2008

Facilitating communication and effective interpersonal relationships at work: A theoretical model of socio-affective competence

Adam C. Bandelli
University of South Florida

Facilitating Communication and Effective Interpersonal Relationships at Work:

A Theoretical Model of Socio-Affective Competence

by

Adam C. Bandelli

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

Major Professor: Walter C. Borman, Ph.D.
Michael T. Brannick, Ph.D.
Russell E. Johnson, Ph.D.
Joseph A. Vandello, Ph.D.
Walter R. Nord, Ph.D.

Date of Approval:
May 2, 2008

Keywords: political skill, emotional intelligence, establishing rapport, promoting acceptance of differences, developing trust, cultivating charismatic influence, social effectiveness, situational judgment test

Dedication

To my mother: thank you for believing in me, for your continual guidance, and for all of your emotional support. I would not have been able to do this without your help over the last nine years. Grandpa is looking down from heaven and he is very pleased to see the first Dr. Bandelli in the family! More importantly, I know he realizes that I will now be able to help you and grandma like he asked me to do a long time ago.

To Joe (a.k.a., "Big Will-E"): I finally did it man! You and your boys can now refer to me as "Doc." On a serious note, it has been amazing to watch you grow into a man. You have been through a lot since college and you have been able handle it all without any difficulties. That has been an inspiration to me during some of my more difficult personal moments. I will always support you and any goal you set for yourself. So you better go back to school and pursue your life's passion!

To Kelli: thank you for loving me and for showing me some of the more important things in life. You have taught me that it is our relationships with others that is more important than any amount of wealth or financial success we accumulate in life.

To Justin: we are close to accomplishing lifelong dreams. Since our days in high school until now, it has always been a privilege of mine to share the events in my life with you. We have supported one another through the challenging and difficult times. I am truly grateful for the wisdom and advice you have so unselfishly offered to me time and time again. I wish you all the luck and success on completing your doctoral degree!

Acknowledgements

In life, we rarely achieve our goals without the guidance, support, encouragement, and assistance of others. This is definitely true in my case and although I will not be able to mention and thank every person, I will take this opportunity to express my sincere appreciation to a few individuals.

First of all, I must recognize and thank my doctoral program advisor, Walter C. Borman. When I began graduate school at USF, I would say that my writing style was a bit atrocious. However, since our first set of revisions on my master's thesis to this very manuscript, you have helped me become a much better writer. I also wanted to thank you for always opening your door to me and providing assistance whenever I needed it.

To my doctoral committee members: Drs. Michael Brannick, Russell Johnson, Joseph Vandello, and Walt Nord. Thank you for all your insightful comments and suggestions with regards to this project. When I wrote my proposal, many of my thoughts and ideas were scattered and inconsistent. Through this process, you have helped me to refine my thinking and the product is much better than I originally thought it would be.

Throughout my four years at USF, there have been many people who have helped me along the way. I would like to acknowledge Dr. Andrew Biga, my close friend and fellow colleague throughout graduate school. We had a lot of amazing experiences in Tampa and I hope we continue to do so throughout our careers. In addition, I would like to acknowledge Matthew Tuttle, Stacey Kessler, Kari Bruursema, and all the members of my cohort; we had some great times in graduate school and I wish you all the very best.

Table of Contents

List of Tables

Facilitating Communication and Effective Interpersonal Relationships at Work:
A Theoretical Model of Socio-Affective Competence

Adam C. Bandelli

ABSTRACT

The research reported here provides an introduction to a theoretical model of socio-affective competence. This conceptual model of social effectiveness consists of four competencies that are related to the development of effective interpersonal relationships in the workplace. These competencies include: establishing rapport, promoting acceptance of differences, developing trust and cultivating charismatic influence. The socio-affective competence model was formulated in an attempt to integrate research on social and emotional skills that have been linked to performance in organizations. The current research proposed the model and defined its competency areas, designed a socio-affective competence situational judgment test (SAC-SJT), identified the variables that were theoretically related and unrelated to the construct, and provided initial evidence in support of the criterion-related validity of the socio-affective competence framework. Results from two different studies established the foundation of the socio-affective competence nomological network and demonstrated the predictive validity of the SAC-SJT on job performance, relational behaviors, and organizational citizenship performance. The author discusses the benefits of developing interpersonal relationship skills and the relevance of these findings in organizational settings.

Introduction

"We discover our role in life through our relationships with others."
-Rick Warren

Interest in the area of interpersonal relationships has had a long history in the field of psychology (Landy, 2005). Topics related to interpersonal relationships include: social skills (McClatchey, 1929; Pintner & Upshall, 1928; Thorndike & Stein, 1937), emotional intelligence (Matthews, Zeidner, & Roberts, 2002; Mayer, Salovey, & Caruso, 2004), practical intelligence (Sternberg, Forsythe, Hedlund, Horvath, Wagner, Williams, Snook, & Grigorenko, 2000), social competence (Schneider, Roberts, & Heggestad, 2002), political skill (Ferris, Perrewe, Anthony, & Gilmore, 2000; Ferris, Treadway, Kolodinsky, Hochwarter, Kacmar, Douglas, & Frink, 2005), and social intelligence (Ford & Tisak, 1983, Kihlstrom & Cantor, 2000, O'Sullivan & Guilford, 1976, Thorndike, 1936).

Although there are a variety of interpersonal relationship constructs, some researchers have had difficulties operationalizing and assessing their conceptual models (Gowing, 2001; Sala, 2002; Schutte, Malouff, Hall, Haggerty, Cooper, Golden, & Dornheim, 1998; Thorndike & Stein, 1937). At the same time, others have enjoyed consistent success in developing theories and measures that focus on components of effective interpersonal relationships (Bar-On, 1997; Ferris et al., 2005; Jordan, Ashkanasy, Hartel, & Hooper, 2002; Mayer, Caruso, & Salovey, 1999; Schneider et al., 2002; Wong & Law, 2002).

In recent years, a considerable amount of research in the field of industrial-organizational (I-O) psychology has focused on two areas related to interpersonal relationships: emotional intelligence (EI) and political skill. The foundations of EI – the ability to monitor one's own and others' feelings, to discriminate among them, and to use this information to guide one's own thinking and actions (Salovey & Mayer, 1990, p. 189) – began in the late 1980s with the work of several theorists (Bar-On, 1988; Salovey & Mayer, 1990), was brought into the mainstream by the mid-90s (Goleman, 1995), and has become an area of theoretical and empirical interest, debate, and controversy (Ashkanasy & Daus, 2005; Bar-On, 2005; Conte, 2005; Locke, 2005; Matthews, Roberts, & Zeidner, 2003; Mayer & Salovey, 1997; Mayer, Salovey, & Caruso, 2000).

Political skill was introduced to the I-O literature by Ferris and colleagues (Ferris, Anthony, Kolodinsky, Gilmore, & Harvey, 2002; Ferris, Berkson, Kaplan, Gilmore, Buckley, & Hochwarter, 1999; Perrewe, Ferris, Frink, & Anthony, 2000) and is defined 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 organizational and/or personal objectives" (Ahearn, Ferris, Hochwarter, Douglas, & Ammeter, 2004, p. 311). Ferris et al. (2005) indicated that there are four dimensions of political skill: a) social astuteness – making astute observations of others and being keen to diverse social situations; b) interpersonal influence – using a subtle and convincing personal style that exerts influence on others; c) networking ability – developing and using a large network of colleagues and coworkers; and d) apparent sincerity – appearing to possess high levels on integrity, authenticity, trust, and genuineness. Additionally, they indicated that political skill is operationalized as a dispositional variable.

Although a considerable amount of research has investigated different aspects of interpersonal relationships in the workplace from the perspectives of EI and political skill, there are several limitations in the current literature. First, many of the conceptualizations of these two constructs and their measures view components of interpersonal relationships as dispositional variables. This suggests that individuals possess certain levels of a construct similar to research on the Five Factor Model or other personality variables. Perspectives on interpersonal constructs that use this approach do not account for the awareness, learning, and development of specific habits and skills that can improve relationships with others. Second, some of the theoretical models of these constructs are too extensive in that they include numerous (often irrelevant) dimensions. For example, many critics of the Goleman & Boyatzis (2001) measure of EI state that the tool includes "everything except GMA" (Ferris et al., 2005).

Pervin, Cervone, and John (2005) suggested that there are certain functions necessary for the development of any theoretical model. They indicated that a "good" model should be: a) comprehensive – it accounts for a wide variety of aspects of the psychological life of an individual; b) parsimonious – it is simple, economic, and efficient; and c) relevant – it "specifies variables and concepts in such a way that there is agreement about their meaning and potential for measurement" (p. 29). Therefore, the purpose of this paper is to introduce a theoretical model of socio-affective competence. Social, in that all interpersonal relationships involve behaviors and actions that are opportunities for effective communication between two or more individuals. Affective, in that an understanding and use of emotions is critical to the success of any human relationship. Lastly, the model is conceptualized as being a set of competencies –

measurable work habits and personal skills that can be used to achieve work-related objectives (Green, 1999) – that an individual can be made aware of, acquire knowledge about, learn and develop, and then practice until he/she is proficient in using the skills.

In the following chapters, I will: a) define socio-affective competence, discuss its four dimensions, and outline its relationship to other variables; b) develop and validate a multi-dimensional situational judgment test (SJT) to assess the construct; c) test a series of hypotheses in support of the construct's relationship with political skill, EI, and personality; and d) present preliminary criterion-related validity results between socio-affective competence and organizational criterion variables.

Theoretical Model of Socio-Affective Competence

Socio-affective competence refers to the study of effective interpersonal relationships at work. The theoretical model was developed from research in the areas of political skill and EI. Specifically, dimensions from the two theories were reviewed and used as a basis for the development of the socio-affective competencies. The four socio-affective competencies include: a) establishing rapport – the process of building a sustaining relationship of mutual trust, harmony, and interpersonal understanding; b) promoting acceptance of differences – tolerating, approving of, and having a favorable reception towards other people or situations that are different from what one is accustomed to; c) developing trust – the willingness of an individual to be open to the actions of another party based on the expectations that the other party will perform a particular action important to the trustor; and d) cultivating charismatic influence – the use of non-coercive influence to direct and coordinate the activities and actions of others in order to accomplish organizational objectives.

Although the theoretical model of socio-affective competence is similar to political skill and EI in that it focuses on human relationships, there are three additional components that distinguish it from these constructs. First, the model is competency-based. McClelland (1973) suggested that competencies (i.e., skills that can be developed with practice and consistent performance) are critical components of everyday functioning. Additionally, he proposed that second only to general mental ability (GMA), competency development is one of the most important factors for success in various

organizational settings. Green (1999) viewed competencies and competency development as assessable patterns of behavior that can be cultivated through knowledge and practice. For example, research on rapport building (Berscheid, 1994) suggests that, with practice and role-playing, organizational members can develop a proficiency in establishing a level of affinity with others. Additionally, Holmes and Rempel (1989) indicated that the development of trust involves a continual process of uncertainty reduction as individuals gain more exposure to and experience with one another in a social setting. Therefore, each of the socio-affective competencies are skill-based constructs that any person within an organizational setting can become proficient in developing and using.

Second, the construct is conceptualized as being a fluid model. Unlike research by Mayer et al. (2004), who view EI and interpersonal relationships in a step-by-step branch progression (e.g., moving from understanding one's own emotions to the emotions of others), individuals can move back and forth between the four competencies. For example, an employee does not have to be fully proficient in promoting acceptance of differences in order to develop trust. Additionally, one does not have to establish rapport in order to cultivate charismatic influence. Each of the competencies work hand-in-hand, but do not require a complete level of expertise before developing the other areas. Research by Alderfer (1972) supports the notion of a fluid interchangeable model of human relationships. Alderfer's existence-relatedness-growth (ERG) model postulated that people could move back and forth between the three areas and did not require them to develop complete expertise in one domain before moving to the next.

Third, the theoretical model of socio-affective competence is most relevant for those in leadership or management positions. Possessing a certain degree of skill in each

of the areas is beneficial to all employees in an organization. However, because of the nature of some entry-level positions (i.e., more technical than interpersonal skill is required), the socio-affective competencies are more relevant for employees who must work with or lead others on a daily basis. As employees move up the organizational hierarchy and are involved in managing the work and activities of others, the competencies become more important to develop and use. Thus, socio-affective competency training and development initiatives should have the most return on investment (ROI) for managers and upper-level executives. In the next section, each of the socio-affective competency dimension areas will be discussed in more detail and their theoretical links to previous research will be outlined.

Dimensions of Socio-Affective Competence

Establishing Rapport

The competency of establishing rapport – "a process of building a sustaining relationship of mutual trust, harmony, and understanding" (McDermott & Jago, 2003, p. 46) – has been studied in the field of applied psychology for over fifty years (Parkhe, Wasserman, & Ralston, 2006). Rapport is often viewed as a starting point for developing trust and influence with others by using empathy and respect to create an environment of mutual understanding. Ferris et al. (2005) suggested that those "adept at developing and using diverse networks of people . . . tend to hold assets seen as valuable for successful personal and organizational functioning" (p. 129). Additionally, other researchers have suggested that establishing rapport is the first step toward building any close relationship.

Research on establishing rapport has often focused on the condition of rapport – a state of existing affinity between two individuals – with the goal of making communication more effective. In the field of I-O, this has most notably been examined within the context of the employment interview (Levine, 1976). Stewart and Cash (2000) suggested that there are eight components to establishing rapport: a) similarity – the degree to which two individuals share cultural norms and values, environmental influences, experiences, personality, attitudes, and expectations; b) inclusion/involvement – the degree to which both people want to get to know one another and develop a relationship; c) affection/liking – the degree to which both parties like and respect one another; d) control/dominance – the degree to which both individuals share control and

neither seeks to dominate the conversation or interaction; e) self-perception – the view one holds about his/her self-concept, based on physical, social, and psychological perceptions; f) other-perception – the manner in which each employee perceives the other person; g) verbal interactions – the words used during communication between two individuals; and h) nonverbal interactions – the use of signals such as physical appearance, dress, eye contact, voice, touch, posture, and proximity of the two parties.

Other researchers have suggested that additional components are related to the establishment of rapport in working relationships. For example, Romero and Cruthirds (2006) argued that humor – "any communicative instance perceived as funny or entertaining" (p. 59) – is a common element of human interaction and daily organizational life. These authors proposed that the use of humor is a management tool that is indispensable. Several of their propositions linked the use of humor to stress reduction, enhancing leadership, creativity, group cohesiveness, and communication. Thus, humor may also be considered a component of establishing rapport as it allows both parties to relax and increase the likelihood of generating camaraderie.

Although theories of interpersonal relationships and social effectiveness do not include a specific dimension labeled "establishing rapport," there are similarities. For example, EI includes discerning and understanding own emotions and the emotions of others (Mayer et al., 2000). Identifying and understanding own emotions and the emotions of others are directly related to the rapport components of affection/liking, self-perception, other-perception, and nonverbal interactions. Similarly, political skill does not directly discuss rapport and rapport building techniques, but contains a dimension known as networking ability. Ferris et al. (2005) defined this dimension as an "ability to

easily develop friendships and build strong, beneficial alliances and coalitions" (p. 129). Employees who are skilled in the area of establishing rapport possess the tools necessary to develop friendships and create a diverse network of people.

Promoting Acceptance of Differences

This competency refers to an employee's ability to "tolerate, approve of, and have a favorable reception towards other people and/or situations that are different from what they are use to" (Scandura & Lankau, 1996, p. 247). Research indicates that those skilled at accepting the differences (e.g., age, ethnicity, gender, race, physical abilities, religious beliefs, sexual orientation, educational background, values, and interests) of other people possess higher levels of social skill and are more effective communicators (Lopes, Cote, & Salovey, 2006; Milliken & Martins, 1996; Robinson & Dechant, 1997; Witt & Ferris, 2003). Additionally, many researchers (e.g., Cox, Lobel, & McLeod, 1991; Hall & Parker, 1993; Williams & O'Reilly, 1998) have indicated that the future workforce will include more ethnic minorities, women, immigrants, and those with special needs. Thus, promoting acceptance of differences is currently and will continue to be an important component of interpersonal relationships at work.

Research in the field of I-O psychology related to promoting acceptance of differences focuses on the area of diversity (Earley & Mosakowski, 2000; Philips & Loyd, 2006; Triandis, Kurowski, Gelfand, 1993). The definitions and dimensions of diversity vary depending on the researcher. For example, Chen and Van Velsor (1996) conceptualized diversity as anything emphasizing group identities related to unique self-identity. Williams and O'Reilly (1998) view the construct as any characteristic an employee may use to detect individual differences. Peller (1996) suggested that diversity

refers to the effects of demographic backgrounds on any type of exchange between two people. Additionally, broad definitions of diversity (i.e., those including any components relating to the differences between employees) have had a more positive influence on perceptions of diversity initiatives (Mannix & Neale, 2005). In particular, researchers have found evidence indicating that a diverse workforce positively affects job performance (McMillan-Capehart, 2004), group cohesion (Richard, 2000), organizational commitment, (DiTomaso & Hooijberg, 1996), interpersonal communication (Chen & Van Velsor, 1996), job satisfaction (Nemetz & Christensen, 1996), and employee morale (Riccucci, 1997).

Research on diversity is often categorized into three separate frameworks: a) resource-based perspectives – viewing diversity as a valuable resource adding to overall levels of job performance and organizational functioning (Barney, Wright, & Ketchen, 1998); b) social identity theories – focusing on how individuals develop their self-concept based on membership in certain groups (Tajfel, 1982; Turner, 1985); and c) contingency theories – examining environmental and social factors as they interact with individual differences to impact organizational performance (Biga, 2007). For the purposes of the present research, I will focus exclusively on the resource-based perspective as it relates the most to promoting acceptance of differences in organizations.

The resource-based perspectives indicate that higher levels of job performance are achieved through a diverse workforce (Barney, 1991; Wright & McMahan, 1992). Additionally, organizations with a diverse workforce receive more internal and external benefits than those that do not promote the value of workplace diversity. For example, several researchers have reported some of the following internal benefits of having a

diverse workforce: a) realistic decision making (Robinson & Dechant, 1997); b) resistance to groupthink (Sawyer, Houlette, & Yeagley, 2006); c) increased innovation and creativity (Kurtzberg, 2005; McLeod, Lobel, & Cox, 1996); and d) enhanced problem solving (Hoffman, 1959). External benefits resulting from a diverse workforce include: a) access to minority markets for new clients and customers (Kochan, Berzukova, Ely, Jackson, Joshi, Jehn, Leonard, Levine, & Thomas, 2003); and b) many opportunities to recruit talented employees from different cultural, ethnic, or minority groups (Watson, Kumar, Michaelsen, 1993; Webber & Donahue, 2001). Based on these findings and related research emphasizing the importance of a diverse workforce, promoting acceptance of differences is a necessary skill that is required for effective communication and for the development of lasting interpersonal relationships at work.

Promoting acceptance of differences is theoretically related to research on political skill and EI in several ways. First, the Ferris et al. (2005) political skill construct has a social astuteness dimension, which involves making discerning observations of others and being keen to diverse social situations. This is similar to promoting acceptance of differences in that both constructs focus on possessing an understanding of others' backgrounds (e.g., cultural, ethnic, religious) and being effective in different social situations. For example, Semadar, Robins, and Ferris (2006) found that social astuteness was positively related to understanding cultural and ethnic differences in leadership and managerial job performance. The discerning emotions in self and the regulation of emotions components of EI are also related to promoting acceptance of differences because employees must be able to understand and manage their own emotions when interacting with others. Additionally, by possessing an understanding of others' emotions,

an individual can understand and interpret different emotional cues (e.g., facial expressions. body posture) from others and use these insights to effectively facilitate interpersonal interactions. Thus, being keen to diverse social situations as well as understanding and managing one's emotions are important factors when promoting acceptance of differences in organizational contexts.

Developing Trust

The concept of trust has played an important role in early conceptualizations of organizational functioning (Argyris, 1962; Likert, 1967; McGregor, 1967) and continues to have an affect on many disciplines (e.g., sociology, psychology, economics, political science, history, and philosophy (Dirks & Ferrin, 2001). Kramer (1999) suggested that this continued interest "has been fueled, at least in part, by accumulating evidence that trust has a number of important benefits for organizations and their members" (p. 569). However, despite the overwhelming interest in trust, the construct suffers from conceptual ambiguity, and divergent theories and definitions regarding trust have been developed.

Deutsch (1958) is often cited as one of the first to define trust. In his seminal work, he defined trust as a behavior that occurs when one person is placed in an ambiguous situation, where the outcome can have positive or negative consequences depending on the actions of another individual. Additionally, he suggested that negative outcomes have a greater influence on the relationship between two people than do positive ones. Although this conceptualization provided an initial basis for studying trust, other theorists have developed their own perspectives. For example, Ross and Wieland (1996) viewed trust as an expectation held by an individual or group of individuals that

the word, promise, verbal, or written statement of another individual or group can be relied on. McLennan and Omodei (2000) defined trust as "an expectation or belief that actions from another party will be motivated by good intentions" (p. 283). Simmel (1978) indicated that trust provides the basis for enhancing interpersonal relationships without the need for continual proof of legitimate intentions of specific individuals.

Building on the research and work of Mayer, Davis, and Schoorman (1995), I define trust as the willingness of an individual to be vulnerable to the actions of another party based on the expectations that the other party will perform a particular action important to the trustor, irrespective of the ability to monitor or control that other party. Developing trust involves the intention of taking a risk or exposing oneself to the actions and behaviors of another individual. It is allowing oneself to be vulnerable in a situation based on the positive expectations of another's intentions. Additionally, the development of trust has been emerging as a critical component of interpersonal relationships in social networks (Karl, 2000; Lewicki, McAllister, & Bies, 1998; McKnight, Cummings, & Chervany, 1998; McLennan & Omodei, 2000).

In the I-O psychology and management literature, trust has been examined on various levels. On the micro-level, trust has been viewed as an essential component of individual and team productivity (Bromiley & Cummings, 1995; Golembiewski & McConkie, 1975; Hwang & Burgers, 1997), group cohesion (Klimoski & Karol, 1976; Meyerson, Weick, & Kramer, 1996), cooperation (Jones & George, 1998), and performance effectiveness (Hackman & Morris, 1975; Jehn & Shah, 1997; Smith & Barclay, 1997). On the macro-level, the development of trust has been explored from the perspective of managers and leaders across organizations (Ross & Wieland, 1996), in

relation to the accountability organizations have with one another (Ammeter, Douglas, Ferris, & Goka, 2004), on ethical behaviors across organizational contexts (Svensson & Wood, 2004), in relation to the establishment of cross-organizational partnerships and corporate alliances (Das & Teng, 1998), and with regard to understanding the influence of national culture on developing trust between multi-national organizations (Doney, Cannon, & Mullen, 1998).

The nuances and specific processes behind developing trust have also been examined by researchers in the applied psychological sciences. For example, Bhattacharya, DeVinney, and Pillutla (1998) reviewed the trust literature over the last fifty years and derived a rigorous definition and empirical model of trust based on the relationship between employees' behaviors and desirable organizational outcomes (e.g., their pay, promotion, or recognition). In a separate line of research, Whitener, Brodt, Korsgaard, and Werner (1998) focused on the antecedents of managerial trustworthiness and the difficulties surrounding the initial stages of developing a trusting relationship at work. Additionally, other researchers have studied the negative effects of distrust (Bigley & Pearce, 1998) and betrayal of trust (Elangovan & Shapiro, 1998) in organizations.

As previous research indicates, the development of trust is essential to the formulation of any effective interpersonal relationship at work. For example, Ferris, Davidson, and Perrewe (2006) suggested that the most essential aspects of political skill are genuineness, honesty, and trustworthiness. Additionally, Ferris et al.'s (2005) apparent sincerity dimension focuses on the extent to which people display high levels of integrity and authenticity. This dimension also determines if an employee will be effective at influencing others, because it pertains to the perceived intentions of the

behavior or action in question. Thus, individuals whose actions are not viewed as manipulative or self-serving are skilled at developing trust with their coworkers.

Cultivating Charismatic Influence

The final socio-affective competency, cultivating charismatic influence – the use of non-coercive influence to direct and coordinate the activities of members of an organization toward the accomplishment of specific group objectives (Scandura & Lankau, 1996; Scandura & Schriesheim, 1994; Yukl, 1994) – refers to one's ability to communicate a well devised vision of the future, build trust among colleagues, and take effective action to accomplish organizational objectives. In the I-O psychology and management literature, cultivating charismatic influence is embodied in the study of leadership. Research on leadership has been prevalent across the field of applied psychology for almost as long as research on interpersonal relationships (Avolio & Gibbons, 1988; Barrick, Day, Lord, & Alexander, 1991; French & Raven, 1959; House, 1977; Kouzes & Posner, 2002; Lord, Foti, DeVader, 1984; McClelland, 1973; Stogdill, 1948; Purvanova, Bono, & Dzieweczynski, 2006).

Over the last twenty years, several theories have become prominent in the I-O literature. These theories include: path-goal theory (Keller, 1989; Schriesheim & Schriesheim, 1980; Stinson & Johnson, 1975), leader-member exchange (LMX; Schriesheim, Castro, & Cogliser, 1999; Snyder & Bruning, 1985; Vecchio & Gobdel, 1984; Wayne & Green, 1993), transactional and transformational leadership (Avolio & Bass, 2002; Avolio, Bass, & Jung, 1999; Bass, 1998; Bass, Avolio, Jung, & Berson, 2003), and charismatic leadership (Conger, 1989; Conger & Kanungo, 1987; Conger & Kanungo, 1998). Cultivating charismatic influence draws from the theory, research, and

empirical results from each of these areas. For example, LMX (vertical dyad linkage) theory proposes that an interpersonal exchange takes place between leaders and their followers. The quality of this exchange is based on the leader and the follower's technical skills, interpersonal style, trustworthiness, and levels of sensitivity. Additionally, several researchers (Graen, Cashman, Ginsburgh, & Schiemann, 1977; Graen & Ginsburgh, 1977) have expanded the relationship between leaders and subordinates to include: support, rewards, and job satisfaction. Each of the components of LMX theory is intimately linked to the four socio-affective competencies. In particular, cultivating charismatic influence revolves around the development of a strong relationship between a leader and his/her followers. However, LMX theory differs from cultivating charismatic influence in that the vertical dyad relationships do not exist for all employees. More specifically, leaders tend to gravitate towards certain followers, causing an in-group versus out-group mentality. In contrast, the author proposes that cultivating charismatic influence is a skill that can be applied to all leader—member relationships.

Research in I-O strongly supports the development and use of leadership in organizational settings (Brown & Moshavi, 2005; Chen & Klimoski, 2003; De Cremer & Knippenberg, 2005). For example, De Hough, Den Hartog, and Koopman (2005) examined the relationship between the Five-Factor Model with both charismatic and transactional leadership on leaders' perceived effectiveness in dynamic work contexts. Their results indicated that personality and leadership styles vary depending on the context. More specifically, they found that agreeableness and conscientiousness were positively related to perceptions of charismatic and transactional leadership. Additionally, their results indicated no direct relationship between perceived effectiveness and

leadership style. However, they found an interaction effect indicating that "subordinates' evaluations of charismatic leader behavior were positively related to perceived effectiveness as rated by superiors and peers, but only under dynamic work conditions" (p. 859).

In a separate line of research, Brown and Moshavi (2005) reviewed the relationship between transformational leadership and EI. They discussed several propositions suggesting that the development and use of EI could potentially enhance the quality of interpersonal influence and leadership abilities. They concluded their theoretical piece by suggesting that more detailed and empirical-based theory, research, and psychological measures are needed to examine interpersonal relationships in work contexts. Many researchers have also examined the positive benefits that come with effective leadership and influence styles. Some of these organizational outcomes include: organizational commitment (Epitropaki & Martin, 2005a), job satisfaction (Brown & Keeping, 2005), employee well-being (Spreitzer, Perttula, & Xin, 2005), cooperation (De Cremer & Knippenberg, 2005), organizational identification, (Epitropaki & Martin, 2005b), networking (Bono & Anderson, 2005), job performance and productivity (Russell, 2001), and citizenship behaviors (Purvanova et al., 2006). Thus, it is apparent that the development and use of influence is critical to the success of various organizational outcomes (Conger, 1999).

There are several similarities between the cultivating charismatic influence competency and political skill. First, the political skill construct contains a dimension called interpersonal influence, which involves having a "subtle and convincing personal style that exerts a powerful influence on others" (Ferris et al., 2005, p. 129). Although

this does not directly relate to effectively leading the actions and behaviors of others, it does speak to the flexibility and adaptation required in social situations to evoke desired responses from others. Thus, interpersonal influence and cultivating charismatic influence are related in that both dimensions use non-coercive behaviors when working with others in order to achieve one's objectives.

Cultivating charismatic influence is also related to EI in that identifying, using, and effectively managing one's emotions are critical to the success of any influence initiative. For example, Brown and Moshavi (2005) suggested that those high in EI tend to be more secure in their personal abilities and can then " . . . provide individual focus to others as well as intellectually stimulate and motivate followers" (p. 868). Additionally, Humphrey (2002) noted that EI is important for influencing the behaviors of others because it affects the level of empathy, their ability to manage the emotions of the group, and the perceptions they give off to their followers (e.g., ability to delay gratification when working long hours, overcoming temporary setbacks and minor frustrations). Thus, through the use of EI and its related abilities, individuals in leadership positions are more likely to cultivate charisma and exert powerful influence on other members of the organization.

In the following chapter, I will outline the relationship between socio-affective competence and other variables in support of the construct's preliminary nomological network. Additionally, the study's hypotheses will be presented with respect to the convergent and discriminant validity of the socio-affective competence model.

Correlates of Socio-Affective Competence

Political Skill

As discussed in the previous chapters, political skill refers to one's ability to understand others in social settings and to use this information to effectively influence their behaviors in order to achieve personal goals or organizational objectives. Ferris et al. (2006) suggested that those high in political skill traits tend to possess a calm demeanor and sense of personal security that attracts others and provides them with emotional comfort. These types of individuals are also skilled at making connections and friendships with others and can often disguise self-serving motives in order to accomplish their goals. Additionally, Semadar et al. (2006) found that political skill is positively related to self-monitoring behaviors and leader self-efficacy. These relationships demonstrate the ability those high in political skill have in developing networks and forming alliances within organizational settings.

The four dimensions of the political skill framework were developed based on years of research in the management and organizational politics literature. Social astuteness refers to an employee's ability to make good judgments about others and to be aware of diverse social situations. According to Ferris and colleagues (Ferris et al., 1999; 2000; 2005), those high in this political skill dimension have a unique understanding of the dynamics involved in social interactions and have the self-awareness to adjust their behavior accordingly. Socially astute individuals are also skilled at identifying with others and can effectively interact with different types of people. It is this skill that

directly relates to promoting acceptance of differences because socially astute employees must be able to effectively interact with others who have different values, beliefs, and cultural backgrounds.

The interpersonal influence dimension of political skill focuses on an employee's ability to effectively use their own personal style and sense of charisma to direct, in a non-threatening manner, the actions and behaviors of others. Ferris et al. (2005) indicated that those high in interpersonal influence are "capable of appropriately adapting and calibrating their behavior to each situation in order to elicit particular responses from others" (p. 129). The ability to adapt influence techniques when interacting with different parties relates to cultivating charismatic influence because components of the two constructs involve understanding others and using this knowledge to communicate a shared vision when accomplishing organizational objectives.

Ferris et al.'s (2005) networking ability dimension involves the ability to develop large and diverse networks of colleagues and coworkers. Those high in this area enjoy meeting new people and interacting with others in social settings. Furthermore, as Ferris et al. (2006) noted, through the ability to effectively network with others, employees can "position themselves to both create and take advantage of opportunities" (p. 11). Because networking ability involves interacting with others to build beneficial alliances and coalitions, the establishment of rapport is critical to the start of any network development initiative, and the two dimensions should be positively related to one another.

Apparent sincerity is the dimension of integrity and genuineness within the political skill construct. Employees high in this domain are open and honest with others and they strive to develop trustworthy relationships with their coworkers. It is based on

their authenticity, that those high in apparent sincerity are able to influence the behaviors of others. Therefore, in order to develop trust with colleagues, an individual must appear sincere in their actions and behaviors.

Based on the outlined relationships discussed and the theoretical links between political skill and socio-affective competence, individuals high in political skill should also be able to develop and maintain effectively interpersonal relationships with others. Additionally, networking ability should demonstrate the strongest relationship with establishing rapport, social astuteness should be directly related to promoting acceptance of differences, apparent sincerity should be linked to developing trust, and interpersonal influence should have the strongest relationship with cultivating charismatic influence. Therefore, the author summarizes these relationships with the following hypotheses:

Hypothesis 1: There will be a significant positive relationship between the socio-affective competence total score and political skill.

Hypothesis 2a: Establishing rapport will demonstrate the strongest positive correlation with networking ability.

Hypothesis 2b: Promoting acceptance of differences will demonstrate the strongest positive correlation with social astuteness.

Hypothesis 2c: Developing trust will demonstrate the strongest positive correlation with apparent sincerity.

Hypothesis 2d: Cultivating charismatic influence will demonstrate the strongest positive correlation with interpersonal influence.

Emotional Intelligence

The emotional intelligence (EI) construct was developed by Salovey and Mayer (1990) and focuses on the "ability to perceive emotions, to access and generate emotions to assist thought, to understand emotions and emotional knowledge, and to regulate emotions reflectively to promote emotional and intellectual growth" (Mayer & Salovey, 1997, p. 7). These theorists developed a model that encompassed two areas (experiential and sequential) and four branches to assess EI. The branches of the Mayer, Salovey, and Caruso (2002) model include: a) perceiving emotions – the ability to recognize emotion in self and others (this can include nonverbal behaviors such as facial expressions); b) using emotions to facilitate thought – using emotions to help individuals think and reason about their emotions (the relationship between thought and emotion that can be used for planning and goal setting); c) understanding emotions – the ability to analyze emotions (this includes understanding how emotions effect thinking over time); and d) management of emotions – properly regulating emotions in relation to environmental circumstances. According to their theory, each of these branches play a key role in understanding, using, and managing emotions to achieve desired outcomes.

In organizational settings, EI had been positively related to a number of different variables. Some of these constructs include: leadership (Wong & Law, 2002), job performance (Lyons & Schneider, 2005; Sosik & Megerian, 1999), conflict management (Rahim & Psenicka, 2002), teamwork (Jordan et al., 2002), organizational citizenship behaviors (Ashkanasy & Daus, 2005), emotional labor (Daus & Ashkanasy, 2005), conscientiousness (Van Rooy, Viswesvaran, & Pluta, 2005), and organizational commitment (Bar-On, 2005). Research has also supported the notion that EI is directly

related to interpersonal relationships and influence behaviors. Specifically, Schutte, Malouff, Bobik, Coston, Greeson, Jedlicka, Rhodes, and Wendorf (2001) found that individuals with higher levels of self-reported EI were more empathic when interacting with others, possessed higher levels of social skills, displayed more cooperative responses towards others, were more likely to develop close and affectionate relationships, and had greater satisfaction in their personal relationships. Thus, it is likely that EI is positively related to socio-affective competence.

The relationship between EI and socio-affective competence is based on several factors. First, the EI branches of perceiving and understanding emotions is related to establishing rapport and promoting acceptance of differences because organizational members must be able to understand their own emotions and the emotions of others to effectively develop a mutually beneficial working relationship. Second, the use of emotions to facilitate thought and performance plays a major role in developing trust because people that emotionally engage in their work are more likely to receive the trust and support from their colleagues who are equally exerting effort to accomplish goals. Lastly, managing emotions is critical to influencing the behaviors of others. Those that refrain from letting temporary disappointments and daily frustrations affect their performance demonstrate a sense of discipline and hard work to others, which can affect the manner in which an individual cultivates influence. Therefore, based on these relationships, the author proposes the following hypothesis:

Hypothesis 3: There will be a significant positive relationship between the socio-affective competence total score and emotional intelligence.

Neuroticism

Neuroticism is one of the traits in the Five Factor Model of personality, which refers to the tendency to experience negative feelings and emotional states. Neurotic people are often characterized as being nervous, anxious, and tense (McCrae & Costa, 1999). Additionally, those who score high on neuroticism are more likely to experience negative emotions such as anger, anxiety, guilt, and hopelessness. Research has indicated that neurotics respond poorly to stress in their environment and are more likely to view ordinary experiences as threatening (Furnham, Forte, & Cotter, 1998).

According to Costa and McCrae (1997), there are six facets of neuroticism: anxiety, anger-hostility, depression, self-consciousness, impulsiveness, and vulnerability. Of the six facets, anxiety is considered to be the major factor that plays a role in neurotic behavior. Anxiety is a physiological state that creates negative feelings such as worry, fear, or apprehension. Anxious individuals' reactions to situations tend to be more intense than those who are emotionally stable. Their anxious feelings can also persist for unusually long periods of time and may interfere with making decisions and effectively coping with stress.

Research has demonstrated that neuroticism is negatively related to social skills and interactions with others (Costa, 1996). For example, Lopez, Salovey, and Straus (2003) found that neuroticism was negatively correlated with EI and positive relations with others. In separate research, Kohnstamm and Mervielde (1998) found that neurotics have difficulties trusting others and often avoid developing close relationships. Results of these studies suggest that neurotics have trouble identifying with people and forming productive interpersonal relationships. Additionally, these types of individuals may also

have problems when it comes to charismatically influencing the behaviors of others. Therefore, the following hypothesis will be examined:

Hypothesis 4: The socio-affective competence total score will demonstrate a significant negative relationship with neuroticism.

Machiavellianism

Christie and Geis (1970) were the first to study Machiavellianism in social and organizational settings. They defined the Machiavellian personality type as someone "who views and manipulates others for his/her own personal gain" (Christie, 1970). Additionally, their model contained four components describing the characteristics of those effective in manipulating the behaviors of others. These areas include: a) a relative lack of affect in interpersonal relationships – others are viewed entirely as objects or means to personal ends; b) a lack of concern with conventional morality – people who manipulate others have an utilitarian rather than a moral view of their interactions; c) a lack of gross psychopathology – those who tend to be manipulative hold a rational view of the world; and d) a low ideological commitment –focusing attention on accomplishing tasks in the present with little regard to the long-term ramifications of their actions.

Christie and Geis (1970) found that Machiavellian personality types exist on a continuum, with one end representing those who reject Machiavelli's principles and ideology, and the other end representing people who endorse Machiavelli's themes and ideals. Although some employees tend to fall in the high and low categories, most organizational members are believed to fall somewhere in the middle of the continuum. For those who are identified as high Machs, "the ends justify the means." These types of people resist social influence, are amoral in controlling personal interactions, desire to

personally control situations, and display a lack of affect in interpersonal relationships (Deluga, 2001).

Research on Machiavellianism suggests that the construct is negatively related to the development of effective interpersonal relationships. For example, Gable and Dangello (1994) found that high Machs have difficulties managing others in organizational contexts. In other research, Mudrack and Mason (1995) found that high Machs tend to manipulate others early on in the development of personal relationships. Additionally, their results indicated that high Machs often appear genuine and trustworthy but that this behavior is used to achieve one's personal desires. If high Machs have a tendency to manipulate and take advantage of others, it appears that they would have difficulties developing and maintaining long-term relationships with others. Thus, the following hypothesis is proposed:

Hypothesis 5: There will be a significant negative relationship between the socio-affective competence total score and Machiavellianism.

Agreeableness

Agreeableness, another dimension of the Five Factor Model, focuses on the tendency to be friendly, accommodating, and pleasant with others in social situations. The facets of agreeableness include: trust, straightforwardness, altruism, compliance, modesty, and tender-mindedness. The combination of these facets tends to make agreeable people highly generous, trustworthy, honest, and empathic. Additionally, those high on agreeableness thrive in environments of cooperation and teamwork (Costa & McCrae, 1997), enjoy interacting and working with others (Barrick & Mount, 1991), value social harmony (Montag & Levin, 1994), and are willing to compromise their

interests (Costa, McCrae, & Kay, 1995). Research has also indicated that highly agreeable individuals tend have an optimistic view of others, are generally more satisfied with their life circumstances, and are willing to go out of their way to assist colleagues and coworkers (Costa, 1996).

Since agreeable people are honest, friendly, and value working with others, it is likely that they are skilled at developing interpersonal relationships. In fact, research by Kohnstamm and Mervielde (1998) suggested that those high on agreeableness are more likely to form trusting relationships with others. Compared to disagreeable individuals – those that are generally unconcerned with the well-being of others – those high on agreeableness also have an easier time working with people from different backgrounds. For example, Costa et al. (1995) found that when choosing careers, agreeable job candidates tend to value selecting environments where they will have interactions with a diverse range of people. In separate research, Karney and Bradbury (1995) found that agreeableness is positively related to a number of relationship variables such as friendship development, relationship satisfaction, and marital stability.

Based on previous research, agreeable employees should have little difficulty establishing rapport and making friendships with others. They should also find enjoyment out of working with people from different backgrounds. Lastly, those that are honest and straightforward should have little trouble developing trust with others. Thus, the author proposes the following hypothesis:

Hypothesis 6: There will be a significant positive relationship between the socio-affective competence total score and agreeableness.

Extraversion

Extraversion is the extent to which people are outgoing, enthusiastic, gregarious, and assertive. Extraverts obtain gratification from the external world and enjoy interacting with other individuals. Additionally, extraverts thrive in activities involving large social gatherings (e.g., parties), seek variety in their job, and are action-oriented when accomplishing goals. According to Costa and McCrae (1997), the six facets of extraversion include: warmth, gregariousness, assertiveness, activity, excitement-seeking, and positive emotions. Research on each of these areas has indicated that extraverts are quick to develop close relationships, seek opportunities to express emotions openly, are calm and confident in the presence of others, and enjoy risk-taking activities.

Extraversion has been linked to a number of interpersonal behaviors in organizational settings. For example, in a meta-analysis by Barrick and Mount (1991), extraversion was positively related to job productivity and performance as a supervisor. In separate research, Robertson and Kinder (1993) found that extraverted employees were more likely to develop long-term trusting relationships with colleagues and coworkers. Extraversion has also been associated with effective leadership behaviors such as coaching and mentoring, motivating and inspiring performance, creating a sense of contribution, and coordinating teamwork (Hogan, Curphy, & Hogan, 1994). These findings suggest that there is a positive relationship between extraversion and the socio-affective competencies. Thus, the following hypothesis will be explored:

Hypothesis 7: There will be a significant positive relationship between the socio-affective competence total score and extraversion.

Job Performance

In recent years, research on the relationship between social and emotional skills and job performance has proliferated. For example, research on EI and job performance has indicated that those with high emotional self-awareness and the ability to understand others' emotions are effective when working on teams (Jordan et al., 2002). Use of the emotions dimension of EI has also been positively related to job performance in sales and customer service occupations. Specifically, Salovey, Mayer, and Caruso (2002) found that employees who use emotions to generate enthusiasm and excitement during sales presentations were more likely to complete their sales than those who did not. Even more promising are the findings between managing emotions and job performance. Individuals who are able to regulate both positive and negative emotions at work are more effective leaders (DiTomaso & Hooijberg, 1996), elicit favorable responses from coworkers (Bar-On, 2005), promote positive expectations for social interaction (Lopez, Salovey, Cote, & Beers, 2005), and can make sound decisions under stress (Perrewe, Zellars, Rossi, Ferris, Kacmar, Liu, Zinko, & Hochwarter, 2005).

Political behaviors and social skills have also been linked to effective job performance. For example, Semadar et al. (2006) found that political skill, leadership self-efficacy, and EI all had significant positive relationships with managerial job performance. Additionally, their results indicated that political skill provided significant incremental validity above and beyond the variance accounted for by self-monitoring, EI, and leadership self-efficacy. In separate research, Ferris et al. (2005) found that political skill accounted for a significant portion of the variance in leader effectiveness ratings. Their results also indicated that social astuteness and apparent sincerity were positively

correlated with leadership behaviors. Treadway, Hochwarter, Kacmar, and Ferris (2005) also found political skill and its dimensions to be positively related to job performance. Specifically, they examined the relationship between political skill and factors such as need for achievement and intrinsic motivation at work. Their results suggested that those high in political skill were more likely to have a higher need for achievement and were more intrinsically motivated to perform at their best in their job roles.

Research in the EI and political skill areas suggests that job performance is related to developing and maintaining long-term positive relationships with others. Additionally, through the use of establishing rapport, promoting acceptance of differences, developing trust with others and cultivating charismatic influence, organizational members should be more likely to perform better on the job. Therefore, to explore these relationships in more depth, the following hypotheses will be examined:

Hypothesis 8a: The socio-affective competence total score will demonstrate significant positive prediction of self-ratings of job performance.

Hypothesis 8b: The socio-affective competence total score will demonstrate significant positive prediction of peer-ratings of job performance.

Job Satisfaction

Job satisfaction is concerned with the degree to which an employee enjoys his/her job. Brief and Weiss (2001) defined the construct as a "pleasurable emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one's job" (p. 282). Others have viewed it is an affective response to the work environment (Arvey, Bouchard, Segal, & Abraham, 1989), an attitude about one's job duties and responsibilities (Jex, 2002), and a positive feeling

people experience based on their relationship with colleagues or coworkers (Judge, Thoresen, Bono, & Patton, 2001).

There are a number of different variables that have been examined in relation to job satisfaction. For example, Hackman and Oldham (1976) suggested that there are five specific job characteristics that are related to satisfaction. These job tasks include: skill variety – the number of different skills that are required to do a job; task identity – the extent to which an employee does an entire job or a piece of the job; task significance – the impact that the job has on other people; autonomy – the extent to which the employee is given freedom to do their job as they see fit; and job feedback – the extent to which an employee is told that they are doing a job correctly. In separate research, Spector (1985) argued that there are nine distinct dimensions of job satisfaction. Some of these include: satisfaction with pay, promotion opportunities, the nature of the work, satisfaction with supervisors, and satisfaction with coworkers. It is these last two areas that concern the degree to which job satisfaction is related to interpersonal relationships at work. It seems logical that if organizational members have positive relationships with others at work they will have higher levels of satisfaction in that environment.

Research has supported the relationship between interpersonal communication and job satisfaction. Kolodinsky, Hochwarter, and Ferris (2004) found a significant linear positive relationship between political skill and job satisfaction. Additionally, these researchers found that political skill added incremental validity above and beyond other social effectiveness constructs (e.g., social competence, interpersonal acumen, functional flexibility) in the prediction of satisfaction at work. Other researchers have also demonstrated the relationship between job satisfaction and interpersonal relationship

constructs. For example, Perrewe, Young, and Blass (2002) found a significant relationship between the rapport building stages of mentoring experiences at work and career satisfaction. Leader political skill and the ability to cultivate a positive vision for the future has been shown to be positively related to employee reactions and the extent to which they are committed to their organization (Treadway, Hochwarter, Ferris, Kacmar, Douglas, Ammeter, & Buckley, 2004). Lastly, Salovey et al. (2002) found that the management of emotions in leader-member exchanges has been positively related to emotional and affective reactions to one's job. Based on these findings and the conceptual link between job satisfaction, affect, and social relations in the workplace, the author proposes the following hypothesis:

Hypothesis 9: The socio-affective competence total score will demonstrate significant positive prediction of self-ratings of job satisfaction.

Interpersonal Relationship Behaviors

Research on the behaviors that facilitate camaraderie and collaboration in the workplace has increased over the last twenty years. At first, scholars in the mid to late 1980s suggested that organizations were inherently political arenas (Mintzberg, 1985) and that the ability to develop and maintain positive alliances with others promotes individual effectiveness (Luthans, Hodgetts, & Rosenkrantz, 1988). However, as research in the areas of emotion (Salovey & Mayer, 1990) and social skills (Schneider, Ackerman, & Kanfer, 1996) began to emerge, many of the findings indicated that there were positive relationships between interpersonal relations and job performance (Ferris et al., 2005), leadership (Ammeter et al., 2004), team performance (Jordan et al., 2002), proactive support (Bateman & Crant, 1993), mentoring and career development (Blass & Ferris,

2007), and organizational commitment (Dirks & Ferrin, 2001). Additionally, links between specific relational behaviors and effective performance began to emerge.

Some of the direct links between interpersonal relationship behaviors and performance have been observed in the arena of social interactions. For example, Pfeffer (1992) suggested that possessing high self-awareness along with the ability to personally identity with others is important for obtaining valuable organizational resources. Sternberg et al. (2000) indicated that employees with strong relational skills tend to develop diverse networks of people. These networks can then be used to create personal and professional opportunities.

Interpersonal relationship behaviors are not only important for network and alliance development, but they are equally critical to the success of leadership. As Graen and Uhl-Bien (1995) suggested, the leader-member exchange theory focuses on the development of separate dyadic relationships between managers and their subordinates. The theory proposes that there is a high degree of trust, respect, influence, and mutual obligation between the two parties. The leader-follower relationship has also been viewed as a series of social exchanges in which both parties benefit from the high-quality social interactions (Schriesheim et al., 1999). Empirical evidence has supported this notion and has found that high-quality relationships result in positive work outcomes such as lower turnover (Harris, Kacmar, & Witt, 2005), high subordinate performance (Bauer & Green, 1994), increased organizational citizenship behaviors (Gerstner & Day, 1997), higher levels of job satisfaction (Day & Crain, 1992), and increased levels of organizational commitment (Deluga & Perry, 1991).

Based on the previous research, it seems possible that those skilled in each of the socio-affective competencies would be more likely to engage in positive relations with others in the workplace. The use of establishing rapport and promoting acceptance of differences could be associated with relational behaviors such as network development and alliance building. Developing trust and cultivating charismatic influence may be linked to the development of mutually beneficial leader-member exchanges and components of transformational and charismatic leadership behaviors. Thus, the following hypotheses will be explored:

Hypothesis 10a: The socio-affective competence total score will demonstrate significant positive prediction of self-ratings of interpersonal relationship behaviors.

Hypothesis 10b: The socio-affective competence total score will demonstrate significant positive prediction of peer-ratings of interpersonal relationship behaviors.

Organizational Citizenship Behaviors

Organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) can be defined as "individual behavior that is discretionary, not directly or explicitly recognized by the formal reward system, and that in the aggregate promotes the effective functioning of the organization" (Organ, 1988, p. 4). Although this definition provides a starting point for examining extra-role behaviors, there have been numerous terms related to citizenship performance. Some of these include: extra-role behavior (Van Dyne, Cummings, & Parks, 1995), prosocial organizational behavior (Brief & Motowidlo, 1986), principled organizational dissent (Graham, 1986), organizational spontaneity (George & Brief, 1992), and contextual

performance (Borman & Motowidlo, 1993). It is the last conceptualization by Borman and Motowidlo (1993) that is hypothesized to be related to socio-affective competence and will be the focus of this study because it encompasses many factors (e.g., extra-role behaviors, prosocial work attitudes, and organizational spontaneity) that support the organization.

Borman and Motowidlo (1993) defined contextual performance as "behaviors that do not support the technical core itself so much as they support the broader organizational, social, and psychological environment in which the technical core must function" (p. 73). Within this framework, these researchers suggested that there are five categories of contextual performance. These areas include: a) volunteering for activities that are beyond a person's formal job duties and responsibilities; b) enthusiastic persistence when it is required to complete important job assignments; c) providing support and assistance to colleagues and coworkers; d) following organizational rules and regulations even when it is inconvenient; and e) actively promoting and defending the organization when other employees or outsiders criticize it (Organ, 1997). The important characteristic throughout each of these five categories is that the behaviors do not need to be extra-role, but that they must enhance or contribute to the effectiveness of the work environment.

The association between contextual performance and socio-affective competence is directly related to the relationships that employees develop in the workplace. Those that develop positive, supportive, and long-term relationships with others are more likely to provide assistance when needed, demonstrate persistent enthusiasm when working as a team, and volunteer to help others when it is not required. Additionally, as Van Dyne et

al. (2005) suggested, the affective states employees experience in the workplace relates to the emotional connections they share with others. Therefore, if an employee has developed a personal affinity and acceptance of another's perspective, it is more likely that they will be helpful, courteous, and supportive. If two colleagues have also developed a trusting relationship, they are more likely to give of their time to make sure they can assist the other individual when needed. Lastly, through the use of charismatic influence, a leader can create a supportive work environment where all employees can act as a cohesive team. Thus, the author proposes the following hypothesis:

Hypothesis 11: The socio-affective competence total score will demonstrate significant positive prediction of peer-ratings of contextual performance.

The preceding hypotheses will be explored in support of a preliminary nomological network for socio-affective competence. In addition, several of the hypotheses will determine the criterion-related validity of the socio-affective competence construct. The following section will outline the methodology behind situational judgment tests and their relationship to the measurement of emotional and social skills in organizational settings.

Situational Judgment Tests

Situational judgment tests (SJTs) have been used in organizational settings for more than 70 years (File, 1945; McDaniel, Morgenson, Finnegan, Campion, & Braverman, 2001; Mowry, 1957). Recently, there has been resurgence in research on SJTs (Weekly, Ployhart, & Holtz, 2006) and the methodology associated with developing and using these types of assessments (Motowidlo, Dunnette, & Carter, 1990). SJTs are commonly used to identify how people behave in certain work-related situations. Specifically, SJTs present test takers with hypothetical scenarios that relate to real-life experiences that might take place on the job. Test takers are typically required to choose the best response among a series of response options that could hypothetically solve the dilemma presented in the scenario. SJTs are classified as low-fidelity assessments and have demonstrated consistent criterion-related validity with various measures of job performance (Reynolds, Winter, & Scott, 1999; Stevens & Campion, 1994).

There are five steps in the process of developing a SJT: a) developing situation stems, b) eliciting situation response options, c) determining the method of response instructions, d) determining the effectiveness of responses, and e) developing a method for scoring the test. Situation item-stem development involves four components. First, the source from which the item-stem content will be written is determined. Several researchers have supported the use of the critical incidents technique (Motowidlo, Hooper, & Jackson, 2006b). Others have used theory-based methods (Weekly & Jones, 1999) and archival approaches (Bandelli, Dorio, & Schmidt, 2006). Weekly et al. (2006)

suggested that of all the item-stem development methods, critical incidents usually provide the richest source of information. However, because of the multidimensional nature of the socio-affective competencies, all three (e.g., critical incidents, theory-based, archival) item-stem approaches were used in the present study.

The second step in the process involves eliciting a number of response options that will be used for each situational stem. Typically, SJTs contain between three to fifteen possible response options per scenario (Ployhart, Porr, & Ryan, in press). Additionally, response options are usually written by subject matter experts (SMEs), who are often managers or executives currently serving in the position to be filled. However, in some instances response options can be written by the test developers (Stevens & Campion, 1999). Currently, research has not been conducted indicating that one approach is superior to the other. The current study relied on the use of SMEs; however, theory and archival-based approaches were also employed.

Next, response option instructions must be determined. Instructions can contain two different phrases used at the end of each situational stem. Test takers can respond to the scenarios based on what they "would do" or what they "should do." Research by McDaniel and Nguyen (2001) indicated that the latter is less susceptible to faking. Additionally, some researchers have found evidence for higher validity estimates when using "should do" response instructions. However, other researchers have found higher validity estimates, greater variance, and more normal distributions with the "would do" instructions (Ployhart & Enrhart, 2003). For example, Nguyen and McDaniel (2003) found that situations ending with "should do" are more cognitively loaded than SJTs with "would do" instructions, which could result in adverse impact (Biga, 2007). Additionally,

several researchers have suggested that "would do" instructions are more appropriate for personality or skill-based constructs (Clevenger, Pereira, Wiechmann, Schmitt, & Harvey, 2001). Thus, the present study employed "would do" instructions since the socio-affective competencies are skill-based.

The fourth step involves determining the response option effectiveness scores. Three different methods have been used in the literature: SMEs, empirical keying, and theory-based approaches. Many studies have compared each of these methods (Krokos, Meade, Cantwell, Pond, & Wilson, 2004; MacLane, Barton, Holloway-Lundy, & Nickles, 2001; Paullin & Hanson, 2001) and consistent results have indicated that SME and empirical keying approaches have equivalent levels of validity. Thus, the present research employed a SME-based approach. SMEs for effectiveness ratings can be job incumbents, trainers, research experts, and non-experts. Little research has indicated the degree to which one group of SMEs is superior to the other groups. The present research used one SME group. Specifically, researchers and practitioners in the areas of EI, political skill, and leadership comprised the expert group. Research by Mayer et al. (2002) supports the use of ratings by research experts. In the development of the *Mayer—Salovey—Caruso Emotional Intelligence Test (MSCEIT)*, experts in the field of emotions and affective theory were approached and asked to complete the MSCEIT in order to develop an expert scoring key.

The last step in the SJT development process is the scoring method. This stage involves determining how to combine response options within and across scenarios to determine the test takers overall score on the SJT. Two methods are often discussed in the literature: forced-choice and Likert-scale methods. Several researchers (Chan & Schmitt,

2002; Wagner & Sternberg, 1985) have found that the forced-choice methods are more appropriate for SJTs measuring skill-based constructs. Additionally, research by Mayer et al. (2002) indicated that when using a forced-choice methodology (i.e., having the participants' select one response for each scenario), the predictive validity estimates were higher on several different criterion variables than when using Likert-scale responses.

Weekly et al. (2006) also referred to the benefits of using forced-choice responses. In fact, these researchers indicated that there were substantial advantages to using a forced choice methodology involving both *most likely* and *least likely* responses as opposed to one single "correct" answer per scenario. One advantage is that the *most likely/least likely* approach tends to increase the variance in any one item score. Additionally, research has indicated that the increased variance associated with the *most likely/least likely* approach has led to higher validity estimates for certain SJTs (Weekly & Ployhart, 2006). Therefore, based on these findings, the author used a *most likely/least likely* forced choice scoring method for the socio-affective competence SJT.

Research on SJTs suggests that this type of test can be used to assess a number of different skills and abilities (Weekly et al., 2006). For example, SJTs have been used as assessments of conscientiousness (Becker, 2004), extraversion (Brooks & Highhouse, 2006), practical intelligence (Sternberg et al., 2000), agreeableness (Gillespie et al., 2002), and emotional intelligence (Mayer et al., 2002). A substantial amount of research has also documented that SJTs are a valuable tool in predicting performance (Schmitt & Chan, 2006). Thus, the development of an SJT to assess socio-affective competence will hopefully provide a useful approach to the measurement of interpersonal relationships in the workplace.

Methods

The research reported here was drawn from two separate studies. The purpose of the first study was to develop the socio-affective competence situational judgment test (SAC-SJT). There were three steps in this process. First, scenario item stems were generated using several methods that have been supported in the literature (e.g., Motowidlo, Hanson, & Crafts, 1997; Stevens & Campion, 1999; Weekly et al, 2006). Next, item response options were developed for each of the retained scenarios. Finally, the response option scoring key was developed for all the scenarios in the assessment. Additionally, Study 1 examined the relationship between socio-affective competence and its correlates (e.g., political skill, emotional intelligence, personality, and job satisfaction). Several researchers (Hanson, Horgen, & Borman, 1998; McDaniel & Nguyen, 2001) have discussed the importance of construct validity evidence in relation to the development of SJTs, and therefore, efforts were made to establish a preliminary socio-affective competence nomological network.

Study 2 focused on the criterion-related validity of the SAC-SJT. This study examined the relationship between the SAC-SJT and the criterion variables (e.g., job performance, interpersonal relationship behaviors, and contextual performance) hypothesized to be related to socio-affective competence. Scores on the criterion variables in Study 2 were collected from self-ratings by the target employee as well as peer-ratings from their colleagues and/or coworkers.

Study 1: SAC-SJT Development

Situational Item Stem Development

Procedure. Situational item stems for the SAC-SJT were generated using critical incident techniques, theory-based methods, and archival sources.

Critical Incident Situational Stems. Weekly et al. (2006) suggested that the most common approach to SJT stem development is the use of the critical incident method. In this approach, SMEs report instances of good and poor performance. In a majority of cases, the Antecedent-Behavior-Consequence (ABC) format is used when developing the relevant critical incidents. This format involves the description of an event leading up to the specific incident, the actual behavior that the individual in question used, and the result from this course of action. Typically, job incumbents or managers are asked to provide examples of relevant performance (Weekly & Ployhart, 2006).

Following previous research, SMEs were solicited from a graduate MBA program in the business school of a large southeastern university. All volunteering participants were required to have had at least one year of management or supervisory experience. Individuals that met this requirement were given a specific set of instructions (please see Appendix A for socio-affective competence dimension instructions) pertaining to one of the four socio-affective competencies and asked to write incidents from their work experience that related to the dimension of interest.

A total of 94 graduate students (n = 56 males, n = 38 females) from four different MBA courses met the preceding requirements and agreed to participate in the item

writing process. Each class received one of the four sets of instructions and students were asked to write two to four scenarios for that particular dimension. This yielded approximately 60-80 situations for each dimension.

After all situational stems were collected from the MBA students, the author reviewed each scenario for clarity, item fidelity, content adequacy, and dimensionality. Situations appearing too complex, unclear, redundant, and/or involving multiple socio-affective competence dimensions were removed. This elimination process yielded approximately 10-12 scenarios that were retained for each dimension.

Theory-Based Situational Stems. Next, a theoretical approach to developing SAC-SJT situational stems was employed. The author used the underlying theoretical model of socio-affective competence to develop additional SJT situational stems. This approach was consistent with previous methods used to generate situational stems (e.g., Arad, Borman, & Pulakos, 1999; Motowidlo et al., 1990; Reynolds et al., 1999; Stevens & Campion, 1994). The author wrote three additional situational stems for each of the four socio-affective competence dimensions. These additional stems were written in line with Weekly et al.'s (2006) recommendations concerning stem complexity, content adequacy, and fidelity. Although a lack of theory pertaining to work situations has been cited as a major criticism of theoretically-based approaches (Motowidlo, Hooper, & Jackson, 2006a), the current study attempted to remedy this deficiency by developing SJT items based on the theoretical model of socio-affective competence.

*Archival Situational Stems. C*onsistent with previous approaches to the development of SJT items (Gillespie et al., 2002; Hunter, 2003; Kim, Schmitt, Oswald, Gillespie, & Ramsay, 2003), situational stems were obtained from an existing SJT that

was developed for operational use in a financial services organization. Items contained in this existing SJT were evaluated for content adequacy by the author and were selected for inclusion if they represented one of the four socio-affective competence dimensions. Upon inspection of the financial services SJT, eight additional scenarios were retained for the SAC-SJT. After generating situational stems using each of the development methods (e.g., critical incident techniques, theory-based methods, and archival sources), a total of 65 scenarios were retained and used in the content adequacy assessment.

Situational Item Stem Content Adequacy Assessment

Procedure. Although participants in the item stem phase were instructed to write scenarios for each of the specific dimensions, it was important to determine if the scenarios represented each of their specific competencies and did not overlap with one another. Therefore, it was necessary to determine the dimensionality of each of the scenarios before moving to the response option writing phase. In order to deal with this issue, all of the situational stems were assessed using a consensus rating method (Schriesheim, Powers, Scandura, Gardiner, & Lankau, 1993).

Twenty-two I-O psychology doctoral students (n = 8 males, n = 14 females) from a large southeastern university participated in the item stem adequacy assessment. According to Schriesheim et al. (1993), graduate students are appropriate to use as content adequacy judges because they possess a relatively high level of intellectual ability and can comprehend the instructions and construct definitions that are provided to them. The 22 content adequacy judges were given a short ten minute presentation on the socio-affective competence model and its associated dimensions. Next, they were provided with definitions and examples of the four socio-affective competencies and then asked to

read each of the situational stems and decide which of the four dimensions it most closely reflected. Additionally, the judges were asked to rate how confident they felt the situational stem was representative of the particular socio-affective competence dimension to which they assigned it. This was completed using a five-point Likert scale (*1=Not Very Sure to 5 = Very Sure*).

Analyses. As described in Schriesheim et al. (1993) and employed by Carlson, Kacmar, and Williams (2000), categorization and rating analyses were performed. First, for each situational stem, the number of participants endorsing the item as descriptive of each socio-affective competence dimension was computed. Consistent with previous research (e.g., Carlson et al, 2000; Schriesheim & Hinkin, 1990), a cut-off score was employed: if 75% or more of the judges categorized the situational stem into the correct socio-affective competence dimension, it was retained. Additionally, to further ensure the selected scenarios were operationalizations of the socio-affective competencies, mean item accuracy ratings for each situational stem were calculated. Consistent with previous SJT development methods (Bergman, Drasgow, Donovan, & Juraska, 2003; Brooks & Highhouse, 2006), if the mean of participant ratings for the item "How sure are you this stem falls into the category you assigned it to?" was above a 3.5 (70%), the situation was retained.

Using the 75% cut-off score for item selection, the content adequacy judges agreed that 28 scenarios (seven for each socio-affective competency area) out of the 65 developed during the initial situational stem development stage should be retained. Additionally, mean item accuracy ratings were calculated. The average mean score for

the 28 selected scenarios was 4.40 with individual mean ratings ranging from 3.94 to 4.81.

Situation Response Option Development

Procedure. Response options were developed using similar methods as those employed in the development of situational stems: a) critical incident methods, b) theory-based approaches, and c) archival sources.

Critical Incidents. Eight graduate students (n = 4 males, n = 4 females) in an (I-O) psychology doctoral program at a large southeastern university were asked to develop response options. Two students were assigned to write for each dimension, with each individual writing response options for three to four situational stems. All of the writers were provided with a set of instructions containing a general description of the study, guidelines for writing response options, and a definition of the socio-affective competency for which they were writing. Participants were also asked to read each situational stem and then answer the following question: "What would you do if you were in this situation?" Participants were encouraged to record as many different responses as possible. Once all response options were returned to the author, they were reviewed for relevance to the specific dimension, content adequacy, suitability, clarity, and complexity. In addition, response options that were selected were chosen based on varying levels of effectiveness.

Theory-Based Approach. Next, a theoretical-based approach was used to generate additional response options. The author used the definitions and the underlying theory behind the four socio-affective competencies to write additional responses. This approach

was consistent with previous research in which the authors constructed the majority of their response options (e.g., Stevens & Campion, 1999; Weekly & Jones, 1999).

Archival Sources. Response options were also selected from the existing financial services SJT similar to how the situational stems were chosen (described above). These responses were evaluated for content adequacy by the author and were selected for inclusion if they pertained to the dimension of interest. Additionally, responses were selected if they could be modified to represent one of the socio-affective competency dimensions.

Once all the response options were selected, the final SAC-SJT consisted of 28 situational stems, with seven situations pertaining to each of the four socio-affective competence dimensions. Additionally, each situational stem contained four response options and employed a *most likely* and *least likely* forced choice scoring methodology.

Response Option Ratings and SAC-SJT Scoring Key

Procedure. Response option effectiveness scores were assessed using one group of SME raters. Consistent with previous research (e.g., Pulakos & Schmitt, 1996; Reynolds et al., 1999; Sinar, Paquet, & Scott, 2002), the sample of SMEs was drawn from researchers in the areas of political skill, EI, and leadership studies. Research experts were asked to complete the SJT if they had at least three published articles in the area of interest. Additionally, academic/practitioner websites (e.g., EI consortium, Emonet) were reviewed when selecting the expert sample. One hundred and seventy one email invitations were sent out to research expert SMEs over a secure website (e.g., Survey Monkey). Forty (n = 28 males, n = 12 females) experts responded to the email and completed the SAC-SJT for a response rate of 23%. The SME expert sample was

comprised of researchers between the ages of 25 to 69, with 43% of the experts between the ages of 50 to 59. Additionally, the sample was predominately White (88%) and all the SME experts had doctoral degrees.

Analyses. To finalize the SAC-SJT scoring key, SME response option percentages for the *most likely* and *least likely* scores were computed. This procedure was followed based on research by Mayer et al. (2002) and the expert scoring key developed for their MSCEIT. Specifically, in scoring their EI test, these researchers selected the response that was endorsed by the highest percentage of experts as the "correct" answer to the specific scenario. Therefore, similar to the content adequacy assessment, a cut-off score was used for the SME ratings: if 65% or more of the research experts selected a particular response option as their *most likely* and *least likely* approach to handling the situation, these choices were retained as the "correct" answers to the situation. Please see Appendix B for a complete listing of the scenarios, response options, and expert percentages for each of the items on the SAC-SJT.

Once the "correct" *most likely* and *least likely* responses were computed for each scenario, it was important to determine the manner in which future participants would be awarded points for selecting the same responses as the SME experts. Similar to research outlined by Motowidlo et al. (1990), participants were awarded +2 points if they selected both the *most likely* and *least likely* responses, +1 point if they selected only one of the responses, and zero points if they did not select either of the responses. Dimension scores were determined by summing the points received for each of the four socio-affective competency areas. Lastly, the total SAC-SJT score for each participant was calculated as an aggregate of the points received across the four dimensions.

Study 1: Construct Validity Evidence

Participants

Three-hundred and thirty nine (n = 113 males, n = 226 females) undergraduate students from a large southeastern university participated in the study. These individuals were required to work a minimum of 20 hours per week and had to have a job for at least six months. Participants' ages ranged from 18 to 39, with approximately 80% of the sample between the ages of 18 to 24. The sample was ethnically diverse: 56% of the respondents identified themselves as White, 16% as African American, 14% as Hispanic/Latino, 5% Asian American, and 9% as Other (e.g., bi-racial, multi-racial). Thirty-two percent of the sample were college freshmen, 17% were sophomores, 28% were juniors, and 23% identified themselves as college seniors. Lastly, participants reported that they worked between 20 to 49 hours per week, with 66% of the sample indicating that they worked less than 35 hours per week.

Measures

Socio-Affective Competence Situational Judgment Test (Bandelli, 2008). This 28-scenario situational judgment test was developed as part of this study. As mentioned, the test consisted of four dimensions (e.g., establishing rapport, promoting acceptance of differences, developing trust, and cultivating charismatic influence), and each area was measured with seven scenarios. Each scenario contained four responses and participants were instructed to select one choice that was *most likely* the best way to handle the scenario and one choice that was *least likely* the best method to deal with the situation.

Items were scored based on comparing the participant's responses to the expert scoring key as described previously. Higher scores indicated more interpersonal skills in each of the four competency areas. The internal consistency reliability for the test was reasonably high (a = .78).

Political Skill Inventory (Ferris et al., 2005). This 18-item measure examines the extent to which an individual "combines social astuteness with the ability to relate well, and otherwise demonstrate situationally appropriate behavior in a disarmingly charming and engaging manner that inspires confidence, trust, sincerity, and genuineness" (Ferris et al., 2000, p. 30). The items are scored on a seven-point Likert scale *(1 = strongly disagree to 7 = strongly agree)*, with high scores indicating higher levels of political skill. Sample items include: It is easy for me to develop good rapport with most people; and, I spend a lot of time and effort at work networking with others. See Appendix B for a complete list of political skill items. Ferris et al. (2005) reported an overall internal consistency reliability estimate of .89. In the current study, the internal consistency for the scale was consistent with past research (a = .87).

Emotional Intelligence (Wong & Law, 2002). This instrument consists of 16 items that examine four dimensions of emotional intelligence (EI). The four EI dimensions include: self-emotions appraisal, other-emotions appraisal, use of emotions, and regulation of emotions. The items are scored on a seven-point Likert scale *(1 = strongly disagree to 7 = strongly agree)*, with high scores indicating higher levels of EI. Sample items include: a) I have good understanding of my own emotions (self-emotions appraisal); b) I am a good observer of others' emotions (other-emotions appraisal); c) I would always encourage myself to try my best (use of emotions); and, d) I have good

control of my own emotions (regulation of emotions). See Appendix C for a complete list of EI items. Wong and Law (2002) reported reliability estimates for the four dimensions of EI to be high (.76 to .89). In this study, the alpha coefficient for the overall scale was high (a = .89). Additionally, the coefficient alphas for each dimension were consistent with earlier research (.78 to .91).

Big Five Inventory (John, Donahue, & Kentle, 1991). This scale consists of 44 items that measure the five dimensions of the Big Five. The instrument was developed out of factor analytic work involving the five-factor model. The inventory has eight items measuring extraversion, nine items assessing agreeableness, nine items for conscientiousness, eight items for neuroticism, and 10 items measuring openness to experience. Items are scored on a five-point Likert scale (*1 = disagree strongly to 5 = agree strongly)*, with high scores reflecting higher standings on each of the individual constructs. See Appendix D for a complete list of BFI items. John et al. (1991) reported alpha coefficients in the low .80s for each of the dimensions. Additionally, the BFI has shown convergent validity with the NEO-FFI (Benet-Martinez & John, 1998). The internal consistency reliability for the BFI scale in the present study was high (a = .83). Additionally, the alpha coefficients for each of the five factors were similar to past findings (.77 to .89).

Mach IV Scale (Christie & Geis, 1970). This scale contains 20 items concerning the degree to which an individual adheres to the principles in Machiavelli's *The Prince*. Each of the items are scored on a seven-point Likert scale (*1 = strongly disagree to 7 = strongly agree*), with high scores indicating individuals high on the Machiavellianism

construct. See Appendix E for a complete list of Mach items. The internal consistency reliability for the scale in this study was acceptable (a = .77).

Job Performance (Williams & Anderson, 1991). This seven item subscale focuses on task performance and was used to determine the degree to which participants adequately perform the duties of their job. Items are scored on a seven-point Likert scale *(1 = strongly disagree to 7 = strongly agree)*. Sample items include: I see myself as someone who fulfills responsibilities specified in my job description; and, I see myself as someone who meets formal performance requirements of the job. See Appendix F for a complete list of job performance items. The coefficient alpha for this scale was relatively high (a = .89).

Job Satisfaction (Cammann, Fichman, Jenkins, & Klesh, 1979). This global measure of job satisfaction contains three items that assess participants' overall level of satisfaction with their job. The items are scored on a seven-point Likert scale *(1 = strongly disagree to 7 = strongly agree)*, with higher scores indicating higher levels of job satisfaction. See Appendix G for a complete list of job satisfaction items. The job satisfaction scale demonstrated high internal consistency reliability (a = .91).

Interpersonal Relationship Behaviors (Bandelli, 2008). This 12-item measure was developed by the researcher to assess the degree to which individuals develop and maintain positive relationships with others in organizational settings. The items are scored on a seven-point Likert scale *(1 = strongly disagree to 7 = strongly agree)*, with higher scores indicating the use of more interpersonal relationship behaviors. Sample items include: I believe it is important to be well connected with others and develop large social networks at work; and, my friends and coworkers know they can depend on me to

keep my word. See Appendix H for a complete list of interpersonal relationship items. The coefficient alpha for this scale was high (a = .88).

Demographic Variables. Five demographic questions were included in this study: gender (male or female); age (18 to 24, 25 to 29, 30 to 34, and 35 to 39); ethnicity (White/Caucasian, Black/African American, Hispanic/Latino, Asian American, and Other); school year (freshman, sophomore, junior, and senior); and, hours worked per week (20 to 24, 25 to 29, 30 to 34, 35 to 39, 40 to 44, and 45 to 49).

Procedure

Instructors in the psychology department at a large southeastern university were approached and provided information about the study. The professors who granted permission to the researcher to enter their class received the complete questionnaire packet for review prior to in-class administration. The questionnaire packet contained the SAC-SJT, all the self-report scales (e.g., political skill, personality, job satisfaction, etc.), and the demographic items. The questionnaire was administered in paper and pencil format to students in seven different courses. No identifying information was collected from any of the participants and students were permitted to stop taking the survey at any point without penalty.

The questionnaire packet took approximately 35 to 40 minutes to complete and participants were awarded extra credit points in their classes for completing the assessments. Prior to starting the survey, all students were read the instructions and the researcher handled any questions or concerns from the participants. Local permission for the administration of the survey was obtained through the Institutional Review Board

(IRB), and all participants were treated in accordance with the ethical guidelines specified by the American Psychological Association (APA).

Analyses

Means, standard deviations, and correlation coefficients were calculated for all study variables. Additionally, scores on the SAC-SJT were summed (by dimension and as a total score) and then correlated with the rest of the study variables to determine the relationship between the SAC-SJT responses and the other constructs. This information was used to provide evidence for the construct validity (e.g., convergent and discriminant validity) of the socio-affective competence construct and to begin to establish its nomological network. Correlation and regression analyzes were used to test the series of hypotheses.

Study 1: Results

Table 1 presents the means, standard deviations, and minimum/maximum scores for each of the study variables. The average cumulative score for the SAC-SJT was a 33.15 (SD = 5.18, min. = 24, max. = 49). Males (mean = 33.55, SD = 5.27) scored slightly higher than females (mean = 32.95, SD = 5.14), although this finding was not statistically significant: $t(337) = 1.01$, *n.s.* Thirty to 34 year olds (mean = 34.38, SD = 7.57) scored the highest on the SAC-SJT, although a one-way ANOVA indicated that this finding was not significant, $F(4, 334) = 0.97$, *n.s.* In the ethnicity category, Others (mean = 35.89, SD = 6.23) and Whites (mean = 33.24, SD = 4.91) had the highest scores, although there was not a significant difference between the groups, $F(4, 334) = 1.57$, *n.s.*

College seniors (mean = 34.43, SD = 6.26) scored the highest on the SAC-SJT, followed by juniors (mean = 32.96, SD = 4.91), although these findings were not statistically significant, $F(3, 335) = 1.96$, *n.s.* Lastly, there was a significant difference, $F(5, 333) = 3.22$, $p < .01$, on the SAC-SJT scores by number of hours worked per week. LSD and Bonferroni post hoc analyses revealed that individuals working between 35 to 39 hours per week (mean = 34.37, SD = 6.18) scored significantly higher than the other categories of working hours (e.g., 20 to 24, 30 to 34, 40 to 44, and 45 to 49), except for those working between 25 to 29 hours per week (mean = 34.76, SD = 5.42).

Table 1

Descriptive Statistics for Study 1: Construct-Related Correlates of Socio-Affective Competence.

		N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Standard Deviation
1.	Socio-Affective Competence	339	24	49	33.15	5.18
2.	Establishing Rapport	339	0.00	14	7.88	2.35
3.	Promoting Acceptance of Differences	339	2.00	14	8.79	1.97
4.	Developing Trust	339	2.00	14	7.76	2.19
5.	Cultivating Charismatic Influence	339	3.00	14	8.72	1.93
6.	Political Skill	339	3.17	7.00	5.17	0.68
7.	Social Astuteness	339	3.40	7.00	5.20	0.61
8.	Interpersonal Influence	339	1.75	7.00	5.44	0.97
9.	Networking Ability	339	2.00	7.00	4.66	0.94
10.	Apparent Sincerity	339	1.67	7.00	5.78	0.98
11.	Emotional Intelligence	339	4.44	7.00	5.51	0.53
12.	Openness to Experience	339	1.70	5.00	3.59	0.60
13.	Conscientiousness	339	1.00	5.00	3.71	0.64
14.	Extraversion	339	1.38	5.00	3.39	0.71
15.	Agreeableness	339	1.33	5.00	3.83	0.65
16.	Neuroticism	339	1.00	5.00	2.92	0.71
17.	Machiavellianism	339	1.20	7.00	3.61	0.60
18.	Job Performance	339	3.43	7.00	5.71	0.61
19.	Job Satisfaction	339	5.67	7.00	6.73	0.32
20.	Interpersonal Relationship Behaviors	339	2.17	7.00	5.32	0.80

Table 2

Socio-Affective Competence and Political Skill Dimension Correlations: Study 1.

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
1. Socio-Affective Competence	**(.78)**									
2. Establishing Rapport†	.64**	**(.67)**								
3. Promoting Acceptance Differences†	.57**	.13*	**(.72)**							
4. Developing Trust†	.71**	.23**	.27**	**(.76)**						
5. Cultivating Charismatic Influence†	.53**	.12*	.03	.21**	**(.75)**					
6. Political Skill	.25**	.09	.09	.23**	.21**	**(.87)**				
7. Social Astuteness††	.14*	-.01	.03	.13*	.20**	.73**	**(.81)**			
8. Interpersonal Influence††	.17**	.04	.01	.20**	.17**	.83**	.56**	**(.78)**		
9. Networking Ability††	.27**	.18**	.13*	.21**	.12*	.84**	.45**	.53**	**(.91)**	
10. Apparent Sincerity††	.17**	-.03	.09	.15**	.22**	.69**	.39**	.52**	.40**	**(.83)**

Note: †Indicates dimensions of socio-affective competence. ††Indicates dimension of political skill. *Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed). **Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Hypothesis 1 predicted that there would be a positive relationship between the socio-affective competence total score and political skill. The data supported this hypothesis (r = .25, p < .01). However, results between the individual competencies and the political skill dimensions (please refer to Table 2) were less promising.

Hypothesis 2a indicated that establishing rapport would demonstrate the strongest positive correlation with networking ability. The data supported this hypothesis (r = .18, p < .01). Hypothesis 2b purported that promoting acceptance of differences would demonstrate the strongest positive correlation with social astuteness. The findings did not support this hypothesis (r = .03, *n.s.*). Hypothesis 2c suggested that developing trust would demonstrate the strongest positive correlation with apparent sincerity. Although this finding was statistically significant (r = .15, p < .01), developing trust did not demonstrate the strongest positive correlation with apparent sincerity. Therefore, this hypothesis was not supported. Hypothesis 2d indicated that cultivating charismatic influence would demonstrate the strongest positive correlation with interpersonal influence. Similar to the previous hypothesis, the findings were significant (r = .17, p < .01); however, cultivating charismatic influence did not have the strongest positive correlation with interpersonal influence. Thus, this hypothesis was not supported.

Table 3 presents the correlation matrix for the construct validation scales. Hypothesis 3 suggested that there would be a positive relationship between socio-affective competence and EI. Results from the study supported this hypothesis (r = .27, p < .01). Hypothesis 4 indicated that there would be a significant negative correlation between the socio-affective total score and neuroticism. Although the relationship was in the right direction, the data did not support the hypothesis (r = -.06, *n.s.*).

Table 3

Construct-Related Validity Correlation Matrix.

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
1. Socio-Affective Competence	**(.78)**											
2. Political Skill	.25**	**(.87)**										
3. Emotional Intelligence	.27**	.66**	**(.89)**									
4. Extraversion	.14*	.01	.03	**(.85)**								
5. Agreeableness	.12*	.08	.04	.07	**(.82)**							
6. Neuroticism	-.06	.06	.04	-.10	-.43**	**(.77)**						
7. Conscientiousness	.07	.00	.02	.13*	.55**	-.26**	**(.89)**					
8. Openness to Experience	.00	.00	.09	-.01	.22**	-.01	.24**	**(.84)**				
9. Machiavellianism	-.04	-.10*	-.12*	-.08	-.04	-.11*	-.07	-.08	**(.77)**			
10. Job Performance	.19**	.61**	.51**	.05	.06	-.04	.06	.04	-.11*	**(.89)**		
11. Job Satisfaction	.09	.12*	.09	-.03	-.03	.02	-.02	.05	-.04	.08	**(.91)**	
12. Interpersonal Relationship Behaviors	.24**	.66**	.59**	.03	.03	-.02	.05	.06	-.06	.59**	.16**	**(.88)**

*Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed). **Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Hypothesis 5 proposed that there would be a negative relationship between socio-affective competency and Machiavellianism. Similar to the preceding hypothesis, the relationship was in the right direction. However, the results indicated that the relationship was not significant (r = -.04, *n.s.*). Hypothesis 6 purported that there would be a significant positive relationship between the socio-affective competence total score and agreeable. The data supported this hypothesis (r = .12, p < .05). Hypothesis 7 suggested that there would be a positive relationship between socio-affective competence and extraversion. Once again, the results provided support for this hypothesis (r = .14, p < .05).

Hypothesis 8a suggested that the total competence total score would demonstrate significant positive prediction of self-ratings of job performance. The regression analysis indicated that the socio-affective competence total score was found to account for a significant portion of the variance in self-ratings of job performance (R^2 = .04, F(1, 337) = 12.52, p, < .01). Hypothesis 9 proposed that the socio-affective competence total score would demonstrate significant positive prediction of self-ratings of job satisfaction. The data did not support this hypothesis (R^2 = .01, F(1, 337) = 2.51, *n.s.*). Lastly, hypothesis 10a purported that the socio-affective competence total score would demonstrate significant positive prediction of self-ratings of interpersonal relationship behaviors. In this regression analysis, the socio-affective competence total score accounted for a significant portion of the variance in the self-ratings of interpersonal relationship behaviors (R^2 = .06, F(1, 337) = 21.16, p, < .01).

Study 1: Discussion

In Study 1, the SAC-SJT was developed and the initial construct-related validity results provided promising support for the model and its competency areas. Additionally, the 28-item SAC-SJT was positively related to several of the other study variables, which provided preliminary support for the socio-affective competence nomological network. Most notably, the socio-affective competence total score was positively related to political skill and EI. These results are consistent with the conceptual development of the theoretical model of socio-affective competence. It is also important to note that the correlations between socio-affective competence and both constructs (e.g., political skill and EI) were in an acceptable range (0.20 to 0.40) in terms of providing estimates of convergent validity. Had the correlations been in the range of 0.60 to 0.80, one could make the argument that the socio-affective competence construct assessed close to the same thing as political skill and EI. If this was the case, it may not have been necessary to develop an additional interpersonal relationships construct.

One interesting finding was the inconsistent results between the socio-affective competency areas and the dimensions of political skill. The only hypothesis that was fully supported was the relationship between establishing rapport and networking ability. However, the findings in the other three areas were not related to the conceptual links between political skill and socio-affective competence. For example, there was a nonsignificant relationship between promoting acceptance of differences and social astuteness. One reason for this finding might be that social astuteness focuses on

comprehending social environments and accurately interpreting the behaviors of others, whereas promoting acceptance of differences is more concerned with diversity issues.

The findings regarding developing trust and cultivating charismatic influence were also puzzling. The correlations for both of these constructs were significant with all the political skill dimensions. This may have occurred due to conceptual and/or empirical reasons. First, on a conceptual level, research on transformational leadership and LMX theory suggests that trust, charisma, and connecting with others are all related to effective influence behaviors (Bass, 1998; Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1995). Thus, the significant correlations between developing trust, cultivating charismatic influence, and each of the political skill areas may be indicative of the manner in which these skills affect influence behaviors. From an empirical standpoint, the correlations may have been found due to overlapping situations that were developed during the item writing phase of the SAC-SJT. If this is the case, additional scenarios will need to be written and more stringent efforts will have to be made to make sure the competencies do not overlap with one another.

Another interesting finding was that the socio-affective competence total score did not demonstrate significant negative correlations with neuroticism and Machiavellianism. Although the relationships between these constructs were in the hypothesized direction, additional research is needed to determine what types of constructs are negatively related to socio-affective competence. For example, one variable that might be negatively correlated with socio-affective competence is counterproductive work behavior (CWB). Employees that sabotage or inflict harm on

others probably have difficulty forming long-lasting supportive relationships in the workplace and this could provide one avenue for future research.

A third unexpected finding was that the socio-affective competence total score did not predict self-ratings of job satisfaction. Although it was hypothesized that having positive interpersonal relationships on the job would lead to satisfaction with one's work, there may be a reason why this relationship did not exist. Specifically, one may have great relationships with others in the workplace but he/she may not enjoy the work that they do. As Spector (1985) demonstrated, there are many facets of job satisfaction; a relationship with colleagues is only one of nine areas that are related to satisfaction with work.

Results concerning the relationship between socio-affective competence and job performance provided preliminary support for the predictive validity of the construct. Additionally, the findings regarding socio-affective competence and interpersonal relationship behaviors indicated that the model is useful for predicting relational behaviors with colleagues and coworkers. Together, these relationships suggest that the socio-affective competence construct is related to criterion variables in the workplace. Although this is a promising first step, additional research is needed to determine the degree to which the socio-affective competencies are related to job outcomes (e.g., productivity and performance). Therefore, Study 2 will explore the predictive validity of socio-affective competence using both self and peer ratings of job performance and interpersonal relationship behaviors.

Study 2: Criterion Validity Evidence

Participants

Electronic surveys were sent out via email from a secure website (e.g., Survey Monkey) to 3,000 members of a young professional group in the Greater Tampa Bay Area. Three-hundred and seventy two people responded to the email and took the survey. Ninety-three responses were removed from the final dataset because participants started the survey and answered only a few of the questions. Next, the response time for a single SAC-SJT item was determined (mean = 47.58 seconds, SD = 14.23 seconds). To help ensure that participants were taking the proper amount of time to complete each of the items, response times under 10 seconds were discarded. Using this procedure, an additional 31 responses were removed from the final dataset. Therefore, the final dataset was comprised of 248 participants (n = 105 males, n = 143 females) for an 8% response rate. Additionally, 170 of these respondents had a colleague or coworker complete a separate on-line survey about them, which were also used in the final analyses.

Participants' ages ranged from 25 to 44, with approximately 62% of the sample between the ages of 25 to 29. The sample was racially diverse: 59% of the respondents identified themselves as White, 15% as African American, 9% as Hispanic/Latino, 6% Asian American, 6% as Middle Eastern and 5% as Other (e.g., bi-racial, multi-racial). Five percent reported having some college experience, 48% of the sample had their bachelor's degree, 33% had their master's degree, and 14% had their doctorate.

Participants also reported that they worked between 35 to 69 hours per week, with 45% of the sample indicating that they worked 40 to 44 hour per week. Lastly, the employment categories of the participants were diverse (e.g., healthcare, social services, advertising, legal, education, management, and sales). The largest job categories included: healthcare (29%), management (12%), and marketing and advertising (11%).

Measures

Socio-Affective Competence Situational Judgment Test (Bandelli, 2008). The 28-scenario situational judgment test developed in Study 1 was used in this study. The internal consistency reliability for the test was acceptable (a = .76).

Political Skill Inventory (Ferris et al., 2005). The 18-item measure designed to assess the four dimensions of political skill was used in this study. The scale demonstrated high internal consistency reliability (a = .89).

Job Performance (Williams & Anderson, 1991). The seven item subscale from the Organizational Citizenship measure was used in this study. The coefficient alphas for both self-ratings (a = .84) and peer ratings (a = .86) were relatively high.

Interpersonal Relationship Behaviors (Bandelli, 2008). The 12-item measure that was developed by the researcher in Study 1 was used in the current study. The scale demonstrated good reliability for both self-ratings (a = .87) and peer ratings (a = .85).

Organizational Citizenship Behaviors (Williams & Anderson, 1991). This 16-item scale measures two facets of contextual performance. The facets include OCB-I, or discretionary acts directed towards specific individuals and OCB-O, acts directed toward the organization as a whole. Organ (1997) discussed the importance of relating citizenship behaviors to both individuals as well as the organization and supported the

use of the instrument. Scale items are scored on a seven-point Likert scale *(1 = strongly disagree to 7 = strongly agree)*. Sample items from each dimension include: a) OCB-I – Helps others who have been absent; and b) OCB-O – Conserves and protects organizational property. See Appendix I for a complete list of OCB items. The internal consistency reliability estimate for the total OCB scale was high (a = .87).

Demographic Variables. Six demographic questions were included in this study: gender (male or female); age (25 to 29, 30 to 34, 35 to 39, and 40 to 44); ethnicity (White/Caucasian, Black/African American, Hispanic/Latino, Asian American, Middle Eastern, and Other); education (some college, bachelor's, master's, and doctorate); hours worked per week (35 to 39, 40 to 44, 45 to 49, 50 to 54, 55 to 59, 60 to 64, and 65 to 69), and job category (architecture/engineering, entertainment/sports, financial operations, social services, computer/mathematical, education, marketing/advertising, healthcare, human resources, legal, management, sales, administrative support, and other).

Procedure

Executive directors of a large networking group for young professionals were approached and presented with the purpose of the study. Next, the researcher asked for permission to distribute the SAC-SJT and related scales to members of the professional organization over email via a secure third party website (e.g., Survey Monkey). The directors granted permission for the survey administration and provided the researcher with an email database of all current members. A general welcome email was drafted and sent out to all members in the database, which included two survey links: one for the target individual to fill out and one for a colleague or coworker to complete.

Members interested in participating were directed to the third party website where they completed some demographic items, the SAC-SJT, and measures of political skill, job performance, and interpersonal relationship behaviors. Next, they were instructed to send an email to a colleague or coworker, which included a link to a survey that was used to collect peer-ratings. The peer-ratings survey included measures of job performance, interpersonal relationship behaviors, and organizational citizenship behaviors. In order to link the target's survey with his/her peer, a four-digit coding scheme was designed. Each target participant was asked to create a personal four-digit number for their survey and then to include this number in the email they forwarded to a colleague or coworker.

The online survey for the target participant took approximately 25 to 30 minutes to complete and the peer survey took about 5 minutes to complete. No identifying information was collected from any of the survey participants and individuals were permitted to exit the survey at any point without penalty. Additionally, all survey participants (e.g., target and peers) were provided with the researcher's email if they had any questions or comments regarding any part of the survey.

Analyses

Means, standard deviations, and correlations were calculated for all variables. Scores on the SAC-SJT were calculated and then correlated with the other variables to determine the relationship between the SAC-SJT and self reports of political skill, job performance, and interpersonal relationship behaviors. Additionally, SAC-SJT responses and peer ratings were examined to determine the predictive relationship of socio-affective competence on others' reports of organizational criterion variables. Correlation and regression analyses were used to test the hypotheses in Study 2.

Study 2: Results

Table 4 presents the means, standard deviations, and minimum/maximum scores for each study variable. The average cumulative score for the SAC-SJT was a 34.72 (SD = 5.67, min. = 22, max. = 49). Females (mean = 35.31, SD = 5.32) scored higher than males (mean = 33.78, SD = 6.01); however, this finding was not statistically significant: $t(246) = 1.89$, *n.s.* Forty to 44 year olds (mean = 34.96, SD = 7.15) scored the highest on the SAC-SJT, although this finding was not significant, $F(3, 244) = .99$, *n.s.* Individuals of Middle Eastern decent (mean = 35.44, SD = 6.29) and Whites (mean = 34.78, SD = 5.81) had the highest scores, although there was not a significant difference in these findings, $F(5, 242) = .65$, *n.s.*

Participants with master's degrees (mean = 36.20, SD = 6.17) scored the highest on the SAC-SJT; however, these findings were not statistically significant, $F(3, 244) = .42$, *n.s.* Individuals who worked between 45 to 49 hours per week (mean = 35.13, SD = 6.11) had the highest test scores, although these findings were also not significant, $F(6, 241) = .45$, *n.s.* Lastly, participants in the field of education (mean = 36.14, SD = 5.01) had the highest scores on the SAC-SJT, followed by social services (mean = 35.91, SD = 4.37) and administrative support (mean = 35.79, SD = 7.56), although these findings were not statistically significant, $F(13, 234) = .87$, *n.s.*

Table 4

Descriptive Statistics for Study 2: Criterion-Related Correlates of Socio-Affective Competence.

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Standard Deviation
1. Socio-Affective Competence	248	22	49	34.72	5.67
2. Establishing Rapport	248	2.00	14	8.77	2.02
3. Promoting Acceptance of Differences	248	3.00	14	8.42	2.10
4. Developing Trust	248	2.00	14	8.56	2.21
5. Cultivating Charismatic Influence	248	3.00	14	8.97	2.47
6. Political Skill	248	3.89	7.00	4.60	0.31
7. Social Astuteness	248	3.40	7.00	4.23	0.39
8. Interpersonal Influence	248	3.75	7.00	4.94	0.38
9. Networking Ability	248	3.33	7.00	4.59	0.58
10. Apparent Sincerity	248	3.67	7.00	4.81	0.42
11. Job Performance	248	4.43	7.00	5.81	0.40
12. Peer Ratings of Job Performance	170	4.71	7.00	5.77	0.39
13. Interpersonal Relationship Behaviors	248	3.25	7.00	4.20	0.51
14. Peer Ratings Interpersonal Relationship Behaviors	170	4.00	7.00	5.06	0.32
15. Peer Ratings of Organizational Citizenship Behaviors	170	3.81	7.00	5.27	0.52

Table 5

Socio-Affective Competence and Political Skill Dimension Correlations: Study 2.

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
1. Socio-Affective Competence	**(.76)**									
2. Establishing Rapport†	.66**	**(.70)**								
3. Promoting Acceptance Differences†	.62**	.20**	**(.73)**							
4. Developing Trust†	.68**	.28**	.19**	**(.81)**						
5. Cultivating Charismatic Influence†	.71**	.30**	.28**	.32**	**(.80)**					
6. Political Skill	.29**	.09	.22**	.27**	.18**	**(.89)**				
7. Social Astuteness††	.23**	.11	.21**	.17**	.12	.61**	**(.86)**			
8. Interpersonal Influence††	.22**	.07	.19**	.19**	.14*	.57**	.26**	**(.92)**		
9. Networking Ability††	.19**	.05	.12	.20**	.12	.81**	.21**	.24**	**(.87)**	
10. Apparent Sincerity††	.12	.01	.06	.13*	.11	.50**	.25**	.22**	.20**	**(.90)**

Note: †Indicates dimensions of socio-affective competence. ††Indicates dimension of political skill. *Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed). **Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Hypothesis 1 predicted that there would be a positive relationship between the socio-affective competence total score and political skill. The data supported this hypothesis (r = .29, p < .01). Although there was a significant relationship between socio-affective competence and political skill, there were mixed findings between the individual competencies and the political skill dimensions (please refer to Table 5).

Hypothesis 2a suggested that establishing rapport would demonstrate the strongest positive correlation with networking ability. The data did not support this hypothesis (r = .05, *n.s.*). Hypothesis 2b indicated that promoting acceptance of differences would demonstrate the strongest positive correlation with social astuteness. The findings supported this hypothesis (r = .21, p < .01). Hypothesis 2c purported that developing trust would demonstrate the strongest positive correlation with apparent sincerity. Although this finding was statistically significant (r = .13, p < .05), developing trust did not demonstrate the strongest positive correlation with apparent sincerity; it had higher correlations with the rest of the political skill dimensions. Thus, this hypothesis was not supported. Hypothesis 2d suggested that cultivating charismatic influence would demonstrate the strongest positive correlation with interpersonal influence. The findings were consistent with this hypothesis (r = .14, p < .05).

Table 6 presents the correlations between socio-affective competence and the organizational criterion variables. Hypothesis 8a purported that socio-affective competence would demonstrate significant positive prediction of self-ratings of job performance. The regression analysis supported this hypothesis (R^2 = .07, $F(1, 246)$ = 17.70, p, < .01). Hypothesis 8b suggested that socio-affective competence would demonstrate significant positive prediction of peer-ratings of job performance. The

results indicated that socio-affective competence was found to account for a portion of the variance in peer-ratings of job performance (R^2 = .04, F(1, 168) = 7.23, p, < .01).

Table 6

Criterion-Related Validity Correlation Matrix.

	1	2	3	4	5	6
1. Socio-Affective Competence	**(.76)**					
2. Job Performance	.26**	**(.84)**				
3. Peer Ratings of Job Performance	.20**	.32**	**(.86)**			
4. Interpersonal Relationship Behaviors	.28**	.28**	.22**	**(.87)**		
5. Peer Ratings of Interpersonal Relationship Behaviors	.29**	.35**	.35**	.50**	**(.85)**	
6. Peer Ratings of Organizational Citizenship Behaviors	.23**	.34**	.12	.33**	.46**	**(.87)**

**Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Hypothesis 10a purported that socio-affective competence would predict self-ratings of interpersonal relationship behaviors. The regression analysis indicated that the socio-affective competence total score accounted for a significant portion of the variance in the self-ratings of interpersonal relationship behaviors (R^2 = .08, F(1, 246) = 21.58, p, < .01). Hypothesis 10b predicted that socio-affective competence would predict peer-ratings of interpersonal relationship behaviors. The findings provided support for this hypothesis (R^2 = .08, F(1, 168) = 14.56, p, < .01). Lastly, Hypothesis 11 suggested that socio-affective competence would demonstrate significant positive prediction of peer-ratings of contextual performance. The results of the regression analysis supported this hypothesis (R^2 = .05, F(1, 168) = 9.28, p, < .01).

Study 2: Discussion

Results from Study 2 provided preliminary support for the predictive validity of the socio-affective competence construct. The SAC-SJT demonstrated significant positive prediction of each of the criterion variables for both the target employees and their working peers. Specifically, the results indicated that the SAC-SJT is an effective predictor of self-ratings of job performance and interpersonal relationships behaviors. Additionally, the test scores also showed significant findings for predicting peer-ratings of job performance, interpersonal relationship behaviors, and contextual performance. Overall, these findings indicated that socio-affective competence may be an important skill set for employees to develop in organizational settings.

Although the findings regarding the criterion-related validity of the SAC-SJT were promising, results concerning the relationship between socio-affective competence and political skill were less compelling. Consistent with the results from Study 1, the socio-affective competence total score was significantly related to political skill. However, some of the results between the socio-affective competency areas and the political skill dimensions were not supported. Specifically, establishing rapport was not related to networking ability, which could have occurred for several reasons. For example, Stewart and Cash (2000) viewed rapport building as a relational skill that occurs between two individuals. However, Ferris et al. (2005) suggested that networking ability involves using a wide range of diverse networks to accomplish personal and/or organizational goals. Although there are certain elements that overlap between these

constructs, this may have been one explanation for the findings. Another possibility is that the scenarios used for establishing rapport in the SAC-SJT did not accurately reflect the conceptual definition of this area.

Results for developing trust were also puzzling. Similar to results from Study 1, this competency was significantly related to apparent sincerity; however, it was also positively related to all of the other political skill dimensions. Conceptually speaking, this outcome could have occurred because the use of trust is required across all the political skill dimensions. For example, trust is needed when networking with others because an individual must appear honest and sincere when forming alliances with other parties. Additionally, developing trust is needed for interpersonal influence because an individual must form a caring and supportive relationship with others before he/she is able to influence their behaviors in a positive and productive manner. However, these findings may also indicate that new scenarios need to be written for the developing trust competency area of the SAC-SJT.

Despite the nonsignificant results between some of the individual competency areas and political skill dimensions, the overall findings of Study 2 provide additional support for socio-affective competence and its use as an interpersonal relationship construct in organizational settings. Although additional research will be needed to explore relationships between socio-affective competence and other organizational criterion variables, the research reported here provided a compelling foundation for the theoretical model and its assessment instrument.

General Discussion

The research presented here provided initial support for the theoretical model of socio-affective competence and its associated skill sets: establishing rapport, promoting acceptance of differences, developing trust, and cultivating charismatic influence. Results from Study 1 outlined the variables that were related and unrelated to socio-affective competence and established the construct's nomological network. The findings of Study 2 provided insight into the criterion-related validity of the SAC-SJT. Together, these findings indicated that: a) socio-affective competence was positively related to (but did not have high overlap with) political skill and EI; b) the construct was significantly related to some of the dispositional personality variables in the Five-Factor Model; and c) The SAC-SJT was an effective predictor of self-rated and peer-rated job performance, interpersonal relationship behaviors, and contextual performance.

Although many of the findings provided support for the socio-affective competence construct, there were some discrepancies with regard to the model's relationship with political skill. In both studies, some of the socio-affective competencies did not demonstrate the strongest positive correlations with their political skill counterparts. For example, developing trust was positively related to all of the political skill dimensions in Study 1 and Study 2. This finding may be caused by conceptual links between trust and interpersonal relationships. However, it appears more likely that the findings reflect an empirical issue with the SAC-SJT. Specifically, new developing trust scenario stems should be written that focus exclusively on that competency area.

Additionally, factor analysis could be used to determine if developing trust stands as its own area or should be incorporated into one of the other competencies.

The findings regarding establishing rapport and promoting acceptance of differences were also puzzling. For example, in Study 1, establishing rapport demonstrated the strongest positive correlation with networking ability, but these findings were not replicated in Study 2. Similarly, in Study 1, promoting acceptance of differences did not demonstrate the strongest positive correlation with social astuteness; however, in Study 2, this hypothesis was supported. This provides further indication that additional work may be needed on the SAC-SJT. Specifically, situations for each of the competency areas may need to rewritten and factor analytic work will be needed to address issues of dimensionality.

Study 1 also provided initial support for the different variables related and unrelated to socio-affective competence. The convergent results regarding EI, agreeableness, and extraversion were in the expected direction and were all statistically significant. Additionally, the discriminant results regarding neuroticism and Machiavellianism (although not significant) were in the expected direction. It is also important to note that socio-affective competence was not related to conscientiousness and openness to experience, which provided additional discriminant validity support for the construct. Future research should continue to examine the variables that are related and unrelated to socio-affective competence. For example, counterproductive work behaviors (CWB) – acts that violate organizational norms and may be harmful to organizational members (Robinson & Bennett, 1995) should be negatively related to socio-affective competence. As Fox, Spector, and Miles (2001) noted, interpersonal

forms of CWB can include political deviance, sabotage, or personal aggression. These forms of CWB would appear to conflict with the socio-affective competencies and effective interpersonal relationships at work. Therefore, this would be an interesting area to explore and could provide additional insight into the socio-affective competence nomological network.

Results from both studies supported the predictive validity of the SAC-SJT on job performance. This suggests that those who are able to develop and maintain positive relationships with their colleagues and/or coworkers are more likely to be effective in their job roles. This finding is also relevant for work that is conducted in teams. Specifically, as teamwork becomes more prevalent in many organizations, the ability to develop working relationships and successfully interact with others will continue to remain important. Additionally, the significant findings for peer-ratings of job performance in Study 2 implied that those high in socio-affective competence are viewed by others as being effective on the job. This suggests that an employee's relational behaviors are viewed by others as being related to their overall performance in the workplace.

The findings from Study 1 and Study 2 also indicated that socio-affective competence is predictive of interpersonal relationship behaviors and contextual performance. Results from both studies illustrated that those higher in each of the socio-affective competency areas are more likely to effectively interact with other organizational members. These types of people may even enjoy the various steps (e.g., rapport building, developing trust) involved in developing relationships with others, and therefore, seek out opportunities to engage their coworkers. The peer-ratings in Study 2

also suggested that those high on the socio-affective competence skill set are viewed by others as being more helpful, caring, and supportive in the workplace. Additionally, the results revealed that others view those high on socio-affective competence as possessing the skills necessary for effective interpersonal interaction in the work environment.

Implications for Leadership and Executive Development

The research and findings presented here provide a compelling case for the importance of socio-affective competence at the senior management and executive leadership levels of any organization. The use of effective interpersonal skills (e.g., promoting acceptance of differences, cultivating charismatic influence) are critical to the success of any leader because of the considerable amount of time these individuals spend interacting with others. Additionally, the daily interactions that exist between an individual and his/her organization, team, or subordinates revolves around the management of relationships. For example, possessing the ability to create a high degree of affinity with followers allows a leader to influence them in a positive and efficient manner. Similarly, promoting diversity issues and valuing the opinions of individuals with different beliefs fosters an environment of support and encourages the development of innovative solutions to organizational issues. Thus, individuals that are currently in key leadership roles and/or those that are identified as high potentials should be exposed to each of the socio-affective competencies.

In many of today's organizations, senior leaders invest a considerable amount of time and money in high potential development. Specifically, those individuals that have been identified as "star employees" are typically monitored and given challenging assignments to grow, develop, and excel. Additionally, a substantial amount of mentoring

and developmental opportunities are provided to these individuals. One area that is critical to this process is the manner in which these individuals interact with others. As Green (1999) noted, many competency-based leadership programs spend a noticeable amount of time on the development of interpersonal skills (e.g., conflict resolution, negotiation, stress-tolerance, emotion regulation, self-awareness). Therefore, the socio-affective competence construct could be used as part of a training program for high potential development in organizations.

A socio-affective competence training program would be helpful to many organizations because it would provide a concrete, competency-based approach to the development of interpersonal relationship skills. Additionally, this type of developmental opportunity would allow organizational members to work on building their skills in each of the four areas instead of focusing on global dispositional factors or interpersonal traits. For example, discussing diversity issues with a heterogeneous group or taking part in exercises that involve understanding others' perspectives would be more beneficial to high potential employees than learning about the differences between extraverted and introverted personality types.

This type of program would also be useful in determining how effective and influential high potential employees are when they interact with others. However, in order to determine the effectiveness of the socio-affective competence training program, specific evaluation criteria would need to be developed (Arthur, Bennett, Edens, & Bell, 2003). One metric that could be used to determine the whether program participants have acquired the socio-affective competencies would be the SAC-SJT. This assessment could be given prior to the training program to demonstrate an employee's current level of skill

in each of the competency areas or it could be administered after the training to determine the degree to which the skill-sets were retained.

Another area in which the socio-affective competence model would be applicable is executive coaching. Many organizations spend millions of dollars each year to hire coaches for their senior talent (Peltier, 2001). Typically, the coaching engagement begins with an assessment followed by a development plan. Next, the coach meets periodically with the target executive to discuss progress on the plan, identify problems that must be resolved, and provide feedback to critical issues facing the employee. In many instances, the coaching often revolves around interpersonal conflicts or relationships between the executive and other organizational members (Fairley & Stout, 2004).

Incorporating the model of socio-affective competence into the coaching dynamic may provide additional assistance in determining how an individual is interacting with others. For example, if the target executive has difficulties forming initial relationships with clients or other senior organizational members, some of the coaching sessions should focus on establishing rapport. Likewise, if the senior executive has problems opening up to the perspectives of other individuals, coaching on promoting acceptance of differences would be warranted. Organizations that are able to provide coaching to their senior executives in each of the socio-affective competency areas should be able to improve the interpersonal skills of these individuals and allow them to be more influential with their followers.

Limitations

Although the results from Study 1 and Study 2 provided consistent support for the socio-affective competence construct and the SAC-SJT, there were several limitations

associated with this research. First, the sample of SME research experts used to develop the scoring key for the SAC-SJT was relatively small (N = 40). Had more experts completed the SJT, it may have provided additional information regarding the most likely and least likely responses to each scenario. However, it is important to note that small sample sizes have been used in the development of other SJT scoring keys for interpersonal relationship constructs. For example, the MSCEIT was validated on an expert sample of 21 individuals from the International Society for Research on Emotions (Mayer et al., 2002).

One alternative approach that could be used instead of the expert ratings would be a consensus scoring methodology. Here, the scores for an individual would be compared to an on-going database of accumulated scores from all test takers. If the individual's scores were consistent with those from the database, he/she would receive a high score on the SAC-SJT. Although this approach might be suitable for some assessments, SJTs have typically used SME samples to develop scoring keys (Weekly et al., 2006). A solution to this issue might involve using both approaches and then correlating the scores to determine if the two groups are in agreement.

Another study limitation concerns the method in which the data were collected in both studies. Although efforts were made to recruit as diverse of a sample as possible, convenience samples were used. However, it should be noted that this approach to data collection is often used in the social sciences. Additionally, the target population for Study 2 was much larger (N = 3,000) and represented individuals from a variety of industries and organizations. This provided a much better opportunity to explore the SAC-SJT and its relationship to other variables. In the future, research efforts should be

directed at continuing to use diverse samples of working individuals in order to provide additional support for the socio-affective competence construct and the SAC-SJT.

A third limitation of the study involved some of the assessment scales that were used in Study 1. For example, the Wong and Law (2002) EI scale is a self-report measurement and although it correlated with the SAC-SJT, there are other instruments in the research literature that might have provided a more accurate reflection of the relationship between socio-affective competence and EI. One example of this type of instrument is the MSCEIT. This EI assessment is a SJT that measures the four-branch model of EI that was developed by Mayer et al. (2002). Had the MSCEIT been used in this research, additional insight may have been provided in terms of how the two SJTs related to one another. However, there are two reasons why the MSCEIT was not incorporated into the present research. First, the MSCEIT is an assessment that is on the commercial market and must be paid for prior to administration. The standard cost of administering 15 tests via the internet is approximately $155.00. Thus, it was not feasible to include the MSCEIT in research that was not being funded. Second, the MSCEIT takes approximately 45 minutes to an hour to complete. Additionally, the SAC-SJT takes about 25 to 30 minutes to complete. It would have been very difficult to administer both assessments simultaneously and expect them to be completed by non-paid research participants. However, one area for future research might be to conduct a study that focuses on the relationship between these two instruments.

A fourth limitation of the present study is that research on the dynamics of interpersonal relationships in the workplace is fairly new. Thus, a new scale (e.g., interpersonal relationship behaviors) had to be developed as part of this study to

determine the criterion-related validity of the SAC-SJT on interpersonal interactions in the work environment. Although the reliability coefficients were high for both self and peer-ratings and the scale showed evidence of unidimensionality, some could argue that the scale overlapped with the political skill inventory. For example, a number of items on the political skill inventory (e.g., I know a lot of important people and am well connected; it is easy for me to develop good rapport with most people) were very similar to items on the interpersonal relationship behaviors inventory (e.g., my first response when I meet new people is to be genuinely interested in them; I enjoy developing close and harmonious relationships with those I meet in the workplace). In fact, the correlations between the two measures in both studies were fairly high (i.e., greater than .35). Therefore, in future research, efforts should be made to make sure the interpersonal relationship behaviors scale is distinct from other instruments measuring relational factors.

One final limitation is related to the manner in which respondents complete items on SJTs. Specifically, many participants may select responses that do not reflect their actual beliefs. Additionally, since SJTs measure thinking and decision making rather than how an individual would actually behave in a given situation, it is difficult to determine if the respondent's reactions would be different in a real world experience. Another related issue, is that since many of the SAC-SJT items dealt with sensitive subject matters (e.g., racial issues, religious beliefs, sexual preferences), many participants could have selected responses that were socially appropriate. Although there is the possibility that these factors could have affected the test scores, the overall positive findings between the SAC-SJT scores and job performance, interpersonal relationship behaviors, contextual

performance, and other personality/social effectiveness constructs supports continued research using the SAC-SJT.

Future Research

Many of the promising findings from the present study indicated that future research is warranted on the theoretical model of socio-affective competence and the SAC-SJT. In particular, there are several areas that future research efforts should be directed. First, there should be additional research conducted on the criterion-related validity of the SAC-SJT. Specifically, collecting supervisor ratings or 360-degree reports of job performance and interpersonal relationship behaviors would provide another valuable source of information regarding one's relational skills. This would also be important for the SAC-SJT to be used in developmental initiatives in organizational settings. For example, feedback from supervisors concerning individuals' interpersonal skills could be used as a catalyst for implementing company-wide socio-affective competency training programs. Additionally, as discussed above, the SAC-SJT could be used as a pre or post-test measure of interpersonal skills in order to determine the effectiveness of any interpersonal relationships training program.

A second area for future research concerns the continued expansion of the socio-affective competence nomological network. The findings presented above provided a starting point for determining the constructs relationship to other variables. However, future research should be directed at determining if other variables are related and unrelated to the model. For example, constructs such as organizational-based self-esteem (Pierce, Gardner, Cummings, & Dunham, 1988), self-monitoring (Snyder, 1987), empathy (Penner, Fritzsche, Craiger, & Freifeld, 1995), life satisfaction (Diener,

Emmons, Larsen, Griffin, 1985), core self-evaluations (Judge, Erez, Bono, & Thorseen, 2003), organizational commitment (Meyer &Allen, 1991), and work self-concept (Bandelli, Rohvana, Borman, & Kessler, 2007) would provide additional insight into construct-related validity of the socio-affective competence model.

Another area for future research is on the relationship between the SAC-SJT and general mental ability (GMA). In general, some of the criticisms of SJTs are that they have a high cognitive component and correlate considerably with GMA (Weekly & Ployhart, 2006). It would be important to determine if this relationship existed between cognitive ability and the SAC-SJT. One would think that there would be little overlap between the two areas because socio-affective competence focuses on interpersonal relationship skills while GMA is concerned with verbal and quantitative abilities. In fact, there have been moderate correlations (e.g., .20-.30) found between the MSCEIT and GMA. Since the MSCEIT is a SJT that focuses on aspects of interpersonal behaviors, it is possible that the SAC-SJT would share a similar relationship with cognitive ability. However, this is an empirical question that would have to be examined in further detail.

Lastly, future research is needed on the incremental validity of the socio-affective competence model over other social effectiveness constructs. For example, it would be important to determine if the competencies were related to certain criterion variables over and above the variance accounted for by political skill and EI. Having this information would provide support for the model's predictive validity and would indicate the degree to which it covers information that is not included by those two constructs. Additionally, it would be interesting to see if socio-affective competence provided incremental validity over and above GMA and personality variables. If the SAC-SJT did, one could make a

strong argument for incorporating the socio-affective competence model into training and development programs that typically focus on dispositional factors or cognitive decision making.

Conclusion

The research presented here provided preliminary support for the theoretical model of socio-affective competence and the SAC-SJT. The findings regarding the construct-related and criterion-related validities indicated that the model is associated with other social effectiveness constructs and that it is predictive of job performance, interpersonal relationship behaviors, and contextual performance. Research on interpersonal relationships is an exciting area within the field of I-O psychology. Specifically, many of the recent findings regarding political skill and EI suggest that interest in social effectiveness constructs will continue. The present development of the socio-affective competence model and its conceptual links to other interpersonal relationship constructs was an attempt to integrate the previous literature and provide an avenue for future research on improving interpersonal communication and enhancing the quality of relationships in the workplace. Although a strong theoretical foundation and thorough empirical approach has been used in the present studies, more research will be needed to determine the long-term sustainability of socio-affective competence.

References

Ahearn, 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.

Alderfer, C.P. (1972). *Existence, relatedness, growth: Human needs in organizational settings.* New York: Free Press Publishers.

Ammeter, A.P., Douglas, C., Ferris, G.R., & Goka, H. (2004). A social relationship conceptualization of trust and accountability in organizations. *Human Resource Management Review, 14,* 47-65.

Arad, S., Borman, W.C., & Pulakos, E.D. (1999). *Construct validation of a situational judgment test of adaptive behavior.* Paper presented at the 14th Annual Meeting of the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology, Atlanta, GA.

Argyris, C. (1962). *Interpersonal competence and organizational effectiveness.* Homewood, IL: Dorsey Publishing Company.

Arthur, W., Bennett, W., Edens, P.S., & Bell, S.T. (2003). Effectiveness of training in organizations: A meta-analysis of design and evaluation features. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 88*, 234-245.

Arvey, R.D., Bouchard, T.J., Segal, N.L., & Abraham, L.M. (1989). Job satisfaction: Environmental and genetic components. *Journal of Applied Psychology,74,* 187-192.

Ashkanasy, N.M., & Daus, C.S. (2005). Rumors of the death of emotional intelligence in organizational behavior are vastly exaggerated. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 26,* 441-452.

Avolio, B.J., & Gibbons, T.C. (1988). Developing transformational leaders: A lifespan approach. In J. A. Conger & R. N. Kanungo (Eds.), *Charismatic leadership* (pp. 276-308). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Avolio, B.J., & Bass, B.M. (2002). *Manual for the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (Form 5X).* Redwood City, CA: Mindgarden.

Avolio, B.J., Bass, B.M., & Jung, D. (1999). Reexamining the components of transformational and transactional leadership using the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire. *Journal of Occupational & Organizational Psychology, 7,* 441-462.

Bandelli, A.C., Dorio, J.M., Schmidt, G. (2007). *Development and Validation of the Emotional Competence Situational Judgment Test (SJT).* Paper presented at the 22nd Annual Meeting of the Society for Industrial Organizational Psychology, New York, New York.

Bandelli, A.C., Rohvana, S., Borman, W.C., & Kessler, S.R. (2007). *Self-Concept in the Workplace: Development and Validation of the Work Self-Concept Scale (WSCS).* Paper presented the 115th Annual Meeting of the American Psychological Association, San Francisco, CA.

Bar-On, R. (1988). *The development of a concept of psychological well-being.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Rhodes University, South Africa.

Bar-On, R. (1997). *Bar-On Emotional Quotient Inventory: Technical Manual (EQ-i).* Toronto, Canada: Multi-Health System.

Bar-On, R. (2005). The Bar-On model of emotional-social intelligence. In P. Fernandez-Berrocal and N. Extremera (Eds.), Special Issue on Emotional Intelligence. *Psicothema, 17,* 1-28.

Barney, J.B. (1991). Firm resources and sustained competitive advantage. *Journal of Management, 27,* 625-641.

Barney, J.B., Wright, M., & Ketchen, D.J. (1998). The resource-based view of the firm: Ten years after 1991. *Journal of Management, 27,* 625-641.

Barrick, M.R., Day, D.V., Lord, R.G., & Alexander, R.A. (1991). Assessing the utility of executive leadership. *Leadership Quarterly, 2,* 9-22.

Barrick, M.R., & Mount, M.K. (1991). The Big Five personality dimensions and job performance: A meta-analysis. *Personnel Psychology, 44,* 1-26.

Bass, B.M. (1998). *Transformational leadership: Individual, military, and educational impact.* Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum Publishers.

Bass, B.M., Avolio, B.J., Jung, D.I., & Berson, Y. (2003). Predicting unit performance by assessing transformational and transactional leadership. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 88(2),* 207-218.

Bateman, T.S., & Crant, J.M. (1993). The proactive component of organizational behavior. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 14,* 103-118.

Bauer, T.N., & Green, S.G. (1994). Leader-member exchange: Relationships with performance expectations and leader delegation at two points in time. Paper presented at the Academy of Management Meetings, Dallas, TX.

Becker, T.E. (2004). *Development and validation of a scenarios-based measure of employee integrity.* Paper presented at the 19th Annual Meeting of the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology, Chicago, IL.

Benet-Martinez, V., & John, O.P. (1998). *Los Cinco Grandes* across cultures and ethnic groups: Multitrait-multimethod analyses of the Big Five in Spanish and English. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 75,* 729-750.

Bergman, M.E., Drasgow, F., Donovan, M.A., & Juraska, S.E. (2003). *Scoring situational judgment tests.* Paper presented at the 18th Annual Meeting of the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology, Orlando, FL.

Berscheid, E. (1994). Interpersonal relationships. *Annual Review of Psychology, 45,* 79-129.

Bhattacharya, R., DeVinney, T.M., & Pillutla, M.M. (1998). A formal model of trust based on outcomes. *Academy of Management Review, 23(3),* 459-472.

Biga, A.M. (2007). Measuring diversity management skill: Development and validation of a situational judgment test: *Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation: University of South Florida.*

Bigley, G.A., & Pearce, J.L. (1998). Straining for shared meaning in organization science: Problems of trust and distrust. *Academy of Management Review, 23(3),* 405-421.

Blass, F.R., & Ferris, G.R. (2007). Leader reputation: The roles of mentoring, political skill, contextual learning, and adaptation. *Human Resource Management, 46,* 5-19.

Bono, J.E., & Anderson, M.H. (2005). The advice and influence networks of transformational leaders. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 90(6),* 1306-1314.

Borman, W.C., & Motowidlo, S.J. (1993). Expanding the criterion domain to include elements of contextual performance. In N. Schmitt & W.C. Borman (Eds.), *Personality Selection* (pp. 71-98). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Brief, A.P., & Motowidlo, S.J. (1986). Prosocial organizational behaviors. *Academy of Management Review, 10,* 710-725.

Brief, A.P., & Weiss, H.M. (2001). Organizational behavior: Affect in the workplace. *Annual Review of Psychology, 53,* 279-307.

Bromiley, P., & Cummings, L.L. (1995). Transaction costs in organizations with trust. In R. Bies, B. Sheppard, & R. Lewicki (Eds.), *Research on negotiations in organization* (pp. 219-247). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Brooks, M.E., & Highhouse, S. (2006). Can good judgment be measured? In J.A. Weekly & R.E. Ployhart (Eds.), *Situational Judgment Tests: Theory, Measurement, and Application* (pp. 42-71). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.

Brown, D.J., & Keeping, L.M. (2005). Elaborating the construct of transformational leadership: The role of affect. *Leadership Quarterly, 16,* 245-272.

Brown, F.W., & Moshavi, D. (2005). Transformational leadership and emotional intelligence: A potential pathway for an increased understanding of interpersonal influence. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 26,* 867-871.

Cammann, C., Fichman, M., Jenkins, D., & Klesh, J. (1979). The Michigan Organizational Assessment Questionnaire. Unpublished Manuscript, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor.

Carlson, D.S., Kacmar, K.M., & Williams, L.J. (2000). Construction and initial validation of a multidimensional measure of work-family conflict. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 56,* 249-276.

Chan, D., & Schmitt, N. (2002). Situational judgment and job performance. *Human Performance, 25,* 185-199.

Chen, G., & Klimoski, R.J. (2003). The impact of expectations on newcomer performance in teams as mediated by work characteristics, social exchanges, and empowerment. *Academy of Management Journal, 46(5),* 591-607.

Chen, C.C., & Van Velsor, E. (1996). New directions for research and practice in diversity leadership. *Leadership Quarterly, 7(2),* 285-302.

Christie, R. (1970). Relationship between Machiavellianism and measures of ability, opinion, and personality. In R. Christie & F. Geis (Eds.), *Studies in Machiavellianism* (pp. 35 – 52). New York: Academic Press.

Christie, R., & Geis, F. (1970). *Studies in Machiavellianism*. New York: Academic Press.

Clevenger, J., Pereira, G.M., Wiechmann, D., Schmitt, N., & Harvey, V.S. (2001). Incremental validity of situational judgment tests. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 86,* 410-417.

Conger, J.A. (1989). *The charismatic leader; Behind the mystique of exceptional leadership.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Conger, J.A. (1999). Charismatic and transformational leadership in organizations: An insider's perspective on these developing streams of research. *Leadership Quarterly, 10,* 145-179.

Conger, J.A., & Kanungo, R.N. (1987). Toward a behavioral theory of charismatic leadership in organizational settings. *Academy of Management Review, 12,* 637-647.

Conger, J.A., & Kanungo, R.N. (1998). *Charismatic leadership in organizations.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publishing Inc.

Conte, J.M. (2005). A review and critique of emotional intelligence measures. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 26,* 433-440).

Costa, P.T, Jr. (1996). Work and personality: Use of the NEO-PI-R in industrial-organizational psychology. *Applied Psychology: An International Review, 45(3),* 225-241.

Costa, P.T., Jr., & McCrae, R.R. (1997). Longitudinal stability of adult personality. In R. Hogan, J. Johnson, & S. Briggs (Eds.), *Handbook of personality psychology* (pp. 269-290). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.

Costa, P.T., Jr., McCrae, R.R., & Kay, G.G. (1995). Persons, places, and personality: Career assessment using the Revised NEO Personality Inventory. *Journal of Career Assessment, 3,* 123-139.

Cox, T., Lobel, S., & McLeod, P.L. (1991). Effects of ethnic group cultural differences on cooperative and competitive behavior on a group task. *Academy of Management Journal, 34,* 827-847.

Das, T.K., & Teng, B.S. (1998). Between trust and control: Developing confidence in partner cooperation in alliances. *Academy of Management Review, 23(3),* 491-512.

Daus, C.S., & Ashkanasy, N.M. (2005). The case for the ability-based model of emotional intelligence in organizational behavior. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 26,* 453-467.

Day, D.V., & Cram, E.C. (1992). The role of affect and ability in initial exchange quality perceptions. *Group & Organization Management, 17, 380-397.*

De Cremer, D., & Knippenberg, D. (2005). Cooperation as a function of leader self-sacrifice, trust, and identification. *Leadership and Organization Development, 26(5),* 355-369.

De Hough, A.H.B., Den Hartog, D.N., & Koopman, P.L. (2005). Linking the Big Five-Factors of personality to charismatic and transactional leadership; perceived dynamic work environment as a moderator. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 26,* 839-865.

Deluga, R.J. (2001). American presidential Machiavellianism: Implications for charismatic leadership and rated performance. *Leadership Quarterly, 12,* 339 – 363.

Deluga, R.J., & Perry, J.T. (1991). The relationship of subordinate upward influencing behavior, satisfaction and perceived superior effectiveness with Leader-Member Exchanges, *Journal of Occupational Psychology, 64, 239-252.*

Deutsch, M. (1958). Trust and suspicion. *Journal of Conflict Resolution, 2,* 265-279.

Diener, E., Emmons, R., Larsen, J., Griffin, S. (1985). The Satisfaction With Life Scale. *Journal of Personality Assessment,* 49(1), 71-75.

Dirks, K.T., & Ferrin, D.L. (2001). The role of trust in organizational settings. *Organizational Science, 12(4),* 450-467.

DiTomaso, N., & Hooijberg, R. (1996). Diversity and the demands of leadership. *Leadership Quarterly, 7(2),* 163-187.

Doney, P.M., Cannon, J.P., & Mullen, M.R. (1998). Understanding the influence of national culture on the development of trust. *Academy of Management Review, 23(3),* 601-623.

Earley, P.C., & Mosakowski, E. (2000). Creating hybrid team cultures: An empirical test of transnational team functioning. *Academy of Management Journal, 43,* 26-49.

Elangovan, A.R., Shapiro, D.L. (1998). Betrayal of trust in organizations. *Academy of Management Review, 23(3),* 547-566.

Epitropaki, O., & Martin, R. (2005a). From ideal to real: A longitudinal study of the role of implicit leadership theories on leader—member exchanges and employee outcomes. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 90(4),* 659-676.

Epitropaki, O., & Martin, R. (2005b). The moderation role of individual differences in the relation between transformational/transactional leadership perceptions and organizational identification. *Leadership Quarterly, 16,* 569-589.

Fairley, S.G., & Stout, C.E. (2004). *Getting started in personal and executive coaching: How to create a thriving coaching practice.* Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons.

Ferris, G.R., Anthony, W.P., Kolodinsky, R.W., Gilmore, D.C., & Harvey, M.G. (2002). Development of political skill. In C. Wankel & R. DeFillippi (Eds.), *Research in managerial education and development, Volume 1: Rethinking management education for the 21st century:* 3-25. Greenwich, CT: Information Age Publishing.

Ferris, G.R., Berkson, H.M., Kaplan, D.M., Gilmore, D.C., Buckley, M.R., & Hochwarter, W.A. (1999). *Development and initial validation of the political skill inventory*. Paper presented at the 59th Annual Meeting of the Academy of Management, Chicago, IL.

Ferris, G.R., Davidson, S.L., & Perrewe, P.L. (2006). *Political skill at work: Impact on work effectiveness.* Mountain View, CA: Davies-Black Publishing.

Ferris, G.R., Perrewe, P.L., Anthony, W.P., & Gilmore, D.C. (2000). Political skill at work. *Organizational Dynamics, 28(4),* 25-37.

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, 30(1),* 126-152.

File, Q.W. (1945). The measurement of supervisor quality in industry. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 29,* 323-337.

Ford, M.E., & Tisak, M.S. (1983). A further search for social intelligence. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 75,* 196-206.

Fox, S., Spector, P.E., & Miles, D. (2001). Counterproductive work behavior (CWB) in response to job stressors and organizational justice: Some mediator and moderator tests for autonomy and emotions. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 59(3),* 291-309.

French, J.R.P., Jr., & Raven, B.H. (1959). The bases of social power. In D. Cartwright (Ed.), *Studies in social power* (pp. 150-167). Ann Arbor, MI: Institute for Social Research.

Furnham, A., Forte, L., & Cotter, T. (1998). Personality and intelligence. *Personality and Individual Differences, 24,* 187-192.

Gable, M., & Dangello, F. (1994). Locus of control, Machiavellianism, and managerial job performance. *Journal of Psychology, 128(5),* 599 – 608.

George, J.M., & Brief, A.P. (1992). Feeling good—doing good: A conceptual analysis of the mood at work-organizational spontaneity relationship. *Psychological Bulletin, 112,* 310-329.

Gerstner, C.R., & Day, D.V. (1997). Meta-analytic review of leader-member exchange theory: Correlates and construct issues. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 82,* 827–844.

Gillespie, M.A., Oswald, F.L., Schmitt, N., Manheim, L., & Kim, B.H. (2002). *Construct validation of a situational judgment test of college student success.* Paper presented at the 17th Annual Meeting of the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology, Toronto, CA.

Goleman, D. (1995). *Emotional intelligence.* New York: Bantam Books.

Goleman, D., & Boyatzis, R. (2001). *Emotional competence inventory—University edition.* Boston, MA: Hay Group, Inc.

Golembiewski, R., & McConkie, M. (1975). The centrality of interpersonal trust in group process. In C.L. Cooper (Ed.), *Theories of group process* (pp. 131-185). New York: Wiley Publishers.

Gowing, M. K. (2001). Measurement of individual emotional competence. In C. Cherniss & D. Goleman (Eds.), *The emotionally intelligent workplace: How to select for, measure, and improve emotional intelligence in individuals, groups, and organizations* (pp. 83-131). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Graen, G., Cashman, J.F., Ginsburgh, S., & Schiemann, W. (1977). Effects of linking-pin quality upon the quality of working life lower participants: A longitudinal investigation of the managerial understructure. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 22,* 491-504.

Graen, G., & Ginsburgh, S. (1977). Job resignation as a function of role orientation and leader acceptance: A longitudinal investigation of organizational assimilation. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 19,* 1-17.

Graen, G. B., & Uhl-Bien, M. (1995). Relationship-based approach to leadership: Development of leader-member exchange (LMX) theory of leadership over 25 years: Applying a multi-level multi-domain perspective. *Leadership Quarterly, 6,* 219–247.

Graham, J.W. (1986). *Organizational citizenship informed by political theory.* Paper presented at the Meeting of the Academy of Management, Chicago, IL.

Green, P. C. (1999). *Building robust competencies: Linking human resource systems to organizational strategies.* New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Hackman, J.R., & Morris, C.G. (1975). Group tasks, group interaction process, and group performance effectiveness: A review and proposed integration. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (Vol. 8, pp. 45-99). New York: Academic Press.

Hackman, J.R., & Oldham, G.R. (1976). Motivation through the design of work: Test of a theory. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 16,* 270-279.

Hall, D.T., & Parker, V.A. (1993). The role of workplace flexibility in managing diversity. *Organizational Dynamics, 16,* 5-18.

Hanson, M.A., Horgen, K.E., & Borman, W.C. (1998). *Situational judgment tests as measures of knowledge/expertise.* Paper presented at the 13th Annual Meeting of the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology, Dallas, TX.

Harris, K. J., Kacmar, K. M., & Witt, L. A. (2005). An examination of the curvilinear relationship between leader-member exchange and intent to turnover. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 26,* 363–378.

Hoffman, L.R. (1959). Homogeneity of member personality and its effects on group problem-solving. *Journal of Abnormal & Social Psychology, 58,* 27-32.

Hogan, R., Curphy, G., & Hogan, J. (1994). What we know about leadership effectiveness and personality. *American Psychologist, 49,* 493-504.

Holmes, J.G., & Rempel, J.K. (1989). Trust in close relationships. In C. Hendrick (Ed.), *Close relationships* (pp. 187-220). Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publishing.

House, R.J. (1977). A 1976 theory of charismatic leadership. In J. G. Hunt & L. L. Larson (Eds.), *Leadership: The cutting edge* (pp. 189-207). Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.

Humphrey, R.H. (2002). The many faces of emotional leadership. *The Leadership Quarterly, 13,* 493-504.

Hunter, D.R. (2003). Measuring general aviation pilot judgment using a situational judgment technique. *International Journal of Aviation Psychology, 13,* 373-386.

Hwang, P., & Burgers, W. (1997). Properties of trust: An analytical view. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 69,* 67-73.

Jehn, K., & Shah, P. (1997). Interpersonal relationships and task performance: An examination of mediating processes in friendship and acquaintance groups. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 72,* 775-790.

Jex, S.M. (2002). *Organizational psychology: A scientist-practitioner approach*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.

John, O.P., Donahue, E.M., & Kentle, R.L. (1991). *The Big Five Inventory—Version 4a and 54.* Berkeley, CA: University of California, Berkeley, Institute of Personality and Social Research.

Jones, G.R., & George, J.M. (1998). The experience and evolution of trust: Implications for cooperation and teamwork. *Academy of Management Review, 23(3),* 531-546.

Jordan, P.J., Ashkanasy, N.M., Hartel, C.E.J., & Hooper, G.S. (2002). Workgroup emotional intelligence: Scale development and relationship to team process effectiveness and goal focus. *Human Resources Management Review, 12,* 195-214.

Judge, T.A., Erez, A., Bono, J.E., & Thorseen, C.J. (2003). The Core-Self-Evaluations Scale (CSES): Development of a measure. *Personnel Psychology, 56,* 303–331.

Judge, T.A., Thoresen, C.J., Bono, J.E., Patton, G.K. (2001). The job satisfaction-job performance relationship: A qualitative and quantitative review. *Psychological Bulletin, 127, (3),* 376-407.

Karl, K.A. (2000). Trust and betrayal in the workplace: Building effective relationships in your organization. *Academy of Management Executive, 14,* 133-135.

Karney, B.R., & Bradbury, T.N. (1995). The longitudinal course of martial quality and stability: A review of theory, method, and research. *Psychological Bulletin, 118,* 3-34.

Keller, R.T. (1989). A test of the path—goal theory of leadership with need for clarity as a moderator in research and development organizations. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 74(2),* 208-212.

Kihlstrom, J.F., & Cantor, N. (2000). Social intelligence. In R.J. Sternberg (Ed.), *Handbook of intelligence*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Kim, B.H., Schmitt, N., Oswald, F.L., Gillespie, M.A., & Ramsay, L.J. (2003). *Job knowledge tests on the path to successful performance.* Paper presented at the 18th Annual Meeting of the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology, Orlando, FL.

Klimoski, R.J., & Karol, B.L. (1976). The impact of trust on creative problem solving groups. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 61,* 630-633.

Kochan, T., Berzukova, K., Ely, R., Jackson, S., Joshi, A., Jehn, K., Leonard, J., Levine, D., & Thomas, D. (2003). The effects of diversity on business performance: Report of the Diversity Research Network. *Human Resource Management, 42,* 3-21.

Kohnstamm, G.A., & Mervielde, I. (1998). Personality development. In A. Demetriou, W. Doise, & K.F.M. van Lieshout (Eds.), *Life-span developmental psychology* (pp. 399-445). London: Wiley Publishing.

Kolodinsky, R.W., Hochwarter, W.A., & Ferris, G.R. (2004). Nonlinearity in the relationship between political skill and work outcomes: Convergent evidence from three studies. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 65,* 294-308.

Kouzes, J.M., & Posner, B.Z. (2002). *The leadership challenge* (3rd ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Kramer, R. (1999). Trust and distrust in organizations: Emerging perspectives, enduring questions. *Annual Review of Psychology, 50,* 569-598.

Krokos, K.J., Meade, A.W., Cantwell, A.R., Pond, S.B., & Wilson, M.A. (2004). *Empirical keying in situational judgment tests: Rationale and some examples.* Paper presented at the 19th Annual Meeting of the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology, Chicago, IL.

Kurtzberg, T.R. (2005). Feeling creative, being creative: An empirical study of diversity and creativity in teams. *Creativity Research Journal, 17,* 51-65.

Landy, F.J. (2005). Some historical and scientific issues related to research on emotional intelligence. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 26,* 411-424.

Levine, E.L. (1976). *The joy of interviewing: A gourmet guide to employee selection.* Tempe, AZ: Personnel Services Organization.

Lewicki, R.J., McAllister, D.J., & Bies, R.J. (1998). Trust and distrust: New relationships and realities. *Academy of Management Review, 23,* 438-458.

Likert, R. (1967). *The Human Organization.* New York: McGraw-Hill Publishers.

Locke, E.A. (2005). Why emotional intelligence is an invalid concept. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 26,* 425-431.

Lopes, P.N., Cote, S., & Salovey, P. (2006). An ability model of emotional intelligence: Implications for assessment and training. In V.U. Druskat, F. Sala, & G. Mount (Eds.), *Linking emotional intelligence and performance at work: Current research evidence with individuals and groups*. (pp. 53-80). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Lopez, P.N., Salovey, P., Cote, S., & Beers, M. (2005). Emotion regulation abilities and the quality of social interaction. *Emotion, 5(1),* 113-118.

Lopez, P.N., Salovey, P. & Straus,R. (2003). Emotional intelligence, personality, and the perceived quality of social relationships. *Personality and Individual Differences, 35,* 641-658.

Lord, R.G., Foti, R.J., & DeVader, C.L. (1984). A test of leadership categorization theory. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 34,* 343-378.

Luthans, F., Hodgetts, R.M., & Rosenkrantz, S.A. (1988). *Real managers.* Cambridge, MA: Ballinger.

Lyons, J.B., & Schneider, T.R. (2005). The influence of emotional intelligence on performance. *Personality and Individual Differences, 39,* 693-703.

MacLane, C.N., Barton, M.G., Holloway-Lundy, A.E., & Nickles, B.J. (2001). *Keeping score: Expert weights on situational judgment responses.* Paper presented at the 16th Annual Meeting of the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology, San Diego, CA.

Mannix, E., & Neale, M.A. (2005). What differences makes a difference? The promise and reality of diverse teams in organizations. *Psychological Science in the Public Interest, 6,* 31-55.

Matthews, G., Roberts, R.D., & Zeidner, M. (2003). Development of emotional intelligence: A skeptical – but not dismissive – perspective. *Human Development, 46,* 109-114.

Matthews, G., Zeidner, M., & Roberts, R.D. (2002). *Emotional intelligence: Science and myth*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Mayer, J.D., Caruso, D.R., & Salovey, P. (1999). Emotional intelligence meets traditional standards for an intelligence. *Intelligence, 27,* 267-298.

Mayer, J.D., & Salovey, P. (1997). What is emotional intelligence. In P. Salovey, & D. Sluyter (Eds.), *Emotional development and emotional intelligence: Implications for educators* (pp. 3-31). New York: Basic Books.

Mayer, J.D., Salovey, P., & Caruso, D.R. (2000). Models of emotional intelligence. In R.J. Sternberg (Ed.), *Handbook of intelligence.* Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Mayer, J.D., Salovey, P., & Caruso, D.R. (2002). *Mayer—Salovey—Caruso Emotional Intelligence Test (MSCEIT).* Toronto, ON: MHS.

Mayer, J.D., Salovey, P., & Caruso, D.R. (2004). Emotional intelligence: Theory, findings, and implications. *Psychological Inquiry, 15(3),* 197-215.

Mayer, R.C., Davis, J.H., & Schoorman, F.D. (1995). An integrative model of organizational trust. *Academy of Management Review, 20,* 709-734.

McClatchey, V.R. (1929). A theoretical and statistical critique of the concept of social intelligence and of attempts to measure such a process. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 24,* 217-220.

McClelland, D.C. (1973). Testing for competence rather than intelligence. *American Psychologist, 28,* 1-14.

McCrae, R.R., & Costa, P.T. (1999). A five-factor theory of personality. In A. Pervin, & O.P. John (Eds.), *Handbook of personality* (pp. 139-153). New York: Gulford.

McDaniel, M.A., Morgenson, 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,* 103-113.

McDermott, I. & Jago, W. (2003). *The NLP coach: A comprehensive guide to personal well-being and professional success.* New York: Piatkus Books.

McGregor, D. (1967). *The Professional Manager.* New York: McGraw-Hill Publishers.

McKnight, D.H., Cummings, L.L., & Chervany, N.L. (1998). Initial trust formation in new organizational relationships. *Academy of Management Review, 23,* 473-490.

McLennan, J., & Omodei, M.M. (2000). Conceptualizing and measuring global interpersonal mistrust-trust. *Journal of Social Psychology, 140,* 279-294.

McLeod, P.L., Lobel, S.A., & Cox, T.H. (1996). Ethnic diversity and creativity in small groups. *Small Group Research, 27,* 248-264.

McMillan-Capehart, A. (2004). A configurational framework for diversity: Socialization and culture. *Personnel Review, 34(4),* 488-503.

Meyer, J. & Allen, N. (1991). A three component conceptualization of organizational commitment. *Human Resource Management Review, 1*, 61-89.

Meyerson, D., Weick, K., & Kramer, R. (1996). Swift trust and temporary groups. In R. Kramer & T. Tyler (Eds.), *Trust in organizations* (pp. 166-195). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Millliken, F., & Martins, L. (1996). Searching for common threads: Understanding the multiple effects of diversity in organizational settings. *Academy of Management Review, 21,* 402-433.

Mintzberg, H. (1985). The organization as a political arena. *Journal of Management Studies, 22,* 133-154.

Montag, I., & Levin, J. (1994). The five-factor personality model in applied settings. *European Journal of Personality, 8,* 1-11.

Motowidlo, S.J., Dunnette, M.D., & Carter, G.W. (1990). An alternative selection procedure: The low-fidelity simulation. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 75,* 640-747.

Motowidlo, S.J., Hanson, M.A., & Crafts, J.L. (1997). Low-fidelity simulations. In D.L. Whetzel & G.R. Wheaton (Eds.), *Applied Measurement Methods in Industrial Psychology* (pp. 241-260). Palo Alto, CA: Davies-Black Publishing.

Motowidlo, S.J., Hooper, A.C., & Jackson, H.L. (2006a). A theoretical basis for situational judgment tests. In J.A. Weekly & R.E. Ployhart (Eds.), *Situational Judgment Tests: Theory, Measurement, and Application* (pp. 97-132). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.

Motowidlo, S.J., Hooper, A.C., & Jackson, H.L. (2006b). Implicit policies about relations between personality traits and behavioral effectiveness in situational judgment items. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 91(4),* 749-761.

Mowry, H.M. (1957). A measure of supervisor quality. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 41,* 405-408.

Mudrack, P.E., & Mason, E.S. (1995). Extending the Machiavellianism construct: A brief measure and some unexplored relationships. *Journal of Social Behavior and Personality, 10,* 187-200.

Nemetz, P., & Christensen, S. (1996). The challenge of cultural diversity: Harnessing a diversity of views to understand multiculturalism. *Academy of Management Review, 21(2),* 434-462.

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

Organ, D.W. (1988). *Organizational citizenship behavior: The good soldier syndrome*. Lexington, MA: Lexington Publishing.

Organ, D.W. (1997). Organizational citizenship behavior: It's construct clean-up time. *Human performance, 10(2),* 85-97.

O'Sullivan, M., & Guilford, J.P. (1976). *Four factor test of social intelligence (behavioral cognition): Manual of instructions and interpretations.* Palo Alto: Sheridan Psychological Services.

Parkhe, A., Wasserman, S., & Ralston, D.A. (2006). New frontiers in network theory development. *Academy of Management Review, 31(3),* 560-568.

Paullin, C., & Hanson, M.A. (2001). *Comparing the validity of rationally-derived and empirically-derived scoring keys for a situational judgment inventory.* Paper presented at the 16th Annual Meeting of the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology, San Diego, CA.

Peller, L.H. (1996). Demographic diversity, conflict, and work group outcomes: An intervening process theory. *Organization Science, 7(6),* 615-631.

Peltier, B. (2001). *The psychology of executive coaching: Theory and application.* New York: Taylor & Francis Group Publishing.

Penner, L.A., Fritzsche, B.A., Craiger, J.P., & Freifeld, T.S. (1995). Measuring the prosocial personality. In J.N. Butcher & C.D. Spielberger (Eds.), *Advances in Personality Assessment* (Vol. 12). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum Publishers.

Perrewe, P.L., Ferris, G.R., Frink, D.D., & Anthony, W.P. (2000). Political skill: An antidote for workplace stressors. *Academy of Management Executive, 14,* 115-123.

Perrewe, P.L., Young, A.M., & Blass, F.R. (2002). Mentoring the political arena. In G.R. Ferris, M.R. Bucklet, & D.B. Fedor (Eds.), *Human Resources Management: Perspectives, Context, Functions, and Outcomes* (4th Ed.): 343-355. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Perrewe, P.L, Zellars, K.L., Rossi, A.M., Ferris, G.R., Kacmar, C.J., Liu, Y., Zinko, R., & Hochwarter, W.A (2005). Political skill: An antidote in the role overload—strain relationship. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 10(3),* 239-250.

Pervin, L.A., Cervone, D., & John, O.P. (2005). *Personality: Theory and research (9th Ed.)*. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Phillips, K.W., & Loyd, D.L. (2006). When surface and deep-level diversity collide: The effects on dissenting group members. *Organizational Behavior & Human Decision Processes, 99,* 143-160.

Pierce, J.L., Gardner, D.G., Cummings, L.L., & Dunham, R.B. (1988). Organization-based self esteem: Construct definition, measurement, and validation. *Academy of Management Journal, 32(3),* 622-648.

Pintner, R., & Upshall, C. (1928). Some results of social intelligence tests. *School and Society, 27,* 369-370.

Pfeffer, J. (1992). *Managing with power: Politics and influence in organizations.* Boston: Harvard Business School Press.

Ployhart, R.E., & Enrhart, M.G. (2003). Be careful what you ask for: Effects of response instructions on the construct validity and reliability of situational judgment tests. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment, 11,* 1-16.

Ployhart, R.E., Porr, W.B., & Ryan, A.M. (In Press). Developing situational judgment tests in a service context: Exploring an alternative methodology. *Journal of Applied Psychology.*

Pulakos, E.D., & Schmitt, N. (1996). An evaluation of two strategies for reducing adverse Impact and their effects on criterion-related validity. *Human Performance, 9,* 241-258.

Purvanova, R.K., Bono, J.E., & Dzieweczynski, J. (2006). Transformational leadership, job characteristics, and organizational citizenship performance. *Human Performance, 19(1),* 1-22.

Rahim, M.A., Psenicka, C. (2002). A model of emotional intelligence and conflict management strategies: A study in seven countries. *International Journal of Organizational Analysis, 10(4),* 302-326.

Reynolds, D.H., Winter, J.L., & Scott, D.R. (1999). *Development, validation, and translation of a professional-level situational judgment inventory.* Paper presented at the 14th Annual Meeting of the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology, Atlanta, GA.

Riccucci, N. (1997). Cultural diversity programs to prepare for workforce 2000: What's gone Wrong? *Public Personnel Management, 26(1),* 35-41.

Richard, O. (2000). Racial diversity, business strategy, and firm performance. *Academy of Management Journal, 43,* 164-177.

Robertson, I.T., & Kinder, A. (1993). Personality and job competences: The criterion-related validity of some personality variables. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 66,* 225-244.

Robinson, S.L., & Bennett, R.J. (1995). A typology of deviant workplace behaviors: A multidimensional scale study. *Academy of Management Journal, 38(2),* 555-572.

Robinson, G., & Dechant, K. (1997). Building a business case for diversity. *Academy of Management Executive, 11,* 21-31.

Romero, E.J. & Cruthirds, K.W. (2006). The use of humor in the workplace. *Academy of Management Perspectives, 20(2),* 58-69.

Ross, W.H., & Wieland, C. (1996). Effects of interpersonal trust and time pressure on managerial mediation strategy in a simulated organizational dispute. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 81(3),* 228-248.

Russell, C.J. (2001). A longitudinal study of top-level executive performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 86(4),* 560-573.

Sala, F. (2002). *Emotional Competence Inventory: Technical manual.* Philadelphia, PA: McClelland Center For Research, HayGroup.

Salovey, P., & Mayer, J.D. (1990). Emotional intelligence. *Imagination, Cognition, & Personality, 9,* 185-211.

Salovey, P., Mayer, J. D., & Caruso, D. (2002). The positive psychology of emotional intelligence. In C. R. Snyder & S. J. Lopez (Eds.), *Handbook of positive psychology* (pp. 159–171). New York: Oxford University Press.

Sawyer, J.E., Houlette, M.A., & Yeagley, E.L. (2006). Decision performance and diversity structure: Comparing faultlines in convergent, crosscut, and racially homogeneous groups. *Organizational Behavior & Human Decision Processes, 99,* 1-15.

Scandura, T.A., & Lankau, M.J. (1996). Developing diverse leaders: A leader-member exchange approach. *Leadership Quarterly, 7(2),* 243-263.

Scandura, T.A., & Schriesheim, C.A. (1994). Leader-member exchange and supervisor career mentoring as complementary concepts in leadership research. *Academy of Management Journal, 37,* 1588-1602.

Schmitt, N., & Chan, D. (2006). Situational judgment test: Method or construct? In J.A. Weekley & R.E. Ployhart (Eds.) *Situational judgment tests: Theory, measurement, and application*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Schneider, R.J., Ackerman, P.L., & Kanfer, R. (1996). To "act wisely in human relations:" Exploring the dimensions of social competence. *Personality and Individual Differences, 21,* 469-482.

Schneider, R.J., Roberts, R.D., & Heggestad, E.D. (2002). Exploring the structure and construct validity of a self-report social competence inventory. In L.M. Hough (Chair), *Compound traits: The next frontier of I-O personality research.* Symposium conducted at the 17th Annual Meeting of the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology, Toronto, Canada.

Schriesheim, C.A., Castro, S.L., & Cogliser, C.C. (1999). Leader—member exchange (LMX) research: A comprehensive review of theory, measurement, and data-analytic practices. *Leadership Quarterly, 10(1),* 63-113.

Schriesheim, C. A., & Hinkin, T.R., (1990). Influence tactics used by subordinates: A theoretical and empirical analysis and refinement of the Kipnis, Schmidt, and Wilkinson Subscales. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 75,* 246-257.

Schriesheim, C. A., Powers, K. J., Scandura, T. A., Gardiner, C. C., & Lankau, M. J. (1993). Improving construct measurement in management research: Comments and quantitative approach for assessing the theoretical content adequacy of paper-and-pencil survey-type instruments. *Journal of Management,* 19**,** 385–417.

Schriesheim, J.F., & Schriesheim, C.A. (1980). A test of the path—goal theory of leadership and some suggested directions for future research. *Personnel Psychology, 33,* 349-370.

Schutte, N.S., Malouff, J.M., Bobik, C., Coston, T.D., Greeson, C., Jedlicka, C., Rhodes, E.,& Wendorf, G. (2001). Emotional intelligence and interpersonal relations. *Journal of Social Psychology, 141(4),* 523-536.

Schutte, N.S., Malouff, J.M., Hall, L.E., Haggerty, D.J., Cooper, J.T., Golden, C.J., & Dornheim, L. (1998). Development and validation of a measure of emotional intelligence. *Personality and Individual Differences, 25,* 167-177.

Semadar, A., Robins, G., & Ferris, G.R. (2006). Comparing the validity of multiple social effectiveness constructs in the prediction of managerial job performance. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 27,* 443-461.

Simmel, G. (1978). *The Philosophy of Money.* Boston, MA: Routledge & Kegal Paul Publishers.

Sinar, E.F., Paquet, S.L., & Scott, D.R. (2002). *Internet versus paper selection tests: Exploring comparability issues.* Paper presented at the 17th Annual Meeting of the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology, Toronto, Canada.

Smith, J., & Barclay, D. (1997). The effects of organizational differences and trust on the effectiveness of selling partner relationships. *Journal of Marketing, 61,* 3-21.

Sosik, J.J., & Megerian, L.E. (1999). Understanding leader emotional intelligence and performance. *Group and Organizational Management, 24(3),* 367-390.

Snyder, M. (1987). *Public appearances, private realities: The psychology of self-monitoring.* New York: W.H. Freeman Publishers.

Snyder, R.A., & Bruning, N.S. (1985). Quality of vertical dyad linkages: Congruence of supervisor and subordinate competence and role stress as explanatory variables. *Group and Organizational Studies, 10,* 81-94.

Spector, P.E. (1985). Measurement of human service staff satisfaction: Development of job satisfaction survey. *American Journal of Community Psychology, 13,* 693-713.

Spreitzer, G.M., Perttula, K.H., & Xin, K. (2005). Traditionality matters: An examination of the effectiveness of transformational leadership in the United States and Taiwan. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 26,* 205-227.

Sternberg, R.J., Forsythe, G.B., Hedlund, J., Horvath, J.A., Wagner, R.K., Williams, W.M., Snook, S.A., & Grigorenko, E.L. (2000). *Practical intelligence in everyday life.* New York: Cambridge University Press.

Stevens, M.J., & Campion, M.A. (1994). The knowledge, skill, and ability requirements for teamwork: Implications for human resource management. *Journal of Management, 20,* 503-530.

Stevens, M.J., & Campion, M.A. (1999). Staffing work teams: Development and validation of a selection test for teamwork settings. *Journal of Management, 25,* 207-228.

Stewart, C.J., & Cash, W.B. (2000). *Interviewing principles and practices.* New York: McGraw-Hill Publishing.

Stinson, J.E., & Johnson, T.W. (1975). The path—goal theory of leadership: A partial test and suggested refinement. *Academy of Management Journal, 18,* 242-252.

Stogdill, R.M. (1948). Personal factors associated with leadership: A survey of the literature. *Journal of Psychology, 55,* 5-14.

Svensson, G., & Wood G. (2004). Corporate ethics and trust in intra-corporate relationships: An in-depth and longitudinal case description. *Employee Relations, 26(3),* 320-336.

Tajfel, H. (1982). Social psychology of intergroup relations. *Annual Review of Psychology, 33,* 1-39.

Thorndike, R.L. (1936). Factor analysis of social and abstract intelligence. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 12(3),* 124-127.

Thorndike, R.L., & Stein, S. (1937). An evaluation of the attempts to measure social intelligence. *Psychological Bulletin, 34,* 275-285.

Treadway, D.C., Hochwarter, W.A., Ferris, G.R., Kacmar, C.J., Douglas, C., Ammeter, A.P., & Buckley, M.R. (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.

Triandis, H., Kurowski, L., & Gelfand, M. (1993). Workplace diversity. In H. Triandis, M. Dunnette, & L. Houghs (Eds.), *Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology* (pp. 769-827). Palto Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.

Turner, J. (1985). Social categorization and the self concept: A social cognitive theory of group behavior. *Advances in group processes* (pp. 77-121). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Van Dyne, L., Cummings, L.L., & Parks, J.M. (1995). Extra role behaviors: In pursuit of construct and definitional clarity (a bridge over muddied waters). In L.L. Cummings & B.W. Staw (Eds.), *Research in Organizational Behavior* (Vol. 17, pp. 215-285). Greenwich, CT: JAI.

Van Rooy, D.L., Viswesvaran, C., & Pluta, P. (2005). An evaluation of construct validity: What is this thing called emotional intelligence? *Human Performance, 18(4),* 445-462.

Vecchio, R.P., & Gobdel, B.C. (1984). The vertical dyad linkage model of leadership: Problems and prospects. *Organization Behavior and Human Performance, 34,* 5-20.

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.

Watson, W., Kumar, K., & Michaelsen, L. (1993). Cultural diversity's impact on interaction processes and performance: Comparing homogeneous and diverse task groups. *Academy of Management Journal, 36,* 590-602.

Wayne, S.J., & Green, S.A. (1993). The effects of leader—member exchange on employee citizenship and impression management behavior. *Human Relations, 46,* 1431-1440.

Webber, S.S., & Donahue, L.M. (2001). Impact of highly and less job-related diversity on work group cohesion and performance: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Management, 27,* 141-162.

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

Weekly, J.A., & Ployhart, R.E. (2006). An introduction to situational judgment tests. In J.A. Weekly & R.E. Ployhart (Eds.), *Situational Judgment Tests: Theory, Measurement, and Application* (pp. 1-10). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.

Weekly, J.A., Ployhart, R.E., & Holtz, B.C. (2006). On the development of situational judgment tests: Issues in item development, scaling, and scoring. In J.A. Weekly & R.E. Ployhart (Eds.), *Situational Judgment Tests: Theory, Measurement, and Application* (pp. 160-200). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.

Whitener, E.M., Brodt, S.E., Korsgaard, M.A., & Werner, J.M. (1998). Managers as initiators of trust: An exchange relationship framework for understanding managerial trustworthy behavior. *Academy of Management Review, 23(3),* 513-530.

Williams, K., & O'Reilly, C. (1998). The complexity of diversity: A review of forty years of research. In B. Staw & R. Sutton (Eds.), *Research in organizational behavior* (pp. 77-140). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Williams, L.J., & Anderson, S.E. (1991). Job satisfaction and organizational commitment as predictors of organizational citizenship and in-role behaviors. *Journal of Management, 17,* 601-617.

Witt, L.A., & Ferris, G.A. (2003). Social skill as moderator of the conscientiousness—performance relationship: Convergent results across four studies. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 88(5),* 809-820.

Wright, P.M., & McMahan, G.C. (1992). Theoretical perspectives for strategic human resource management. *Journal of Management, 18,* 295-320.

Wong, C.S., & Law, K.S. (2002). The effects of leader and follower emotional intelligence on performance and attitude: An exploratory study. *The Leadership Quarterly, 13,* 243-274.

Yukl, G. (1994). *Leadership in organizations,* 3rd ed. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall Publishers.

Appendices

Appendix A: Socio-Affective Competence SJT Dimension Instructions

Establishing Rapport SJT Instructions

Definitions & Sample Items

The purpose of this study is to generate situations in which an individual must deal with problems related to and/or involving **empathy, understanding, and networking with others**. Using the following establishing rapport definitions and descriptions, think about an instance where an individual would be placed in a situation and need to **establish a relationship or set up a social network with others**. **Please write 8-10 situations that would involve establishing rapport with another individual.** The situations can come from real-life experiences or hypothetical circumstances an individual might encounter.

Establishing Rapport Dimension Definitions

I. A close and harmonious relationship in which there is common understanding.

II. Creating a feeling of sympathy and understanding; the start of a close emotional bond.

III. A feeling of sympathetic and mutual understanding and/or agreement between people.

IV. An emotional bond or friendly relationship between people based on mutual liking, trust, and a sense that they understand and share each other's concerns.

Important characteristics of good situations:

- It requires a response from an individual that has been placed in this scenario. The respondent will be asked "What would you do?" There are many possible ways that the issue could be addressed.
- It is challenging. Write about situations that are difficult and not everyone will know the answer.
- It is realistic. It may be something that happened to you, or you think it could happen.
- It provides sufficient detail. This is necessary to help the respondent make a choice between possible actions.

Appendix A (continued): Socio-Affective Competence SJT Dimension Instructions

Establishing Rapport SJT Instructions

Definitions & Sample Items

Scenario Examples:

1. You have just been assigned to work on a project with a coworker from another department that you have never met before. You will be working with this person for two months on the project. The project is highly important to the organization and is expected to bring in a substantial amount of revenue. You have heard different stories about this person and are not sure how they work with others. What would you do?

2. A female subordinate has been late to work repeatedly over the past week. You have warned her multiple times about consequences for her behavior. Until recently, she has been a great employee who produces excellent work. She comes to you and reveals that she has been having problems with her current daycare provider for her son, which has resulted in her tardiness. What would you do?

3. A long time friend of yours has recently asked to borrow a large sum of money from you. You know he has had financial difficulties in the past, but he has never let you down in your friendship. What would you do?

4. You are asked by your supervisor to give a speech in front of a black audience about the importance of diversity in the workplace. During the speech, some audience members make known their discontent with the company's past racial relations and question the sincerity of your organization. What would you do?

Promoting Acceptance of Differences SJT Instructions

Definitions & Sample Items

The purpose of this study is to generate situations in which an individual must deal with problems related to and/or involving **acceptance, diversity, and respect for others**. Using the following promoting acceptance of differences definitions and descriptions, think about an instance where an individual would be placed in a situation and need to be **accepting and respectful of others. Please write 8-10 situations that would involve the use of promoting acceptance of differences skills.** The situations can come from real-life experiences or hypothetical circumstances an individual might encounter.

Promoting Acceptance of Differences Dimension Definition

I. The tendency to tolerate, approve of, and have a favorable reception towards other people and/or situations that are different from what we are use to (Scandura & Lankau, 1996)

II. The recognition of another's abilities & potential contributions to a working relationship, a work unit, and the organization.

III. Acknowledging another's person sense of worth and/or value as a result of their unique cultural upbringings, experiences, education, and training.

IV. Respecting racial/ethnic, gender, cultural, disability, sexual orientation, and social differences in other individuals.

Important characteristics of good situations:

- It requires a response from an individual that has been placed in this scenario. The respondent will be asked "What would you do?" There are many possible ways that the issue could be addressed.
- It is challenging. Write about situations that are difficult and not everyone will know the answer.
- It is realistic. It may be something that happened to you, or you think it could happen.
- It provides sufficient detail. This is necessary to help the respondent make a choice between possible actions.

Appendix A (continued): Socio-Affective Competence SJT Dimension Instructions

Promoting Acceptance of Differences SJT Instructions

Definitions & Sample Items

Scenario Examples:

1. You have a new manager placed on your team. The company has recently made some public announcements about a "push for diversity." The new manager is a Black male and some of your co-workers have privately questioned his competence. What would you do?

2. A female subordinate has been late to work repeatedly over the past week. You have warned her multiple times about consequences for her behavior. Until recently, she has been a great employee who produces excellent work. She comes to you and reveals that she has been having problems with her current daycare provider for her son, which has resulted in her tardiness. What would you do?

3. A co-worker in your group comes to you and says that they have been diagnosed with bi-polar and might need to take some time off from work. Several co-workers notice the employee's sudden absence and raise concerns. What would you do?

4. You are asked by your supervisor to give a speech in front of a black audience about the importance of diversity in the workplace. During the speech, some audience members make known their discontent with the company's past racial relations and question the sincerity of your organization. What would you do?

Developing Trust SJT Instructions

Definitions & Sample Items

The purpose of this study is to generate situations in which an individual must deal with problems related to and/or involving the **development of trust and/or trusting other individuals**. Using the following developing trust definitions and descriptions, think about an instance where an individual would be placed in a situation and need to **develop a trusting relationship with another individual or group of people**. **Please write 8-10 situations that would involve the use of trusting another person.** The situations can come from real-life experiences or hypothetical circumstances an individual might encounter.

Developing Trust Dimension Definitions

I. Willingness of a party to be vulnerable to the actions of another party based on the expectations that the other will perform a particular action important to the trustor, irrespective of the ability to monitor or control that other party (Mayer, Davis, & Schoorman, 1995).

II. An expectation or belief that actions from another party will be motivated by good intentions.

III. A psychological state comprising the intention to accept vulnerability based upon positive expectations of the intentions or behavior of another.

IV. A commitment to an action based on a belief that the future actions of that person will lead to a good outcome.

Important characteristics of good situations:

- It requires a response from an individual that has been placed in this scenario. The respondent will be asked "What would you do?" There are many possible ways that the issue could be addressed.
- It is challenging. Write about situations that are difficult and not everyone will know the answer.
- It is realistic. It may be something that happened to you, or you think it could happen.
- It provides sufficient detail. This is necessary to help the respondent make a choice between possible actions.

Appendix A (continued): Socio-Affective Competence SJT Dimension Instructions

Developing Trust SJT Instructions

Definitions & Sample Items

Scenario Examples:

1. You have just been assigned to work on a project with a coworker from another department that you have never met before. You will be working with this person for two months on the project. The project is highly important to the organization and is expected to bring in a substantial amount of revenue. You have heard different stories about this person and are not sure how they work with others. What would you do?

2. A female subordinate has been late to work repeatedly over the past week. You have warned her multiple times about consequences for her behavior. Until recently, she has been a great employee who produces excellent work. She comes to you and reveals that she has been having problems with her current daycare provider for her son, which has resulted in her tardiness. What would you do?

3. A long time friend of yours has recently asked to borrow a large sum of money from you. You know he has had financial difficulties in the past, but he has never let you down in your friendship. What would you do?

4. You are asked by your supervisor to give a speech in front of a black audience about the importance of diversity in the workplace. During the speech, some audience members make known their discontent with the company's past racial relations and question the sincerity of your organization. What would you do?

Cultivating Charismatic Influence SJT Instructions

Definitions & Sample Items

The purpose of this study is to generate situations in which an individual must deal with problems related to and/or involving **leadership and influence**. Using the following definitions and descriptions, think about an instance where an individual would be placed in a situation and need to use his/her **charismatic influence skills**. **Please write 8-10 situations that would involve the use of cultivating charismatic influence skills.** The situations can come from real-life experiences or hypothetical circumstances an individual in a leadership position might encounter.

Cultivating Charismatic Influence Dimension Definitions

I. Use of non-coercive influence to direct & coordinate the activities of the members of an organized group toward the accomplishment of group objectives (Scandura & Lankau, 1996)

II. The function of knowing yourself, having a vision that is well communicated, building trust among colleagues, and taking effective action to realize your own leadership potential (Bennis, 1997)

III. The process whereby one individual influences other group members toward the attainment of defined group & organizational goals (Greenberg & Baron, 2003)

IV. An inspiring process focused on the attainment of a vision/ goals and objectives through influencing others to do their best (Rice University Leadership Development Program, 2005)

Important characteristics of good situations:

- It requires a response from an individual that has been placed in this scenario. The respondent will be asked "What would you do?" There are many possible ways that the issue could be addressed.
- It is challenging. Write about situations that are difficult; not everyone will know the answer.
- It is realistic. It may be something that happened to you, or you think it could happen.
- It provides sufficient detail. This is necessary to help the respondent make a choice between possible actions.

Appendix A (continued): Socio-Affective Competence SJT Dimension Instructions

Cultivating Charismatic Influence SJT Instructions

Definitions & Sample Items

Scenario Examples:

1. You are the captain of your soccer team. Your team is down two goals in the state championship game. Just before the half one of your best player's goes down with an injury. The team's morale is low during halftime. What would you do?

2. A female subordinate has been late to work repeatedly over the past week. You have warned her multiple times about consequences for her behavior. Until recently, she has been a great employee who produces excellent work. She comes to you and reveals that she has been having problems with her current daycare provider for her son, which has resulted in her tardiness. What would you do?

3. As an assistant manager, you notice that Sally has been leaving work at 5:15pm but has been recording 5:30pm on her time sheet. Sally is your top performer, but the department manager is a stickler for punctuality and accurate time keeping. He has fired another associate for falsifying his time sheet. What would you do?

4. You are the new manager of a team that has one team member who is technically brilliant but is often abrupt, abrasive, and rude with fellow team members. Others are beginning to complain about the associate's interpersonal skills. What would you do?

Appendix B: Ferris et al. (2005) Political Skill Inventory

Political Skill Inventory (PSI)

Dimensions & Associated Items

Social Astuteness

1. I always seem to instinctively know the right thing to say or do to influence others.
2. I have good intuition or "savvy" about how to present myself to others.
3. I am particularly good at sensing the motivations and hidden agendas of others.
4. I pay close attention to people's facial expressions.
5. I understand people very well.

Interpersonal Influence

6. It is easy for me to develop good rapport with most people.
7. I am able to make most people feel comfortable and at ease around me.
8. I am able to communicate easily and effectively with others.
9. I am good at getting people to like me.

Networking Ability

10. I spend a lot of time and effort at work networking with others.
11. At work, I know a lot of important people and am well connected.
12. I am good at using my connections and networks to make things happen at work.
13. I have developed a large network of colleagues and associates at work who I can call on for support when I really need to get things done.
14. I spend a lot of time at work developing connections with others.
15. I am good at building relationships with influential people at work.

Apparent Sincerity

16. It is important that people believe I am sincere in what I say and do.
17. I try to show a genuine interest in other people.
18. When communicating with others, I try to be genuine in what I say and do.

Note: All items are measured on a 7-point Likert scale from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (7).

Appendix C: Wong & Law (2002) Emotional Intelligence Scale

Emotional Intelligence (EI) Scale

Dimensions & Associated Items
Self-Emotion Appraisal
1. I have a good sense of why I have certain feelings most of the time.
2. I have a good understanding of my own emotions.
3. I really understand what I feel.
4. I always know whether or not I am happy.
Others' Emotion Appraisal
5. I always know my friends' emotions from their behavior.
6. I am a good observer of others' emotions.
7. I am sensitive to the feelings and emotions of others.
8. I have a good understanding of the emotions of people around me.
Use of Emotions
9. I always set goals for myself and then try my best to achieve them.
10. I always tell myself I am a competent person.
11. I am a self-motivated person.
12. I would always encourage myself to try my best.
Regulation of Emotion
13. I am able to control my temper and handle difficulties rationally.
14. I am quite capable of controlling my own emotions.
15. I can always calm down quickly when I am very angry.
16. I have good control of my own emotions.

Note: All items are measured on a 7-point Likert scale from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (7).

Appendix D: John et al. (2005) Big Five Inventory

Big Five Inventory (BFI)

Dimensions & Associated Items

Here are a number of characteristics that may or may not apply to you. For example, do you agree that you are someone who *likes to spend time with others?* Please write a number next to each statement to indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with that statement.

I See Myself as Someone Who . . .

Extraversion

1. Is talkative.
2. Is reserved.*
3. Is full of energy.
4. Generates a lot of enthusiasm.
5. Tends to be quiet.*
6. Has an assertive personality.
7. Is sometimes shy, inhibited.*
8. Is outgoing, sociable.

Agreeableness

9. Tends to find fault with others.*
10. Is helpful and unselfish with others.
11. Starts quarrels with others.*
12. Has a forgiving nature.
13. Is generally trusting.
14. Can be cold and aloof.*
15. Is considerate and kind to almost everyone.
16. Is sometimes rude to others.*
17. Likes to cooperate with others.

Conscientiousness

18. Does a thorough job.
19. Can be somewhat careless.*
20. Is a reliable workers.
21. Tends to be disorganized.*
22. Tends to be lazy.*
23. Perseveres until the task is finished.
24. Does things efficiently.
25. Makes plans and follows through with them.
26. Is easily distracted.*

Appendix D (continued): John et al. (2005) Big Five Inventory

Big Five Inventory (BFI)

Dimensions & Associated Items

Here are a number of characteristics that may or may not apply to you. For example, do you agree that you are someone who *likes to spend time with others?* Please write a number next to each statement to indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with that statement.

I See Myself as Someone Who . . .

Neuroticism

27. Is depressed, blue.
28. Is relaxed, handles stress well.*
29. Can be tense.
30. Worries a lot.
31. Is emotionally stable, not easily upset.*
32. Can be moody.
33. Remains calm in tense situations.*
34. Gets nervous easily.

Openness to Experience

35. Is original, comes up with new ideas.
36. Is curious about many different things.
37. Is ingenious, a deep thinker.
38. Has an active imagination.
39. Is inventive.
40. Values artistic, aesthetic experiences.
41. Prefers work that is routine.*
42. Likes to reflect, play with ideas.
43. Has a few artistic interests.*
44. Is sophisticated in art, music, or literature.

Note: All items are measured on a 5-point Likert scale from disagree strongly (1) to agree strongly (5).
* Indicates items that are reverse-coded.

Appendix E: Christie & Geis (1970) Mach IV Scale

Mach IV Scale

Scale Items
1. The best way to handle people is to tell them what they want to hear.
2. When you ask someone to do something for you, it is best to give the real reasons for wanting it rather than giving reasons which might carry more weight.*
3. Anyone who completely trusts anyone else is asking for trouble.
4. It is hard to get ahead without cutting corners here and there.
5. Honesty is the best policy in all cases.*
6. It is safest to assume that all people have a vicious streak and it will come out when they are given a chance.
7. Never tell anyone the real reason you did something unless it is useful to do so.
8. One should take action only when sure it is morally right.*
9. It is wise to flatter important people.
10. All in all, it is better to be humble and honest than important and dishonest.*
11. Barnum was very wrong when he said there's a sucker born every minute.
12. People suffering from incurable diseases should have the choice of being put painlessly to death.
13. It is possible to be good in all respects.*
14. Most people are basically good and kind.*
15. There is no excuse for lying to someone else.*
16. Most men forget more easily the death of their father than the loss of their property.
17. Most people who get ahead in the world lead clean, moral lives.*
18. Generally speaking, men will not work hard unless they are forced to do so.
19. The biggest difference between most criminals and other people is that criminals are stupid enough to get caught.
20. Most men are brave.*

Note: All items are measured on a 7-point Likert scale from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (7).
* Indicates items that are reverse-coded.

Appendix F: Williams & Anderson (1991) Job Performance

Task Performance

Scale Items
I See Myself as Someone Who(se) . . .
1. Adequately completes assigned duties.
2. Fulfills responsibilities specified in my job description.
3. Performs tasks that are expected of me.
4. Meets formal performance requirements of the job.
5. Engages in activities that will directly affect my performance.
6. Neglects aspects of the job that I am obligated to perform.*
7. Fails to perform essential duties.*

Note: All items are measured on a 7-point Likert scale from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (7).
* Indicates items that are reverse-coded.

Appendix G: Cammann et al. (1979) Job Satisfaction Scale

Job Satisfaction Scale

Scale Items
1. In general, I do not like my job.*
2. All in all, I am satisfied with my job.
3. In general, I like working at my job.

Note: All items are measured on a 7-point Likert scale from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (7).
* Indicates items that are reverse-coded.

Appendix H: Bandelli (2008) Interpersonal Relationship Behaviors

Interpersonal Relationship Behaviors

Scale Items
1. My first response when I meet new people is to be genuinely interested in them.
2. I enjoy developing close and harmonious relationships with those I meet in the workplace.
3. I believe it is important to be well connected with others and develop large social networks at work.
4. I have a favorable opinion of people who are different (e.g., race, gender, religion) from me in the workplace.
5. When at work, I respect the racial, ethnic, and cultural differences of my colleagues and coworkers.
6. I believe that people with different backgrounds and upbringings can contribute value to my organization.
7. My friends and coworkers know they can depend on me to keep my word.
8. Even when people make mistakes, I continue to trust and support them.
9. I believe most people have good intentions and will not violate my trust.
10. I truly value the people I work with as people – not just as the "human capital" needed to produce results.
11. Because I care about my coworkers, I actively support their efforts to accomplish important personal goals.
12. It is important to communicate a shared vision that inspires my coworkers to perform at their best.

Note: All items are measured on a 7-point Likert scale from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (7).

Appendix I: Williams & Anderson (1991) Organizational Citizenship Behaviors Scale

Organizational Citizenship Behaviors

Dimensions & Associated Items
I See Myself as Someone Who(se) . . .
OCB-Individual
1. Helps others who have been absent.
2. Helps others who have heavy work loads.
3. Assists supervisor with his/her work (when not asked).
4. Takes time to listen to co-workers' problems and worries.
5. Goes out of the way to help new employees.
6. Takes a personal interest in other employees.
7. Passes along information to co-workers.
OCB-Organization
8. Attendance at work is above the norm.
9. Gives advance notice when unable to come to work.
10. Takes undeserved work breaks.*
11. Spends a great deal of time with personal phone conversations.*
12. Complains about insignificant things at work.*
13. Conserves and protects organizational property.
14. Adheres to informal rules devised to maintain order.
15. Defends the organization when other employees or outsiders criticize it.
16. Actively promotes the organization's products and services to potential users.

Note: All items are measured on a 7-point Likert scale from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (7).
* Indicates items that are reverse-coded.

About the Author

Adam C. Bandelli received a Bachelor's degree in Psychology from Fairleigh Dickinson University in 2003 and a M.A. in Industrial-Organizational Psychology from Fairleigh Dickinson University in 2004. Since his senior honor's thesis, he has conducted research in the area of interpersonal relationships with an emphasis on the social and emotional skills related to organizational effectiveness. He entered the industrial-organizational doctoral program at the University of South Florida in the fall of 2004. While working on his degree, he provided consulting services to a number of organizations in the areas of leadership assessment, organizational development, and emotions in the workplace. His work at RHR International Company focuses on executive and organizational development with CEOs, senior leadership teams, and high potential employees. He is accomplished in talent management, executive assessment and selection, coaching, team development, cultural integration and executive education.