptions of valid interview questions. Motowidlo (1999) argued that the validity of situational questions rests on the assumption that what people say they will do in hypothetical situations accurately represents their true intentions for future actions in such situations, and the validity of past behavior questions rests on the assumption that applicants truthfully describe their past behaviors, and they are likely to behave the same in the future. However, applicants might be inclined to deceive recruiters by telling them what they think will create a favorable impression. When candidates do not state their true intentions or do not truthfully describe their past behaviors, the assumptions are not met, and the validity of both interview types suffers. However, past research has failed to examine these assumptions. This study demonstrates that past behavioral interviews may be more resilient to faking. The IFB scale could be used to improve the theory of interviews by assessing the likelihood of faking as a function of other components of interview structure. Fourth, this study investigates the role of follow-up questioning in promoting faking. We could not locate any study that investigates follow-up questioning in interviews. However, it has been proposed that follow-up questions could be used to get a specific and detailed answer (Motowidlo et al., 1992), keep candidates on track (Janz, 1989), or test hypotheses about the candidate (Drake, 1982). In this study, standardized follow-up questions (e.g., "Could you please elaborate?") were perceived by interviewees as cues signaling that the requested information was important for the interviewer and prompting more detailed answers that encouraged respondents to fake. Fifth, the results of this study indicate that undergraduate candidates engage in different types of faking during their employment interviews, and they fake to different extents. Finally, we hope that the results of this article are not perceived as an endorsement of faking behaviors and do not suggest to students that faking is practically necessary to gain a job offer. Candidates should answer interview questions in a way that will help them get a job offer that fits their true personality and credentials. For example, they might use self-promotion tactics (Stevens & Kristof, 1995) by presenting their best experiences, but they should not outright fake or lie.

Limitations

There are two limitations caused by the samples used. First, the taxonomy of faking behaviors was studied in samples of job candidates with limited work experience. Some types of faking behaviors may be more common for candidates with more work experience. Second, the fact that college students served as candidates in Study 6 may have decreased the generalizability of the results. However, students were motivated to do their best during the interview because of not only extrinsic motivation (a better grade) but also intrinsic motivation (to prepare themselves for future employment interviews). Also, the nature of the mock interview could have affected the behaviors of participants. However, the experimental design that we used allowed us to manipulate the interview conditions without imposing any artificial restrictions on the behaviors of participants (e.g., asking them to fake an interview). At the same time, participants may have still felt some encouragement to impression manage in the interviews despite our instructions. Nevertheless, we believe that our results provide some useful information about the behaviors of job applicants.

Future Research

There are many areas for future research. First, future research may refine the scale. For example, data from different samples could be collected to cross-validate the factor structure of the scale. Also, future research could examine the relationships between the IFB scale and additional measures in the nomological network.

This may include other measures of faking and measures of applicant reactions (e.g., perceptions of justice). Second, future research should examine the relationships between identified types of faking and different types of IM to see whether, for instance, Slight Image Creation is the typical case of the self-promotion tactic (Stevens & Kristof, 1995). Third, future research should examine further the criterion-related validity of the IFB scale and assess whether faking is related to job performance if faking candidates are hired. Fourth, future research should explore other components of interview structure to identify those that encourage less faking (e.g., number of interviewers, interview length, rating scales). Fifth, more studies on follow-up questioning are needed. There is some evidence that candidates as well as interviewers may prefer follow-up questioning (Dipboye, 1994). Thus, future research could investigate whether there are types of follow-up questioning that could be used to clarify answers and seek information without prompting faking. Sixth, future research could investigate whether interviewers are able to detect different faking behaviors that candidates use during an interview. For example, interviewer's perceptions of whether faking behaviors appeared to occur could be compared with behaviors that interviewees self-reported on the IFB. In the end, it is hoped that this study and the availability of the IFB scale will encourage more research on this long-neglected topic.

References

Aldrich, J. H., & Nelson, F. D. (1984). *Linear probability, logit, and probit models*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Allsopp, J., Eysenck, H. J., & Eysenck, S. B. (1991). Machiavellianism as a component in psychoticism and extraversion. *Personality and Individual Differences, 12,* 29–41.

Arbuckle, J. L. (2003). *AMOS 5.0 user's guide*. Chicago: Smallwaters.

Bass, B. M., Cascio, W. F., & O'Connor, E. J. (1974). Magnitude estimations of frequency and amount. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 59,* 313–320.

Baumeister, R. F. (1982). A self-presentational view of social phenomena. *Psychological Bulletin, 91,* 3–26.

Baumeister, R. F. (1989). Motives and costs of self-presentation in organizations. In R. A. Giacalone & P. Rosenfeld (Eds.), *Impression management in the organization* (pp. 57–73). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Bentler, P. M. (1990). Comparative fit indexes in structural models. *Psychological Bulletin, 107,* 238–246.

Bentler, P. M., & Bonett, D. G. (1980). Significance tests and goodness of fit in the analysis of covariance structures. *Psychological Bulletin, 88,* 588–606.

Braithwaite, V. A., & Scott, W. A. (1991). Values. In J. P. Robinson, P. R. Shaver, & L. S. Wrightsman (Eds.), *Measures of personality and social psychological attitudes* (pp. 661–753). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.

Cattell, R. B. (1966). The scree test for the number of factors. *Multivariate Behavioral Research, 1,* 254–276.

Christie, R., & Geis, F. L. (Eds.). (1970). *Studies in Machiavellianism*. New York: Academic Press.

Cizek, G. J. (1999). *Cheating on tests: How to do it, detect it, and prevent it*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Comrey, A. L., & Backer, T. E. (1975). Detection of faking on the Comrey Personality Scales. *Multivariate Behavioral Research, 10,* 311–319.

Cronbach, L. J., & Meehl, P. E. (1955). Construct validity in psychological tests. *Psychological Bulletin, 52,* 281–302.

Crowne, D. P., & Marlowe, D. (1960). A new scale of social desirability independent of psychopathology. *Journal of Consulting Psychology, 24,* 349–354.

DePaulo, B. M., Epstein, J. A., & Wyer, M. M. (1993). Sex differences in lying: How women and men deal with the dilemma of deceit. In M. Lewis & C. Saarni (Eds.), *Lying and deception in everyday life* (pp. 126–147). New York: Guilford Press.

DePaulo, B. M., Kashy, D. A., Kirkendol, S. E., Wyer, M. M., & Epstein, J. A. (1996). Lying in everyday life. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 70,* 979–995.

DePaulo, B. M., Stone, J. I., & Lassiter, G. D. (1985). Deceiving and detecting deceit. In B. R. Schlenker (Ed.), *The self and social life* (pp. 323–370). New York: McGraw-Hill.

Dipboye, R. L. (1994). Structured and unstructured selection interviews: Beyond the job-fit model. In G. R. Ferris (Ed.), *Research in personnel and human resources management* (Vol. 12, pp. 79–123). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

DiStefano, C. (2002). The impact of categorization with confirmatory factor analysis. *Structural Equation Modeling, 9,* 327–346.

Dolan, C. V. (1994). Factor analysis of variables with 2, 3, 5, and 7 response categories: A comparison of categorical variable estimators using simulated data. *British Journal of Mathematical and Statistical Psychology, 47,* 309–326.

Drake, J. D. (1982). *Interviewing for managers: A complete guide to employment interviewing*. New York: AMACOM.

Drake, J. D. (1997). *The perfect interview: How to get the job you really want*. New York: AMACOM.

Edwards, A. L. (1957). *The social desirability variable in personality assessment and research*. Ft. Worth, TX: Dryden Press.

Ellingson, J. E., Smith, D. B., & Sackett, P. R. (2001). Investigating the influence of social desirability on personality factor structure. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 86,* 122–133.

Ellis, A. P. J., West, B. J., Ryan, A. M., & DeShon, R. P. (2002). The use of impression management tactics in structured interviews: A function of question type? *Journal of Applied Psychology, 87,* 1200–1208.

Fletcher, C. (1989). Impression management in the selection interview. In R. A. Giacalone & P. Rosenfeld (Eds.), *Impression management in the organization* (pp. 269–281). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

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

Furnham, A. (1986). Response bias, social desirability, and dissimulation. *Personality and Individual Differences, 7,* 385–400.

Furnham, A. (1990). Faking personality questionnaires: Fabricating different profiles for different purposes. *Current Psychology: Research & Reviews, 9,* 46–55.

Giacalone, R. A., & Rosenfeld, P. (Eds.). (1989). *Impression management in the organization*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Gilmore, D. C., & Ferris, G. R. (1989). The effects of applicant impression management tactics on interviewer judgments. *Journal of Management, 15,* 557–564.

Gilmore, D. C., Stevens, C. K., Harrell-Cook, G., & Ferris, G. R. (1999). Impression management tactics. In R. W. Eder & M. M. Harris (Eds.), *The employment interview handbook* (pp. 321–336). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Greene, W. H. (1990). *Econometric analysis*. New York: Macmillan.

Higgins, C. A., & Judge, T. A. (2004). The effect of applicant influence tactics on recruiter perceptions of fit and hiring recommendations: A field study. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 89,* 622–632.

Holden, R. R., & Fekken, G. C. (1989). Three common social desirability scales: Friends, acquaintances, or strangers? *Journal of Research in Personality, 23,* 180–191.

Hopper, R., & Bell, R. A. (1984). Broadening the deception construct. *Quarterly Journal of Speech, 70,* 288–302.

Isaksen, S. G., & Davis, G. A. (1979). Faking high and low creativity scores on the Adjective Check List. *Journal of Creative Behavior, 13,* 139–145.

Janz, T. (1989). The patterned behavior description interview: The best prophet of future is the past. In R. W. Eder & G. R. Ferris (Eds.), *The employment interview: Theory, research, and practice* (pp. 158–168). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Kaiser, H. F. (1960). The application of electronic computers to factor analysis. *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 20,* 141–151.

Kashy, D. A., & DePaulo, B. M. (1996). Who lies? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 70,* 1037–1051.

Kelloway, E. K. (1998). *Using LISREL for structural equation modeling: A researcher's guide*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Kipnis, D., Schmidt, S. M., & Wilkinson, I. (1980). Intraorganizational influence tactics: Explorations in getting one's way. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 65,* 440–452.

Kline, R. B. (1998). *Principles and practice of structural equation modeling*. New York: Guilford Press.

Knapp, M. L., & Comadena, M. E. (1979). Telling it like it isn't: A review of theory and research on deceptive communications. *Human Communication Research, 5,* 270–285.

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

Kumar, K., & Beyerlein, M. (1991). Construction and validation of an instrument for measuring ingratiatory behaviors in organizational settings. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 76,* 619–627.

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

Levashina, J., & Campion, M. A. (2006). A model of faking likelihood in the employment interview. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment, 14,* 299–316.

Levin, R. A., & Zickar, M. J. (2002). Investigating self-presentation, lies, and bullshit: Understanding faking and its effects on selection decisions using theory, field research, and simulation. In J. M. Brett & F. Drasgow (Eds.), *The psychology of work: Theoretically based empirical research* (pp. 253–276). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Marsh, H. W., Balla, J. R., & Hau, K. (1996). An evaluation of incremental fit indices: A clarification of mathematical and empirical properties. In G. A. Marcoulides & R. E. Schumacker (Eds.), *Advanced structural equation modeling: Issues and techniques* (pp. 315–353). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Maruyama, G. M. (1998). *Basics of structural equation modeling*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

McFarland, L. A., Ryan, A. M., & Kriska, S. D. (2003). Impression management use and effectiveness across assessment methods. *Journal of Management, 29,* 641–661.

Medley, H. A. (1993). Sweaty palms: The neglected art of being interviewed. Berkeley, CA: Ten Speed.

Miller, G. R., DeTurck, M. A., & Kalbfleisch, P. J. (1983). Self-monitoring, rehearsal, and deceptive communication. *Human Communication Research, 10,* 97–117.

Morrison, E. W., & Bies, R. J. (1991). Impression management in the feedback-seeking process: A literature review and research agenda. *Academy of Management Review, 16,* 522–541.

Motowidlo, S. J. (1999). Asking about past behavior versus hypothetical behavior. In R. W. Eder & M. M. Harris (Eds.), *The employment interview handbook* (pp. 179–190). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Motowidlo, S. J., Carter, G. W., Dunnette, M. D., Tippins, N., Werner, S., Burnett, J. R., & Vaughan, M. J. (1992). Studies of the structured behavioral interview. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 77,* 571–587.

Nunnally, J., & Bernstein, I. H. (1994). *Psychometric theory*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Ones, D. S., & Viswesvaran, C. (1998). The effects of social desirability and faking on personality and integrity assessment for personnel selection. *Human Performance, 11,* 245–269.

Palmer, D. K., Campion, M. A., & Green, P. C. (1999). Interviewing training for both applicant and interviewer. In R. W. Eder & M. M. Harris (Eds.), *The employment interview handbook* (pp. 337–353). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Paulhus, D. L. (1984). Two-component models of socially desirable responding. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 46,* 598–609.

Paulhus, D. L. (1991). Measurement and control of response bias. In J. P. Robinson, P. R. Shaver, & L. S. Wrightsman (Eds.), *Measures of personality and social psychological attitudes* (pp. 17–59). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.

Riggio, R. E., Tucker, J., & Throckmorton, B. (1987). Social skills and deception ability. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 13,* 568–577.

Rummel, R. J. (1970). *Applied factor analysis*. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press.

Sackett, P. R., & Wanek, J. E. (1996). New developments in the use of measures of honesty, integrity, conscientiousness, dependability, trustworthiness, and reliability for personnel selection. *Personnel Psychology, 49,* 787–829.

Schlenker, B. R. (1980). *Impression management: The self-concept, social identity, and interpersonal relations*. Monterey, CA: Brooks/Cole.

Scott, W. A. (1965). *Values and organizations: A study of fraternities and sororities*. Chicago: Rand McNally.

Sincoff, M. Z., & Goyer, R. S. (1984). *Interviewing*. New York: Macmillan.

Snyder, M. (1974). Self-monitoring of expressive behaviors. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 30,* 526–537.

Snyder, M., & Monson, T. C. (1975). Persons, situations, and the control of social behavior. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 32,* 637–644.

Stark, S., Chernyshenko, O. S., Chan, K., Lee, W. C., & Drasgow, F. (2001). Effects of the testing situation on item responding: Cause for concern. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 86,* 943–953.

Stevens, C. K., & Kristof, A. L. (1995). Making the right impression: A field study of applicant impression management during job interviews. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 80,* 587–606.

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

Topp, K. L. (2001). Perceptions of organizational cultures and impression management behaviors: An investigation of the relationship. *Dissertation Abstracts Internationa, 62*(05), 2526b. (UMI No. 3014293)

Tyler, J. M., & Feldman, R. S. (2004). Truth, lies, and self-presentation: How gender and anticipated future interaction relate to deceptive behavior. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 34,* 2602–2615.

Wrightsman, L. S. (1964). Measurement of philosophies of human nature. *Psychological Reports, 14,* 743–751.

Zerbe, W. J., & Paulhus, D. L. (1987). Socially desirable responding in organizational behavior: A reconception. *Academy of Management Review, 12,* 250–264.

(*Appendix follows*)

Appendix

Taxonomy of Faking Behaviors and the Interview Faking Behavior Scale

Please think about your last employment interviews that you had. What strategies from the list below have you used during your interview? Rate the extent to which you used each strategy by circling the appropriate number.

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

Your answers will remain completely confidential and anonymous. We have no way of connecting the answers back to you. Please answer as honestly as possible.

I. SLIGHT IMAGE CREATION
(to make an image of a good candidate for the job)

Embellishing (to overstate or embellish answers beyond a reasonable description of the truth)

ICEMB1	I said that I am an expert in an area even though I am only familiar with it.[a]	1 2 3 4 5
ICEMB2	I said that it would take less time to learn the job than I knew it would.	1 2 3 4 5
ICEMB3	I exaggerated my future goals.	1 2 3 4 5
ICEMB4	I exaggerated my responsibilities on my previous jobs.	1 2 3 4 5
ICEMB5	I exaggerated the impact of my performance in my past jobs.	1 2 3 4 5
ICEMB6	I used examples of my best performance to answer questions about my everyday performance.[a]	1 2 3 4 5

Tailoring (to modify or adapt answers to fit the job)

ICTAI7	During the interview, I distorted my answers based on the comments or reactions of the interviewer.	1 2 3 4 5
ICTAI8	During the interview, I distorted my answers to emphasize what the interviewer was looking for.	1 2 3 4 5
ICTAI9	I distorted my answers based on the information about the job I obtained during the interview.	1 2 3 4 5
ICTAI10	I distorted my work experience to fit the interviewer's view of the position.	1 2 3 4 5
ICTAI11	I distorted my qualifications to match qualifications required for the job.	1 2 3 4 5
ICTAI12	I tried to find out about the organization's culture and then use that information to fabricate my answers.	1 2 3 4 5

Fit Enhancing (to create the impression of a fit with the job or organization in terms of beliefs, values, or attitudes)

ICFIT13	I enhanced my fit with the job in terms of attitudes, values, or beliefs.	1 2 3 4 5
ICFIT14	I inflated the fit between my values and goals and values and goals of the organization.	1 2 3 4 5
ICFIT15	I inflated the fit between my credentials and needs of the organization.	1 2 3 4 5
ICFIT16	When asked, I did not mention any disagreements with the organization's philosophies.[a]	1 2 3 4 5
ICFIT17	I tried to use information about the company to make my answers sound like I was a better fit than I actually was.	1 2 3 4 5

II. EXTENSIVE IMAGE CREATION
(to invent an image of a good candidate for the job)

Constructing (to build stories by combining or arranging work experiences to provide better answers)

ICCON18	I told fictional stories prepared in advance of the interview to best present my credentials.	1 2 3 4 5
ICCON19	I fabricated examples to show my fit with the organization.	1 2 3 4 5
ICCON20	I made up stories about my work experiences that were well developed and logical.	1 2 3 4 5
ICCON21	I constructed fictional stories to explain the gaps in my work experiences.	1 2 3 4 5
ICCON22	I told stories that contained both real and fictional work experiences.	1 2 3 4 5
ICCON23	I combined, modified and distorted my work experiences in my answers.	1 2 3 4 5
ICCON24	I used made-up stories for most questions.	1 2 3 4 5

Inventing (to cook up better answers)

ICINV25	I claimed that I have skills that I do not have.	1 2 3 4 5
ICINV26	I made up measurable outcomes of performed tasks.	1 2 3 4 5
ICINV27	I claimed work experiences that I do not actually have.[a]	1 2 3 4 5
ICINV28	I promised that I could meet all job requirements (e.g., working late or on weekends), even though I probably could not.	1 2 3 4 5
ICINV29	I misrepresented the description of an event.	1 2 3 4 5
ICINV30	I stretched the truth to give a good answer.	1 2 3 4 5
ICINV31	I invented some work situations or accomplishments that did not really occur.	1 2 3 4 5
ICINV32	I told some "little white lies" in the interview.	1 2 3 4 5

Borrowing (to answer based on the experiences or accomplishments of others)

ICBOR33	My answers were based on examples of job performance of other employees.	1 2 3 4 5
ICBOR34	When I did not have a good answer, I borrowed work experiences of other people and made them sound like my own.	1 2 3 4 5
ICBOR35	I used other people's experiences to create answers when I did not have good experiences of my own.	1 2 3 4 5
ICBOR36	I described team accomplishments as primarily my own.[a]	1 2 3 4 5

II. IMAGE PROTECTION
(to defend an image of a good candidate for the job)

Omitting (to not mention some things in order to improve answers)

IPOMI37	When asked directly, I tried to say nothing about my real job-related weaknesses.	1 2 3 4 5
IPOMI38	I tried to avoid discussion of job tasks that I may not be able to do.	1 2 3 4 5
IPOMI39	I tried to avoid discussing my lack of skills or experiences.	1 2 3 4 5
IPOMI40	I tried not to admit that I did not know an answer.[a]	1 2 3 4 5
IPOMI41	I did not mention that I believed I needed additional training to do the job.[a]	1 2 3 4 5
IPOMI42	When asked directly, I did not mention my true reason for quitting previous job.	1 2 3 4 5

Masking (to disguise or conceal aspects of background to create better answers)

IPMAS43	I tried to mention only my limitations that are easily remedied[a]	1 2 3 4 5
IPMAS44	I did not reveal my true career intentions about working with the hiring organization.	1 2 3 4 5
IPMAS45	I tried not to show my true personality.[a]	1 2 3 4 5
IPMAS46	When asked directly, I did not mention some problems that I had in past jobs.	1 2 3 4 5
IPMAS47	I did not reveal requested information that might hurt my chances of getting a job.	1 2 3 4 5
IPMAS48	I talked mainly about my strengths to mask my weaknesses.[a]	1 2 3 4 5
IPMAS49	I covered up some "skeletons in my closet."	1 2 3 4 5

Distancing (to improve answers by separating from negative events or experiences)

IPDIS50	I tried to suppress my connection to negative events in my work history.	1 2 3 4 5
IPDIS51	I clearly separated myself from my past work experiences that would reflect poorly on me.	1 2 3 4 5
IPDIS52	I tried to convince the interviewer that factors outside of my control were responsible for some negative outcomes even though it was my responsibility.	1 2 3 4 5

(*Appendix continues*)

III. INGRATIATION
(to gain favor with the interviewer to improve the appearance of a good candidate for the job)

Opinion Conforming (to express beliefs, values, or attitudes held by the interviewer or organization)

INCON53	I tried to adjust my answers to the interviewer's values and beliefs.	1 2 3 4 5
INCON54	I tried to agree with interviewer outwardly even when I disagree inwardly.	1 2 3 4 5
INCON55	I tried to find out interviewer's views and incorporate them in my answers as my own.	1 2 3 4 5
INCON56	I tried to express the same opinions and attitudes as the interviewer.	1 2 3 4 5
INCON57	I tried to appear similar to the interviewer in terms of values, attitudes, or beliefs.	1 2 3 4 5
INCON58	I tried to express enthusiasm or interest in anything the interviewer appeared to like even if I did not like it.	1 2 3 4 5
INCON59	I did not express my opinions when they contradicted the interviewer's opinions.	1 2 3 4 5
INCON60	I tried to show that I shared the interviewer's views and ideas even if I did not.	1 2 3 4 5

Interviewer or Organization Enhancing (to insincerely praise or compliment the interviewer or organization)

INENH61	I laughed at the interviewer's jokes even when they were not funny.	1 2 3 4 5
INENH62	I exaggerated the interviewer's qualities to create the impression that I think highly of him/her.	1 2 3 4 5
INENH63	I exaggerated my positive comments about the organization.	1 2 3 4 5
INENH64	I complimented the organization on something, however insignificant it may actually be to me.	1 2 3 4 5

Note. The first two letters in each variable name correspond to three big groups of faking behaviors (IC = image creation, IP = image protection, IN = and ingratiation), the following letters correspond to 11 subfactors of faking behaviors (EMB = embellishing, TAI = tailoring, FIT = fit enhancing, CON = constructing, INY = inventing, BOR = borrowing, OMI = omitting; MAS = masking, DIS = distancing, CON = opinion conforming, and ENH = interviewer or organization enhancing), and the number corresponds to the item number in the instrument. For example, IPOM138 is the item number 38 in Image Protection, Omission.

[a]Items were eliminated on the basis of the results of the factor analysis. The final Interview Faking Behavior Scale has 54 items.

Received March 13, 2006
Revision received March 1, 2007
Accepted March 14, 2007 ■