

Self-promotion Statements in Video Resumes: Frequency, intensity, and gender effects on job applicant evaluation

Marie Waung*, Robert Hymes*, Joy E. Beatty**
and Pam McAuslan*

*College of Arts, Sciences, and Letters, University of Michigan, Dearborn, MI, USA. mwaung@umich.edu

**Joy Beatty, College of Business, University of Michigan, Dearborn, MI, USA

Although video resumes have received a substantial amount of media attention and there seems to be a growing awareness among Human Resource professionals of video-based job applications, little is known about the effect of video resumes on applicant evaluation. This research investigates the effectiveness of self-promotion within the context of video resumes. Self-promotion frequency and intensity and applicant gender were manipulated. Ratings by recruiters and college students indicate that high levels of self-promotion in video resumes are ineffective for male applicants and potentially detrimental for female applicants. Job applicants should use caution when attempting to promote themselves using video resumes. More research is needed on impression management tactics used at the earliest stages of selection and on the mechanisms operating within video resumes that impact applicant evaluation.

1. Introduction

Video resumes are a growing trend in the job application process, and have received a substantial amount of media attention in Europe and in the United States (Gissel, Thompson, & Pond, 2013). More organizations are offering online resume posting sites with multimedia capabilities, allowing job applicants the option of submitting a video resume to replace or supplement a traditional written resume (Dizik, 2010), and a recent international study found that 70% of experienced Human Resource (HR) professionals were familiar with video resumes (Hiemstra, Derous, Born, & Serlie, 2011). Despite media attention and a general awareness among employers of video-based job applications, little is known about the actual use of video resumes by organizations nor about their effect on applicant evaluation.

Some HR representatives and federal employment officials have voiced concerns regarding video resumes due to the potential for increased subjectivity and implicit bias early in the selection process (Giordani, 2009; Langfitt, 2006). However, to our knowledge only one published

study has compared evaluations when based on video versus paper resumes. In that study, video resumes were found to result in different assessments of applicant personality and harsher evaluations of skill and ability levels compared to paper resumes (Waung, Hymes, & Beatty, 2014). Research is needed to examine the specific mechanisms operating within video resumes that affect applicant evaluation so that employers may make informed decisions regarding whether or not to allow them.

In these experiments we focus on the impression management (IM) tactic of self-promotion in video resumes and its effect on applicant evaluation. The resume is typically viewed as a tool with which to sell one's self (Amare & Manning, 2009) and a common goal of those developing resumes is to make the most positive impression possible (Varma, Soo Min, & Pichler, 2006). Thus, IM tactics such as self-promotion are likely to be a core component of video resumes. In addition, because gender may moderate the effectiveness of IM tactics (e.g., Moss-Racusin & Rudman, 2010), we test for interactions between gender and self-promotion in job applicant evaluation.

2. Impression management

Impression management describes efforts to create, maintain, protect or alter one's image (Bozeman & Kacmar, 1997) using a variety of behaviors. Job seekers have been found to engage in IM behaviors (e.g., ingratiation, self-promotion, excuses, and justifications) to impress interviewers and to gain employment (e.g., Barrick, Shaffer, & DeGrassi, 2009; Higgins & Judge, 2004; Posthuma, Morgeson, & Campion, 2002; Stevens & Kristof, 1995). More specifically, during brief introductory interactions, interviewees have been found to use assertive, self-focused IM tactics (Stevens & Kristof, 1995), rather than defensive (e.g., Rosenfeld, Giacalone, & Riordan, 1995; Tedeschi & Melburg, 1984) or other-focused (e.g., Kacmar, Delery, & Ferris, 1992; Wayne & Ferris, 1990; Wayne & Liden, 1995) tactics. In general, job candidates attempted to construct a positive image by using IM tactics that focused on themselves (e.g., self-promotion), rather than IM tactics that focused on the target (e.g., opinion conformity, flattery). Video resumes are brief and introductory in nature, such that assertive, self-focused IM strategies are also likely to be used by job candidates in that context.

One such assertive, self-focused strategy is self-promotion, which involves attempts to elicit specific, positive character attributions directed toward oneself (Godfrey, Jones, & Lord, 1986; Schlenker & Weigold, 1992). Video resumes are used by job applicants to set themselves apart by demonstrating the uniqueness and/or strength of a variety of positive characteristics (Gissel & Thompson, 2012); thus, self-promotion is likely to be a core component of video resumes. Self-promotion tactics include positive self-descriptions, entitlements (claims of responsibility for positive events), enhancements (claims that events for which one is responsible are more positive than they first appear to be), overcoming obstacles (descriptions of how goals were achieved despite obstacles), and exemplification (indicating that one acts as a role model; Ellis, West, Ryan, & DeShon, 2002; Kacmar et al., 1992; Stevens & Kristof, 1995).

Although self-promotion has been found to have positive effects on interview outcomes (e.g., Gilmore & Ferris, 1989; Higgins, Judge, & Ferris 2003; Kacmar et al., 1992), we expect more mixed effects when self-promotion is used in resumes. When impression management statements have been included in paper resumes, results have been mixed with IM tactics being found to enhance ratings in some studies (Bright & Hutton, 2000; Knouse, 1994) and to detract from them in others (Knouse, Giacalone, & Pollard, 1988). However, available resume research is based on paper resumes only, and may not generalize to video resumes due to their unique features (i.e., a lack of established norms regarding their content; the greater opportunity to use IM tactics; and brief exposure to applicant appearance, mannerisms, voice, and speech patterns).

The type of selection device used (interview, paper resume or video resume) may affect the degree to which applicants are able to adjust IM behaviors, and the adjustment of such behaviors based on the target's cues may be important to their effectiveness. Given that video resumes are static, one-way communications, job applicants are unable to modify their self-presentations during the evaluation process in response to evaluator reactions to prior IM attempts. Thus, self-promotion may be less effective in the context of video resumes. In addition, when developing video resumes, job applicants have little information about the evaluator or target, making it difficult to determine how much self-promotion to use and which self-promotion strategies are likely to be most effective.

Furthermore, the effectiveness of IM tactics may depend on whether or not the evaluator is aware of their use. If self-promotion is undetected it may evoke attributions of competence (Lievens & Peeters, 2008), while if detected it may result in attributions that the applicant is untrustworthy (Fletcher, 1989; Higgins et al., 2003) or manipulative (Kacmar et al., 1992).

Interviewers have been found to have some difficulty identifying the use of IM tactics by applicants (Roulin, Bangarter, & Levashina, 2014, 2015; Stevens & Kristof, 1995). Thus, positive dispositional attributions may be more likely than negative ones when IM behaviors are used in the context of an interview. In contrast, self-promotion within video resumes is likely to be obvious because it must be concentrated in a short time period (2 or 3 min) with no social interaction between applicant and evaluator. Finally, in situations where little information is available upon which to base evaluations (i.e., a typical resume evaluation situation), more attention and weight may be placed on the IM behaviors that are detected (Bolino, Klotz, & Daniels, 2014).

Employees and job seekers may vary in the IM tactics they employ, as well as in the frequency and intensity of those tactics. However, IM research has ignored IM intensity, focusing primarily on IM frequency. For example, the use of IM tactics is typically measured by having participants indicate how frequently (never to always) they have engaged in a variety of IM behaviors (e.g., Wayne & Ferris, 1990), or by the presence/absence of IM tactics used by interviewees (e.g., Stevens & Kristof, 1995). Furthermore, manipulations of IM tactics have centered on the presence or absence of particular tactics (e.g., Wayne & Ferris, 1990). Bolino and colleagues (Bolino, Kacmar, Turnley, & Gilstrap, 2008) called for studies that expand beyond IM frequency to include dimensions such as the variability or timing of IM tactics.

In this research, we argue that strength or intensity of IM statements is also likely to affect impressions formed. For example, the self-promotion tactic, entitlement, involves claiming responsibility for positive events or outcomes. However, the degree of responsibility claimed

(i.e., 'I contributed to the success of this project' versus 'This project was successful solely due to my efforts') will affect the intensity of the statement.

If self-promotion becomes obvious it may negatively affect evaluations by reducing the credibility of the job candidate and the perceived truthfulness of his or her claims (Fletcher, 1989; Higgins et al., 2003), leading to attributions that the candidate is manipulative (Kacmar et al., 1992). Furthermore, any negative reactions to self-promotion may be stronger for female applicants because self-promotion is inconsistent with the female gender role (e.g., Guadagno & Cialdini, 2007; Rudman, 1998).

3. Gender and self-promotion

Research indicates that gender bias persists in the workplace (e.g., Blau & Kahn, 2007; Correll, Benard, & Polk, 2007; Heilman & Haynes, 2008) and that this bias may occur due to a mismatch between gender stereotypes and work roles (e.g., Eagly & Karau, 2002; Heilman & Eagly, 2008; Riach & Rich, 2002). 'Ideal' female attributes involve more communal characteristics (i.e., concern for the welfare of others, being kind, gentle, sympathetic, and nurturing, Eagly, 1987; Kite, Deaux, & Haines, 2008), which are often inconsistent with more masculine attributes thought to be needed for success in key organizational roles and positions (Schein, 2001). In contrast, 'ideal' male attributes are associated with more agentic characteristics (i.e., the tendency to be assertive, controlling, and confident; Kite et al., 2008) often considered necessary for success in organizations, particularly at higher levels.

This lack of fit model (Heilman & Eagly, 2008) predicts that men should benefit from self-promotion, whereas women will be harmed by it, due to a mismatch between the female gender role and self-promotion. Gender role violations often result in negative repercussions, such that women using masculine self-promotion tactics encounter backlash and negative outcomes (e.g., Fiske, Bersoff, Borgida, Deaux, & Heilman, 1991; Guadagno & Cialdini, 2007; Phelan, Moss-Racusin, & Rudman, 2008). Women adopting a confident and assertive manner are reacted to more negatively than men behaving in a similar way (e.g., Butler & Geis, 1990; Heilman & Okimoto, 2007), and attitudes may be less positive toward female managers due to the incongruity between the female gender role and the leadership role (Eagly & Karau, 2002).

Although women engaging in higher levels of self-promotion and men who fail to self-promote are both in violation of gender norms, reactions to a female in violation of gender norms may be stronger than reactions to a male violating such norms. Past research indicates that in the workplace, role violations by men tend to be met with milder repercussions (Guadagno & Cialdini, 2007; Hultin, 2003; Tyler & McCullough, 2009) than those by

women, and that women may be more bound to prescribed gender-role behaviors than men (Smith et al., 2013). Such research suggests that level of self-promotion in video resumes may be more strongly related to the evaluation of females than males.

Within the context of video resumes, female gender role violations are likely to be reacted to strongly due to a high concentration of self-promotion within a short time frame, and a lack of individuating information which may increase rater reliance on stereotypes (e.g., Landy, 2008). As such, evaluators are likely to react more harshly to women who strongly self-promote (i.e., violate gender roles) compared to women who engage in milder self-promotion and to men regardless of their self-promotion level.

4. Applicant evaluation

Much of the research on IM in employee selection (e.g., Gilmore & Ferris, 1989) has focused on outcomes related to interviews (e.g., hiring decisions, starting salary, perceived qualifications, and interviewee performance). With the exception of perceived qualifications, these variables may not capture the effects of IM at the resume stage of selection. With regard to qualifications, applicants are purported to engage in self-enhancement tactics to boost recruiter perceptions of their credentials, and such tactics have been found to have a stronger effect on ratings of job candidates than their actual credentials (Gilmore & Ferris, 1989). Thus, it appears that judgments regarding applicant credentials are likely to be affected by the amount of self-promotion present in video resumes. As such, credentials were selected as a dependent measure in the present study.

Social skills and mental ability are two constructs also commonly used in job candidate evaluation (Huffcutt, Conway, Roth, & Stone, 2001). Social skills, in particular, are likely to be tied to perceptions of both male and female gender-ascribed social behaviors and should be apparent to some degree in video resumes. Self-promotional behaviors may serve as cues about an applicant's skill in social situations (e.g., interpersonal awareness, adherence to social norms) and may affect applicant evaluation. Given the gender-ascribed attributes of interpersonal sensitivity, niceness, warmth, and sociability, women may be expected to engage in socially facilitative behaviors. In contrast, men are likely to be expected to perform well when persuading and negotiating with others and as leaders (Cuddy, Fiske, & Glick, 2007). Deviations from such ascribed behaviors may be apparent in video resumes and may affect applicant evaluation. Self-promotion may also affect judgment of mental ability through IM tactics such as positive self-descriptions (e.g., 'I am very capable') and overcoming obstacles (i.e., problem solving). Thus, both social skills and mental ability were selected as dependent measures.

In addition, person–organization (P–O) and person–job (P–J) fit were chosen as dependent measures, because fit has been found to affect recruiter decision-making (Cable & Judge 1996; Gilmore & Ferris, 1989; Rynes & Gerhart, 1990) and to be influenced by IM tactics (Higgins & Judge, 2004; Kacmar et al., 1992). For example, the use of self-focused IM tactics has been related to the assessment of applicant fit (Kristof-Brown, Barrick, & Franke, 2002) with self-promotion being more strongly related to fit compared to other IM tactics.

Finally, self-promotional behaviors have been related to interviewer ratings, and hiring and promotion decisions (e.g., Barrick et al., 2009; Kacmar et al., 1992; Rynes & Gerhart, 1990; Stevens & Kristof, 1995). Studies that have examined IM tactics and outcomes have found that IM tactics are related to interview performance and hiring decisions (Gilmore & Ferris, 1989), as well as perceived suitability and likelihood that the organization would pursue the applicant (Stevens & Kristof, 1995), or invite him/her for a second interview (Barrick et al., 2009). However, such measures are relevant to decisions based on interviews, rather than resumes. Thus, we developed several outcome measures to reflect decisions made at the resume stage of selection. Decisions after viewing a resume may include inviting the applicant for an interview, requesting more information from the job applicant, and, perhaps, making some sort of early judgment regarding the applicant's likelihood of being successful as an employee. We used these measures as resume outcomes and expect that level of self-promotion in a video resume is likely to influence such outcomes.

5. General method

5.1. Overview

In these two studies, we manipulate job applicant gender and self-promotion level to examine their effects on job applicant evaluation. In Experiment 1 recruiters and hiring managers evaluate the potential of either one female or one male job applicant actor depicted in a video resume who either engages in self-promotion or does not self-promote (control condition). In Experiment 2, college students evaluate one of three male or three female job applicant actors in a video resume within which the frequency (high or low) and intensity (high or low) of self-promotion statements is manipulated. Evaluation of applicant credentials (education, training, and work experience), social skills, mental capability, organizational fit, and resume outcomes (probability of inviting for an interview, of hiring the applicant, and of applicant success, if hired) are dependent measures in both studies. Experiment 2 also includes person–job fit as a dependent measure. This measure was omitted in Experiment 1 due to concerns regarding survey length and subsequent response rate for the recruiter sample.

5.2. Stimuli

Participants across all conditions received the same paper resume with the name on the paper resume listed as Andrea or Andrew Phillips, depending on the gender manipulation. This is similar to the gender manipulation in previous resume research (e.g., Tyler & McCullough, 2009). The paper resume contained basic information about the job applicant's educational achievements, work experiences, and extracurricular activities without embellishment. In addition, participants were provided with a video resume ostensibly of either Andrea or Andrew Phillips.

5.2.1. Paper resume development

A stimulus resume typical of a college senior preparing to graduate and enter the job market was developed based on 36 sample resumes collected from students who provided written consent for their resumes to be used for research. The majority of the students whose resumes were examined were enrolled in the College of Business. Each of the resumes included educational information and most of them began with a statement of the applicant's objectives. The mean number of work experiences referenced was 2.58 ($SD = 1.10$) and the mean number of extracurricular activities was 1.76 ($SD = 2.02$). In addition, 35% of students included a line detailing their computer knowledge and skills. Based on the sample resumes, a stimulus resume was developed with a statement of the applicant's objective, a summary of the applicant's education, two separate examples of work experiences, two extracurricular activities, and a line listing the applicant's computer skills. The name on the resume was either Andrea R. Phillips or Andrew R. Phillips, depending on the gender condition. All else was identical between the male and female applicants' resumes.

5.2.2. Video resume development

Initially, videos were developed for one male and one female actor and these were used as stimuli in Experiment 1. However, due to concerns regarding the generalizability of results based on only one male and one female actor, four additional actors (two male and two female) were recruited for Experiment 2. In total three male and three female students, all Caucasian and of traditional college age, were hired to act as job applicants in the video resumes. For each gender condition, all three actors were videotaped reading the scripts for each self-promotion condition. In Experiment 2 all six actors were used as experimental stimuli with actor being randomly assigned along with experimental condition.

Sixty-nine undergraduate psychology students from a pilot sample rated screen shots of each of the six actors on attractiveness, using a 5-point scale with the midpoint

of 3 anchored as 'average attractiveness.' A repeated-measures ANOVA was conducted to determine the effects of applicant gender and individual actor on attractiveness scores. Although analysis indicated that specific applicants within each gender were seen as more attractive than others, $F(2, 68) = 3.53$, $p < .05$, the difference between the attractiveness of applicant genders was not significant, $F(1, 68) = 0.35$, $p > .05$. Mean attractiveness ratings across the female actors was 2.89 ($SD = 0.60$) and across the male actors was 2.84 ($SD = 0.85$). Thus, average attractiveness level was moderate for the applicants and did not differ between the male and female applicant conditions.

A control condition was developed in which no self-promotion was used in the video resumes. For this condition the actor read the content of the paper resume without embellishment. Appendix A contains the script for the control condition. All experimental conditions built upon this script with the number of self-promotion frequency statements and the intensity of those statements added to the basic control script, depending on the condition.

For the self-promotion conditions each actor was videotaped presenting a series of scripts with varying levels of self-promotion statements. Actors wore professional clothing and taping was completed in a television studio with identical video backgrounds and camera angles. A teleprompter was used during taping by the actors. In addition, an observer listened in the control room during taping to ensure that the script was followed word-for-word to ensure no differences in video content between the male and female actors.

The video resume scripts were developed based on Kacmar et al.'s (1992) impression management manipulation, and descriptions of self-promotion presented by Ellis et al. (2002). The scripts intentionally varied both the frequency and the intensity of self-promotion. The self-promotion tactics used included overcoming obstacles, exemplification, entitlement, enhancement, and general self-promotion. (See Appendix B for a description of each IM tactic and a summary of the video resume content for each frequency and intensity condition.) The lower intensity condition contained IM statements that were milder (i.e., 'While working on this project I was told that I was a good example to the newer interns due to my positive attitude and professionalism') than the higher intensity condition (i.e., 'While working on this project I was told that I was an ideal example to the newer interns due to my positive attitude and unfailing professionalism'). The lower frequency condition contained fewer self-promotion statements (seven self-promotion items) than the higher frequency condition (14 self-promotion items). The scripts were developed to yield these conditions: low frequency, low intensity; high frequency, low intensity; low frequency, high intensity; and high frequency, high intensity.

5.3. Procedure

All participants were provided with a paper and a video resume. These two resumes were for the same applicant and were provided simultaneously to allow the opportunity to compare the content of the paper and video resumes. The paper resume was identical in all conditions with only the name varied to indicate applicant gender.

Participants were also presented with a hiring scenario to allow for assessment of person–organization and person–job fit. This scenario describes a large medical equipment manufacturing company focused on expansion and growth in a variety of regions with the company seeking to hire MBA graduates and recent college graduates for positions requiring these competencies: communication, persuasion and negotiation, planning, problem-solving, and confidence and decisiveness.

5.4. Manipulation checks and dependent measures

Two manipulation checks were used. The first manipulation check evaluated the extent to which self-promotion was detected in the video resumes and was designed to judge the adequacy of the intensity manipulation, whereas the second manipulation check assessed memory for the specific self-promotion items contained in the video resumes and was designed to determine the adequacy of the frequency manipulation. The self-promotion intensity manipulation check consisted of five items assessing the extent to which the applicant: embellished or exaggerated his/her accomplishments; provided primarily factual information about his/her accomplishments (reversed); was difficult to believe; appeared to be truthful (reversed) and provided additional information that went beyond the information conveyed in the paper resume. Responses were made using a 7-point scale with anchors of never; rarely; occasionally; about half the time; routinely; almost always; and all the time.

The self-promotion frequency manipulation check was assessed by providing participants with eight pieces of information related to the self-promotion statements contained in the resumes (e.g., the applicant was told that s/he was an example to other interns; the applicant increased access to recycling bins on campus). Three of the items were provided only in the high frequency conditions, whereas the other five items were provided in both the high and low frequency conditions. Thus, participants exposed to the higher frequency manipulation should endorse more items from the list than the lower frequency condition and be more confident of those items. For each of the eight pieces of information, participants indicated whether or not (yes or no) the information had been conveyed by the applicant. In addition, they indicated how sure they were of each response, using a 7-point

scale, ranging from 1, very unsure to 7, very sure. Four distracter items, consisting of information not provided by the applicant in any condition, were also included in this measure.

Social skills and mental capability scales were adapted from Huffcutt et al. (2001). Social Skills were measured using four items assessing oral communication, interpersonal skills, leadership, and persuading and negotiating. Mental Capability was measured with five items assessing judgment, problem-solving, decision-making, written communication, and creativity. A 7-point response scale with the anchors of never; seldom; occasionally; about half the time; usually; often; all of the time was used for both scales.

Person–organization (P-O) Fit was assessed with four items; three items asked how well the candidate's values, personality, and skills and abilities fit the organization, while a fourth item assessed overall fit. Person–job (P-J) Fit was measured with three items pertaining to the extent to which the candidate's expertise matched the job demands, the suitability or fit of the candidate for the job, and the fit of candidate personality and values with the job. The response format for the P-O and P-J fit measures was a 7-point scale with these anchors: exceptionally weak fit; weak fit; somewhat weak fit; neither weak nor strong fit; somewhat strong fit; strong fit; exceptionally strong fit.

Finally, Resume Outcomes were assessed by three items asking participants to estimate the probability that they would invite the candidate for an interview, that they would hire the candidate, and that the candidate would be a successful employee; these items were estimated on a scale of 0 (indicating no chance) and 100 (indicating complete certainty).

6. Experiment 1

In Experiment 1, the effects of self-promotion and applicant gender on applicant evaluation are examined with a small sample of actual recruiters and hiring managers as research participants.

Hypothesis 1: Self-promotion level and applicant gender will interact, such that ratings of job applicants will be affected by the congruence/incongruence of applicant gender and self-promotion level. Specifically, the female applicant will receive lower ratings when she self-promotes compared to when she does not, whereas the male applicant will receive higher ratings when he self-promotes compared to when he does not.

6.1. Method

6.1.1. Sample

A snowball sampling method was used. First, an e-mail was sent to recruiters who worked with either a univer-

sity placement center or a college of business internship office, requesting their participation in a study on job applicants. The e-mail briefly described the study, promised a \$25 VISA™ gift card for participation, and sent a link to be used for participation. Thirty recruiters participated based on this initial request. In a 'thank you' e-mail to the initial participants, we asked them to pass the survey link along to other recruiters and hiring managers. This yielded 26 additional responses for a total of 56 participants. However, data from four of the participants contained a number of missing responses so that the resulting sample size was 52. Sixty-six percent of the participants were female. Forty participants were Caucasian; four were African-American; and two were Asian (six participants did not respond to the race item). The median age interval reported was 30–39 years-old. Eighty-six percent of the sample indicated that they were recruiters with an average of 8.95 years of experience ($SD = 7.56$). The remainder of the sample indicated that they hired employees regularly in the course of their employment as managers.

6.1.2. Procedure

Resumes from one male and one female actor were used in Experiment 1. These two actors were chosen because they were siblings and were very similar in appearance. A 2 (male or female applicant) \times 2 (self-promotion or no self-promotion) between subjects experimental design was used. Self-promotion was manipulated by using either the high frequency/high intensity self-promotion video or the control video in which no self-promotion occurred.

Recruiters were randomly assigned to one of four conditions: female applicant, no self-promotion; male applicant, no self-promotion; female applicant, self-promotion; male applicant, self-promotion. Participation was completed entirely on-line. A link was e-mailed to participants that allowed them to respond to a consent form, read a scenario about the hiring organization, view the applicant's text and video resumes, and complete an evaluation form. The evaluation form contained measures of the applicant's credentials, social skills, fit with the organization, and resume outcomes. Alpha reliabilities for these scores are as follows: self-promotion manipulation check ($\alpha = .71$); credentials ($\alpha = .80$), social skills ($\alpha = .90$), mental capability ($\alpha = .91$), and person–organization fit ($\alpha = .92$). The three resume outcome measures (probability of inviting for an interview; of hiring; and of success, if hired) were highly correlated; thus these were combined into a resume outcome scale ($\alpha = .91$). After completing the evaluation form, participants responded to the manipulation check items assessing self-promotion intensity.

6.2. Results

When the self-promotion manipulation check was tested, it resulted in a significant difference by experimental

condition for the male applicant ($t(23) = -2.38, p < .05$; no self-promotion, $M = 2.56, SD = 0.78$; self-promotion, $M = 3.44, SD = 1.01$) and for the female applicant ($t(27) = -2.04, p = .05$; no self-promotion, $M = 2.79, SD = 0.66$; self-promotion, $M = 3.45, SD = 1.04$). Thus, the self-promotion manipulation was effective.

Correlations among social skills, mental capability, and organizational fit scales were high, ranging from .66 to .82. Factor analysis revealed that the three rating scales loaded highly on a single factor (Eigenvalue = 2.52) accounting for 83.96% of the total variation. These were combined into a composite applicant evaluation score with a resulting alpha coefficient of .95. Table 1 lists intercorrelations for all dependent variables, as well as factor loadings for the composite evaluation scale. Despite strong intercorrelations among all scales, the credential and outcome measures were not included in the composite evaluation score because they are based on different response formats than the other study measures. Furthermore, the outcome scale is conceptually distinct from the applicant evaluation measures with its focus on video resume outcomes, rather than on applicant evaluation.

Therefore, three dependent measures were used in the analyses: credentials (5-point response format); applicant evaluation, the combined evaluation measure (7-point response format), and resume outcomes (probability ranging from 0 to 100). In all cases, higher numbers indicate more positive evaluation and outcomes. We tested for applicant gender and self-promotion condition effects and their interaction with a two-way ANOVA. For the credentials and applicant evaluation measures, gender and self-promotion main effects were not significant, nor were their interactions, all p 's $> .05$. However, for resume outcome, a significant two-way interaction was found ($F[1,47] = 4.62, p < .05, \eta_p^2 = .09$). The pattern of means indicates that the female applicant had more negative resume outcomes when she self-promoted ($M = 49.00, SD = 28.43$), compared to when she did not ($M = 72.72, SD = 18.80$). In contrast, the male applicant's resume outcomes were unaffected by the use of self-promotion tactics ($M = 65.56, SD = 13.88$, for the self-promotion condition; $M = 61.09, SD = 28.16$ when self-promotion was not used).

6.3. Discussion

Self-promotion was ineffective for the male applicant (i.e., it had no positive effect on his evaluation or outcomes), and detrimental to the female applicant with regard to resume outcomes. Recruiters were more reluctant to interview and hire the female applicant when she self-promoted, and they predicted that she would be less successful, if hired, compared to when she did not promote herself. Although recruiters were unaffected by gender stereotypes when evaluating applicant credentials, skills, and fit, bias occurred at the outcome level.

Experiment 1 results were based on only one male and one female actor who were siblings, strongly resembled one another, and appeared to be similar in attractiveness. However, when a sample of undergraduate students ($n = 69$) was subsequently asked to evaluate the physical attractiveness of these two actors (along with four other actors), the female job applicant ($M = 3.00, SD = 0.79$) was rated as somewhat more attractive than the male applicant ($M = 2.75, SD = 1.01; t(68) = 2.12, p < .05$). Despite this, the female applicant did not benefit from being more attractive (i.e., did not receive higher ratings than the male applicant). Furthermore, evaluative differences were found within the female applicant conditions, rather than between gender conditions, such that the small difference in male and female attractiveness cannot account for the present findings.

7. Experiment 2

Job seekers may vary in the frequency and intensity of IM tactics used. However, IM research has ignored IM intensity, focusing primarily on IM frequency. In Experiment 2 we refine the self-promotion manipulations used in Experiment 1, add four additional actors for a total of three male and three female actors in video resumes, and use a large sample of college students as evaluators. We manipulate both IM frequency and IM intensity, examining the effects of frequency, intensity, and applicant gender on applicant evaluation.

Table 1. Experiment 1: Correlations, means, and standard deviations for applicant evaluation measures, credentials, and resume outcomes

	1	2	3	4	5	M	SD	Factor loadings for composite evaluation measure
1. Social skills	—					4.76	1.21	0.94
2. Mental capability	.76	—				4.79	1.11	0.89
3. Organizational fit	.82	.66	—			4.39	1.24	0.92
4. Credentials	.74	.75	.79	—		3.29	0.65	
5. Outcomes	.76	.51	.82	.73	—	61.41	24.36	

Note: $N = 52$. All correlations are significant at $p < .001$. The composite evaluation measure includes these variables: social skills, mental capability, and organizational fit.

Hypothesis 2: Interactions between applicant gender, self-promotion frequency, and self-promotion intensity will result in the most negative evaluation scores under these conditions: female applicant, high self-promotion frequency, and high self-promotion intensity.

7.1. Method

7.1.1. Sample

Participants were 295 undergraduate psychology students who volunteered in exchange for course credit. Five students did not report demographic information; thus the following percentages are based on 290 respondents. The sample was 56% female and participant race/ethnicity was as follows: 71% Caucasian; 13% African-American; 8% Asian; 3% Hispanic; 1% Native American; 4%, Mixed Race/Other. The median age of the sample was 19 with a range from 18 to 51 years old. These data were collected on a commuter campus where the majority of students work part or full time throughout the year. Seventy percent ($n = 204$) of participants were employed and reported working from 4 to 60 hours per week with a median of 20 hours worked per week. Thirty-three percent ($n = 96$) of participants indicated that they had supervisory experience and 26% ($n = 76$) reported having made a hiring decision.

7.1.2. Procedure

For the experimental conditions a 2 (male or female applicant) \times 2 (high or low intensity self-promotion) \times 2 (high or low frequency self-promotion) between subjects experimental design was employed. The video resume script for each condition was read by three different male and three different female actors. Applicant gender, self-promotion frequency and intensity levels, as well as the actor depicting the condition were randomly assigned. Paper resumes were handed to participants and video resumes were accessed by clicking on a link on a computer screen.

The alpha reliability of scores for the self-promotion intensity manipulation check is $\alpha = 0.66$. For credentials scores $\alpha = .82$; social skills, $\alpha = .85$; mental capability, $\alpha = .81$; P-O fit, $\alpha = .81$; P-J fit $\alpha = 0.82$; and resume outcomes, $\alpha = .94$.

7.2. Results

In this section, we first examine the manipulation checks for the video resume self-promotion frequency and intensity conditions. Next, we describe how the dependent measures were combined for analyses. Finally, we test the experimental data for self-promotion and gender effects. Evaluator gender is also included as a factor in the hypothesis tests because rater and ratee gender have been

found to interact in some evaluation situations (e.g., Chung, 2001; Tyler, & McCullough, 2009).

For the self-promotion frequency manipulation check participant recognition of information presented to them (indicated by a yes/no response) was combined with confidence in their answer. If a given statement from the video resume was recognized, it was assigned a score that reflected the participant's confidence on a 7-point scale (1 = very unsure; 7 = very sure). If a statement was not recognized, it was assigned a score of 0. Thus, participants could receive memory scores from 0, indicating a complete lack of recognition of the set of eight previously presented statements, to 56, indicating full confidence in recognition of all eight statements. Participants in the high frequency video condition should obtain higher recognition scores than those in the low frequency condition.

A $2 \times 2 \times 2$ ANOVA was conducted with self-promotion statement frequency, statement intensity, and applicant gender as the independent variables and the frequency recognition score as the dependent variable to verify the impact of the statement frequency manipulation. As expected, participants in the high frequency condition demonstrated higher recognition scores, $M = 48.51$, $SD = 7.69$, than those in the low frequency condition, $M = 37.70$, $SD = 7.34$, $F(1, 269) = 149.33$, $p < .001$, $\eta_p^2 = 0.36$. There was also a small but significant effect found for stimulus-applicant gender, $F(1, 269) = 6.75$, $p < .01$, $\eta_p^2 = 0.02$. Participants in the female applicant condition reported higher recognition scores, $M = 43.62$, $SD = 9.14$, than those in the male condition, $M = 41.74$, $SD = 9.26$. There were no other main effects or interactions. Thus, the frequency manipulation was effective. However, despite identical self-promotion in the male versus female applicant conditions, female applicant self-promotion was remembered to a greater extent than male applicant self-promotion.

The self-promotion intensity manipulation check assessed participants' perceptions regarding the extent to which the stimulus-applicant's statements had been exaggerated or truthful. Higher scores on this measure reflect perceptions that the applicant had exaggerated; therefore, participants in the high intensity video condition should report higher levels of exaggeration than those in the low intensity condition. An ANOVA examining the impact of the three factors (frequency, intensity, and applicant gender) revealed only a main effect for the statement-intensity manipulation, $F(1, 284) = 42.43$, $p < .001$, $\eta_p^2 = 0.13$. As expected, participants in the high intensity condition reported that the applicant was seen as exaggerating more ($M = 3.57$, $SD = 0.88$) than those in the low intensity condition ($M = 2.88$, $SD = 0.94$). Thus, both the statement-frequency and statement-intensity manipulations were effective with participants appearing to be somewhat more sensitive to the frequency of female compared to male self-promotion.

7.2.1. Dependent measures

Preliminary analyses indicated strong relationships between ratings of social skills, mental capability, person–organization fit, and person–job fit. Factor analysis revealed that the four rating scales loaded highly on a single factor (Eigenvalue = 3.12) accounting for 77.93% of the total variation. Table 2 displays correlations among the study dependent measures and factor loadings across the four scales. Reliability analyses further indicated high consistency across the four scales ($\alpha = 0.94$). Therefore, scores on the rating scales (social skills, mental capability, person–organization fit, and person–job fit) were combined to produce a composite evaluative measure, Applicant Evaluation, with higher scores reflecting more positive evaluations.

Despite strong intercorrelations among all scales, the credential and outcome measures were not included in the composite evaluation score due to different response formats from the other study measures. In addition, the outcome scale is conceptually distinct from the applicant evaluation measures with its focus on resume outcomes, rather than on applicant evaluation. As with Experiment 1, these three dependent measures were used in the analyses: credentials (5-point response format); applicant evaluation, the combined evaluation measure (7-point response format), and resume outcomes (probability ranging from 0 to 100). In all cases, higher numbers indicate more positive evaluation and outcomes.

7.2.2. Test of hypothesis

Each of the dependent measures was submitted to a four-way ANOVA testing for main effects and interactions of self-promotion frequency, self-promotion intensity, applicant gender, and evaluator gender. For the dependent variable, credentials, a self-promotion frequency main effect was found ($F[1, 275] = 4.11, p < .05, \eta_p^2 = .02$) such that when self-promotion statements were used more frequently ($M = 3.88, SD = 0.62$), applicant credentials were rated as lower than when self-promotion statements were used less often ($M = 3.98, SD = 0.54$). In addition, an evaluator gender main effect was found ($F[1, 275] = 12.88,$

$p < .001, \eta_p^2 = .04$) with male evaluators ($M = 3.81, SD = 0.61$) giving lower ratings than female evaluators ($M = 4.03, SD = 0.54$). The three-way interaction of evaluator gender, applicant gender and self-promotion frequency was not significant ($F[1, 275] = 1.55, p > .05$). However, a three-way interaction of evaluator gender, applicant gender, and self-promotion intensity level was found ($F[1, 275] = 5.25, p < .05, \eta_p^2 = .02$). See Table 3 for dependent variable cell means and standard deviations for evaluator gender, applicant gender, and self-promotion intensity level. Post hoc tests indicate that male evaluators gave significantly lower credential ratings to female applicants who more intensely self-promoted compared to female applicants who engaged in less intense self-promotion. In contrast, female evaluators were unaffected by applicant gender and self-promotion intensity level.

For the applicant composite evaluation measure, main effects were significant for self-promotion intensity level ($F[1, 278] = 6.70, p < .01, \eta^2 = .02$) and rater gender ($F[1, 278] = 16.59, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = .06$). Higher intensity self-promotion tactics ($M = 20.89, SD = 3.53$) resulted in lower evaluations than lower intensity tactics ($M = 21.84, SD = 3.51$), and male evaluators ($M = 20.49, SD = 3.70$) gave lower ratings than female evaluators ($M = 22.14, SD = 3.24$).

As predicted by Hypothesis 2, a three-way interaction of applicant gender, self-promotion frequency, and self-promotion intensity was significant for the applicant evaluation score ($F[1, 278] = 3.91, p < .05, \eta_p^2 = .01$). Post hoc tests show that the female applicant was given significantly lower evaluation scores when she engaged in high frequency and high intensity self-promotion compared to when she engaged in high frequency and low intensity self-promotion, whereas ratings of the male applicant were unaffected by self-promotion level. Table 4 presents dependent variable cell means for applicant gender, self-promotion frequency, and self-promotion intensity.

A three-way interaction of evaluator gender, applicant gender, and self-promotion intensity level was found ($F[1, 278] = 5.21, p < .05, \eta_p^2 = .02$). Post hoc tests

Table 2. Experiment 2: Correlations, means, and standard deviations for applicant evaluation measures, credentials, and resume outcomes

	1	2	3	4	5	6	M	SD	Factor loadings for composite evaluation measure
1. Social skills	–						5.53	1.10	0.86
2. Mental capability	.70	–					5.52	0.83	0.85
3. Organizational fit	.69	.68	–				5.29	0.98	0.92
4. Job fit	.66	.64	.86	–			5.08	1.09	0.90
5. Credentials	.70	.70	.75	.77	–		3.93	0.58	
6. Outcomes	.68	.60	.78	.75	.68	–	78.78	19.32	

Note: $N = 295$. All correlations are significant at $p < .001$. The Composite Evaluation Measure includes these variables: social skills, mental capability, organizational fit, and job fit.

Table 3. Experiment 2: Cell means and standard deviations of dependent measures by evaluator gender, applicant gender, and self-promotion intensity

	Female evaluator				Male evaluator			
	Female applicant		Male applicant		Female applicant		Male applicant	
	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD
Credentials								
Lower intensity	3.97 ^a	0.64	4.04 ^a	0.54	4.07 ^a	0.55	3.76	0.64
Higher intensity	4.11 ^a	0.50	4.05 ^a	0.40	3.56 ^b	0.56	3.85	0.57
Applicant evaluation score								
Lower intensity	25.98 ^a	4.30	26.52 ^a	3.32	26.52 ^a	3.06	24.13	4.61
Higher intensity	25.96 ^a	3.42	26.13 ^a	3.44	22.27 ^b	4.23	24.27	3.76
Resume outcomes								
Lower intensity	80.86 ^a	20.06	81.79 ^a	16.03	86.88 ^a	10.08	74.57 ^a	20.54
Higher intensity	82.15 ^a	15.97	81.67 ^a	15.13	59.97 ^b	27.63	80.74 ^a	11.80

Note: Higher numbers indicate more positive evaluation. For each dependent variable, different letters indicate means that significantly differ at $p < .05$.

indicate that male evaluators gave female applicants significantly lower evaluation scores when they more intensely self-promoted compared to when they engaged in less intense self-promotion. When the applicant was male, level of self-promotion had no impact on evaluation. The evaluator gender, applicant gender, and self-promotion frequency three-way interaction was not significant ($F[1, 278] = 1.70$, $p > .05$).

For resume outcomes (probability of inviting for an interview, of hiring, and of being successful on the job), the same pattern of results was found as for the combined evaluation measure. Main effects were significant for self-promotion intensity level ($F[1, 277] = 4.29$, $p < .05$, $\eta_p^2 = .01$) and evaluator gender ($F[1, 277] = 8.05$, $p < .01$, $\eta_p^2 = .03$). Again, means were lower when self-promotion tactics were higher in intensity ($M = 76.54$, $SD = 20.58$) than when they were of lower intensity ($M = 80.61$, $SD = 18.12$), and male raters ($M = 72.23$, $SD = 21.38$) gave lower ratings than female raters ($M = 81.54$, $SD = 17.11$). A three-way interaction of applicant gender, self-promotion frequency, and self-promotion intensity was significant for resume outcomes

($F[1, 277] = 4.50$, $p < .05$, $\eta_p^2 = .02$). As predicted by Hypothesis 2, female applicants who engaged in high frequency and high intensity self-promotion were given significantly lower scores than male applicants who engaged in high frequency and high intensity self-promotion, and female applicants who engaged in lower intensity self-promotion. Thus, the female applicant was penalized for strongly self-promoting, whereas strong self-promotion had no effect on the male applicant's resume outcomes.

In addition, a three-way interaction was found for evaluator gender, applicant gender, and self-promotion intensity ($F[1, 277] = 15.79$, $p < .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .05$). Inspection of the means in Table 3 reveals that male raters gave significantly lower outcome ratings to the female applicant when she engaged in more intense self-promotion compared to when she engaged in less intense self-promotion, and compared to the male applicant regardless of his level of self-promotion. Once again, the three-way interaction of evaluator gender, applicant gender, and self-promotion frequency was not significant ($F[1, 277] = 0.38$, $p > .05$).

Table 4. Experiment 2: Cell means and standard deviations of dependent measures by applicant gender, self-promotion frequency and self-promotion intensity

	Female applicant				Male applicant			
	Lower frequency		Higher frequency		Lower frequency		Higher frequency	
	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD
Evaluation score								
Lower intensity	25.84	3.97	26.65 ^a	3.74	25.40	3.82	25.17	4.64
Higher intensity	25.25	3.61	23.00 ^b	4.61	24.72	3.95	25.99	3.34
Resume outcomes								
Lower intensity	81.24 ^a	18.31	85.42 ^a	15.72	77.67	17.43	78.51	20.51
Higher intensity	78.01	17.47	64.20 ^b	29.87	79.16	15.56	83.29 ^a	11.68

Note: Higher numbers indicate more positive evaluation. For each dependent variable, different letters indicate means that significantly differ at $p < .05$.

7.3. Discussion

Applicant gender and self-promotion frequency and intensity levels interacted to affect evaluations and resume outcomes, such that when female applicants engaged in high frequency, high intensity self-promotion, they received lower ratings compared to female applicants who engaged in less-intense self-promotion. For the male applicant, level of self-promotion frequency and intensity had no effect on his evaluation or outcomes. Thus, self-promotion in the video resume was largely ineffective for the male applicant and in some situations it was detrimental for the female applicant. In addition, rater gender was found to interact with applicant gender and self-promotion level. These results are consistent with research on paper resumes (Tyler & McCullough, 2009), in which rater and evaluator gender have been found to interact to affect applicant evaluation.

Although the content of the manipulation may appear to be very strong (e.g., 'I take full credit for that success'; 'The fundraiser was successful solely due to my efforts'), when self-promotion intensity statements were presented in the context of a video resume, they were perceived at a moderate level of self-promotion (for the higher intensity self-promotion condition, $M = 3.57$; $SD = .88$; for the lower intensity condition, $M = 2.88$, $SD = .94$; responses were based on a 7-point scale). Thus, the manipulation was not perceived as overly strong and is likely to accurately depict what a job applicant might communicate to a potential employer.

One of the strengths of this study is that it distinguishes between two aspects of IM by manipulating both the frequency and intensity of self-promotion. These results indicate that both frequency and intensity may be separate dimensions of impression management and that raters may react to these dimensions differently. Specifically, more intense self-promotion statements were more damaging to female applicants than more frequent, lower intensity self-promotion statements. Guadagno and Cialdini (2007) noted that women who are successful in powerful male-dominated roles may engage in a 'hybrid' self-promotion style, balancing the conflicting demands of gender and occupational roles. Less intense, more frequent self-promotion may be an example of such a hybrid style.

Given that only high and low levels of self-promotion frequency and intensity were manipulated, it is unclear if self-promotion level is linearly related to applicant evaluation. Future research should include mid-range levels of self-promotion frequency and intensity to determine the form of the relationship between self-promotion level and applicant evaluation. Furthermore, researchers should test for threshold levels of IM frequency and intensity that may be required for the detection of IM tactics.

8. General discussion and conclusions

The results of these two studies indicate that experienced recruiters, as well as college students, react to the level of self-promotion apparent in video resumes and that these reactions are affected by applicant gender. The sample of experienced recruiters in Experiment 1 and the sample of college students in Experiment 2 were less willing to interview and hire a female applicant who self-promoted and less likely to believe that she would be successful, compared to when she engaged in little or no self-promotion. Although the college sample showed gender bias across all of the dependent measures, recruiters responded differently to the three dependent measures, only reacting in a gender biased manner for resume outcomes. Perhaps, recruiters were reacting to the realities of organizational life (i.e., that self-promoting women face backlash and that this may impede success) in their evaluation of outcomes.

Researchers have cautioned that obvious self-promotion may be harmful to job candidates (e.g., Fletcher, 1989; Higgins et al., 2003; Kacmar et al., 1992). However, in the context of video resumes, harmful effects were apparent only when the applicant was female. The present research is consistent with the lack of fit model (Heilman & Eagly, 2008) and research indicating that gender bias may occur due to a mismatch between gender stereotypes and work roles (Eagly & Karau, 2002; Heilman & Eagly, 2008; Riach & Rich, 2002). Male applicants who strongly self-promoted (i.e., behaved in a gender congruent manner) were not rewarded for this behavior. Video resumes may result in conditions that make self-promotion obvious to evaluators, reducing its effectiveness.

Research on gender and impression management indicates that men and women may engage in different IM tactics, with the tactics used by men being more assertive and dominant than those reported by women (Guadagno & Cialdini, 2007). Thus, video resumes developed by women may contain less intense self-promotion or a more balanced use of IM tactics. For example, self-promotion may work better when combined with ingratiation than when used alone (Bolino et al., 2008), particularly for female applicants. However, tactics used more commonly by women (e.g., modesty, opinion conformity, flattery) may be less effective in a video resume context compared to those used by men (e.g., self-enhancement/promotion, entitlement). In addition, many of the IM tactics considered to be feminine (see Guadagno & Cialdini, 2007) rely on knowledge of the target, which is unlikely to be available at the resume stage of selection. Thus, video resumes may offer fewer viable IM options for women.

Future research should examine actual video resumes developed by men and women for differences in the

use of IM tactics and their relative effectiveness. In addition, evaluator attributions regarding the causes of self-promotion (i.e., the situation requires it versus the person is being manipulative or conceited) may be a fruitful area for future research. For example, raters have been found to attribute more external attributions (i.e., performance was due to the communication medium used) to interviewees who used video conferencing technology (versus face-to-face interviewing), resulting in more favorable ratings for those interviewees (Chapman & Webster, 2001). Similarly, if self-promotion observed in video resumes is attributed to the resume format itself, rather than to the applicant, then gender bias may be reduced or eliminated. In particular, if norms were to develop regarding video resume content and evaluation, then resume reviewers may become less sensitive to self-promotion in that context and gender bias might be reduced or eliminated.

In this research, controlled experiments were employed as a reasonable initial step in examining self-promotion in the context of video resumes. The similar findings for the current recruiter and college student samples are consistent with research by Roulin et al. (2015) in which novice and experienced interviewers were similar in their ability to detect IM tactic use. In addition, laboratory and field studies have been found to converge with regard to the effect of workplace gender stereotypes on evaluation (Leslie, King, Bradley, & Hebl, 2008). However, future research should use actual selection situations with recruiters and hiring managers as research participants. Furthermore, the stimulus resumes used in the present research depict young, moderately attractive, Caucasian job applicants applying for a managerial job. The lack of diversity in the age, race, and attractiveness level of the applicants may affect the generalizability of these findings. Future experimental research should include stimuli depicting a more diverse applicant pool.

Job applicants, regardless of gender, should proceed with caution regarding the use of self-promotion tactics in video resumes. Video resumes may result in conditions that make self-promotion more obvious to evaluators compared to self-promotion in interviews. This may reduce the effectiveness of self-promotion when used in video resumes. In contrast, the use of IM tactics in interviews has been found to be beneficial to job candidates (Gilmore & Ferris, 1989; Higgins et al., 2003; Kacmar et al., 1992). It appears that evaluative processes operating in the context of video resumes may be distinct, and perhaps inconsistent, from those occurring in interviews. More research is needed on IM tactics used at the earliest stages of selection, and, more specifically, on the mechanisms operating within video resumes that impact applicant evaluation.

Finally, managers should be educated with regard to the effects of stereotypes and gender roles on job candidate evaluation. In addition, care should be taken to ensure that gender neutral criteria are used in applicant selection and that the gender of evaluators is considered (Guadagno & Cialdini, 2007). Furthermore, increasing the personal significance of ratings to evaluators, through increased outcome dependence (e.g., Rudman, 1998) and/or increased accountability (e.g., Lerner & Tetlock, 1999), may mitigate the effect of gender stereotypes on applicant evaluation. Given that technology will continue to influence recruitment and selection procedures and devices, more research examining the application of technology to job search and selection situations is needed.

Acknowledgements

We thank Greg Taylor for his help in filming the videos, and Britta Roan and Regina Storrs for their help in contacting recruiters. We also thank Diana Maizo, Ann Najar, Anjana Pillarisetty, Stephanie Sauber, Markie Silverman, Heidi Sittas, Shantel Spears, Kristi Sutherland, Akif Tahir, and Travis Walker for their help with data collection.

References

- Amare, N., & Manning, A. (2009). Writing for the robot: How employer search tools have influenced resume rhetoric and ethics. *Business Communication Quarterly*, 72, 35–60. doi: 10.1177/1080569908330383
- Barrick, M. R., Shaffer, J. A., & DeGrassi, S. W. (2009). What you see may not be what you get: Relationships among self-presentation tactics and ratings of interview and job performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 94, 1394–1411. doi: 10.1037/a0016532
- Blau, F. D., & Kahn, L. M. (2007). The gender pay gap: Have women gone as far as they can? *Academy of Management Perspectives*, 21, 7–23. doi: 10.5465/AMP.2007.24286161
- Bolino, M. C., Kacmar, K. M., Turnley, W. H., & Gilstrap, J. B. (2008). A multi-level review of impression management motives and behaviors. *Journal of Management*, 34, 1080–1109. doi:10.1177/0149206308324325
- Bolino, M. C., Klotz, A. C., & Daniels, D. (2014). The impact of impression management over time. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 29, 266–284. doi: 10.1108/JMP-10-2012-0290
- Bozeman, D. P., & Kacmar, K. M. (1997). A cybernetic model of impression management processes in organizations. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 69, 9–30. doi: 10.1006/obhd.1996.2669
- Bright, J. E. H., & Hutton, S. (2000). The impact of competency statements on resumes for short-listing decisions. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 8, 41–53. doi: 10.1111/1468-2389.00132
- Butler, D., & Geis, F. L. (1990). Nonverbal affect responses to male and female leaders: Implications for leadership evaluations.

- Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 58, 48–59. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.58.1.48
- Cable, D. M., & Judge, T. A. (1996). Person–organization fit, job choice decisions, and organizational entry. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 67, 294–311. doi: 10.1006/obhd.1996.0081
- Chapman, D. S., & Webster, J. (2001). Rater correction processes in applicant selection using videoconference technology: The role of attributions. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 31, 2518–2537. doi: 10.1111/j.1559-1816.2001.tb00188.x
- Chung, J. (2001). The effects of rater sex and ratee sex on managerial performance evaluation. *Australian Journal of Management*, 26, 147–161.
- Correll, S.J., Benard, S., & Polk, I. (2007). Getting a job: Is there a motherhood penalty? *American Journal of Sociology*, 112, 1297–1338. doi: 10.1086/511799
- Cuddy, A.J.C., Fiske, S.T., & Glick, P. (2007). The BIAS Map: Behaviors from intergroup affect and stereotypes. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 92, 631–648. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.92.4.631
- Dizik, A. (2010, May 20). Wooing job recruiters with video resumes. *The Wall Street Journal*, Eastern Edition, D4.
- Eagly, A. H. (1987). *Sex differences in social behavior: A social-role interpretation*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Eagly, A. H. & Karau, S. J. (2002). Role congruity theory of prejudice toward female leaders. *Psychological Review*, 109, 573–598. doi: 10.1037/0033-295X.109.3.573
- Ellis, A. P. J., West B. J., Ryan, A.M., & DeShon, R.P. (2002). The use of impression management tactics in structured interviews: A function of question type? *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87, 1200–1208. doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.87.6.1200
- Fiske, S. T., Bersoff, D. N., Borgida, E., Deaux, K., & Heilman, M. E. (1991). Social science research on trial: Use of sex stereotyping research in Price Waterhouse v. Hopkins. *American Psychologist*, 46, 1049–1060. doi: 10.1037/0003-066X.46.10.1049
- Fletcher, C. (1989). Impression management in the selection interview. In R. A. Giacalone & P. Rosenfeld (Eds.), *Impression management in the organization* (pp. 269–281). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Gilmore, D. C. & Ferris, G. R. (1989). The effects of applicant impression management tactics on interviewer judgments. *Journal of Management*, 15, 557–564. doi:10.1177/014920638901500405
- Giordani, P. (2009). Video resumes and interviews: Are paper and in-person passé? *NACE Journal*, 69, 45–48.
- Gissel, A.L., & Thompson, L. F. (2012). Who is inclined to make video resumes? Assessing Video Resumes: Valuable and/or Vulnerable to Biased Decision-making? Presented at the Twenty Seventh Annual Conference of the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology, San Diego, CA.
- Gissel, A. L., Thompson, L. F., & Pond, S. P. III (2013). A theory-driven investigation of prospective applicants' intentions to submit video resumes. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 43, 2449–2461. doi: 10.1111/jasp.12191
- Godfrey, D. K., Jones, E. E., & Lord, C. G. (1986). Self-promotion is not ingratiating. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 50, 106–115. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.50.1.106
- Guadagno, R. E., & Cialdini, R. B. (2007). Gender differences in impression management in organizations: A qualitative review. *Sex Roles*, 56, 483–494. doi: 10.1007/s11199-007-9187-3
- Heilman, M. E., & Eagly, A. H. (2008). Gender stereotypes are alive, well, and busy producing workplace discrimination. *Industrial and Organizational Psychology: Perspectives on Science and Practice*, 1, 393–398. doi: 10.1111/j.1754-9434.2008.00072.x
- Heilman, M. E., & Haynes, M. C. (2008). Subjectivity in the appraisal process: A facilitator of gender bias in work settings. In E. Borgida & S. T. Fiske (Eds.), *Beyond common sense: Psychological science in the courtroom* (pp. 127–155). Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Heilman, M. E., & Okimoto, T.G., (2007). Why are women penalized for success at male tasks?: The implied communality deficit. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92, 81–92. doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.92.1.81
- Hiemstra, A., Derous, E., Born, M., & Serlie, A. (2011). Ethnically diverse perceptions of video resumes. In E. Derous (Chair) *Multimedia based tools for recruitment and selection: Psychometric properties, equivalence, and applicant perceptions. Presentation delivered at the 15th European Congress of Work and Organizational Psychology*, Maastricht, The Netherlands.
- Higgins, C. A., & Judge, T. A. (2004). The effect of applicant influence tactics on recruiter perceptions of fit and hiring recommendations: A field study. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 89, 622–632. doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.89.4.622
- Higgins, C. A., Judge, T. A., & Ferris, G. R. (2003). Influence tactics and work outcomes: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 24, 89–106. doi: 10.1002/job.181
- Huffcutt, A. I., Conway, J. M., Roth, P. L., & Stone, N. J. (2001). Identification and meta-analytic assessment of psychological constructs measured in employment interviews. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86, 897–913. doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.86.5.897
- Hultin, M. (2003). Some take the glass escalator, some hit the glass ceiling?: Career consequences of occupational sex segregation. *Work and Occupations*, 30, 30–61. doi:10.1177/0730888402239326
- Kacmar, K. M., Delery, J. E., & Ferris, G. R. (1992). Differential effectiveness of applicant impression management tactics on employment interview decisions. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 22, 1250–1272. doi: 10.1111/j.1559-1816.1992.tb00949.x
- Kite, M. E., Deaux, K., & Haines, E. L. (2008). Gender stereotypes. In F. L. Denmark & M. A. Paludi (Eds.), *Psychology of women: A handbook of issues and theories* (2nd ed., pp. 205–236). Westport, CT: Praeger.
- Knouse, S. B. (1994). Impressions of the Resume: The effects of applicant education, experience, and impression management. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 9, 33–45. doi: 10.1007/BF02230985
- Knouse, S. B., Giacalone, R.A., Pollard, H. (1988). Impression management in the resume and its cover letter. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 3, 242–249. doi: 10.1007/BF01014492
- Kristof-Brown, A. L., Barrick, M. R., & Franke, M. (2002). Applicant impression management: Dispositional influences and consequences for recruiter perceptions of fit and similarity. *Journal of Management*, 28, 27–46. doi:10.1177/014920630202800103
- Langfitt, F. (2006, December 20). Job hunters seek winning edge in video resumes. Morning Edition (Radio Broadcast Transcript). Washington, DC: National Public Radio. Available at www.npr.org.
- Landy, F. J. (2008). Stereotypes, bias, and personnel decisions: Strange and stranger. *Industrial and Organizational Psychology:*

- Perspectives on Science and Practice*, 1, 379–392. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1754-9434.2008.00071.x>
- Lerner, J. S., & Tetlock, P. E. (1999). Accounting for the effects of accountability. *Psychological Bulletin*, 125, 255–275. doi: 10.1037/0033-2909.125.2.255
- Leslie, L. M., King, E. B., Bradley, J. C., & Hebl, M. R. (2008). Triangulation across methodologies: All signs point to persistent stereotyping and discrimination in organizations. *Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, 1, 399–404. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1754-9434.2008.00073.x>
- Lievens, F., & Peeters, H. (2008). Interviewers' sensitivity to impression management tactics in structured interviews. *European Journal of Psychological Assessment*, 24, 174–180. doi: 10.1027/1015-5759.24.3.174
- Moss-Racusin, C. A., & Rudman, L. (2010). Disruptions in women's self-promotion: The backlash avoidance model. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 34, 186–202. doi: 10.1111/j.1471-6402.2010.01561.x
- Phelan, J. E., Moss-Racusin, C. A., & Rudman, L. A. (2008). Competent yet out in the cold: Shifting criteria for hiring reflects backlash toward agentic women. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 32, 406–413. doi: 10.1111/j.1471-6402.2008.00454.x
- Posthuma, R. A., Morgeson, F. P., & Campion, M. A. (2002). Beyond employment interview validity: A comprehensive narrative review of recent research and trends over time. *Personnel Psychology*, 55, 1–81. doi: 10.1111/j.1744-6570.2002.tb00103.x
- Riach, P. A., & Rich, J. (2002). Field experiments of discrimination in the market place. *Economic Journal*, 112, F480–F518.
- Rosenfeld, P., Giacalone, R. A., & Riordan, C. A. (1995). *Impression management in organizations*. London: Routledge.
- Roulin, N., Bangerter, A., & Levashina, J. (2014). Interviewers' perceptions of impression management in employment interviews. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 29, 141–163. doi: 10.1108/JMP-10-2012-0295
- Roulin, N., Bangerter, A., & Levashina, J. (2015). Honest and deceptive impression management in the employment interview: Can it be detected and how does it impact evaluations? *Personnel Psychology*, 68, 395–444. doi: 10.1111/peps.12079
- Rudman, L. A. (1998). Self-promotion as a risk factor for women: The costs and benefits of counter-stereotypical impression management. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 74, 629–645. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.74.3.62A
- Rynes, S. & Gerhart, B. (1990). Interviewer assessments of applicant "fit": An exploratory investigation. *Personnel Psychology*, 43, 13–35. doi: 10.1111/j.1744-6570.1990.tb02004.x
- Schein, V. E. (2001). A global look at the psychological barriers to women's progress in management. *Journal of Social Issues*, 57, 675–688. doi: 10.1111/0022-4537.00235
- Schlenker, B. R., & Weigold, M. F. (1992). Interpersonal processes involving impression regulation and management. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 43, 133–168. doi: 10.1146/annurev.ps.43.020192.001025
- Smith, A. N., Watkins, M. B., Burke, M. J., Christian, M. S., Smith, C. E., Hall, A., & Simms, S. (2013). Gendered influence: A gender role perspective on the use and effectiveness of influence tactics. *Journal of Management*, 39, 1156–1183. doi:10.1177/0149206313478183
- Stevens, C. K., & Kristof, A. L. (1995). Making the right impression: A field study of applicant impression management during job interviews. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 80, 587–606. doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.80.5.587
- Tedeschi, J. T., & Melburg, V. (1984). Impression management and influence in the organization. In S. B. Bacharach & E. J. Lawler (Eds.), *Research in the sociology of organizations* (Vol. 3, pp. 31–58). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- Tyler, J. M., & McCullough, J. D. (2009). Violating prescriptive stereotypes on job resumes: A self-presentational perspective. *Management Communication Quarterly*, 23, 272–287. doi: 10.1177/0893318909341412
- Varma, A., Soo Min, T., & Pichler, S. (2006). Ingratiation in job applicants: Impact on selection decisions. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 21, 200–210. doi: 10.1108/02683940610659551
- Waung, M., Hymes, R. W., & Beatty, J. E. (2014). The effects of video and paper resumes on assessments of personality, applied social skills, mental capability, and resume outcomes. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology*, 36, 238–251. doi: 10.1080/01973533.2014.894477
- Wayne, S. J., & Ferris, G. R. (1990). Influence tactics, affect, and exchange quality in supervisor–subordinate interactions: A laboratory experiment and a field study. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 75, 487–499. doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.75.5.487
- Wayne, S. J., & Liden, R. C. (1995). Effects of impression management on performance ratings: A longitudinal study. *Academy of Management Journal*, 38, 232–260. doi: 10.2307/256734.

Appendix A

Script of video resume (control condition – no self-promotion)

Hi. My name is Andrea (Andrew) Phillips. I'm currently a student at XXX. I am looking for an entry level management position where I may use my knowledge and skills to contribute to the goals of your organization.

I am currently completing a Bachelors of Business Administration with a GPA of 3.25. I have had experience working as an HR Intern at XXX in XXX. As an HR Intern I assisted the Global HR Manager with employee relations by developing data base and research aids to facilitate analysis.

Another project involved working with the HRIS Administrator to develop orientation materials which included policies, procedures, and benefits to new employees. In this job the files and record-keeping were a mess to the point that it took a lot of time to track down information, so my task was to organize the files using a computer database.

I have also worked as a sales associate at XXX. I interacted with customers and provided assistance to them with the goal of increasing customer satisfaction and sales.

As a member of the service organization, XXX, I worked to raise money for cystic fibrosis. As a student government representative I worked on a recycling program and on the shuttle service on campus.

My computer skills include MS Word, Power Point, Excel, Access, Outlook, Internet, Adobe Photoshop, SPSS, and HTML.

Thank you for taking the time to view my video. I hope to hear from your organization soon.

My contact information may be found on my resume. Thank you.

Appendix B

Self-promotion frequency and intensity manipulation

Self-Promotion Tactic	Lower Intensity	Higher Intensity
Overcoming Obstacles – this tactic deals with how the applicant circumvented problems or barriers impeding progress toward a goal. (Intensity was operationalized as the difficulty of obstacles to overcome.)	[I work 20 hours each week to help put myself through school but I have still been able to maintain a 3.25 GPA in my major of business administration through hard work and determination.] I have faced financial setbacks as tuition has increased; however, I've always managed to earn enough money to pay my tuition.	[I work 40 hours each week to put myself through school but I have still been able to maintain a 3.25 GPA in my major of business administration while, while having a more challenging schedule than other students. I have been able to do this through hard work and determination.] I have faced extreme financial setbacks as tuition has increased and loans have become scarcer; however, I've always managed to earn enough money to pay my tuition.
Exemplification – acting as a role model or as an example to others. (Intensity was operationalized as the strength/quality of the role model)	[While working on this project I was told that I was a good example to the newer interns due to my positive attitude and professionalism.] I worked hard to increase access to recycling bins and was a good example to other students by making sure that I was recycling and that student government was too.	[While working on this project I was told that I was an ideal example to the newer interns due to my positive attitude and unfailing professionalism.] I worked very hard to increase access to recycling bins and was an exceptional example to other students by making sure that I was recycling and that student government was too.
Entitlement – claim responsibility for positive events or outcomes even if personal credit for such outcomes is unmerited. (Intensity was operationalized as the amount of credit taken for outcomes.)	[The fundraising committee lacked direction and leadership so I helped take charge and motivate the group and we were able to raise a thousand dollars. I was an important part of that fundraiser.] I also worked to add an extra shuttle service to campus.	[The fundraising committee lacked direction and leadership so I took complete charge and completely motivated the group and we were able to raise a thousand dollars. The fundraiser was successful solely due to my efforts.] I also worked to add an extra shuttle service to campus and the success of this was completely due to my efforts. I take full credit for that success.
Enhancement – refers to claims that the value of a positive event for which the applicant was responsible may be greater than most people might think. (Intensity was operationalized as the value of the positive event.)	[I fostered customer satisfaction due to my knowledge of store products. I consistently exceeded my sales goals for the everyday lines and for Bridal & Gift Registry. I had one of the higher sales totals in the store. My work with customers probably resulted in an increase in overall store sales of about \$100 each shift that I worked.] I took responsibility for this task and I estimate that I saved the department time and improved efficiency by 10%. (filing task)	[I fostered customer satisfaction due to my extensive knowledge of store products. I consistently exceeded my sales goals for the everyday lines and for Bridal & Gift Registry. I had the highest sales total in the area. My work with customers probably resulted in an increase in overall store sales of about \$400 each shift that I worked.] I took responsibility for this task and I estimate that I saved the department time and improved efficiency by 40%. (filing task)
General Self-Promotion (positive self descriptions) – tactics are intended to show that the applicant possesses	[This is due to my organizational skills and motivation.] I am a persistent person and this	[This is due to my strong organizational skills and unusually high levels of motivation.]

desirable qualities for the job. (Intensity was operationalized as the desirability, superiority, uniqueness or importance of qualities possessed.)	shows in my accomplishments. I like to be a role model for others. [I am efficient and able to accomplish many different tasks. This shows that I have leadership ability.] [In closing, I have many skills to offer. I possess good judgment and decision-making skills.] I am persuasive and I have strong interpersonal skills. I have been told that I am creative and a good problem-solver. I am organized. I have also been praised for my strong work ethic. Finally, I am a team player and I strive to be professional in all aspects of my work.	I am a very persistent person and this shows in my many unique accomplishments. I like to be a role model for others. I find that others want to be like me. [I am exceptionally efficient and able to accomplish many difficult tasks.] This shows that I have superior leadership ability. [In closing, I have many exceptional skills to offer. I possess superior judgment and decision-making skills.] I am extremely persuasive and I have exceptionally strong interpersonal skills. I have been told that I am uniquely creative and an excellent problem-solver. I am completely organized in all aspects of my work. I have also been praised for my very strong work ethic. Finally, I am an invaluable team player and I strive to be completely professional in all aspects of my work.
---	---	--

Descriptions of IM tactics can be procured from Ellis et al. (2002) and Kacmar et al. (1992). Low frequency content is bracketed.