

Impression Management

We often receive questions concerning the “Impression Management” subscale cluster on the HPI: Mastery, Moralistic, and Virtuous. Although these three subscales predict intended behaviors such as adhering to personal values, working hard, and striving for perfection, we also stress that high scores on all three might reflect impression management. In other words, while it is certainly possible for someone to be high on all three of these subscales, they also represent areas where individuals are likely to focus when purposefully trying to present themselves in the very best light possible.

Below are questions we often receive about the HPI’s “Impression Management” subscale cluster.

Q. How do we identify impression management?

A. Hogan identifies potential impression management using three Prudence subscales. These subscales help determine if a participant’s scores reflect a person attempting to manage positive impressions of him/herself through social skill and conscientious responding. Previously, we classified individuals as potential impression managers if their raw scores across these subscales added up to 12 points or greater across 14 total items. Now, with our updated subscale reporting format, brick scores for these subscales range from 0 to 12. With this new scoring format, total brick scores of 11 or 12 now indicate potential impression management.

Q. Should you be concerned if a large percentage of your sample demonstrates impression management?

A. No. During everyday social interactions, individuals try to manage how others view them. Responding to personality items is a form of social interaction, which serves as the basis for one’s reputation. We’ve designed our assessments to predict reputations at work, which are the best source of information concerning how individuals will perform in the future. Therefore, responding to items in a socially desirable manner reflects how a person is likely to behave in potential job-related situations.

For more information on measuring personality and the impact of impression management, we recommend the following articles and book chapters:

- ❖ Dilchert, S., Ones, D. S., Viswesvaran, C., & Deller, J. (2006). Response distortion in personality measurement: Born to deceive, yet capable of providing valid self-assessments? *Psychology Science*, 48, 209-225.
- ❖ Hogan, J., Barrett, P., & Hogan, R. (2007). Personality measurement, faking, and employment selection. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92, 1270–1285.
- ❖ Hogan, R. & Foster, J. (2016). Rethinking personality. *International Journal of Personality Psychology*, 2, 37–43.
- ❖ Johnson, J. A., & Hogan, R. (2006). A socio-analytic view of faking. In R. Griffith (Ed.), *A closer examination of applicant faking behavior* (pp. 209-231). Greenwich, CT: Information Age Publishing.