

Categorization Of Faking Patterns In Relation To Job Tenure And Frequency Of Interview Experience

¹Dr. Meenakshi Sharma, ²Mr.Sandeep Saxena, ³Mr.Sunny Masand

¹Professor-RNB Global University-Bikaner

²Assistant Professor-RNB Global University-Bikaner

³Assistant Professor-RNB Global University-Bikaner

Abstract

This research aims to characterize deceptive behaviors commonly exhibited by job applicants, including both recent graduates and experienced professionals, during the selection interview process. The study involved 258 participants selected based on the following criteria: (1) employment at companies in Gurgaon City, (2) inclusion of both fresh graduates and experienced individuals, and (3) willingness to participate in the research. The participants were chosen randomly and administered Levashina's Likert scale to assess faking behavior.

The raw data were analyzed using descriptive statistics, frequency distribution tables, and crosstabs to present an overview of faking tendencies among both groups of subjects. The findings revealed that 162 respondents (62%) predominantly employed Image Protection (IP) as their faking mechanism, followed by 55 individuals (21%) using Extensive Image Protection. Integration was observed in 20 interviewees (8%), slightly different from the total employing Slight Image Creation (SIC), which amounted to 21 subjects (8%). Additionally, both fresh graduates and experienced interviewees exhibited the highest percentage of each faking type, ranging from 1-3 occurrences.

Keywords: Type of Faking, Job Interview, Applicants, Image Protection, Extensive Image Creation, Slight Image Creation, Ingratiation.

Introduction

Human resources are obviously the most pivotal assets in a company. The advance level of the company is strongly related to their performance and productivity. Therefore, to recruit the ones with outstanding performances takes an adequate process of selection (Garaika and Helisia 2019; Utomo and Meilan, 2007; Poernomo and Hartono, 2019).

Selection process is the crucial steps to determine which candidate deserve the vacant position (Hamali, 2018; Garaika and Helisia, 2019; Sunyoto, 2012). Its main objectives are to hire the one with good capability and skill supporting their jobs and to minimize the likelihood of hiring the wrong person who naturally doesn't meet the expected qualification (Garaika and Helisia, 2019)

Hunter pointed out that there are various methods to screen and assess the candidates which is predictively valid such as general ability test, mental ability test, personality test, and work sample test (Law, et.al., 2016). However, interview is still widely used in the decision-making process (Huffcutt and Culbertson, in Law., 2016).

Interviewing is still the most popular technic applied for selection process due to its reliable effectivity and high flexibility (Reddy, 2016). However, some shortcomings are inevitable during the process. One of them is impression management explicitly depicting as a faking within the interview process.

Faking is a deliberate distortion or fabrication by interviewee when responding the interviewer in order to impress or mislead the latter with the best made-up answers (Comrey and Backer; Furnham; Stark, et al., in Levashina and Campion 2007). Furthermore Levashina and Campion (2007) also clarify that applicants, during the selection process, fake to diminish the difference between what they assume they can contribute and what necessary for the job being applied in which they consequently create, change and adjust the description of the competences to their job experience.

Levashina and Campion (2007) categorize 4 models of faking at interview: (1) Slight image creation, the little attempt to fake for managing good impression from a candidate by exaggerating their job experiences.; (2) Extensive image creation, the interviewee falsify their job experiences report which actually are never there.; (3) Image protection, an attempt to defend oneself by ignoring the experiences related to one's bad job performances; and (4) Deceptive ingratiation, an attempt to impress the interviewer by giving them "insincere" compliments.

Many studies conclude that people are basically able to convincingly manipulate their elicited emotions, attitudes, and even personal characteristics (DePaulo, in Levashina and Campion 2007) which are unfortunately hardly detectable (Barrick and Mount; Furnham; McFarland and Ryan; Sackett and Harris; Sackett and Wanek; Toris DePaulo, in Levashina and Campion 2007). This strategy is committed by the applicants to give impression that as if he/she meets requirements for the job they are applying (Goffin and Boyd; Marcus, in Kiefer and Benit, 2016) and they strongly believe that it is necessary to be successful in the recruitment (Griffith et al.; Ellingson and McFarland, in Kiefer and Benit, 2016) which eventually turn

to be a motive for someone to do faking since it is regarded as potentially valid tactic for passing interview. Overall, this current study is intended to depict quantitatively the types of faking experiences the applicants have ever had. The result will map the faking behaviour committed at the moment they were being selected at the recruitment process. This research is the continuation of the previous one which consist only of limited subjects, 69, at the one particular company in which the result indicated that Slight Image Creation type was the mostly applied while Ingratiation was the less frequently one. (Akmal, et al., 2020). Furthermore, it is more comprehensive since the large number of subjects who were being recruited from various companies,

Method

The approach of the study is by means of descriptive quantitative method with ‘faking’ as the main variable. This kind of method is essentially intended to describe the collected quantitative data related to a condition of subjects deriving from one particular group. Data was obtained from the analysed scores of the Likert scales, built by Leyashina and Campion (2007) answered by the applicants being interviewed at a few companies between January and March 2021. This study was participated by 258 subjects following the interview section with the criteria as follow: (1) those being selected at the companies in Gurgaon City (2) Both fresh graduates who had never been interviewed and the working experienced ones (3) Willingness to participate in the research.

The sampling technic is the accidental one, whosoever met by chance the researcher could be included for the sample on the condition that they meet the purpose of the study. The collected data were further analysed descriptively by the table of frequency distribution and of crosstab to discover the types of faking from the work-experienced interviewee.

Results

The ensuing table is the description of the group of interviewees based on their tenure:

Table 1: Group of Subjects Based on Their Tenure

Job Experiences	F	%
Fresh graduate	140	54,3
1 – 3 years	62	24,0
3 – 5 years	15	5,8
5 – 10 years	17	6,6
> 10 years	24	9,3
Total	258	100,0

Table 1 illustrates that based on the tenure of the subjects; the highest percentage was fresh graduates, as many as 140 subjects (54,3%). This group consisted of the applicants whose tenure were less than 1 year. While the lowest one was those with more-than 10-year tenure, around 9 subjects (3,5 %)

Furthermore, the description based on the experience of being interviewed is as follow,

Table 2: Subject Characteristics based on Experience of being Interviewed

Experience of Being Interviewed	F	%
First timer	3	1,2
1 – 3 times	205	79,5
3 – 5 times	19	7,4
5 – 10 times	22	8,5
> 10 times	9	3,5
Total	258	100,0

Table 2 shows that out of 258 applicants being the respondent of the research, those with 1-3 times of experience of being interviewed was as many as 205 subjects (79,5%) while the first timer is the least, only 3 subjects (1,2%). It implies that the majority of the samples (255) are relatively familiar with the interview process. The analysis to describe the type of faking based on their tenures used crosstab. The final result is as follow:

Table 3: The Result of Crosstab between Tenure of the Interviewee with The Types of Faking

Job Experienced	Type of Faking									
	EIC		IP		I		SIC		Total	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	F	%	Total	%
fresh graduate	36	14%	79	31%	9	3%	16	6%	140	54%
1 – 3 years	9	3%	46	18%	5	2%	2	1%	62	24%
3 – 5 years	4	2%	9	3%	1	0%	1	0%	15	6%
5 – 10 years	4	2%	11	4%	2	1%	0	0%	17	7%
> 10 years	2	1%	17	7%	3	1%	2	1%	24	9%
Total	55	21%	162	63%	20	8%	21	8%	258	100%

Table 4: The Result of Crosstab between Experience of Being Interviewed and Types of Faking

Experience of Being Interviewed	Type of Faking									
	EIC		IP		I		SIC		Total	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	F	%	Total	%
Never	1	0%	2	1%	0	0%	0	0%	3	1%
1 – 3 times	47	18%	124	48%	15	6%	19	7%	205	79%
3 – 5 times	2	1%	12	5%	3	1%	2	1%	19	7%
5 – 10 times	5	2%	16	6%	1	0%	0	0%	22	9%
> 10 times	0	0%	8	3%	1	0%	0	0%	9	3%
Total	55	21%	162	63%	20	8%	21	8%	258	100%

From the result of Crosstab (see table 3 and 4), there are apparently 162 applicants (63%) who mostly applied Image Protection (IP) as an attempt to fake during the process of interview. It is followed with 55 applicants with Extensive Image Creation (EIC), 21%. Integration was committed by 20 interviewers (8%) which was slightly different from the total of the those using Slight Image Creation (SIC) which was as much as 21 subjects (8%). Aside from that, the fresh graduates and the interviewee with interview experiences have the highest percentage for each type of faking, as many as 1-3 times.

Discussion

The result of the study is compatible with previous one in which the one-year-tenure interviewees mostly used the types of faking: Extensive image creation (EIC) dan Image Protection(IP) (Akmal, et al., 2020). This one is parallel as well with Levashina’s in 2007 where the result revealed that the fresh graduates were prone to fake with all of its types.

The contrast was just evinced from the fresh graduates’ one in which Image Protection (IP) was the most common one to attract the interviewer while from the earlier study they preferred Slight Image Creation (SIC) (Akmal, et al., 2020).

The most likely explanation of the difference between the current and previous research is the motivation to be untrue when being surveyed related to higher faking level. This is actually proven in Levashina’s study (2007) wherein at the 6th study, the one on faking behaviour at job simulation interview is lower than the 5th study on the real job interview which of course the former’s is lower than the latter’s. Roulin, et al., (2014) strengthen with their findings that work experience and culture are able to lead one’s intention to do Impression Management (IM) for working-experienced candidate can build their opinion from their previous career while the fresh graduate interviewee takes more effort to build their image to compensate their insufficient experiences. The manifestation of their intention by the time committing IM can also be discerned from cultural perspective. In Swiss, people value higher politeness and self-promotion higher than in USA.

It is worsened by the pandemic hitting the economy sector causing tremendous number of employee lost their jobs and hard to find the new one. As Kelly authored in the article (2020) that many subjects interviewed admitted that they found it uneasy to deal with the situation and insensible question during the interview. He (2021) added that interview is similar to pageant contest where the participant must expose their best properties. Naturally, it turns to be the main reason why most of them make up their mind to fake.

On the other hand, Law, et al., (2016) assume that an individual who own low level of honesty and modesty is likely to apply Impression Management (IM), same as other type of faking Slight Image Creation (SIC), Extensive Image Creation (EIC), and Image Protection (IP) when being interviewed. Yu (2008) revealed that level of one’s integrity and intelligence serve also as the factor of doing. The previous findings also strengthen this as well (Akmal, et al., 2021), that the family background and intelligence enable one to fake or not.

Kelly (2021), argues further that dishonest when responding the interviewer is very likely to frequently take place

without and hardly detectable by interviewer. However, to cover one's lies takes another lie will continuously happen and it will naturally negatively impact to the doer or to the company they work for (Fleming & Zyglidopoulos, in Hogue, M., Levashina, J., Hang H., 2013).

Conclusion

To sum up, the result illustrates that out of 258 research participants, there are 165 of them (63%) applying Image Protection (IP) as their faking attempt during the interview. It is followed with Extensive Image Creation (EIC) as many as 55 (21%) On the other side Integration (I) and Slight Image Creation (SIC) are slightly different at their percentage: 20 (8%) and 21 (8%) respectively, Moreover, the proportion of the fresh graduates and the interviewee with interviewing experiences is 1-3 times, having higher percentage for each type of faking.

References

1. Akmal, Mukhaira El, et al. "Gambaran Perilaku Faking Pada Kegiatan Wawancara Kerja." *Jurnal Psikologi: Media Ilmiah Psikologi*, vol. 18, no. 1, 2021, pp. 20-29.
2. Akmal, Mukhaira El, et al. "Self awareness dan Perilaku Faking Pada Kegiatan Wawancara Kerja Karyawan." *Psyche 165 Journal*, 2021, pp. 45-52.
3. pp. 45-52.
4. Garaika, and Helisia Margahana. "Peran Seleksi (Selection) Tenaga Kerja Yang Tepat Terhadap Tercapainya Tujuan Organisasi." *Jurnal Aktual STIE Trisna Negara*, vol. 17, no. 2, 2019, pp. 133-41.
5. pp. 133-41.
6. Hamali, Arif Yusuf. *Pemahaman Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia: Strategi Mengelola Karyawan*. Center for Academic Publishing Service, 2018.
7. Utomo, Hastho Joko Nur, and Meilan Sugiarto. *Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia*. Ardana Media, 2007.
8. Hogue, Mary, et al. "Will I Fake It? The Interplay of Gender, Machiavellianism, and Self-Monitoring on Strategies for Honesty in Job Interviews." *Journal of Business Ethics*, vol. 117, no. 2, 2013, pp. 399-411.
9. Kelly, Jack. "The Rude, Inconsiderate Things Job Seekers are Forced to Endure in the Job Search and Interviewing Process." *Forbes*, 2020.
10. Kelly, Jack. "The Truth about Everyone Lying in the Interview Process." *Forbes*, 2021.
11. Kiefer, Christoph, and Nils Benit. "What is Applicant Faking Behavior? A Review on the Current State of Theory and Modeling Techniques." *Journal of European Psychology Students*, vol. 7, no. 1, 2016, pp. 9-19.
12. Law, Stephanie J., et al. "To Fake or Not to Fake: Antecedents to Interview Faking, Warning Instructions, and Its Impact on Applicant Reactions." *Frontiers in Psychology*, 2016.
13. Levashina, Julia, and Michael A. Campion.
14. "Measuring Faking in Employment Interview: Development & Validation of an Interview Faking Behavior Scale." *Journal of Applied Psychology*, vol. 92, no. 6, 2007, pp. 1638-56.
15. Poernomo, Hadi and Hartono. "Pengaruh Rekrutmen dan Seleksi Terhadap Kinerja Karyawan PT. Telkom Indonesia, Tbk Cabang Sidoarjo." *J-MACC : Journal of Management and Accounting*, vol. 2, no. 1, 2019, pp. 87-101.
16. Reddy, Chitra. "Why Interviews are Important in Recruitment Process?." *Wisestep*, 2016, <https://content.wisestep.com/interviews-important-recruitment-process>