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ABSTRACT

WHY DOES HONEST IMPRESSION MANAGEMENT POSITIVELY INFLUENCE INTERVIEW RATINGS? THE MEDIATING EFFECT OF INTERVIEWERS’ PERCEPTIONS

Amanda Amaral
University of Guelph, 2018

Interviewee use of self-promotion and ingratiation impression management (IM) tactics consistently and positively predict interview ratings of interview performance as rated by the interviewer. Researchers have yet to determine exactly why these IM tactics relate to higher interview ratings. The Stereotype Content Model and previous empirical research provides evidence that two fundamental dimensions of social perception – Competence and Warmth – may act as mediators. Thus, this study aimed to examine competence and warmth as mediators of the relationship between IM tactics and interview ratings. I hypothesized that interviewers’ perception of interviewee competence mediates the relationship between honest self-promotion-IM and interview ratings, and interviewers’ perception of interviewee warmth mediates the relationship between honest ingratiation-IM and interview ratings. These hypotheses were tested using real interviews for a research assistant position. Using structural equation modeling, I found support for perception of competence as a mediator of the relationship between honest self-promotion-IM and interview ratings but did not find support for perception of warmth as a mediator of the relationship between honest ingratiation-IM and interview ratings. Results indicate that the Stereotype Content Model extends to the interview context with regards to the ubiquity of competence perceptions. In addition, interviewees can fare better in interviews by increasing their appearance of competence through honest self-promotion.
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Why does honest impression management influence interview ratings? The mediating effect of interviewers’ perceptions

The employment interview is one of the most commonly used selection tools within organizations worldwide (Rynes, Barber, & Varma, 2000; Wilk & Cappelli, 2003). Nearly every organization uses interviews in their selection process to decide which candidate to hire (Shackleton & Newell, 1997). Despite the fact that interviews are widely used, they are impacted by extraneous factors besides what they are intended to assess (Huffcutt, Van Iddekinge, & Roth, 2011). One such extraneous factor is impression management tactics (Barrick, Shaffer, & DeGrassi, 2009; Huffcutt et al., 2011). Impression management (IM) tactics are a “conscious or unconscious attempt to control the images that are projected in social interactions” (Schlenker, 1980), and interviewees use them frequently during interviews (Ellis, West, Ryan, & DeShon, 2002; Levashina & Campion, 2007). Numerous studies have shown that when interviewees use certain IM tactics they tend to achieve better interview ratings and outcomes, such as hiring recommendations and job offers, even when interviewers use highly structured interviews (Barrick et al., 2009; Chen & Lin, 2014; Higgins, Judge, & Ferris, 2003; Higgins & Judge, 2004; Kleinmann & Klehe, 2011; Roulin, Bangerter, & Levashina, 2014; Stevens & Kristof, 1995; Van Iddekinge, McFarland, & Raymark, 2007). Although the relationship between IM tactics and interview ratings has been well documented (Barrick et al., 2009), researchers have yet to successfully determine why these tactics relate higher interview ratings. An important next step is to examine the mechanisms that explain the relationship between IM use and interview ratings. Accordingly, the goal of the current study is to investigate potential mediators of the relationship between IM tactics and interview ratings.
Impression Management Tactics

The conceptualization of impression management (IM) within the organizational context has evolved over the last few decades. In the early 1980’s, researchers in social psychology started to define IM in a manner that resembles the current conceptualization within the organizational literature (Jones & Pittman, 1982; Tedeschi & Melburg, 1984). Specifically, IM was defined as an individual, often described as the actor, enacting IM behaviours either consciously or unconsciously in order to convey or maintain a desirable impression of oneself to another person, known as the target (Jones & Pittman, 1982; Schlenker, 1980; Tedeschi & Melburg, 1984). Historically, IM was classified and studied as indirect tactics and direct tactics, with direct tactics being further broken down into assertive and defensive tactics. More recently, interview literature has focused on direct assertive and direct defensive tactics, with assertive tactics being comprised of self-promotion and ingratiation, and defensive tactics being comprised of excuses, justifications, and apologies. (See Table 1 for a complete list of all IM tactics and definitions.)

Up until relatively recently, researchers did not distinguish between honest and deceptive IM. They often made the assumption that interviewees were being honest in their expressions and reporting of IM. Consequently, past measures of IM likely confounded honest and deceptive IM into one measure. IM tactics are not inherently dishonest (Leary & Kowalski, 1990; Rosenfeld, 1997), but Levashina and Campion (2007) recognized that they could be. Consequently, Levashina and Campion (2007) conceptualized IM tactics as either honest or deceptive. Honest tactics are used to truthfully describe one’s job-related skills, accomplishments, and experiences, whereas deceptive tactics are used to consciously distort, embellish, or invent job-related qualifications, or create a favourable image of oneself.
Recently, Bourdage, Roulin, and Tarraf (2015) created the first IM scale to purely measure honest IM called the Honest Interview Impression Management (HIIM) scale. This scale assesses honest assertive tactics as well as honest defensive tactics. The HIIM scale is a more accurate way to measure honest IM, compared to scales used in past research that did not distinguish between honest and deceptive IM and likely confounded both types within the same measure.

During employment interviews, interviewees use a varied combination of some or all of the previously outlined IM tactics (Ellis et al., 2002; Levashina & Campion, 2007), but they use honest assertive tactics – self-promotion and ingratiation – the most (Ellis et al., 2002; Kleinmann & Klehe, 2011; Stevens & Kristof, 1995). Self-promotion-IM is defined as verbally describing past experiences in a way that demonstrates competence and suitability for the job, and includes four subtypes: exemplification, entitlements, enhancements, and self-promoting utterances (Barrick et al., 2009; Ellis et al., 2002; Stevens & Kristof, 1995). Ingratiation-IM is defined as verbally attempting to make oneself likeable to the interviewer or organization, and includes 3 subtypes: other-enhancement, opinion conformity, and fit with organization (Barrick et al., 2009; Bourdage et al., 2015; Ellis et al., 2002; Stevens & Kristof, 1995). (See Table 1 for a complete list of all IM tactics and definitions.) Kleinmann and Klehe (2011) had outside observers record the extent to which interviewees used assertive (self-promotion and ingratiation) and defensive tactics (justifications and excuses) in structured interviews and found that interviewees used assertive tactics ($M = 3.38$) significantly more often than defensive ones ($M = 2.71$). Using real interviews, Stevens and Kristof (1995), and Ellis and colleagues (2002) similarly found that assertive tactics ($M = 37.25$ and $M = 7.61$, respectively) were used significantly more than defensive tactics ($M = .46$ and $M = 1.08$, respectively), as coded by an outside observer.
Accordingly, the current study will focus on these commonly used honest assertive tactics (self-promotion-IM and ingratiation-IM).

Numerous empirical studies have revealed a positive association between those commonly used assertive tactics (self-promotion-IM and ingratiation-IM) and interview outcomes, such as interview ratings and hiring recommendations (Barrick et al., 2009; Chen & Lin, 2014; Ellis et al., 2002; Higgins et al., 2003; Higgins & Judge, 2004; Kleinmann & Klehe, 2011; Roulin et al., 2014; Stevens & Kristof, 1995; Van Iddekinge et al., 2007). See Table 2. Most notably, a meta-analysis examining the magnitude of the relationship between IM and interview ratings revealed that self-promotion and ingratiation, as rated by an outside observer, were positively correlated with interview ratings when assessing over 3,000 interviewees ($r = .32, r = .26$, respectively; Barrick et al., 2009). Thus, out of all IM tactics, interviewees engage in self-promotion and ingratiation most, and these two tactics result in better interview ratings.

Impression management tactics are commonly measured in two ways – self-reported by the interviewee and coded by an outside-observer – which are both related to better interview outcomes, such as higher interview ratings, better evaluations, and more hiring recommendations (Chen, Lee, & Yeh, 2008; Chen & Lin, 2014; Ellis et al., 2002; Higgins & Judge, 2004; McFarland, Ryan, & Kriska, 2003; Peeters & Lievens, 2006; Roulin et al., 2014; Swider, Barrick, Harris, & Stoverink, 2011; Van Iddekinge et al., 2007). It is unclear whether these two methods are truly measuring the same underlying construct, (Macan, 2009) however, regardless of how IM is measured it is related to better interview outcomes. Specifically, self-promotion-IM is positively related to interview outcomes (i.e., interview ratings, general evaluations, or hiring recommendations) both when IM is self-reported ($r = .21$ to $.36$; Ellis et al., 2002; Peeters & Lievens, 2006) and when IM is coded ($r = .18$ to $.38$; Chen & Lin, 2014; Roulin et al., 2014).
Likewise, ingratiation-IM is positively related to interview outcomes (i.e., interview ratings, general evaluations, or hiring recommendations) both when IM is self-reported ($r = .06$ to $.26$; Ellis et al., 2002; Peeters & Lievens, 2006), and when IM is coded ($r = .16$ to $.40$; Chen & Lin, 2014; Higgins & Judge, 2004).

Based on these results, in the current study I expect that:

H1: Self-promotion tactics (as rated by interviewees and coders) will correlate positively with interview ratings (as rated by interviewers).

H2: Ingratiation tactics (as rated by interviewees and coders) will correlate positively with interview ratings (as rated by interviewers).

Even though self-promotion and ingratiation tactics have an effect on interviewers’ ratings, interviewers cannot accurately detect the use of these tactics, regardless of interviewer experience (Roulin et al., 2014; Roulin et al., 2015; Stevens & Kristof, 1995). Over a series of four studies, Roulin and colleagues (2015) found that when watching videotaped interviews, interviewers could correctly detect honest IM tactics only 13-29% of the time. In addition, Roulin and colleagues (2014), and Stevens & Kristof (1995) found that interviewer ratings of IM were either inversely or weakly related to interviewee ratings of IM. Therefore, interviewers cannot accurately detect IM tactics, yet these tactics still influence their ratings. Consequently, the primary purpose of the current study is to determine why and how IM tactics still influence interviewer ratings, despite the fact that interviewers are often unaware of these tactics.

**Competence and Warmth**

Research in social psychology may provide insights into how IM tactics are influencing interviewer evaluations. Research demonstrates that when interacting with others and witnessing
their behaviours, we spontaneously make internal judgments concerning others’ broad-level traits, as opposed to judgments about specific behaviours (Ambady & Rosenthal, 1993; Cuddy, Glick, & Beninger, 2011). Furthermore, the Stereotype Content Model purports that most people spontaneously and unconsciously judge others on two broad traits – Competence and Warmth (analogous to “Agency” and “Communion”) – especially when first meeting (Cuddy et al., 2011). Competence is an overarching label that reflects traits that are related to ability such as: intelligence, assertiveness, efficacy, agency, skill, confidence, and capability (Cuddy et al., 2011; Fiske, Cuddy, & Glick, 2006; Fiske, Cuddy, Glick, Xu, 2002; Peeters, 2001). Warmth is an overarching label that reflects traits that are related to intentions such as: friendliness, trustworthiness, morality, communion, good nature, and sincerity (Cuddy et al., 2011; Fiske et al., 2006; Fiske et al., 2002; Peeters, 2001).

Specifically, the Stereotype Content Model indicates that when interacting with others or witnessing their behaviours, we almost always internally judge their trait levels of competence and warmth, which in turn impacts subsequent evaluations (Cuddy et al., 2011; Fiske et al., 2006). Accordingly, this model would suggest that in an interview context interviewers would form spontaneous and unconscious trait-level judgments about interviewees’ competence and warmth when interviewees engage in self-promotion and ingratiation behaviours, which would in turn influence subsequent interview evaluations.

The Stereotype Content Model can also be explained through evolutionary psychology. Specifically, evolutionary psychology purports that evaluations of competence and warmth are so pervasive across numerous contexts today because they are based on an ancestral need to immediately assess a person or group’s intent and ability to harm us in an effort to maintain survival (Cuddy et al., 2011; Fiske et al., 2006). Whenever our evolutionary ancestors
encountered an unfamiliar person or group they needed to evaluate that person or group’s intention to harm – their warmth or trustworthiness – and their ability to actually enact that harm – their competence or efficacy. Our ancestors who successfully made these vital evaluations prospered and evolved into the humans who are still making these evaluations today. Thus, perceptions and evaluations of others’ warmth and competence are still prevalent and automatic today due to our past survival need to quickly make these assessments when encountering others (Cuddy et al., 2011; Fiske et al., 2006).

Empirical studies also demonstrate the ubiquity of perceptions and evaluations of competence and warmth in our present day (Asch, 1946; Cuddy et al., 2011; Fiske et al., 2006; Rosenberg, Nelson, & Vivekananthan, 1968; Wojciszke, 1994). For example, Rosenberg and colleagues (1968) asked participants to describe ten people they knew based on a list of traits the researchers provided. After the researchers analyzed and grouped the chosen traits, they found that participants described others based on two overarching traits: intellectual and social (which can also be labeled as competence and warmth, respectively). Wojciszke, Abele, and Baryla (2007) found similar results when they asked employees to describe their thoughts about their supervisors. The large majority of their descriptions focused on competence, warmth, or both. These studies support the notion that competence and warmth dominate our perceptions of others.

Another impactful study, conducted by Wojciszke (1994), powerfully demonstrates the ubiquity and spontaneity of perceptions of competence and warmth. Wojciszke (1994) examined how individuals from several countries spontaneously framed their evaluations of others in their recent past without being primed or instructed on how to frame the events. Participants were simply asked to reflect upon and write about several recent events in their lives that led to the
evaluation of another person (Wojciszke, 1994). Nearly one thousand events were described. On scales from 0 to 6, expert judges, who were blind to the purpose of the study, rated the content of the events on the extent to which they reflected competence, morality (which is similar to warmth), and several other traits. They found that over seventy-five percent of the events were spontaneously framed in terms of competence, warmth, or both (Wojciszke, 1994). This study provides substantial support for the primacy of competence and warmth judgments in social perception and evaluation.

Based on the aforementioned research and the Stereotype Content Model, I expect that in an evaluative context with an unfamiliar person (i.e., an interview), after witnessing interviewees’ behaviours (i.e., impression management tactics), interviewers will form broad trait-level impressions or perceptions of interviewee competence and warmth, and these fundamental perceptions will in turn influence subsequent evaluations (i.e., interview ratings). Specifically, in the current study, self-presentation tactics, which are intended to convey competence (Barrick et al., 2009; Ellis et al., 2002; Stevens & Kristof, 1995), will influence perceptions of competence. Ingratiation tactics, which are intended to convey warmth (Barrick et al., 2009; Ellis et al., 2002; Stevens & Kristof, 1995), will influence perceptions of warmth. Furthermore, the Stereotype Content Model (Cuddy et al., 2011; Fiske et al., 2006) would suggest that interviewees who are judged highly on competence or warmth would also receive higher interview ratings.

**Perceptions of Competence and Warmth in Interviews**

Past interview research also provides evidence that these fundamental perceptions of competence and warmth are related to self-presentation-IM and ingratiation-IM tactics. Specifically, research shows that when interviewees use self-presentation they are usually viewed
as competent by interviewers (Chen & Lin, 2014; Howard & Ferris, 1996; Kristof-Brown, Barrick, & Franke, 2002). Howard and Ferris (1996) manipulated interviewee use of self-promotion using pre-developed scripts and found that “candidates” who engaged in more self-promotion were slightly more likely to be viewed as more competent by interviewers ($r = .13$). Kristof-Brown and colleagues (2002) similarly found that interviewee self-reported self-promotion tactics correlated significantly with interviewer perceptions of P-J (person-job) fit ($r = .40, p < .05$), which can be used as a proxy for perceptions of competence (Chen & Lin, 2014; Kristof, 1996). Another field study examined the relationship between self-promotion (as reported by the interviewee) and P-J fit (i.e., competence) and found a significant positive correlation between the two constructs ($r = .30, p < .01$; Chen & Lin, 2014). In summary, when interviewees use self-promotions tactics, interviewers tend to perceive them as competent.

Thus, in the current study I expect that:

H3: Self-promotion tactics (as rated by interviewees and coders) will correlate positively with perceptions of interviewee competence (as rated by interviewers).

Empirical support also exists for the connection between ingratiation tactics and perceptions of warmth. Specifically, a study by Kacmar and Carlson (1999) investigated the relationship between other-focused tactics (which is another term for ingratiation tactics) and liking of candidates. Participants, acting as interviewers, read vignettes describing interviewees who used either self-promotion or ingratiation tactics. Interviewers rated the interviewees who used ingratiation as more likeable than the interviewees who used self-promotion (Kacmar & Carlson, 1999). Likeability and warmth are similar constructs that are strongly correlated ($r = .61$ to $.74$; Lemmink and Mattsson, 1998). Those who are perceived as warm are often also seen as likable (Ambady & Rosenthal, 1993; Rudman & Glick, 1999; Uranowitz & Doyle, 1978). Thus,
it is reasonable to expect that those who are perceived as likeable will also be perceived as warm. This research shows that when interviewees engage in ingratiation, interviewers are likely to perceive them as interpersonally warm.

Thus, in the current study I expect that:

H4: Ingratiation tactics (as rated by interviewees and coders) will correlate positively with perceptions of interviewee warmth (as rated by interviewers).

Researchers have also found that perceptions of interviewee competence and warmth are positively related to interview evaluations and outcomes (Chen & Lin, 2014; Graves & Powell, 1988; Howard & Ferris, 1996). For instance, Howard and Ferris (1996) had interviewers watch videos of interviewees and rate their perceptions of the interviewees’ competence and warmth, as well as provide evaluations of job suitability. Both competence and warmth perceptions significantly influenced ratings of job suitability \((r = .71, p < .01; r = .59, p < .01, \text{ respectively})\). Graves and Powell (1988) also found support for the relationship between competence, warmth, and interview outcomes. After completion of actual interviews, 396 interviewers reported on their perceptions of interviewee qualifications (which the authors described as akin to competence) and interpersonal attraction toward the interviewee (which the authors described as similar to likability and warmth), and provided interview outcome ratings (including ranking of applicant, likelihood of second interview, and likelihood of job offer). Perceptions of competence (or qualifications) and perceptions of warmth (or interpersonal attraction) significantly and positively affected all interview outcomes combined \((r = .74, p < .05; r = .16, p < .05, \text{ respectively})\). Chen and Lin’s (2014) field study provides more support for these relationships as they found that interviewers’ perceptions of interviewee competence (i.e., P-J fit) were positively correlated with interviewer hiring recommendations \((r = .84, p < .01)\). Because
perceptions of competence and warmth positively impact several types of interview outcomes, they should positively impact interview ratings, too.

Thus, I expect that:

H5: Perceptions of interviewee competence (as rated by interviewers) will correlate positively with interview ratings (as rated by interviewers).

H6: Perceptions of interviewee warmth (as rated by interviewers) will correlate positively with interview ratings (as rated by interviewers).

Thus far, past research has provided evidence to support the relationships between: self-promotion-IM and interview ratings; self-promotion-IM and perceptions of competence; perceptions of competence and interview ratings; ingratiation-IM and interview ratings; ingratiation-IM and perceptions of warmth; and perceptions of warmth and interview ratings (Barrick et al., 2009; Chen & Lin, 2014; Graves & Powell, 1988; Howard & Ferris, 1996; Kacmar & Carlson, 1999; Kristof-Brown et al., 2002). Despite these findings, researchers have yet to examine perceptions of competence and perceptions of warmth (two fundamental dimensions of social perception) as mediators of the relationship between self-promotion and interview ratings, and ingratiation and interview ratings, respectively.

Guided by the Stereotype Content Model and past empirical results, the current study will fill this research gap by testing the following hypotheses:

H7: Perceptions of interviewee competence (as rated by interviewers) will partially mediate the relationship between self-promotion tactics (as rated by interviewees and coders) and interview ratings (as rated by interviewers). See Table 2 and Figure 1.
H8: Perceptions of interviewee warmth (as rated by interviewers) will partially mediate the relationship between ingratiation tactics (as rated by interviewees and coders) and interview ratings (as rated by interviewers). See Table 2 and Figure 1.

Considering Chen and Lin (2014) found marginally significant partial mediators to explain similar relationships (i.e., the relationship between self-promotion and hiring recommendations and the relationship between ingratiation and hiring recommendations), the proposed mediators in this study are unlikely to provide full mediation. Therefore, partial mediation as opposed to full mediation is expected.

Methodology

A Priori Power Analyses

I completed a series of power analyses in R to determine the number of participants required to achieve a power of .80 for hypotheses 1 to 6. For hypotheses 7 and 8 combined, I completed two RMSEA power analyses in R, which included all variables of interest, to determine the number of participants required to achieve a power of .80 with 4 degrees of freedom. The first RMSEA power analysis included self-reported IM and the second RMSEA power analysis included coded IM. See Appendix A for all a priori (and post hoc) power analyses.

Participants

This study was advertised in conjunction with a temporary research position in a psychology research lab at the University of Guelph. The research position paid $27 per hour and required a total of 30 hours of work during the month of April 2017. The advertisement flyer for the position included key job details and informed potential participants that they would be
invited to participate in a study at the time of their interview (see Appendix B). In addition, the advertisement directed interested applicants to send an email to a specified email address to book an interview. All interested applicants were eligible to interview for the position after completing a job application, and thus, anyone who emailed to request an interview and completed the job application was interviewed.

In February and March of 2017, the job and study was advertised to undergraduate students of all ages, genders, and programs at the University of Guelph. The job and study was advertised online through: various Facebook pages and groups, a University of Guelph student job posting website (called Recruit Guelph), and online (CourseLink) announcement boards for various courses with the instructors’ consent. Flyers were also posted within several campus buildings, and announcements were made in several classes with the instructors’ consent.

Approximately 300 people emailed to express interest in interviewing for the position or to inquire about the position. Those who requested to be interviewed completed a job application and were scheduled for an interview. In February, March, and April of 2017, 137 applicants interviewed for the position. 123 of those applicants consented to participate in the current study at the time of their interview. This total sample of 123 participants consisted of 18% males and 82% females. On average participants were twenty-one years of age, had participated in a total of eight interviews in the past, and had three years and nine months of work experience.

Materials and Measures

Job description. Two members of the research team created a research assistant job description using information adapted from O-Net OnLine (see Appendix C). The job description included duties and responsibilities that require both competence and warmth.
Participants were provided with this job description after they emailed indicating their interest in the position.

**Structured behavioural interview.** The structured behavioural interview used in this study consisted of three questions (see Appendix D) that were taken from a larger bank of interview questions for a research assistant position. Each of the three interview questions assessed one skill deemed necessary for the research assistant position. These skills were: task and time management, problem solving, and teamwork. Each question was accompanied by a list of several standard optional follow-up questions that interviewers asked depending on the participants’ responses. Each question also had a set of behavioural descriptions that composed behaviourally anchored rating scale (BARS) for that question. The BARS signified excellent, adequate, and poor behavioural descriptions of the skill being assessed, and were used to rate the interviewees’ responses. Subject matter experts (SMEs; graduate students and student consultants) previously reviewed these interview questions and BARS.

**Impression management tactics.**

**Self-reported impression management tactics.** Participants self-reported on their use of IM tactics using the honest self-promotion and honest ingratiation sub-scales from the Honest Interview Impression Management (HIIM) scale (Bourdage et al., 2015; see Appendix E). The HIIM scale was specifically constructed and validated to capture honest impression management. The fourteen-item honest self-promotion sub-scale includes items like “I made sure to let the interviewer know about my job credentials”. The eight-item honest ingratiation sub-scale includes items like “I tried to find out the values or opinions the interviewer and I shared in common, and was vocal about these”. Participants indicated the extent to which they engaged in these IM tactics on a five-point scale, from one (to no extent) to five (to a very great extent).
Observer coded impression management tactics. Two coders from a total group of six coders listened to the audio portion of the interviews and coded for the frequency of IM tactics used by the participants. This study used similar coding procedures to those used in past research (Ellis et al., 2002; Peeters & Lievens, 2006; Stevens & Kristof, 1995; see Appendix F). Specifically, the coders reported the frequency of self-promotion tactics, which included exemplification, entitlements, enhancements, and self-promoting utterances. They also coded for the frequency of ingratiation tactics, which included other-enhancement, opinion conformity, and fit with organization.

Interview ratings. Participants were interviewed by one of five female interviewers. I chose to use female interviewers for two reasons. Research shows that when male interviewers engage in non-verbal social dominance behaviours (e.g., eye contact, interruptions) they rate female interviewees lower, however, social dominance behaviour has no effect when enacted by female interviewers (Latu & Schmid Mast, 2016). In addition, most human resource professionals are women (72%; Government of Canada, 2017), thus, this study would reflect real workplace conditions. Therefore, I chose to use female interviewers as opposed to male interviewers to avoid the negative impact of male social dominance behaviours and to enhance this study’s ecologically valid.

While listening to a participant’s response, the interviewer checked off the BARs that corresponded to their response. Each BAR reflected behaviours that were poor (level one), adequate (level three), or excellent (level five) manifestations of that skill (see Appendix D). After a participant finished responding to a question, the interviewer used the checked BARs to calculate an overall rating for that question before moving the next question. For each question, interviewers could potentially calculate a rating of one (poor behaviour), three (adequate
behaviour), or five (excellent behaviour) based on checked BARs (see Appendix D).

Interviewers could also potentially calculate a score of two or four for a question if there was an equal distribution of BARs checked off in level one and level three, or in level three and level five, respectively. In addition, interviewers could provide a score of zero for a question if the participant: did not provide a response, provided an un-rateable response (i.e., irrelevant information, minimal information), or made inappropriate comments.

To increase reliability of interview ratings, two different interviewers rated each participant’s interview. For each participant, the interviewer conducting the interview provided the first rating for that interview, and a different interviewer, who watched the interview video, provided the second rating for that interview. Consequently, each interview was rated twice (live rating and video rating) and these two ratings were averaged to create one overall interview rating. I did not expect live (in-person) and video interview ratings to differ because past research demonstrates that in-person structured interview ratings and videotaped structured interview ratings are significantly positively correlated (Conway, Jako, & Goodman, 1995; Swider, Barrick, & Harris, 2016). Indeed, the current study did find that live and video ratings of interview performance were significantly positively correlated ($r = .44$; See Table 3).

**Interviewer reported competence and warmth.** Interviewers rated their perception of participants’ competence and warmth. When conducting a live interview, interviewers provided these ratings immediately after the interview once the participant had left the room. If they were watching an interview video, they provided these ratings immediately after the video was complete. Specifically, interviewers rated the extent to which they thought a list of traits, reflecting competence and warmth, were characteristic of the participant on a scale from one (not at all) to five (extremely; see Appendix G). This list of traits was adapted from Fiske and
colleagues (2002). The traits reflecting competence are: capable, intelligent, efficient, skillful, confident, competent, and agentic. The traits reflecting warmth are: good-natured, sincere, friendly, well intentioned, trustworthy, warm, and communal. This approach to measuring competence and warmth has been applied successfully in past studies (Ambady & Rosenthal, 1993; Fiske et al., 2002; Rudman & Glick, 1999).

Training

Interview Training. Prior to conducting the study, I trained 5 female interviewers (volunteer research assistants) on the following: running the study, videotaping the interviews, conducting structured behavioural interviews, and providing ratings using the structured behavioural interview tool. The interviewers also completed an online Course in Research Ethics (CORE) prior to their training.

Coder Training. I taught 6 coders about self-promotion tactics (exemplification, entitlement, enhancement, self-promoting utterance) and ingratiation tactics (other enhancement, opinion conformity, fit with the organization), and how to identify them (see Appendix F). The coders were also trained on how to manage the audio interviews, and count the frequency of the IM tactics while listening to the interviews (see Appendix F).

Procedure

Once applicants emailed indicating their interest in the interview, they were sent a standard reply email (see Appendix H), which included an attachment of the job description (see Appendix C) and the study letter of consent (see Appendix I). The standard reply email also included a link to a Qualtrics survey where applicants could complete the job application and upload their transcript. Their responses on the job application and their transcripts were not used
in this study; their completed job applications and transcripts were only used to inform the hiring decision for the position. The standard reply email informed applicants that their interview would be videotaped in order to obtain a second rating of interview performance for a more accurate overall interview rating. The email also asked applicants to reply back indicating their availability for an interview if interested. In addition, the email reminded applicants that they would be invited to participate in the current study at the time of their interview, but that the study was completely voluntary and would have no impact on their interview or the hiring decision.

When applicants arrived at the lab for their interview, an interviewer greeted them and directed them to have a seat. The interviewer explained the interview process, and reminded the applicant that the interview would be videotaped (see Appendix J). The interviewer then started the video. Each interview lasted for approximately twenty minutes. During the interview, applicants responded to three structured behavioural interview questions asked by the interviewer (see Appendix D). Depending on the applicant’s response, the interviewer asked follow-up questions taken from a standard set of optional follow-up questions. The interviewer also checked off BARs corresponding to the applicant’s response and took notes. The interviewer provided a rating for each question before moving onto the next question. Upon completion of the interview, the interviewer stopped videotaping. The interviewer asked applicants if they had any questions and answered questions using the job description and FAQ sheet (see Appendix L) as resources if needed. The interviewer then thanked the applicant for their time and directed them to a second lab room nearby, where the applicant was invited to participate in this study. After applicants exited the interview room, the interviewer inputted the hardcopy interview ratings onto a Qualtrics online survey and completed the perceptions of
competence and warmth scales on Qualtrics. Interviewers also completed another survey on Qualtrics for the purpose of a different study (assessing interviewee anxiety).

Once applicants arrived in the second lab room, they were greeted by a member of the research team who assured them that from that point forward their behaviour and responses would not be considered whatsoever in the hiring decision (see Appendix K). Applicants were invited to take part in the current study and were informed verbally and through a consent form (see Appendix I): of their right to withdraw at any point during the study, that their identities will remain confidential, and that their participation or lack of participation in the study would have no impact on the hiring decision. Applicants then read the consent form and signed the form if they agreed to participate in the study. If applicants chose to withdraw themselves or their data from the study, they were still considered for the job.

Participants were provided with a laptop and instructed to complete a 25-minute questionnaire on Qualtrics. The questionnaire included: demographic questions pertaining to gender, age, background, and previous interview and job experience, as well as the self-report honest impression management scale. The questionnaire also included 4 additional surveys for the purpose of different research studies (i.e., deceptive impression management scale, interview anxiety scale, personality scale, and Machiavellianism scale). Upon completion of the questionnaire, participants read the debriefing form, which was theirs to take (see Appendix M). This form included contact information should participants have questions later. The researcher then thanked participants for their time, and reminded them not to disclose the events of the interview or the study with anyone else in order to preserve the fairness of the process and integrity of the data.
Results

Data Cleaning and Handling

Prior to data analysis, I devised a plan for cleaning and handling data to account for missing data, abnormal responding, multicolinearity, skewness, kurtosis, and outliers (Hair, 2010; Shiffler, 1988). First, a research assistant and I manually checked each hardcopy interview and ensured that the data on the hardcopies matched the data entered on Qualtrics. We also manually checked the data online on Qualtrics to ensure that it matched the data file that was downloaded from Qualtrics. To account for missing data, I planned to use the person-mean substitution method. A missing data analysis on SPSS yielded no missing data points.

An analysis to determine abnormal responding (i.e., participant selected same response for every item) showed that standard deviations of responses for all participants exceeded zero, meaning abnormal responding was not detected. An analysis of multicolinearity of variables did not reveal any extreme values for the variance inflation factor nor for tolerance. In addition, analyses did not reveal any issues with skewness, and only one extreme kurtosis value, which was for coded ingratiation tactics. This extreme kurtosis value (6.25) may likely be because participants exhibited a relatively low number of ingratiation tactics.

I planned to screen for both univariate and multivariate outliers in SPSS. Because I anticipated a relatively low number of participants, I did not plan to remove or alter any outliers, but instead to report outliers in an appendix (See Appendix N). I screened for univariate outliers by determining scores that were beyond 3.29 standard deviations from the mean. Specifically, I converted scores into standardized z-scores and determined scores that were either greater than 3.29 or less than 3.29. To screen for multivariate outliers I calculated Cook’s distance between each predictor and criterion variable of interest. I also calculated Cook’s distance between all of
the predictor variables together predicting the criterion variables. Distance scores above one were recorded as outliers. I found 10 univariate outliers and did not find any multivariate outliers (See Appendix N).

**Analyses**

Table 3 outlines correlations between variables of interest as well as means, standard deviations, and scale reliabilities. Also see Appendix A for (a priori and) post hoc power analyses for all relationships of interest.

**Hypotheses 1 to 6.** I hypothesized that self-promotion tactics (as self-rated by interviewees or as rated by coders) would positively correlate with interview ratings (H1). Correlational analyses supported this hypothesis. Self-promotion tactics (self-rated) had a moderate positive relationship with interview ratings, with a confidence interval that ranged from a small positive to a moderate positive effect ($r = 0.30$, 95% CI [0.13, 0.46], $p < .01$). Similarly, self-promotion tactics (coded) had a moderate positive relationship with interview ratings, with a confidence interval that ranged from a moderate positive to a large positive effect ($r = 0.40$, 95% CI [0.24, .54], $p < 0.01$).

I hypothesized that ingratiation tactics (as self-rated by interviewees or as rated by coders) would positively correlate with interview ratings (H2). Correlational analyses did not support this hypothesis. Ingratiation tactics (self-rated) did not correlate with interview ratings, with a confidence interval that ranged from a small negative to a small positive effect ($r = 0.01$, 95% CI [-0.16, 0.19]). Ingratiation tactics (coded) had a small positive relationship with interview ratings, however, the confidence interval overlapped with zero ($r = 0.18$, 95% CI [0.00, 0.35], $p < 0.05$).
I hypothesized that self-promotion tactics (as self-rated by interviewees or as rated by coders) would positively correlate with interviewers’ perceptions of interviewee competence (H3). Correlational analyses supported this hypothesis. Self-promotion tactics (self-rated) had a small positive relationship with perceptions of competence, with a confidence interval that ranged from a small positive to a moderate positive effect ($r = 0.27$, 95% CI [0.10, 0.43], $p < .01$). Self-promotion tactics (coded) had a moderate positive relationship with perceptions of competence, with a confidence interval that ranged from a moderate positive relationship to a large positive relationship ($r = 0.37$, 95% CI [0.21, 0.51], $p < 0.01$).

I hypothesized that ingratiating tactics (as self-rated by interviewees and as rated by coders) would positively correlate with interviewers’ perceptions of interviewee warmth (H4). Correlational analyses partially supported this hypothesis. Ingratiating tactics (self-rated) had a small positive relationship with perceptions of warmth, however, the confidence interval approaches zero ($r = .18$, 95% CI [0.01, .35], $p < .05$). Ingratiating tactics (coded) had a small positive relationship with perceptions of warmth, but again the confidence interval approaches zero ($r = 0.23$, 95% CI [0.05, 0.39], $p < 0.01$).

I hypothesized that interviewers’ perceptions of interviewee competence would positively correlate with interview ratings (H5). Correlational analyses supported this hypothesis. Perceptions of competence had a large positive relationship with interview ratings, with a confidence interval that supports this ($r = .64$, 95% CI [0.53, 0.74], $p < .01$).

I hypothesized that interviewers’ perceptions of interviewee warmth would positively correlate with interview ratings (H6). Correlational analysis supported this hypothesis. Perceptions of warmth had a large positive relationship with interview ratings, with a confidence
interval that ranged from a moderate positive relationship to a large positive relationship \((r = 0.52, 95\% \text{ CI } [0.37, 0.64], p < .01)\).

**Hypotheses 7 and 8.** I hypothesized that perceptions of competence would partially mediate the relationship between self-promotion tactics and interview ratings (H7), and that perceptions of warmth would partially mediate the relationship between ingratiation tactics and interview ratings (H8). I tested these hypotheses together using structural equation modeling path analyses, which included all variables of interest. Specifically, in R I conducted path analyses with bootstrapped standard errors at 1000 and bias-corrected bootstrapped confidence intervals. I tested for direct and indirect effects using two variations of the model. The first model (Figure 2) used self-reported IM while the second model (Figure 3) used coded IM. See Appendix O for four additional exploratory models, which test model 1 and 2 using either live or video ratings for competence, warmth, and interview performance as opposed to averaging live and video ratings.

The first model (see Figure 2) included self-reported self-promotion and ingratiation tactics, and averaged ratings for competence, warmth, and interview performance (meaning the ratings were averaged across both the live and video ratings, which were rated by two different raters). I found a small positive direct effect of self-promotion (self-rated) on interview ratings (averaged) \((\text{direct effect} = 0.229(0.300), 95\% \text{ BC bootstrapped CI } [0.189, 1.354], p < 0.05)\), and also found a small positive indirect effect through perceptions of competence (averaged) \((\text{indirect effect} = 0.135(0.194), 95\% \text{ BC bootstrapped CI } [0.112, 0.856], p < 0.05)\). I found a small negative direct effect of ingratiation (self-rated) on interview ratings (averaged) \((\text{direct effect} = -0.189(0.260), 95\% \text{ BC bootstrapped CI } [-1.138, -0.105], p < 0.05)\), but did not find an indirect effect through perceptions of warmth (averaged) \((\text{indirect effect} = 0.054(0.097), 95\% \text{ BC bootstrapped CI } [0.012, 0.097])\).
BC bootstrapped CI [0.039, 0.475], \( p = 0.097 \). Thus, results of the first model support hypothesis 7 but do not support hypothesis 8, meaning perceptions of competence (averaged) partially mediated the relationship between self-promotion (self-rated) and interview ratings (averaged), but perceptions of warmth (averaged) did not partially mediate the relationship between ingratiatiation (self-rated) and interview ratings (averaged). See Figure 2.

The second model (see Figure 3) included coded self-promotion and ingratiatiation tactics, and averaged ratings for competence, warmth, and interview performance (meaning the ratings were averaged across both the live and video ratings, which were rated by two different raters). I did not find a direct effect of self-promotion (coded) on interview ratings (averaged) (direct effect = 0.181(0.057), 95% BC bootstrapped CI [0.012, 0.235], \( p = 0.051 \)), but did find a small positive indirect effect through perceptions of competence (averaged) (indirect effect = 0.187(0.037), 95% BC bootstrapped CI [0.056, 0.203], \( p < 0.01 \)). I did not find a direct effect of ingratiatiation (coded) on interview ratings (averaged) (direct effect = 0.019(0.079), 95% BC bootstrapped CI [-0.136, 0.187], \( p = 0.777 \)), and also did not find an indirect effect through perceptions of warmth (averaged) (indirect effect = 0.058(0.036), 95% BC bootstrapped CI [0.015, 0.162], \( p = 0.054 \)). Thus, results of the second model provide partial support for hypothesis 7 but do not support hypothesis 8. Specifically, perceptions of competence (averaged) actually fully mediated the relationship between self-promotion (coded) and interview ratings (averaged), instead of partially mediating the relationship. Perceptions of warmth (averaged) did not partially mediate the relationship between ingratiatiation (coded) and interview ratings (averaged). See Figure 3.
Discussion

The current study found that increased use of self-promotion in interviews relates to higher interview ratings, which is consistent with past research that shows that engaging in self-promotion results in better interview outcomes, such as higher interview ratings, more job recommendations, and more job offers (Barrick et al., 2009; Chen & Lin, 2014; Ellis et al., 2002; Higgins et al., 2003; Higgins & Judge, 2004; Kleinmann & Klehe, 2011; Roulin et al., 2014; Stevens & Kristof, 1995; Van Iddekinge et al., 2007). However, contrary to the aforementioned research, which shows a positive relationship between ingratiation and interview outcomes, the current study did not find that increased use of ingratiation relates to higher interview ratings. This contrary finding could be explained by the fact that the interviewees in this study used little to no ingratiation tactics. These interviewees might have been less inclined to ingratiate because their interviewer was a third party and was not the person responsible for hiring. Alternatively, the limited use of ingratiation may have been due to the use of behavioural questions in this interview. Behavioural questions ask about specific past experiences and do not allow for much opportunity to ingratiate by, for example, complimenting the interviewer. In fact, Ellis and colleagues (2002) found that when asked behavioural questions applicants engaged in significantly more self-promotion than ingratiation tactics. Regardless of why interviewees in this study engaged in less ingratiation, this limited use of ingratiation may explain why a relationship between ingratiation and interview ratings was not found. In sum, the current study supports past research that shows that self-promotion tactics are beneficial in interviews, but does support the research on the effectiveness of ingratiation tactics.

Additionally, the current study parallels past research that reveals a positive relationship between self-promotion and perceptions of competence (Chen & Lin, 2014; Howard & Ferris,
1996; Kristof-Brown et al., 2002), as well as a positive relationship between perceptions of competence and interview outcomes (Chen & Lin, 2014; Graves & Powell, 1988; Howard & Ferris, 1996). Specifically, interviewers viewed interviewees as more competent (i.e., agentic, capable, intelligent) when the interviewees engaged in more self-promotion, and those who were viewed as more competent also achieved higher interview ratings. Accordingly, it may be advantageous for interviewees to enhance their appearance of competence in interviews to achieve better interview outcomes, and honest self-promotion may be an effective means to enhance appearance of competence. In summary, increased use of self-promotion by interviewees is related to being perceived as competent by interviewers, and increased perceptions of competence are related to higher interview ratings.

The current study does not support past research that suggests ingratiation tactics are positively related to perceptions of warmth (Kacmar & Carlson, 1999). Specifically, the current study found when interviewees ingratiated they were either viewed as only slightly more warm or not viewed as more warm. Thus, contrary to past research, the use of ingratiation tactics was not successful in increasing the appearance of warmth. Perhaps ingratiation did not increase appearance of warmth because the ingratiation attempts were viewed as deceitful or manipulative instead of warm. Treadway, Ferris, Duke, Adams, and Thatcher (2007) did find that employees’ ingratiation attempts are viewed as manipulative when the employees are low on political skill – “the ability to effectively understand others at work, and to use such knowledge to influence others to act in ways that enhance one’s personal and/or organizational objectives” (Ferris et al., 2005). This finding suggests that political skill may moderate the relationship between ingratiation tactics and perceptions of warmth, such that interviewees with strong political skills are more likely to be perceived as warm when ingratiating, than those with weak political skills.
In sum, although past research would suggest that ingratiation tactics improve one’s appearance of warmth, this may not have been supported in the current study if some interviewees had poor political skills.

The current study is consistent with past research that demonstrates a positive relationship between perceptions of warmth and interview outcomes (Chen & Lin, 2014; Graves & Powell, 1988; Howard & Ferris, 1996). Specifically, those who were perceived as warm by interviewers received higher interview ratings. Thus, some interviewees did indeed appear warm to the interviewers and this was related to a better interview outcome. Interestingly, as previously discussed, in the current study the use of ingratiation tactics had a very small to nonexistent relationship with perceptions of warmth, meaning that interviewers did perceive some interviewees as more warm, but this perception was unlikely to be due to the interviewees’ verbal ingratiation attempts. Perhaps interviewers inferred interviewee warmth from something other than verbal ingratition-IM, such as non-verbal IM tactics. In fact, research shows that individuals who engage in certain non-verbal behaviours such as Duchene smiling, nodding, and leaning forward are perceived as more warm, friendly and likeable, than those who do not (Cuddy et al., 2011). Accordingly, interviewers may have perceived warmth when interviewees engaged in warm non-verbal behaviours, as opposed to verbal ones. Regardless of how warmth was inferred in this study, appearing warm is indeed related to achieving higher interview ratings.

A very important finding from this study is that perceptions of competence are a mediator of the relationship between self-promotion and interview ratings. To date, there is ample support for a positive relationship between self-promotion and interview outcomes (Barrick et al., 2009; Chen & Lin, 2014; Ellis et al., 2002; Higgins et al., 2003; Higgins & Judge, 2004; Kleinmann &
Klehe, 2011; Roulin et al., 2014; Stevens & Kristof, 1995; Van Iddekinge et al., 2007), but there is minimal evidence to support mediators of this relationship (Chen & Lin, 2014). The current study addresses this gap in the literature by explaining why this relationship exists. Specifically, this study revealed that the more an interviewee engages in self-promotion tactics, the more they are perceived as competent at a trait level by the interviewer, and the better they are then rated on interview performance. The strength of this mediator (perceptions of competence) does however depend on the measurement of self-promotion – self-reported versus coded. When self-promotion is self-reported, perceptions of competence partially mediates the relationship between self-promotion and interview ratings, whereas when self-promotion is coded, perceptions of competence fully mediates the relationship between self-promotion and interview ratings. Regardless of how self-promotion is measured, in both cases (self-reported and coded), perceptions of competence mediates the relationship between self-promotion and interview ratings and as such the current study provides new evidence to explain why self-promotion positively influences interview outcomes.

**Implications**

This study provides support for the Stereotype Content Model (Fiske et al., 2006) within a new context – the employment selection interview. As theoretically expected, fundamental judgments of competence and warmth had a strong impact on subsequent evaluations (i.e., interview ratings). Specifically, perceptions of competence strongly correlated with interview ratings ($r = .64$) and perceptions of warmth strongly correlated with interview ratings ($r = .52$). These fundamental judgments were influential even while using a structured interview, which past research shows is usually less susceptible to interviewer biases than unstructured interviews (Barrick et al., 2009; Huffcutt et al., 2011).
Moreover, akin to what this model would suggest, interviewers formed broad trait-level impressions of competence based on applicants’ specific self-promotion behaviours. However, contrary to what this model would suggest, interviewers did not seem to form impressions of warmth when applicants engaged in ingratiation. This contrary finding may have been due to priming. Specifically, if one trait (i.e., competence) over another (i.e., warmth) were primed, this would alter the extent to which interviewees’ behaviours were perceived on one dimension (e.g., competence) over another (e.g., warmth; Fiske et al., 2006). It could be argued that, in this context, competence over warmth was primed because the interview was for the position of Research Assistant, which could be viewed as a job requiring competence over warmth. Accordingly, if competence were indeed primed then interviewers would interpret interviewees’ behaviours on the basis of competence rather than warmth. If applicants’ verbal ingratiation attempts were indeed interpreted in terms of competence as opposed to warmth, this could explain the nonexistent relationship between ingratiation tactics and warmth perceptions.

Taken together, results of the current study suggests that in order to fare better in interviews, interviewees should attempt to appear more competent by self-promoting and to appear more warm. Interviewees can appear more competent by using honest verbal self-promotion-IM, such as recounting areas of expertise or explaining positive qualities and traits. Warmth, however, seems difficult to convey through verbal ingratiation-IM, and may be more effectively conveyed through non-verbal IM tactics such as smiling, nodding, and leaning forward (Cuddy et al., 2011). Moreover, because the current study used a purely honest measure of IM (Bourdage et al., 2015), the results indicate that interviewees can be very successful in interviews by honestly selling themselves (i.e., honestly self-promoting) without resorting to lying or stretching the truth. In summary, to increase chances of interview success, interviewees
should engage in honest self-promotion-IM to ultimately appear more competent, as well as attempt to appear interpersonally warm.

For organizations it is important to recognize factors that may impact their interviews. According to the current study, interviewers select for applicants who use more honest self-promotion. Even though interviewers may likely want to hear honest self-promotion from applicants, each applicant will differ in the amount of honest self-promotion tactics they use, which in turn would impact their interview outcome. For example, two applicants may be similarly qualified for a position, but the applicant who is more talkative and who engages in more self-promotion may receive a better interview evaluation, even if the other less talkative applicant is better suited for the job. One way to reduce this self-promotion bias is to ask less talkative applicants neutral, non-leading follow-up questions in order to garner more information. This would ensure that all applicants have a more equal chance to honestly self-promote, and that organizations are not simply selecting for applicants who engage in more self-promotion in the interview. Organizations should also know that when interviewing applicants even their structured interviews select for applicants who, during the interview, appear (at a broad-trait level) more competent and warm. Since interviews are influenced by extraneous factors such as interviewer’s perceptions of interviewees’ competence and warmth, it is important for organizations to use multiple selection tools (e.g., work samples; reference checks; job knowledge, integrity, and personality tests) to assess and hire applicants instead of solely relying on an interview.

**Strengths, Limitations, and Future Directions**

Many of this study’s strengths can be attributed to its methodology. First, data was obtained from real job interviews as opposed to mock interviews. Past employment interview
research often relied on mock interviews instead of real interviews. However, in the current study, data was obtained from actual job applicants and interviewers in real employment interviews, which strengthens the ecological validity of the findings. A second strength of this study is that effects were found even while using structured interviews as opposed to unstructured interviews. Compared to unstructured interviews, structured interviews usually dampen the effects of extraneous variables and interviewer biases on interview outcomes (Barrick et al., 2009; Huffcutt et al., 2011). In the current study effects were found even while using a structured interview, which may indicate that the effects would be even stronger with an unstructured interview that is more susceptible to extraneous factors. Therefore, both the use of real employment interviews and structured interviews strengthens the validity of these findings.

In addition, the variety of methods and sources of data collection as well as the measure used to assess self-rated IM are also key strengths. In the literature, impression management is commonly measured by either self-report or observer coding. This study measured IM using both self-report and coding, resulting in a richer data set and more findings to analyze and interpret. Furthermore, this study used multiple raters to measure coded impression management and ratings of competence, warmth, and interview performance. Specifically, two of six coders coded impression management tactics for each interview, and two of five interviewers rated each interviewee on competence, warmth, and interview performance. The use of multiple raters increases the reliability of these measures and the findings derived from these measures. A final and very important strength of this study is that it used a pure measure of self-reported honest IM (Bourdage et al., 2015). Past measures of IM did not distinguish between honest and deceptive IM and thus, likely erroneously confounded and measured IM as one construct. The current study used the only existing pure measure of honest IM to assess honest impression
management. Accordingly, the current study was able to further validate this new measure. In addition, the use of a purely honest IM measure strengthens the validity of the resulting inferences concerning self-reported honest IM. In sum, the methodological aspects discussed are substantial strengths of the current study.

Of course this study is not without its limitations. First, this study is not an experiment and consequently cannot draw cause and effect conclusions. Despite the benefits of an experiment, a correlational study was chosen for a few important reasons. First, I would have to have used mock interviews instead of real interview if I conducted an experimental study in order to allow for the manipulation impression management tactics. The use of mock interviews would not be as ecologically valid as the real interviews that were used in this study. In addition, manipulating impression management would be unauthentic and thus less ecologically valid. Lastly, a goal of the current study was to investigate the influence of honest impression management. The use of mock interviews and the manipulation of IM, which would be necessary in an experimental study, would not allow for honest IM to occur. Therefore, I opted to conduct a correlational study considering the benefits (i.e., ecological validity and ability to investigate honest IM) seemed to outweigh the limitations (i.e., cannot conclude cause and effect).

Another limitation, which alludes to a future research avenue, is the lack of situational questions in the interview. Situational questions are structured questions that ask an applicant what they would do if they were in a specific scenario in order to assess a skill needed for the job (Latham, Saari, Pursell, & Campion, 1980). Situational questions would have likely encouraged more ingratiation considering applicants engage in considerably more ingratiation when asked situational questions compared to behavioural questions (Ellis et al., 2002; Peeters & Lievens, 2006). As previously mentioned, the applicants in this study engaged in little to no ingratiation
tactics and all hypotheses involving ingratiation were not supported. Had there have been some situational questions, perhaps the applicants may have engaged in more ingratiation and consequently there may have been support for the hypotheses involving ingratiation. Accordingly, an important avenue for future research is to conduct this study with the addition of situational questions and reanalyze the relationships between ingratiation, perceptions of warmth, and interview outcomes.

A final limitation of this study is that the applicant pool limited the number of participants I could obtain, and consequently the power for each hypothesis. Indeed, some hypotheses (H2, H4, H7, and H8) were underpowered (less than .80; See Appendix A). Interestingly, the three hypotheses in this study that were not supported were also underpowered (H2, H4, and H8). Perhaps with a larger applicant pool and more power these three hypotheses may have been supported. Accordingly, future research could replicate this study with a larger sample size in order to achieve an adequate power of .80 for each hypothesis.

Despite these limitations, this research reveals novel contributions to literature, theory, and practice. First, this research explains a gap in the employment interview literature: why do self-promotion tactics positively influence interview ratings despite the fact that interviewers are usually unaware of these tactics. These findings demonstrate that the relationship between self-promotion and interview ratings is mediated by interviewers’ perception of interviewees’ competence. Second, this research extends the Stereotype Content Model to the employment selection interview context. This research demonstrates that, similar to other social contexts, during interviews competence and warmth judgments are made and these judgments impact subsequent evaluations. Third, these findings suggest a way for job applicants to improve their interview outcomes. It seems that one key to interview success is displaying an overall
appearance of competence to the interviewer. Applicants can appear competent simply by honestly describing their knowledge, skills, abilities, and experiences (i.e., honestly self-promoting).
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impression Management Tactics and Definitions</td>
<td>Definition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect tactics</td>
<td>Enhancing or protecting one’s image by managing the information about the people and things with which one is simply associated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boast</td>
<td>Proclaiming a positive link to a favourable other.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blur</td>
<td>Disclaiming a positive link to an unfavourable other.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blare</td>
<td>Proclaiming a negative link to an unfavourable other.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bury</td>
<td>Disclaiming a negative link to a favourable other.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct tactics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assertive tactics</td>
<td>Verbally and proactively promoting a favourable image of oneself.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-promotion</td>
<td>Verbally describing experiences in a way that demonstrates competence and suitability for the job.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exemplification</td>
<td>Explaining how past and future behaviours could be used as a good model for others to follow.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entitlement</td>
<td>Claiming major responsibility or the lead in positive past experiences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhancement</td>
<td>Trying to increase the value of positive past experiences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-promoting utterance</td>
<td>Explaining positive qualities and traits.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ingratiation</td>
<td>Verbally attempting to make oneself likeable to the interviewer or organization.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other-enhancement</td>
<td>Flattering or praising the interviewer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opinion-conformity</td>
<td>Expressing or endorsing attitudes or values that are similar to the interviewer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fit with organization</td>
<td>Expressing or endorsing attitudes and values that are similar to the organization.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defensive tactics</td>
<td>Verbally and reactively repair or protect one’s image.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Excuses</strong></td>
<td>Claiming oneself is not responsible for a negative event or behaviour.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Justifications</strong></td>
<td>Accepting responsibility for a negative outcome or event but suggesting that it is not as bad as it seems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Apologies</strong></td>
<td>Accepting responsibility for a negative outcome or event and also recognizing the negative implications of such responsibility.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Deceptive tactics</strong></td>
<td>Verbally and consciously distorting, embellishing, or inventing job-related qualifications or creating a favourable image of oneself.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Slight image creation</strong></td>
<td>Faking in order to make the image of a good candidate for the job.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Extensive image creation</strong></td>
<td>Faking in order to invent the image of a good candidate for the job.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Image protection</strong></td>
<td>Faking in order to defend the image of a good candidate for the job.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ingratiation</strong></td>
<td>Faking in order to gain favour with the interviewer to improve the appearance of a good candidate for the job.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note:* Definitions are adapted from: Andrews & Kacmar, 2001; Bourdage et al., 2015; Cialdini, 1989; Ellis et al., 2002; Levashina & Campion, 2007; Stevens & Kristof, 1995; Tedeschi & Melburg, 1984; Tedeschi & Norman, 1985
### Table 2

**Hypotheses**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impression management tactic (as reported by the interviewee or observer)</th>
<th>Correlation with interview ratings</th>
<th>Competence Hypothesis</th>
<th>Warmth Hypothesis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self-promotion</td>
<td>$r = .32$, 95% CI [.32, .32] (meta-analytic correlation)$^a$</td>
<td>Self-promotion will increase competence perceptions which in turn will increase interview ratings</td>
<td>No hypothesis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ingratiation</td>
<td>$r = .26$, 95% CI [.14, .38] (meta-analytic correlation)$^a$</td>
<td>No hypothesis</td>
<td>Ingratiation will increase warmth perceptions which in turn will increase interview ratings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defensive tactics</td>
<td>$r = .12$, 95% CI [.08, .16] (meta-analytic correlation)$^b$</td>
<td>No hypothesis</td>
<td>No hypothesis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slight image creation (deceptive)</td>
<td>$r = -.11$ to $.17^c$</td>
<td>No hypothesis</td>
<td>No hypothesis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extensive image creation (deceptive)</td>
<td>$r = -.19$ to $.28^c$</td>
<td>No hypothesis</td>
<td>No hypothesis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Image protection (deceptive)</td>
<td>$r = -.10$ to $.32^c$</td>
<td>No hypothesis</td>
<td>No hypothesis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ingratiation (deceptive)</td>
<td>$r = -.03$ to $.11^c$</td>
<td>No hypothesis</td>
<td>No hypothesis</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note:* $^a$ is from Barrick et al., 2009. $^b$ is from Levashina, Hartwell, Morgeson, & Campion, 2014. $^c$ is from Roulin et al., 2015; Schneider, Powell, & Roulin, 2015; Swider et al., 2011.
Table 3
Means, standard deviations, scale reliabilities, and correlations with confidence intervals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>α</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Self-rated self-promotion</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Self-rated ingratiation</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>.53**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Coded self-promotion</td>
<td>11.69</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>0.83a</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Coded ingratiation</td>
<td>1.99</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>0.76a</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Live competence ratings</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>.21*</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.37**</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Video competence ratings</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>.23*</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.23*</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.31**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05  ** p < .01
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>α</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7. Averaged competence ratings</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>.27**</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.37**</td>
<td>.20*</td>
<td>.80**</td>
<td>.82**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[.10,</td>
<td>[.12,</td>
<td>[.21,</td>
<td>[.02,</td>
<td>[.72,</td>
<td>[.75,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Live warmth ratings</td>
<td>4.31</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>.18*</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.29**</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.48**</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.36**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[.00,</td>
<td>[.01,</td>
<td>[.11,</td>
<td>[.05,</td>
<td>[.33,</td>
<td>[.06,</td>
<td>[.20,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Video warmth ratings</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>.18*</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.18*</td>
<td>.23*</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.58**</td>
<td>.45**</td>
<td>.31**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[.00,</td>
<td>[.04,</td>
<td>[.01,</td>
<td>[.05,</td>
<td>[.05,</td>
<td>[.45,</td>
<td>[.29,</td>
<td>[.14,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Averaged warmth ratings</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>.22*</td>
<td>.18*</td>
<td>.28**</td>
<td>.23*</td>
<td>.36**</td>
<td>.45**</td>
<td>.50**</td>
<td>.77**</td>
<td>.84**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[.05,</td>
<td>[.01,</td>
<td>[.11,</td>
<td>[.05,</td>
<td>[.19,</td>
<td>[.30,</td>
<td>[.36,</td>
<td>[.69,</td>
<td>[.78,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Live interview performance ratings</td>
<td>11.41</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>.28**</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.35**</td>
<td>.19*</td>
<td>.55**</td>
<td>.43**</td>
<td>.61**</td>
<td>.29**</td>
<td>.41**</td>
<td>.44**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[.11,</td>
<td>[.15,</td>
<td>[.18,</td>
<td>[.01,</td>
<td>[.42,</td>
<td>[.27,</td>
<td>[.48,</td>
<td>[.12,</td>
<td>[.25,</td>
<td>[.28,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Video interview performance ratings</td>
<td>$M$</td>
<td>$SD$</td>
<td>$\alpha$</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>10.66</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>.23**</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.34**</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.26**</td>
<td>.52**</td>
<td>.49**</td>
<td>.25**</td>
<td>.45**</td>
<td>.44**</td>
<td>.44**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[.06,</td>
<td>[.19,</td>
<td>[.17,</td>
<td>[.06,</td>
<td>[.09,</td>
<td>[.38,</td>
<td>[.34,</td>
<td>[.07,</td>
<td>[.30,</td>
<td>[.29,</td>
<td>[.29,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Averaged interview performance ratings</td>
<td>11.03</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>.30**</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.40**</td>
<td>.18*</td>
<td>.48**</td>
<td>.56**</td>
<td>.64**</td>
<td>.32**</td>
<td>.51**</td>
<td>.52**</td>
<td>.85**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[.13,</td>
<td>[.16,</td>
<td>[.24,</td>
<td>[.00,</td>
<td>[.33,</td>
<td>[.43,</td>
<td>[.53,</td>
<td>[.15,</td>
<td>[.36,</td>
<td>[.37,</td>
<td>[.79,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* * indicates $p < .05$; ** indicates $p < .01$. $M$ and $SD$ are used to represent mean and standard deviation, respectively. *a* indicates that these values are inter-rater reliability values from six coders using a subset of 13 participants. Values in square brackets indicate the 95% confidence interval for each correlation. The confidence interval is a plausible range of population correlations that could have caused the sample correlation (Cumming, 2014).
Figure 1

Hypothesis 7 and 8

- Self-promotion (self-rated or coded)
- Ingratiation (self-rated or coded)
- Perceptions of competence (averaged)
- Perceptions of warmth (averaged)
- Interview ratings
Figure 2

*Model 1: SEM results of hypotheses 7 and 8 using self-rated IM*

Indirect effect of $a*b = 0.135(0.194)$, 95% BC bootstrapped CI [0.112, 0.856]

Indirect effect of $d*e = 0.054(0.097)$, 95% BC bootstrapped CI [0.039, 0.475]
Figure 3

*Model 2: SEM results of hypotheses 7 and 8 using coded IM*

![Diagram](image_url)

- **Self-promotion (coded)**
  - Indirect effect of $a*b = 0.187(0.037)$, 95% BC bootstrapped CI [0.056, 0.203]

- **Ingratiation (coded)**
  - Direct effect of $c = 0.181(0.057)$, 95% BC bootstrapped CI [0.012, 0.235]
  - Indirect effect of $d*e = 0.058(0.036)$, 95% BC bootstrapped CI [0.015, 0.162]

- **Perceptions of competence (averaged)**
  - Direct effect of $f = 0.019(0.079)$, 95% BC bootstrapped CI [-0.136, 0.187]

- **Perceptions of warmth (averaged)**
  - Indirect effect of $e = 0.058(0.036)$, 95% BC bootstrapped CI [0.015, 0.162]
## Appendix A

### A Priori and Post Hoc Power Analyses

#### Correlational Power Analyses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>A priori (power = 0.80)</th>
<th>Post Hoc (N = 123)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Effect Size</td>
<td>N required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H1</td>
<td>Self-promotion (self-rated) and interview ratings</td>
<td>$r = 0.32^a$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Self-promotion (coded) and interview ratings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2</td>
<td>Ingratiation (self-rated) and interview ratings</td>
<td>$r = 0.26^a$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ingratiation (coded) and interview ratings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H3</td>
<td>Self-promotion (self-rated) and competence</td>
<td>$r = 0.40^b$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Self-promotion (coded) and competence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H4</td>
<td>Ingratiation (self-rated) and warmth</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ingratiation (coded) and warmth</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H5</td>
<td>Competence and interview ratings</td>
<td>$r = 0.71^c$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H6</td>
<td>Warmth and interview ratings</td>
<td>$r = 0.59^c$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA) Power Analyses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>A priori (power = 0.80)</th>
<th>Post Hoc (N = 123)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Degrees of freedom</td>
<td>N required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H7</td>
<td>Competence partially mediates the relationship between self-promotion and interview ratings</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H8</td>
<td>Warmth partially mediates the relationship between ingratiation and interview ratings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: * indicates .80 power achieved. a is from Barrick et al., 2009. b is from Kristoff-Brown et al., 2002. c is from Howard & Ferris, 1996.*
Are you interested in making extra money after final exams?

Do you need more research experience?

Dr. Deborah Powell is looking for a research assistant from the University of Guelph to help with her daily laboratory duties.

If interested, you will be automatically eligible for a job interview. At the time of your interview, you will also be invited to participate in a research study.

- Competitive wage: $27 per hour for 30 hours of work
- Flexible hours: you decide when you want to work
- Open to all undergraduates: all majors are welcome to apply

To set up an interview, please contact: uoginterview@gmail.com

REB: 16-12-882
Appendix C
Job Description

**Position:** Research Assistant

**Department:** Psychology

**Rate of pay:** $27/hour – for 30 hours of work in total

**Total hours of work:** 30 hours

**Start date:** Monday, April 10th 2017

**End date:** Friday, April 28th 2017

*Hours are flexible and can be completed when preferred. E.g., hours can be completed after exams or around exam schedule.* *

**Required qualifications and skills:**

- Current University of Guelph undergraduate student from any program
- Written communication skills
- Interpersonal and oral communication skills
- Problem-solving and problem sensitivity abilities
- Time management and organizational skills
- Attention to detail
- Ability to work and collaborate with others on a team
- Active listening skills
- Ability to work with minimal supervision

**Duties:**

- Assist with the preparation of project-related reports, manuscripts, and poster presentations.
- Collaborate with other research assistants and students to complete tasks.
- Code data in preparation for computer entry.
- Verify the accuracy and validity of data entered in databases, correcting for errors.
- Prepare tables, graphs, fact sheets, and written reports summarizing research results.
- Conduct internet-based and library research and summarize findings.
- Provide assistance in the design of survey instruments such as questionnaires.
- Interact and communicate with research participants to conduct studies and obtain informed consent.
- Administer standardized tests to research participants, or interview them to collect research data.
- Recruit and schedule research participants.
- Track research participants, and perform any necessary follow-up tasks.
Appendix D

Interview Guide

**Question 1:** Can you tell me about a time when you had to work independently on a large project at either work or school?

**Potential Follow-up Probes:**
- Take me back to…
- What did you do or say?
- What happened next OR what were the next steps?
- How did you feel OR what did you think about X?
- How did you react to X?
- Why did you choose this approach OR to do X?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Behaviourally Anchored Descriptions</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Meets all required deadlines ahead of schedule.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Proactively seeks help or resources to complete project.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Completes the task to a high degree of quality or goes beyond expectations.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Displays a positive attitude or treats the project as an opportunity.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sets their own personal goals, deadlines, schedules, etc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adheres to all required deadlines for the task on schedule.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Seeks help after a problem occurs; reactionary towards tasks.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Completes the task to an adequate degree of quality or to expected standards.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Completes the project as a matter of necessity or has a neutral attitude towards it.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Completes the task with missing information.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Does not complete the assigned task within the required time frame.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Requires unrequested intervention from other parties.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Does not meet quality expectations for the completed task or the task is incomplete.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Does not display a positive attitude towards the task (or blames others, or fails to take responsibility, etc.).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Does not structure or ‘project manage’ their tasks at all (does not set goals, deadlines, make schedules, etc.).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fails to provide a relevant or thorough response.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Is there anything else that you would like to add, that either reflects STAR or that you have not been able to say yet?*

*Rating: _____*
**Question 2:** Can you tell me about a time when you had to work closely with other people at either work or school?

**Potential Follow-up Probes:**
- Take me back to…
- What did you do or say?
- What happened next?
- How did you feel about X?
- What were you thinking when X?
- How did you react to X?
- Why did you choose this approach?
- Why did you choose to do (or say) X?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Behaviourally Anchored Descriptions</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
|        | • Proactively takes on a role within the team (e.g., organizing, leadership, etc.). 
• Ensures their tasks and team tasks are completed on time and with sufficient quality. 
• Takes on new or extra tasks without being asked by group. 
• Works through team decisions taking into account everyone’s input. 
• Handles issues or disagreements within team assertively or objectively. 
• Displays a positive attitude towards working in team. |       |
|        | • Takes more of a passive role in team. 
• Completes their portion of work on time and with sufficient quality. 
• Only completes assigned tasks as they come up. 
• Takes part in team decisions. 
• Attempts to deal with team issues. 
• Displays at least a neutral attitude towards working in team. |       |
|        | • Just does at they are told by teammates. 
• Does not complete their work on time or completes it with insufficient quality. 
• Contributes to the team in a limited way. 
• Resists working with others any more than is necessary. 
• Demonstrates relational/personal conflict with team members, or poor handling of issues or avoidance. 
• Displays a negative attitude towards working in team. |       |
|        | • Fails to provide a relevant or thorough response. |       |

*Is there anything else that you would like to add, that either reflects STAR or that you have not been able to say yet?*

**Rating:** ____
**Question 3:** Can you tell me about a time when you had to work through a problem at either work or school?

**Potential Follow-up Probes:**

- Take me back to…
- What did you do or say?
- What happened next?
- How did you feel about X?
- What were you thinking when X?
- How did you react to X?
- Why did you choose this approach?
- Why did you choose to do (or say) X?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Behaviourally Anchored Descriptions</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
|        | - Is proactive in coming up with and executing a solution.  
        | - Considers all relevant parties or implications.  
        | - Remains calm under pressure and attempts to calm others involved.  
        | - Displays creativity or ‘outside-the-box’ thinking.  
        | - Focuses on solution and implications of solution.  
        | - Contacts others parties or resources and uses this in working towards better solution. |       |
|        | - Works on solution to the problem by mostly relying on guidance or input of others.  
        | - Implements solution with limited consideration of other relevant parties or implications.  
        | - Remains calm under pressure.  
        | - Uses a basic, procedural, or past solution to problem.  
        | - Focuses on solution instead of the problem. |       |
|        | - Does not attempt to address or solve the situation.  
        | - Does not consider other parties or implications at all.  
        | - Is only able to solve the problem because of intervention or instruction from other parties.  
        | - Does not remain calm or has trouble doing so.  
        | - Is problem-focused, blames others, or displays a victim mentality. |       |
|        | - Fails to provide a relevant or thorough response. |       |

*Is there anything else that you would like to add, that either reflects STAR or that you have not been able to say yet?*

**Rating:** _____
Appendix E

Honest Interview Impression Management (HIIM) scale (Bourdage et al., 2015)

Please think about the interview you just participated in and indicate the extent to which you used the following behaviours during the interview using the scale provided.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I made sure to let the interviewer know about my job credentials.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I tried to find out the values or opinions the interviewer and I shared in common, and was vocal about these.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I let the interviewer know how my qualifications were well suited for the position.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I demonstrated to the interviewer genuine ways that I was a good performer in my previous job.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I let the interviewer know about those values of the organization that I shared.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I made the interviewer aware of all the responsibilities I had on my previous jobs.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I made sure the interviewer was aware of my skills and abilities.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When the interviewer expressed views that I shared, I focused on incorporating these into my answers.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I described my skills and abilities in an attractive way.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I let the interviewer know how my previous work experiences were</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>relevant to the position.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When I agreed with the interviewer's opinions or points, I made sure to let him/her know.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I brought up my past experience with other well-known previous employers to make the interviewer aware of my competence.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I showed the interviewer how I felt I could be a valuable addition to the organization.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I did my best to convey the values, attitudes, or beliefs that I felt me and the interviewer shared.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I made the interviewer aware of the accomplishments I’d had at my previous job.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I made sure to recount my areas of expertise.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I found out about values and goals that I shared with the organization, and made sure to emphasize them.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I looked for opportunities to make the interviewer aware of my success at previous jobs.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I promoted the skills and abilities that I thought most relevant to the position.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I discussed interests I shared in common with the recruiter.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I brought up my past work experience to make the interviewer aware of my competence.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I complimented the organization on accomplishments or qualities that I found impressive.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix F  
Coding Materials  
Form

**Participant ID:** ________

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Self-Promotion Tactics</strong></th>
<th><strong>Times</strong></th>
<th><strong>Total</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Specific Self-Promoting Utterance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entitlement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhancement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exemplification</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Ingratiation Tactics</strong></th>
<th><strong>Times</strong></th>
<th><strong>Total</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Opinion Conformity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Enhancements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fit with the Organization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments:**

**Instructions**

**Steps:**
1. Have the Coding Scheme with you.
2. Label each Coding Form with the Participant ID.
4. Indicate the time of the use of each IM tactic.
5. Total the amount of tactics used for each category.

**Types of IM to Code:**

Self-Promotion OR Ingratiation

- **If Self-Promotion:** Specific Self-Promoting Utterance, Entitlement, Enhancement, or Exemplification
- **If Ingratiation:** Opinion Conformity, Other Enhancement, or Fit with the Organization

**Important Notes**
- Make sure that your coding is done independently from others.
- When you are unsure about the use of a tactic, either listen to it a few times or write a comment with the time and come back to it later.
Try as much as possible to put the tactic in the correct category (this can be difficult because sometimes there is some overlap); it is especially important that they are coded in the correct main categories (self-promotion or ingratiation).

- If there is more than 1 tactic that could apply to a situation, pick the one that is most pertinent.
- If a tactic is used multiple times within the same phrase/sentence and is clearly related to one idea, count it as only one instance of the tactic (separate instances should be clearly separable thoughts/ideas/topics or separated by a long pause).

Scheme

**Self-Promotion Tactics**

These tactics are intended to show that the applicant possesses desirable qualities for the job.

### Specific Self-Promoting Utterances

This tactic refers to statements that are intended to persuade a target that the applicant possesses positive qualities or traits. They are used to elicit specific character attributions, such as competence or respect. The applicant tries to make others think that he/she is competent in either general ability dimensions (e.g., intelligence) or specific skills (e.g., ability to play a musical instrument).

- Active voice (i.e. not secondary like, “this experience taught me _____ skill”)
- Explicit (e.g., “I have good leadership skills”, “I gained experience with leadership”, “I worked on my leadership skills to do well at the job”)
- Job-relevant (either general skills related to all jobs, or specific to the job they are applying for; e.g., critical thinking, organization, communication, interpersonal, teamwork, reliability/dependability)

E.g.: “The office lost one of its senior leaders this year. Because she had so much experience and knowledge, many of the workers looked to her for advice. Now that she is gone, many of those same workers look to me because I have good leadership qualities.”

E.g.: “I got an 80% on that project” – a sign of intelligence

### Entitlements

When using this tactic, individuals claim responsibility for positive events or outcomes, only if personal credit is not merited (e.g., they weren’t solely responsible for the positive event or outcome)

- Only if they say that the outcome/event ended up positively because of the action that they took, but their actions weren’t fully responsible for the positive outcome
- Needs to be focused on the actual outcome or the event, not the process of coming to this outcome

E.g.: “I was responsible for making sure that everyone on the team completed their part of the project.”

### Enhancements

This tactic refers to claims that the value for a positive event, for which the applicant was responsible, was greater than most people think.

- Obvious positive event must be present, and the person makes the positive event seem better than it was

E.g.: “We had a day of activities together that I organized and because of it, the group will be a lot more cohesive in the future.”

### Exemplification
This tactic refers to claims that their behaviour/skills/experience is or can be a good role model for others. Applicants can explain how either their past or future behaviour(s)/skills/experiences can be used as a good model for others.

- The applicant talks about how they or their specific behaviour/skill/experience was followed by others or used as a model for others to follow
- The applicant talks about how they or their future behaviour/skill can be used as a model to follow

E.g.: “After I started taking time to organize the office, my coworkers started to do the same thing.”

**Ingratiation Tactics**

These tactics are intended to invoke interpersonal liking and attraction between the interviewer and the applicant.

**Opinion Conformity**

This tactic is used when an individual expresses opinions, beliefs, or values that may reasonably be assumed to be held by the interviewer given the interviewer’s occupation, status, or organizational affiliation. Also, the applicant may describe experiences that are likely to be similar to those of the interviewer.

- Opinion/belief/value needs to be expressed in an active way (e.g., I think, enjoy, love, like, am interested in ____)
- Must reference themselves explicitly (e.g., “I” or “to me, ____”)
- Also includes actively expressing a desire to be in the profession/job they are applying for

E.g.: “I believe that a healthcare worker should always be understanding of their patients”

**Other Enhancement**

This tactic involves a favourable evaluation of the interviewer by doing things such as praising or flattering the interviewer in order to bolster the interviewer’s self-esteem (being complimentary to the interviewer or organization).

- If they praise Guelph as a city or the university, this should not be counted

E.g.: “I really like your necklace!” “Your organization is quite impressive”

**Fit with the Organization**

This tactic is used when the applicant expresses or supports attitudes/values/opinions that are similar to the organization or work group, to show that they are a good fit within the organization or workplace. The applicant may describe experiences and say that they fit with the organization or are similar to the organization or work group.

- Showing that they or their experiences/attitudes/opinions would fit well or work well within the workplace, workgroup, or organization

E.g.: “I worked within a lab before, so I know that my experience will help me work well within this lab too.”
Appendix G

Competence and Warmth Scale

Please indicate the extent to which the interviewee exemplified each of the following traits on a scale from 1 (*not at all*) to 5 (*to a large extent*).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trait</th>
<th>1 Not at all</th>
<th>2 To a small extent</th>
<th>3 To some extent</th>
<th>4 To a moderate extent</th>
<th>5 To a large extent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Capable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good-natured</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intelligent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sincere</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficient</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friendly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skillful</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well-intentioned</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confident</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trustworthy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agentic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Good morning/afternoon,

Thank you for your interest in the Research Assistant position in Dr. Deborah Powell’s lab! The job description is attached for more information about the position.

If you are interested in interviewing for this position please:

1) Reply back to this email indicating all the times that you are available within the next two weeks for an interview out of the following times:

- Mondays at 9:45am, 10:30am, 11:30am, 12:30pm, 1:30pm, 2:30pm, 3:30pm
- Tuesdays at 9:30am, 10:30am, 11:30am, 12:30pm, 1:30pm, 2:45pm, 3:30pm, 4:30pm
- Wednesdays at 12:30pm, 1:30pm, 2:30pm
- Thursdays at 9:30am, 10:30am, 11:30am, 12:30pm, 1:30pm
- Fridays at 12:30pm, 1:30pm

2) Click the following link to: answer job application questions, and upload your unofficial transcript.
   [https://uoguelph.eu.qualtrics.com/SE/?SID=SV_4VNRzpflh1JdDk9](https://uoguelph.eu.qualtrics.com/SE/?SID=SV_4VNRzpflh1JdDk9)

**Interview Information:** This interview is a structured behavioural interview and will take about 20 minutes. When interviewing we encourage you to answer each question using the STAR approach (meaning when answering you should talk about the situation, tasks, actions, and results) along with anything else you would like to speak to. We will video record the interview so that a second interviewer can provide a rating later to improve reliability of ratings.

*You can apply and interview for this position even if you do not want to participate in the study. Participation in the study (which will take place after the interview) is completely voluntary. You do not have to make any decisions about participating in the study at this point. We just want to make you aware that after your interview you will be invited to participate in a study and you can decide to participate or not at that point.

**Study Information:** After your interview, the interviewer will lead you into a separate study room where a researcher (not the interviewer) will give you more information about the study so that you can make an informed decision at that point about participating in the study. Should you wish to participate, you will be asked to complete a 25-minute questionnaire about yourself and the interview. Your participation or lack of participation in the study will have NO impact on the hiring decision for the position. **Neither the interviewer nor the person in charge of the hiring decision (Dr. Powell) will know whether or not you choose to participate.** If you choose to participate, your data from the study will NOT be used in any way to inform the hiring decision.

The letter of information for the study is attached for you reference.

Please email me if you have any questions about the job position or the study.

I am looking forward to hearing back from you!

Sincerely,

Amanda Amaral

Master’s Candidate
Appendix I

Consent Form

CONSENT TO PARTICIPATE IN RESEARCH

Employment Interview Techniques

You are invited to participate in a research study conducted by Dr. Deborah Powell, Amanda Amaral (Master’s student), and Cullen McCurrach (undergraduate student) from the Psychology Department at the University of Guelph. The results will contribute to a Master’s thesis and an undergraduate thesis.

Please be aware that this study is completely voluntary – your participation will not affect the likelihood of you being hired for the research assistant position.

If you have any questions or concerns about the research, please feel free to contact Dr. Deborah Powell at dpowell@uoguelph.ca or (519) 824-4120, ext. 52167.

PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

The goal of this study is to investigate techniques that different people use to present their qualifications in a job interview.

PROCEDURES

If you volunteer to participate in this study, we would ask you to do the following things:

This research study will take about 30 additional minutes of your time.
If you choose to participate in this study, you will fill out an online questionnaire. The questionnaire will ask you questions about yourself (i.e., personality traits) and the interview that you just completed (i.e., how you felt during the interview, and the techniques you used during the interview to present yourself).
If you choose to participate in this study, 6 research assistants will listen to only the audio portion of your video to code for interview techniques.
If you choose to participate in this study, we will use your interview ratings (live and video) as part of this study, but your name will not be attached to your ratings in any way for the purpose of the study. In addition, if you choose to participate, your video/audio and your study data will be stored on an encrypted computer in a locked lab for up to five years post publication.
If you do not choose to participate in this study, Dr. Powell will use the interview ratings (live and video) simply to make the hiring decision only, and your interview video will be destroyed immediately after the hiring period.
As a reminder, regardless of your participation in the study, your video will be watched once by one of Dr. Powell’s interviewers to provide a second rating of the interview (to check for reliability of ratings), for the purpose of hiring for the position.
As a reminder, your job application and transcript will not be used in any way for the purposes of this research project – they will only be used in the job application process.

POTENTIAL RISKS AND DISCOMFORTS

The risks you may experience in the study are no different from the risks you may experience when engaging in any employment interview.

POTENTIAL BENEFITS TO PARTICIPANTS AND/OR TO SOCIETY

This research will provide empirical support for the types of techniques that interviewees use in employment interviews, and how these techniques are related to various personality traits.

PAYMENT FOR PARTICIPATION

You will not receive payment for your participation in this study.
CONFIDENTIALITY

Every effort will be made to ensure confidentiality of any identifying information that is obtained in connection with this study. Each research investigator and assistant who will be in contact with your study data and video/audio recordings was required to sign a confidentiality agreement.

Your name and contact information will never be linked to your study data at any point in time and in any way. We will link all study data (interview ratings, videos/audio, and questionnaire data) using a participant number only. Paper copies of your study data will be stored in a locked cabinet in a locked lab. The electronic study data and video/audio recordings from this study will be stored on an encrypted computer in this locked lab.

PARTICIATION AND WITHDRAWAL

You can choose whether to be in this study or not. If you volunteer to be in this study, you may withdraw at any time without consequences of any kind. You may exercise the option of removing your data from the study during the time of the study. You may also refuse to answer any questions you don’t want to answer and still remain in the study. The investigator may withdraw you from this research if circumstances arise that warrant doing so.

If you wish to withdraw from the study or remove your data please let the research investigator know at any point during the study. If you choose to withdraw from the study, you will still be considered for the position of research assistant without penalty. Your participation in this study will have no impact on the hiring decision for the position of Research Assistant.

You are able to withdraw your data up until the time that you leave the room today. If you choose to withdraw your data you must let the research investigator know before leaving today. After that, we will have no way of identifying which data is yours, since your name is not linked to the data, so we won’t be able to remove your data after this session. Withdrawing your data will have no impact on our hiring decision.

RIGHTS OF RESEARCH PARTICIPANTS

If you have questions regarding your rights and welfare as a research participant in this study (REB#16-12-882), please contact: Director, Research Ethics; University of Guelph; reb@uoguelph.ca; (519) 824-4120 (ext. 56606). Please note that confidentiality cannot be guaranteed while data are in transit over the internet. You do not waive any legal rights by agreeing to take part in this study. This project has been reviewed by the Research Ethics Board for compliance with federal guidelines for research involving human participants.

SIGNATURE OF RESEARCH PARTICIPANT

I have read the information provided for the study “Employment Interview Techniques” as described herein. My questions have been answered to my satisfaction, and I agree to participate in this study. I have been given a copy of this form.

________________________________________
Name of Participant (please print)

________________________________________
Signature of Participant

________________________________________
Date

SIGNATURE OF WITNESS

________________________________________
Name of Witness (please print)

________________________________________
Signature of Witness

________________________________________
Date
Appendix J
Interviewer Script

BEFORE INTERVIEW

“Good morning/afternoon! My name is __________.”

[Say your first name and shake hands with the applicant.]

[Engage in small talk for 1 minute or so. E.g., How is your day going? Were you able to find the building and room okay? What’s the weather like out there now?]

“Before we get started, I want to provide you with some information about the interview. I will be reading from a script so that all applicants receive the same information. First, anything you say during the interview will be kept confidential. As a reminder, this is a structured behavioural interview, and it will take about 15 to 20 minutes. I will ask you 3 interview questions, and might ask some follow-up questions, too. As a reminder, we encourage you to use the STAR approach when answering questions, in addition to anything else you would like to say. I will keep the 3 interview questions along with a reminder of STAR here for you to reference during the interview if you would like.”

[Place the sheet with Interview Questions & Star on the table.]

“During the interview, please do not be alarmed if I am not making eye contact – it is only because I will be taking notes. Also, if I seem to have a poker face it’s only because I am trying to remain neutral so that we are treating all applicants in the same fair way. Please do not take my straight face as a response to your answers – I am simply trying to remain standard across applicants.”

“As you can see, each of these three interview questions will require you to recall a specific past event or experience. When answering you may be tempted to talk about things generally, but we are actually looking for a description of a specific situation from your past and what you did specifically. Try to be as comprehensive as possible in your response. Sometimes it takes a while to remember a past event – and that is nothing to worry about – just take the time you need to pause and think at any point. Before moving onto the next question, I will always ask you if there is anything else you would like to add so that you have a chance to say anything that was not captured in your previous response.”

“As a reminder, you will be videotaped for the duration of the interview only, and this is so that a second interviewer can provide a second rating of the interview later.”

“Are you okay to start now?”

[Turn on the video. Remember to talk after the video starts so that the camera registers audio.]

[Interview the candidate. Always take notes for each BAR, check off BARS, and score a question before moving onto the next question.]

AFTER INTERVIEW

“I am going to turn off the video now.”

[Turn off the videotape.]
“Thank you! The interview is now over, and again I am going to read from a script. Thank you very much for your time and for your interest in this position! You will hear back from us no later than April 7th. If you do not hear back from us by April 7th you can assume that you were not selected for the position.”

“Do you have any questions for me?”

[Answer the applicant’s questions. Refer to the Job Description or FAQ sheet if needed. If there are questions that you cannot answer then give the applicant Deb’s email and encourage them to email her, dpowell@uoguelph.ca.]

“Here is Dr. Powell’s email in case you have questions in the future (and/or to ask her anything I was not able to answer for you today).”

“Thank you again! It was very nice to meet you! I’ll direct you over to the study room now.”

[Direct the applicant to Room 216.]
Appendix K
Researcher Script

“Hi! My name is ____________. It’s very nice to meet you! Please have a seat here.”

[Shake hands with the applicant when you introduce yourself. Direct them to the seat and desk with the laptop, consent form, and pen.]

“First, before I give you any information about the study, I want to ensure you that the interview is completely over and you are no longer being evaluated for the job at all. I am here to provide you with some information about the study so that you can then make an informed decision about participating.”

“Before I tell you about the study, can I get you a water or tea? We have ______ type of tea.”

[Show them their options for tea.]

[“Absolutely! I can get that for you then in just a minute while you are reading through the consent form.”]

“Before you do start reading the consent form I’ll give you some quick information about the study. First, I want to ensure you that your decision to participate in the study or not will have no impact whatsoever on the interview or the hiring decision for the job – this study is completely separate from the interview and the job. This study will simply require you to complete an online questionnaire about yourself and the interview that you just completed. Dr. Powell will NOT be using any of your study responses at all in the hiring process or when making the hiring decision – again, all of your study data is completely separate from the interview and the job.”

“Please take a few minutes to read the following consent form, and sign it if you do consent to participate in the study.”

[Direct the applicant to the consent form and pen on the desk in front of them.]

[“While you are reading through the consent form, I am going to quickly grab your beverage and I will be back in just a minute.”]

[Provide the applicant with their beverage.]

[“Do you have any questions about the consent form or the study that I can answer for you?”]

[Answer the applicant’s questions, and collect their consent form and pen.]

“Thank you! You can complete the survey on the laptop in front of you. I will be sitting a couple desks over to give you some space to complete it. Please let me know if you have any questions or concerns while completing the questionnaire. The last page of the questionnaire will indicate that you are finished, so once you do reach this last page please let me know. You can now start the questionnaire whenever you are ready.”

[After the participant indicates that they completed the questionnaire...]

“Great! Thank you very much for participating in our study! We do ask that you do not discuss the study with anyone else so that we can maintain the integrity of the data.
Here is a debriefing form for your reference – please take a few minutes to read it over now, and let me know if you have any questions afterwards.”

[Give the participant the debriefing form and allow them time to read it, and then answer any questions they might have.]

“Thank you again for your time and participation!”

[Direct the participant out if need be.]
Appendix L

Interviewee Frequently Asked Questions

When will I hear back?

- You will hear back no later than April 7th, 2017. If you do not hear back by April 7th then you can assume you were not selected for the position.

When will the job start?

- The job will start either on or sometime shortly after Monday, April 10th. You will have the ability to choose your start date, as long as you have enough time to complete a total of 30 hours sometime in April.

What specific times will I work at?

- Your hours will be very flexible and based on your preference. You will have to work some of your hours during regular business hours (Monday-Friday from 8:30am – 4:30pm), however, you will be able to work many of your hours when you would like to – days, evenings, weekdays, weekends; it will largely be up to you.

What days will I work in April?

- You will complete your hours either around your exam schedule and/or after your exams, as long as they are completed in April – whatever works best for you.

What will I be doing?

- The position responsibilities will be finalized before April. You will be completing a combination of some of the duties listed in the job description. The duties may also be tailored or focused on your expertise and/or interests. For example, if you are interested in social media, then you may be spending some of your work time managing social media accounts, or if you have expertise with data analysis they you may be assisting with that.

Where will I be working?

- Your working location is flexible. You’ll need to be on campus for some of your hours. For example, you may need to be on campus for meetings with Dr. Powell or if you need to access the lab computer. Otherwise, many of your hours can be completed where you would like, such as from home.

How many positions are available?

- 1 position is available.

How many people are interviewing for the position?

- I am not sure because the interviews are still on going. We plan to interview everyone that applies.

Will I be allotted or paid for break time?

- No, since the work is task-based rather hourly, you can complete your tasks at whatever time works best for you taking breaks whenever you would like.
Was this position created specifically for the study?

- No, it just worked out that the timing of these interviews overlapped with when the researchers wanted to collect data.

Who will watch my video?

- One additional interviewer will watch your video to provide a second rating in order to improve rating reliability.

How long will you keep my interview video?

- If you choose to participate in the study then your video will be kept for up to a year. It will be stored on an encrypted laptop in a locked lab room and only the research team will have access to it after the hiring period is over. If you do not choose to participate in the study then your video will be kept until the end of the hiring period at which point it will be deleted.

Is this job the same as the URA (Undergraduate Research Assistant) job in Dr. Powell’s Lab?

- No, this is a different position than the URA position.

If I get the job, can I continue to work or volunteer for Dr. Powell afterwards?

- This is something that you should discuss with Dr. Powell afterwards.

If I do not get this job, can I work or volunteer with Dr. Powell in another capacity?

- It is best for you to discuss this possibility with Dr. Powell.

Can Dr. Powell or someone else provide me with a reference?

- This is something you should wait to discuss with Dr. Powell afterwards.

Is there anything you (the interviewer) would like to check in with me about or ask me?

- No, we have everything we need to make our hiring decision. If you have further questions you are welcome to check-in with Dr. Powell.

Who should I email if I have any questions in the future (about the interview, position, etc.)?

- Email Dr. Powell @ dpowell@uoguelph.ca. You will be working in her lab.

Questions about the study…?

- The researcher whom you will meet soon can answer any questions about the study.
Appendix M
Debriefing Form

DEBRIEFING FORM

Employment Interview Techniques

Thank you for participating in our research! You have just participated in a research study conducted by Dr. Deborah Powell, Amanda Amaral (Master’s student), and Cullen McCurrach (undergraduate student) from the Psychology Department at the University of Guelph.

The results will contribute to a Master’s thesis and an undergraduate thesis. You can find out more about the results of this research by attending the honours thesis poster days in April 2017, or accessing Amanda Amaral’s Master’s thesis in the University of Guelph’s library atrium once it is submitted in the summer of 2017.

If you have any questions or concerns about the research, please feel free to contact Dr. Deborah Powell at dpowell@uoguelph.ca or (519) 824-4120, ext. 52167.

If you would like further information about your interview skills we encourage you to visit Co-op and Career Services located on Trent Lane in Building #54 on campus.

If you are feeling very upset about this study we encourage you to visit Counselling Services on campus on the third floor of the University Centre, (519) 824-4120, ext. 53244.

PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

The purpose of this study is to investigate the relationship between certain interview techniques and interview performance. As the literature suggests, we hypothesize that certain techniques will be positively related to interview performance. There is limited research about why these techniques work and the conditions under which these techniques are more or less effective. Consequently, we also hypothesize that certain interviewee traits will explain the positive relationship between successful techniques and interview performance. We also hypothesize that certain interviewee traits and feelings will influence the strength of the relationship between interviewee techniques and interview performance.

METHODOLOGY

We collected your data today through: videotaping the interview, rating the interview, observer ratings of traits, and self-report measures. One additional interviewer will watch your video in order to provide a second interview rating and a second observer rating of traits (so we can check for reliability of ratings). Four research assistants will only listen to the audio recording from your video to code for interviewee techniques.

Dr. Powell will make all hiring decisions for the job position based on interviews, application forms, and transcripts. Your audio recording and all other data will not be used in any way to make hiring decisions – they will only be used for the current study.

CONFIDENTIALITY
Your name and contact information will only be attached to your interview score for the purpose of hiring. This hiring information will be on a password protected Excel file that only the three research investigators will have access to. In early April 2017, after an applicant is hired for the job position, this Excel file with your name, contact information, and interview score will be deleted.

Your name and contact information will never be linked to your study data at any point in time and in any way – we will link interview scores, videos, and questionnaire data using a participant number only. Paper copies of the study data will be stored in a locked cabinet in a locked lab. The electronic data and video recordings from this study will be stored on an encrypted computer in this locked lab.

Each investigator and research assistant who will be in contact with the data and recordings was required to sign a confidentiality agreement.

PARTICIPATION AND WITHDRAWAL

Your participation in this study and your study data will have no impact on the hiring decision for the Research Assistant position in Dr. Deborah Powell's lab. You are able to withdraw your data up until the time that you leave the room today. If you choose to withdraw your data you must let the research investigator know before leaving today. After that, we will have no way of identifying which data is yours, so we won’t be able to remove your data. Withdrawing your data will have no impact on our hiring decision.

RIGHTS OF RESEARCH PARTICIPANTS

If you have questions regarding your rights as a research participant, contact:

Research Ethics Officer
University of Guelph
437 University Centre
Guelph, ON N1G 2W1

Telephone: (519) 824-4120, ext. 56606
Email: sauld@uoguelph.ca
Fax: (519) 821-5236
# Appendix N
Univariate and Multivariate Outliers

## Univariate Outliers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Participant Number</th>
<th>Raw Score</th>
<th>Z-Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self-promotion self-rated</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-promotion coded</td>
<td>092</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ingratiation self-rated</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>4.38</td>
<td>3.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ingratiation coded</td>
<td>034</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>126</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competence average</td>
<td>073</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>-3.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warmth live</td>
<td>020</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>-4.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warmth video</td>
<td>060</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-3.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warmth average</td>
<td>020</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>-3.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview ratings live</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-3.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview ratings video</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview ratings average</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>-3.52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Multivariate Outliers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Participant Number</th>
<th>Cook’s Distance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self-promotion (self-rated) and interview ratings</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-promotion (coded) and interview ratings</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ingratiation (self-rated) and interview ratings</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ingratiation (coded) and interview ratings</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-promotion (self-rated) and competence</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-promotion (coded) and competence</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ingratiation (self-rated) and warmth</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ingratiation (coded) and warmth</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competence and interview ratings</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warmth and interview ratings</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-promotion self-rated, ingratiation self-rated, competence average, warmth average, interview ratings average</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-promotion self-rated, ingratiation self-rated, competence live, warmth live, interview ratings video</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-promotion self-rated, ingratiation self-rated, competence video, warmth video, interview ratings live</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-promotion coded, ingratiation coded competence average, warmth average, interview ratings average</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-promotion coded, ingratiation coded, competence live, warmth live, interview ratings video</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-promotion coded, ingratiation coded, competence video, warmth video, interview ratings live</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Exploratory SEM Analyses

The third model included self-reported self-promotion and ingratiation tactics, live ratings of competence and warmth, and video ratings of interview performance. The direct effect of self-promotion (self-rated) on interview performance (video) was significant (direct effect $= 0.283(0.433), 95\%$ BC bootstrapped CI $[0.296, 2.019], p < 0.01$), while the indirect effect through perceptions of competence (live) was not significant (indirect effect $= 0.027(0.108), 95\%$ BC bootstrapped CI $[-0.037, 0.414], p = 0.294$). The direct effect of ingratiation (self-rated) on interview performance (video) was significant (direct effect $= -0.192(0.369), 95\%$ BC bootstrapped CI $[-1.454, -0.041], p < 0.05$), while the indirect effect through perceptions of warmth (live) was not significant (indirect effect $= 0.029(0.097), 95\%$ BC bootstrapped CI $[0.007, 0.381], p = 0.247$). Thus, results of the third model did not support hypothesis 7 or 8, meaning perceptions of competence (live) did not partially mediate the relationship between self-promotion (self-rated) and interview performance (video), and perceptions of warmth (live) also did not partially mediate the relationship between ingratiation (self-rated) and interview performance (video).

The fourth model included self-reported self-promotion and ingratiation tactics, video ratings of competence and warmth, and live ratings of interview performance. The direct effect of self-promotion (self-rated) on interview performance (live) was significant (direct effect $= 0.278(0.453), 95\%$ BC bootstrapped CI $[0.313, 2.061], p < 0.05$), while the indirect effect through perceptions of competence (video) was not significant (indirect effect $= 0.056(0.140), 95\%$ BC bootstrapped CI $[0.018, 0.579], p = 0.102$). The direct effect of ingratiation (self-rated) on interview performance (live) was not significant (direct effect $= -0.164(0.403), 95\%$ BC bootstrapped CI $[-1.406, 0.171], p = 0.127$), and the indirect effect through perceptions of warmth (video) was also not significant (indirect effect $= 0.034(0.094), 95\%$ BC bootstrapped CI $[0.005, 0.417], p = 0.175$). Thus, results of the fourth model did not support hypothesis 7 or 8, meaning perceptions of competence (video) did not partially mediate the relationship between self-promotion (self-rated) and interview performance (live), and perceptions of warmth (video) also did not partially mediate the relationship between ingratiation (self-rated) and interview performance (live).

The fifth model included coded self-promotion and ingratiation tactics, live ratings of competence and warmth, and video ratings of interview performance. The direct effect of self-promotion (coded) on interview performance (video) was significant (direct effect $= 0.273(0.084), 95\%$ BC bootstrapped CI $[0.053, 0.388], p < 0.05$), while the indirect effect through perceptions of competence (live) was not significant (indirect effect $= 0.036(0.031), 95\%$ BC bootstrapped CI $[-0.029, 0.095], p = 0.378$). The direct effect of ingratiation (coded) on interview performance (video) was not significant (direct effect $= 0.054(0.115), 95\%$ BC bootstrapped CI $[-0.169, 0.288], p = 0.480$), and the indirect effect through perceptions of warmth (live) was also not significant (indirect effect $= 0.017(0.030), 95\%$ BC bootstrapped CI $[-0.006, 0.118], p = 0.404$). Thus, results of the fifth model did not support hypothesis 7 or 8, meaning perceptions of competence (live) did not partially mediate the relationship between self-promotion (coded) and interview performance (video), and perceptions of warmth (live) also did not partially mediate the relationship between ingratiation (coded) and interview performance (video).
The sixth model included coded self-promotion and ingratiation tactics, video ratings of competence and warmth, and live ratings of interview performance. The direct effect of self-promotion (coded) on interview performance (live) was significant (direct effect = 0.259(0.058), 95% BC bootstrapped CI [0.084, 0.305], p < 0.01), while the indirect effect through perceptions of competence (video) was not significant (indirect effect = 0.059(0.030), 95% BC bootstrapped CI [0.003, 0.125], p = 0.147). The direct effect of ingratiation (coded) on interview performance (live) was not significant (direct effect = 0.074(0.113), 95% BC bootstrapped CI [-0.112, 0.328], p = 0.339), and the indirect effect through perceptions of warmth (video) was also not significant (indirect effect = 0.050(0.047), 95% BC bootstrapped CI [0.002, 0.191], p = 0.121). Thus, results of the sixth model did not support hypothesis 7 or 8, meaning perceptions of competence (video) did not partially mediate the relationship between self-promotion (coded) and interview performance (live), and perceptions of warmth (video) also did not partially mediate the relationship between ingratiation (coded) and interview performance (live).