Graduate Theses and Dissertations   Graduate School

1-1-2015

Assessing Political Skill for Management Selection

Nneka Joseph
University of South Florida, nneka.joseph@gmail.com

Assessing Political Skill for Management Selection

by

Nneka Joseph

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy Industrial and Organizational Psychology
Department of Psychology
College of Arts and Sciences
University of South Florida

Major Professor: Michael Brannick. Ph.D.
Walter Borman, Ph.D.
Jennifer Bosson, Ph.D.
Walter Nord, Ph.D.
Paul Spector, Ph.D.

Date of Approval:
February 6, 2015

Keywords: Test, Recruitment, Employees, Comparison

DEDICATION

I would like to dedicate my dissertation to my family; my parents, Jennifer and Peter Joseph, my sister, Zahra Gibbons, my grandmother, Dora Gibbons and all other family members for their love, support and encouragement.

I would also dedicate this project to my close friends who kept my spirits up, provided stress relief and were there when I needed them.

I dedicate my dissertation work and specially thank my best friend. Shayne Cooper, who reassured me when I doubted myself, gave words of inspiration and coached me through this process till the end.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to warmly thank my advisor Michael Brannick, PhD. for his support, guidance and feedback throughout graduate school. I would also like to acknowledge my dissertation committee for their spirited discussion, fair evaluation and many suggestions for future studies. Thank you to Jacob Opadeyi, PhD and Alison Gibbons PhD., though not formerly my advisors they gave me a lot of guidance to assist with the completion of my dissertation.

To my cohort, Jeff, Jacob, Erin and Jason, we did it. We all completed our Ph.Ds and I know I would not have made it through my classes, research projects and dissertation without you. I would like to give a special thank you to my other school friends Soner and Ande who actively got involved in my project and helped with the paper work. To my friends and work colleagues I would like to say thank you for your support in participating in pilot tests and the initial stages of test development for my study.

Finally, I would like to show my appreciation to the UWI-Arthur Lok Jack Graduate School of Business, Professor Miguel Carrillo, for giving me permission to interview and assess their students for my dissertation.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

ABSTRACT

Political skill has been described as using human resources and manipulating social exchanges to influence group outcomes (Mintzberg, 1983). Researchers have found that political skill has significant relationships with constructs such as contextual performance, career satisfaction and leadership. Based on these empirical findings it may be beneficial to include a measure of political skill as part of a selection process. In this study, different methods were explored for measuring political skill that may be appropriate for administrative purposes such as the self-rated questionnaire called the Political Skill Inventory (PSI), a situational judgment test (SJT) and the structured interview. A sample of 100 graduate business students, most of whom had extensive managerial experience, completed the previously mentioned measures in exchange for feedback on their assessments. The participants were subsequently rated on political skill by their coworkers. The only significant association with the coworker scores was the PSI; neither the SJT nor the structured interview showed a significant relationship with the peer ratings of political skill. However, there were unforeseen technical limits to the measures that might explain the negative findings. The paper concludes with recommendations for improving the measures prior to a follow-up study.

CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION

What makes one employee more successful than another is an important question for industrial and organizational (I/O) psychologists. Researchers have examined various antecedents to job performance and some have noted that the more capable a person is at utilizing different resources and skills in order to influence change, the more likely that they will be a successful and effective employee. Mintzberg (1983) introduced the term Political Skill, to describe utilizing human resources to influence change. He explored how the ability to observe and manipulate social exchanges could contribute to being an effective employee. Expounding on Mintzberg's concept, Ferris, et al. (2005) further defined Political Skill as "the ability to effectively understand others at work and to use such knowledge to influence others to act in ways that enhance one's personal and/or organizational objectives".

Building on the perception that political skill could be a contributing factor to job performance it became essential to develop an instrument to measure it. In the initial stages of test development, Ferris, et al. (2007) conducted several psychometric analyses and discovered that a four factor model was best suited for the content of political skill. The four dimensions identified from the factor analysis were termed social astuteness, interpersonal influence, networking ability and apparent sincerity. Ferris and his colleagues defined social astuteness as the ability to observe others' behaviors and critically analyze social interactions. Those who are socially astute can empathize with others in order to receive personal gains. Interpersonal influence involves adjusting one's behavior to match the audience to maximize one's influence with the intent of achieving one's personal objective. Developing a significant social group incorporates negotiating and conflict management skills. People who can

strategically position themselves through alliances and coalitions can take advantage of multiple opportunities that arise from knowing other influential people. This practice is referred to as networking. The final dimension is apparent sincerity which is simply managing your image such that you appear to others as having high levels of integrity and that you are authentic, sincere, and genuine.

Based on the results of the factor analysis the Political Skill Inventory (PSI) was developed by Ferris, et al. (2005). The current PSI is an 18 item test that asks candidates to rate on a $1 - 7$ scale their agreement with statements such as "I am good at getting people to like me." With an instrument developed it was now time for researchers to truly explore the relationships between political skill and job performance along with other job relevant variables. The PSI and its modified 6 item version have been used in many studies concerning political skill. The following section will review current research which provides insight into the role that political skill plays in the work environment.

CURRENT RESEARCH

Although Mintzberg introduced this concept in the early 1980s, it was only recently that researchers have explored the relationship between political skill and other constructs of interest. Through the use of the PSI, researchers discovered that political skill has significant positive relationships with contextual job performance (Jawahar, Meurs, Ferris & Hochwarter, 2008), career satisfaction, and promotion within the organization (Todd, Harris, Harris & Wheeler, 2009).

Political skill was initially proposed as the manipulation of human resources and social interactions which is similar to the concept of leadership. "A leader gets organizations and people to change", Maccoby (2000). Therefore it was also important to look specifically at leader political skill since managers have additional social pressures requiring them to build and maintain relationships with multiple persons at varying levels, both internal and external to the organization. Ahearn, Ferris, Hochwarter, Douglas & Ammeter (2004) found that leader political skill accounted for a significant increment in team performance variance after controlling for a number of leader characteristics and

team variables. It was also discovered that political skill positively related to subordinate and supervisor ratings of leader effectiveness (Douglas & Ammeter, 2004) and employee perceptions of perceived support and trust (Treadway et al. 2004).

These significant results led researchers to conduct more complex analyses in order to further understand the significance of political skill. Studies found that political skill can also be a moderator for several relationships involving stress. One study uncovered that political skill has a positive effect on reducing stress by moderating its relationship with role conflict. Another explored the relationship between role conflict and strain. Strain, a sub-factor of stress, occurs when the appraisal of one's situation becomes psychologically uncomfortable and generates negative emotional and physical reactions. The researchers of the this study, Perrewé, Zellars, Ferris, Rossi, Kacmar & Ralston (2004), found that more politically skilled individuals experienced less negative effects of role conflict as it relates to psychological and physiological strain. Jawahar, Stone & Kisamore (2007) explored the concept of burnout. Burnout refers to a drain of mental/emotional resources caused by chronic job stress. In their research paper, they explained that high levels of political skill reduced the negative effects that role conflict has on personal accomplishment, which is one manifestation of burnout.

Political skill not only moderates the role conflict and job stress relationship; it was discovered to play a role in the relationship between impression management and job performance. Harris, Kacmar, Zivnuska & Shaw (2007) found that those who engaged in impression management techniques were rated more favorably by their supervisor when they had high political skill. However, workers who had low political skill scores but engaged in impression management received less favorable performance evaluations from their supervisors. These studies and many others demonstrate that political skill is important as it relates to several constructs such as job satisfaction, job stress and leader effectiveness. However, this is only the beginning stages of discovering the extent to which political skill can impact the workplace. Therefore this paper continues by investigating

existing gaps in current research, focusing in an area that is of great interest to I/O psychologists, employee selection.

GAPS AND LIMITATIONS OF CURRENT RESEARCH

Despite the many significant findings, political skill is a relatively new research area and there is opportunity for improvement and extension of this construct. For example, the current literature has not explored political skill from a selection perspective. Because most of the constructs and relationships examined appear significant for job performance, it seems prudent to measure the political skill of applicants, especially for managerial jobs. As mentioned previously, political skill impacts leadership success in terms of team performance (Ahearn et al., 2004) and perceived leader effectiveness (Douglas & Ammeter, 2004).

One limitation of the current research is that the majority of previous studies of political skill were conducted using one political skill measure, the PSI. The PSI is a self-report measure that uses a Likert-scale response option. Such measures have been shown to be prone to response distortion and appear easily "fakable" in the context of personnel selection (Donovan, Dwight, & Hurtz, 2003). Similar concerns have been raised regarding personality testing for administrative purposes (Arthur, Woehr and Granziano, 2001).

Arthur, et al. (2001) explored several issues associated with personality testing and selection. Two such issues appear relevant to the PSI. One issue is the assumption of a linear relationship between predictors and criteria. The linear model implies that higher scores on the predictor are more desirable, which suggests selecting those with the highest scores over those with more intermediate scores. Alternatively, it may be the case that for some jobs there is an ideal point for the trait; for example, for police officers there may be an ideal point for agreeableness. Because there may be an ideal point for using political behavior this issue is a concern when using the PSI for selection. The second issue noted in this article is impression management and self-deception on a self-report test.

Persons applying for a job are motivated to present themselves in the best light and may therefore alter their responses to do so. It is also possible that they may truly believe that they are very conscientious, for example, when in reality they are not as detail oriented as they think. Impression management and self-deception lead to biased responses on self-report Likert scales.

Though it has been shown that response distortion does not appear to impact the validity of a test (Barrick & Mount, 1996) it has been demonstrated that using the typical top down selection process, especially in management selection when there is a low selection ratio, the selected candidates are disproportionately those who faked on the test (Rosse, Stecher, Miller & Levin, 1998). Thus, for selection contexts at least, it appears preferable to design a measure of political skill that is not as easily manipulated by the test taker to create a favorable impression.

Secondly, the PSI has been mainly validated using undergraduate students who may or may not represent well the population of managerial job applicants. It will be preferable to use a sample of participants that are either managers, managerial applicants, or those who are likely to be managerial applicants within some reasonable period of time.

Thirdly, Mintzberg (1985) argued that to successfully use political behaviors, individuals must not only possess 'political will,' or capacity to expend personal effort, but also possess 'political skill,' the ability to execute behaviors in a politically shrewd way. Treadway, Hochwarter, Kacmar & Ferris (2005) conducted a study that attempted to test Mintzberg's theory by proposing a model of political behavior. However this study did not actually observe participants' political behavior but simply asked whether they engaged in such behavior. It would be preferable to relate scores on a test of political skill to a more impartial measure of behaviors indicative of more or less political skill in job relevant contexts. Since this study will be looking at predicting political behavior; and it may be difficult to actually observe political behavior in the workplace, using other ratings maybe a more appropriate approach rather than self-report. Supervisors, peers and subordinates should be able to provide a

more unbiased evaluation of someone's behavior as opposed to how individuals think they act. Using this type of rating will help fill the gap of measuring political skill that occurs in the workplace.

CURRENT STUDY

Based on the limitations mentioned in the previous section, the purpose of this paper was to develop a measure of political skill that could be used for selection, compare that instrument to existing alternative measures, and compare each of the selected methods to an external job-related performance criterion. The study is intended to provide a better understanding of the measurement of political skill and the reasons for its relation to employee success. The results should also be of interest in the practice of managerial selection.

In order to determine which selection method or methods will be best for assessing political skill, it is important to explore the different options currently used. For job selection there are several measurement methods such as interviews, work samples, assessment centers and situational judgment tests that can be used to assess different constructs. Therefore it is prudent to review the pros and cons of each of these methods to determine which will be best suited as an alternative to the PSI for measuring political skill in selection situations.

SELECTION MEASUREMENT METHODS

One popular measurement method for assessing political skill is the interview. It is included in most selection processes for all job levels. The employment interview is a communication method that allows the employer to ask questions about the applicant and also for the applicant to find out more about the organization and the job requirements. There are a few advantages to this method. Firstly, interviews can provide information that may be missing or questionable from other selection procedures. For example responses on specific personality items may not be clear and the interviewer could ask for further clarification. Secondly, especially for jobs where employees are directly

interacting with people, including clients, subordinates, peers and supervisors, interviews can be used to assess applicant appearance, verbal communication and interpersonal competence. Thirdly, the main purpose of any selection method is to evaluate applicants' job knowledge, using an interview can be beneficial in this area as many interview questions may be technical. One concern about interviews is the ability to compare one candidate's responses to another. A structured interview allows for applicant comparisons and has been shown to be a valid predictor of job performance while adding incremental validity over cognitive ability (Schmidt & Hunter, 1998). Additionally an interview can be used to measure other constructs besides job knowledge. One study found that personality and applied social skills such as interpersonal relations and ability to work with others were rated frequently during an interview (Huffcutt, Conway, Roth & Stone, 2001). Such a finding makes the interview a plausible method for measuring political skill for selection purposes. To illustrate, candidates can be asked to describe an occasion in which they had to use their networking skills or explain how they persuaded others to agree to one of their project ideas.

Despite the above mentioned advantages, interviews have a few shortcomings. Firstly, they are time consuming and expensive to administer. Each interview can take up to 15 – 30 minutes and interviewers have to be paid for that time. It also does not allow for testing of a large number of applicants at one time. The next major concern of an employment interview is rating the applicants' responses. There are several rater errors such as halo and leniency and other biases that can influence decisions made based on interview scores. Attempts to reduce this problem include having a panel of interviewers and rater training, but this adds to the cost of conducting interviews as it increases the number of interviewers and increases the time taken to train human resource personnel.

Another selection tool is the work sample, which provides the applicant with a specific job-related task and results in observable job-relevant behavior. In other words, a work sample is a miniature replica or simulation of situations or tasks which an applicant will face on the job (e.g., a

welding test or a driving test). This method has the highest criterion validity on average ($r = 0.54$; Schmidt & Hunter, 1998), it is well accepted by applicants and tends to have minimal adverse impact (Brugnoli, Campion & Basen 1979). Managerial work samples can be group activities like a leaderless group discussion. Such an exercise might require a group of participants to discuss some job-related topic whereby each person attempts to persuade the others to a different course of action (Cascio & Aguinis, 2008). There are also individual exercises such as the business game. One example is a simulation that was created to have participants perform six one-hour tasks. They were challenged to complete several critical managerial tasks which required skills in strategy and planning and were assessed on response time and use of opportunities (Struefert, Pogash & Piasecki, 1988).

The different dimensions of political skill could possibly be measured using such a selection method. For example the leaderless group discussion could be used for assessing interpersonal influence. However this would mean that several work samples may have to be designed for each political skill dimension, which would be very expensive to design and administer. As noted in the example of the business game simulation, it took six hours per applicant. This means that it is not a feasible method for testing a large applicant pool. For work samples that test interpersonal relations, observers are typically needed for scoring. Once such observers become part of the measurement process, questions of reliability and validity of the raters become an issue. As with the interview, the number of raters, their training, and their expense must be considered.

Building on the work sample concept is a selection tool referred to as an assessment center (AC), which is mostly a collection of work samples (e.g., a leaderless group discussion or an in-basket) combined with other psychological testing (e.g., personality tests). The assessment center method is used mainly for management selection and can provide feedback for developmental and administrative purposes (Cascio & Aguinis, 2008). The main purpose of an AC is to measure the dimensions or competencies that participants need in order to perform well on the job (Thornton & Rupp, 2006).

In a typical assessment center, assessors observe the behaviors of the 6 – 12 assessees and score their behavior based on dimensions (e.g. communication, problem solving) that were identified through a job analysis. Therefore this method allows others to rate social interactions in a simulated work environment which makes an assessment center appear to be one of the best ways to measure political skill behaviors.

The main advantages of this method stems from its design. Because it brings together many selection instruments and techniques (Cascio & Aguinis, 2008), it has all the advantages associated with cognitive and personality tests, interviews and work samples. ACs are also moderately correlated ($r = 0.37$; Schmidt & Hunter, 1998) with job performance; appear fair to minority groups with little to no adverse impact and applicants can be compared on different dimensions including overall assessment ratings.

Despite the many advantages there is the major concern of construct validity and the problem of exercise factors (Woehr & Arthur, 2003). Similar to interviews and work samples there is the issue of rater errors and biases. Thirdly, ACs are time consuming and costly to design and administer. Generally participants engage in a series of exercises over a three to five day period (Gaugler, Rosenthal, Thorton & Bentson, 1987) and this may not be feasible for most businesses.

As a result of the cost and time associated with ACs, researchers have explored an alternative way to present applicants with multiple job situations and assess their responses to critical incidents. Because high fidelity assessments are so expensive, a lower fidelity method was considered. This led to the development of the final type of measurement method described here, the situational judgment test (SJT). The SJT is essentially a low fidelity work sample test that typically presents applicants with a variety of job relevant situations. Such scenarios are generally created based on critical incidents or other job analytical methods. For each situation, test takers are presented with multiple possibilities for handling the hypothetical scenario. Participants are then required to select the most appropriate

response using either a forced choice (select the option you will most/least likely perform) or a Likert-style (rate the effectiveness of each option on a 1 – 5 scale) format (Weekley & Polyhart, 2006). SJTs are usually presented in a paper and pencil form, although video and computer based versions have also been used (Weekly & Jones, 1997). In either case (written or video stimulus presentation), the responses are *selected* rather than *generated* by test takers. According to McDaniel & Nguyen (2001) this measurement method can be used to assess a variety of constructs and will therefore be a possible option for measuring political skill.

The popularity of this type of selection tool has increased over the years due to its many positive features. The first advantage is its relationship with job performance as researchers McDaniel, Morgeson, Finnegan, Campion & Braverman (2001) discovered by analyzing 102 validity coefficients. The results of their analysis found a mean corrected validity of 0.34 with job performance. Secondly, other researchers found that this test type provides incremental validity beyond more typically used assessment methods such as personality and cognitive ability (Chan & Schmitt, 2002). One possible reason for this incremental validity is that SJTs have been found to be correlated with job knowledge (Motowidlo, Borman, & Schmit, 1997) and job experience (Weekley & Jones, 1999). It is possible that an SJT for political skill might measure 'tacit knowledge' (Wagner & Sternberg, 1985) in leadership situations, which could be important for managerial success.

Thirdly, SJTs are relatively well perceived by applicants (Lievens, Peeters & Schollaert, 2008). They tend to have less adverse impact towards minorities than cognitive ability tests, and good face validity because test takers can see connections between items and actual job situations (Lievens, Peeters & Schollaert, 2008). In addition, the SJT can also provide applicants with a realistic job preview because it describes a variety of problems that applicants will likely face after being hired.

Apart from the above mentioned advantages, there are two major benefits of this method. It can be easily administered to a large applicant pool, which is an advantage over interviews and typical

work samples. Also, there are minimal rater errors from observers because the scores are based solely on the response selected by the applicant rather than an observer's interpretation of the behavior observed in the test situation. Conversely, an SJT can be expensive to develop because it requires the generation of many scenarios and associated actions (Lievens, Peeters & Schollaert, 2008). The actions must be plausible but still discriminate among candidates so as to identify those who best fit the job. Judges must still evaluate each of the responses to the stem or stimulus situation presented in the SJT. However, the magnitude of the error (disagreement) among judges can be more easily studied and better controlled by the researcher than in the case of interviews and assessment centers. With the SJT, the error is largely confined to the development of the scoring key. After that, the error in scoring the applicant response tends to be negligible.

Although the SJT has clear benefits, the applicant must select, rather than generate, the response to the situation. It is possible that the applicant may recognize the appropriate response to a problem even though that response would not have occurred to them when simply presented with the problem. Additionally, the manner or style in which the applicant would respond is not observable. One could select the option 'delegate this item to your assistant' for example, but selecting such an option does not tell us the medium chosen (face-to-face, email, etc.) or the tact and consideration for the subordinate that gets displayed while delegating. In the paper-and-pencil SJTs it is difficult to represent nonverbal social cues realistically as part of the stimulus; this is less of an issue with video SJTs, where actors present such cues.

CHOICE OF METHODS

Based on the review of the literature, three different methods were compared in the current study. First, the situational judgment test was chosen because it has many of the benefits of work simulations (eliciting job-related knowledge and skill in a manner that is face valid and yet standardized). Additionally this test type may also gather more information about political skill by

addressing how workers analytically process social situations (tacit knowledge). The second method that was chosen is an interview. Interviews are used in the majority of recruitment processes and unlike the PSI and the SJT, the interview allows candidates to generate their own responses to different political situations. The inclusion of an interview allows an indirect comparison of the importance of direct interpersonal contact as a source of information about political skill.

The PSI is the third measurement method to be included as it has been used in previous studies that found relationships between political skill and other constructs. Based on the literature, the PSI appears to be the researcher's choice for measuring political skill. Though response distortion is a concern, some researchers have reported that faking on measures in employee selection only slightly affects the validities of these tests (Barrick & Mount, 1996; Ones, Viswesvaran & Reiss, 1996). Each of the methods, the PSI, SJT and Interview appears feasible for measuring political skill; however each method has advantages and disadvantages. For example, the interview is more challenging to administer than the others, but it is the only method which allows the direct observation of interpersonal behavior. Such observation is likely to provide cues that are important for politically skilled actions. The SJT on the other hand, is difficult to develop, but it also appears relatively difficult to fake compared to the PSI and is essentially sample situations and behavioral choices related to political skill rather than self- assessments. The PSI is an established scale with evidence of reliability and validity. It is easy to administer and has been used in several studies. However, for selection there is the concern of candidates distorting their responses either intentionally or because they lack insight into their own competence as compared to others.

HYPOTHESES

H1: There will be a positive relationship between scores from each of the predictors (PSI, SJT and structured interview).

H2: Each of the three predictor tests will significantly predict the criterion of political skill on the job.

H3: SJT will add incremental validity over the structured interview and PSI.

H4: The structured interview will add incremental validity over the PSI.

STUDY DESIGN OVERVIEW

The current study consists of three parts. The first section describes the development of the other predictor measures, that is, the SJT and the structured interview. Experts in political skill and employee management were used to create test items for these two measurements. The second section incorporates the development of the criterion measure for this study. This consists of other peer ratings of political skill. Experts for the SJT were sampled from jobs including sales managers, customer service managers, I/O psychologists and university professors. These persons were identified because of their extensive experience in the four areas that make up political skill. Measurement validation was the purpose of section three, in which each of the predictor tests (SJT, interview and PSI) were compared to other ratings of the candidate's political skill. The participants for this section were master of business administration (MBA) students that are managers and manager trainees because they are generally working in their career of choice and have more work experience compared to other college students. Because this study is primarily interested in management selection this group also represented more managers or prospective managers and have a wider age range than would a typical undergraduate group or a random sample of workers.

CHAPTER II: METHOD

SECTION 1: DEVELOPMENT OF PREDICTORS - SJT & STRUCTURED INTERVIEW

POLITICAL SKILL SITUATIONAL JUDGMENT TEST

As outlined previously, SJTs are somewhat laborious to design as the development of this assessment involved several steps before the final product was ready for administration. The first step was to determine the presentation format. SJTs can be presented in either a written format or a video presentation. For this study the written presentation was used because it is simpler and less expensive to create and administer.

Following the format of the instrument, a decision was needed for the instructions on how to complete the test. For a SJT this becomes a significant consideration as there has been a debate among researchers between using "will do" versus "should do" instructions. The main purpose of this study was to find an alternative selection method to a self-rated Likert type test due to prevalence of response distortion especially under administrative conditions. With this in mind, the "should do" instructions was selected as the most appropriate due to evidence that SJTs with this directive have higher validity (Reynolds, Sydell, Scott, & Winter, 2000) as compared to the "will do" versions. Although this instruction has been linked to higher cognitive load (Nguyen & McDaniel, 2003), this test was designed for management selection; because managerial applicants typically have advanced educational degrees, cognitive load was less of a concern.

The subsequent steps involved the creation of the test's content, which included the creation of the item stems and corresponding responses. There are several ways to develop test items and for this SJT construction it was decided to use subject matter experts (SMEs). SMEs are typically persons who have specific job or construct knowledge/experience. The first step was the creation of critical

incidents (stems) that form the basis of the final scenarios used in the test. The second step was to create possible responses to the incidents selected. Each expert was asked to provide an effective and an ineffective response to their scenario. I/O psychologists also provided responses to the stems that were selected for the initial assessment. For these stages both the scenarios and responses were reviewed before being selected for the test. According to Weekley & Polyhart, (2006) it is important to consider the content, complexity and fidelity of the items to make sure that the test matches the applicant pool and the intentions for using the measure.

The final step was to develop the scoring key. During this stage another group of experts rated each stem response on a 1 – 7 scale, where 7 represented a very effective approach to dealing with the situation presented and 1 indicated a very ineffective choice to the problem. Different responses could have the same rating from experts and for each item not all of the rating scale points were used. When a test taker selected an option, they were given the score provided by the mean of the expert ratings for that response.

Scenario & Response Development

A sample of 10 managers and executives from different industry backgrounds were selected as SMEs in order to generate 2 critical incidents for each of the four political skill dimensions. This group of experts composed of 4 males and 6 females from diverse professional backgrounds including human resource management, corporate communication, architecture and sales. Their years of experience in the respective fields spanned 12 – 30 years, each having earned either a bachelor's or master's (n = 5) degree. In conjunction with the incidents provided by the experts, business case studies and sample competency-based interview questions and responses were reviewed and edited to make up a total of 100 possible critical incidents which could have been used in the final set of SJT stems. One example that corresponded to the interpersonal influence dimension involved persuading others in order to achieve a personal objective. This scenario described an occasion whereby the

support from an important executive member was needed for a project and participants were asked how they should go about convincing someone on the executive team to approve their project budget.

As part of the stem generation procedure, the cases were sorted by dimension so that each incident was grouped according to the dimension it best represents. The compilation of the scenarios created was edited for content and wording. While editing the cases and making final selections the following questions were considered: "Could the scenario be applicable to multiple industries?", "Does the situation match a dilemma that a manager could face?" and "Could there be multiple responses to the circumstance?". At the end of the process the resulting scenarios were applicable to various job categories, phrased so that there were several desirable responses and related to one of the political skill dimensions.

The second component that makes up the test items of a SJT is the responses to the scenarios. To generate these responses, the ten (10) experts who provided critical incidents along with five (5) additional persons were asked to generate potential responses to the edited situations. Each respondent was tasked with proposing an effective course of action, one that may be reasonable but not optimal as well as a response that was ineffective given the circumstances. Similar to the stems, the responses were edited and restructured by I/O psychologists so that they were comprehensible responses to the corresponding scenario.

The final phase of the scenario and response development was to narrow down the test items to determine the final set of dilemmas that was used in the study. This involved two parts. Firstly three (3) I/O psychologists reviewed all the items (stems with responses) and coded them according to the dimension definition that it best represents. Items where at least two persons agreed were kept and those that were not matched were removed from the test. The resulting set of 40 items was pilot tested by 12 professional who all had undergraduate degrees and were working at supervisory or above job positions. Pilot participants also provided feedback on grammatical errors, typos and item clarity.

Items were eliminated if respondents only chose one option or if the feedback indicated that the item was difficult to read or generally confusing. Based on these criteria, 32 items remained. The resulting (32 item) SJT was administered during this study. The test had 8 different scenarios per dimension each with 5 corresponding potential courses of action.

Scoring

As previously mentioned, the SME scoring procedure was chosen in part because of test validation results using a similar construct, 'leadership skills assessment' (Bergman, Drasgow, Donovan, Henning & Juraska, 2006). 20 SMEs were used to develop a scoring key with 5 per dimension. Each SME independently read each stem and the corresponding responses. For each response, they rated how effective it appeared in relation to the corresponding dimension definition using a 1 – 7 scale. The average score for each item response was calculated, and this was used to score the participants' selection. The instruction to the test taker was to select the most appropriate response to the scenario presented. The chosen response was awarded the SME mean score for that response. A total score was calculated for each of the four categories by summing the candidate's selections chosen for the respective stems for that dimension, as shown in the following example.

Example:

Stem: You have been assigned a major account but cannot manage it on your own. It will be easier if you receive assistance from one your colleagues. What should you do?

a. Think about it some more and decide that you can handle it on your own

b. Promise your colleague dinner if he/she helps with the account

c. Offer to help your colleague with his/her work if they can help you with yours

d. Tell your supervisor that you need assistance from one of your colleagues

Expert Ratings: a = 1   b = 3   c = 4

d = 2

Test Taker selection = b   Test Taker score for this item = 3

The expert ratings in this example are hypothetical and used solely to illustrate the process of scoring the response.

POLITICAL SKILL STRUCTURED INTERVIEW

Similar to the SJT, the development of an interview has a few factors that need to be considered. The first is the degree of the interview structure. Interviews can be unstructured whereby interviewers are allowed to ask any question they deem necessary or structured where interviewers are given specific questions to ask each candidate (Cascio & Aguinis, 2008). For this study a complete standardization of the questions that interviewers can ask was used. This technique permits the interviewer to collect the same information about each interviewee (Campion, Palmer & Campion, 1998) therefore allowed for better comparison between responses provided by participants in this study. Also according to Huffcutt et al. (2001), structured interviews have higher validity because they focus more on constructs that are related to performance.

The next feature to consider is the type of questions that are asked. Questions can be experiential whereby candidates are asked about past work or life experiences and are phrased "Can you tell about a time when…?" (Janz, 1982). They can also be situational questions such that participants are given a particular job relevant situation and are asked, "What will you do if…?" (Latham, Saari, Pursell & Campion, 1980). The situational type was used as this allowed all study participants the ability to answer questions whether or not they have years of work experience. Also a meta-analysis conducted by Taylor and Small (2002) found that inter-rater reliability was not significantly different for the question types nor were there differential validity based on job complexity. Finally, the situational type of question matched the other predictor measures, which allowed for better comparisons of responses across test types.

A main goal of the study was to compare measures of political skill that might be used in personnel selection. Therefore in conjunction with using situational type questions, interview items were also chosen to be behavioral. Salgado and Moscoso (2002) defined behavioral questions as interview questions that are geared towards job knowledge and behavior descriptions. In their article they further described behavioral interview question content areas as mainly descriptions of experience and activity and questions focused on past behavior or future behavior. They were able to show that behavioral items were better for evaluating situational judgment and social skills which makes it a more appropriate format for this study.

By taking into consideration all the factors mentioned above, a sample of eight (8) SJT stems were selected as the interview questions followed by "What would you do?". This is because these dilemmas allowed for standardized questions that are both situational and behavioral in content. In addition to these eight questions, participants were also asked to compare themselves to their colleagues in each of the political skill dimensions. They were given the opportunity to indicate whether they thought they were above average, average or below average with respect to the different dimensions in relation to other workers. The final question asked of interviewees was to rank each of the dimensions where the top position indicates the term they were best at demonstrating.

Example of Interview Question:

You are at the grocery store and see your neighbor chatting with the President of "Sunbloom Distributors," a company that your firm has been trying to work with for a long time. What would you do?

Example of Ranking Question:

In terms of developing a significant social group, negotiating and conflict management skills, how would you rate yourself in relation to your colleagues?

Top 5% = Outstanding

Top 15% = Good

Top 1/3 = Above Average

Middle 1/3 = Average

Bottom 1/3 = Below Average

Bottom 15% = Poor

Bottom 5% = Very Poor

One trained interviewer conducted all the interviews and did not probe any of the participants in order to maintain consistency with each person. For twenty (20) participants a second expert provided scores for the interview responses and this was used to measure inter-rater reliability and to ensure that the scoring was accurate. The interviewer took detailed notes during the interview sessions and used the scores provided by experts for the SJT as the standardized scoring for the responses. For those responses that did not match any of the SJT options an anchored rating scale was used such that the quality of the answer was defined. For example a score of 1 meant "Candidate did not respond to the question" and a score of 7 indicates "Candidate provided a competent response to the question, provided evidence and provided a similar response identified by experts as an effective course of action". In total the interview took approximately 30 minutes to administer.

SECTION 2: DEVELOPMENT OF A CRITERION MEASURE – OTHER RATING SCALE

The main purpose of this section was to determine the best method for assessing political skill for personnel selection. The previous section identified 3 methods that were used in a typical selection process. The next step was to determine the criterion that was used to compare these measures to each other. Political skill has been linked to different variables such as job performance (Jawahar, Meurs, Ferris & Hochwarter, 2008) and leadership effectiveness (Douglas & Ammeter, 2004). In order to determine the validity of the different predictor measures being studied it was decided to use a criterion that best matched the predictor. When comparing the validity of various measures using

measures of the same construct for the predictor and the criteria yields the best validity (Lievens, Buyse, & Sackett, 2005). Based on this concept, coworker ratings of the candidates' political skill were used as the criterion.

The outcome rating scale followed a performance appraisal format, such that the two part process of observation and judgment (Thorton & Zorich, 1980) was used. Observation gathers the information required to make adequate evaluations of the person's behavior. Since Mintzberg (1983) described political skill as utilizing human resources to influence change then it makes sense for the criterion to be others' evaluation of someone's ability to behave in a political manner.

The source of the ratings was the first factor considered in the design of the others' ratings of political skill. Immediate supervisors are typically responsible for evaluating employee behavior and job performance (Cascio & Aguinis, 2008) because they understand the full scope of work that is required of employees and therefore will have a better perspective on the effectiveness of the participants' behavior on the job. However, in many jobs such as teaching, self-managed work teams, and external sales, immediate supervisors may not have many opportunities to observe a worker's behavior (Becker & Klimoski, 1989). Therefore another source was considered for this study, peer assessments. In Harris & Schaubroeck (1988) meta-analysis of self-supervisor, self-peer, and peer-supervisor ratings, they cited that work colleagues can be used to provide additional information about a worker's behavior because they have more contact with their coworkers resulting in more observation time. Peers may also have a different perspective on the person's actions as well as a qualitatively different sample of behavioral observations. Therefore, in this section two co-workers were asked to provide ratings on how politically skilled they thought their counterparts were.

Subordinate ratings can also assist in making evaluations of an employee's performance but not all participants in this study had subordinates (they may not have been in supervisory positions) and therefore it was not possible to collect that kind of data during this study.

Subordinate ratings can also assist in making evaluations of an employee's performance, but because not all participants in this study had subordinates (some participants were not in supervisory positions). Lack of subordinate would have created a missing data problem; sample size is an important characteristic in selection validation studies where effect sizes are typically small. Therefore, it was decided not to collect data from subordinates during this study.

The second step was to select the type of evaluative measure that was best suited for this study. Performance measures fall into two major categories - tangible measures and subjective measures (Cascio & Aguinis, 2008). Tangible measures include variables such as dollar value of sales or number of errors; for the purposes of this study; there were no tangible measures that could reasonably be used across jobs. Therefore political skill was measured subjectively. Within the category of subjective measures there are the subgroups relative and absolute rating systems (Cascio & Aguinis, 2008). For this study, a combination of both relative (norm-referenced) and absolute (criterion referenced) judgments was used. Relative measures require that raters make comparisons such that the performance of the subject employee is compared to others. Employees within an organization are ranked in terms of their performance from first to last or placed within groups according to where they stand in relation to others. Relative judgments were elicited from coworkers for participants' standings on each of the political skill dimensions (an example item is shown below).

It was also important to provide standard scenarios for the raters to evaluate political skills. For these scenarios, coworkers were asked to make judgments about how well they thought the participant would handle the problem embedded within the scenario. Such judgments are criterion-referenced because they compare the person's behavior to a standard of task performance rather than to other people. The most popular rating scale is the graphic rating scale (Cascio & Aguinis, 2008), which was chosen for use in this study. With a graphic rating scale raters are asked to determine if the performance of workers are high/low or excellent/unsatisfactory. Finally, similar to the development

of the predictor measures, variations of the critical incidents developed for the SJT and interview were used so that a standard set of situational referents was used by raters. As previously mentioned, using the same construct for the predictor and the criterion typically yields the highest validity.

By combining the norm-referenced and criterion-referenced rating scales a unique rating measure was developed that assessed the political skill of participants of this study. An example of an interpersonal influence rating item is as follows:

Example:

Instructions:

For each of the following scenarios rate this person on how effective you think his/her response would be. Consider their past behavior and the given definition to make your judgment.

Scenario:

1. Your company has gotten some bad press recently about your waste disposal practices and the fact that they are harmful to the environment. An environment activist has called for a boycott of all your company's products. Your colleague has volunteered to take charge of the campaign to convince the public to continue to support the company.

Rating Scale:

7= Very Effective

1 = Very Ineffective

7   6   5   4
○   ○   ○   ○   ○   ○   ○
          3   2   1

Ranking Question:

2. In relation to his/her peers, rate this employee in terms of interpersonal influence using the definition given above.

> Top 5% = Outstanding
>
> Top 15% = Good
>
> Top 1/3 = Above Average
>
> Middle 1/3 = Average
>
> Bottom 1/3 = Below Average
>
> Bottom 15% = Poor
>
> Bottom 5% = Very Poor

Raters were instructed that their ratings were for developmental purposes and it would be most helpful for the ratee if the rater were honest in their assessments.

SECTION 3: MEASUREMENT COMPARISON

The purpose of this section was to compare the measures of political skill for selection purposes. To execute this objective, scores from the newly developed SJT, scores from the interview, and scores from the PSI were all be correlated with one another to determine the amount of shared variance for each pair and for all three together. Then each test was used as a predictor of the outcome measure. To establish criterion-validity and to determine if one test adds incremental validity over another, multiple regressions estimated the overall variance accounted for in the criterion and unique contribution for each of the predictors as well as for specific combinations.

PARTICIPANTS

One hundred and twenty five (125) persons were interviewed as part of this study and one hundred (100) completed all the instruments. Participants for this study were working students from a variety of programs from a graduate business school located in Trinidad and Tobago. These included MBA students as well as those studying specialized areas such as human resource

management, marketing, finance and event planning. Some of the business programs at this school accept students that are in the category "mature entry". This means that though they may not have an undergraduate degree they have extensive work experience (over 10 years at a supervisory or above job level) in conjunction with relative professional certificates. In this study eighty-five percent (85%) had a bachelor's degree or higher level of education. The majority of participants had more than 10 years working experience and the typical job level was that of middle management.

Table 1: Participants Demographic Information

Gender	Male			Female	
N	25			77	
Age (years)	18 - 24	25 - 34	35 - 44	45 - 54	55 - 64
N	4	46	29	19	4
Job Tenure (years)	0 - 5	6 - 10	11 - 15	16 - 20	Over 20
N	20	20	24	12	26
Job Level	Executive	Management	Administrative	Consultant	Other
N	5	52	21	22	2

Job Type	n
Arts, Entertainment, or Recreation	4
Education	19
Finance and Insurance	19
Government and Public Administration	9
Health Care and Social Assistance	5
Information - Services and Data	6

Manufacturing	6
Oil/Gas/Energy Sector	5
Retail	4
Telecommunications	5
Utilities	4
Other (i.e. construction, agriculture, religious…)	16

n = 102

MEASURES:

Three assessments were used to measure the predictor construct political skill. The first was the Political Skill Inventory (PSI), which was developed by Ferris, et al. (2005). This test consisted of 18 items posing questions on each of the four dimensions. The second instrument that was administered to participants was the Political Skill SJT that was developed as part of section 1. Participants were presented with 32 critical incidents and asked to select the best solution to the problem presented. The final predictor measure was the Structured Interview. Participants were asked to respond to 8 scenarios that were also used in the SJT as well as self-evaluations for each of the four dimensions. The criterion measure was the Other Rating Scale. Peers of each participant were given the same subset of incidents used in the interview and asked to rate the anticipated effectiveness of the participant in handling each. They were also tasked with ranking the participants in comparison to other co-workers on each of the four political skill dimensions.

PROCEDURE:

The execution of section 3 took place at a graduate business school located in Trinidad and Tobago. Participants reviewed the informed consent document and were given a unique 5 digit identification code (e.g., 51900). The participants were interviewed for approximately 30 minutes and then all instructions were emailed with respect to the online instruments – the PSI, SJT and Co-worker

questionnaire. Participants were asked to email a link to the co-worker questionnaire along with their 5 digit code to two work peers. All data were stored by code number rather than by name, so that anonymity was assured.

Participants took about two weeks to complete all the instruments. Follow up reminders were emailed for those who were missing responses to different instruments. The data collection period lasted two months.

As an incentive to participate, a feedback report was designed and only those participants who completed all the instruments including two co-worker questionnaires were eligible to receive one. Feedback reports were subsequently emailed to the eligible participants.

CHAPTER 3: RESULTS

SECTION 1: DEVELOPMENT OF PREDICTORS - SJT & STRUCTURED INTERVIEW

The first of three studies was to develop predictor instruments to measure the political skill of potential job applicants for comparison to the PSI. The following results show the reliability analysis of all the assessments that were used in the study. It is important to note that for all analyses 'listwise deletion' was used to handle missing data, such that an entire record was deleted if a participant missed a questioned. Therefore, in the calculations there were different sample sizes used depending on the instruments or questions being analyzed.

The overall test reliability for the PSI measure was $\alpha = 0.94$, (n = 98). The subscale alphas are listed in the table below and the tabled values are all consistent with those reported in Ferris et al. (2005).

Table 2: Cronbach Alpha for the entire Political Skill Inventory and the test Subscales

	SA 5 items	NW 6 items	II 4 items	AS 3 items	Overall 18 items
A	0.91	0.88	0.90	0.56	0.94

NB: SA – Social Astuteness; NW – Networking; II – Interpersonal Influence; AS – Apparent Sincerity

The scoring for both the SJT and interview were based on ratings provided by subject matter experts who were tasked with providing scores based on the effectiveness of the responses as compared to the hypothetical scenarios. There were five (5) expert raters who provided scores for each political skill dimension. The inter-rater reliability for these persons ranged from r = 0.37 to r =

0.59. For each dimension, there were a different group of raters, such that no experts rated the entire set of SJT items. Therefore, an overall reliability score was not calculated.

Table 3: Intra-class Correlation Coefficient of 5 Experts Ratings of the SJT

	SA	NW	II	AS
ICC	0.59	0.37	0.58	0.49

NB: SA – Social Astuteness; NW – Networking; II – Interpersonal Influence; AS – Apparent Sincerity
All values were significant; $p < 0.05$

These Intra-Class Correlation (ICC) values are fairly low and there are two options to improve the reliability of the ratings provided, the first being to increase the number of persons providing expert ratings. To determine the number of experts that would be necessary to improve the ICC ratings to at least 0.80 a Spearman Brown calculation was conducted. This calculation involves using the current ICCs and determining the number of judges that would be needed to improve the coefficients values. The results of this analysis are provided in Table 4.

Table 4: Spearman Brown Number of Judges Analysis for ICC (r = 0.80)

	SA	NW	II	AS
No. of Judges Needed	15	30	15	20

NB: SA – Social Astuteness; NW – Networking; II – Interpersonal Influence; AS – Apparent Sincerity

Based on the large number of judges that would be needed to improve the reliability coefficients, the decision was made to choose option 2, which is to remove extreme scores. Therefore one (1) low extreme rating and one (1) high extreme were removed leaving three (3) middle values to determine the score for a particular response. This improved the inter-rater reliability to $r = 0.72$ to $r = 0.80$. It is important to note that the same two raters were not removed each time and that these results are more a comparison of the three middle values rather than strictly comparing 3 distinct raters.

Table 5: Intra-class Correlation Coefficient of 3 Experts Ratings of the SJT

	SA	NW	II	AS
ICC	0.80	0.72	0.79	0.76

NB: SA – Social Astuteness; NW – Networking; II – Interpersonal Influence; AS – Apparent Sincerity
All values were significant; $p < 0.05$

An average score was computed using the middle values and this was used to score the interview and SJT responses. The Cronbach alpha (α) was then calculated for the SJT, and the initial coefficients ranged between $\alpha = 0.19 – 0.52$ for the individual test sections and $\alpha = 0.19$, ($n = 101$) for the entire test. Based on this initial analysis certain items were removed due to poor relations with others in the scale and a final set of twenty – three (23) items were selected from the original thirty-two (32). It should be noted that items that were used for the interview and co-worker questionnaire were not removed from the SJT; although removing them would have yielded higher internal consistency values in a couple of cases.

Table 6: Cronbach Alpha for the 23 Item Situation Judgment Test and the Subscales

	SA 6 items	NW 6 items	II 5 items	AS 6 items	Overall 23 items
α	0.33	0.56	0.37	0.27	0.24

NB: SA – Social Astuteness; NW – Networking; II – Interpersonal Influence; AS – Apparent Sincerity

These reliability values are below the typical alphas seen in SJTs. In a meta-analysis by McDaniel et al. (2001) the average value from the studies they used was $\alpha = 0.60$. Some of the studies in Mc Daniel's analyses had reliability results as low as 0.43 but not as small as the values found in this study. The lowest value was the overall scale reliability and this could be accounted for by the poor subscale correlations. These coefficients can be seen in Table 11.

To determine the reliability for the interview twenty (20) participants' interview responses were scored by two independent raters and the inter-rater reliability of these scores are as follows:

Table 7: Intra-Class Correlation Coefficient of 2 Expert Raters of the Interview

	SA	NW	II	AS	Overall
ICC	0.84	0.82	0.91	0.83	0.87

NB: SA – Social Astuteness; NW – Networking; II – Interpersonal Influence; AS – Apparent Sincerity

The test internal consistency was also computed for the interview and values are provided in Table 8 below. As mentioned previously 125 persons participated in the interview.

Table 8: Cronbach Alpha for the 8 Item Interview and Subscales

	SA	NW	II	AS	Overall
α	0.52	0.31	0.57	0.35	0.70

NB: SA – Social Astuteness; NW – Networking; II – Interpersonal Influence; AS – Apparent Sincerity

SECTION 2: DEVELOPMENT OF A CRITERION MEASURE – OTHER RATING SCALE

The purpose of section 2 was to create a criterion instrument that would measure a person's on the job displays of political skill. As outlined previously, this consisted of the same subset of eight (8) SJT scenarios that were selected for the interview. Two (2) co-workers of the participant rated how effectively they believe their colleague's response to the situation would be based on their observations of the person. The inter-rater reliability for the co-worker scores ranged between $r = 0.22$ to $r = 0.33$ with a sample size $n = 89$.

Table 9: Intra-Class Correlation Coefficient of 2 Co-worker Raters

	SA	NW	II	AS	Overall
ICC	0.22	0.26	0.24	0.30	0.33

NB: SA – Social Astuteness; NW – Networking; II – Interpersonal Influence; AS – Apparent Sincerity
All values were significant; $p < 0.05$

Based on these low co-worker agreement scores only co-worker 1 scores were used in the final measurement comparison correlations. This group was chosen due to its larger sample size (n = 107). The alpha values for this scale are presented below in Table 10 and there was little change in the alpha values using only the co-worker 1 group.

Table 10: Cronbach Alpha for the Co-worker Questionnaire and Subscales

	SA 3 items	NW 3 items	II 3 items	AS 3 items	Overall 12 items
α (2 co-workers)	0.81	0.84	0.83	0.82	0.93
α (co-worker 1)	0.77	0.82	0.85	0.79	0.92

NB: SA – Social Astuteness; NW – Networking; II – Interpersonal Influence; AS – Apparent Sincerity

SECTION 3: MEASUREMENT COMPARISON

The third section was meant to compare the three predictor measures and to determine which is most suitable for predicting political skill performance. The final instruments used in these comparisons were the original 18 item PSI, the 3 middle value expert rated 23 item SJT, the Interview using the scoring key of the 3 expert ratings of the SJT and the criterion measure consisting of the scores provided by the co-worker 1 responses to the peer questionnaire.

The first hypothesis proposed was that all the predictor instruments would correlate with each other. As can be seen in Table 11, the overall scale of the Interview significantly correlated with both the PSI and the SJT. However, the PSI and SJT did not relate to each other. In terms of the individual sections of the tests, there were only three significant relationships. The interview interpersonal influence scale was significantly related to the corresponding questions in the PSI. Also, between the interview and the SJT, networking items were significantly correlated as well as the apparent sincerity questions.

Hypothesis 2 was to determine the relationship between the predictor instruments and the scores provided by the participants' work colleagues. The results of these analyses showed that only the PSI had a significant relationship with the co-worker ratings.

The PSI was the only predictor to significantly relate to co-worker ratings. AS a result the regression tests comparing the predictive ability of the three predictors were superfluous. However, for completeness of the project, the results of the regressions are as follows: the PSI significantly predicted co-worker 1 ratings; $\beta = 0.14$, $t\,(99) = 2.45$, $p < 0.05$. The PSI also explained a significant proportion of variance in co-worker political skill evaluation scores, $R^2 = .07$, $F\,(1, 99) = 7.19$, $p < 0.05$. The hierarchical regression analysis for Hypothesis 3 showed no significant added incremental validity $R^2 = 0.001$ for the SJT over the PSI and Interview. The same result occurred for the Interview over the PSI which did not support Hypothesis 4.

SUPPLEMENTAL ANALYSES

Several supplemental analyses were computed in an attempt to better understand the reasons for the lack of support for the hypotheses. The initial analyses used the first coworker only. To assess whether the choice of coworker was influential, additional analyses were computed with the average of both coworkers and just using the scores of the second coworker. The correlations changed but little, and the results still did not support the hypotheses.

To assess whether the choice of SJT items was consequential, the original 32 item SJT scores were computed, and scores were computed both with keys based on the average of just the middle three judges and also with the average of all five judges. Again the hypotheses were not supported. The full correlation matrices for these analyses can be found in the appendix A of this document.

The first adjustment tried was to use only the eight (8) items that were consistent for the SJT, Interview and peer ratings. The results of this correlation are presented in Table 12. As can be seen

there were no significant relationships between the SJT and the Interview, PSI or with the Co-worker responses.

In an attempt to address the issue with the rating key of the SJT and Interview these responses were rescored by one I/O psychologist (the principle study investigator) and each of the above analyses were computed again. The results of these correlations are shown in Table 13 and 14 and there were no changes in the results.

Table 11: Correlation matrix with PSI, Interview, SJT 3 EXPERTS and Co-worker 1

		M	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
1	PSA	25.62	5.81	**1.00**																			
2	PNW	27.94	6.69	0.74*	**1.00**																		
3	PII	20.67	4.62	0.71*	0.68*	**1.00**																	
4	PAS	16.96	2.74	0.68*	0.43*	0.58*	**1.00**																
5	PTOT	91.19	17.25	0.92*	0.89*	0.86*	0.71*	**1.00**															
6	SSA	29.23	2.83	0.08	0.08	0.12	-0.02	0.09	**1.00**														
7	SNW	26.81	3.94	0.05	0.00	0.15	0.05	0.06	0.08	**1.00**													
8	SII	25.29	2.64	-0.12	-0.09	-0.09	-0.09	-0.11	0.04	0.07	**1.00**												
9	SAS	25.78	3.09	0.14	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.08	0.05	-0.11	-0.07	**1.00**											
10	STOT	107.10	6.40	0.08	0.02	0.12	0.01	0.07	0.53*	0.63*	0.44*	0.41*	**1.00**										
11	ISA	8.75	1.82	0.17	0.17	0.30*	0.22*	0.24*	0.05	0.11	0.06	-0.03	0.10	**1.00**									
12	INW	9.08	1.89	0.14	0.16	0.21*	0.22*	0.20	0.09	**0.29***	0.10	-0.06	0.23*	0.42*	**1.00**								
13	III	9.14	1.91	0.19	0.17	**0.32***	0.32*	0.26*	0.04	0.18	0.08	-0.12	0.10	0.38*	0.44*	**1.00**							
14	IAS	8.34	1.59	0.07	0.02	0.13	0.10	0.08	-0.04	0.08	0.06	**0.28***	0.19	0.17	0.15	0.25*	**1.00**						
15	ITOT	35.32	5.02	0.21*	0.19	0.35*	0.32*	**0.29***	0.05	0.24*	0.11	0.01	0.22*	0.72*	0.74*	0.76*	0.53*	**1.00**					
16	CW1SA	16.08	2.56	**0.20***	0.14	0.29*	0.05	0.21*	0.01	-0.03	0.12	0.12	0.09	0.04	-0.03	0.02	0.19	0.07	**1.00**				
17	CW1NW	16.57	2.94	0.18	**0.26***	0.24*	-0.01	0.22*	0.01	-0.02	-0.15	0.13	-0.01	0.01	-0.02	-0.07	0.01	-0.03	0.69*	**1.00**			
18	CW1IIT	16.49	2.80	0.28*	0.17	**0.36***	0.19	0.29*	-0.02	-0.02	0.04	0.13	0.05	0.24*	0.12	0.15	0.14	0.23*	0.76*	0.66*	**1.00**		
19	CW1AS	16.72	2.95	0.18	0.04	0.26*	**0.23***	0.18	-0.08	-0.06	-0.10	0.07	-0.08	0.09	-0.01	0.04	0.15	0.09	0.60*	0.50*	0.65*	**1.00**	
20	CW1TOT	65.86	9.60	0.25*	0.18	0.34*	0.14	**0.26***	-0.03	-0.04	-0.03	0.13	0.01	0.11	0.02	0.04	0.14	0.10	0.88*	0.83*	0.90*	0.81*	**1.00**

All * values were significant at p < 0.05, n = 97

Table 12: Correlation matrix with PSI, Interview, 8 Consistent Items SJT, Co-worker 1

		M	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
1	PSA	25.62	5.81	**1.00**																			
2	PNW	27.94	6.69	0.74*	**1.00**																		
3	PII	20.67	4.62	0.71*	0.68*	**1.00**																	
4	PAS	16.96	2.74	0.68*	0.43*	0.58*	**1.00**																
5	PTOT	91.19	17.25	0.92*	0.89*	0.86*	0.71*	**1.00**															
6	ISA	8.75	1.82	0.17	0.17	0.30*	0.22*	0.24*	**1.00**														
7	INW	9.08	1.89	0.14	0.16	0.21*	0.22*	0.20	0.42*	**1.00**													
8	III	9.14	1.91	0.19	0.17	0.32*	0.32*	0.26*	0.38*	0.44*	**1.00**												
9	IAS	8.34	1.59	0.07	0.02	0.13	0.10	0.08	0.17	0.15	0.25*	**1.00**											
10	ITOT	35.32	5.02	0.21*	0.19	0.35*	0.32*	0.29*	0.72*	0.74*	0.76*	0.53*	**1.00**										
11	SSA56	9.04	1.45	0.11	0.11	0.14	0.11	0.13	-0.07	-0.03	-0.09	-0.23	-0.14	**1.00**									
12	SNW27	9.44	2.51	0.01	-0.04	0.04	0.02	0.00	0.04	0.31*	0.09	0.02	0.17	0.12	**1.00**								
13	SII36	10.66	1.54	-0.05	0.00	0.03	0.02	0.00	0.17	0.15	0.12	0.21*	0.23*	-0.08	0.05	**1.00**							
14	SAS17	8.03	2.13	0.06	0.10	0.09	0.01	0.08	-0.05	0.05	-0.02	0.35*	0.10	-0.14	0.00	0.03	**1.00**						
15	STOT8	37.16	3.94	0.06	0.07	0.14	0.06	0.09	0.04	0.27*	0.06	0.19	0.20	0.34*	0.70*	0.41*	0.50*	**1.00**					
16	CW1SA	10.43	1.87	0.17	0.15	0.29*	0.06	0.20*	0.05	-0.01	0.03	0.18	0.08	0.04	-0.02	0.11	0.10	0.10	**1.00**				
17	CW1NW	10.87	2.23	0.16	0.23*	0.25*	-0.02	0.21*	0.00	-0.03	-0.04	0.02	-0.02	0.08	-0.06	-0.08	0.09	0.01	0.69*	**1.00**			
18	CW1II	10.78	2.04	0.26*	0.17	0.36*	0.18	0.27*	0.22*	0.12	0.14	0.09	0.21*	0.04	-0.03	0.04	0.06	0.04	0.76*	0.66*	**1.00**		
19	CW1AS	42.99	7.24	0.22*	0.17	0.33*	0.13	0.25*	0.08	0.01	0.04	0.11	0.08	0.09	-0.04	-0.02	0.05	0.03	0.88*	0.84*	0.89*	**1.00**	
20	CW1TOT	10.91	2.27	0.17	0.04	0.26*	0.21*	0.17	0.03	-0.04	0.01	0.11	0.04	0.12	-0.03	-0.09	-0.05	-0.04	0.63*	0.54*	0.67*	0.83*	**1.00**

All * values were significant at $p < 0.05$, n = 97

Table 13: Correlation matrix with PSI, Interview, SJT (Rescore), Co-worker 1

		M	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
1	PSA	25.62	5.81	**1.00**																			
2	PNW	27.94	6.69	0.74*	**1.00**																		
3	PII	20.67	4.62	0.71*	0.68*	**1.00**																	
4	PAS	16.96	2.74	0.68*	0.43*	0.58*	**1.00**																
5	PTOT	91.19	17.25	0.92*	0.89*	0.86*	0.71*	**1.00**															
6	SSA	29.23	2.83	0.08	0.08	0.12	-0.02	0.09	**1.00**														
7	SNW	26.81	3.94	0.05	0.00	0.15	0.05	0.06	0.08	**1.00**													
8	SII	25.29	2.64	-0.12	-0.09	-0.09	-0.09	-0.11	0.04	0.07	**1.00**												
9	SAS	25.78	3.09	0.14	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.08	0.05	-0.11	-0.07	**1.00**											
10	STOT	107.10	6.40	0.08	0.02	0.12	0.01	0.07	0.53*	0.63*	0.44*	0.41*	**1.00**										
11	ISA	8.75	1.82	0.17	0.17	0.30*	0.22*	0.24*	0.05	0.11	0.06	-0.03	0.10	**1.00**									
12	INW	9.08	1.89	0.14	0.16	0.21*	0.22*	0.20	0.09	**0.29***	0.10	-0.06	0.23*	0.42*	**1.00**								
13	III	9.14	1.91	0.19	0.17	**0.32***	0.32*	0.26*	0.04	0.18	0.08	-0.12	0.10	0.38*	0.44*	**1.00**							
14	IAS	8.34	1.59	0.07	0.02	0.13	0.10	0.08	-0.04	0.08	0.06	**0.28***	0.19	0.17	0.15	0.25*	**1.00**						
15	ITOT	35.32	5.02	0.21*	0.19	0.35*	0.32*	**0.29***	0.05	0.24*	0.11	0.01	**0.22***	0.72*	0.74*	0.76*	0.53*	**1.00**					
16	CW1SA	16.08	2.56	0.20*	0.14	0.29*	0.05	.210*	0.01	-0.03	0.12	0.12	0.09	0.04	-0.03	0.02	0.19	0.07	**1.00**				
17	CW1NW	16.57	2.94	0.18	0.26*	0.24*	-0.01	0.22*	0.01	-0.02	-0.15	0.13	-0.01	0.01	-0.02	-0.07	0.01	-0.03	0.69*	**1.00**			
18	CW1II	16.49	2.80	0.28*	0.17	0.36*	0.19	0.29*	-0.02	-0.02	0.04	0.13	0.05	0.24*	0.12	0.15	0.14	0.23*	0.76*	0.66*	**1.00**		
19	CW1AS	16.72	2.95	0.18	0.04	0.26*	0.23*	0.18	-0.08	-0.06	-0.10	0.07	-0.08	0.09	-0.01	0.04	0.15	0.09	0.60*	0.50*	0.65*	**1.00**	
20	CW1TOT	65.86	9.60	0.25*	0.18	0.34*	0.14	0.26*	-0.03	-0.04	-0.03	0.13	0.01	0.11	0.02	0.04	0.14	0.10	0.88*	0.83*	0.90*	0.81*	**1.00**

All * values were significant at $p < 0.05$, n = 97

Table 14: Correlation matrix with PSI, Interview, 8 Consistent Items SJT (Rescore), Co-worker 1

		M	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
1	PSA	25.62	5.81	**1.00**																			
2	PNW	27.94	6.69	0.74*	**1.00**																		
3	PII	20.67	4.62	0.71*	0.68*	**1.00**																	
4	PAS	16.96	2.74	0.68*	0.43*	0.58*	**1.00**																
5	PTOT	91.19	17.25	0.92*	0.89*	0.86*	0.71*	**1.00**															
6	ISA	8.75	1.82	0.17	0.17	0.23*	0.22*	0.24*	**1.00**														
7	INW	9.08	1.89	0.14	0.16	0.21*	0.22*	0.20	0.42*	**1.00**													
8	III	9.14	1.91	0.19	0.17	0.32*	0.32*	0.26*	0.38*	0.44*	**1.00**												
9	IAS	8.34	1.59	0.07	0.02	0.13	0.10	0.08	0.17	0.15	0.25*	**1.00**											
10	ITOT	35.32	5.02	0.21*	0.19	0.35*	0.32*	0.29*	0.72*	0.74*	0.76*	0.53*	**1.00**										
11	SSA56	9.04	1.45	0.11	0.11	0.14	0.11	0.13	-0.07	-0.03	-0.09	-0.23	-0.14	**1.00**									
12	SNW27	9.44	2.51	0.01	-0.04	0.04	0.02	0.00	0.04	0.31*	0.09	0.02	0.17	0.12	**1.00**								
13	SII36	10.66	1.54	-0.05	0.00	0.03	0.02	0.00	0.17	0.15	0.12	0.21*	0.23*	-0.08	0.05	**1.00**							
14	SAS17	8.03	2.13	0.06	0.10	0.09	0.01	0.08	-0.05	0.05	-0.02	0.35*	0.10	-0.14	0.00	0.03	**1.00**						
15	STOT8	37.16	3.94	0.06	0.07	0.14	0.06	0.09	0.04	0.27*	0.06	0.19	0.20	0.34*	0.70*	0.41*	0.50*	**1.00**					
16	CW1SA	10.43	1.87	0.17	0.15	0.29*	0.06	0.20*	0.05	-0.01	0.03	0.18	0.08	0.04	-0.02	0.11	0.10	0.10	**1.00**				
17	CW1NW	10.87	2.23	0.16	0.23*	0.25*	-0.02	0.21*	0.00	-0.03	-0.04	0.02	-0.02	0.08	-0.06	-0.08	0.09	0.01	0.69*	**1.00**			
18	CW1II	10.78	2.04	0.26*	0.17	0.36*	0.18	0.28*	0.22*	0.12	0.14	0.09	0.21*	0.04	-0.03	0.04	0.06	0.04	0.76*	0.66*	**1.00**		
19	CW1AS	10.91	2.27	0.17	0.04	0.26*	0.21*	0.17	0.03	-0.04	0.01	0.11	0.04	0.12	-0.03	-0.09	-0.05	-0.04	0.63*	0.54*	0.67*	**1.00**	
20	CW1TOT	42.99	7.24	0.22*	0.17	0.33*	0.13	0.25*	0.08	0.01	0.04	0.11	0.08	0.09	-0.04	-0.02	0.05	0.03	0.88*	0.84*	0.89*	0.83*	**1.00**

All * values were significant at p < 0.05, n = 97

CHAPTER IV - DISCUSSION

SUMMARY OF RESULTS

The main purpose of this study was to find a suitable instrument that measures political skill and could be used as part of a selection assessment for managers. Typically a self-evaluation Likert scale type inventory like the PSI is susceptible to response distortion. Since there are no other political skill instruments currently existing, this study also incorporated the development of two possible predictor instruments, an SJT and a structured interview. To determine the validity of these new assessments and in order to compare the different types of measurement, a co-worker political performance evaluation was also developed. The study was therefore divided into three sections. The first was aimed to develop political skill predictor assessments that could be used for the selection of managers as an alternative to the PSI. The second segment consisted of the development of the co-worker questionnaire, which was designed in a performance appraisal format whereby work colleagues provided ratings of the participants' political behavior. Using these instruments, the third section compared the different assessments to one another and to a criterion of political skill on the job.

The first hypothesis stated that each of the predictor tests would be correlated with the others. The second hypothesis stated that each of the instruments would be correlated with co-worker ratings of political skill. Thirdly it was proposed that the SJT would add incremental validity over the interview and PSI and finally the fourth hypothesis stated that the interview would add incremental validity over the PSI.

The results of the correlation analyses with respect to Hypothesis 1 and 2 showed that the interview scores were significantly correlated with both the overall scores for the PSI and the overall

scores for the SJT. The SJT and the PSI were not significantly related. For the subscales there were only three significant relationships found. In terms of relations with the criterion measure, only the PSI had significant relationships with co-worker ratings overall and for the subscales. The SJT and interview failed to correlate significantly with peer ratings for both the overall score and the subscales.

In reviewing the entire set of analyses there were several possible reasons that the measurement comparison hypotheses were not all confirmed. One possible reason for this occurrence was the low internal consistency coefficients for the SJT. Typically SJTs tend to fall below the conventional rule of 0.70, but the values seen in this study were even smaller than SJT averages of 0.45 - 0.60 (McDaniel et al (2001). As the reliability of a scale is necessary to determine the validity of it, this may be one way to account for the poor relationships between the SJT and PSI in addition to co-worker ratings. Part of the problems with the SJT may have been the quality of the keys as evidenced by the low reliability of the judges. Although the reliability appears to have improved by eliminating extreme judgments, there were only three experts for response, and the item scores may not have been very stable. Based on the Spearman Brown analyses it would have taken at least 15 experts to improve the ICC ratings and this would have proved challenging for this study.

The non-significant relationships between the SJT and two interview subscales Social Astuteness and Interpersonal Influence could have occurred as a result of inconsistent responding by the participants across the two instruments. It is possible that the responses provided in the interview were not similar to the ones they selected in the SJT. Participants may have selected an alternative to their interview answers when they had the opportunity to see other possible responses they did not initially consider. To further explore this a correlation analysis was conducted only for the questions that were consistent across the two instruments. The results showed that there were significant relationships for Networking ($r = 0.31$; $p = .002$) and Apparent Sincerity ($r = 0.35$; $p = 0.001$). However, the Interpersonal Influence and Social Astuteness relationships were not significant.

In order to look at the inconsistency of the responses, a frequency analysis was conducted to compare the interview to the SJT for one of the common Social Astuteness items. Interview responses were coded to match SJT options and of the ninety-six participants only forty-five had consistent answers. The results of the analysis confirm that participants did select a different course of action when answering the SJT compared to their response to the interview questions. See the full comparison on Table 15.

Table 15: Frequency Analysis of Interview Question 1 and SJT item 6 Responses

Interview Responses	SJT Responses				
	a	**b**	**c**	**d**	**e**
a	0	5	0	0	0
b	0	**37**	4	0	0
c	0	33	**8**	0	0
d	0	0	0	0	0
e	0	5	2	0	0
Other	0	2	0	0	0

NB: Bold numbers are frequency counts for matched responses. N = 96
"Other" indicates responses that did not match any of the SJT options.

The fundamental difference between the instruments is that the PSI is a self-rating instrument as opposed to the SJT and Interview whereby participants were responding to hypothetical situations. The non-relationship found between the SJT and the co-worker ratings was that while persons may have been able to identify what they should do or how they should act, they may not have engaged in the actual behavior. Though the co-workers were presented with the same situations, their task was not to choose which option they thought their colleague would select, but

rather to rate how effectively they thought their co-worker would respond given their observations of the person's behavior in the workplace. As mentioned in the introduction Threadway, et al. (2005) explored the differences among political will, political skill and political behavior as they researched the relationships among these three factors and emotional labor. They concluded that political will or motivation to act in a political way is necessary for one to exhibit political skill. Based on this study it is reasonable to assume that the SJT may be measuring a persons' political skill such that they can determine the appropriate action given a particular circumstance. However, it does not necessarily tap into their will to actually perform these actions. Therefore those who may be politically skilled may not always be the ones that are motivated to display these behaviors. This is different from the PSI as it asks persons to select statements that best matches their behavior, which could be taping into a persons' political will to a greater degree.

The SJT is closely allied with the notion of tacit knowledge or practical intelligence (Schmidt & Hunter, 1993; Sternberg, et al., 2000; Wagner & Sternberg, 1985). It aims to tap knowledge acquired through experience that is often unwritten and difficult to articulate. It is possible that developing generic SJTs may be difficult because the type of knowledge required may be specific to a given domain such as a particular work context, including specific kinds of organizations, jobs, conflicts, or kinds of negotiation. If so, then writing political skill SJT items would prove difficult because experts from diverse backgrounds would correctly identify different best responses.

An explanation for the non-significant relationship with the interview and the peer assessment is that co-workers have a wider range of behavior to draw from in order to make an accurate assessment of the participant's ability to respond to the different situations. The interviews were 30 minutes long and an assessment during that time period would only give a rater limited range to make their evaluation of the person's political skill. Also the interviewer did not probe participants to

maintain consistency from one person to the next and this could also account for the limited information to make judgments, especially for those persons who did not elaborate in their interview answers.

IMPLICATIONS

As the hypotheses proposed were not supported and many of the correlations between the different instrument scores were not significant there are no major implications other than further confirmation that the PSI is a significant predictor of political skill. This study advanced the validity of this instrument among a graduate level population who had more than 10 years' work experience and who were at higher job levels than the original validation study conducted with undergraduate students. These findings would suggest that even at a management level the PSI is a good predictor of political behavior.

LIMITATIONS

There were a few limitations noted in this study. As mentioned above, the poor internal consistency of the SJT was a major problem for the validation of the instrument. However it should be noted that for a couple of the subscales the removal of one the items would have yielded higher alpha values. It may be valuable to possibly use a different subset of scenarios to compare SJT and co-worker ratings.

Another limitation was the limited responses provided by participants in the interview. In many cases persons did not elaborate in their answers to the questions, which gave the interviewer less information to provide an accurate rating. In typical competency based interviews, some probing is allowed in order for the assessor to better elicit a person's competency level. Socially desirable responding could have occurred with the interview versus the other instruments. As discovered by the Richman, Kiesler, Weisband & Drasgow (1999) meta-analysis, response distortion is higher for

face to face interviews than computer based assessments. Finally, there was the inconsistency in responses between the Interview and the SJT. The fact that persons did not select the same responses could mean that they were not as politically skilled as the SJT scores would suggest, or that they were not confident or consistent in their decision to act in a political way.

FUTURE STUDIES

One promising future study is to further explore measurement comparisons especially for instruments being used under high stakes conditions. One of the limitations of the measurement comparison component of this study was that the instruments being compared did not accurately predict the criterion, coworkers' rating of political skill. Therefore in the future it may be best to simply use a construct that each of the methods on their own have already been shown to predict, for example leadership. The outlined methodology may be the same. However, it is essential that instruments are criterion valid, in order for comparisons to be made. Finding a suitable measurement for administrative purposes is very important due to the limitations of self-rating scales in job selection situations.

CONCLUSION

This study was designed to establish alternative instruments for measuring political skill and to compare different assessment methodologies in order to determine the most appropriate one(s) for selection purposes. Though the overall design did not yield favorable results, the goals highlighted should still be explored as political skill continues to be a significant factor in job performance, especially for managers. As the market becomes more competitive, the need to hire and train politically skilled managers and company leaders increases. Therefore, it would be important to assess job applicants the best way possible.

REFERENCES

Aheam, K.K., Ferris, G.R., Hochwarter, W.A., Douglas, C. & Ammeter, A.P. (2004). Leader Political Skill and Team Performance. *Journal of Management 30*, 309-327.

Arthur, W., Woehr, D.J. & Graziano, W.G. (2001). Personality testing in employment settings: Problems and issues in the application of typical selection practices. *Personnel Review, 30*, 657 – 676

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.

Becker, T.E. & Klimoski, R.J. (1989). A field study of the relationship between organizational feedback environment and performance. *Personnel Psychology, 42*, 343 – 358.

Bergman, M. E., Drasgow, F., Donovan, M. A., Henning, J. B. & Juraska, S. E. (2006). Scoring situational judgment tests: Once you get the data, your troubles begin. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment, 14*, 223 – 235

Brugnoli, G.A., Campion, J.E. & Basen, J.A. (1979). Racial bias in the use of work samples for personal selection. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 64*, 119 – 123

Burnett, J.R., & Motowidlo, S.J. (1998). Relation between different sources of information in the structured selection interview. *Personnel Psychology, 51*, 963–983.

Campion, M. A., Palmer, D. K., & Campion, J. E. (1998). Structuring employment interviews to improve reliability, validity, and users' reactions. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 77-82.

Cascio, W.F. & Aguinis, H.A. (2008). A*pplied psychology in human resource management*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Prentice Hall

Chan, D. & Schmitt, N. (2002). Situational judgment and job performance. *Human Performance, 15*, 233 – 254.

Donovan, J. J., Dwight, S. A., & Hurtz, G. M. (2003). An assessment of the prevalence, severity, and verifiability of entry-level applicant faking using the randomized response technique. *Human Performance, 16*(1)*, 81-106.

Douglas, C. & Ammeter, A.P. (2004). An examination of leader political skill and its effect on ratings of leader effectiveness. *The Leadership Quarterly, 15*, 537–550.

Ferris, G.R., Treadway, D.C., Kolodinsky, R.W., Hochwarter, W.A., Kacmar, C.J. Douglas C. & Frink, D.D. (2005). Development and validation of the political skill inventory**. *Journal of Management, 31*, 126-152

Ferris, G.R., Treadway, D.C., Perrewé, P.L., Brouer, R.L. Douglas, C. & Lux, S. (2007). Political Skill in Organizations. *Journal of Management, 33*, 290-320

Gauler, B.B., Rosenthal, D.B., Thorton, G.C. III & Bentson, C. (1987). Meta-analysis of assessment center validity. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 72*, 493 – 511.

Harris, K. J., Kacmar, K., Zivnuska, S. & Shaw, J. D. (2007). The impact of political skill on impression management effectiveness. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92(1), 278-285.

Harris, M. M., & Schaubroeck, J. (1988). A Meta-Analysis of Self-Supervisor, Self-Peer, and Peer-Supervisor Ratings. *Personnel Psychology, 41*(1), 43-62.

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.

Jawahar, I. M., Meurs, J. A., Ferris, G. R. & Hochwarter, W. A. (2008). Self-efficacy and political skill as comparative predictors of task and contextual performance: A two-study constructive replication. *Human Performance, 21*, 138-157.

Jawahar, I. M., Stone, T. H. & Kisamore, J. L. (2007). Role conflict and burnout: The direct and moderating effects of political skill and perceived organizational support on burnout dimensions. *International Journal of Stress Management, 14*, 142-159.

Kane, J.S. & Lawler, E.E. III. (1978). Methods of peer assessment. *Psychological Bulletin, 85*, 555 – 586.

Lievens, F., Buyse, T., & Sackett, P. R. (2005). The operational validity of a video-based situational judgment test for medical college admissions: Illustrating the importance of matching predictor and criterion construct domains. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 90*, 442-452.

Lievens, F., Peeters, H. & Schollaert, E. (2008). Situational judgment tests: A review of recent research. *Personnel Review, 37*, 426 – 441

Maccoby, M. (2000). Understanding the difference between management and leadership. *Research Technology Management; 43(1)*, 57 - 59.

Maurer, T., Solamon, J. & Troxtel, D. (1998). Relationship of coaching with performance in situational employment interviews. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 83*, 128–136.

McDaniel, M.A., Morgeson, F.P., Finnegan, E.B., Campion, M.A. & Braverman E.P. (2001). Use of situational judgment tests to predict job performance: A clarification of the literature. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 80*, 730 -740

McDaniel, M.A. & Nguyen, N.T. (2001). Situational judgment tests: a review of practice and constructs assessed, *International Journal of Selection and Assessment, 9*, 103-13

Mintzberg, H. 1983. Power in and around organizations. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Motowidlo, S. J., Borman, W. C. & Schmit, M. J. (1997). A theory of individual differences in task and contextual performance. *Human Performance, 10*, 71- 83.

Motowidlo, S.J., Dunnette, M.D. & Carter, G.W. (1990). An alternative selection procedure: The low-fidelity simulation. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 75*, 640 – 647.

Nguyen, N. T. & McDaniel, M. A. (2003). Response instructions and racial differences in a situational judgment test. *Applied H.R.M. Research, 8*, 33-44.

Perrew, P., P.I., Zellars, K.l, Ferris, G.R., Rossi, A. Kacmar, C.J. & Ralston, D.A. (2004). Neutralizing job stressors: political skill as an antidote to the dysfunctional consequences of role conflict. *Academy of Management Journal, 47*, 141-152.

Pulakos, E. D. & Schmitt, N. (1995). Experience-based and situational interview questions: studies of validity. *Personnel Psychology*, *48,* 289-308.

Rausch, E., Sherman, H. & Washbush, J.B. (2002). Defining and assessing competencies for competency-based, outcome-focused management development. *Journal of Management Development, 21*, 184 - 200

Reynolds, D. H., Sydell, E. J., Scott, D. R. & Winter, J. L. (2000, April). Factors affecting situational judgment test characteristics. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Society of Industrial and Organizational Psychology, New Orleans, LA.

Richman, W. L., Kiesler, S., Weisband, S., & Drasgow, F. (1999). A meta-analytic study of social desirability distortion in computer-administered questionnaires, traditional questionnaires, and interviews. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 84(5)*, 754-775.

Rosse, J. G., Stecher, M. D., Miller, J. L. & Levin, R. A. (1998). The impact of response distortion on pre-employment personality testing and hiring decisions. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 83*, 634-644.

Schmidt, F. L.; Hunter, J. E. (1993). Tacit knowledge, practical intelligence, general mental ability, and job knowledge. *Current Directions in Psychological Science, 2*: 8–9.

Schmidt, F.L. & Hunter, J.E. (1998). The validity and utility of selection methods in personnel psychology: practical and theoretical implications of 85 years of research findings. *Psychological Bulletin, 124*, 262-274.

Sternberg, R. J., Forsythe, G. B., Hedlund, J., Horvath, J. A., Wagner, R. K., Williams, W. M., et al. (2000). Practical intelligence in everyday life. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Struefert, S., Pogash, R. & Piasecki, M. (1988). Simulation-based assessment of managerial competence: Reliability and validity. *Personnel Psychology, 41*, 537 – 557.

Thornton, G. C. & Rupp, D. E. (2006). *Assessment centers in human resource management: Strategies for prediction, diagnosis, and development*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Thornton, G.C. & Zorich, S. (1980). Training to improve observer accuracy. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 65*, 351 – 354.

Todd, S. Y., Harris, K. J., Harris, R. B. & Wheeler, A. R. (2009). Career success implications of political skill. *The Journal of Social Psychology, 149*, 179-204.

Treadway, D. C., Hochwarter, W. A., Ferris, G. R., Kacmar, C. J., Douglas, C., Ammeter, A. P. & Buckley, M. (2004). Leader political skill and employee reactions. *The Leadership Quarterly, 15*, 493-513.

Treadway, D. C., Hochwarter, W. A., Kacmar, C. J. & Ferris, G. R. (2005). Political will, political skill, and political behavior. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 26*, 229-245.

Wagner, R. K., & Sternberg, R. J. (1985). Practical intelligence in real-world pursuits: The role of tacit knowledge. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 49*, 436-458

Weekley, J.A. & Jones, C. (1999). Further studies of situational tests. *Personnel Psychology, 52*, 679 – 700.

Weekley, J.A. & Jones, C. (1997). Video-based situational testing. *Personnel Psychology, 50*, 25 - 49.

Weekley, J. A. & Polyhart, R. E. (2006). An introduction to situational judgment testing, In J. A. Weekley & R. E. Polyhart (Eds.), *Situational judgment tests: Theory, measurement, and application* (pp. 1-10). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.

Woehr, D. J. & Arthur, W. r. (2003). The construct-related validity of assessment center ratings: A

   review and meta-analysis of the role of methodological factors. *Journal of Management, 29*, 231-

   258.

APPENDIX

Table A 1: Correlation matrix with PSI, Interview, SJT 32 Items 5 Experts and Co-worker Average

		M	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
1	PTOT	91.19	17.25	**1.00**																			
2	PSA	25.62	5.81	0.92*	**1.00**																		
3	PNW	27.94	6.69	0.89*	0.74*	**1.00**																	
4	PII	20.67	4.62	0.86*	0.71*	0.68*	**1.00**																
5	PAS	16.96	2.74	0.71*	0.68*	0.43*	0.58*	**1.00**															
6	STOT	148.84	6.79	-0.03	-0.01	-0.05	0.02	-0.09	**1.00**														
7	SSA	35.02	2.84	0.07	0.03	0.07	0.14	-0.02	0.55*	**1.00**													
8	SNW	37.58	3.56	-0.03	-0.02	-0.09	0.03	-0.01	0.65*	0.23*	**1.00**												
9	SII	40.68	3.35	-0.13	-0.13	-0.11	-0.09	-0.16	0.53*	-0.04	0.06	**1.00**											
10	SAS	35.55	2.57	0.06	0.13	0.05	-0.02	0.01	0.44*	0.08	0.01	0.06	**1.00**										
11	ITOT	35.32	5.02	**0.29***	0.21*	0.19	0.35*	0.32*	0.15	0.06	0.17	0.05	0.03	**1.00**									
12	ISA	8.75	1.82	0.24*	0.17	0.17	0.30*	0.22*	0.03	-0.04	0.09	-0.03	0.04	0.72*	**1.00**								
13	INW	9.08	1.89	0.20	0.14	0.16	0.21*	0.22*	0.15	0.10	**0.24***	0.01	-0.05	0.74*	0.42*	**1.00**							
14	III	9.14	1.91	0.26*	0.19	0.17	**0.32***	0.32*	0.09	0.12	0.10	0.02	-0.05	0.76*	0.38*	0.44*	**1.00**						
15	IAS	8.34	1.59	0.08	0.07	0.02	0.13	0.10	0.14	-0.03	0.01	0.16	0.17	0.53*	0.17	0.15	0.25*	**1.00**					
16	CWTOT	66.03	8.55	**0.23***	0.24*	0.12	0.30*	0.14	-0.05	-0.14	-0.02	-0.04	0.11	0.09	0.10	0.07	0.01	0.08	**1.00**				
17	CWSA	16.17	2.21	0.17	0.19	0.07	0.24*	0.08	0.04	-0.10	0.01	0.09	0.10	0.06	0.04	0.05	-0.01	0.11	0.91*	**1.00**			
18	CWNW	16.61	2.55	0.21*	0.18	0.20	0.25*	0.00	-0.04	-0.10	0.04	-0.11	0.09	0.00	0.03	0.06	-0.06	-0.03	0.83*	0.70*	**1.00**		
19	CWII	16.53	2.34	0.22*	0.23*	0.10	**0.30***	0.12	-0.01	-0.15	-0.01	0.00	0.14	0.14	0.17	0.09	0.05	0.09	0.90*	0.77*	0.68*	**1.00**	
20	CWAS	16.72	2.72	0.21*	0.24*	0.04	0.28*	**0.27***	-0.14	-0.16	-0.09	-0.10	0.06	0.11	0.11	0.03	0.05	0.11	0.86*	0.73*	0.51*	0.72*	**1.00**

All * values were significant at p < 0.05, n = 97

Table A 2: Correlation matrix with PSI, Interview, SJT 32 Items 5 Experts and Co-worker 1

		M	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
1	PTOT	91.19	17.25	**1.00**																			
2	PSA	25.62	5.81	0.92*	**1.00**																		
3	PNW	27.94	6.69	0.89*	0.74*	**1.00**																	
4	PII	20.67	4.62	0.86*	0.71*	0.68*	**1.00**																
5	PAS	16.96	2.74	0.71*	0.68*	0.43*	0.58*	**1.00**															
6	STOT	148.84	6.79	-0.03	-0.01	-0.05	0.02	-0.09	**1.00**														
7	SSA	35.02	2.84	0.07	0.03	0.07	0.14	-0.02	0.55*	**1.00**													
8	SNW	37.58	3.56	-0.03	-0.02	-0.09	0.03	-0.01	0.65*	0.23*	**1.00**												
9	SII	40.68	3.35	-0.13	-0.13	-0.11	-0.09	-0.16	0.53*	-0.04	0.06	**1.00**											
10	SAS	35.55	2.57	0.06	0.13	0.05	-0.02	0.01	0.44*	0.08	0.01	0.06	**1.00**										
11	ITOT	35.32	5.02	**0.29***	0.21*	0.19	0.35*	0.32*	0.15	0.06	0.17	0.05	0.03	**1.00**									
12	ISA	8.75	1.82	0.24*	0.17	0.17	0.30*	0.22*	0.03	-0.04	0.09	-0.03	0.04	0.72*	**1.00**								
13	INW	9.08	1.89	0.20	0.14	0.16	0.21*	0.22*	0.15	0.10	**0.24***	0.01	-0.05	0.74*	0.42*	**1.00**							
14	III	9.14	1.91	0.26*	0.19	0.17	**0.32***	0.32*	0.09	0.12	0.10	0.02	-0.05	0.76*	0.38*	0.44*	**1.00**						
15	IAS	8.34	1.59	0.08	0.07	0.02	0.13	0.10	0.14	-0.03	0.01	0.16	0.17	0.53*	0.17	0.15	0.25*	**1.00**					
16	CW1TOT	65.86	9.60	**0.26***	0.25*	0.18	0.34*	0.14	-0.06	-0.08	-0.04	0.00	-0.01	0.10	0.11	0.02	0.04	0.14	**1.00**				
17	CWSA	16.08	2.56	0.21*	**0.20***	0.14	0.29*	0.05	0.02	-0.05	-0.04	0.11	0.00	0.07	0.04	-0.03	0.02	0.19	0.88*	**1.00**			
18	CW1NW	16.57	2.94	0.22*	0.18	**0.26***	0.24*	-0.01	-0.06	-0.03	-0.01	-0.08	-0.01	-0.03	0.01	-0.02	-0.07	0.01	0.83*	0.69*	**1.00**		
19	CW1II	16.49	2.80	0.29*	0.28*	0.17	**0.36***	0.19	-0.03	-0.08	-0.04	0.06	0.00	0.23*	0.24*	0.12	0.15	0.14	0.90*	0.76*	0.66*	**1.00**	
20	CW1AS	16.72	2.95	0.18	0.18	0.04	0.26*	**0.23***	-0.11	-0.11	-0.04	-0.08	-0.01	0.09	0.09	-0.01	0.04	0.15	0.81*	0.60*	0.50*	0.65*	**1.00**

All * values were significant at p < 0.05, n = 97

Table A 3: Correlation matrix with PSI, Interview, SJT 32 Items 5 Experts and Co-worker 2

		M	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
1	PTOT	91.19	17.25	**1.00**																			
2	PSA	25.62	5.81	0.92*	**1.00**																		
3	PNW	27.94	6.69	0.89*	0.74*	**1.00**																	
4	PII	20.67	4.62	0.86*	0.71*	0.68*	**1.00**																
5	PAS	16.96	2.74	0.71*	0.68*	0.43*	0.58*	**1.00**															
6	STOT	153.94	7.97	0.02	0.03	-0.02	0.07	-0.01	**1.00**														
7	SSA	38.51	3.65	0.10	0.07	0.09	0.12	0.08	0.55*	**1.00**													
8	SNW	36.94	4.19	0.06	0.04	0.00	0.15	0.05	0.58*	0.06	**1.00**												
9	SII	41.21	3.18	-0.18	-0.16	-0.17	-0.14	-0.14	0.56*	0.03	0.15	**1.00**											
10	SAS	25.78	3.09	0.08	0.14	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.39*	0.07	-0.11	0.06	**1.00**										
11	ITOT	35.32	5.02	**0.29***	0.21*	0.19	0.35*	0.32*	0.19	0.06	0.27*	0.01	0.01	**1.00**									
12	ISA	8.75	1.82	0.24*	0.17	0.17	0.30*	0.22*	0.07	0.01	0.17	-0.05	-0.03	0.72*	**1.00**								
13	INW	9.08	1.89	0.20	0.14	0.16	0.21*	0.22*	0.19	0.10	**0.32***	-0.03	-0.06	0.74*	0.42*	**1.00**							
14	III	9.14	1.91	0.26*	0.19	0.17	**0.32***	0.32*	0.13	0.07	0.19	0.07	-0.12	0.76*	0.38*	0.44*	**1.00**						
15	IAS	8.34	1.59	0.08	0.07	0.02	0.13	0.10	0.15	-0.04	0.05	0.03	**0.28***	0.53*	0.17	0.15	0.25*	**1.00**					
16	CW2TOT	66.03	8.55	**0.23***	0.24*	0.12	0.30*	0.14	-0.02	-0.09	0.02	-0.05	0.12	0.09	0.10	0.07	0.01	0.08	**1.00**				
17	CW2SA	16.17	2.21	0.17	0.19	0.07	0.24*	0.08	0.08	-0.05	0.06	0.04	0.16	0.06	0.04	0.05	-0.01	0.11	0.91*	**1.00**			
18	CW2NW	16.61	2.55	0.21*	0.18	0.20	0.25*	0.00	-0.02	-0.05	0.05	-0.12	0.06	0.00	0.03	0.06	-0.06	-0.03	0.83*	0.67*	**1.00**		
19	CW2I	16.53	2.34	0.22*	0.23*	0.10	**0.30***	0.12	0.01	-0.11	0.03	0.00	0.11	0.14	0.17	0.09	0.05	0.09	0.90*	0.77*	0.68*	**1.00**	
20	CW2AS	16.72	2.72	0.21*	0.24*	0.04	0.28*	**0.27***	-0.10	-0.11	-0.06	-0.08	0.11	0.11	0.11	0.03	0.05	0.11	0.86*	0.73*	0.51*	0.72*	**1.00**

All * values were significant at $p < 0.05$, n = 97

Table A 4: Correlation matrix with PSI, Interview, SJT 32 Items 3 Experts and Co-worker Average

		M	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
1	PTOT	91.19	17.25	**1.00**																			
2	PSA	25.62	5.81	0.92*	**1.00**																		
3	PNW	27.94	6.69	0.89*	0.74*	**1.00**																	
4	PII	20.67	4.62	0.86*	0.71*	0.68*	**1.00**																
5	PAS	16.96	2.74	0.71*	0.68*	0.43*	0.58*	**1.00**															
6	STOT	153.94	7.97	0.02	0.03	-0.02	0.07	-0.01	**1.00**														
7	SSA	38.51	3.65	0.10	0.07	0.09	0.12	0.08	0.55*	**1.00**													
8	SNW	36.94	4.19	0.06	0.04	0.00	0.15	0.05	0.58*	0.06	**1.00**												
9	SII	41.21	3.18	-0.18	-0.16	-0.17	-0.14	-0.14	0.56*	0.03	0.15	**1.00**											
10	SAS	25.78	3.09	0.08	0.14	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.39*	0.07	-0.11	0.06	**1.00**										
11	ITOT	35.32	5.02	**0.29***	0.21*	0.19	0.35*	0.32*	0.19	0.06	0.27*	0.01	0.01	**1.00**									
12	ISA	8.75	1.82	0.24*	0.17	0.17	0.30*	0.22*	0.07	0.01	0.17	-0.05	-0.03	0.72*	**1.00**								
13	INW	9.08	1.89	0.20	0.14	0.16	0.21*	0.22*	0.19	0.10	**0.32***	-0.03	-0.06	0.74*	0.42*	**1.00**							
14	III	9.14	1.91	0.26*	0.19	0.17	**0.32***	0.32*	0.13	0.07	0.19	0.07	-0.12	0.76*	0.38*	0.44*	**1.00**						
15	IAS	8.34	1.59	0.08	0.07	0.02	0.13	0.10	0.15	-0.04	0.05	0.03	**0.28***	0.53*	0.17	0.15	0.25*	**1.00**					
16	CWTOT	66.03	8.55	**0.23***	0.24*	0.12	0.30*	0.14	-0.02	-0.09	0.02	-0.05	0.12	0.09	0.10	0.07	0.01	0.08	**1.00**				
17	CWSA	16.17	2.21	0.17	0.19	0.07	0.24*	0.08	0.08	-0.05	0.06	0.04	0.16	0.06	0.04	0.05	-0.01	0.11	0.91*	**1.00**			
18	CWNW	16.61	2.55	0.21*	0.18	0.20	0.25*	0.00	-0.02	-0.05	0.05	-0.12	0.06	0.00	0.03	0.06	-0.06	-0.03	0.83*	0.67*	**1.00**		
19	CWII	16.53	2.34	0.22*	0.23*	0.10	**0.30***	0.12	0.01	-0.11	0.03	0.00	0.11	0.14	0.17	0.09	0.05	0.09	0.90*	0.77*	0.68*	**1.00**	
20	CWAS	16.72	2.72	0.21*	0.24*	0.04	0.28*	**0.27***	-0.10	-0.11	-0.06	-0.08	0.11	0.11	0.11	0.03	0.05	0.11	0.86*	0.73*	0.51*	0.72*	**1.00**

All * values were significant at $p < 0.05$, n = 97

Table A 5: Correlation matrix with PSI, Interview, SJT 32 Items 3 Experts and Co-worker 1

		M	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
1	PTOT	91.19	17.25	**1.00**																			
2	PSA	25.62	5.81	0.92*	**1.00**																		
3	PNW	27.94	6.69	0.89*	0.74*	**1.00**																	
4	PII	20.67	4.62	0.86*	0.71*	0.68*	**1.00**																
5	PAS	16.96	2.74	0.71*	0.68*	0.43*	0.58*	**1.00**															
6	STOT	153.94	7.97	0.02	0.03	-0.02	0.07	-0.01	**1.00**														
7	SSA	38.51	3.65	0.10	0.07	0.09	0.12	0.08	0.55*	**1.00**													
8	SNW	36.94	4.19	0.06	0.04	0.00	0.15	0.05	0.58*	0.06	**1.00**												
9	SII	41.21	3.18	-0.18	-0.16	-0.17	-0.14	-0.14	0.56*	0.03	0.15	**1.00**											
10	SAS	25.78	3.09	0.08	0.14	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.39*	0.07	-0.11	0.06	**1.00**										
11	ITOT	35.32	5.02	**0.29***	0.21*	0.19	0.35*	0.32*	0.19	0.06	0.27*	0.01	0.01	**1.00**									
12	ISA	8.75	1.82	0.24*	0.17	0.17	0.30*	0.22*	0.07	0.01	0.17	-0.05	-0.03	0.72*	**1.00**								
13	INW	9.08	1.89	0.20	0.14	0.16	0.21*	0.22*	0.19	0.10	**0.32***	-0.03	-0.06	0.74*	0.42*	**1.00**							
14	III	9.14	1.91	0.26*	0.19	0.17	**0.32***	0.32*	0.13	0.07	0.19	0.07	-0.12	0.76*	0.38*	0.44*	**1.00**						
15	IAS	8.34	1.59	0.08	0.07	0.02	0.13	0.10	0.15	-0.04	0.05	0.03	**0.28***	0.53*	0.17	0.15	0.25*	**1.00**					
16	CW1TOT	65.86	9.60	**0.26***	0.25*	0.18	0.34*	0.14	-0.02	-0.04	-0.01	-0.05	0.13	0.10	0.11	0.02	0.04	0.14	**1.00**				
17	CWSA	16.08	2.56	0.21*	**0.20***	0.14	0.29*	0.05	0.03	-0.02	-0.01	0.04	0.12	0.07	0.04	-0.03	0.02	0.19	0.88*	**1.00**			
18	CW1NW	16.57	2.94	0.22*	0.18	**0.26***	0.24*	-0.01	-0.04	0.00	-0.01	-0.14	0.13	-0.03	0.01	-0.02	-0.07	0.01	0.83*	0.69*	**1.00**		
19	CW1II	16.49	2.80	0.29*	0.28*	0.17	**0.36***	0.19	0.03	0.00	0.01	-0.01	0.13	0.23*	0.24*	0.12	0.15	0.14	0.90*	0.76*	0.66*	**1.00**	
20	CW1AS	16.72	2.95	0.18	0.18	0.04	0.26*	**0.23***	-0.08	-0.10	-0.03	-0.05	0.07	0.09	0.09	-0.01	0.04	0.15	0.81*	0.60*	0.50*	0.65*	**1.00**

All * values were significant at $p < 0.05$, n = 97

Table A 6: Correlation matrix with PSI, Interview, SJT 32 Items 3 Experts and Co-worker 2

		M	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
1	PTOT	91.88	16.71	**1.00**																			
2	PSA	25.84	5.60	0.91*	**1.00**																		
3	PNW	28.34	6.56	0.89*	0.72*	**1.00**																	
4	PII	20.66	4.61	0.86*	0.67*	0.69*	**1.00**																
5	PAS	17.04	2.66	0.68*	0.66*	0.39*	0.53*	**1.00**															
6	STOT	153.60	8.27	-0.02	-0.01	-0.04	0.03	-0.07	**1.00**														
7	SSA	38.54	3.64	0.08	0.07	0.06	0.09	0.06	0.58*	**1.00**													
8	SNW	36.72	4.24	0.01	-0.02	0.00	0.09	-0.04	0.57*	0.07	**1.00**												
9	SII	41.04	3.22	-0.14	-0.12	-0.12	-0.11	-0.13	0.59*	0.08	0.16	**1.00**											
10	SAS	25.78	3.05	0.05	0.10	0.01	0.04	0.02	0.40*	0.15	-0.14	0.11	**1.00**										
11	ITOT	35.35	5.11	**0.25***	0.15	0.17	0.33*	0.27*	0.18	0.10	0.25*	0.02	-0.05	**1.00**									
12	ISA	8.76	1.80	0.26*	0.17	0.20	0.33*	0.24*	0.08	0.06	0.18	-0.05	-0.11	0.74*	**1.00**								
13	INW	9.12	1.94	0.14	0.09	0.11	0.15	0.16	0.18	0.10	**0.31***	0.00	-0.07	0.75*	0.47*	**1.00**							
14	III	9.10	1.95	0.24*	0.15	0.17	**0.29***	0.28*	0.10	0.10	0.15	0.06	-0.15	0.77*	0.43*	0.42*	**1.00**						
15	IAS	8.37	1.59	0.04	0.01	-0.02	0.13	0.06	0.14	0.00	0.03	0.06	**0.24***	0.52*	0.15	0.15	0.24*	**1.00**					
16	CW2TOT	66.59	10.37	0.14	0.18	0.04	0.19	0.09	0.01	-0.08	0.02	-0.01	0.05	0.01	0.02	0.05	-0.03	-0.02	**1.00**				
17	CW2SA	16.29	2.69	0.05	0.10	-0.03	0.08	0.06	0.10	-0.02	0.06	0.06	0.13	-0.01	0.00	0.05	-0.05	-0.02	0.88*	**1.00**			
18	CW2NW	16.78	2.90	0.15	0.17	0.08	0.21	0.05	0.04	-0.08	0.12	0.01	-0.06	0.03	0.04	0.08	0.01	-0.05	0.84*	0.63*	**1.00**		
19	CW2I	16.64	2.92	0.08	0.11	0.02	0.13	-0.03	-0.01	-0.14	0.01	0.00	0.05	-0.04	-0.03	0.01	-0.10	0.01	0.88*	0.69*	0.74*	**1.00**	
20	CW2AS	16.88	3.48	0.19	0.22*	0.06	0.22*	0.20	-0.09	-0.05	-0.10	-0.08	0.05	0.04	0.05	0.04	0.02	-0.01	0.86*	0.76*	0.55*	0.62*	**1.00**

All * values were significant at p < 0.05, n = 97