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The current study looked at student job applicants and investigated the relationship between use of deceptive IM in the interview and personal outcomes on the job. I hypothesized that use of deceptive IM in the interview would be positively related to job stress, and negatively related to perceived fit, affective well-being and employee engagement. I also hypothesized that perceived fit would be negatively related to job stress and positively related to affective well-being and employee engagement, and would mediate the relationship between deceptive IM and these variables. These hypotheses were tested with 105 co-op students self-reporting on real job interviews and job attitudes. Path analyses and correlational results supported the relationship between perceived fit and the job outcomes. The relationships between deceptive IM and the job outcomes were all in the expected direction, but there were wide confidence intervals around these relationships. Further research with larger samples should be conducted in this area. However, the results indicate that deceptive IM may not be the best interview strategy for those hoping to obtain long-term jobs where they can grow and develop.
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Impact of interview deceptive impression management on new employees:

Relationship with fit, stress, well-being and engagement

Employment interviews are one of the most common tools used when hiring new employees (Macan, 2009). Most organizations use employment interviews as part of their selection process, so most job seekers will go through the interview process before getting hired. Yet, despite the popularity of employment interviews, interview performance is not based solely off of an interviewee's skills, abilities and fit with the job (Huffcutt, Van Iddekinge, & Roth, 2011). Instead, many things can affect an interview's outcome, including the interview strategy that the applicant decides to use. One strategy commonly used by interviewees involves lying or exaggerating the truth in order to seem like a better candidate for the job (i.e., Levashina & Campion, 2007; Roulin, Bangerter, & Levashina, 2014). This strategy that applicants use in interviews to present themselves in a positive light, by exaggerating or omitting information, is known as deceptive impression management (IM; Levashina & Campion, 2007). Despite the common use of deceptive IM, interviewees who use this technique may not realize how their use of deceptive IM in the interview could impact them once they've been hired. In this study, I will investigate the relationship between this deceptive interview technique and important job outcomes to attempt to discover if there could be long-term personal harm to lying in the interview.

As there is currently no research on this question, I will outline existing research on deceptive IM and use person-environment fit theory to propose the relationship between deceptive IM in the interview and personal outcomes on the job. I will then investigate the effects of deceptive IM use in the interview on new student employees' perceived fit, job stress, affective well-being and employee engagement.
Defining Deceptive Impression Management

Interview deceptive IM is a relatively new construct in psychology (Levashina & Campion, 2007). For years, researchers did not distinguish between impression management techniques that were honest and those that were not. Instead, many researchers examined impression management (IM) in general, which can be defined as applicants’ use of various techniques in order to present themselves positively in the interview (Kristof-Brown, Barrick, & Franke, 2002). After decades of research on IM, Levashina and Campion identified that some IM techniques involved altering the truth in order to present oneself better in the interview, such as exaggerating the extent of successes or pretending to fit well with the organization. However, other techniques were honest ways for job candidates to highlight their experiences, such as focusing on their successes and emphasizing their fit with the organization. Yet measures of IM focused on interviewees’ positive self-presentation in the interview, without considering that some of the interviewees were honestly highlighting their skills and others were misrepresenting themselves. Because of this confounding in previous measures of general IM, Levashina and Campion created a separate definition of deceptive IM, as well as a behavioural taxonomy and a scale to measure deceptive IM in the interview.

According to Levashina and Campion (2007, p. 1639), deceptive IM involves “the conscious distortions of answers to the interview questions in order to obtain a better score on the interview and/or otherwise create favorable perceptions.” In order to create these favourable perceptions, interviewees can utilize four types of deceptive IM: slight image creation, extensive image creation, image protection and deceptive ingratiating (Levashina & Campion, 2007). Slight image creation involves slightly altering the truth to present oneself as a good job candidate, whereas extensive image creation involves inventing or borrowing stories for that
same reason. Image protection involves choosing not to reveal past experiences that may present oneself in a negative light in order to keep up the impression of a good job candidate. Finally, deceptive ingratiation involves agreeing with the interviewer’s or organization’s ideas or values, when one really does not, in order to appear more suitable for the job. These four factors, and the behaviours which relate to them, constitute the behavioural taxonomy of deceptive IM.

**Deceptive Impression Management and the Interview**

In the 10 years since Levashina and Campion’s conception of deceptive IM as a construct separate from honest IM, many researchers have studied deceptive IM. However, the majority of this research has focused on behaviours and outcomes in the interview itself. One commonly investigated topic within the deceptive IM literature is how the use of deceptive IM affects the interview’s outcome. This research has presented mixed findings. Some researchers have found that deceptive IM has a moderate positive correlation with the interview’s outcome (e.g., Levashina & Campion, 2007), whereas others have found small negative correlations (e.g., Swider, Barrick, Harris, & Stoverink, 2011). Additionally, findings are often mixed within studies for the various factors of deceptive IM. For example, Schneider, Powell and Roulin (2015) found that extensive image creation had a small positive correlation of \( r = .16 \) with interview performance, but slight image creation had a negligible correlation of \( r = -.02 \). As this research is relatively new, there has not been a meta-analysis on the subject and there is no clear answer as to how deceptive IM impacts the interview. However, meta-analytic results of IM in general suggest that there is a moderate positive correlation of \( r = .34 \) between the use of IM and the interview’s outcome (Barrick, Shaffer, & DeGrassi, 2009). This indicates that impression management can impact the interview’s outcome, and that deceptive IM has sometimes been found to do so as well.
Other common research topics include the antecedents of deceptive IM and ways to identify use of deceptive IM the interview, as interviewers tend to have considerable difficulty identifying applicants who use deceptive IM (Roulin, Bangarter and Levashina, 2015). Much of this research on deceptive IM is based on the assumption that deceptive IM is a problematic behaviour; however, there is little research attempting to investigate this assumption and only conjectural support for this conclusion. Some researchers have drawn this conclusion based on the finding that the use of deceptive IM is often related to undesirable personality traits, such as high Machiavellianism and low conscientiousness (Roulin & Bourdage, 2017). However, even though deceptive IM is often related to problematic personality traits, it does not necessarily mean that deceptive IM itself is a problematic behaviour. In order to determine whether or not deceptive IM in itself is problematic, researchers should investigate important outcomes for employees who used high levels of deceptive IM in their interviews compared to those who used low levels of deceptive IM. Doing so could help to determine if employees who used deceptive IM in their interview differ from those who did not on important personal or organizational outcomes. If findings indicate that those who used deceptive IM vary little from those who did not, then the assumption that deceptive IM is a problematic behaviour could be false. Thus, researching the difference between those who used deceptive IM and those who did not would help to determine if using deceptive IM in the interview is a problem.

Nevertheless, very little research has been conducted on post-hiring outcomes for employees who used deceptive IM in their interviews. The two studies that exist examine job performance as the outcome; however, there are mixed findings regarding job performance. One study found a small positive correlation between use of deceptive IM in the interview and performance on the job (Ingold, Kleinmann, König, & Melchers, 2015), while the other reported
mixed findings, depending on the deceptive IM tactic used and the relationship to the individual who rated job performance (Schneider, 2015). Meta-analytic research on IM confuses the picture even further, with researchers finding a positive relationship between general IM and job performance (Barrick et al., 2009), although these general IM measures combined honest and deceptive IM. These mixed research findings present an interesting question, with researchers speculating if job applicants who use deceptive IM in the interview are less qualified than other applicants, or if they may actually be better performers due to their impression management ability.

The current studies in this area focus on outcomes that are important to the hiring organization, in the form of an employee's job performance. But these organizational outcomes only explain some of the long-term consequences of deceptive IM use; they are missing the impact on the individual who used deception to obtain their job. Yet, outcomes that are personally relevant to the new employee, such as job stress, well-being and employee engagement, are also important to investigate. These types of outcomes have a large impact on one's health, happiness and success, both at work and outside of it (e.g., Lyubomirsky, King, & Diener, 2005). However, there are currently no studies that have examined personal outcomes of those who used deceptive IM in their interview and subsequently obtained the job.

This is a significant gap in the literature as it misses the long-term impact on the individuals who decided to use deception. While a job applicant's goal in the interview is to obtain the job, once they begin work, they want to enjoy the job and the workplace. But what if their interview deception gets in the way of their well-being on the job? Could using deception to obtain a job actually hurt these individuals once they begin work? If so, it may indicate that using deceptive IM in the interview is actually a bad idea for job applicants. Even though it may help
them to obtain the job, using deceptive IM could help interviewees get a job for which they are not a good fit because they lied about their values and experiences.

Because of these possible consequences, exploring this research question is important not only for researchers, but also for interviewees. Interviewees are the individuals who stand to be the most impacted by the long-term success or harm of using deceptive IM in the interview. As such, if findings indicate that deceptive IM is in fact problematic for interviewees, then job applicants might want to choose a different interview strategy. However, if it was found that deceptive IM helps interviewees obtain jobs and there are no negative effects of its use, then interviewees may be more inclined to deceive in the interview. All in all, this study could help to inform interviewees of the potential benefits or consequences of using deceptive IM in the interview and obtaining a job.

Conducting a multi-phase study examining the long-term impact of deceptive IM use in the interview on personal outcomes would be beneficial for both researchers and interviewees. However, as there is currently no research in this area, it presents an intriguing question. These deceptive employees decided to misrepresent themselves in their interviews and then were hired: how do these employees feel once they begin work? Are they happier, knowing that they did everything in their power to obtain their desired position? Or might they be more stressed, feeling as though they do not possess the necessary skills or abilities for the job at hand? To answer these questions and discover on-the-job outcomes of using deceptive IM, we must first discuss why applicants would use deceptive IM in their interviews.

**Why Use Deceptive IM**

In the literature, there are two ideas behind why job applicants use deceptive IM in their interviews. The first idea is that deceptive IM is a trait, a stable behaviour that does not change
from one situation to another (e.g., Buehl & Melchers, 2017). Researchers who investigate according with this view believe that individuals naturally possess different tendencies to use deceptive IM. These tendencies do not vary much depending on the situation, but are instead a characteristic of the individual. The second view of deceptive IM considers deceptive IM to be a situation-specific behaviour (e.g., Roulin & Bourdage, 2017). This means that people will use deceptive IM at different levels, depending on the situation. Thus, in difficult interviews where the applicant cannot think of a real-life example that puts them in a positive light, they may instead make up a suitable response. On the other hand, if the applicant already has the perfect experience they can use to answer the interviewer’s question, there would be no benefit to being deceptive. Although these two ideas offer different explanations for the use of deceptive IM, they are not mutually exclusive.

Roulin, Krings and Bingelli’s (2016) model of applicant faking combines both these views of deceptive IM. Roulin et al. (2016) proposed a dynamic model pertaining to job applicants’ deception in selection contexts. In their model, they explain that faking is a dynamic behaviour in which a job applicant weighs their capacity, motivation and opportunity to fake. Capacity relates to the job applicant’s ability to understand what the interviewer is looking for in a response, and the applicant’s ability to convey this to the interviewer (Roulin et al., 2016). Motivation relates to the applicant’s personal characteristics and characteristics of the organization that may motivate them to fake. Finally, opportunity to fake relates to the presence or lack of measures that the organization has put in place to prevent applicant faking. In this model, an individual’s stable personality traits come into play as part of the individual’s motivation and ability to fake; however, the other factors that affect faking are dynamic. Thus,
how much deception an applicant uses will vary from one interview to the next, and researchers must ask participants about a particular interview in order to obtain relevant data.

This view of deceptive IM as a dynamic, situation-specific construct is supported by some recent research. Law, Bourdage, & O’Neill, (2016) found that they were able to influence interviewees' use of deceptive IM based on warnings given in the interview. When interviewees were told that the interviewers were able to identify lying in the interview, they used less deceptive IM than those given no warning (Law et al., 2016). As such, the researchers were able to adjust the interview situation to affect interviewees' use of deception. Additional support for the situation-specific view of deceptive IM comes from Roulin and Bourdage (2017), who found that interviewees' use of deceptive IM varied from one interview to another and that university students’ year of study impacted their use of deceptive IM, with students earlier in their program using more deceptive IM than students who were more advanced. These findings offer support for a situation-specific view of deceptive IM, where interviewees' use of deception varies depending on multiple factors. For this research, I will be using this view of deceptive IM and focusing on how interviewees' fit with the job affects their use of deception.

**Deceptive IM and Fit**

Job interviews are designed to find the ideal candidate for a job, hopefully an individual who fits well with the job and the organization (Cable & Judge, 1997). As such, interview questions are designed to assess the competencies or shared values necessary for the job. When interviewees deceive in order to offer up a compelling interview response, it may be the case that they do not possess the competency or value that is being assessed. If this is the case, it would mean that they lack fit with the job or the organization. In such cases, the more deceptive IM the interviewees use, the fewer necessary competencies or shared values they possess and the less
likely they are to fit well once on the job. However, their deceptive response disguises their lack of fit (Roulin et al., 2014). Since it is difficult for interviewers to recognize deception in the interview, these deceptive applicants may be hired. Thus, job applicants may be able to utilize deceptive IM in order to be hired for jobs where they do not fit well (Roulin et al., 2014).

Once these job applicants begin working and learn more about the organization and their responsibilities, they may realize that this lack of fit is not ideal (Rynes, Bretz, & Gerhart, 1991). Person-environment fit theory can be used to explain the consequences for these employees, and help to answer my research question.

**Person-Environment Fit Theory**

Person-environment fit theory is a theory of the relationship between employee fit and stress. Person-environment fit can be defined as “the congruence, match or similarity between the person and the environment” (Edwards, 2008, p. 168) and can be represented in multiple domains, including on the job, in the organization, or with one’s supervisor or workgroup. The proposed study is most concerned with employees’ level of fit with their job and their organization. Thus, person-job and person-organization fit are the domains of fit most relevant to the current study, and person-job fit will be used as the primary domain to explain person-environment fit theory.

In each of the environmental domains, there are two aspects of fit: needs-supplies fit and demands-abilities fit (Edwards, 2008). Needs-supplies fit is the level of fit between what employees need to satisfy their personal needs and values, and what the environment supplies to them. For example, an employee who values work-life balance would have greater needs-supplies fit with a job that has flexible hours. This level of fit identifies how the job meets the needs of the employee. On the other hand, demands-abilities fit is concerned with how the
employee meets the needs of the job. Demands-abilities fit can be defined as the level of fit between the employee’s skills and abilities, and the requirements of the environment (Edwards, 2008). For example, in a statistical data analysis job, an employee would need to be proficient in at least one type of statistical software in order to have demands-abilities fit. Both needs-supplies fit and demands-abilities fit contribute to an employee's overall person-job and person-organization fit, so they are generally measured together under those domains.

Person-environment fit theory states that a lack of either needs-supplies fit or demands-abilities fit will lead to stress, and then to strain (the outcome of stress; Edwards, 2008). Moreover, this theory states that perceived fit is what matters in relation to stress, meaning that employees need to perceive a lack of fit in order for this lack of fit to affect their stress reactions. Thus, if interviewees use deceptive IM in their interview to imply fit where none exists, get hired for a job, and then realize that they do not fit well with the job or the organization, they can experience consequences.

This is where person-environment fit theory comes into effect. Once the employee realizes that there is a problem with their fit in the company or with their job, they may begin to feel stress (Edwards, 2008). The employee will begin to suffer from this stress and experience stress reactions; soon their work may suffer as well (e.g., Marcatto et al., 2016). How much deceptive IM the interviewee used can affect this stage of the job. Those who used only a small amount of deception in their interview may be able to overcome their lack of fit. If they only need to learn a couple things or accept some aspect of the job that is less than ideal, these employees may be able to do so and improve their fit with the job. However, high deceptive IM users who deceived about much of their past experiences and current needs may be worse off. These new employees could have to learn a lot and alter many of their views in order to improve
their fit. Thus, they may instead experience further negative effects. If employees' level of fit does not improve, this stress will soon lead to strain, and can even lead to illness (Edwards, 2008).

Support for this relationship between fit and strain comes from meta-analytic research; in a 2005 meta-analysis of fit, Kristof-Brown, Zimmerman and Johnson found that person-job fit and person-organization fit had correlations of $r = -0.28$ and $r = -0.27$ with strain. As the outcome of stress, strain can manifest in many different ways, such as lowered well-being and happiness, or increased anxiety and emotional exhaustion (Boswell, Olson-Buchanan & LePine, 2004). Other personal work outcomes can also be impacted by a lack of person-job fit. For example, meta-analytic research has also demonstrated a strong positive relationship between person-job fit and job satisfaction, as well as person-organization fit and job satisfaction (Kristof-Brown, Zimmerman, & Johnson, 2005). Additionally, these researchers found strong positive relationships with organizational commitment, and strong negative relationships with turnover intentions. Since a presence of fit is positively related to many positive outcomes, a lack of fit would be negatively related to these same outcomes. As such, many important personal outcomes can be negatively affected by a lack of perceived person-job and person-organization fit.

Though small alterations or exaggerations in the interview may seem harmless, these uses of deceptive IM can indicate a lack of fit between a new hire and their new job. If the new hire subsequently perceives this lack of fit, they may become stressed by it. In turn, they may begin to suffer the effects of stress and strain. This can then affect their personal outcomes at work, such as their affective well-being and engagement.
Workplace Personal Outcomes

There are many personal outcomes that can be affected by stress reactions. However, three important areas of research involve job stress, affective well-being and employee engagement. These will be the focus of the current study.

Stress

Job stress can be defined as the “process by which workplace psychological experiences and demands produce both short-term and long-term changes in mental and physical health” (Ganster & Rosen, 2013, p. 1088). Stress is an important personal outcome to consider not only because of its role in person-environment fit theory, but also because of the consequences of workplace stress. First of all, stress at work has been linked to both physical and mental illness. In terms of physical illness, high levels of work stress have been linked to heart disease, musculoskeletal pain such as back and neck pain, problems with the immune system, and greater ill health in general (Marcatto et al., 2016; Sultan-Taïeb, Chastang, Mansouri, & Niedhammer, 2013). Stress has also been linked to mental illnesses, including emotional exhaustion, anxiety, depression and the use of addictive substances (Ganster & Rosen, 2013; Kouvonen, Kivimäki, Virtanen, Pentti & Vahtera, 2005). After decades of studying workplace stress, researchers have found considerable evidence demonstrating the negative effects of this stress on the employees themselves.

Although the impact of stress on employees is important, employees are not the only ones harmed by workplace stress as stress can also impact organizations. Researchers have found that workplace stress is negatively related to job performance and job satisfaction, and positively related to absenteeism, presenteeism and turnover (Marcatto et al., 2016; Sullivan & Baghat, 1992). Additionally, researchers estimate that work stress causes approximately half of all
absences from work (Marcatto et al., 2016). Because of this, workplace stress is deleterious for organizations who may have to absorb the cost of their stressed employees. In fact, researchers have estimated the total cost of workplace stress in countries such as Canada, the US and the UK to be between $221 million to $187 billion USD per year (Hassard, Teoh, Visockaite, Dewe, & Cox, 2017). Such a large cost not only affects employees and their organizations, but also society at large. Thus, stress is an important workplace outcome to consider, and employees and employers should both do their best to minimize stress at work. If deceptive IM is found to be related to higher stress levels, then employees may be able to minimize their workplace stress by avoiding deception in their interviews.

**Affective Well-being**

In the workplace, affective well-being is the extent that one’s job makes one feel high levels of positive affect and low levels of negative affect (Anderson, Kaplan, & Vega, 2015). This has become an important research area, with an increased focus on positive psychology, well-being and happiness in life and in the workplace. Researchers have found that affective well-being is linked to a number of important personal outcomes. These include better mental health, with individuals high in affective well-being experiencing less depression, anxiety, phobias and substance abuse (Lyubomirsky et al., 2005). Additionally, those high in affective well-being tend to have better personal relationships, experience more support from others, and self-report higher levels of physical health (Lyubomirsky et al., 2005; Pressman & Cohen, 2005). As for work-related outcomes, employees high in affective well-being are more satisfied with their jobs, have higher incomes and experience less burnout than their colleagues (Lyubomirsky et al., 2005; Pressman & Cohen, 2005). Thus, there is considerable evidence demonstrating the benefits of affective well-being on an individual level.
In addition to the benefits of well-being for individuals, affective well-being is beneficial for employers. One of the most important qualities for employers is job performance, and there has been considerable research into affective well-being and job performance. Researchers have found that employees high in affective well-being tend to be rated high in job performance, productivity and quality by both managers and objective observers (Lyubomirsky et al., 2005). Additionally, employees high in well-being perform more organizational citizenship behaviours and less counterproductive workplace behaviors, both of which are important for organizational success (Lyubomirsky et al., 2005). Taken all together, this research demonstrates the importance of affective well-being for employees and their workplaces. If affective well-being is negatively related to use of deceptive IM in the interview, it may be in a job applicant’s best interest to avoid deceptive IM so as not to impair their well-being on the job.

Engagement

In the past 15 years, research on employee engagement has exploded, becoming a key area of concern for researchers as well as organizations (Saks & Gruman, 2014). There is much debate over engagement, including how to define and measure the construct (e.g., Macey & Schneider, 2008); however, employee engagement can be considered as an employee’s psychological presence while at work (Saks, 2006). Despite these disagreements, researchers have found substantial support for the importance of employee engagement, particularly from an organizational perspective but also at an individual level. On a personal level, employee engagement has been linked with higher self-reports of mental and physical health and wellness, including lower levels of anxiety and depression (Saks & Gruman, 2014). On the job, engagement has also been linked to higher job satisfaction, less burnout and less intended turnover (Halbesleben, 2010; Saks & Gruman, 2014). In terms of organizational outcomes,
where the bulk of the research lies, engagement has been linked to higher performance and productivity, greater organizational commitment, and more organizational citizenship behaviours (Cole, Walter, Bedeian, & O’Boyle, 2012; Halbesleben, 2010; Saks & Gruman, 2014). Moreover, companies with higher levels of engaged employees have also seen greater profits and customer satisfaction than companies with less engaged employees (Saks & Gruman, 2014).

Although there is still some debate about engagement, researchers have found many positive outcomes associated with high engagement. As such, it is important to learn if deceptive IM may impede a new employee’s level of engagement.

**The Current Study**

This study examined how the use of deceptive IM in the interview affects personal outcomes on the job. The personal outcomes of interest were perceived person-job and person-organization fit, job stress, affective well-being and employee engagement. The proposed relationship between these outcomes is as follows: deceptive IM will lead to a lack of perceived fit once the employee is on the job, which will be related to affective job outcomes, namely higher stress, and lower affective well-being and employee engagement (see figure 1). Thus, I hypothesized that:

H1: Deceptive IM is negatively related to perceived fit.

H2: Perceived fit is negatively related to job stress.

H3: Perceived fit is positively related to affective well-being.

H4: Perceived fit is positively related to employee engagement.

H5: Deceptive IM is positively related to job stress, and this relationship is mediated by negative relationships with perceived fit.
H6: Deceptive IM is negatively related to affective well-being, and this relationship is mediated by perceived fit.

H7: Deceptive IM is negatively related to employee engagement, and this relationship is mediated by perceived fit.

In order to test these hypotheses, I conducted a two phase study asking co-op students to self-report on the variables of interest. Self-reports on deceptive IM were collected shortly after the participants completed co-op interviews and obtained a job for their upcoming co-op work terms. Self-reports for the other variables were collected after participants had spent almost two months on the job. I then analysed the data using correlations and path analysis in R to explore the relationships of interest.

**Methods**

**Power Analysis**

I computed a mediation model power analysis using the MARlab web app (Schoemann, Boulton, & Short, in press) to determine the number of participants that would need to take part in my study in order to attain a power of .80. As there has been no research in the past determining the relationship between my variables of interest, I used the mean correlational effect size in industrial-organizational psychology, $r = .22$ (Bosco, Aguinis, Singh, Field, & Pierce, 2015). Results indicated that I would need a sample of 267 to obtain a power of .80.

However, I was not able to obtain a sample of 267 participants. Since I did not obtain the necessary number of participants and therefore did not meet a power of .80, I used a robust estimator for my statistical analyses. Furthermore, I do not draw any strong conclusions from this research and instead consider this study to be a preliminary study in this area, with more research needed to form any conclusions to my research question.
Participants

Two samples of participants took part in my study. Both samples were composed of students of varying ages, genders and programs. The first group of participants was composed of 190 co-op students from the University of Guelph who interviewed for winter co-op jobs in the fall of 2017. The second group of participants was composed of 50 co-op students from Centennial College who also interviewed for winter co-op jobs in the fall of 2017. The students were invited to participate in my study in November 2017 (Guelph) and January 2018 (Centennial), after they underwent interviews and accepted a co-op position.

After data cleaning (see table 1), my total sample was composed of 105 participants, 88% from the University of Guelph and 12% from Centennial College. 70% of the sample identified as female, 30% as male, and 1% as non-binary. The mean age of participants was 20.6 years old, and participants were divided between program years, with 34% in the fourth year of their program, 32% in third year, 29% of second year and 3% in first year. The majority of participants were of white/European descent (66%); however, participants of Southeast Asian (16%), South Asian (9%), Black/African/Caribbean (2%), First Nations/Métis/Inuit (1%), Latin American (1%), or other (3%) descents also participated in the study. The most strongly represented programs were accounting (12%), marketing management (10%), biochemistry (9%) and software engineering (9%; see Appendix A for full breakdown of participants’ programs).

Procedure

Time 1. Participants were contacted shortly after their interviews and asked to take part in my study (see Appendix B for recruitment emails). The University of Guelph students received a survey invitation from Co-operative Education and Career Services in mid-November when the majority of co-op students had accepted jobs. The Centennial College students received
a survey invitation from their co-op coordinator in early January when the majority of students had once again accepted jobs. The students were then asked to think about their job interview for the position that they accepted while they completed the survey.

Prior to completing the survey, all participants were informed that their responses would be confidential and that their future employer would not be privy to the results of the study (see Appendix C). At this time, participants completed the Interview Faking Behavior - Short scale (IFB-S) to measure deceptive IM. On this survey, the IFB-S questions were interspersed with questions from a short honest impression management scale so that participants did not realize I was asking about lying and alter their responses. This survey also included a self-verification striving questionnaire, an interview anxiety questionnaire and a short demographic questionnaire; however, these variables were not analysed in this study. Additionally, two attention check questions were interspersed in the questionnaire, both asking “Please answer “4 - somewhat agree” for this question.” Two questions were also added at the end asking about participants’ honesty in completing the survey: “I answered the survey questions honestly” and “How confident are you that your responses from this questionnaire will be kept confidential?” Finally, participants were also asked to leave their email address and position title so that I could match up their time 1 and time 2 survey data.

**Time 2.** All participants were contacted again in mid-February (Guelph) or mid-March (Centennial), after they spent approximately 1.5 months working at their new job. Participants were contacted via the same means as the first survey, and were asked to fill out a second survey with the perceived person-job and person-organization fit, job stress, affective well-being, employee engagement, global autonomy and role clarity scales. Once again, the same two attention check questions were interspersed in the questionnaire and the same two honesty check
questions were included at the end. Participants were also asked for their name and position title. Participants who completed both time 1 and time 2 surveys received a $5 Starbucks e-gift card.

**Measures**

All of the questionnaires were completed online to accommodate the schedule of the participants. Participants were asked for their co-op position title and school e-mail address when completing both surveys so that I could connect their time 1 and time 2 data.

**Deceptive impression management.** I used the Interview Faking Behavior - Short (IFB-S) scale developed by Bourdage, Roulin and Tarraf (in press) to measure deceptive impression management. These researchers shortened the 54-item Interview Faking Behavior scale created by Levashina and Campion (2007) in order to create a shorter and more user-friendly version. In the IFB-S, participants rate 16 items on a scale from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). Sample items include "I tried to express the same opinions and attitudes as the interviewer" and "I invented some work situations or accomplishments that did not really occur" (see Appendix D). Deceptive IM had a reliability of $\alpha = .80$ in my sample.

**Perceived fit.** To measure employee perceptions of their fit, I used the 5-item perceived person-job fit scale and the 5-item perceived person-organization fit scale, both developed by Saks and Ashforth (1997). These measures contain questions assessing both needs-supplies fit and demands-abilities fit, as well as overall person-job and person-organization fit. On these scales, participants rate items from 1 (to a very little extent) to 5 (to a very large extent). Sample items on the person-job fit scale include "To what extent do your knowledge, skills, and abilities match the requirements of the job?" and "To what extent is the job a good match for you?" (see Appendix E). Sample items on the person-organization fit scale include "To what extent are the values of the organization similar to your own values?" and "To what extent is the organization a
good match for you?" (see Appendix F). I found a reliability of $\alpha = .92$ for overall perceived fit, with reliabilities of $\alpha = .85$ and of $\alpha = .90$ for perceived person-job fit and perceived person-organization fit, respectively.

**Job Stress.** I used the Job Stress Scale that Lambert, Hogan, Camp and Ventura (2006) adapted to measure work stress. Participants rated 5 items that measure an individual's overall level of job stress on a scale from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). Sample items include "I am usually under a lot of pressure when I am at work" and "I am usually calm and at ease when I’m working" (see Appendix G). I found a reliability of $\alpha = .86$ for job stress in my sample.

**Affective well-being.** Participants' affective well-being was assessed using the Job-Related Affective Well-Being Scale (Van Katwyk, Fox, Spector, & Kelloway, 2000). In this scale, participants were presented with 15 items representing positive affect and 15 items representing negative affect, and were asked to rate each item on a scale from 1 (never) to 5 (extremely often or always). The negative affect items were reversed scored so that high scores on the scale indicate high levels of affective well-being. Sample items include “My job made me feel proud” and “My job made me feel frustrated” (see Appendix H). I found that affective well-being had a reliability of $\alpha = .95$ in my sample.

**Employee engagement.** Finally, participants completed Saks' (2006) job engagement scale to assess their employee engagement. Participants rated 6 items that measure an individual's overall job engagement on a scale from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). Sample items include "Sometimes I am so into my job that I lose track of time" and "I really “throw” myself into my job" (see Appendix I). I obtained a reliability of $\alpha = .78$ for employee engagement.
Demographic information. Demographic information was collected, including participants' year of study, age, gender, and academic program.

Control variables. Autonomy and role clarity were collected as control variables, using the 9-item Global Autonomy Scale (Breaugh, 1998) and the 6-item Role Ambiguity Scale (Rizzo, House, & Lirtzman, 1970; see Appendix J). These control variables were included to see if deceptive IM would impact the outcome variables above and beyond the impact from control variables that were known to be strong predictors of affective outcomes. Autonomy and role clarity were chosen as they have been found to have moderate to strong correlations with the outcome variables (e.g., Giallonardo, Wong, & Iwasiw, 2010; Vandenberghhe, Panaccio, Bentein, Mignonac, & Roussel). Both control variables had acceptable levels of reliability, as I found that global autonomy had a reliability of $\alpha = .92$ and role clarity had a reliability of $\alpha = .79$.

Results

Data Handling and Cleaning

As I collected data from participants at two different educational institutions, I had to decide whether or not to combine the data from these participants. My original plan had been to analyze the two samples to ensure that there were no systematic differences between samples, and combine the data if that assumption was met. However, when I obtained a very small number of participants from one institution ($n = 13$), I could no longer follow this plan. With such a small sample size, I would not be able to distinguish between random and systematic differences between my two samples. As such, I decided to combine the two samples as that had been the original goal. Additionally, combining the two samples would increase my sample size.

Prior to data analysis, I developed several decision rules regarding data cleaning to account for dropout between time 1 and time 2, as well as for individuals who did not pass
attention or honesty checks. Namely, participants who did not answer the instructed response questions as instructed were not included in my analysis. For example, for the question "Please answer "4 - somewhat agree" for this question," participants who did not select the answer "4 - somewhat agree" were removed. Additionally, participants who selected 1 (strongly disagree/extremely unconfident) or 2 (disagree/unconfident) to the honesty check questions of "I answered the survey questions honestly" and "How confident are you that your responses from this questionnaire will be kept confidential?" were not included in my analysis. Before data cleaning, $n = 240$ participants began the time 1 survey. After data cleaning, I was left to analyze $n = 105$ participants. Table 1 explains my reasons for data cleaning, and shows how many participants were removed at each step.

**Data Screening**

I performed several screening checks on my data prior to performing the full data analysis. First, I assessed the univariate normality of my variables using the $MVN$ package in R. Figure 2 includes graphic representation of the univariate normality of each of my variables of interest and control variables. Unfortunately, only deceptive IM and employee engagement were found to be normally distributed. Additionally, I assessed the multivariate normality of my data, also using the $MVN$ package in R. I determined that my data did not meet the assumption of multivariate normality. This meant that I would have to use a robust estimation method with robust standard errors to account for non-normality of data. Finally, I screened my data for outliers; however, because of my low sample size, I did not plan to remove any outliers. Instead, outliers are reported in Appendix K. To screen for outliers, I converted participants' scale scores into z scores and searched for participants who had scores 3.29 standard deviations above or below the mean. I found 2 outliers (see Appendix K).
Analytic Approach

After cleaning and screening my data, my first step of my analysis was to calculate descriptives and correlations for all my variables of interest (table 2), as well as scale reliability analyses for each variable. After completing this step, I used path analysis to assess my model. To do this, I used the lavvan package in R to assess path coefficients, variance and model fit with the MLM estimator, meaning maximum likelihood estimation controlling for non-normality with robust standard errors and the Santorra-Bentler correction for calculating fit statistics (Rosseel, 2017). I chose this estimation method as my data did not meet the assumption of multivariate normality necessary to use regular maximum likelihood estimation. R scripts are provided in Appendix L.

Using this technique, I first assessed the fit statistics for a model including all the variables of interest and the control variables (figure 3). However, this model had poor fit and was not acceptable for analyzing my data. Thus, I modified my model and assessed the fit statistics of this modified model (figure 4); it had acceptable fit. In order to test each of my hypotheses, I examined the correlations I had already obtained and the path coefficients from this modified model.

Model Fit

I first assessed the model outlined in figure 3 and table 3, which includes control variables and both direct and indirect paths between my predictor and outcomes variables. This model indicated poor fit, $\chi^2(2) = 97.314, p < .001; \text{CFI}_{\text{Robust}} = .81; \text{RMSEA}_{\text{Robust}} = .54; \text{SRMR} = .18$. However, this model included control variables which were not part of the theory being tested, and were simply included to assess the impact on the relationship between deceptive IM and the outcome variables. Additionally, this model included direct relationships between
deceptive IM and all three control variables; however, analysis of this model found a negligible
direct relationship between deceptive IM and employee engagement, meaning that one of the
outlined paths did not exist. To discover if the poor fit of this model was a reflection of my
theoretical model as a whole or merely reflected the inclusion of control variables and a direct
path between deceptive IM and employee engagement which did not exist, I created a new
model. The model outlined in figure 4 and table 4 reflects these changes, as it no longer includes
control variables or a direct path between deceptive IM and job engagement. The fit for this
model was considerably improved, and the model produced near-perfect fit with my data, $\chi^2(1) =
0.002, p = .96; \text{CFI}_{\text{Robust}} = 1.00; \text{RMSEA}_{\text{Robust}} = 0.00; \text{SRMR} = .001$. However, it is important to
note that this near-perfect fit could be due to the small sample size and low degrees of freedom.
Models with these characteristics can appear to fit the data very well, but this is mainly due to
the low degrees of freedom remaining after designating model paths (Goodboy & Kline, 2017).
Nonetheless, due to its acceptable fit, this model was used to examine my hypotheses.

**Analyses**

**Hypotheses 1 to 4.** Table 2 outlines the correlations between my main variables of
interest, as well as the 95% confidence intervals, means and standard deviations. Deceptive IM
was found to be normally distributed, with a mean of 2.57 and a standard deviation of 0.56. For
eleven of the sixteen items, participants' answers ranged from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly
agree). "When I did not have a good answer, I borrowed work experiences of other people and
made them sound like my own" was the only item with responses ranging from 1 (strongly
disagree) to 4 (somewhat agree). Thus, many participants reported using deceptive IM in their
coop interviews. In terms of the deceptive IM subtypes, deceptive ingratiation was most
common, with a mean of 3.49 and a standard deviation of 0.68. Slight image creation ($M = 2.73,$
$sd = 0.95$) and image protection ($M = 2.42, sd = 0.69$) were also relatively common, and extensive image creation ($M = 1.63, sd = 0.73$) was used much less frequently. These descriptive characteristics are fairly similar to other published studies, including the most recent article published on deceptive IM, in which the authors validated the deceptive IM scale used in the current study. In this publication, the authors also found that extensive image creation was used least often ($M = 1.93, sd = 1.12$) and deceptive ingratiation was used the most ($M = 2.51, sd = 1.05$), with image protection ($M = 2.12, sd = 1.06$) and slight image creation ($M = 2.11, sd = 1.08$) once again being used moderately by participants (Bourdage et al., in press). However, there was a smaller difference between the means of the subtypes of deceptive IM in their study compared to the current study, and three of the subtypes had smaller means than in the current study.

Figure 4 outlines the analysis model I used to assess the relationships between my variables of interest, and table 4 outlines path coefficients, confidence intervals, standard errors and p-values for this model. Also, see Appendix M for post-hoc power analyses for each hypothesis.

For Hypothesis 1, I posited that deceptive IM would be negatively related to fit. Based on Bosco et al.’s (2015) benchmarks for correlational effect sizes in industrial-organizational psychology, deceptive IM and fit had a weak negative relationship, $r = -.11, 95\%$ CI $[-.30, .08], p = .26$. Additionally, the confidence interval was fairly large, indicating that the relationship could range from a moderate negative to a weak positive effect. Furthermore, the standardized path coefficient for path $a$ between deceptive IM and fit within the context of my model was $-.11, 95\%$ CI $[-.32, .09], p = .29$. This means that there was some support to indicate that there may be
a weak negative relationship between deceptive IM and fit; however, it was not statistically significant.

For my second hypothesis, I hypothesized that fit would be negatively related to job stress. I found that fit had a strong negative relation with job stress, with a confidence interval ranging from a moderate to very strong negative effect, $r = -.52$, 95% CI [-.65, -.36], $p < .001$. The standardized path coefficient for path $b$ between fit and job stress supported a moderate relationship between the variables, with a value of -.51, 95% CI [-.70, -.32], $p < .001$. Thus, hypothesis 2 was supported.

I also hypothesized that fit would be positively related to affective well-being (hypothesis 3) and employee engagement (hypothesis 4). Providing support for hypothesis 3, fit had a very strong positive relationship with affective well-being, $r = .74$, 95% CI [.64, .81], $p < .001$. Within the context of the full path model, the standardized path coefficient for path $c$ between fit and well-being indicated a strong positive relationship of .73, 95% CI [.58, .88], $p < .001$. In terms of employee engagement, I hypothesized that participants who had higher levels of fit would also be more engaged at work. My results found support for this hypothesis, as fit was strongly related to employee engagement, $r = .61$, 95% CI [.47, .72], $p < .001$. Furthermore, the standardized path coefficient for path $c$ between fit and well-being supported a moderate relationship, with a value of .61, 95% CI [.48, .73], $p < .001$. These findings indicate that hypotheses 3 and 4 were supported.

**Hypotheses 5 to 7.** I hypothesized that deceptive IM would be positively related to job stress (hypothesis 5) and negatively related to both well-being (hypothesis 6) and employee engagement (hypothesis 7), and that these three relationships would be mediated by fit. For hypothesis 5, the indirect path $a*b$ from deceptive IM to fit to job stress in the mediation model
demonstrates a weak positive relationship, $a \times b = .06, 95\% \text{ CI } [-.05, .16], p = .28$. The direct effect of path $e'$ from deceptive IM to job stress in this model also demonstrates a weak positive relationship, $e' = .08, 95\% \text{ CI } [-.09,.24], p = .35$. Finally, the total effect of path $e$ from deceptive IM to job stress in a model including only those two variables was slightly stronger, $e = .14, 95\% \text{ CI } [-.05,.32], p = .16$. However, the indirect effect accounted for only 43% of the total effect, and the ratio of indirect to direct effect was 0.75. As this data was obtained from a fairly small sample and effect sizes based on ratios can be inaccurate in such samples, I also calculated upsilon to determine the amount of variance in the outcome variable that was accounted for by both the predictor and mediator variables, as suggested by Lachowicz, Preacher and Kelley (in press). This analysis indicated that the mediation accounted for only 0.3% of the variance of job stress, $\upsilon = .003, 95\% \text{ CI } [.00,.02]$. Thus, hypothesis 5 was not supported.

For hypothesis 6, I posited that deceptive IM would be negatively related to well-being, and that this relationship would again be mediated by fit. The indirect path $a \times c$ from deceptive IM to fit to well-being in the mediation model demonstrates a weak negative relationship, $a \times c = -.08, 95\% \text{ CI } [-.23,.07], p = .29$. The direct effect of path $f'$ from deceptive IM to well-being in this model also demonstrates a weak negative relationship, $f' = -.06, 95\% \text{ CI } [-.18,.05], p = .28$. The total effect of path $c$ from deceptive IM to job stress in a model with only those two variables was slightly stronger, $f = -.14, 95\% \text{ CI } [-.34,.05], p = .14$. The indirect effect accounted for 57% of the total effect, and the ratio of indirect to direct effect was 1.30. However, upsilon indicated that only 0.7% of the variance in well-being was accounted for by this mediation, $\upsilon = .007, 95\% \text{ CI } [.00,.06]$. Thus, hypothesis 6 was not supported.

Finally, I hypothesized that deceptive IM would be negatively related to employee engagement, and that this relationship would be mediated by fit (hypothesis 7). The indirect path
a*d from deceptive IM to fit to employee engagement in the mediation model demonstrates a weak negative relationship, $a*d = -.07$, 95% CI $[-.19, .06]$, $p = .29$. However, as there was no direct relationship from deceptive IM to employee engagement in my larger model, the direct path was not included in this model. The total effect of path $g$ from deceptive IM to employee engagement in a model including only those two variables was also a weak negative effect, $g = -.07$, 95% CI $[-.26, .13]$, $p = .52$. This indicates that the indirect effect accounted for 100% of the total effect. However, upsilon indicated that only 0.5% of the variance in employee engagement was accounted for by this mediation, $\upsilon = .005$, 95% CI $[.00, .04]$. Thus, the effect here was very small; however, the mediation accounted fully for the effect.

**Discussion**

The main goal of this research was to investigate the on-the-job impact of deceptive IM on new employees who used deception in their interviews. Would these employees be happier at their jobs knowing that they used all the resources available to them to obtain the job they wanted and now get to enjoy the benefits of that work? Or would employees who used deceptive IM in their interviews feel uncomfortable and unprepared for their jobs, leading to higher stress and lower happiness at work? Though the small sample size in this study makes it hard to draw solid conclusions, the results indicate that it is most likely that use of deceptive IM had either a negative or neutral effect on workplace outcomes; however, we cannot rule out a small positive effect. In terms of job stress, correlational confidence intervals ranged from a very small negative effect to a moderate positive effect. For affective well-being, correlational confidence intervals ranged from a very small positive effect to a moderate negative effect. Thus, it's unlikely that using deceptive IM in the interview was related to decreased job stress or increased affective well-being. Instead, deceptive IM likely has a harmful effect or no effect on these variables.
There were similar findings with fit and employee engagement, though the confidence intervals were slightly wider. Taken all together, this indicates that using deceptive IM in the interview is likely harmful or neutral for employees once they are working. Thus, although deceptive IM might not be a harmful interview strategy, other strategies may be more useful in both the short and long term.

In terms of the proposed mediations, none of the mediations were found to be statistically significant or to have a substantive effect on the variance of the outcome variables. However, for each outcome variable, the results indicated that there was an indirect effect present. For employee engagement, this indirect effect accounted for the entire effect of deceptive IM. The indirect effect for job stress and affective well-being were slightly smaller, in that they both accounted for approximately 50% of the total effect. This shows that the relationship between deceptive IM and the outcome variables of job stress, affective well-being and employee engagement is likely due, at least partly, to lack of fit. However, the small sample size I obtained made it difficult to explore these relationships in more detail. Specifically in terms of mediation, I was vastly underpowered with only a power of 0.20 (see Appendix M). This made it difficult to explore how mediation truly affected the relationships between deceptive IM and my outcome variables. However, the presence of the small indirect effects indicates that this is an area of research that could be worth looking into further.

Furthermore, the relationships between perceived fit and the outcome variables were consistent with theory and past research. Person-environment fit theory states that individuals who perceive low fit in their work will experience higher stress, which will lead to strain that can manifest in many ways. Past research has found support for this theory, and the current study
also supports person-environment fit theory, as perceived fit was strongly correlated with negative job stress and positive affective well-being and employee engagement.

However, the correlations between perceived fit and the outcome variables in this study were stronger than past research has indicated. Meta-analytic results have found moderate negative correlations between job strain and both person-organization fit and person-job fit (Kristof-Brown et al., 2005), while I found a strong negative correlation. Past studies also have found moderate correlations between person-job fit and affective well-being (Choi, Tran, & Kang, 2017; Park, Monnot, Jacob, & Wagner, 2011), as well as moderate to strong correlations between person-job fit and employee engagement (Enwereuzor, Ugwu, & Eze, 2018; Lu, Wang, Lu, Du, & Bakker, 2013). I obtained very strong correlations between fit and both of these variables. Thus, for all three outcome variables, I obtained correlations that were stronger than expected given previous research.

The strong correlations between fit and job stress, affective well-being and employee engagement could be a unique attribute of my sample, and may be due to the fact that my sample was composed of co-op students. Looking at the univariate normality of variables, it is clear that my participants had high levels of fit and well-being, and very low levels of job stress overall (see figure 2). During school semesters, co-op students must balance multiple responsibilities, including attending class, completing homework, reading textbooks and articles, studying for exams, writing assignments, updating their resumes, searching for jobs and interviewing for jobs. Compared to this busy schedule, working at a co-op job may be much easier and less stressful for co-op students. Participants may have been happy and at ease no matter their co-op job, because almost any job would be preferable to a school semester. Furthermore, as co-op positions, these jobs were temporary and participants knew that any unpleasantness experienced on the job
would disappear within a couple of months. The temporary nature of the job could alleviate stress and anxiety related to considering their future with the organization. Thus, the nature of my sample may have inflated their self-report ratings, explaining why I found very low levels of stress and high levels of fit and affective well-being. Furthermore, this general happiness could have caused the strong correlations between fit and my outcome variables. While it is worthwhile learning more about co-op students and their work attitudes, it could also be worth examining the relationships between fit and my outcome variables in a different kind of sample in the future, as it's possible that the findings from this study would not generalize to all workers.

**Implications**

Though interviewees can find all sorts of advice online recommending lying or exaggerating the truth, this study helps to demonstrate that deceptive IM is probably not the best interview strategy. The findings from this study indicate that there is little chance of deceptive IM helping interviewees once they are actually hired. Whether deceptive IM is harmful or simply neutral is still unclear, but it is unlikely that deceptive IM will be beneficial after employees start their jobs. When one also considers multiple studies that examined the impact of deceptive IM use on the interview's outcome and came to mixed findings (e.g., Levashina & Campion, 2007; Swider et al., 2011), it provides further support that deceptive IM might not be the best choice for interviewees. This is because there is currently no research evidence definitively supporting that deceptive IM is a beneficial interview strategy with respect to interview performance. Instead, some researchers found that it could be beneficial (e.g., Levashina & Campion, 2007), some found that it could be harmful (e.g., Swider et al., 2011) and others reported mixed findings depending on multiple factors (e.g., Schneider, 2015). With mixed evidence making it difficult to
determine if deceptive IM is useful, either in the interview or afterwards, it may not be the best interview strategy for those hoping to obtain long-term jobs where they can grow and develop.

This information is important for interviewees to understand, so that they can choose a more promising interview strategy, such as honest IM, that will help them obtain their desired job and succeed at that job in the long term. Furthermore, it's important for career counsellors and interview coaches to learn this information so that they can provide the best strategies for their clients. Based on the research on deceptive IM, career counsellors and interview coaches may want to warn their clients to avoid using deception in the interview, and instead to focus on honest forms of impression management.

Unfortunately, the limited findings in this study also mean that there is still no research evidence to support the idea that deceptive IM is a problematic behaviour that should be minimized. This is most important for deceptive IM researchers who base their own studies on the idea that deceptive IM is problematic. One of the goals of this study was to examine the impact of deceptive IM on important personal outcomes to attempt to discover if this deception could harm organizations or the deceptive individuals themselves. The wide confidence intervals around the correlations and path coefficients that could have helped to answer this question indicate that deceptive IM could be a negative behaviour or it could be a neutral behaviour, though it is less likely to be a positive behaviour. These findings do not provide support for researchers’ assumption that deceptive IM is a negative behaviour, although they indicate that this assumption is a possibility. Thus, more research should be done in this area to attempt to discover if deceptive IM is neutral or if it is problematic for organizations and individuals. However, researchers should make sure to have a large sample size so that they can have adequate power to find and support their proposed effects.
Strengths, Limitations, and Future Directions

One of the main strengths of this study lay in the two phase study design used to answer the research questions. In order to avoid issues inherent with having participants answer a survey on interview behaviour and job behaviour at one time point, this study utilized a two phase study design where participants were sent one survey asking about their interview and another survey sent months later asking about their job behaviours. This is a major strength of this study, as it meant that there was a shorter period of time between participants' interviews and their interview survey than if we sent both surveys after they had been working for 2 months. Additionally, as participants had not yet begun working when they answered the interview survey, their interview data could not be impacted by their job experiences. This two phase design also improved the mediation analysis. Because deceptive IM was measured months before the other variables, it could not have been caused by participants' perceived fit, job stress, affective well-being or employee engagement. This helps to provide support for the mediation model, since deceptive IM could be causing the other variables, but the other variables could not be causing deceptive IM. This means that there is more support for the direction of the arrows in my model (figure 4) than if I had conducted a mediation based off of one data collection point. Thus, the two phase design of my study provided multiple strengths of this research.

An additional strength is that the study was based on actual job interviews and actual job data for co-op students. Many studies examining interview behaviours use mock interviews; however, it can be difficult to generalize behaviour from mock interview to real life interviews. In this study, participants went through actual interviews while knowing that they had to obtain a co-op job in order to stay in the co-op program. This would have added pressure to their interviews, since participants knew that their interview performance could lead to them getting a
job. Thus, their interview data is likely more accurate than if I had used mock interviews in this study. Furthermore, the job outcomes data came from participants who were working and basing their responses on their work life. Here, participants did not have to imagine what work might be like because they knew how they felt at work. Again, their job outcomes data is likely more accurate than if I had asked participants to imagine their work life. All together, the methodological choice to use real interview and job data strengthened my research study.

There were also some limitations to the study. One important limitation relates to the timing of the interview survey. Though it was beneficial that I was able to survey participants before they began their jobs, it would have been ideal to survey participants immediately after their interviews. This would be ideal timing as the interview would be fresh in participants' minds and they should still remember everything accurately. While it's likely that surveying participants about their interviews a couple of weeks or months after they occurred still produced relatively accurate data, it is not as ideal as surveying them immediately after the interview. However, I had to make this choice as co-op students go through multiple interviews and only accept one job. If I had surveyed the co-op students after their first interview, I would have had to clean out a large part of the sample, since many students would not accept the job that that interview related to. Instead, I made the choice to obtain a larger sample but wait until most students had accepted a job before surveying them about their interview.

Another limitation with the survey timing is that participants were asked about their job outcomes after spending only two months on the job. This did not give participants very much time to become accustomed to their job. It can take time to discover which aspects of a job employees like and which aspects are more frustrating, and two months may not have been enough time for participants to explore this in their co-op jobs. This short time period could have
inflated participants' ratings of perceived fit, affective well-being and employee engagement, and minimized ratings of job stress. However, this timing decision was made partly due to the limited time available to conduct a Master's thesis study and partly due to the limited time that co-op students spend on their work terms. In fact, work terms last only for four months, so our survey was send out around the mid-point of the work term. While surveying participants too early in their work term is not ideal, it also would not have been ideal to survey participants shortly before the work term ends, as knowing that they would soon be leaving their jobs could also inflate participants' job outcome ratings. Thus, we determined that surveying participants halfway through the work term was the best solution for this study.

In terms of the mediation, while collecting data at two time points is better than collecting data at only one time point, it would have been ideal to collect data at three points in time. Then, deceptive IM would have been collected at time 1, perceived fit and the control variables would have been collected at time 2, and job stress, affective well-being and employee engagement would have been collected at time 3. This is the ideal way to run a mediation study, as researchers can be assured that the outcomes did not cause the mediator or the predictor, and that the mediator did not cause the predictor. Thus, there is more support for the direction of the arrows in the mediation model, and researchers can begin to discuss causality. However, I made the decision not to collect data at three time points due to the limited time I had available to run a Master's thesis study, as well as the dropout of participants that I knew would occur between time points. As it was, 34 participants did not answer the second survey and instead dropped out of the study. If I had extended the survey to a third data collection point, I would have experiences even greater dropout and would have lowered my sample size. Thus, conducting a
mediation study with three points of data collection would have been ideal, but might not have worked well for this particular study.

In addition to these limitations in terms of survey timing, there could be an issue of selection bias in my study. All of my participants obtained the job for which they interviewed and may not be representative of job applicants who do not obtain jobs. However, my study related to job outcomes for new employees who obtained a job following an interview. Thus, it was necessary for all participants to interview for and successfully obtain a job before participating in my study. However, the results may not generalize to new employees who did not interview for their jobs, or job applicants who do not obtain a job after their interview.

One final limitation is that the participants were co-op students who were on short four-month work terms. This could cause some peculiarities with the sample, as co-op students could feel differently or behave in different ways than the general working population. As previously discussed, participants had very low levels of job stress, and high levels of perceived fit and affective well-being. This could be a peculiarity to the co-op student sample itself, rather than being attributed to factors that would normally affect individuals' fit, job stress and well-being. These co-op students are normally very busy during the school semester as they attend class, complete their readings and homework, write assignments and tests, update their resume and apply for jobs, and interview for multiple positions. In comparison to their busy school semesters, the co-op jobs may be less stressful and more enjoyable for students. This could inflate their ratings on job outcomes, and affect the generalizability of the study. In addition, co-op students only spend four months on each work term and may not be seriously affected if they do not enjoy their jobs. Because students know that their jobs will soon end, they might be less concerned about work than typical employees. All in all, using co-op students could be a
limitation of this study; however, when searching for a sample, it was important to find a large group of individuals who needed to obtain a job quickly and begin that job in a short period of time. Co-op students were a large group of individuals who met these criteria, which meant that they would be looking for actual jobs and going through with real job interviews. Thus, I decided to use co-op students as participants, even if they would not be entirely generalizable.

Despite these limitations, this study began to investigate the impact of deceptive IM on job outcomes, and found that deceptive IM likely has either negative or neutral effects on new employees. In the future, more research with larger samples should be conducted to discover if deceptive IM has a neutral or a negative impact. In order to further the generalizability of future studies, researchers should consider obtaining different types of samples in addition to co-op student samples. Further to this, researchers could investigate other important job outcomes, such as absenteeism, intent to quit one's job, job satisfaction, organizational citizenship behaviours or job performance. This research would further investigate the impact of deceptive IM on important job outcomes.

In addition to this research related to the impact of deceptive IM, other research on deceptive IM could also be useful. A major assumption in this study was that interviewees use deceptive IM because they do not have the necessary skills, abilities or experience to obtain the job honestly. Future research could examine this assumption and investigate interviewees' motivation behind using deceptive IM. Are these deceptive interviewees truly using deceptive IM because they lack skills, or are they just dishonest individuals who enjoy using deception in the interview? This is an interesting question that has not yet been explored and could provide some interesting insight into deceptive IM.
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Tables and Figures

Table 1

*Reasons for data cleaning and number of participants removed at each step*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason for data cleaning</th>
<th>Number of participants removed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Did not complete time 1 survey</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not respond to time 2 survey</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not pass attention check - time 1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not pass honesty check - time 1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not pass attention check - time 2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not pass honesty check - time 2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not interview for their co-op position</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variable</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Deceptive IM</td>
<td>2.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Person-Job Fit</td>
<td>3.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Person-Organization Fit</td>
<td>3.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Overall Fit</td>
<td>3.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Job Stress</td>
<td>2.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Affective Well-Being</td>
<td>3.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Employee Engagement</td>
<td>3.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Role Clarity</td>
<td>3.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Correlations are significant at the .01 level (2-tailed).*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>9. Global Autonomy</th>
<th>3.56</th>
<th>0.90</th>
<th>-0.16</th>
<th>0.53**</th>
<th>0.49**</th>
<th>0.54**</th>
<th>-0.42**</th>
<th>0.50**</th>
<th>0.36**</th>
<th>0.31**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[-0.34, 0.38, 0.33, 0.39, -0.56, 0.35, 0.18, 0.12, 0.04]</td>
<td>[0.66, 0.62, 0.66, -0.25, 0.63, 0.52, 0.47]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Slight Image Creation</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.85**</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[0.78, -0.25, -0.27, -0.26, -0.11, -0.30, -0.25, -0.18, -0.28, -0.08]</td>
<td>[0.14, 0.11, 0.12, 0.27, 0.08, 0.13, 0.21, 0.10]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Extensive Image Creation</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>0.73**</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[0.63, -0.23, -0.27, -0.25, -0.12, -0.27, -0.26, -0.18, -0.33, 0.39]</td>
<td>[0.11, 0.13, 0.27, 0.11, 0.12, 0.21, 0.05, 0.66]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Deceptive Ingratiation</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.62**</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[0.49, -0.27, -0.23, -0.25, -0.11, -0.25, -0.21, -0.20, -0.18, 0.23, -0.03, 0.34]</td>
<td>[0.15, 0.12, 0.13, 0.27, 0.13, 0.18, 0.18, 0.20, 0.56, 0.20]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Image Protection</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.71**</td>
<td>-0.15</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
<td>-0.14</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>-0.17</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[-0.30, -0.32, -0.32, -0.35, -0.22, -0.26, -0.41, 0.24, 0.25, 0.14, 0.34]</td>
<td>[0.05, 0.08, 0.05, 0.34, 0.03, 0.16, 0.12, -0.05, 0.56, 0.57, 0.48]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. M and SD are used to represent mean and standard deviation, respectively. 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). * indicates p < .05. ** indicates p < .01.*
### Table 3

*Path coefficients for full model with control variables*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Path Coefficient</th>
<th>Standardized path coefficient</th>
<th>CI – lower</th>
<th>CI – upper</th>
<th>Standard error</th>
<th>P-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deceptive IM → Fit</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
<td>-0.27</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fit → Stress</td>
<td>-0.38</td>
<td>-0.55</td>
<td>-0.20</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fit → Well-Being</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fit → Engagement</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deceptive IM → Stress</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deceptive IM → Well-Being</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>-0.18</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deceptive IM → Engagement</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>-0.15</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role Clarity → Stress</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
<td>-0.33</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role Clarity → Well-Being</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>-0.16</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role Clarity → Engagement</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy → Stress</td>
<td>-0.19</td>
<td>-0.40</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy → Well-Being</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy → Engagement</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>-0.15</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 4

*Path coefficients for analysis model*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Path Coefficient</th>
<th>Standardized path coefficient</th>
<th>CI – lower</th>
<th>CI – upper</th>
<th>Standard error</th>
<th>P-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deceptive IM → Fit</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
<td>-0.32</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fit → Stress</td>
<td>-0.51</td>
<td>-0.70</td>
<td>-0.32</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fit → Well-Being</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fit → Engagement</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deceptive IM → Stress</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deceptive IM → Well-Being</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>-0.18</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 1. Proposed model. Note: global autonomy and role clarity were also used as control variables to predict job stress, affective well-being and employee engagement.
Figure 2. Univariate normality of variables of interest.
Figure 3. Original model with control variables.

Figure 4. Analysis model, which does not include control variables or a direct effect of deceptive IM on employee engagement.
Appendix A

Breakdown of Participants’ Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Number of Participants</th>
<th>Percentage of Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accounting</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Automation and Robotics</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commerce</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biochemistry</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biological and Pharmaceutical Chemistry</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biological Engineering</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biomedical Toxicology</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biotechnology</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Engineering</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Science</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer System Technology</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Couple, Youth and Family</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecology</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electronic Engineering</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering Systems and Computing</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Engineering</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Science</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food &amp; Agriculture Business</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food science</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotel and Food Management</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management Economics &amp; Finance</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing Management</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanical Engineering</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Microbiology</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Software Engineering</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Resources Engineering</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B

Recruitment Emails

University of Guelph Time 1

Hi there,

Do you have a co-op position lined up for January 2018? Did you interview for this job?

If so, please consider participating in this online survey, from researchers at the University of Guelph. We are exploring how co-op students' interview strategies affect their experience on the job, and would like your help.

If you complete this survey (about strategies used in your co-op interview) and the follow-up survey that will be sent out in February 2018 (about your experience on the job), you will receive a $5 Starbucks e-gift card. To participate or learn more about this research, follow this link https://uoguelph.eu.qualtrics.com/jfe/form/SV_dd8ZldaNGRKtF6B.

Thank you,

Brooke Charbonneau and Deborah Powell
Psychology Department
University of Guelph

University of Guelph Time 2

Thank you so much for filling out our survey about co-op interviews last semester. We've got one more short survey for you to fill out before you get your Starbucks gift card: https://uoguelph.eu.qualtrics.com/jfe/form/SV_574GEdu755jUgbH.

Please consider participating in this follow-up survey, from researchers at the University of Guelph. We are exploring how co-op students' interview strategies affect their experience on the job, and would like your help. If you complete this survey about your experience at your co-op job, you will receive a $5 Starbucks e-gift card.

Thank you,

Brooke Charbonneau and Deborah Powell
Psychology Department
University of Guelph

Centennial College Time 1

Do you have a co-op position lined up for January 2018? Did you interview for this job?
If so, please consider participating in this online survey, which is a joint venture between Centennial College and the University of Guelph. We are exploring how co-op students' interview strategies affect their experience on the job, and would like your help.

If you complete this survey (about strategies used in your co-op interview) and the follow-up survey that will be sent out in February 2018 (about your experience on the job), you will receive a $5 Starbucks e-gift card. To participate or learn more about this research, follow this link https://uoguelph.eu.qualtrics.com/jfe/form/SV_bKHqmhNeICdB8eV.

Thank you,

Brooke Charbonneau and Deborah Powell
Psychology Department
University of Guelph

Centennial College Time 2

Thank you so much for filling out our survey about co-op interviews last semester. We've got one more short survey for you to fill out before you get your Starbucks gift card: https://uoguelph.eu.qualtrics.com/jfe/form/SV_0BUYnXDfzzEtU9v.

Please consider participating in this follow-up survey, which is a joint venture between Centennial College and the University of Guelph. We are exploring how co-op students' interview strategies affect their experience on the job, and would like your help. If you complete this survey about your experience at your co-op job, you will receive a $5 Starbucks e-gift card.

Thank you,

Brooke Charbonneau and Deborah Powell
Psychology Department
University of Guelph
Appendix C

Consent Forms

Time 1

CONSENT TO PARTICIPATE IN RESEARCH

Impact of Interview Strategies on New Employees – Part 1

*Please read the following carefully before consenting.*

Thank you for taking the time to consider this survey. My name is Brooke Charbonneau and I'm a graduate student in the Psychology department at the University of Guelph. I’m working with Dr. Deborah Powell and we’re looking into how co-op students' interview strategies affect their experience on the job. This research will contribute to my Master’s thesis, and is sponsored by SSHRC.

If you have any questions or concerns about the research, please feel free to contact:

- Student researcher: Brooke Charbonneau at charbonb@uoguelph.ca or (519) 820-9165.
- Advisor: Dr. Deborah Powell at dpowell@uoguelph.ca or (519) 824-4120, x52167.

PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

Some employees are happier and more satisfied with their job than others. We want to figure out why these employees are happier, and if interview strategies have any long-term effects on new employees.

PROCEDURES

To be eligible to participate, you must be a co-op of student at the University of Guelph who has interviewed for a job for the Winter 2018 work term.

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

- Think about your Winter 2018 co-op job, and the interview you had to obtain that position.
- Answer the survey questions while thinking about that interview. This should take approximately 15-20 minutes.
- Complete the follow-up survey in February 2018, which will be sent by your co-op advisor. This survey should also take approximately 15-20 minutes.

If you’re interested in seeing the results of this study, please look for Brooke Charbonneau’s Master’s thesis online at the University of Guelph Atrium ([https://atrium.lib.uoguelph.ca/xmlui/](https://atrium.lib.uoguelph.ca/xmlui/)) in September 2018.
POTENTIAL RISKS AND DISCOMFORTS

Participation in this research project should not pose any risk to your education or co-op employment. All your surveys responses will be kept confidential from the University of Guelph and your co-op employer, and they will not find out if you completed this survey or not. However, please note that confidentiality cannot be guaranteed while data are in transit over the internet. To reduce the risk of your employer seeing your responses, please do not complete this survey at your co-op placement site.

Additionally, you may feel uncomfortable with some of the survey questions. You are free to skip any questions that make you feel uncomfortable. If you would like to discuss any feelings you have related to this survey or your interview experience, you are invited to contact your co-op advisor or the University of Guelph Counselling Centre.

POTENTIAL BENEFITS TO PARTICIPANTS AND/OR TO SOCIETY

There are no direct benefits to participating in this research. However:

- The results from this survey will be used to advise the University of Guelph’s co-op program on how to best prepare their students for interviews.
- These survey results will also be used to add to the research on job interviews and the long-term effect of interview strategies.

PAYMENT FOR PARTICIPATION

This study is composed of two online surveys: this survey and a follow-up survey that will be sent out in February 2018. If you complete both surveys, we will send a $5 Starbucks e-gift card to the e-mail address you give us in the survey.

CONFIDENTIALITY

Every effort will be made to ensure confidentiality of any identifying information that is obtained in connection with this study.

You will be assigned an Identification Code, and all identifying data (i.e., your e-mail address and position title) will be deleted on March 1st 2018. The unidentified data will be stored online indefinitely. Results will be presented in a collective format that will not identify any one person.

PARTICIPATION AND WITHDRAWAL

You can choose whether to be in this study or not. If you volunteer to be in this study and complete the survey, you may withdraw your data any time before March 1st 2018 without consequences of any kind. If you choose to do so, email Brooke Charbonneau at charbonb@uoguelph.ca to withdraw your data from the study. You may also refuse to answer any questions you don’t want to answer and still remain in the study.
RIGHTS OF RESEARCH PARTICIPANTS

You may withdraw your consent any time before March 1st 2018 and discontinue participation without penalty. You are not waiving any legal claims, rights or remedies because of your participation in this research study. This project has been reviewed by the Research Ethics Board for compliance with federal guidelines for research involving human participants. If you have questions regarding your rights as a research participant, contact:

Sandy Auld  
Director, Research Ethics  
University of Guelph  
437 University Centre  
Guelph, ON  
Telephone: (519) 824-4120, ext. 56606  
E-mail: sauld@uoguelph.ca  
Fax: (519) 821-5236

SIGNATURE OF RESEARCH PARTICIPANT

I have read the information provided for the study “Impact of Interview Strategies on New Employees” as described herein. My questions have been answered to my satisfaction, and I agree to participate in this study.

By clicking “I consent” you will be implying consent and will be directed to the survey questions. If you choose not to consent please choose to withdraw and close your browser.

Yes, I consent  
No, I withdraw

Time 2

CONSENT TO PARTICIPATE IN RESEARCH

Impact of Interview Strategies on New Employees – Part 2

Please read the following carefully before consenting.

Thank you for taking the time to consider this survey. My name is Brooke Charbonneau and I'm a graduate student in the Psychology department at the University of Guelph. I'm working with Dr. Deborah Powell and we're looking into how co-op students' interview strategies affect their experience on the job. This research will contribute to my Master’s thesis, and is sponsored by SSHRC.

If you have any questions or concerns about the research, please feel free to contact:
PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

Some employees are happier and more satisfied with their job than others. We want to figure out why these employees are happier, and if interview strategies have any long-term effects on new employees.

PROCEDURES

To be eligible to participate, you must be a co-op of student at the University of Guelph who has interviewed for a job for the Winter 2018 work term and completed our initial survey on interview strategies.

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

- Think about your Winter 2018 co-op job and answer the survey questions. This should take approximately 15-20 minutes.

If you’re interested in seeing the results of this study, please look for Brooke Charbonneau’s Master’s thesis online at the University of Guelph Atrium (https://atrium.lib.uoguelph.ca/xmlui/) in September 2018.

POTENTIAL RISKS AND DISCOMFORTS

Participation in this research project should not pose any risk to your education or co-op employment. All your surveys responses will be kept confidential from the University of Guelph and your co-op employer, and they will not find out if you completed this survey or not. However, please note that confidentiality cannot be guaranteed while data are in transit over the internet. To reduce the risk of your employer seeing your responses, please do not complete this survey at your co-op placement site.

Additionally, you may feel uncomfortable with some of the survey questions. You are free to skip any questions that make you feel uncomfortable. If you would like to discuss any feelings you have related to this survey or your interview experience, you are invited to contact your co-op advisor or the University of Guelph Counselling Centre.

POTENTIAL BENEFITS TO PARTICIPANTS AND/OR TO SOCIETY

There are no direct benefits to participating in this research. However:

- The results from this survey will be used to advise the University of Guelph’s co-op program on how to best prepare their students for interviews.
- These survey results will also be used to add to the research on job interviews and the long-term effect of interview strategies.
PAYMENT FOR PARTICIPATION

If you complete this survey, we will send a $5 Starbucks e-gift card to the e-mail address you give us in the survey.

CONFIDENTIALITY

Every effort will be made to ensure confidentiality of any identifying information that is obtained in connection with this study.

You will be assigned an Identification Code, and all identifying data (i.e., your e-mail address and position title) will be deleted on March 6th 2018. The unidentified data will be stored online indefinitely. Results will be presented in a collective format that will not identify any one person.

PARTICIPATION AND WITHDRAWAL

You can choose whether to be in this study or not. If you volunteer to be in this study and complete the survey, you may withdraw your data any time before March 6th 2018 without consequences of any kind. If you choose to do so, email Brooke Charbonneau at charbonb@uoguelph.ca to withdraw your data from the study. You may also refuse to answer any questions you don’t want to answer and still remain in the study.

RIGHTS OF RESEARCH PARTICIPANTS

You may withdraw your consent any time before March 6th 2018 and discontinue participation without penalty. You are not waiving any legal claims, rights or remedies because of your participation in this research study. This project has been reviewed by the Research Ethics Board for compliance with federal guidelines for research involving human participants. If you have questions regarding your rights as a research participant, contact:

Sandy Auld
Director, Research Ethics
University of Guelph
437 University Centre
Guelph, ON N1G 2W1

Telephone: (519) 824-4120, ext. 56606
E-mail: sauld@uoguelph.ca
Fax: (519) 821-5236

SIGNATURE OF RESEARCH PARTICIPANT

I have read the information provided for the study “Impact of Interview Strategies on New Employees” as described herein. My questions have been answered to my satisfaction, and I agree to participate in this study.

Click here to print this form
By clicking “I consent” you will be implying consent and will be directed to the survey questions. If you choose not to consent please choose to withdraw and close your browser.

Yes, I consent
No, I withdraw
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Bourdage, Roulin and Tarraf's (2015) Interview Faking Behavior-Short Scale

_Slight Image Creation_

1. I exaggerated my responsibilities on my previous jobs.
2. I distorted my answers based on the comments or reactions of the interviewer.
3. I distorted my answers to emphasize what the interviewer was looking for.
4. I inflated the fit between my values and goals and values and goals of the organization.

_Extensive Image Creation_

5. I told fictional stories prepared in advance of the interview to best present my credentials.
6. I made up stories about my work experiences that were well developed and logical.
7. I invented some work situations or accomplishments that did not really occur.
8. When I did not have a good answer, I borrowed work experiences of other people and made them sound like my own.

_Ingratiation_

9. I tried to find out interviewer's views and incorporate them in my answers as my own.
10. I tried to express the same opinions and attitudes as the interviewer.
11. I tried to appear similar to the interviewer in terms of values, attitudes, or beliefs.
12. I complimented the organization on something, however insignificant it may actually be to me.

_Image Protection_

13. When asked directly, I did not mention my true reason for quitting previous jobs.
14. When asked directly, I did not mention some problems I had in past jobs.
15. I covered up some "skeletons in my closet."
16. I clearly separated myself from my past work experiences that would reflect poorly on me.
Appendix E

Saks and Ashforth's (1997) Perceived Person-Job Fit Scale

1. To what extent does your new job measure up to the kind of job you were seeking?

2. To what extent do your knowledge, skills, and abilities match the requirements of the job?

3. To what extent does the job fulfill your needs?

4. To what extent is the job a good match for you?

5. To what extent does the job enable you to do the kind of work you want to do?
Appendix F

Saks and Ashforth's (1997) Perceived Person-Organization Fit Scale

1. To what extent does your new organization measure up to the kind of organization you were seeking?

2. To what extent are the values of the organization similar to your own values?

3. To what extent does your personality match the personality or image of the organization?

4. To what extent does the organization fulfil your needs?

5. To what extent is the organization a good match for you?
Appendix G

Lambert, Hogan, Camp and Ventura's (2006) Job Stress Scale

1. A lot of time my job makes me very frustrated or angry.

2. I am usually under a lot of pressure when I am at work.

3. When I’m at work I often feel tense or uptight.

4. I am usually calm and at ease when I’m working. (reverse coded)

5. There are a lot of aspects of my job that make me upset.
Appendix H


1. My job made me feel at ease.
2. My job made me feel angry. (R)
3. My job made me feel annoyed. (R)
4. My job made me feel anxious. (R)
5. My job made me feel bored. (R)
6. My job made me feel cheerful.
7. My job made me feel calm.
8. My job made me feel confused. (R)
9. My job made me feel content.
10. My job made me feel depressed. (R)
11. My job made me feel disgusted. (R)
12. My job made me feel discouraged. (R)
13. My job made me feel elated.
14. My job made me feel energetic.
15. My job made me feel excited.
16. My job made me feel ecstatic.
17. My job made me feel enthusiastic.
18. My job made me feel frightened. (R)
19. My job made me feel frustrated. (R)
20. My job made me feel furious. (R)
21. My job made me feel gloomy. (R)
22. My job made me feel fatigued. (R)
23. My job made me feel happy.
24. My job made me feel intimidated. (R)
25. My job made me feel inspired.
26. My job made me feel miserable. (R)
27. My job made me feel pleased.
28. My job made me feel proud.
29. My job made me feel satisfied.
30. My job made me feel relaxed.
Appendix I

Saks' (2006) Job Engagement Scale

1. I really “throw” myself into my job.

2. Sometimes I am so into my job that I lose track of time.

3. This job is all consuming; I am totally into it.

4. My mind often wanders and I think of other things when doing my job (R).

5. I am highly engaged in this job.
Appendix J

Control Variable Scales

**Breaugh’s (1998) Global Autonomy Scale**

1. I am allowed to decide how to go about getting my job done (the methods I use).
2. I am able to choose the way to go about my job (the procedures to utilize).
3. I am free to choose the method(s) to use in carrying out my work.
4. I have control over the scheduling of my work.
5. I have some control over the sequencing of my work activities (when I do what).
6. My job is such that I can decide when to do particular work activities.
7. My job allows me to modify the normal way we are evaluated so that I can emphasize some aspects of my job and play down others.
8. I am able to modify what my job objectives are (what I am supposed to accomplish).
9. I have some control over what I am supposed to accomplish (what my supervisor sees as my objectives).

**Rizzo, House, & Lirtzman’s (1970) Role Ambiguity Scale**

1. I have clear, planned goals and objectives for my job.
2. I know that I have divided my time properly.
3. I know what my responsibilities are.
4. I know exactly what is expected of me.
5. I feel certain about how much authority I have.
6. Explanation is clear of what has to be done.
## Appendix K

### Outliers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Participant Number</th>
<th>Raw Score</th>
<th>Z-Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deceptive Impression Management</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fit</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>-3.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>66</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>-3.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Stress</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>-4.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affective Well-Being</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>3.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Engagement</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role Clarity</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>-4.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Autonomy</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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R Analysis Scripts

library(tidyverse)
library(apaTables)
library(lavaan)
library(MBESS)

#calculate correlations, means and sds
apa.cor.table(as.data.frame(analytic_data), filename="Table1_thesis.doc", table.number=1)

#enter model with control variables into R and run path analysis
control_model <-
  fit ~ a*dim
  wb ~ b*fit + f*ga + i*ra + k*dim
  js ~ c*fit + e*ga + h*ra + l*dim
  je ~ d*fit + g*ga + j*ra + m*dim

wb~~js
wb~~je
je~~js

indirect.wb := a*b
indirect.js := a*c
indirect.je := a*d'

control_model_fit <- sem(model=control_model, data=analytic_data, estimator = "MLM", bootstrap=1000)
summary(control_model_fit, standardized=TRUE, fit.measures=TRUE, rsquare = TRUE)
parameterEstimates(control_model_fit, ci=TRUE, level = 0.95, boot.ci.type = "norm", standardized = TRUE)

#enter model without control variables or je-dim direct effect into R and run path analysis
full_model <-
  fit ~ a*dim
  wb ~ b*fit + e*dim
  js ~ c*fit + f*dim
  je ~ d*fit

wb~~js
wb~~je
je~~js

indirect.wb := a*b
indirect.js := a*c
indirect.je := a*d'

#calculate path analysis model fit
full_model_fit <- sem(model=full_model, data=analytic_data, estimator = "MLM", bootstrap=1000)
summary(full_model_fit, standardized=TRUE, fit.measures=TRUE)
parameterEstimates(full_model_fit, ci=TRUE, level = 0.95, standardized = TRUE)

#calculate total wb - dim effect
wb_model <- 'wb ~ a*dim'

wb_model_fit <- sem(model=wb_model, data=analytic_data, estimator = "MLM", bootstrap=1000)
standardizedSolution(wb_model_fit)
summary(wb_model_fit, standardized=TRUE, rsquare = TRUE)

#calculate total js - dim effect
js_model <- 'js ~ a*dim'

js_model_fit <- sem(model=js_model, data=analytic_data, estimator = "MLM", bootstrap=1000)
standardizedSolution(js_model_fit)
summary(js_model_fit, standardized=TRUE, rsquare = TRUE)

#calculate total je - dim effect
je_model <- 'je ~ a*dim'

je_model_fit <- sem(model=je_model, data=analytic_data, estimator = "MLM", bootstrap=1000)
standardizedSolution(je_model_fit)
summary(je_model_fit, standardized=TRUE)

#mediation effect sizes - upsilon
upsilon(x=js_analytic_data$dim, mediator=js_analytic_data$fit, dv=js_analytic_data$js, conf.level=0.95, bootstrap=TRUE)
upsilon(x=wb_analytic_data$dim, mediator=wb_analytic_data$fit, dv=wb_analytic_data$wb, conf.level=0.95, bootstrap=TRUE)
upsilon(x=je_analytic_data$dim, mediator=je_analytic_data$fit, dv=je_analytic_data$je, conf.level=0.95, bootstrap=TRUE)
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Post-Hoc Power Analyses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Actual effect size</th>
<th>Power Achieved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Correlational effect size power calculations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H1 Deceptive IM and fit</td>
<td>$r = -.11$</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2 Fit and job stress</td>
<td>$r = -.52$</td>
<td>0.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H3 Fit and affective well-being</td>
<td>$r = .74$</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H4 Fit and employee engagement</td>
<td>$r = .61$</td>
<td>0.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monte Carlo simulations for mediation power calculations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H5 Deceptive IM and job stress, mediated by fit</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H6 Deceptive IM and affective well-being, mediated by fit</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H7 Deceptive IM and employee engagement, mediated by fit</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>0.21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>