

CONVERGENCE OF DIFFERENCE SCORES AND SCALES OF SOCIALLY DESIRABLE RESPONDING: TOWARDS A MULTIDIMENSIONAL APPROACH IN THE ASSESSMENT OF FAKING

Arta Dodaj

(Corresponding Author)

Department of Psychology, University of Mostar,
Matice Hrvatske bb,
88 000 Mostar, Bosnia and Herzegovina.

E-mail: artadodaj@gmail.com

Kristina Sesar,

Center for Mental Health, Health Center Široki Brijeg, Široki
Brijeg, Bosnia and Herzegovina

ABSTRACT

In past research results of faking behavior on personality questionnaires are quite inconsistent. The reason of the discrepancies regarding the prevalence and consequences of faking may be the result of lack of clear operationalization of faking behavior. So the present research tested do two faking measures i.e. operationalization (difference scores and social desirability scales) tend to yield similar conclusion regarding the Paulhus model of socially desirable responding. Study was conducted on dependent sample of participants in three different motivational conditions: respondents first filled out questionnaires in honest conditions, then had to present themselves like an ideal manager job-applicants (induced egoistic bias) and teacher job applicants (induced moralistic bias). The results showed that two measures of faking yield similar results.

Key words: difference scores, impression management, self-deception, egoistic bias, moralistic bias, personality trait

1. Introduction

The 1990s brought resurgence in the use of personality when explaining work behavior (Hough & Ones, 2001). The increased use of personality measures in personnel selection can be attributed to the publication of well-developed taxonomies of personality traits (e. g., the Big Five; Hogan, Hogan, & Roberts, 1996) and the meta-analytic cumulation (Hunter & Schmidt, 2004) of the extent literature using these taxonomies. Several meta-analyses have examined the validity of various personality scales when predicting a wide range of work behaviors (Barrick & Mount, 1991; Hurtz & Donovan, 2000; Salgado, 1997; Tett, Jackson, & Rothstein, 1991). Specifically, these studies clearly indicated the importance of personality traits in prediction of work behavior. However, despite the fact that personality traits predict various aspects of work behavior, skepticism about their validity and applicability for selection purposes is maintained due to the observed low correlations between personality traits and job performance (Morgeson et al., 2007). Certainly the greatest cause of low correlations of personality traits with job performance is the ability of participants to distort their responses on personality questionnaires (Goffin & Christiansen, 2003; Luther & Thornton, 1999; Morgeson et al., 2007).

Most researches when dealing with detecting response distortion of personality inventories heavily rely on the use of social desirability to determine response distortion (Christiansen, et al., 1994; Ones, & Viswesvaran, 1998; Ones, Viswesvaran, & Reiss, 1996). These scales include a number of desirable but false statements (e.g., "I will always tell the truth.") or undesirable but true statements (e. g., "Sometimes I talk about things which I know a little or nothing."). Agreement with the desirable statements and disagreement with an undesirable statement is considered to be an incredible event, and the total score on a scale as indicator of deliberate response distortion. Consequently, the results serve to identify candidates who give excessively positive self-descriptions i. e. for correction the fundamental scales of personality questionnaires (Salgado, 2005). Specifically this indicates that socially desirable responding is tendencies to give responses that make the respondents appear more favorable than they really are (Paulhus, 1991). First scale of social desirability was developed by Ruch in 1942, which was to detect 'positivity bias' or 'defensiveness' while responding to personality measures (by Quist, Arora & Griffith, 2007). The development of Response Validity Scales was quickly followed (Meehl & Hathaway, 1946; by Quist, Arora & Griffith, 2007). MMPI also used L-scale to detect faking, which was later replaced by the K-scale (by Quist, Arora & Griffith, 2007). Other recently used scale of social desirability are Edwards social desirability scale (1957), Marlow-Crowne social desirability scale (1960) and Paulhus Comprehensive Inventory of Desirable Responding (2002) (by Quist, Arora & Griffith, 2007). Generally most accepted as reliable and valid measure of faking behavior is Paulhus (2002) Comprehensive Inventory of Desirable Responding, a 80-item inventory containing four subscales, two for self-deception and two for impression management. According to Paulhus (2002) socially desirable responses occur on the content and process level. On the content level egoistic bias can be distinguished (which refers to the exaggeration one's social and intellectual status) and moralistic bias (which refers to the denial socially-deviant attributes). Each of these components of the content level are further divided into the process level at the conscious and unconscious distortion. Thus egoistic bias is divided on the unconscious self-deceptive enhancement and conscious agency management, since it is a component that is a result of the value agency. On the other hand, moralistic bias refers to that kind of distortion which is motivated by an evaluation of community, and hence has a unconscious component of self-deceptive denial, and the conscious component of the communion management. According to Paulhus (2002), researchers can use the CIDR in conjunction with self-report personality tests to control for the effects of dishonest responding (i.e., impression management scores).

But some authors indicate that empirical support of these scales is questionable (Burns & Christiansen, 2006) and suggest to use a difference scores obtained in applicant (fake) condition and honest condition as indicators of response distortion (McFarland & Ryan, 2000). They indicate that difference scores can obtain impressive reliabilities when the reliabilities of the tests are high, the correlation between them is small to moderate or negative, and the variance of each test is substantial.

Mersman and Shultz (1998) attempted to test the relationship between the direct measure of response distortion (difference scores) and measure of socially desirable responses. Individuals completed the personality measure under two instructional sets (within subjects), as an applicant and as an incumbent. Interestingly, participants completed the measure of social desirability only under honest condition of responding. Direct measure of distortion was difference scores obtained in a situation of responding as applicant and incumbent. They showed that correlation between direct measure of distortion and social desirability measure was weak and concluded that they measure different aspects of self-presentation. But it must be indicated that one of methodological limitations of the study was application of scales of social desirability only in situation of honest responding. It would be more important to test the relationship between response distortion and scales of social desirability applicated in a situation of applicant responding in a situation where there is high motivation for distortion.

Furthermore, McFarland and Ryan (2006) tested does these two measures of response distortion give different results. In this study faking is assessed in both ways. First, all individuals took the personality questionnaire under instructions to respond honestly and also under instructions to behave like an applicant. The difference between these two scores was a measure of faking. Second, Paulhus's (1991, by McFarland & Ryan, 2006) scale, the Balanced Inventory of Desirable Responding (BIDR), was used as a measure of faking because this is a widely used and researched measure of socially desirable responding. It has been suggested that social desirability scales (particularly measures of self-deception) are more indicative of stable traits than of response distortion elicited by a situation (Christiansen, 1998; Smith & Ellingson, 2002). These scales may not be sensitive enough to detect or measure applicant faking behavior because this type of responding is situationally induced (Ellingson, Sackett, & Hough, 1999; Hough, 1998; Stark et al., 2001). Difference scores, on the other hand, have been shown to be sensitive to situational demands on response distortion (McFarland & Ryan, 2000; Tisak & Smith, 1994). Therefore, it was found that faking, as measured by the social desirability scales, was not predicted as well as with difference scores, because the social desirability scales have not been sensitive to situational demands (i.e., increases or decreases in faking caused by the situational manipulations). These findings provide evidence that the use of different operationalizations of faking may be one of the reasons for discrepancies in the literature about consequences of faking on measurement validity.

A small number of studies of this type are evident by which it indicates the necessity to continue to research multiple operationalization of faking and how they relate to each other. So, the aim of this study is to determine do scales of socially desirable responding and difference scores represent the same construct for positive self-presentation. It was decided to use Comprehensive Inventory of Desirable Responding (CIDR) as a measure of faking because this scale makes the distinction between self-deception and impression management and therefore allows us to examine whether the two scales result in different conclusions when used as a measure of faking.

2. Method

2. 1. Participants

The study was conducted on a sample of 200 students from various study units of Philosophy faculty in Mostar. Students of psychology were excluded from the research because they are familiar with measuring instruments which could have influence on the results of study. The total sample included 166 female and 34 male participants, ranging from 19 to 26 years. Age mean score of age was 21.61 (SD = 1.46).

Since the study included dependent sample of participants, the structure of participants with regard to gender, age and type of study units was equal in all situations of completing the questionnaires (anonymous / honest responding and the situations of the induced distortions by instructions).

2. 2. Instruments

For the purpose of this study a questionnaire was constructed with sociodemographic data. Questionnaire included data on student sex, age, year of study and type of study units.

Personality dimensions were explored by International Personality Item Pool Questionnaire (IPIP, Goldberg, 1999; by Goldberg et al., 2006), which assesses extraversion, emotional stability, conscientiousness, agreeableness and intellect. The questionnaire consists of 50 items, and the respondents rate their agreement with the items on the 7-point scale (from 1="not true" to 7= "completely true"). The total score on each dimension is calculated by adding up all the items that belong to a particular dimension. The range of possible results for each dimension is from 10 to 70.

Alpha coefficients of internal consistency for the subscales of Goldberg's personality questionnaire are from .79 to .87 (Goldberg et al., 2006). In this study the reliability of subscales and alpha coefficients of internal consistency was also examined in all three situations and showed an acceptable reliability ranging from 0.62 to 0.85 (Table 1.).

Table 1. Coefficients of internal consistency (Cronbach α) for five subscales of International Personality Item Pool Questionnaire in three situations of application the questionnaire

Personality traits	Honest	„Manager “	„Teacher “
Extraversion	.79	.79	.71
Agreeableness	.62	.76	.85
Conscientiousness	.73	.85	.85
Emotional stability	.75	.75	.74
Intellect	.69	.79	.76

Furthermore, two measures were used to operationalize faking. First, within the IPIP, we included the items from Paulhus's (2006) Comprehensive Inventory of Desirable Responding (CIDR). The questionnaire has four subscales: Self-deceptive enhancement, Agency management, Self-deceptive denial and Communion management. Each of the scale consists of 20 items, and the respondents were asked to rate their agreement with the items on the 7-point scale (from 1="not true" to 7= "completely true").

Paulhus (2002) socially desirable responding defines as the tendency to give overly positive self-descriptions. Therefore, he states that only extreme answers are just an indicator of socially desirable responses, and recommends a dichotomous scoring as the optimal strategy for evaluating participant's responses (Paulhus, 1984).

However, Stöber, Dette and Musch (2002) found that continuous scoring results in a higher Cronbach coefficients, higher correlations with other measures of socially desirable responses and higher correlations with personality traits that are expected to be associated with socially desirable responding. So, according to this it was decided to use continuous instead of dichotomous scoring the results. The total score on each of the subscales is formed as the sum of recoded assessment on all 20 items of the subscale.

Alpha coefficients of internal consistency obtained in this study showed a reliability ranging from 0.64 to 0.90 (Table 2.). Obtained sizes of coefficients are considered as acceptable because they exceeded the minimum level for research purposes of .60 (Carmines & Zeller, 1979). According to Nunnally and Bernstein (1994, by Li & Bagger, 2007), for basic research purposes it is required a higher minimum level of reliability (.80), but the authors add that for the measuring instruments in the development the value of .70 is sufficient. As the CIDR is still at a relatively early stage of development, obtained size of reliability can be considered as satisfactory. Similar results were obtained in other studies (Galić, Jerneić & Belavić, 2009; Stöber, Dette, & Musch, 2002).

Table 2. Coefficients of internal consistency (Cronbach α) for four subscales of Comprehensive Inventory of Desirable Responding in three situations of application the questionnaire

Subscales of social desirable responding	Honest	„Manager “	„Teacher “
Agency management	.70	.90	.81
Self-deceptive enhancement	.64	.83	.78
Communion management	.80	.82	.86
Self-deceptive denial	.66	.72	.78

Second, another measure of faking behavior was derived for each of the personality scales by subtracting the score received in the honest condition from the score received in the applicant condition. This resulted in five difference scores for each individual (one for each of the five personality scales). Some researchers have criticized the use of difference scores on the grounds that they are essentially meaningless, especially because they are generally unreliable (Edwards, 1993; Edwards & Harrison, 1993), but others have suggested that difference scores can obtain impressive reliabilities when the reliabilities of the tests are high (Rogosa, Brandt, & Zimowski, 1982). Measures used in this study had moderate to high reliability.

Reliability of the difference scores was determined by the following formula of McFarland & Ryan (2000): $r_{dd} = \sigma_d^2 - \sigma_{ed}^2$, where $\sigma_{ed}^2 = \sigma_h^2 (1 - r_{hh}) + \sigma_f^2 (1 - r_{ff})$, with h representing the measure in the honest condition, f the measure in the fake condition, and the variance of the difference score. With the exception of one measure in egoistic distortion (agreeableness), the difference scores had acceptable reliability. Table 3 contains reliability of the difference scores. Thus, further analyses that include the difference scores for this measure should be viewed with caution for the openness personality dimension.

Table 3. Reliabilities for Difference Scores on five subscales of International Personality Item Pool Questionnaire

Personality traits	„Manager “	„Teacher “
Extraversion	.70	.67
Agreeableness	.50	.68
Conscientiousness	.60	.66
Emotional stability	.65	.65
Intellect	.63	.63

2. 3. Procedure

Data were collected in the summer semester of 2011 during lectures. Questionnaires were group applied (the study units) and were not limited in time. Each participant was asked to complete a scale of socially desirable responding and personality questionnaire under three different conditions: (1) honestly-as-possible, (2) as a manager job-applicant and (3) as an teacher job-applicant¹. Items of personality questionnaire and scale of socially desirable responding where mixed in random order and applied as a one questionnaire because of simplicity the application and for disabling participants in noticing that the questionnaires have scales that measures distorted responses. After completing those questionnaires under three different conditions participants filled out a questionnaire with sociodemographic data.

Instruction content for honest responding was follow: *"The aim of the research in which you are participating is to test the quality of a personality questionnaire. Validation of a questionnaire is conducted as part of its consideration for future uses in a variety of practical purposes such as careers consulting, classification procedures for admission to colleges and selection of employees of work organizations. In order to be the tested questionnaire valid, your cooperation is very important. Please fill out the entire questionnaire honestly as possible. Responding to this questionnaire is anonymous and your answers can not be connected with you. In this questionnaire there are statements that describe some usually behaviors of people. Describe yourself as what you see now, not what you would like to be in the future. Describe yourself honestly as much is possible in relation to other people who you know, that are the same gender and approximately the same age as you. "*

In a situation of induced egoistic distortion, participants were asked to present themselves as ideal candidates for job manager. Instruction to the participants in this situation was follow: *"The aim of the research in which you are participating is to learn to what extent people can identify personality traits that are necessary for success in different professions. Therefore, please fill out the entire questionnaire in a way in which you will show yourself as an ideal candidate for the manager of a large entrepreneurial firm. How you could make the task easier, you can imagine that selection for this position that you really want depends on the results of this study. This means that you will not answer questions completely honestly, but in a way in which you will show yourself as most suitable candidate for the job manager. In this questionnaire there are statements that describe some usually behaviors of people. Describe yourself in relation to other people who you know, that are the same gender and approximately the same age as you. "*

¹McFarland (2000) reported that order effects on the level of faking is not a concern, which suggest that it does not need to care out which situation of responding (honest responding or induced response distortion) needs to be given the first.

Second situation of induced distortion was situation of moralistic distortion where were participants asked to represent themselves as ideal candidates for classroom teachers. Instruction for this situation was the same as instruction for egoistic distortion, expect that it differed in the sentences that were specifically related to the position of teachers: "... please fill out the entire questionnaire in a way in which you will show yourself as an ideal candidate for the classroom teacher. (...) this means that you will not answer questions completely honestly, but in a way in which you will show yourself as most suitable candidate for the job of teacher. "

After completing questionnaires, the respondents were offered contact information to which they could address questions regarding the conducted study and questions about obtained results. During the entire procedure of filling the questionnaire experimentator was present to ensure that participants follow the order fulfillment and to ensure that they do not consult with other sources of information, as well as to provide the answer on eventual questions. All questionnaires were filled in one session, and considering that on average it lasted one hour, to the respondents were given a pause before filling the questionnaire in situations of induced distortion.

2. 4. Data analysis

Analysis of the results included testing the difference between components of socially desirable responding in three situations of the application. Also, analysis included the correlation analysis for determination of significant correlation between components of socially desirable responses and differences scores. Statistical analyses were done using Statistica 7.0 (StatSoft, Inc., Tulsa, OK, USA).

3. Results

3. 1. Manipulation Checks

To determine whether the applicant condition was an effective manipulation (i.e., led participants to behave like applicants), multivariate analysis of variance was conducted to compare the honest responses on personality scales to the applicant responses. Statistically significant differences were found in responses on personality dimensions between the three situations of application the questionnaires (Pillai Trace $F = 16.41$, $df = 8 / 2388$, $p < .001$). Univariate analysis of variance showed significant differences on all personality traits between all three conditions of responding. Analyses of the results of these tests are presented in Table 4.

Table 4. Mean scores on the International Personality Item Pool Questionnaire and F ratios for each of the dimension of personality trait in three situations of application the questionnaire

	Honest	„Manager “	„Teacher “	F	df
	Mean±standard deviation	Mean±standard deviation	Mean±standard deviation		
Extraversion	4.43±1.11	5.30±1.10	4.91±0.96	53.96***	2/398
Agreeableness	5.25±0.80	5.30±1.01	5.57±1.19	9.79***	2/398
Conscientiousness	4.64±1.04	5.73±1.14	5.48±1.19	99.37***	2/398
Emotional stability	4.07±1.06	4.97±1.05	4.91±1.05	75.11***	2/398
Intellect	4.63±0.88	5.40±1.06	5.08±1.06	51.54***	2/398

Note: * $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$; *** $p < .001$

Tukey's HSD test showed significant differences between the honest and applicant personality test scores for all expect for the agreeableness. Our findings regarding the ability to fake suggest that, when instructed, participants have the capability to fake non-cognitive measures

Furthermore, Tukey's HSD test showed that in a situation of fictive selection for a manager compared with the situation of honest responding respondents showed themselves as more extravert, emotionally stable, conscientious, as well as having a broader intellect. These results suggest that in the situation of responding as ideal manager job-applicant respondents changed their responses in accordance with the egoistic distortion, but in a small part and in accordance with the moralistic distortion due to the obtained results increase in the dimension of conscientiousness.

On the other hand, compared with the situation of honest responding in a situation of responding as ideal teacher job-applicants, respondents showed themselves more positive on all five personality dimensions. Specifically, they were showed as more extrovert, emotionally stable, agreeable, conscientious and having a broader intellect. The above also indicates that participants in a situation of presenting themselves as an ideal teacher applicant (encouraged moralistic distortion), with a predominantly moralistic distortion resort and to egoistic distortion of responses.

3. 2. Convergence of measures of faking behavior

In order to compare the convergence of measures of faking behavior the relationship between differences scores on personality dimensions and scales of socially desirable responding was determined, in situations of induced distortion. The analyses were conducted on samples which differed in content level instruction of distortion (egoistic and moralistic distortion).

Measure derived for each of the personality scales by subtracting the score received in the honest condition from the score received in the applicant condition represented direct measure of faking behavior. This resulted in five difference scores for each individual (one for each of the five personality scales). In this way formulated measure of faking was correlated with the scores on the scale of socially desirable responding. Because the purpose was to test the convergences of direct measure of faking with scales of socially desirable responding in a situation of distortion, difference scores on personality dimensions were correlated with scales of socially desirable responding only in situations of distortion.

Correlations between the difference scores and the social desirability scales obtained in a situation of simulated selection are shown in a Table 5., for a situation of simulated moralistic distortion and in a Table 6., for a situation of egoistic distortion.

Table 5. Pearson correlation coefficients between difference scores on personality dimensions and components of socially desirable responding in a situation of responding as a manger (egoistic distortion)

Difference scores	„Manager “ responding			
	Agency management	Self-deceptive enhancement	Communion management	Self-deceptive denial
Extraversion	0.48*	0.50*	0.43*	0.44*
Agreeableness	0.15*	0.18*	0.19*	0.25*
Conscientiousness	0.58*	0.54*	0.40*	0.32*
Emotional stability	0.50*	0.50*	0.44*	0.37*
Intellect	0.46*	0.52*	0.41*	0.42*

*p<.05.

Table 6. Pearson correlation coefficients between difference scores on personality dimensions and components of socially desirable responding in a situation of responding as a teacher (moralistic distortion)

Difference scores	„Teacher “ responding			
	Agency management	Self-deceptive enhancement	Communion management	Self-deceptive denial
Extraversion	0.27*	0.36*	0.41*	0.38*
Agreeableness	0.35*	0.46*	0.47*	0.41*
Conscientiousness	0.39*	0.46*	0.51*	0.49*
Emotional stability	0.37*	0.42*	0.50*	0.51*
Intellect	0.40*	0.41*	0.47*	0.40*

* $p < .05$.

Correlation coefficients obtained were statistically significant, what suggests that both measures of faking were at least somewhat successful at detecting this type of responding. However, these correlations were not strong. The strongest correlation coefficient was only .58.

Furthermore, the results indicate that difference scores do not correlate higher with scales of impression management (agency and communion management) compared to the scales of the self-deception (self-deceptive enhancement and denial). The results are not in accordance with Paulhus model by which the scales of self-deception should be more “resistant” to faking because they represent unconscious components of socially desirable responding. This indicates that differences scores and social desirability scales beyond response distortion elicited by a situation measure some aspect of disposition.

By comparing the scales of egoistic distortion in a situation of responding as manager and teacher job-applicant it can be seen that the larger correlations between differences scores and scales of egoistic distortion were in a situation of responding as a manager applicant (except for a dimension agreeableness). On the other hand, comparing the correlation coefficients on the scales of moralistic distortion in those two situations of responding larger correlations between differences scores and scales of moralistic bias were in a situation of responding as teacher job-applicant. Results obtained are consistent with the Paulhus (2002) assumptions about the possibility of splitting distortion responses in egoistic and moralistic bias.

4. Discussion

Our results showed that when subjects desire to do so, they can substantially improve their scores on personality scales. This is consistent with a long line of research on faking (Hough et al., 1990; Kluger et al., 1991; Viswesvaran and Ones, 1999, Griffith, Chmielowski & Yoshita, 2005). The differences in social desirability scale scores across the honest and applicant conditions are not very similar to those that have been found to exist between applicant samples and volunteer samples (e.g., Barrick & Mount, 1996; Vasilopoulos, Reilly, & Leaman, 2000). Magnitude of the differences between the honest and applicant responses mimic found using real applicants (i.e., the difference is similar to that observed between voluntary and applicant samples; Hough, 1998) was approximately a half-standard-deviation. In this study the magnitude of standard-deviation difference between applicant and honest condition was smaller. Although these results are not as drastic as suggested in previous simulation studies they still support the notion that applicant can fake on non-cognitive selection instrument, as well as the applicant manipulation was an effective at eliciting applicant response. But the results can indicate that participants were not so motivated in distortion because it was not real-life situation of appealing for job.

Furthermore, used scale of socially desirable responding in this study is defined by Paulhus model of social desirability (2002). According to Paulhus (2002) socially desirable responses occur on the content and process level. On the content level it egoistic bias can be distinguished (which refers to the exaggeration one's social and intellectual status) and moralistic bias (which refers to the denial of socially-deviant attributes). Each of these components of the content level are further divided into the process level at the conscious and unconscious distortion. Thus egoistic bias is divided on the unconscious self-deceptive enhancement and conscious agency management, since it is a component that is a result of the value agency. On the other hand, moralistic bias is that that kind of distortion motivated by an evaluation of community, and hence has an unconscious component of self-deceptive denial, and the conscious component of the communion management.

If Paulhus's model is accurate, the prominence of a particular form of impression management should depend on the motivation of respondents for self-presentation, while both types of self-deception, self-deceptive enhancement and denial should show the stability between different test situations. Furthermore, scales of egoistic distortion, self-deceptive enhancement and agency management, should be in relationship with such genetic traits as extraversion, emotional stability and intellect, while the scales of moralistic distortion, self-deceptive denial and communion management with personality traits that indicate a value of communion such as conscientiousness and agreeableness (Paulhus & John, 1998).

Analysis of the results showed that the motivational context had influence not only on the results of the scales that measure conscious distortion of responses, but also on the results of the scales that measure unconscious distortion of responses that should be in fact insensitive to the manipulation with instruction. Motivation situations differed with regard to the content of instruction in which respondents were asked to present themselves as ideal manager job-applicants i.e. teacher job-applicants. Comparing the scales of egoistic distortion in a situation of responding as a manager and a teacher applicant, higher correlations between difference scores on personality traits and scales of egoistic distortion were found in a situation of responding as a manager applicant. On the other hand, comparing the correlation coefficients on the scales of moralistic distortion in those two situations of distortion larger correlations between differences scores on personality traits and scales of moralistic bias were in a situation of responding as a teacher applicant. These results suggest that both measures of socially desirable responses can be distinguished on the content level into two types, egoistic and moralistic distortion and that it occurs when a motivation for positive self-presentation exists, which is consistent with the results of numerous research studies (Pauls & Crosti, 2004; Stöber, Dette & Musch, 2002).

However, looking at the analysis variance between situations of honest responding and responding as a teacher applicant on the personality dimensions, it was found that the moralistic distortion include egoistic distortion because beside the dimensions conscientiousness and agreeableness included feature characteristics for egoistic distortion (extraversion, emotional stability and conscientiousness). Therefore, with a predominantly moralistic, in a situation of responding as teacher applicant respondents also resort to egoistic distortion. In a situation of egoistic distortion it was found that respondents showed themselves as more extravert, emotionally stable, with broader intellect and more conscientious. Obtained differences on the dimension of conscientiousness suggest that and the scales of egoistic distortion measures some aspect of moralistic bias, but it must be noted that numerous studies showed the same results (e.g., Pauls & Crost, 2004, Galić & JerneiĆ, 2006, Galić, JerneiĆ & Belavić, 2009). Namely, possible explanation is that conscientiousness includes two content different kinds of facets. According to Wiggins and Trapnell (1996), facets of striving for achievement, competence and self-discipline theoretically should be associated with the agency and facets of orderliness, dutifulness and cautiousness with the communion.

Assumed content differences in the model are partially supported since the scales of moralistic distortion also include concepts of egoistic distortion. However, when we imagine the ideal candidate for some position we expect that the person characterize high skills. We have learned by experience that the intelligent, resourceful and socially dominant individuals are also very successful. Therefore, when we are motivated to show ourselves as the best applicant, regardless the position that we compete, we - will always try to emphasize own high abilities. On the other hand, we will not always try to give the impression that we are "saints" because to be "good" and to blindly follow a social norm is not universally desirable. Thus, it raises the question if the respondents "embellish" the responses in the direction of egoistic distortion at every opportunity, can we in selection situation at all separately induce moralistic distortion.

In the present study, strength of relationships between differences scores and scales of socially desirable responding varied from weak to moderate $r=.15-.58$ ($p<0.05$). So, at a best manner, difference scores shared 29% of variance with some subscale of socially desirable responding. This low correlation of direct measures of distortion and scale of socially desirable responding suggests that the distortion and socially desirable responding are two separate constructs, not two operationalizations of the same construct. The present results also call into the question the construct validity of self-deception social desirability scale since it is the component of socially desirable responding that reflects the tendency of individuals to see themselves more positively than is actually the case and therefore is related to true personality variance.

Given that faking can be situationally induced, we are puzzled with the attempts of many personality researchers to treat response bias as a personality trait. We agree that the tendency to respond favorably is correlated with stable personality traits (Ones, Viswesvaran & Reiss, 1995). However, it is also clear that faking can be situationally induced, either by an experimenter or by the wishes of an applicant. In the present study it could be said that difference scores and social desirability scale scores generally resulted in similar conclusions. Both measured in one way some aspect of deliberate socially desirable responding, and in another some stable personality trait.

In this study it was found that, although the measures of faking (difference scores and social desirability scale scores) generally converged, they were not as related to each other as one would expect. This suggests that reliance on only one of the traditional measures of fakability may provide incomplete, or even misleading, assessments of the degree to which applicants are faking on personality tests. Researchers need to consider multiple operationalizations of faking and how they relate to each other.

There are some limitations of the study that should be pointed out. First, the generalizability of these results may be questioned because this study was conducted in the lab. Lab studies using faking instructions are useful for demonstrating the extent to which examinees can fake on a personality test as well as potential consequences of faking on personality test validity. However, lab studies are limited in a way that students instructed to fake good may not represent true applicant behavior. In lab studies, there are no negative consequences for faking. However, to determine applicant behavior, there is no better source of data than actual job applicants.

An additional limitation concerns the direction manipulation instructions provided to students. Specifically, students were instructed to respond in a manner that would present the most favorable impression as a job manager and teacher. Thus, the items that appear on the scales may be biased toward detecting faking for those two positions rather than other positions. Also, not every student may want and like that job, which may affect their motivation to respond to items as if they were manager and teacher applicants. As an alternative, the instructions could have requested that students respond in a manner that would maximize their chances for obtaining their dream job (e.g., Mueller-Hanson, Heggstad & Thorton, 2006). However, different students could interpret these instructions differently, which could further affect the validity of the measure when placed in an applied context.

While the results of this study do not offer conclusive evidence of the existence and prevalence of applicant faking behavior since the different operationalization of faking may yield to inconsistent results, they do confirm that faking does occur in a lab studied. The results of this study indicate towards the need for development theory that will set guidelines how faking should be operationalized, measured, and manipulated, so it could try to reconcile past discrepancies.

5. References

1. Barrick, M. R. & Mount, M. K. (1991). The Big Five personality dimensions and job performance: A meta-analysis. *Personnel Psychology*, 44, 1-26.
2. Barrick, M. R. & Mount, M. K. (1996). Effects of impression management and self-deception on the predictive validity of personality constructs. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 81, 261-272.
3. Burns, G. N. & Christiansen, N. D. (2006). Sensitive or senseless: On the use of social desirability measures in selection and assessment. In R.L. Griffith, & M.H. Peterson (Eds.), *A closer examination of applicant faking behavior* (pp. 113-148). Greenwich, CT: Information Age Publishing.
4. Carmines, E. G. & Zeller, R. A. (1979). *Reliability and validity of assessment*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
5. Christiansen, N. D. (1998, April). *Sensitive or senseless? On the use of social desirability measures to identify applicant response distortion*. Paper presented at the 13th Annual Conference of the Society of Industrial and Organizational Psychology, Dallas, TX.
6. Christiansen, N. D., Goffin, R.D., Johnston, N.G. & Rothstein, M.G. (1994). Correcting the 16PF for faking: Effects on criterion-related validity and individual hiring decisions. *Personnel Psychology*, 47, 847-860.
7. Edwards, J. R. (1993). On the use of polynomial regression equations as an alternative to difference scores in organizational research. *Academy of Management Review*, 36, 1577-1613.
8. Edwards, J. R. & Harrison, R. V. (1993). Job demands and worker health: Three dimensional reexamination of the relationship between personenvironment fit and strain. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 78, 628-648.
9. Ellingson, J. E., Sackett, P. R. & Hough, L. M. (1999). Social desirability corrections in personality measurement: Issues of applicant comparison and construct validity. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 84, 155-166.
10. Galić, Z. & Jerneić, Ž. (2006). Socially desirable responding in various motivational contexts: a test of Paulhus' model of social desirability. *Suvremena psihologija*, 9, 155-170.
11. Galić, Z., Jerneić Ž. & Belavić, M. (2009). On Saints and Superheroes: Testing Paulhus' Model of Social Desirability. *Društvena istraživanja*, 6, 977-997.
12. Goffin, R. D. & Christiansen, N. D. (2003). Correcting personality tests for faking: A Review of popular personality tests and an initial survey of researchers. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 11, 340-344.
13. Goldberg, L. R., Johnson, J. A. , Eber, H. W., Hogan, R., Ashton, M. C., Cloinger, C. R. & Gough, H. G. (2006): The international personality item pool and the future of public-domain personality measures. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 40, 84- 96.
14. Griffith, R. L., Chmielowski, T. i Yoshita, Y. (2007). Do applicants fake? An examination of the frequency of applicant faking behavior. *Personnel Review*, 36, 341-357.
15. Hogan, R., Hogan, J. & Roberts, B. W. (1996). Personality measurement and employment decisions. *American Psychologist*, 51, 469-477.
16. Hough, L. M. (1998). Effects of intentional distortion in personality measurement and evaluation of suggested palliatives. *Human Performance*, 11, 209-244.

17. Hough, L. M., Eaton, N. K., Dunnette, M. D., Kamp, J. D. & McCloy, R. A. (1990). Criterion-related validities of personality constructs and the effect of response distortion on those validities. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 75, 581-595.
18. Hough, L. M. & Ones, D. S. (2001). The structure, measurement, validity, and use of personality variables in industrial, work, and organizational psychology. In N. Anderson, D. S. Ones, H. Sinangil & C. Viswesvaran (Eds.), *Handbook of industrial, work, and organizational psychology* (pp. 233-277). London: Sage.
19. Hunter, J. E. & Schmidt, F. L. (2004). *Method of meta-analysis: Correcting for error and bias in research findings*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
20. Hurtz, G. M. & Donovan, J. J. (2000). Personality and job performance: The Big Five revisited. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 85, 869-879.
21. Kluger, A. N., Reilly, R. R. & Russell, C. J. (1991). Faking biodata tests: Are option-keyed instruments more resistant? *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 76, 889-896.
22. Li, A. & Bagger, J. (2007). The Balanced Inventory of Desirable Responding (BIDR): A Reliability Generalization Study. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 67, 525-544.
23. Luther, N. J. & Thornton, G. C. III. (1999). Does faking on employment tests matter? *Employment Testing Law and Policy Reporter*, 8, 129-136.
24. McFarland, L. A., & Ryan, A. M. (2000). Variance in faking across noncognitive measures. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 85, 812-821.
25. McFarland, L. A., & Ryan, A. M. (2006). Toward an Integrated Model of Applicant Faking Behavior. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 36, 979-1016.
26. Mersman, J.L. & Shultz, K.S. (1998). Individual differences in the ability to fake on personality measures. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 24, 217-227.
27. Morgeson, F. P., Campion, M. A., Dipboye, R. L., Hollenbeck, J. R., Murphy, K. & Schmitt, N. (2007). Reconsidering the use of personality tests in personnel selection contexts. *Personnel Psychology*, 60, 683-729.
28. Mueller-Hanson, R. A., Heggstad, E. D. & Thornton, G. C. (2006). Individual differences in impression management: An exploration of the psychological processes underlying faking. *Psychology Science*, 48, 288-312.
29. Ones, D.S., & Viswesvaran, C. (1998). The effects of social desirability and faking on personality and integrity assessment for personnel selection. *Human Performance*, 11, 245-269.
30. Ones, D. S., Viswesvaran, C., & Korbin, W. P. (1995, May). Meta-analysis of fakability estimates: Between-subjects versus within-subjects designs. Paper presented at the tenth annual meeting of the Society of Industrial and Organizational Psychology, Orlando, FL.
31. Ones, D.S., Viswesvaran, C., & Reiss, A.D. (1996). Role of social desirability in personality testing for selection: The red herring. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 81, 660-679.
32. Paulhus, D. L. (1984). Two-component models of social desirable responding. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 46, 598-609.
33. Paulhus, D. L. (2002). Social desirable responding: The evolution of a construct. In H.I. Brown, D. N. Jackson & D. E. Wiley (Eds.) *The role of constructs in psychological and educational measurement* (pp. 49-69). Mahwah NJ: Erlbaum.

34. Paulhus, D.L. (2006). *A Comprehensive Inventory of Desirable Responding (CIDR)*. Poster presented at the meeting of the Association for Research in Personality, New Orleans.
35. Paulhus, D. L. & John, O. P. (1998). Egoistic and moralistic bias in self-perception: The interplay of self-deceptive styles with basic traits and motives. *Journal of Personality*, 66, 1025-1060.
36. Pauls, C. A. & Crost, N. W. (2004). Effects of faking in self deception and impression management scales. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 37, 1137-1151.
37. Rogosa, D., Brandt, D. & Zimowski, M. (1982). A growth curve approach to the measurement of change. *Psychological Bulletin*, 92, 726-748.
38. Salgado, J. F. (1997). The five factor model of personality and job performance in the European community. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 82, 30-43.
39. Salgado, J. F. (2005) Personality and social desirability in organizational settings: Practical implications for work and organizational psychology. *Papeles del Psicologico*, 26, 115-128.
40. Smith, D. B. & Ellingson, J. E. (2002). Substance versus style: A new look at social desirability in motivating contexts. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87, 211-219.
41. Stark, S. C., Chernyshenko, S., Chan, K. Y., Lee, W. C. & Drasgow, F. (2001). Effects of the testing situation on item responding: Cause for concern. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86, 943-953.
42. Stöber, J., Dette, D. E. & Musch, J. (2002). Comparing continuous and dichotomous scoring of the Balanced Inventory of Social Desirable Responding. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 78, 370-389.
43. Tett, R. P., Jackson, D. N. & Rothstein, M. (1991). Personality measures as predictors of job performance: A meta-analytic review. *Personnel Psychology*, 44, 703-742.
44. Tisak, J. & Smith, C. S. (1994). Defending and extending difference score methods. *Journal of Management*, 20, 675-682.
45. Vasilopoulos, N. L., Reilly, R. & Leaman, J. A. (2000). The influence of job familiarity and impression management on self-report measure scale scores and response latencies. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 85, 50-64.
46. Viswesvaran, C. & Ones, D.S. (1999). Meta-analyses of fakability estimates: Implications for personality measurement. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 59, 197-210.
47. Wiggins, J.S. & Trapnell, P.D. (1996). A dyadic-interactional perspective on the five-factor model. In: J.S. Wiggins, (Eds.), *The five-factor model of personality: Theoretical perspectives* (pp. 87-162). New York: Guilford Press.