

2021

A Test of Expectancy Theory and Demographic Characteristics as Predictors of Faking and Honesty in Employment Interviews

Jordan L. Ho
University of Guelph

Deborah Powell
University of Guelph

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarworks.bgsu.edu/pad>

 Part of the [Human Resources Management Commons](#), and the [Industrial and Organizational Psychology Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Ho, Jordan L. and Powell, Deborah (2021) "A Test of Expectancy Theory and Demographic Characteristics as Predictors of Faking and Honesty in Employment Interviews," *Personnel Assessment and Decisions*: Number 7 : Iss. 2 , Article 3.

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.25035/pad.2021.02.003>

Available at: <https://scholarworks.bgsu.edu/pad/vol7/iss2/3>

This Main Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Journals at ScholarWorks@BGSU. It has been accepted for inclusion in Personnel Assessment and Decisions by an authorized editor of ScholarWorks@BGSU.

A TEST OF EXPECTANCY THEORY AND DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS AS PREDICTORS OF FAKING AND HONESTY IN EMPLOYMENT INTERVIEWS

Jordan L. Ho¹ and Deborah M. Powell¹

1. Department of Psychology, University of Guelph

ABSTRACT

KEYWORDS

employment interview; faking; honesty; valence-instrumentality-expectancy

Job applicants vary in the extent to which they fake or stay honest in employment interviews, yet the contextual and demographic factors underlying these behaviors are unclear. To help answer this question, we drew on Ellingson and McFarland's (2011) framework of faking based in valence-instrumentality-expectancy theory. Study 1 collected normative data and established baseline distributions for instrumentality-expectancy beliefs from a Canadian municipality. Results indicated that most respondents had low levels of instrumentality-expectancy beliefs for faking, but high levels for honesty. Moreover, income, education, and age were antecedents of instrumentality-expectancy beliefs. Study 2 extended these findings with a United States sample and sought to determine if they could be explained by individual differences. Results demonstrated that financial insecurity predicted instrumentality of faking, whereas age predicted expectancy of faking. Finally, valence-instrumentality-expectancy beliefs were all predictors of self-reported faking in a past interview.

Employment interviews are the most common hiring tool used by organizations (Macan, 2009). As such, employers generally hope that applicants will be honest during an interview (Klotz et al., 2013). Interviews are, however, often conducive to *faking*—intentional misrepresentation—from applicants (Levashina & Campion, 2007). The present research examines contextual predictors of interview faking and honesty by drawing on a framework from Ellingson and McFarland (2011).

Ellingson and McFarland (2011) proposed that valence, instrumentality, and expectancy beliefs are the core contextual factors underlying faking. This framework predicts that applicants will fake when the job will bring personal satisfaction (*valence*), when faking is perceived as necessary to interview success (*instrumentality*), and when applicants feel confident they can fake successfully (*expectancy*). As such, valence-instrumentality-expectancy beliefs may help clarify why some applicants fake more than others across different contexts. Study 1 explores this area with normative data for instrumentality-expectancy beliefs in interviews.

Normative Data on Faking and Honesty

Normative data characterize what is “usual” in a population at a specific point in time (O'Connor, 1990) and establishes a baseline distribution for a measurement (Campbell, 2013). Establishing baselines for instrumentality-expectancy beliefs is important for numerous reasons. Based on previous studies, it is assumed, for instance, that most interviewees fake (e.g., Levashina & Campion, 2007). Most research in this area has been limited to students and

Corresponding author:

Jordan L. Ho

Department of Psychology, University of Guelph, 50 Stone Rd. East, Guelph, Ontario, N1G 2W1, Canada

Email: jho09@uoguelph.ca

This work was supported by the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada under Grant [435-2017-0070]. We are grateful to the Survey Research Centre at the University of Waterloo for the expert administration of the Waterloo Region Matters mixed-mode survey.

younger applicants though (Ho et al., *in press*). We therefore aim to establish baseline data on faking and honesty (why applicants choose *not* to fake) for a wider range of applicants to address the range restriction in past research.

Aim 1: Establish baseline distributions of instrumentality-expectancy beliefs for faking and honesty

Demographic Characteristics, Faking, and Honesty

Theoretical work has argued that demographic characteristics influence interviewee behaviors (Huffcutt et al., 2011). A review of interview faking indicates, however, that research examining demographic characteristics is scarce (Melchers et al., 2020). Demographics, such as age, employment status, education, and income may all be relevant to instrumentality-expectancy beliefs. Bourdage et al. (2018) proposed, for instance, that older applicants perceive less need (instrumentality) to fake due to possessing more job knowledge and perceive being more capable (expectancy) of using honesty in interviews. The authors did not directly test these mechanisms nor tease apart the influence of these demographic characteristics though. Huffcutt and colleagues (2011) also argued that education may be relevant. Well-educated applicants may possess high instrumentality beliefs for honesty because they match the job requirements, whereas the opposite may be true for less-educated persons. The answers to these questions remain unclear; thus, Study 1 seeks to clarify the role of demographics in instrumentality-expectancy beliefs.

Aim 2: Determine the relations between demographic characteristics and instrumentality-expectancy beliefs of faking and honesty

STUDY 1

Method

Participants. A random, representative sample of 542 residents from the Waterloo region in Canada were collected via the 2020 Waterloo Region Matters Survey. We consider these data to be our baseline sample for developing normative standards, given the highly diversified economy of the Waterloo region. Specifically, the breakdown of industries in the Waterloo region is comparable to that of both Canada overall (Government of Canada, 2018) and the United States (Galvin, 2012). For these reasons, we believe that the use of a representative sample from the Waterloo region is an appropriate normative standard.

Participants were recruited via random digit dialing ($n = 235$) and email ($n = 307$). Seven percent of participants were 18–24 years old, 15% were 25–34 years, 21% were 35–44 years, 16% were 45–54 years, 18% were 55–64 years, and 23% were 65-plus years. Fifty-seven percent of participants were female and 43% were male. 49% were

full-time workers, 11% were part time, 23% retired, 3% unemployed, 5% students, 4% homemakers, and 5% reported other types of employment (e.g., disability leave). Forty-two percent of participants' highest completed education was university, 31% college/trade apprenticeship, 18% high-school, and 3% grade-school. Regarding income, 6% earned under \$20,000, 16% earned \$20,000–under \$50,000, 21% earned \$50,000–under \$80,000, 16% earned \$80,000–under \$100,000, and 33% earned \$100,000 or more.

Materials and procedure. Participants were presented with the following vignette: “The next few questions are about job interviews. Please imagine that you have an upcoming interview for a job that you very much want. What is your level of agreement or disagreement with each of the following statements?” Participants then completed measures of instrumentality-expectancy beliefs for faking and honesty (scale of 1 = *Strongly Disagree* to 5 = *Strongly Agree*), demographics, and questions from other studies within the Waterloo Region Matters Survey.

Instrumentality of faking. We used two items, a sample being, “Exaggerating or embellishing my answers would be critical for achieving a good interview score.”

Expectancy of faking. We used one item adapted from Schneider and Goffin (2012): “I am confident that I could exaggerate or embellish my answers successfully to achieve a good interview score.”

Instrumentality of honesty. We used two items based on Scott's (1965) Honesty scale, a sample being, “Complete honesty is critical for achieving a good interview score.”

Expectancy of honesty. We used one item based on Scott's (1965) Honesty scale: “I am confident that I could be completely honest and achieve a good interview score.”

Demographics. Participants reported their city/township of residence, age group, employment status, income, education, and gender.

Results

Baseline distributions. For results to be representative of the population by region, age, and education, survey weights were computed using the Hájek estimator (Hájek, 1964). Weighted averages to the items from each outcome measure are displayed in Table 1, with specific percentage breakdowns provided in the supplemental material.

Demographic predictors. We ran multiple regressions using the *svyglm* function (Lumley, 2020) in R statistical environment. Age, employment status, income, education, and gender were entered as predictors. The dummy-coding reference group for each predictor was 18–24 year olds, full-time workers, under \$20,000 income, grade-school education, and male. The dependent variable was either instrumentality of faking, expectancy of faking, instrumentality of honesty, or expectancy of honesty. Variable inter-correlations are provided in Table 2.

Instrumentality of faking. Thirty-five to 44 year olds

TABLE 1.
Weighted Averages of Responses to Outcome Measures in Study 1

Item	Weighted average
Complete honesty is critical for achieving a good interview score	3.98
If I am completely honest in this job interview, I will achieve a better interview score	3.77
I am confident that I could be completely honest and achieve a good interview score	3.98
Exaggerating or embellishing my answers would be critical for achieving a good interview score	2.26
If I exaggerate or embellish my answers in this job interview, I will achieve a better interview score	2.59
I am confident that I could exaggerate or embellish my answers successfully to achieve a good interview score	2.64

Note. Weighted averages are on a scale from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree).

TABLE 2.
Correlations Among Study 1 Variables

Variable	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1. Gender	1.58	0.50								
2. Age group	3.93	1.58	-.17							
3. Employment status	2.39	1.78	.02	.09						
4. Household income	3.60	1.27	-.04	-.03	-.27					
5. Education	3.27	0.92	-.03	.07	-.14	.27				
6. Instrumentality of faking	2.33	0.95	-.10	-.11	-.00	-.10	-.10	(.70)		
7. Expectancy of faking	2.53	1.15	-.13	-.21	-.07	-.02	-.05	.42		
8. Instrumentality of honesty	3.84	0.82	.03	.05	-.00	-.04	-.11	-.45	-.28	(.67)
9. Expectancy of honesty	4.00	0.82	-.03	-.05	-.09	.10	.06	-.32	-.07	.53

Note. *M* and *SD* are used to represent mean and standard deviation, respectively. Gender (1 = male, 2 = female). Age group (1 = 18 to 24 years old, 2 = 25 to 34 years old, 3 = 35 to 44 years old, 4 = 45 to 54 years old, 5 = 55 to 64 years old, 6 = 65 years or older). Employment status (1 = full-time, 2 = part-time, 3 = retired, 4 = unemployed, 5 = student, 6 = homemaker, 7 = other). Household income (1 = less than \$20,000, 2 = \$20,000 to less than \$50,000, 3 = \$50,000 to less than \$80,000, 4 = \$80,000 to less than \$100,000, 5 = \$100,000 or more). Education (1 = grade school, 2 = high school, 3 = college or trade apprenticeship, 4 = university, 5 = other). Reliabilities are shown in the diagonal. Correlations of $|\cdot09|$ or higher indicate $p < .05$. Correlations of $|\cdot13|$ or higher indicate $p < .01$.

reported lower instrumentality ($b = -.70$, $SE = .28$, $t = -2.49$, $p = .01$), as did participants under “other” employment ($b = -.66$, $SE = .24$, $t = -2.75$, $p = .006$). Participants earning \$20,000–under \$50,000 ($b = -.60$, $SE = .24$, $t = -2.54$, $p = .01$), \$50,000–under \$80,000 ($b = -.66$, $SE = .27$, $t = -2.47$, $p = .01$), \$80,000–under \$100,000 ($b = -.92$, $SE = .25$, $t = -3.71$, $p < .001$), and \$100,000 or more ($b = -.77$, $SE = .25$, $t = -3.12$, $p = .002$) also reported lower instrumentality, as did women ($b = -.25$, $SE = .12$, $t = -2.18$, $p = .03$).

Expectancy of faking. Thirty-five to 44 year olds ($b = -.68$, $SE = .32$, $t = -2.14$, $p = .03$), 45–54 year olds ($b = -.69$, $SE = .30$, $t = -2.30$, $p = .02$), 55–64 year olds ($b = -.86$, $SE = .31$, $t = -2.78$, $p = .006$), and 65-plus year olds ($b = -1.14$, $SE = .36$, $t = -3.12$, $p = .002$) had lower expectancy. Participants under “other” employment also had lower expectancy ($b = -.70$, $SE = .31$, $t = -2.28$, $p = .02$), as did participants earning \$50,000–under \$80,000 ($b = -.57$, $SE = .25$, $t = -2.34$, $p = .02$), and women ($b = -.43$, $SE = .13$, $t = -3.31$, $p = .001$).

Instrumentality of honesty. Participants earning \$100,000 or more reported lower instrumentality ($b = -.38$,

$SE = .19$, $t = -2.05$, $p = .04$), as did participants who completed high school ($b = -.46$, $SE = .19$, $t = -2.41$, $p = .02$), college ($b = -.39$, $SE = .18$, $t = -2.21$, $p = .03$), university ($b = -.60$, $SE = .17$, $t = -3.48$, $p < .001$), and other education ($b = -.66$, $SE = .22$, $t = -2.98$, $p = .003$).

Expectancy of honesty. Results indicated no significant predictors.

Study 1 Discussion

Study 1 established baselines on instrumentality-expectancy beliefs of faking and honesty, including the unique contribution of demographics. Results highlighted that respondents typically viewed faking as low in instrumentality and felt low confidence about deceiving an interviewer. This finding is consistent with low mean levels of interview faking found in most studies (Ho et al., in press). Conversely, most respondents believed honesty was highly instrumental for interviewing success and felt confident about using honesty to succeed. These baseline distributions may explain why applicants engage in honesty to a greater extent than faking (Bourdage et al., 2018).

Study 1 further revealed that respondents with higher income viewed faking as less instrumental for interviewing success, whereas unemployed or laid-off respondents viewed faking as more instrumental. One potential explanation is that people who are financially well off may not be as driven to fake, because they are less desperate for a job to support themselves. Indeed, research has demonstrated that poverty predicts increased desperation and risk taking (Ursache & Razer, 2015). Financially poor applicants may hence believe it is necessary to risk faking due to their impoverished circumstances. Thus, low-income or being in greater need for a job to support one's household may be associated with higher instrumentality beliefs about faking.

We also discovered that older participants tended to have lower expectancy beliefs for faking. This finding is surprising, as one might expect older people to be more effective at faking given their greater work and interviewing experience. A plausible explanation for this finding may be that people experience age-related changes in personality, which are associated with expectancy beliefs. Specifically, as people grow older, they typically score lower on Machiavellianism (Mudrack, 1989). Machiavellianism may be related to expectancy beliefs about faking (Ellingson & McFarland, 2011), as people who are high in Machiavellianism believe they can manipulate others for self-interests and are more confident in their ability to deceive others (Kashy & DePaulo, 1996). That is, older people may have less confidence in being able to manipulate or deceive others due to lower Machiavellian tendencies.

Last, respondents with higher levels of education viewed honesty as less instrumental for interviewing success. One might have expected the opposite relation, such that having more education would make someone more qualified for jobs and hence view honesty as a better strategy (Moore et al., 2017). It is possible, however, that being more educated means that one is competing for increasingly prestigious jobs with other similarly or more-qualified applicants. Such applicants may have low instrumentality beliefs of honesty, because they need to find better ways of distinguishing themselves from the competition—outside of signaling their educational credentials (Bangerter et al., 2012).

STUDY 2

Study 2 examined potential reasons for *why* demographic characteristics predict instrumentality-expectancy beliefs and incorporated the valence factor from Ellingson and McFarland's (2011) framework. Demographic differences in these factors may, for instance, stem from demographics being a proxy for relevant individual difference factors. That is, demographics may have shared variance with individual differences in the prediction of instrumentality-expectancy beliefs. In addition to attempting replica-

tion of the main relations between instrumentality-expectancy beliefs and demographics from the baseline sample in Study 1, Study 2 determined the extent to which valence-instrumentality-expectancy beliefs predicted actual faking behavior—as a core test of Ellingson and McFarland's (2011) model.

People with lower income may have higher instrumentality of faking not because of their absolute earnings but due to their feelings of *financial insecurity* (i.e., state of financial well-being; Prawitz et al., 2006). People who are high in financial insecurity may view faking as instrumental to interviewing success, because they are less capable of meeting their basic survival needs. Hence, they may be highly desperate to secure a job and steady income, even if it means resorting to deception.

Hypothesis 1: Income will negatively predict instrumentality of faking, but this relation will weaken after controlling for the effects of financial insecurity.

People with higher levels of education, meanwhile, may view honesty as less instrumental to interviewing success because they are higher in status-seeking. Educational attainment is often a means of achieving high social status, and hence better job prospects (Jin et al., 2011). Given their high need to get ahead of others (Barrick et al., 2013), people who are high in status seeking may view honesty as an inadequate strategy to outcompete others for jobs despite possessing advanced education. Further, Highhouse et al. (2016) demonstrated that people who are higher in status seeking tend to be less honest during job searches. This evidence suggests that status seeking could explain the relation between education and instrumentality beliefs. Thus, after accounting for individual differences in status seeking, education may predict instrumentality beliefs to a lower extent.

Hypothesis 2: Education will negatively predict instrumentality of honesty, but this relation will weaken after controlling for the effects of status seeking.

Ellingson and McFarland (2011) also theorized that expectancy beliefs about faking are related to individual differences in *Machiavellianism* (i.e., tendencies to manipulate others for personal gain; Wilson et al., 1996). People who are high in Machiavellianism perceive themselves to have greater ability to deceive others (Giammarco et al., 2013), likely because they fake often and hence “must be” successful at it. Machiavellianism scores also typically decline with age (Mudrack, 1989), which may explain why older participants had lower expectancy of faking in Study 1. Thus, after accounting for individual differences in Machiavellianism, age may predict expectancy beliefs to a lesser extent.

Hypothesis 3: Age will negatively predict expectancy of faking, but this relation will weaken after controlling for the effects of Machiavellianism.

We next propose that one factor linked to valence of faking is *approach temperament*, which describes one's sensitivity to positive or rewarding stimuli (Elliot & Thrash, 2002). People with high approach temperament give higher evaluations of valence toward stimuli, which suggests that applicants who are high in this trait will be more attracted to desirable jobs. Research has found, for example, that the attractiveness of a university program affected intentions to fake in interviews (Buehl & Melchers, 2018). Thus, high approach sensitivity may be associated with viewing faking positively, because deception will increase one's chances of securing the job.

Hypothesis 4: Approach temperament will positively predict valence of faking.

Last, we tested Ellingson and McFarland's (2011) core proposition that valence-instrumentality-expectancy beliefs about faking would all be positively related to faking behavior.

Hypothesis 5: Instrumentality-expectancy-valence beliefs about faking will positively predict self-reported faking behavior.

Method

Participants. Study 2 was conducted in two phases on Mechanical Turk, using Cloud Research (Litman et al., 2017). In Phase 1, we recruited 303 United States residents who completed an interview within the past year. We invited participants to complete the second phase 2 weeks later. 261 responded and three failed at least one of two attention checks, leaving $N = 258$.

50% of participants were male, 74% were White, while 40% completed university. 67% of participants were full-time workers, 16% part time, and 10% unemployed. Participants ranged from 18–72 years old ($M = 36.99$, $SD = 11.52$) and on average had been in 12.66 interviews. The most common industries of employment were professional/scientific/technical services (15%), education (12%), and wholesale/retail trade (12%).

Materials and procedure. Both phases were completed online via Qualtrics. In Phase 1, participants completed measures of status seeking (Highhouse et al., 2016), financial insecurity (Prawitz et al., 2006), Machiavellianism (Rauthmann, 2013), approach temperament (Elliot & Thrash, 2002), and demographics (age, employment status, income, education, gender). In Phase 2, participants were asked to think back to their most recent interview, report its date, and complete a three-item measure assessing their

memory of that interview (e.g., “I can accurately recall details about the strategies I used when answering questions in my most recent job interview”; $\alpha = .77$). Participants then completed measures of valence (Andrews & Withey, 1976), instrumentality (Ellingson & McFarland, 2011), and expectancy beliefs (Schneider & Goffin, 2012) for faking. These measures also included reports of valence (Andrews & Withey, 1976), instrumentality (Scott, 1965), and expectancy beliefs (Scott, 1965) for honesty. Next, participants completed self-reports of faking (Bourdage et al., 2018) and honest impression management (Bourdage et al., 2018) from that interview. We included additional items for instrumentality-expectancy beliefs in this study to improve reliability (see supplemental material for complete list of items). Responses were on a scale of 1 = *Strongly Disagree* to 5 = *Strongly Agree* for the interview memory and instrumentality-expectancy items, and from 1 = *Terrible* to 7 = *Delighted* for valence items.

Results

We preregistered our hypotheses on Open Science Framework (https://osf.io/82a7g?view_only=7d9df8453b1f44be96b978aeb0416c35). Participants reported sufficient memory of their most recent interview ($M = 4.28$ out of 5, $SD = .53$), with variable intercorrelations presented in Table 3.

Income predicted instrumentality in the expected direction ($b = -.08$, $p = .094$), and this relation decreased after controlling for financial insecurity ($b = -.02$, $p = .686$). This non-significant relation indicates Hypothesis 1 was unsupported. Financial insecurity also positively predicted instrumentality ($b = .06$, $p = .042$) with income accounted for.

Education was unrelated to instrumentality both before ($b = .05$, $p = .154$) and after controlling for status seeking ($b = .05$, $p = .144$). Status seeking was also unrelated to instrumentality ($b = -.03$, $p = .641$). Thus, Hypothesis 2 was unsupported.

Age predicted expectancy in the expected direction ($b = -.03$, $p < .001$), and this relation remained identical after controlling for Machiavellianism. Machiavellianism positively predicted expectancy though ($b = .36$, $p < .001$). Overall, Hypothesis 3 was marginally supported.

Approach temperament was unrelated to valence of faking ($b = .00$, $p = .985$), indicating no support for Hypothesis 4.

Instrumentality ($b = .63$, $p < .001$), expectancy ($b = .55$, $p < .001$), and valence ($b = .29$, $p < .001$) predicted faking in participants' most recent interview. Thus, Hypothesis 5 was supported.

GENERAL DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

The present research offered insight into how contextual factors from Ellingson and McFarland's (2011) model

TABLE 3.
Correlations Among Study 2 Variables

Variable	M	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18
1. Gender	1.51	0.50																		
2. Ethnicity	2.41	1.06	.08																	
3. Age	36.99	11.52	-.14	-.15																
4. Education	4.93	1.70	.04	-.02	.12															
5. Income	2.97	1.27	.16	-.02	.12	.34														
6. Employment status	4.49	0.90	.09	.05	.04	.24	.28													
7. Status seeking	3.18	0.73	-.04	.05	-.20	.11	-.05	.17	(.75)											
8. Mach	2.72	0.73	.07	-.00	-.05	-.09	-.18	.03	.14	(.74)										
9. Approach temperament	5.24	0.85	-.03	.10	-.11	-.01	.04	.15	.27	-.01	(.80)									
10. Financial insecurity	6.01	2.30	-.26	-.09	.01	-.27	-.52	-.26	-.01	.15	-.22	(.95)								
11. Instrumentality of faking	2.27	0.95	.05	.03	-.31	-.11	-.10	.04	.27	.23	-.09	.16	(.87)							
12. Expectancy of faking	2.42	0.96	.12	.01	-.32	-.11	-.09	.08	.25	.28	-.05	.02	.79	(.88)						
13. Valence of faking	3.52	1.55	.10	.03	-.28	-.09	-.13	.05	.28	.23	.00	.08	.67	.69	(.92)					
14. Self-reported faking behavior	2.09	0.74	.07	.06	-.36	-.06	-.12	.08	.34	.28	.05	.13	.81	.72	.62	(.92)				
15. Instrumentality of honesty	3.85	0.86	-.08	-.02	.23	.09	.01	.03	-.02	-.07	.24	-.07	-.66	-.60	-.49	-.45	(.93)			
16. Expectancy of honesty	3.79	0.83	-.03	.01	.22	.08	.07	.09	.03	-.09	.29	-.14	-.59	-.43	-.35	-.38	.81	(.90)		
17. Valence of honesty	6.32	0.80	.01	-.11	.14	-.10	-.00	.07	-.03	-.10	.15	-.08	-.33	-.33	-.19	-.33	.37	.33	(.79)	
18. Self-reported honest IM behavior	3.32	0.60	.10	.11	-.12	.07	.07	.14	.20	.04	.29	-.10	.05	.11	.02	.37	.25	.32	.15	(.81)

Note. M and SD are used to represent mean and standard deviation, respectively. Mach = Machiavellianism. Gender (1 = female, 2 = male). Ethnicity (1 = Indigenous, 2 = White/European, 3 = Black/African/Caribbean, 4 = Southeast Asian, 5 = Arab, 6 = South Asian, 7 = Latin American, 8 = West Asian). Education (0 = some high school, 1 = high school, 2 = some college/university, 3 = apprenticeship training and trades, 4 = college/university, 5 = some graduate education, 6 = graduate education, 7 = professional degrees). Household income (0 = less than \$20,000, 1 = \$20,000 to less than \$50,000, 2 = \$50,000 to less than \$80,000, 3 = \$80,000 to less than \$100,000, 4 = \$100,000 or more). Employment status (0 = homemaker, 1 = student, 2 = unemployed, 3 = part-time, 4 = full-time, 5 = retired). Reliabilities are shown in the diagonal. Correlations of |.12| or higher indicate $p < .05$. Correlations of |.18| or higher indicate $p < .01$.

can be applied to interview faking and honesty. Study 1 was an initial investigation of the extent to which people hold beliefs that people view faking necessary to better interview evaluations, and that people feel confident in their own ability to fake. Our results indicated that most people believed faking to be relatively unnecessary for interviewing success and generally felt unconfident about their ability to fake. These low instrumentality-expectancy beliefs may hence explain the low levels of faking found in past studies.

Study 1 also demonstrated that demographic characteristics—income, education, and age—which have received little attention in past research (Melchers et al., 2020), may improve prediction of people's believed necessity of faking and their confidence in faking to achieve better interview evaluations. Study 2 extended these findings using another geographical sample but found that only the negative relation between age and people's confidence in their ability to fake replicated. This relation was not driven by age-related changes in Machiavellianism though. This finding suggests that older people may feel less confident about faking for a different reason, which we did not examine. Employers may, nonetheless, need to be wary of younger applicants being confident about using deception to appear better qualified.

Our studies also showed that higher income was associated with lower beliefs that faking is critical to interviewing success (albeit nonsignificantly in the predicted direction within Study 2). Moreover, the magnitude of this relation dropped after controlling for financial insecurity, which itself predicted people's belief that faking is necessary to achieve better interview evaluations. This finding therefore suggests that financial insecurity—not just one's absolute level of income—may determine how necessary people perceive faking to be for interviewing success.

We also note that Study 1 found a negative relation between education and people's beliefs that honesty is necessary to achieve better interview evaluations, whereas Study 2 did not. Although participants' levels of completed education was similar across these two studies, this difference may have arisen because Study 1 had older participants and workers primarily in manufacturing and wholesale trade industries, whereas Study 2 participants were younger and worked mainly in professional/scientific services and education sectors. Given the importance of specialist expertise in scientific occupations (Collins, 2014), Study 2 participants may have viewed honesty as instrumental to achieving better interview evaluations regardless—because being dishonest about required skills here would be detrimental to future job performance.

The present research also had limitations. Social desirability may have been a concern in Study 1, for instance, if respondents felt uncomfortable about expressing opinions about deception over telephone. We took steps to minimize this concern, however; telephone interviewers were trained

to ensure respondents felt comfortable, assured respondents of their anonymity, and probed respondents to obtain more accurate answers. A further analysis showed minimal differences in these results across web and telephone modalities (see supplemental material), suggesting that social desirability was likely not a concern.

A limitation of Study 2, meanwhile, was that participants' valence-instrumentality-expectancy beliefs and faking behavior may have been influenced by characteristics of the particular interview they were in. Applicants may, for instance, fake less with situational questions (Bourdage et al., 2018) or fake more when asked follow-up questions (Levashina & Campion, 2007). We unfortunately did not ask participants to report these characteristics; however, there was no reason to suspect that any skewed proportion of our sample utilized any particular type of interview. There was likely a diverse mix of interviews that participants were in, resulting in low likelihood that any particular interview characteristic (e.g., question type) impacted our findings.

In sum, the present research contributed novel insight into the potential importance of people's beliefs regarding the necessity of faking for interviewing success, their confidence in their own ability to fake, and the degree of personal satisfaction that the job is perceived to bring. Our findings with normative data suggest that most people view faking as relatively less necessary for achieving better interview evaluations and feel relatively unconfident about their ability to fake. Our findings discovered, meanwhile, that people had higher levels of these beliefs regarding the necessity of honesty and their confidence in using honesty to achieve better interview scores. When people do have higher beliefs in the necessity of faking, higher confidence in faking, and believe that the job will bring higher personal satisfaction, however, our findings demonstrate that they were more likely to have faked in interviews. These three beliefs all had strong relations with past faking behavior, illustrating their important role in predicting job applicant behavior (Ellingson & McFarland, 2011). Specifically, people's beliefs that faking was critical for achieving better interview evaluations had the strongest relation with faking behavior. We found that the next strongest relation with faking behavior was for people's confidence in their own ability to fake, followed by people's anticipated satisfaction of obtaining the job for which they were interviewing. We additionally found that higher financial insecurity was related to stronger beliefs that faking was critical for interviewing success, whereas lower age and higher Machiavellianism were both associated with higher confidence in the ability to fake. These results suggest that there are at least a few individual difference factors that may drive those beliefs. Overall, the present research shows the potential importance of examining valence-instrumentality-expectancy beliefs in order to understand faking and honesty in employment in-

interviews.

REFERENCES

- Andrews, F. M., & Withey, S. B. (1976). *Social indicators of well-being: American's perceptions of life quality*. Plenum Press.
- Bangerter, A., Roulin, N., & König, C. J. (2012). Personnel selection as a signaling game. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 97*, 719–738. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0026078>
- Barrick, M. R., Mount, M. K., & Li, N. (2013). The theory of purposeful work behavior: The role of personality, higher-order goals, and job characteristics. *Academy of Management Review, 38*, 132–153. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.2010.0479>
- Bourdage, J. S., Roulin, N., & Tarraf, R. (2018). “I (might be) just that good”: Honest and deceptive impression management in employment interviews. *Personnel Psychology, 71*, 597–632. <https://doi.org/10.1111/peps.12285>
- Buehl, A. K., & Melchers, K. G. (2018). Do attractiveness and competition influence faking intentions in selection interviews? *Journal of Personnel Psychology, 17*, 204–208. <https://doi.org/10.1027/1866-5888/a000208>
- Campbell D. (2013). Normative data. In F. R. Volkmar (eds.), *Encyclopedia of autism spectrum disorders*. Springer. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4419-1698-3>
- Collins, H. (2014). Are we all scientific experts now? *Polity*.
- Ellingson, J. E., & McFarland, L. A. (2011). Understanding faking behavior through the lens of motivation: An application of VIE theory. *Human Performance, 24*, 322–337. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08959285.201.597477>
- Elliot, A. J., & Thrash, T. M. (2002). Approach-avoidance motivation in personality: Approach and avoidance temperaments and goals. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 82*, 804–818. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.82.5.804>
- Galvin, J. M. (2012). Labor force characteristics by race and ethnicity, 2011 (Report No. 1036). U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics.
- Giammarco, E. A., Atkinson, B., Baughman, H. M., Veselka, L., & Vernon, P. A. (2013). The relation between antisocial personality and the perceived ability to deceive. *Personality and Individual Differences, 54*, 246–250. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2012.09.004>
- Government of Canada, Statistics Canada. (2018). Table 14-10-0297-01 Labour force characteristics by occupation, annual, inactive (x1,000). <https://doi.org/10.25318/1410029701-eng>
- Hájek, J. (1964). Asymptotic theory of rejective sampling with varying probabilities from a finite population. *Annals of Mathematical Statistics, 35*, 1491–1523. <https://doi.org/10.1214/aoms/1177700>
- Highhouse, S., Brooks, M. E., & Wang, Y. (2016). Status seeking and manipulative self-presentation. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment, 24*, 352–361. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ijsa.12153>
- Ho, J. L., Powell, D. M., & Stanley, D. J. (in press). The relation between deceptive impression management and employment interview ratings: A meta-analysis. *Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science*. <https://doi.org/10.1037/cbs0000223>
- Huffcutt, A. I., Van Iddekinge, C. H., & Roth, P. L. (2011). Understanding applicant behavior in employment interviews: A theoretical model of interviewee performance. *Human Resource Management Review, 21*, 353–367. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.hrmmr.2011.05.003>
- Jin, Y., Li, H., & Wu, B. (2011). Income inequality, consumption, and social-status seeking. *Journal of Comparative Economics, 39*, 191–204. <https://doi.org/subzero.lib.uoguelph.ca/10.1016/j.jce.2010.12.004>
- Kashy, D. A., & DePaulo, B. M. (1996). Who lies? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 70*, 1037–1051. <https://doi.org/10.1037//0022-3514.70.5.979>
- Klotz, A. C., da Motta Veiga, S. P., Buckley, M. R., & Gavin, M. B. (2013). The role of trustworthiness in recruitment and selection: A review and guide for future research. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 34*, 104–119. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.1891>
- Korn, E. L., & Graubard, B. I. (1998). Confidence intervals for proportions with small expected number of positive counts estimated from survey data. *Survey Methodology, 2*, 193–201. Available at <https://www.scienceopen.com/document?vid=2cd14e72-eac5-43fd-9a0d-d38ffc59f992>
- Levashina, J., & Campion, M. A. (2007). Measuring faking in the employment interview: Development and validation of an interview faking behavior scale. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 92*, 1638–1656. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.92.6.1638>
- Litman, L., Robinson, J., & Abberbock, T. (2017). TurkPrime.com: A versatile crowdsourcing data acquisition platform for the behavioral sciences. *Behavior Research Methods, 49*, 433–442. <https://doi.org/10.3758/s13428-016-0727-z>
- Lumley, T. (2020). Survey: Analysis of complex survey samples. R package version 4.0. <https://www.jstatsoft.org/article/view/v009i08>
- Macan, T. (2009). The employment interview: A review of current studies and directions for future research. *Human Resource Management Review, 19*, 203–218. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.hrmmr.2009.03.006>
- Melchers, K. G., Roulin, N., & Buehl, A. K. (2020). A review of applicant faking in selection interviews. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment, 28*(2), 123–142. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ijsa.12280>
- Moore, C., Lee, S. Y., Kim, K., & Cable, D. M. (2017). The advantage of being oneself: The role of applicant self-verification in organizational hiring decisions. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 102*, 1493–1513. <https://doi.org/10.1037/apl0000223>
- Mudrack, P. E. (1989). Age-related differences in Machiavellianism in an adult sample. *Psychological Reports, 64*(3_suppl), 1047–1050. <https://doi.org/10.2466%2Fpr0.1989.64.3c.1047>
- O'Connor P. J. (1990). Normative data: their definition, interpretation, and importance for primary care physicians. *Family Medicine, 22*, 307–311. Available from <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/2200734/>
- Prawitz, A., Garman, E. T., Sorhaindo, B., O'Neill, B., Kim, J., & Drentea, P. (2006). InCharge financial distress/financial well-being scale: Development, administration, and score interpretation. *Journal of Financial Counseling and Planning, 17*, 34–49. Available at SSRN: <https://ssrn.com/ab>

stract=2239338

- Rauthmann, J. F. (2013). Investigating the MACH-IV with item response theory and proposing the trimmed MACH. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 95, 388–397. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00223891.2012.742905>
- Schneider, T. J., & Goffin, R. D. (2012). Perceived ability to deceive and incremental prediction in pre-employment personality testing. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 52, 806–811. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2012.01.015>
- Scott, W. A. (1965). Personal Values Scale. In *Values and organisations*. Rand McNally College Publishing Company.
- Ursache, A., & Raver, C. C. (2015). Iowa Gambling Task performance and executive function predict low-income urban preadolescents' risky behaviors. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 79, 1-6. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2015.01.010>
- Wilson, D. S., Near, D., & Miller, R. R. (1996). Machiavellianism: A synthesis of the evolutionary and psychological literatures. *Psychological Bulletin*, 119, 285–299. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.119.2.285>

RECEIVED 05/29/20 ACCEPTED 02/04/21