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ABSTRACT

Many researchers within the organizational sciences have considered the influence of personality and learned behavior differences between individuals, and some have given thought to how the political landscape of the organization shapes employee competencies. However, few have examined how personality and learned behaviors, which both have a broader domain than the organizational setting, influence the development of political skill within the organization. In addition, although some have found that political skill influences the individual’s stress process, little attention has been given to how that takes place. The present study assessed how specific personality traits and learned behaviors differentially predict dimensions of political skill. Moreover, it investigated the role that political skill has in the stress process.

The findings indicated that although personality characteristics had several relationships with learned behaviors (i.e., Reactive Responding) and political skill, there was little mediation of the personality-political skill relationship by learned behaviors. In addition, the results suggested that two dimensions of self-reported political skill (i.e., Interpersonal Influence and Networking Ability) play a role in the stressor-strain relationship and that supervisor-rated political skill (i.e., Networking Ability) has a direct impact on job performance. The implications from these results are that personality appears to have mostly direct influences on learned behaviors and political skill and that political skill plays several roles in the stressor-strain-behavior process.
CHAPTER 1
OVERVIEW OF RESEARCH STUDY

Within the organizational sciences, many researchers have implicitly or explicitly examined how to predict employee’s success in the workplace. For example, some have proposed that general mental ability, due to its strong association with job performance (e.g., Schmidt & Hunter, 1998), is a strong predictor of adjustment to organizational life. Others have suggested that constructs such as contextual performance are predictive of success in the workplace (e.g., Van Scotter, Motowidlo, & Cross, 2000).

Many researchers have contended that personality traits and characteristics are important predictors of work-related performance (e.g., Barrick & Mount, 2005; Barrick, Mount, & Judge, 2001). Some have called for the use of personality traits as predictors of outcomes relative to the bandwidth of each, matching narrow outcomes with narrow predictors and broad criteria with broad personality characteristics (e.g., Murphy & Dziewczynski, 2005; Ones & Viswesvaran, 1996). Others have gone further, arguing that personality predictors need to not only match the bandwidth of the criterion, but also be relevant (i.e., clear conceptual relationship) to the outcome (i.e., Schneider, Hough, & Dunnette, 1996) or take into consideration situational characteristics (i.e., Hough & Oswald, 2005).

Finally, another group of researchers have proposed that social cognitive predictors of work success merit consideration. The results of some studies suggest that self-efficacy is a strong predictor of performance in an organization (e.g., Bartol, Durham, & Poon, 2001; Saks, 1995). However, one recent study found that the contribution of self-efficacy to predictions of work-related performance was small when compared to that of broad-based personality characteristics (Judge, Jackson, Shaw, Scott, & Rich, 2007). Although these results support the contention that personality constructs can be predictors of success in the organizational setting, they do not close the door to other social cognitive predictors of workplace performance.

Trait and social cognitive personality researchers have long been at odds with one another (Cervone, 1999; Funder, 2001), but a more complete understanding of personality theory allows each to play an important role in the prediction of organizational criteria. Specifically, a system for understanding personality has been proposed that places traits in one level of personality and social cognitive predictors in another level (McAdams, 1995; McAdams & Pals, 2006). This conceptualization allows both sets of predictors to harmoniously coexist in one model and implies that traits have some influence on social cognitive constructs (Graziano, Jensen-Campbell, & Finch, 1997). Specifically, one domain in which social-cognitive competencies have begun to receive attention from organizational researchers is workplace politics, but few have considered the personality traits that influence political competencies.

In looking carefully at organizational phenomena, it has been noted that politics often plays a role in organizational decision making (e.g., Ferris, Russ, & Fandt, 1989; Mintzberg, 1983; Pfeffer, 1992). Both practitioner literature and research based studies have tracked the importance of politics in organizations (e.g., McIntyre, 2005; Perrewé, Ferris, Frink, & Anthony, 2000). For example, one study (i.e., Ng, Eby, Sorenson, & Feldman, 2005) found that not only was hard work related to subjective and objective success, but organizational sponsorship (e.g., career sponsorship and supervisor support) was also associated with success.

The results of another study (i.e., Forret & Dougherty, 2004) demonstrated that some networking behaviors were related to objective and subjective career outcomes. Specifically, the authors found that enhancing internal visibility, being active in professional activities, and
maintaining external contacts were important to success; however, socializing was only marginally important to career success (Forret & Dougherty, 2004). In addition, the flatter, more flexible, and interconnected structure of many organizations (Cascio, 1995) pushes employees into a stressful environment where interpersonal networking becomes essential to gaining promotions and salary increases (Forret & Sullivan, 2002). These environmental changes also create the opportunity for self-regulatory skills to play an important role in adjustment to organizational life.

The present study will consider the role of both personality traits and self-regulatory characteristics in predicting aspects of political skill—the ability to understand coworkers and influence them in ways that advance one’s goals. Although political skill has been demonstrated to be an important multidimensional construct in the prediction of performance in the organizational setting (Blickle, Kramer, Mierke, Meurs, & Ferris, 2007; Ferris et al., 2005; Jawahar, Meurs, Ferris, & Hochwarter, in press; Semadar, Robins, & Ferris, 2006), little research attention has been given to predictors of political skill, and none to differential and competitive prediction of the dimensions of political skill. Similarly, although political skill has been demonstrated to reduce strain for employees (Perrewé et al., 2004), no researchers have attended to how political skill reduces strain or modifies behavior, nor to what dimensions of political skill play the most substantial role in the stress process. Therefore, the present study also will examine how political skill affects the stress process (stressor\rightarrow strain\rightarrow behavior).

In addressing these limitations of our current understanding, I will utilize facets of a recently developed broad-based model of personality traits, the HEXACO model (Ashton, Lee, Perugini et al., 2004), in the prediction of political skill dimensions. The HEXACO has been demonstrated to address aspects of personality traits beyond the more traditional Five Factor Model (FFM or Big Five) (Ashton & Lee, 2005; Ashton, Lee, & Goldberg, 2004). Proactive Personality also has demonstrated associations with political skill (Liu et al., In Press), and will be included in the model of personality trait predictors of political skill.

In addition, one set of learned behaviors also will be hypothesized as predictors of political skill. Recently, some researchers have noted that organizational scholars often perform research with the intent of benefiting either the organizational managers (i.e., finding ways to smooth the process of human interaction) or the organizational sciences (i.e., finding ways to uncover unique phenomena), rather than the research participant (i.e., Wright & Wright, 1999; Wright & Wright, 2002). However, many within organizational research are transitioning to a perspective that is concerned about employee health, well-being, and adjustment to organizational life (see Quick, Quick, Nelson, & Hurrell, 1997; Wright & Cropanzano, 2000, for review).

In line with a participant-focused perspective, the present study will introduce a concept into the organizational sciences that is intended to measure the effect of exposure to low socio-economic status (SES) environments during youth, namely Reactive Responding. Generally, low SES environments have been linked to poorer health and well-being and increased conflict (Adler & Ostrove, 1999; Schuster, Kessler, & Aseltine, 1990), because of the chronic, environmental stressors experienced by those low in SES (see Repetti, Taylor, & Seeman, 2002). These persistent stressors lead to self-regulatory deficiencies for many (Taylor, 1998; Taylor & Seeman, 1999).

However, the present study hypothesizes that for those who have developed certain personality traits, exposure to these stressors is not as harmful to their later adjustment to organizational life (as measured via political skill). Although widely researched by those outside
of the organizational sciences, few within organizational research have considered the impact of SES on organizationally-based constructs, other than as a control variable. Furthermore, the present study provides an initial attempt at examining how SES indirectly influences the individual’s adjustment to organizational life via the construct of Reactive Responding.

Finally, although some have studied how social support influences the stress process (e.g., Carlson & Perrewé, 1999), and research has demonstrated that political skill can play an important role in the stress reactions (e.g., Perrewé et al., 2004), no research has demonstrated how being politically skilled influences the stress process. The present study will examine what role political skill plays in the stress process. Further, it will consider which dimension of political skill will have the greatest impact in the experience of stress. A conceptual model of the relationships discussed in the present research is provided in Figure 1.
CHAPTER 2
LITERATURE REVIEW

Overview of Chapter
This chapter begins with an overview of two dramatically different, but complementary, theories of stress. The first theory, the Cognitive Activation Theory of Stress (CATS), provides an explanation of the process of the stress experience for the individual. I also review a theory, Conservation of Resources (COR), that elucidates the content relevant to stressful experiences.

After reviewing these two stress theories, I provide a thorough discussion of personality research, as it relates to the present study. First, I discuss the framing of the Five Factor Model (FFM or Big Five), relative to both higher order factors and lower order facets of personality. Then, I review each dimension of the Big Five, consider the advantages of using narrow traits in personality research, and examine the trait of Proactive Personality. The following section discusses how personality taxonomies (e.g., the FFM) are developed, and offers a recently developed replacement for the FFM by the HEXACO model. The HEXACO model of personality is reviewed, and an additional dimension of personality traits not included in the Big Five is examined, namely Honesty-Humility. Prior to considering the importance of social cognitive characteristics (i.e., learned behaviors and political skill), a theory for understanding the roles of traits and social cognitive characteristics in personality research is elaborated.

One particular set of learned behaviors, Reactive Responding, is utilized in this research, and it is proposed to be a self-regulatory deficiency induced by the experience of living in a low SES environment. After a brief review of self-regulation, I describe SES’s relation to health and the different ways that many researchers have attempted to explain the relationship between these seemingly distal concepts. Many of these proposed avenues for the SES-health and well-being relationship are brought together in a concept termed Reactive Responding. After reviewing Reactive Responding and its dimensions, I proceed to a discussion of political skill. Political skill is a particular type of social capital resource available to the individual. Therefore, social capital theory is analyzed, and, then, an overview of political skill is presented, and each of its dimensions is examined. I finish this first section of the paper with hypotheses concerning relationships between personality traits, learned behaviors, and political skill dimensions. These hypotheses are presented in Figure 2.

In the final section of this chapter, I consider how political skill influences the stress process. First, I review evidence linking political skill to two potential relationships in the stress process (as an antecedent or a moderator). I then suggest an explanation for these divergent findings and I discuss research that appears to support the contention that one political skill dimension would have a stronger influence in the stress process than the others. At the conclusion of the chapter, these hypotheses are given, and they are displayed in Figure 3.

Stress and Organizational Behavior
Workplace stress has long been an important topic to researchers for many years (Selye, 1955), including those within organizational research (e.g., Averill, 1973; Folkman & Lazarus, 1980; Karasek, 1979; Miller, 1979, 1980; Selye, 1955; Selye, 1974). A variety of theories have been proposed to explain the what, how, why, and when of the individual stress process. Most prominent among these theories are the Job Demands-Job Control Theory (Karasek, 1979, 1990), Appraisal Theory (Lazarus & Folkman, 1984), Conservation of Resources Theory (Hobfoll, 1989), Effort-Reward Imbalance Theory (Siegrist, 1996; Siegrist, Peter, Junge,
Cremer, & Seidel, 1990), and the Cognitive Activation Theory of Stress (Ursin & Eriksen, 2004).

A useful categorization of these theories could be formed on the basis of how each explains the content (i.e., what and why) and/or the process (i.e., how and when) of an individual’s stress experience. Although some theories (e.g., Effort-Reward Imbalance Theory) attempt to explain both the content and the process of stress experiences, the current study is framed by having one theory explain the process of stress for the individual (i.e., Cognitive Activation Theory of Stress), and another theory elaborate the content of stressful experiences (i.e., Conservation of Resources Theory) as it pertains to the workplace behaviors and outcomes in this study.

**Cognitive Activation Theory of Stress**

Sokolov’s (1963) model of orienting responses and habituation was significant to the development of cognitive theory and control theory in neuroscience. The model proposed that neurophysiological activation (i.e., orienting responses) occurs when a person encounters a disparity between what was expected and what actually happened. Whereas, when the mismatch does not occur (i.e., habituation), there is no response to the stimulus and no need for an orientation.

The Cognitive Activation Theory of Stress (CATS) (Ursin & Eriksen, 2004) can be thought of as an extension of the Sokolov model (Ursin, 2005), contending that “orientation” is an alarm (i.e., increase in arousal) that takes place whenever there is a discrepancy between what is expected and what occurs. Consequently, the expectancy of an outcome of an event becomes paramount. If the person has control and expects a desired outcome, then the “alarm system” will not be activated (i.e., stressors will not be felt, psychologically or physiologically). However, if the future is unpredictable, and/or an individual does not have the necessary resources to handle the demands, then the alarm is activated.

CATS proposes four components of the stress process (Ursin & Eriksen, 2004). The first part is the stress stimuli (i.e., stressors). It is argued that it is not the physical characteristics of a stimulus that makes it a stressor (Levine & Ursin, 1991), but a person’s appraisal based on previous experience and expectations that translates a situation into a stressor. Second in the stress process is the stress experience. The third part is the individual’s general response (“alarm”) to the stress experience, including an increase in wakefulness and arousal, and a specific response to handle the cause of the alarm. The final component of the process is the person’s experience of the stress response, where feedback is given to the brain and the stimulus, or the perception of it is changed by acts or expectancies.

The expectancies both of the outcome and of the responses available to the individual determine the level of the alarm, corresponding to classical conditioning and instrumental conditioning in learning theory (Eriksen, Murison, Pensgaard, & Ursin, 2005). These two expectancies are the primary source for the individual differences in the response to the stress experience, and can vary according to the acquisition strength (e.g., whether learning will occur, how strong it will be, how often the event is occurring, etc…), the perceived probability (i.e., control), and the affective value (i.e., whether the expected outcome is attractive, aversive, or neutral) (Ursin & Eriksen, 2004). CATS argues that a positive outcome expectancy is the definition of coping, and it results in low arousal. The stimulus expectancy can be distorted through psychological defense mechanisms, and the outcome expectancy can be changed via the appraisal of available responses. The expected outcomes from response can be either positive, negative, or none, each equating to coping, hopelessness, and helplessness, respectively.
Critical to an understanding of CATS is that a person’s health is only threatened by sustained and high arousal levels, particularly when there is no foreseen solution to the problem (Eriksen et al., 2005; Ursin & Eriksen, 2004). Repeated brief exposure to stressors may be of some concern (McEwen, 1998), particularly when there is no expectation of being able to control them. However, in the short-term, activating the alarm is both necessary and healthy. When individuals are able to cope with a difficult task, there is a short-lasting arousal (Ursin, Baade, & Levine, 1978), but the arousal pattern does not appear to put strain on the person (e.g., Arnetz, 1996; Ursin & Eriksen, 2004).

Activation is not only a physiological phenomenon, but also a psychological one as well. The cognitive component of the theory stems from the presence of persistent negative thoughts and expectancies (Eriksen et al., 2005). However, as noted by Brosschot, Pieper, and Thayer (2005), CATS theory does not specify the mechanism that leads to the negative expectancy being prolonged. The authors proposed a concept called Perseverative Cognition which they defined as, “The repeated or chronic activation of the cognitive representation of stress-related content” (Brosschot et al., 2005, p. 1045). They argued that this mechanism can be seen in stressors of worry, rumination, and anticipatory stress, and it represents the final psychological conduit by which the stress experience affects the body’s systems by psychologically prolonging the stressor itself.

The critical pathogenic property of perseverative cognition is its duration and the inadequate autonomic and emotional regulation associated with it (Brosschot, Gerin, & Thayer, 2006). Brosschot and colleagues (Brosschot et al., 2006; Brosschot et al., 2005) documented a number of studies that demonstrated results which appear to support the effects of perseverative cognition. These studies included outcomes such as somatic disease and complaints, endocrine and immune responses, cardiac activity, blood pressure, and sleep. Recently, two other studies appear to provide stronger support for the Perseverative Cognition hypothesis. One study demonstrated the effects of daily worrying on somatic health complaints (Brosschot & VanDerDoef, 2006). Another found that daily worrying was related to higher heart rate and lower heart rate variability during both waking and sleeping periods, and that worrying mediated the effects of stressors on these two outcomes (Brosschot, VanDijk, & Thayer, 2007).

CATS (along with Perseverative Cognition) provides a thorough explanation for the stress process that is not out of line with early stress researchers. For instance, similar to CATS, Selye (1955) argued that the first stage in the stress process is the “alarm reaction”, and contended that not all stress necessarily should be avoided, making the distinction between eustress and distress (Selye, 1974). Just as CATS provides a profound account of the stress process with a little explanation of the why and what via Perseverative Cognition, Conservation of Resources Theory primarily supplies the what of the stress process, a conceptualization of the resources that can be utilized within the stress process with some elaboration on how they can be used.

Conservation of Resources Theory

Conservation of Resources Theory (COR) is predicated on the belief that individuals endeavor to retain, protect, and build resources, and that what is most threatening is the potential or actual loss of resources (Hobfoll, 1989). Resources can be objective or subjective and COR argues that negative outcomes (e.g., strain) are most likely to occur when there is an actual resource loss, a perceived threat of resource loss, a situation in which one's resources are perceived to be inadequate to meet work demands, or when the anticipated returns are not obtained on a resource investment (Hobfoll & Shirom, 2000). Further, Hobfoll (2001) argued
that events are stressful to the extent that demands outstrip resources. One of the primary purposes of resources is to nullify the effects of demands (Schaufeli & Bakker, 2004). As noted by Hobfoll (1989), the COR model specifies “what individuals will do when confronted with stress and when not confronted with stress” (p. 517).

According to COR theory (Hobfoll, 1989), there are four types of resources available to the individual. First, people have conditions that serve as resource, such as marriage, seniority, or tenure. Second, individuals have objects that are valuable because of their physical characteristics or rarity/expense. The third resource that people have at their disposal is personal characteristics, such as personality traits and skills. Finally, individuals have energies such as time, money, and knowledge that are available resources.

Although the COR model includes objective components and resources, the subjective appraisal by persons of their resources is also considered important. For instance, according to Hobfoll (1989), people can conserve their resources by reinterpreting a threat to resources as a challenge, much like the re-appraisal function of the appraisal model of stress (see Lazarus, 1993; Lazarus & Folkman, 1984). In fact, Hobfoll (1989) argued that many everyday stressors are amenable to subjective interpretations of their threat to resources.

Four clarifications of COR theory were made by Hobfoll and Shirom (2000). First, people need to retrieve and use resources to prevent the loss of resources. Second, those with a greater supply of resources from which to draw are more likely to accumulate resources and less likely to lose them. Third, those with a smaller pool of resources are more likely to lose resources. Fourth, individuals with substantial resource pools are more likely to risk their possessed resources if a resource gain is possible.

A number of stress-related studies have utilized this model of stress as a framework. Many researchers have found the COR model helpful when examining workplace burnout (e.g., Halbesleben, 2006; Wright & Hobfoll, 2004). Others have found it helpful when: assessing work-family conflict (e.g., Grandey & Cropanzano, 1999; Witt & Carlson, 2006), under conditions of perceptions of politics with age as a resource (i.e., Treadway et al., 2005), personality traits are thought of as resources (e.g., Zellars, Perrewé, Hochwarter, & Anderson, 2006), and predicting depression and anxiety among patients (e.g., Luyster, Hughes, Waechter, & Josephson, 2006).

Personality Traits

Psychology researchers have been interested in personality variations between individuals for many years (e.g., Eysenck, 1967; Jung, 1921/1971). Although research waned for several decades, the past 25 years has seen a revival of interest in studies examining the characteristics and outcomes of between-person personality differences. Much of the renewed energy has come from the emergence of the Five Factor Model (Digman, 1990), discussed below. Personality characteristics have been demonstrated to play an important role in both workplace behaviors, such as organizational citizenship behaviors (Borman, Penner, Allen, & Motowidlo, 2001) and leadership (Judge & Bono, 2000), and outcomes, such as performance (Barrick et al., 2001) and absence (Judge, Martocchio, & Thoreson, 1997). In addition, personality traits have been related to the probability that a person will experience a stressful situation (Bolger & Zuckerman, 1995), will appraise an event as stressful (Gunthert, Cohen, & Armeli, 1999), and to the likelihood of utilizing certain coping strategies (McCrae & Costa, 1986).

This section, first, provides a framework for understanding personality traits. Then, I review the Five Factor Model of personality and each of its factors. I also consider the debate
surrounding the use of narrow traits or facets of personality in research. Next, Proactive Personality, a narrow trait of personality, is reviewed. This is followed by an examination of a more recently developed model of personality, the HEXACO Model. Finally, the Personality Traits section concludes with an expansion of the personality discussion by utilizing social cognitive theory to introduce the following two sections of the paper, “Learned Behaviors” and “Social Capital Resources.”

**Personality Framework**

Prior to a review of the Five Factor Model, I first put forth a framework in which both the broad (e.g., FFM factors) and the narrow (e.g., Proactive Personality) personality trait constructs can be understood. Digman (1997) analyzed 14 studies of the FFM and found that a two-factor structure usually emerged in the datasets. One factor comprised the FFM dimensions of Agreeableness, Conscientiousness, and Emotional Stability. Digman (1997) argued that, depending upon the interpretation, this factor could represent either a social desirability factor or the socialization process. The other factor was comprised of the FFM dimensions of Extraversion and Openness to Experience, potentially representing a personal growth factor. Digman (1997) contended that these factors represent an even broader and more abstract level of constructs beyond the Big Five. In accordance with Digman’s (1997) findings, I argue that these two factors represent what seem to be the broadest possible personality dimensions.

Although not directly studied in the current research, it is worth noting that many organizational researchers have given attention to negative affectivity (NA) and positive affectivity (PA) (see for review Perrewé & Spector, 2002), rather than to Digman’s (1997) two factors mentioned above. Persons who are high on NA are more likely to experience a range of negative emotions (e.g., anger, nervousness, guilt) across a range of situations, and those high on PA are thought to be more likely to experience positive emotions (e.g., energy, enthusiasm, joyfulness) (Perrewé & Spector, 2002; Watson, Clark, & Tellegen, 1988). Rather than two ends of the same pole of a single personality characteristic, most researchers hold that NA and PA are two separate constructs (Perrewé & Spector, 2002). Stress researchers have given particular attention to NA (e.g., Höge & Büssing, 2004; Parkes, 2002), and somewhat less attention to PA. However, although NA will serve as a control in the analyses of the stress process, neither NA nor PA plays a substantive role in the present study.

As also noted by Digman’s (1997) framework, the FFM variables are subsumed within the two superordinate factors, and there are personality facets or characteristics (narrow traits) that are subsumed under the FFM. Unlike Digman’s (1997) framework implies, I maintain that there is much left to explain concerning personality traits (below these two factors) that are not either the Big Five or subsumed under (facets of) the Big Five. In other words, I do not believe that the FFM and/or its facets explain all of personality traits, as is explained in greater detail below when discussing personality taxonomies and the HEXAXO model.

Even Digman (1997) admitted that he may have been “overly enthusiastic about the Big Five as a possible ‘grand unified theory’” (Digman, 1990) for personality” (p. 1246). Digman (1997) asserted that the FFM is not a complete theory of personality, and that the apparent orthogonality of the FFM is the result of the use of principal components analysis accompanied by varimax rotation of factors, a procedure that imposes rather than finds factors. In other words, Digman (1997) contended that the FFM is arranged rather than discovered by factor analysis, only implying existing theoretical concepts. Furthermore, even if one were to agree with Digman’s (1990) overly enthusiastic assertions about the FFM, including that the FFM explains
roughly 85% of personality, there is still a modest amount of personality (15% at minimum) at both the broad and narrow trait levels that remains unexplained by the Big Five framework. An Overview of the Five Factor Model of Personality

Setting aside concerns about the adequacy of the FFM for explaining all of personality, the Big Five have received a substantial amount of research attention. Furthermore, the personality taxonomy utilized in the present study, the HEXACO model, is conceptually and structurally very similar to the FFM. Therefore, an overview of the Big Five, and a review of the research findings concerning each of its factors prior to a discussion of the HEXACO model, are helpful and warranted.

Many conducting dispositional research have concluded that the Big Five factors describe the most significant portions of personality (e.g., Tokar, Fischer, & Subich, 1998). Some (e.g., Weiss & Adler, 1984) have called for a more unified study of personality and, in response, others (e.g., Digman, 1990) have suggested that the FFM allows the researcher to study a substantial portion of the total of personality characteristics. Previous research also has demonstrated that the FFM is a reliable and valid factor structure. Goldberg (1981) found that self-ratings of the FFM scales provided a reliability estimate of about 85%, and McCrae and Costa (1985) demonstrated a correlation (r) of peer ratings with self-report in the high .40’s. Digman (1990) reviewed FFM research and argued that there was significant support for the FFM structure, and that the FFM had high reliability and validity. The Five Factor Model has demonstrated consistency across cultures, sources, and measures of ratings (McCrae & John, 1992), and has achieved the greatest level of acceptance of any personality theory (Briggs, 1992; McCrae & John, 1992).

As noted by John (1990), although there has been some disagreement over the names of the dimensions, there has been little dissension over the five dimensions themselves. They are often articulated using five single-word descriptors, specifically: Conscientiousness (responsible, persevering, fussy, scrupulous), Neuroticism (anxious, excitable, nervous), Extraversion (talkative, sociable, adventurous), Agreeableness (good-natured, mild, cooperative, not jealous), and Openness to Experience (imaginative, artistically sensitive, intellectual). Each dimension is reviewed, in turn, below.

Conscientiousness

Conscientiousness has been defined as “the tendency toward being dependable, purposeful, organized, and achievement-oriented” (Perrewé & Spector, 2002, p. 6). Persons high on Conscientiousness have been described as hardworking, ambitious, competent, persevering, achievement striving, and dependable (Block, 1961; Digman, 1990). Conscientiousness has been found to have a positive relationship with both intrinsic success (e.g., job satisfaction) and extrinsic success (e.g., income) (Judge, Bono, & Locke, 2000), and Barrick et al (2001) concluded that Conscientiousness is the strongest predictor of job performance of the five factors, predicting performance across measures and occupational groups. Similarly, Demetriou and Kazi (2001) found that self-perceived cognitive efficiency was strongly and significantly related to Conscientiousness.

However, Conscientiousness also has been found to be one of the easiest scales on which to fake good during the interview process (McFarland & Ryan, 2000), a finding that, if combined with the suggestions by Barrick and colleagues (2001), could pose a dilemma for organizational practitioners desiring to hire those who are likely to demonstrate the highest performance. High Conscientiousness also has been found to serve as a buffer to the negative effects of perceptions of politics on job performance (Hochwarter, Witt, & Kacmar, 2000). Conscientiousness has been
positively related to organizational citizenship behaviors (Borman et al., 2001) and self-efficacy (Martocchio & Judge, 1997), and negatively related to absence (Judge et al., 1997). Finally, Bouchard and colleagues (Bouchard, Guillemette, & Landry-Leger, 2004) suggested that conscientious persons would try to avoid uncontrollable situations.

**Neuroticism**

Neuroticism, also termed emotional instability, describes the tendency to focus on the negative aspects of the self, or to feel nervousness or distress (Watson, 2000). Those low on Neuroticism are perceived as emotionally stable, calm, or even-tempered (McCrae & John, 1992). Those high on Neuroticism have been found to be socially anxious (Costa & McCrae, 1987), engage in ineffective coping (Costa & McCrae, 1987), and experience burnout (Zellars & Perrewé, 2001). Often used interchangeably with negative affectivity (Perrewé & Spector, 2002), Neuroticism, generally, has been found to be negatively related to overall performance (Barrick et al., 2001) and organizational citizenship behaviors (Borman et al., 2001). However, Barrick and Mount (1991) noted that for professionals in their study they found a negative correlation between Emotional Stability and job performance. Similarly, Smillie and colleagues (Smillie, Yeo, Furnham, & Jackson, 2006) found that highly neurotic persons out-performed others when in a busy work environment, or one that required intense effort.

Highly Neurotic persons place themselves in situations that produce negative affect (Emmons, Diener, & Larsen, 1985), and, consequently, are more likely to experience job dissatisfaction when this occurs while at the workplace. Persons high on Neuroticism are more likely to experience a variety of negative emotions and behaviors such as depression, anxiety, anger, hostility, embarrassment and emotional distress (see McCrae & Costa, 1987). Robins, Spranca, and Mendelsohn (1996) found that neurotic individuals attributed their neurotic behavior to other persons or the situation. They suggested that one potential source of this external attribution could be that neurotic feelings and behaviors are undesirable, and people may not be willing to confess that they themselves are the source of their Neuroticism.

Another possible explanation is that neurotic persons generally are more concerned than most people with their appearance to others. In their analysis of a self-monitoring scale, one of the factors that Briggs, Cheek, and Buss (1980) found was other-directedness, the willingness to change personal behavior to suit the desire of others. Neuroticism was positively related to other-directedness. Therefore, neurotic persons might have stronger desires to adapt to the environment despite the anxiety that it produces for them.

**Extraversion**

Extraversion has been described as the tendency to be social, talkative, or optimistic, and those low in Extraversion often have been described as quiet, reserved, or withdrawn (John, 1990). Contrary to neurotics, extraverts can be described as experiencing a range of positive emotions (Costa & McCrae, 1992; McCrae & Costa, 1987). It has been argued that extraverts appear to exhibit optimism in the way things will work out (Zellars, Perrewé, & Hochwarter, 2000), and Extraversion sometimes is used interchangeably with positive affectivity (Perrewé & Spector, 2002). Borman and colleagues (2001) argued that there is a positive, though questionable, relationship between Extraversion and organizational citizenship behaviors.

Extraversion has been positively related to job searching (Boudreau, Boswell, Judge, & Bretz, 2001), transformational leadership (Judge & Bono, 2000), and absence (Judge et al., 1997), supporting the contention that extraverts crave excitement (Perrewé & Spector, 2002). Extraversion has not been consistently related to overall performance (Barrick et al., 2001), but it has been shown to relate to performance in jobs that require a substantial amount of social
interaction (Barrick & Mount, 1991). Those high on Extraversion also are more likely to find the relationships that are established in workplaces to be rewarding (Watson & Clark, 1997), and they have been demonstrated to engage in more conversations at work (Zellars & Perrewé, 2001).

**Agreeableness**

Those high on the FFM dimension of Agreeableness are considered flexible, cooperative, trusting, and compliant (Barrick et al., 2001; Perrewé & Spector, 2002). However, Agreeableness might be more easily recognized by its negative pole. Persons low on Agreeableness generally are described as antagonistic, skeptical, callous, and uncooperative (McCrae & Costa, 1987). Like Extraversion, Agreeableness describes the interpersonal aspects of personality (McCrae & John, 1992). Agreeable individuals are more likely to experience happiness because they have an increased desire to have close interpersonal relationships, and high scores on Agreeableness have been related to life satisfaction (McCrae & Costa, 1991).

Agreeableness has been positively associated with citizenship behaviors (Borman et al., 2001), job searching (Boudreau et al., 2001), and is the strongest and most consistent predictor of transformational leadership (Judge & Bono, 2000). Although Barrick and colleagues (2001) found no direct relationship between Agreeableness and overall job performance, the authors suggested that Agreeableness might predict working well in teams. However, Ellis and colleagues (Ellis et al., 2003) found that team learning was negatively affected when teams were composed of individuals who were high in Agreeableness.

**Openness to Experience**

Openness to Experience has been described as the tendency to be, original, imaginative, creative, or nonconforming (McCrae & Costa, 1987). Openness is revealed through the ideas, feelings, fantasies, and actions of a person (McCrae & Costa, 1987). Openness to Experience concerns how the self and others perceive the intelligence of an individual, rather than the actual intelligence of the person. Demetriou, Kyriakides, and Avraamidou (2003) found that openness was very closely related to perceived cognitive ability, exhibiting the strongest correlation with it of any of the five factors of personality. The authors even suggested that “Openness to Experience is the translation of cognitive ability (actual or reflected) into personality dispositions related to cognitive functioning” (Demetriou et al., 2003, p. 578).

LePine, Colquitt, and Erez (2000) found that after an unforeseen change, those high on openness were able to adapt to the change and make better decisions than those who scored low on Openness. Openness has been positively associated with transformational leadership (Judge & Bono, 2000), and it has been suggested that those high on Openness experience both the good and the bad more intensely (Costa & McCrae, 1984).

**Factors or Facets: Which Should be Utilized in Organizational Research?**

A number of articles by organizational researchers have considered the issue of whether to use broad factors or narrow facets of personality as predictors of criterion. Below, I first review the empirical evidence concerning the FFM that is relevant to this discussion. Then, I review the theoretical arguments made by organizational researches concerning the use of broad or narrow factors.

**Empirical Research on Facets and Factors**

As noted above, each of the FFM dimensions has been argued to have several facets (Digman, 1990). At present, there is no consensus regarding how to best partition the broad Big Five traits into isolated facets (Costa & McCrae, 2006), unlike the consensus regarding the partitioning of the Big Five dimensions (i.e., Agreeableness) (John, 1990). Some (i.e., Costa &
McCrae, 2006) have suggested that the 30 facets of the Revised NEO Five Factor Inventory (NEO-PI-R) (Costa & McCrae, 1992) have demonstrated universality (McCrae & Terracciano, 2005), cross-observer validity (McCrae et al., 2004), rank-order stability (Costa, Herbst, McCrae, & Siegler, 2000), and incremental validity beyond the five broad factors (Reynolds & Clark, 2001). However, in a study of applicant faking good, Griffin, Hesketh, and Grayson (2004) found differential item bias in the NEO-PI-R facet scales of Conscientiousness and Openness, suggesting that the properties of the measurement tests were impacted by faking. This finding would seem to suggest that the NEO-PI-R facets might not be as reliable under certain conditions as Costa and McCrae (2006) suggest. Nevertheless, because of the popularity of the NEO-PI-R among researchers, the following discussion of the facets of the FFM will reference studies that used the instrument.

In a study utilizing the 30 facets of the NEO-PI-R, Paunonen and Ashton (2001) found that facets of the Big Five traits were better predictors of a number of criteria (such as dieting behavior, tobacco consumption, buys lottery tickets, etc.) than the broad traits, often predicting variance unaccounted for by the factors. Also, Ashton, Jackson, Paunonen, Helmes, and Rothstein (1995) found the facets of the FFM Extraversion and Conscientiousness factors that were thought to be conceptually related to fun-seeking behavior (traits involving sociability and impulse control) were better predictors of fun-seeking behavior than were the broad factors to which they belong.

In organizational research, Van Iddekinge, Raymark, and Roth (2005) provided evidence that facets of the Big Five personality factors of Agreeableness, Conscientiousness, and Neuroticism can be evaluated via a structured interview in a simulated selection setting. Colquitt, Hollenbeck, Ilgen, Le Pine, and Sheppard (2002) found that access to computer-assisted communication improved the decision-making performance of teams only when teams were high in Openness to Experience. This result was the case for both global openness and for certain facets of openness but not others, as hypothesized (Colquitt et al., 2002).

Moon (2001) found that two facets of Conscientiousness (i.e., duty and achievement striving) predicted escalation of commitment in opposing directions, with the duty facet being associated with de-escalation of commitment and the achievement striving facet being associated with commitment escalation, while the broad measure of Conscientiousness was unassociated with escalation of commitment. Moon, Hollenbeck, Humphrey, and Maue (2003) analyzed the effect of two facets of Neuroticism (anxiety and depression) on escalation of commitment and found that while anxiety had a positive relationship with commitment escalation, depression had a negative relationship with escalation of commitment.

Stewart (1999) found that the global trait of Conscientiousness was associated with job performance for both newly hired employees and veteran employees. However, of two facets of Conscientiousness, order correlated more strongly with performance for newly hired employees and achievement was associated more strongly for veteran employees, with each facet providing incremental validity beyond the Conscientiousness factor (Stewart, 1999).

In one of the few published studies that have not attested to the incremental validity of the FFM facets, Morgeson, Reider, and Campion (2005) found no evidence that facets of Conscientiousness, Extraversion, Agreeableness, and Neuroticism were stronger predictors of contextual performance than their respective Big Five factors. Finally, a meta-analysis by Dudley, Orvis, Lebiecki, and Cortina (2006) found that narrow Conscientiousness traits (e.g., dependability) predicted performance beyond global Conscientiousness, depending on the particular performance criterion and occupation of interest.
Theoretical Arguments Concerning the use of Factors or Facets

It has long been debated in psychometric and personality research that there is a trade-off between fidelity and bandwidth in assessment (Cronbach, 1960; Cronbach & Gleser, 1965). In other words, in regards to using personality traits as predictors, researchers have questioned whether their attention is better directed toward broader, more inclusive personality constructs or narrower, more exclusive traits. Cronbach and Gleser (1957) argued that broad traits should predict broad criteria with moderate validity, and that narrow constructs would maximize validity in prediction of specific outcomes. Although some have argued for the use of broad traits (e.g., Moskowitz, 1982), others (e.g., Mischel & Peake, 1982) advocated for the use of narrower, more homogenous, personality constructs.

The Journal of Organizational Behavior (1996) included a “Point/Counterpoint” section in three articles that discussed the issue of the level of specificity at which traits should be assessed. The first article (Ones & Viswesvaran, 1996) argued against what the authors saw as the belief by some (Hough, 1992) that narrow personality traits should be preferred over broad personality constructs such as the Big Five. Instead, Ones and Viswesvaran (1996) contended that the nature of the criterion dictates the level of measurement in the predictor. Consequently, because the nature of, for example, job performance is broad, broad personality constructs should be used for prediction. They maintained that there is too much invalid variance, arising from measurement error, in the homogenous measures of specific personality constructs. Further, the authors claimed that these specific measures are construct deficient concerning the general, overall factor they tap. Consequently, they concluded that broad personality traits have more explanatory power and higher predictive validity (i.e., because of their greater reliability) for composites of job performance dimensions than do narrow traits.

The second of the three articles, by Hogan, Hogan, and Roberts (1996), critiqued the argument and analyses of Ones and Viswesvaran (1996). These researchers asserted that Ones and Viswesvaran generally ignored the “fidelity” portion of the bandwidth-fidelity debate, arguing that both the nature and the bandwidth of the criterion determine the choice of predictor specificity. In essence, Hogan and colleagues agreed that broad personality constructs should be used to predict broad outcomes, while narrow traits should be utilized when the criterion is narrow.

In the third article, Schneider and colleagues (Schneider et al., 1996) also stated their disagreements with Ones and Viswesvaran (1996), elaborating in greater detail than Hogan and colleagues (1996) the importance of the relevance of the trait to the criterion. Schneider and colleagues advocated that researchers adopt a construct-oriented approach to personality research that includes specifying not only a taxonomy for both job performance and personality, but also a nomological net that links the two (Schneider & Hough, 1995). They argued that, with a nomological net, researchers are better able to make hypotheses about the specific personality constructs that will correlate with specific job performance criteria.

Schneider and colleagues (1996) asserted that narrow traits have substantial explanatory value, and that Ones and Viswesvaran (1996) are incorrect in their statement that narrow traits are plagued by error variance. They proposed that more complex theories of work behavior need to be developed in order to understand the unique variance explained by narrow traits. Mount and Barrick (1995) compared the predictive validity of the global FFM trait of Conscientiousness with that of two facets of Conscientiousness on both overall and specific job performance. In apparent support of Schneider and colleagues’ assertions, they found that the facets of
Conscientiousness were better predictors than the broader construct only when there was a strong conceptual linkage between the facet and the criterion.

The authors of both of the latter two pieces (Hogan et al., 1996; Schneider et al., 1996) also noted that the use of broad personality measures can obscure our understanding of the personality-related causes of individuals work behavior. Similarly, Paunonen, Rothstein, and Jackson (1999) argued that even when a broad personality measure explains a significant amount of variance in the criterion, it is difficult to sufficiently explain the relationship between the two. In other words, the relationship could be due to the criterion’s association with one facet of the trait, all of the facets, or only some of the facets. However, Paunonen and colleagues maintained that an association between a criterion and a narrow trait reflects an individual’s standing on an identifiable psychological construct. Furthermore, they held that this allows for a better understanding of the relationship of traits to behavior.

More recently, some scholars have provided additional criticism of the use of broad factors of personality. Murphy and Dziweiczynski (2005) argued that the validity of broad personality traits (e.g., the FFM) in predicting job performance is still low, and that the theories relating broad personality constructs to job performance are vague. Further, they noted that the results of the Barrick et al. (2001) meta-analysis of the relationship between the FFM factors and job performance demonstrated a correlation of only .06 or lower for four of the FFM factors, and that for the other factor, Conscientiousness, the highest mean validity was .12 (or .20 when corrected for range restriction and reliability).

The Question Remains: Which Should be Used in Organizational Research?

Research has indicated that personality-criterion relationships also could be mediated by more proximal variables to the criterion and situational characteristics. Barrick, Mount, and Strauss (1993) provided evidence that the relationship between Conscientiousness and job performance was mediated by goal-setting behaviors. Also, a number of studies (see for review Yeo & Neal, 2004) have suggested that, under certain situations, the relationship between Conscientiousness and job performance is negative. Finally, Beaty, Cleveland, and Murphy (2001) found that situation strength moderated the relationship between personality traits and job performance ratings by supervisors, and according to Hough and Oswald (2005), future research should consider the impact of situational characteristics on the relationship between personality and performance.

In conclusion, after several decades of debate, it appears that the assertions by Cronbach and Gleser (1957) were approximately correct, that is, broad traits are predictive to a modest degree of broad outcomes, whereas narrow facets maximize prediction, particularly for more narrow outcomes. It is my contention that the decision to use either broad or narrow aspects of personality rests on the dependent variable(s) in the study. In other words, both the bandwidth of the predictor and the criterion variables and the relevance they have to each other are important.

A substantial amount of research (Hogan et al., 1996; e.g., Mount & Barrick, 1995; Schneider & Hough, 1995; Schneider et al., 1996; Yeo & Neal, 2004) seems to suggest that predictive validity is maximized by matching not only the bandwidth of the predictor and the criterion, but also matching them according to their relevance (e.g., via nomological net) (Schneider & Hough, 1995) to each other. (The relevance of a trait to a criterion—or the determination of whether to use broad or narrow traits—can be assessed in a variety of ways, such as, for example, through prior conceptual and/or empirical research or through a structured job analysis.) Consequently, although broad measures of personality are strong predictors of overall job performance, an even stronger correlation potentially can be obtained by utilizing a
particular facet that can be \emph{a priori} linked to a particular job performance criterion, such as was suggested by Mount and Barrick (1995).

Moreover, the results of a study by Hogan and Holland (2003) also demonstrated that the convergent and discriminant validity of predictors is improved when both the bandwidth and the content (i.e., conceptual linkage, fidelity) of the predictor and criterion are matched. On this theoretical basis, the paper reviews Proactive Personality (i.e., a narrow personality trait that does not appear to be subsumed under the FFM), personality taxonomy development, and the HEXACO Model of personality (i.e., a recently developed replacement for the FFM).

\textbf{Proactive Personality}

Proactive personality has been described as the tendency to effect environmental change or take initiative (Bateman & Crant, 1993). Bateman and Crant (1993) developed a Proactive Personality scale, demonstrating its discriminant validity against the Big Five and locus of control. A number of studies have shown that Proactive Personality is differentially associated with the Big Five, and that it predicts a number of criterion variables over and above the contribution of the FFM and other relevant predictors (e.g., Crant, 1995; Crant & Bateman, 2000).

Chan (2006) found support for the hypotheses that proactive personality predicted work perceptions (i.e., procedural justice, supervisor support, and social integration) and work outcomes (i.e., job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and job performance) positively for those with high situational judgment effectiveness, and negatively for those with low situational judgment effectiveness. The results of another study indicated that the relationship between Proactive Personality and job performance is mediated by network building and initiative taking on the part of the employee (i.e., Thompson, 2005).

Brown, Cober, Kane, Levy, and Shallop (2006) demonstrated that proactive personality predicted success of college graduates job search, was partially mediated by self-efficacy, and was independent of self-esteem and Conscientiousness. Parker, Williams, and Turner (2006) found that proactive personality related to proactive work behavior through role-breadth self-efficacy. These results appear to suggest that Proactive Personality cannot be subsumed under the Big Five, and that it has a substantial, though mostly mediated, impact on a number of important work outcomes.

\textbf{Personality Taxonomy Development}

Prior to reviewing the HEXACO model of personality, it will be helpful to first understand the need for developing and utilizing an approach to personality aside from the FFM. Hough (1992) developed a taxonomy of personality variables, because, as the author stated, “the Big Five is not an adequate taxonomy of personality variables for predicting important criteria” (p. 139), namely job performance. Although such a taxonomy might be useful in predicting job performance, by forming the personality taxonomy upon the basis of the results of prior predictor-criterion research, Hough’s (1992) conceptualization is dependent upon the accuracy of previous job performance research.

However, for example, political skill and proactive personality are constructs that recently have been demonstrated to be important predictors of job performance (e.g., Blickle et al., 2007; Chan, 2006; Ferris et al., 2005; Liu et al., 2007; Semadar et al., 2006). Thus, taxonomies, such as Hough’s (1992), which are intended to predict a certain outcome and utilize previous research as a basis for the taxonomy, are certain to become increasingly deficient as research progresses concerning predictors of the criterion.
Lexical investigations (e.g., was conducted in constructing the FFM) develop personality constructs and taxonomies on the assumption that the complete list of personality-descriptive adjectives of a given language can approximate the domain of important human personality traits (Galton, 1884; Goldberg, 1982, 1993). Researchers then seek the major dimensions of personality by attempting to discover the axes of those adjectives through factor analyses of self and peer ratings. These constructs can have an advantage over predictive taxonomies in that they can be utilized across a wide range of criteria, and can not be found deficient based upon the progress made within the research concerning a given criterion.

As noted by Cattell (1943), “all aspects of human personality which are of importance, interest, or utility have already become recorded in the substance of language” (p. 483), and Norman (1963) argued that constructing a taxonomy of personality characteristics should proceed “from an examination of the natural language” (p. 574). Rather than developing characteristics that are dependent on the criterion and aim at predictability, the lexical perspective is a framework of observable (i.e., surface) characteristics that describe, not explain, personality (see for review Saucier & Goldberg, 1996b).

Also, the lexical perspective is not a trait theory (Pervin, 1994), meaning that it does not require personality attributes to remain stable over time, and the degree of representation of an attribute in the language corresponds to the importance of the characteristic (Saucier & Goldberg, 1996b). In short, the lexical method of taxonomy development and perspective on personality provides a particularly strong rationale for the selection of constructs and variables in personality research (Saucier & Goldberg, 1996b).

By all accounts, the FFM was developed via a lexical method (Ashton & Lee, 2005). However, although many have suggested that the Big Five factors of personality cover most of personality (e.g., Digman, 1990), some of the FFM’s most vocal proponents and others also have argued that not all individual personality differences can be explained by the Big Five and its facets (e.g., Funder, 2001; Saucier & Goldberg, 1998; Saucier, Hampson, & Goldberg, 2000). For instance, Paunonen and colleagues (Paunonen, 2002; Paunonen, Haddock, Forsterling, & Keinonen, 2003) recently demonstrated the incremental validity of the Supernumerary Personality Inventory (SPI) (i.e., developed through lexical investigations), which is composed of ten traits that are specifically designed to fall outside of the Big Five.

On the other hand, some have argued for the inclusion of a sixth factor of personality in addition to the FFM. For instance, Piedmont (1999) proposed Spiritual Transcendence as a sixth factor of personality. However, others (Ashton, Lee, & Goldberg, 2004; Ashton, Lee, Perugini et al., 2004) recently conducted or reviewed a number of lexical studies and concluded that there appears to be some similarity, across languages, regarding the complexion of the sixth factor. They also have found slight differences with the FFM regarding two of the other five factors. The following section introduces the personality taxonomy utilized in the present study, and discusses the conclusions from these lexical investigations.

The HEXACO Model of Personality

During the 1990’s, lexical studies of personality branched out from the English language into many other languages. Among the seven languages in which these studies were performed (i.e., Dutch, French, German, Hungarian, Italian, Korean, and Polish), the factor structure that emerged appeared to be similar to that of the FFM. From these eight studies (two in Italian), the most frequent loading of the factors in order of their strength was: Extraversion, Agreeableness, Conscientiousness, Emotionality (Neuroticism), Honesty-Humility, and Openness to Experience (Ashton, Lee, Perugini et al., 2004). However, there were two main differences. First, these
studies suggested the presence of a “sixth factor” of personality that has been labeled Honesty-Humility (Ashton, Lee, & Goldberg, 2007), to be discussed in greater detail below. Second, in some English studies (e.g., Saucier & Goldberg, 1996a), words similar to sensitivity versus toughness loaded primarily on Agreeableness, and terms of patience versus irritability loaded chiefly on Emotional Stability.

However, in these other seven languages the associations were the opposite, with patience versus irritability loading on the Agreeableness factor and sensitivity versus toughness loading on Emotional Stability (Ashton, Lee, Perugini et al., 2004). Consequently, because this Emotional Stability factor lacks the undesirable or pathological components of Neuroticism, it has been labeled Emotionality or Emotional Stability (Ashton et al., 2007; Lee & Ashton, 2004). In an analysis of a potential seven-factor solution, little consistency was found across the seven (i.e., of the eight presented above) studies that were examined (Ashton, Lee, Perugini et al., 2004). The six-factor structure that has emerged from these datasets has been called the HEXACO model of personality.

Clearly, one can question why six factors were not recovered in previous English language lexical investigations. As explained by Ashton, Lee, and Goldberg (2004), given the substantial size of the English personality adjectives, previous research either forced clusters of similar terms into variables so that the computers available at that time could factor analyze the data (Goldberg, 1990), or selected smaller sets of adjectives that could be administered in a single session (Ashton, Lee, & Goldberg, 2004).

However, the trade-offs for these compromises were that the location of factor axes was not as exact and that smaller factors may not have emerged. One re-examination (i.e., Ashton, Lee, & Goldberg, 2004) of a dataset that approaches the full population of English personality descriptions (i.e., without the limitations mentioned above) produced a factor structure more similar to the seven other language studies that produced the HEXACO model than to earlier English language results based on the reduced sets of variables of clusters (Goldberg, 1990) or highly familiar terms (Saucier & Goldberg, 1996a).

Lee and Ashton (2004) found that this sixth factor of personality and the HEXACO model correlated weakly with the Big Five, and Lee, Ogunfowora, and Ashton (2005) found that the ten SPI traits put forth by Paunonen and colleagues (2003) contained variance not explained by either the FFM or the HEXACO model of personality. However, the strongest factor of the SPI was highly correlated with the Honesty-Humility factor at \( r = .65 \). Considering that each of these three taxonomies (i.e., FFM, HEXACO, and SPI) has both (broad) dimensions and (narrow) facets, these findings seem to suggest that there is a substantial amount of personality research that still can be conducted at both the broad and narrow levels. These results also imply that the Honesty-Humility dimension of personality is worthy of investigation.

Honesty-Humility

Aside from the differences in the Agreeableness and Emotional Stability (Neuroticism) dimensions mentioned in the previous section, there is only one other major difference between the HEXACO and the FFM taxonomy, that is, the Honesty-Humility factor. Across a number of languages, the Honesty-Humility dimension has been described as “Integrity,” “Trustworthiness,” “Truthfulness,” “Values,” and “Morality” (Ashton, Lee, & Son, 2000). In general, this factor reflects either reluctance (i.e., the positive pole) or inclination (i.e., negative pole) to exploit others. The facets of this dimension include Sincerity (i.e., tendency to be genuine in interpersonal relations), Fairness (i.e., tendency to avoid fraud and corruption), Greed
Avoidance (i.e., tendency to be uninterested in possessing lavish wealth, goods, and signs of high social status), and Modesty (i.e., tendency to be modest and unassuming) (Lee & Ashton, 2004).

Research has demonstrated that two (of the six total) facets of the Big Five Agreeableness dimension, Straightforwardness and Modesty, correlated strongly with the HEXACO Honesty-Humility factor (Ashton & Lee, 2005). This corresponds with the theoretical argument made by Lee and Ashton (2004) and Ashton, Lee, and Goldberg (2004) that Agreeableness and Honesty-Humility are two dimensions of personality that represent two distinct aspects of interpersonal altruism. Agreeableness represents forgiving (i.e., cooperation without expectation of reciprocation) and Honesty-Humility represents fair-mindedness (i.e., cooperation even when another is unlikely to retaliate against exploitation) (Ashton, Lee, & Goldberg, 2004).

In a study utilizing FFM constructs, a realignment of the FFM Agreeableness dimension to separate the Agreeableness factor from a Honesty-Humility factor (i.e., included two FFM facets: Straightforwardness and Modesty) allowed for better prediction of Social Adroitness and Self-Monitoring, two variables that measure interpersonal impression management without hostility (Ashton & Lee, 2005). In a study utilizing a different sample, the HEXACO Honesty-Humility factor was found to be a stronger predictor of Machiavellianism, Psychopathy, and Social Adroitness than any of the Big Five factors (Ashton et al., 2000). Also, using Australian, Dutch, and Canadian samples, Lee and colleagues (2005) found that the HEXACO model was a better predictor of workplace delinquency and an overt integrity test than the FFM, with the Honesty-Humility factor of the HEXACO model accounting for an additional 14% of the variance (on average) in the outcome variables when added to the equation using the FFM variables. Similarly, Marcus, Lee, and Ashton (Marcus, Lee, & Ashton, 2007) found that Honesty-Humility was a better predictor of an overt integrity test than the FFM, and the FFM, particularly conscientiousness, was a better predictor of personality based integrity tests.

**Personality Theory**

Although the FFM model and other taxonomies of personality have gained prominence in the past couple decades, personality researchers often have bemoaned the lack of theory supporting recent personality research (e.g., Perrewé & Spector, 2002). Block (1995) preferred the term *approach* to that of *model* when describing the Big Five. He argued that it was a deficient factor structure, and both Block (1995) and Briggs (1989) contended that there was no *a priori* theoretical reason why these particular five constructs should emerge. The same arguments could be made for a six, ten, or greater factor model of personality that lacked theoretical underpinnings. Many have believed that, rather than a theory, the FFM (and presumably other taxonomies as well) is a tool that can be used to organize personality phenomena to be explained by theory (e.g., Ozer & Reise, 1994).

Consequently, some researchers have proposed frameworks, systems, or theories for understanding personality differences among individuals. However, in order to better understand the particular theoretical approach of this paper, it is beneficial first to discuss what comprises a personality theory. Maddi (1996) proposed four components of all personality theories. First, he argued that, at the *core level*, assumptions are made about the unlearned characteristics that all people bring into life. Second, personality theories have *developmental statements* that explain the early interactions between individuals and their environments that form learned aspects of personality. Third, the result of these learned characteristics are *peripheral statements* that expound the habits or learned modes of functioning that are apparent when individuals become adults. The final aspect of personality theories is that they contain *data statements* that relate the
concrete expressions (e.g., actions, reactions, self-descriptions) in life to the peripheral
statements.

**Social Cognitive Constructs and Personality Theory**

The “cornerstone” construct in the present study, political skill, is argued to be a social
cognitive competence (Ferris et al., 2007), and Reactive Responding is conceptualized as a social
cognitive defense mechanism (Taylor & Seeman, 1999). Consequently, the present study seeks
to integrate both a trait (dispositional) and social cognitive (process) approach to the framing of
personality. Many social cognitive theorists have held to the view that social cognitive theory is
at odds with a dispositional approach, arguing that an integration of the two is unwarranted and
problematic (e.g., Cervone, 1999).

However, others have welcomed the potential for an integrative framework that could
encompass both trait and process theorists (e.g., Funder, 2001; Mischel, 1999). Although some
frameworks have held promise, namely the cognitive-affective personality system (Mischel,
1999) and Bandura’s social cognitive theory of personality (Bandura, 2001), I believe that a
different theory for personality research provides a stronger foundation for integration of
dispositional and social cognitive perspectives.

Recently, a theoretical-systems approach to personality has been proposed by McAdams
(1995) and extended by McAdams and Pals (2006), which argues for three levels of personality.
Level one includes traits, which are broad, decontextualized, and non-conditional descriptions of
personality (McAdams, 1995). These are the most stable and recognizable elements of
personality (McAdams & Pals, 2006). Level two consists of the motivational, social-cognitive,
and developmental constructs that speak to coping, domain-specific skills, defense mechanisms,
and personal strivings contextualized in time, place, and/or social role.

These level two adaptations are not simply consequences of level one attributes, although
they are partially influenced by traits. Level three describes the life stories or personal narratives
that evoke unity, purpose, and identity. Finally, McAdams and Pals (2006) made two
qualifications: 1. Any personality theory should begin with the principles of the evolutionary
human nature, and 2. Culture exerts differential effects on personality, with the weakest effects at
level one, stronger effects on level two, and its most powerful impact on level three.

Concerning the present study, the three-level systems approach is a helpful way of
framing personality traits, learned behaviors, and political skill dimensions. It appears that all
three of these construct areas could be included within the first two levels of personality.
Certainly, the personality taxonomies of the Big Five and the HEXACO model are considered
traits and fall within level one. Behaviors that are learned as a way of coping with stressors or
that are social-cognitive skill-sets specific to a domain of life, including the learned behaviors of
Reactive Responding and the organizationally specific political skill (both to be discussed
below), belong to the second level of personality. However, the current study is unlikely to be
able to address the third level of personality, because none of the utilized constructs assess an
individual’s narrative identity or meaning.

Utilizing McAdams (1995) levels of personality, one study proposed a model that is
theoretically similar to that of the present study (Graziano, Jensen-Campbell et al., 1997).
Graziano and colleagues tested a model of personality’s (FFM) influence on adjustment and
behavior as mediated by self-esteem in middle-school aged children. In the study, the authors
found significant relationships between a number of the FFM variables (level one) and their self-
evaluative and adjustment variables (level two), supporting their contention of at least a loose
connection between level one and level two of personality (Graziano, Jensen-Campbell et al.,
1997). The present study attempts to apply the theoretical conceptions of McAdams (1995) and McAdams and Pals (2006) in a method similar to that of Graziano and colleagues, but in a different context (e.g., an organization) and utilizing different constructs (e.g., Reactive Responding and political skill).

Learned Behaviors

Within the context of the present study, learned behaviors (i.e., Reactive Responding) and social cognitive (i.e., political skill) personality constructs both develop, in part, through the practice of self-regulatory processes. The learned behaviors utilized in the present study can be thought of coping tendencies or developmental constructs learned through self-regulation beginning in life stages prior to adulthood. Whereas, the social-cognitive construct used in the present study (i.e., political skill) is a motivationally-based striving that is a more domain-specific regulatory practice than learned behaviors. Although the present study does not explicitly test the effects of the more general concept of self-regulation, these processes impact the individual’s development beyond that of personality traits. Therefore, prior to discussing these constructs, it is helpful to briefly review the concept of self-regulation that informs them. (More specific relationships of self-regulation to each of the two constructs are delineated below in their particular sections.)

Self-regulation has been argued to be a five-stage process, including: 1. Resource accumulation, 2. Recognition of potential stressors, 3. Initial appraisal, 4. Preliminary coping efforts, and 5. Elicitation and use of feedback (Aspinwall & Taylor, 1997). Some have suggested that self-regulation overrides or inhibits impulses or desires that are in opposition to one another (Baumeister, Heatherton, & Tice, 1994), and that self-regulatory behaviors are intended to maximize long-term interests (Mischel, Cantor, & Feldman, 1996). Self-regulation is an effortful process that involves changing certain characteristics of the self with the intent of sustaining a focus on goals (Carver, 2004; Muraven & Baumeister, 2000; Muraven, Tice, & Baumeister, 1998).

The relationship between learned and social cognitive behaviors and self-regulation can be understood from several perspectives. First, learned, social cognitive, and self-regulatory behaviors are domain specific (McAdams, 1995; Muraven & Baumeister, 2000; Muraven et al., 1998). Second, all are focused on the motivational desires for goal achievement (Carver, 2004; Dweck, 1996; McAdams, 1995; Mischel et al., 1996). Finally, given the importance of the context in the development of these behaviors, they also develop from many person-situation interactions (Murtha, Kanfer, & Ackerman, 1996; Pervin, 1989) that accrue to form learned behaviors, competencies, and regulatory practices internal to the individual, and available for use in handling stressors.

Socio-Economic Status, Stressors, Health, and Adjustment

Within the framework of personality discussed above (i.e., McAdams, 1995; McAdams & Pals, 2006), individuals are proposed to develop coping strategies and other strategic mechanisms within the context of their life. As demonstrated by Graziano and colleagues (1997), trait differences between individuals can influence the development of the behaviors. In this section, I discuss the relationships between socio-economic status (SES), learned behaviors, and health and adjustment outcomes that have been investigated by researchers and are believed to form the basis for Reactive Responding.

An extensive number of studies have demonstrated relationships between a person’s socio-economic status and important health outcomes. Although differences in SES have been related to health among children and the elderly, the most dramatically unequal distributions in
health and mortality have been demonstrated for those aged 40 to 65 (Taylor, Repetti, & Seeman, 1997), who often are in the heart of their organizational careers. SES usually is measured via three indicators (i.e., education, occupation, and income), that are interrelated, but represent distinct dimensions of SES (Adler & Ostrove, 1999).

Overall, low SES has been associated with poorer health (Adler & Ostrove, 1999), including morbidity and mortality for almost every condition and disease (Antonovsky, 1967; Illsley & Baker, 1991). Low SES also has been related to a greater amount of social conflict among adults (Schuster et al., 1990), poorer peer relationships among adolescents (Bolger, Patterson, Thompson, & Kupersmidt, 1995), workplace absence (Harvey & Nicholson, 1999; North et al., 1993), and a weaker relationship between career-oriented mentoring and promotion rate (Whitely, Dougherty, & Dreher, 1991), when compared to those high in SES. Because of these findings, and, much like gender, SES generally has been restricted to the role of a control variable (Adler et al., 1994; Marmot, Kogevinas, & Elston, 1987), and has received scant attention in the organizational literature.

How Does SES Affect Health?

Because of the dearth of organizational and behavioral research concerning SES, this review focuses on the relationship between SES and individual health as demonstrated primarily by researchers outside of the organizational sciences. There are a number of possible ways that SES could impact a person’s health. SES has been argued to influence a person’s health through personal habits (i.e., smoking, alcohol consumption, drug abuse), the lack of health services, the effects of chronic stress, and the lack of resources (i.e., financial resources, transportation, membership in community organizations) to effectively manage chronic stressors (Taylor et al., 1997). However, a review of the literature from over ten years ago concluded that SES related to morbidity and mortality even for those high in the SES hierarchy (Adler et al., 1994). These conclusions rule out the traditional theory that SES is related to health outcomes only for those low in SES (i.e., because of the ill health effects of poverty), and it implies that explanations for the differences in health between low and high SES groups need to consider constructs that affect individuals across the SES gradient (Adler et al., 1994). The results of one examination of three datasets (i.e., one of elderly Americans, one of the Whitehall II study in the United Kingdom, and one of the ULF study in Sweden) suggested that although when previous health conditions were included in the model SES did not predict health outcomes, SES did appear “to have direct causal effects on some mental health and degenerative conditions” (p. 62) across all three studies (Adda, Chandola, & Marmot, 2003).

These findings suggest that the effects of SES on health are mediated through chronic conditions. However, few have considered potential psychological and psychosocial explanatory variables (mediators) of the SES-health (and adjustment) relationship (Lachman & Weaver, 1998), and very few have attempted to group these variables into a multidimensional construct. First, some of the psychological and psychosocial constructs that have received attention in the SES-health relationship are reviewed. Then, I discuss the small number of studies that explicitly have examined how SES and psychological and psychosocial variables might influence health. Third, I review how a group of researchers have attempted to assemble these constructs into a multidimensional concept. Lastly, I present a re-invention of this construct intended for use in organizational research.

Possible Reasons for the SES-Health Relationship

Personal control and mastery long has been argued to be a foundational element of individual motivation (e.g., White, 1959). Although research has demonstrated a positive
association between SES and beliefs in personal control and motivation, personal control has been related to both positive and negative outcomes (see for review Taylor & Seeman, 1999). Some have proposed that, rather than an antecedent, SES may serve as a moderator of the control-health relationship (Taylor & Seeman, 1999). A number of studies have considered relationships between SES, control, and health. One study (i.e., Griffin, Fuhrer, Stansfeld, & Marmot, 2002) found that women who were in the lowest or middle employment grades who indicated low control reported the highest rates of depression and anxiety. Another study (i.e., Lachman & Weaver, 1998) found that of those in the lowest income bracket, persons with a strong sense of personal control indicated levels of health and well-being similar to those in the higher income groups.

Sociologists have indicated several common situations of those low in SES that might deprive them of feelings of personal control, including powerlessness (i.e., from having low status jobs and the frequency of job disruptions), structural inconsistency (i.e., when society does not provide enough resources to achieve objectives legitimately), alienated labor (i.e., when the worker does not decide when/what to produce and does not own the product), and dependency (Mirowsky & Ross, 1986). In children, lower SES also has been related to diminished beliefs of personal mastery (Bandura, Barbaranelli, Caprara, & Pastorelli, 2001), self-efficacy (Whitbeck et al., 1997), and learned helplessness (i.e., through chaotic living conditions) (Evans, Gonnella, Marcynyszyn, Gentile, & Salpekar, 2005).

SES also could be related to an individual’s beliefs about outcome expectancies. For instance, Taylor and Seeman (1999) analyzed four datasets and found that pessimism, but not optimism, was not related to SES, indicating that SES is related to expectations of negative, but not positive, outcomes. Kessler and Cleary (1980) argued that the upwardly mobiles’ experience of success creates the coping skills needed to avoid developing psychological problems.

A range of individual personality differences also have been thought to potentially account for some of the relationships between SES and health outcomes. Depression and hostility have demonstrated the most consistent relationships with SES (Adler et al., 1994). Over a 16-year period, a Canadian community demonstrated substantially greater rates of depression for those low in SES (12.4%) than those either average (4.5%) or high in SES (1.9%) (Murphy et al., 1991). Further, higher rates of depressive symptoms over a nine-year period have been found among those lower in education and income (Kaplan, Roberts, Camacho, & Coyne, 1987).

In a nationally-representative sample in the United States, hostility was negatively associated with five levels of education, occupation, and income (Barefoot et al., 1991). Also, low childhood SES has been related to levels of optimism and pessimism in adulthood (Heinonen et al., 2006). The results indicated that although childhood SES was related to the development of both optimism and pessimism later in life, childhood SES might be more important to the development of pessimism. In other words, the authors argued that high SES environments are not sufficient in and of themselves to yield positive outcome expectancies in adulthood (Heinonen et al., 2006).

Individuals’ social lives may bridge the gap between SES and health. For example, social support range and composition has been related to SES (e.g., Campbell, Marsden, & Hurlbert, 1986) and, as noted above, social conflict has been associated with SES (e.g., Bolger et al., 1995; Schuster et al., 1990). It has been argued that those lower in SES have fewer opportunities to development, maintain, and utilize social networks (Cohen & Wills, 1985). Further, social support by family friends and other adults has been found to be most beneficial to mental health for those low in SES (Wright, Botticello, & Aneshensel, 2006).
Another possible avenue is coping. Coping has been categorized as either problem-solving or emotion-focused, and research has shown that in most stressful situations people utilize both methods (Folkman & Lazarus, 1980), with a predominant choice based upon one’s coping style. However, although coping might be one link out of many in the chain between SES and health, research has not made a clear connection between SES and coping, though problem-solving (or active) coping strategies seem to produce better health outcomes than avoidant strategies (see for review Taylor & Seeman, 1999).

**SES, Chronic Stressors, and the Use of Stress Theory**

Concerning the chronic stressors present in low SES environments, several points can be made. First, as suggested by others (e.g., Evans, Palsane, Lepore, & Martin, 1989; Repetti et al., 2002), patterns of behavior that are learned as an adaptive response to stressors in one environment are not applicable to other environments. Second, Aspinwall and Taylor (1997) argued that freedom from chronic stressors allows individuals to better cope with future stressors. Also, concerning the COR theory of stress, socioeconomic status has been argued to be a valuable resource (Hobfoll, 1989; Worden & Sobel, 1978).

Fourth, Steptoe and Marmot (2006) found that psychosocial characteristics (i.e., social isolation and mental health) were related to blood pressure recovery even after controlling for employment grade (i.e., a proxy for SES). In other words, although it does not appear that mediation tests were conducted, the results support the belief that it is not the presence of low SES itself that leads to poorer health, but instead it is the psychosocial characteristics and patterns of behavior that develop as a result of low SES that lead to poorer health (Steptoe & Marmot, 2006).

Finally, each of the two stress theories utilized in the present study have been analyzed within the context of an economically disadvantaged environment. Within the COR framework, Hoboll, Johnson, Ennis, and Jackson (2003) examined resource loss and gain among inner city women. The authors found that not only did the loss and gain of personal and social resources impact depressive mood and anger, but also resource loss had a greater impact than resource gain. Also, utilizing CATS, Kristenson, Eriksen, Sluiter, Starke, and Ursin (2004) presented a convincing argument for the relationship of stressors to health among low SES individuals. They argued that the effects of SES on health are the result of acquired expectancies that lead to sustained stressor responses and behaviors. They contended that findings across studies indicated that the challenges faced by those who are low in SES in their psychosocial life when combined with negative expectations leads to an inadequate stress response.

Within the CATS model, these results can be interpreted as meaning that this (deficient) stress response pattern is a failure to turn off activation, yet an inability to respond to the level needed to adequately address the stressor. Without referencing the COR model, the authors argued that psychosocial factors are **resources**, and that the inability to respond to new challenges (sustained arousal) and to relax after a challenge leads to a loss of dynamic capacity, a potential cause of poorer health (Kristenson et al., 2004).

**Modeling the Mediation of the SES-Health Relationship**

Some researchers have constructed models to test the mediation of psychological and psychosocial variables in the SES-health relationship to better determine how SES impacts health. One such study considered the impact of a neighborhood’s low SES (Feldman & Steptoe, 2004). The researchers found that living in a low SES neighborhood lead to greater neighborhood strain, which resulted in individual poorer physical functioning through less social integration, less perceived control, and greater financial strain. Another group of researchers
studied the influence of a person’s early family environment and SES on peer relations and objective and subjective health, as mediated by depression, anxiety, and hostility (Taylor, Lerner, Sage, Lehman, & Seeman, 2004).

Socioemotional skills have been thought to develop early in life (i.e., even before the onset of adolescents), having a dramatic effect on how a person perceives and reacts to stressful situations (Taylor et al., 2004). Non-nurturing, cold, abusive, or otherwise troubled family environments have been argued to exacerbate the effect of chronic stressors (Repetti et al., 2002), particularly those found among low SES environments (Taylor et al., 2004), leading to increased risk of emotional, behavioral, and health problems later in life (Felitti et al., 1998; Repetti et al., 2002).

One study indicated that low childhood SES and a harsh family environment in youth were related to C-reactive protein in adulthood through psychosocial dysfunction (i.e., depression, personal mastery, and social contacts) and high body mass index (Taylor, Lehman, Kiefe, & Seeman, 2006). Further, C-reactive protein has been related to an increased risk for cardiovascular disease and other disorders (King, Mainous, & Taylor, 2004; Taylor, Lehman et al., 2006). Another study demonstrated that such family backgrounds lead to atypical responses to emotional stimuli (i.e., pictures of facial expressions) as evidenced at the neural level (Taylor, Eisenberger, Saxbe, Lehman, & Lieberman, 2006).

Developing a Multidimensional Construct Explaining the SES-Health Relationship

Taylor and colleagues (2004) suggested that such troubled family environments affect physical and mental health through their effect on emotion regulation, social competencies and biological responses to stressors. Further, they argued that family context (e.g., SES) and genetic factors (e.g., children’s temperaments) affect the extent of the influence of a troubled family environment. Using Structural Equation Modeling (SEM), the study (Taylor et al., 2004) demonstrated that SES was (negatively) related to a risky family environment, which was associated with hostility and depression-anxiety. Moreover, they found that hostility and depression-anxiety were associated with base, peak, and recovery cortisol levels in response to stressors.

These findings mirror those of another from the same dataset which found that childhood SES, associated with harsh parenting, was related to metabolic functioning, mediated by depression, hostility, and poor social relations (Lehman, Taylor, Kiefe, & Seeman, 2005). In a separate SEM model, the impact of SES and a “risky” family environment on peer relations and subjective health was found to be mediated by depression, anxiety, and hostility. However, in the study by Taylor et al. (2004), although the overall model demonstrated good fit, the path coefficients were modest, rarely exceeding .20, with only five of the ten reaching a $p < .05$ significance level.

These results would appear to indicate that the relationships between these variables are weak, suggesting the need to investigate possible mediators or moderators of these relationships. Attempts to conceptualize and operationalize a multidimensional construct (e.g., Reactive Responding) designed to more accurately reflect the primary mediators of these relationships are discussed below. In addition, Taylor and colleagues (2004) suggested that an important future direction for research would be to investigate how social skills influence “the ability to attract and maintain social support” (p. 1388). The present study can be seen as a response to this call for future research due to the inclusion of interpersonal skill moderators (i.e., political skill dimensions) of the relationships between stressors and both behavioral outcomes and subjective health outcomes.
In summary, the findings presented above and the suggestions of others (e.g., Lachman & Weaver, 1998) indicate that psychological and psychosocial resources influence the SES-health and adjustment relationship. Also, current SES has been demonstrated to have its strongest impact when a person is between the ages of 40 and 65 (Taylor et al., 1997). However, as can be seen from several of the studies given above (e.g., Heinonen et al., 2006; Taylor et al., 2004), an individual’s childhood SES (and family environment) has been demonstrated to have a profound impact throughout the lifetime. During youth, individuals develop learned behaviors and coping tendencies that are adaptive with respect to their particular situation (Repetti et al., 2002), possibly including a family, neighborhood, and/or social environment that is abusive, unloving, or inattentive to their needs and that promotes short-term planning, emotional reactivity, little interaction with those outside of the community, and few alternatives in decision-making. However, coping and self-regulatory tendencies that may have been adaptive in such situations are not necessarily adaptive as the individual moves into adulthood.

**Reactive Responding**

In an attempt to better explain these phenomena, a small group of researchers proposed a concept they termed Reactive Responding (Taylor, 1998; Taylor & Seeman, 1999). According to these researchers, Reactive Responding measures the individual’s self-regulatory patterns that are thought to develop from exposure to the chronic stressors that increase as SES decreases. Different social classes present individuals with different sets of environmental stressors, and these regularities are believed to influence the self-regulatory strategies and skills learned by the occupants. Taylor and colleagues (Taylor, 1998; Taylor & Seeman, 1999) suggested that those who are low in SES, learn behaviors and responses to their environment that are maladaptive when attempting to become upwardly mobile or otherwise participating in situations outside of their typical environment.

This group of researchers (Taylor, 1998; Taylor & Seeman, 1999) postulated seven dimensions of Reactive Responding. The first is **Chronic Vigilance/Load**, which includes a constant monitoring of the environment for threatening cues. Second, **On-line Responding/On-line Planning** represents individual action that is driven by the environmental demand rather than internal (anticipatory) planning. The third is **Emotional Action**, which is characterized by response to the environment in an emotionally charged manner due to environmental risks and absence of personal control. The fourth is **Constrained Options**, which explains that when environmental options are few, there is little incentive to develop alternatives. **Narrow Learning and Skill Development** is the fifth dimension, and it represents the belief that there are few opportunities for broad learning in low SES environments. The sixth is **Present Orientation**, which indicates that high levels of environmental demands lead to a focus on the short-term future. Finally, the seventh dimension is **Simple, Short-Term Goal Orientation** because those lower in SES are believed to be more likely to develop short-term rather than long-term goals.

However, at least three of these dimensions (e.g., On-Line Responding/On-line Planning, Present Orientation, and Simple, Short-Term Goal Orientation) appear to overlap in their conceptual domain space. Also, an early pilot study demonstrated that Chronic Vigilance/Load was modestly negatively correlated with other Reactive Responding dimensions (i.e., Meurs, 2007). In addition, studies that utilized these measures found both positive and negative relationships between Reactive Responding and subjective/objective SES, and the relationships between Reactive Responding and health have been weak or nonsignificant (Taylor, 1998). Although the concept of Reactive Responding seems in line with research cited above, the
dimensionalization and use by these researchers (Taylor, 1998; Taylor & Seeman, 1999) appears to be deficient.

**Reactive Responding and Self-Regulation**

As mentioned above, Reactive Responding is believed to develop from self-regulatory practices, and self-regulation has been defined as a program of internal processes that provide an individual with a course of action designed to attain goals (Carver, 2004; Jensen-Campbell et al., 2002). The relationship between Reactive Responding and self-regulation also can be seen in the strong correlations that both have with Conscientiousness (e.g., Jensen-Campbell et al., 2002; Taylor, 1998). A person’s self-regulatory processes allow him or her to plan and be less impulsive, rising above the demands of a particular situation (Bandura, 1986; Jensen-Campbell et al., 2002). Baumeister and colleagues (1994) argued that many of the problems faced by individuals and society involve self-regulatory failure.

Breakdowns in self-regulation have been related to depression (e.g., Wenzlaff, Wegner, & Roper, 1988), obsessive or ruminative thoughts (e.g., Wegner, Schneider, Carter, & White, 1987), and aggression (e.g., Baumeister, 1997). The self-regulatory processes developed in low SES environments are likely to become most highly activated when in different social settings, such as the organizational context. Just as Muraven, Tice, and Baumeister (1998) found decreases in ability to utilize self-regulation in subsequent acts, so would a person coming from a low SES background experience difficulties when faced with the chronic stressors of different environments (e.g., attempts at upward mobility into middle management of a corporation).

The research on self-regulation strongly suggests that self-regulatory abilities are associated with behavioral functions of the individual. However, Reactive Responding, believed to develop from self-regulatory processes, has been almost exclusively examined in regards to health outcomes (see for review Taylor, 1998), but not behavioral outcomes. Therefore, the present study intends to link Reactive Responding to behavioral outcomes, namely the acquisition and use of political skill.

Because of its association with self-regulatory processes, I suggest that Reactive Responding will demonstrate stronger relationships with more proximal behavioral, rather than more distal, health outcomes. Therefore, based on previous pilot research (i.e., Meurs, 2007) and conceptual and empirical work by others (e.g., Taylor, 1998; Taylor & Seeman, 1999), four dimensions of Reactive Responding have been developed, including: Constrained Options, Emotional Action, Short-Term Goal Orientation, and Restricted Social Experiences. Each of these dimensions is described below.

Constrained Options is the belief that there are few alternatives from which to choose when making decisions, and low SES environments are proposed to permit few alternative options for decision making. Short-Term Goal Orientation suggests that lower SES environments promote short-term, rather than long-term, goal pursuit. Emotional Action describes when responses to the environment are emotionally charged with a focus on anger/aggressive responses. Finally, those who are lower in SES are argued to have Restricted Social Experiences. They are likely to be exposed to a narrow range of social interactions, predominately with people similar to themselves, and these social experiences are perceived as providing inadequate social skill development for interactions later in life. These dimensions of Reactive Responding are utilized within the context of the present study as both having personality antecedents and as predictors of dimensions of political skill.
Social Cognitive Resources

Social Capital

Prior to reviewing and discussing research on the construct of political skill, it is important to understand the larger framework in which political skill is put into action. The concept of social capital has received little attention within the organizational sciences apart from theoretical and organization- or collective-level empirical work (e.g., Fischer & Pollock, 2004; Oh, Labianca, & Chung, 2006; Shaw, Duffy, Johnson, & Lockhart, 2006). However, although it addressed community-level health and well-being rather than, for instance, organizational performance, a recent review argued that both ecological and multilevel modeling approaches have found inconclusive evidence connecting social capital to community health and well-being (Poortinga, 2006). Social capital was conceived as an individual-level variable, and only became a group-level variable due to the influence of Putnam (e.g., 1993), and some researchers disagree with the belief in an aggregated value of social capital (e.g., Poortinga, 2006; Portes & Landolt, 1996), arguing that the effects of social capital occur at the individual level.

Some organizational researchers (e.g., Bolino, Turnley, & Bloodgood, 2002; Seibert, Kraimer, & Liden, 2001; Smith, 2006; Thompson, 2005) have explicitly conceptualized or examined the effects of social capital within the organizational setting at the individual level. Certainly, a range of interpersonal- and individual-level research (e.g., leadership, motivation, citizenship behaviors) could benefit from an integration of social capital theory, and some research literatures (e.g., social influence) appear to assume the effects of social capital in their constructs and models without an explicit discussion of it. Such is the case with the literature concerning political skill, which occasionally has referred to the resource accumulation characteristics of those possessing political skill (e.g., Perrewé et al., 2004).

On the other hand, the concept of social capital has inspired a number of theoretical and empirical pieces in other disciplines (e.g., Coleman, 1988; Poortinga, 2006; Putnam, 1993), mostly in the fields of sociology and health science. Social capital has been defined as the “features of social organization, such as networks, norms, and trust, that facilitate coordination and cooperation for mutual benefit” (Putnam, 1993, p. 35) and as the “resources embedded in a social structure that are accessed and/or mobilized in a purposive actions” (Lin, 2001, p. 29). As these definitions imply, social capital stems from the organization and structure of social systems, but it is not the systems themselves that are social capital. Rather, social capital is the resources or features of the social system that can be utilized to bring about desired goals in a mutually beneficial manner. Consequently, social capital can result from strong or weak ties between individuals (Coleman, 1988; Granovetter, 1973; Lin, 2001).

Researchers have proposed several aspects or characteristics important to social capital. Nahapiet and Ghoshal (1998) proposed that social capital can be viewed structurally (i.e., a pattern of relationships), relationally (i.e., the kind or quality of relationships between persons), and cognitively (i.e., shared common perspective). Others (e.g., Adler & Kwon, 2002) have differentiated between bonding social capital (i.e., a closed network of dense relationships or strong ties) (e.g., Putnam, 1993) and bridging social capital (i.e., occupying structural holes or non-redundant contacts or weak ties) (e.g., Burt, 1992). On the other hand, Lin (2001) argued that what is most valuable to social capital is not the nature of the relationship (weak or strong ties), but whether the resources a person obtains provide what is needed to fulfill objectives.

Social capital allows individuals to solve problems through coordination and facilitation of information sharing (Lazega & Pattison, 2001; Lin, 2001). Seibert and colleagues (2001)
found that access to information, resources, and career sponsorship were full mediators of the relationship between social capital and career success. Smith (2006) detailed how social capital can be influential in the intentional change process.

Nahapiet and Ghoshal (1998) utilized the resource-based view of the firm as their theoretical backdrop for explaining how social capital affects firm performance. In a similar manner, I use Conservation of Resources theory to support the belief that social capital resources are gathered, maintained, and employed to bring about desired personal and organizational goals by the politically skill individual. The resources that I believe are likely to be most valued are those that are valuable, rare, inimitable, and nonsubstitutable (Barney, 1986, 1991), and the politically skilled person is better able to discern which resources fall into those categories and to strategically utilize them in pursuit of the desired goal(s). In addition, to the extent that political skill itself is valuable, rare, inimitable, and nonsubstitutable, it can be a resource, as has been argued by others (Perrewé et al., 2004). Coleman (1988) suggested that social capital is a specific type of resource available to individuals. Putnam (1993) contended that those who have social capital tend to accumulate more, and, as noted above, similar assumptions have been stated within the COR literature (Hobfoll & Shirom, 2000). In short, social capital is a particular resource available to the politically skilled person to use when encountering stressors in the work environment. Next, I discuss the concept and dimensionality of political skill.

**Political Skill**

Both those within organizations and the researchers who study their behavior have long believed that political considerations are made within the workplace (e.g., Ferris et al., 1989; Mintzberg, 1983; Pfeffer, 1981, 1992). Certain individuals appear to be better at maneuvering the organizational landscapes as they pursue their job, career, and organizational objectives (Luthans, Hodgetts, & Rosenkrantz, 1998) and some scholars have weighed the effects of the political climate on employees (e.g., Ferris et al., 1989). Despite this understanding, with few exceptions, for many years organizational researchers have neglected the skill of political behavior when addressing important organizational issues, such as the prediction of job performance (e.g., Schmidt & Hunter, 1998).

However, more recently, some scholars addressed this oversight by developing and validating a construct of political skill (i.e., Ferris et al., 1999; Ferris et al., 2005) and relating it to a number of important work outcomes (Ferris et al., 2005; Liu et al., 2007; Perrewé et al., 2004; e.g., Semadar et al., 2006). Political skill has been 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 personal and/or organizational objectives” (Ahearn, Ferris, Hochwarter, Douglas, & Ammeter, 2004, p. 311). Concerning the distinctions within the social capital framework between structural and cognitive social capital (Harpham, Grant, & Thomas, 2002), political skill is a structural manifestation of social capital because it refers to one’s behavior rather than one’s attitude, a cognitive aspect of social capital. Ferris and colleagues (1999) initiated research in developing a measure of political skill, and provided evidence of convergent validity by demonstrating political skill to be modestly related to understanding of events, self-monitoring, positive affectivity, extraversion, empathy, conscientiousness, and delay of gratification. As expected, political skill also was unrelated to general mental ability.

Over a series of studies, Ferris and colleagues (2005) demonstrated the validity of the Political Skill Inventory (PSI), the measure utilized to assess political skill. According to the PSI, political skill is a multidimensional construct, consisting of Social Astuteness, Interpersonal Influence, Networking Ability, and Apparent Sincerity. Each dimension is discussed in greater
detail below. Political skill was found to be positively related to emotional intelligence, self-monitoring, and political savvy, negatively related to trait anxiety, unrelated to general mental ability, and predictive of ratings of managerial performance.

In addition to the studies mentioned above, Higgins (2000) found that political skill was significantly related to interviewers’ ratings and evaluation of job applicants. Similarly, Ahearn and colleagues (2004) found that leader political skill was significantly related to team performance. In a recent study, the results indicated that political skill was a stronger predictor of managerial performance than other social effectiveness constructs, including self-monitoring, leadership efficacy, and emotional intelligence (Semadar et al., 2006). Whereas the four constructs together explained 14% of the performance variance, political skill accounted for 12% on its own. Both self and supervisor reports of political skill demonstrated the largest correlations with performance ($\beta=.34$, $\beta=.30$, respectively).

As can be inferred from the discussion above, the end or aim of political skill is personal and/or organizational goals. Consequently, given the levels of personality discussed above (McAdams, 1995; McAdams & Pals, 2006), political skill can be considered a social-cognitive personality construct. According to social cognitive theory, people are anticipative, purposive, and self-evaluating regulators of their motivation and actions (Bandura, 2001). Bandura (1991) argued that human behavior is primarily motivated and regulated by the ongoing exercise of self-influence.

This self-regulative mechanism is evidenced in three sub-functions: 1. The self-monitoring of one’s behavior, its determinants, and its effects; 2. The comparison of the individual’s behavior to personal standards and environmental circumstances; and, 3. Affective self-reactions. Research suggests that the cognitive determinant of self-regulation is self-efficacy beliefs (Bandura, 2001), and self-efficacy has been conceptualized as the judgment of one’s ability to organize and execute a given course of action required to attain certain goals (Bandura, 1986). Further, it has been argued that political skill affects the above second and third sub-functions (Jawahar et al., in press).

As a social effectiveness construct (Ferris, Perrewé, & Douglas, 2002), political skill (in self-report form) appears to be a particular form of interpersonal (or social-cognitive) self-efficacy. In the same way that self-efficacy assesses an individual’s more general beliefs about their capabilities to produce valued outcomes, a self-report of political skill characterizes individuals’ beliefs about their ability to bring about important personal or organizational outcomes. Moreover, Dweck (1996) suggested that personality can be organized with goal pursuit as its foundation, and goals are an important part of both political skill and self-efficacy. Finally, recent evidence appears to indicate that both job-related or task-specific self-efficacy (i.e., a commonly measured form of self-efficacy) and political skill are social cognitive constructs that predict distinct, though somewhat overlapping, criterion space in task and contextual job performance (Jawahar et al., in press).

Dimensionality of Political Skill

In support of the dimensionality of political skill, social capital also has been implied by some to have multiple dimensions. For instance, Adler and Kwon (2002) discussed bridging and bonding social capital, and others have referred to structural and cognitive aspects of social capital (e.g., Harpham et al., 2002; Yip et al., 2007). In addition, the findings of Seibert and colleagues (2001) suggested that networking alone will not affect outcomes of career success. Early literature on organizational politics and political skill also suggest the dimensionality of
political skill (see for review Ferris et al., 2005; e.g., Mintzberg, 1983; Pfeffer, 1981, 1992; Snyder, 1987).

Finally, within the political skill literature, a series of studies has given evidence to the validity of a multidimensional conceptualization of political skill (Ferris et al., 2005). Consequently, there is sufficient evidence to assess differential predictions of political skill dimensions. Each of these dimensions of political skill is hypothesized to have particular personality and learned behavior antecedents. Below, each dimension is reviewed and, in the following section, evidence is provided for its hypothesized antecedents.

*Social Astuteness*

Social astuteness involves understanding social settings and correctly assessing the behavior of people (including the self) in social interactions. Socially astute individuals are interpersonally self-aware and discerning in a variety of social settings (Ferris et al., 2005). Pfeffer (1992) termed this characteristic sensitivity to others. Ferris and colleagues (1999) found that political skill (i.e., using a 6-item measure of political skill developed prior to the PSI) was a significant predictor of supervisor performance ratings (controlling for age and tenure) and measures of leader effectiveness. For both outcomes, Social Astuteness was the one dimension that best predicted ratings (Ferris et al., 1999).

*Networking Ability*

Networking Ability assesses how successfully a person builds effective, advantageous partnerships with others. Those high on Networking Ability are able to construct and maintain a diverse network of individuals that can be utilized to assist in achieving goals. They are connected with influential people and they know how to utilize their network to accomplish what needs to be done. Ferris and colleagues (2005) reported that, in one of their studies, the Networking Ability dimension was the strongest predictor (of the four) of the influence tactics of upward appeal, coalition, and assertiveness.

*Interpersonal Influence*

Persons high on Interpersonal Influence have a powerful ability to persuade others, and are able to adapt their behavior to different targets of their influence attempts. People feel comfortable around those with Interpersonal Influence because they are skilled at getting people to like them. Pfeffer’s (1992) reference to “flexibility” (i.e., the ability to strategically adapt behavior to different persons in different settings) is a concept similar to Interpersonal Influence.

*Apparent Sincerity*

Political skill involves possessing or appearing to possess “high levels of integrity, authenticity, sincerity, and genuineness” (Ferris et al., 2005, p. 129). This dimension addresses the potential success of an individual’s influence attempts because, if the target perceives ulterior motives or dishonesty on the part of the actor, then any attempts at influence are likely to be ineffective. Those possessing Apparent Sincerity are more likely to inspire the trust and support of their coworkers as they pursue their goals.

**Predicting Political Skill**

As noted by others (e.g., Graziano, Jensen-Campbell et al., 1997), within the levels of personality (McAdams, 1995; McAdams & Pals, 2006), it would seem likely that level one (i.e., traits) of personality has an influence on the second level of personality (e.g., characteristics related to goals or coping). Within the present study, the level one personality traits (i.e., HEXACO facets and Proactive Personality) are hypothesized to influence level two personality characteristics (i.e., Reactive Responding and PSI dimensions).
This study is being conducted within the context of stress research, and political skill is thought to be a form of interpersonal control (Perrewé et al., 2004) or a resource that can alleviate the negative effects of stressful experiences, as discussed below. The relationship between personality traits and stress coping has received a substantial amount of research attention. Therefore, one explanation for interpersonal types of coping is the use of political skill. Consequently, where applicable, the inclusion of relationships found between a personality trait and coping tendencies may further elucidate the relationships between personality and political skill.

In the following sections, I discuss, in turn, each hypothesized predictor of political skill dimensions. I begin with a review of the call by others to research relationships between personality traits and political skill. I then discuss personality traits (i.e., HEXACO facets and Proactive Personality), reviewing their proposed relationships first with political skill dimensions and then with Reactive Responding dimensions. Within the first six of these sections, hypotheses are made regarding the relationships between one facet of each of the HEXACO factors and a political skill dimension(s). Because little research has been conducted regarding the HEXACO factors of personality and even less published research was found that related the facets of the HEXACO factors of personality to other constructs, the evidence in support of the hypotheses is drawn from literature that utilized the FFM. I hypothesize that SES is negatively related to Reactive Responding, and I conclude the section by reviewing, more generally, the relationship between Reactive Responding and political skill, and, then, hypothesizing relationships between the two.

The Need to Research Relations between Personality Traits and Political Skill

Hochwarter (2003) suggested that research attention be given to the dispositional antecedents of political behavior, noting, particularly because both NA and PA had nonsignificant relations with politicking, that those who act politically may possess a combination of a number of personality traits. Further, Kolodinsky Hochwarter, and Ferris (2004) called for research into the personality antecedents of political skill. One study (i.e., Liu et al., 2007) has analyzed two dispositional predictors of political skill (i.e., Extraversion and Proactive Personality). However, studies have neither comprehensively addressed the dispositional and learned behavior prediction of political skill, nor considered the dimensionality of political skill in such predictions. The following sections discuss the particular personality traits of interest in the present study with respect to their relationships with selected political skill dimensions.

Emotionality (Emotional Stability)

As mentioned above, individuals high on Neuroticism are more likely to experience anxiety, hostility, anger, and emotional distress (McCrae & Costa, 1987). The relationship between Neuroticism and coping methods probably has received more attention than the relationship between coping and any other personality variable. Numerous studies have demonstrated that Neuroticism is associated with emotion-focused or passive coping tendencies (see for review Lee-Baggley, Preece, & DeLongis, 2005). O’Brien and DeLongis (1996) found that persons high on Neuroticism tend to use a maladaptive interpersonal coping tendency relative to the closeness of the relationship with another person. Specifically, those scoring high on Neuroticism used more confrontational coping when a stressor involved a person emotionally close to them, and more empathetic responding when a stressor involved someone distant.

The results of a study of nurses (i.e., Buunk, Van der Zee, & VanYperen, 2001) concerning the social comparisons of those high on Neuroticism were consistent with a similar,
earlier study conducted among cancer patients (i.e., Van der Zee, Buunk, & Sanderman, 1998). The second of the two studies (i.e., Buunk et al., 2001) indicated that those higher on Neuroticism respond less positively to, and identify less with, upward comparison targets, but identify more with downward comparison targets. These effects were found even when controlling for negative affect.

Horney (1945) argued that neurotic distress stems from the incompatibility of conscious interpersonal strategies with unconscious attitudes towards the self and others. This incompatibility yielded two patterns of behavior. Either the individual supported a hostile strategy toward others but did not pursue it because of the appreciation of others relative to the self, or the person supported a friendly approach to others but did not completely follow this strategy because of his or her unconscious dislike for others relative to the self (Horney, 1945). In a study of friendship dyads, Berry, Willingham, and Thayer (2000) found that, of the Big Five, the strongest predictors of a participant’s irritation was a friend’s self-reported Neuroticism (i.e., $r$ of .29, almost double the size of the second strongest predictor).

Research on the social lives of those high on Neuroticism has found what on the surface would appear to be inconsistent results. Some (e.g., Sarason, Levine, Basham, & Sarason, 1983) demonstrated that Neuroticism had no relationship with network size, whereas Bolger and Eckenrode (1991) found that Neuroticism was negatively related to measures of social support but unrelated to frequency of social contact. Similar to Neuroticism, trait anxiety and dysfunctional attitudes have been found to be negatively associated with perceived support (Lakey & Cassady, 1990), and Ferris and colleagues (2005) found that the PSI was negatively correlated with trait anxiety, with the Interpersonal Influence dimension showing the strongest correlation of any of the four dimensions.

Significance tests also demonstrated that the correlation between Interpersonal Influence and trait anxiety was significantly larger than the correlations between trait anxiety and any of the other three dimensions (Ferris et al., 2005). One study (Russell, Booth, Reed, & Laughlin, 1997) only minimally associated Neuroticism with characteristics of the social network, but found that it strongly and negatively related to the perceptions of available social support. However, in the same study, Neuroticism did not predict the proportion of negative relationships in the social support network (Russell et al., 1997).

These results indicate that the FFM Neuroticism trait is likely to be highly predictive of the Interpersonal Influence dimension of political skill. Neuroticism appears to be unrelated to the size of one’s social network, but it is associated with the perceived quality of the social network. A friend’s irritation was related to self-reported Neuroticism (Berry et al., 2000). In short, Neuroticism appears to be unrelated to the size of someone’s network, and no indication is given regarding a neurotic person’s social understanding or (apparent) sincerity. However, the present study utilizes the HEXACO model facets for prediction of political skill dimensions. As mentioned above, the HEXACO version of the Neuroticism factor (Emotionality) lacks the pathological components contained in the FFM’s Neuroticism.

Consequently, in order to align the current study with previous results, I attempt to choose the HEXACO Emotionality factor that appears to be most similar to the FFM’s Neuroticism factor. Of the four facets of the HEXACO’s Emotionality factor (i.e., Anxiety, Fearfulness, Dependence, and Sentimentality), the latter three appear less relevant to the present study. Fearfulness concerns a person’s response to danger, Dependence addresses an individual’s need for others’ approval, and Sentimentality measures a person’s sensitivity to others’ needs and willingness to cry around others. On the other hand, Anxiety, which mostly concerns worry,
appears to be the most reflective of the FFM’s Neuroticism factor, particularly because one of the NEO-PI-R (Costa & McCrae, 1992) (the most widely utilized measure of the FFM) facet’s of Neuroticism also is Anxiety.

Hypothesis 1: The Anxiety facet of Emotionality is negatively related to both self- and supervisor-rated Interpersonal Influence.

Extraversion

Those high on Extraversion are characterized as social, talkative, or active, whereas those low on Extraversion are likely to experience discomfort in social interactions. A range of literature supports the view that extraverts (i.e., those high on Extraversion) have larger, more diverse social networks with which they keep in frequent contact. In apparent support of the definition of Extraversion, some have found that extraverts have larger social networks (e.g., Henderson, 1981; Russell et al., 1997), and other studies demonstrated that they contact others more often (e.g., Bolger & Eckenrode, 1991; Lu, 1997; Russell et al., 1997). Cohen, Doyle, Skoner, Rabin, and Gwaltney (1997) found that Extraversion was associated with high network diversity, and a study by Wanberg, Kanfer, and Banas (2000) demonstrated that Extraversion was related to higher levels of networking intensity among job seekers.

Forret and Dougherty (2001) found that Extraversion strongly predicted four of the five networking behaviors studied (e.g., maintaining contacts, socializing). One study found that undergraduate students higher on Extraversion reported greater frequency of social activity (i.e., Watson, Clark, McIntyre, & Hamaker, 1992). Russell and colleagues (1997) also reported that those high on Extraversion had a greater proportion of confidants than those low on Extraversion. In a unique study in prediction of everyday life events, it was found that although personality variables played a more minor role in predicting daily events than past events (i.e., due to the stability of daily events), the interaction of Extraversion and network size was a significant predictor (Zautra, Finch, Reich, & Guarnaccia, 1991).

In differentiating Extraversion from Agreeableness, some have stated that Extraversion refers to social impact, whereas Agreeableness deals with the maintenance of positive relations with others (e.g., Jensen-Campbell & Graziano, 2001). Research has demonstrated that those high on Extraversion have higher performance in more social jobs, where being assertive and sociable is likely to contribute to success (Barrick et al., 2001). In their second-order meta-analysis, Barrick, Mount, and Judge (2001) also found that Extraversion was related to performance in managerial positions. In addition, another study suggested that extraverts are interpersonally dominant with peers (Lee-Baggley et al., 2005).

A study by Watson and Hubbard (1996) indicated that in comparison to the other Big Five traits, Extraversion was the most predictive of seeking emotional and instrumental support during stressful events. Amirkhan, Risinger, and Swickert (1995) demonstrated that Extraversion was predictive of coping strategies chosen, because it was positively related to both help seeking and social support seeking, and negatively associated with avoidance. Extraverts have been found to report not only having more available social support, but also a greater likelihood to utilize social support (Swickert, Rosentreter, Hittner, & Mushrush, 2002). In addition, the perceived availability of social support has been found to mediate the relationship between Extraversion and reported stressors (i.e., daily hassles) (Swickert et al., 2002).

However, the same study did not find that enacted or structural support mediated Extraversion and stressors, and extraverts did not report more satisfaction with their network members than introverts. These results suggested that the perceived availability of support rather than utilized support is important to the extravert experiencing stressors. Another study (i.e.,
Duckitt, 1984) found that among six personality variables, Extraversion had the strongest relationship with level of support (i.e., social resources). Finally, Liu and colleagues (2007) demonstrated that Extraversion was related to political skill.

Persons scoring high on Extraversion have been found to engage in more conversations during stress (Zellars & Perrewé, 2001). However, other studies have found that extroverts tend to use avoidance coping (e.g., Brebner, 2001). Gallagher (1996) explained this difference by suggesting that high performing extroverts might engage in greater social interaction, whereas lower performing extroverts might utilize avoidance coping.

It appears that those high on Extraversion are more social, and in more frequent contact with those in their social networks. However, it does not seem that extraverts necessarily utilize their networks for support or influence attempts (Swickert et al., 2002), nor that they appear more sincere in their social influence. Also, although it may appear reasonable to conclude that extraverts might be more socially astute due to the extent and frequency of their social connections, being socially astute is not simply a matter of socializing, but of understanding social interactions. Therefore, of the four dimensions of political skill, Extraversion likely has its strongest relationship with Networking Ability.

Ferris and colleagues (2007) suggested that Extraversion was related to three of the four PSI dimensions, including Networking Ability. Of the four facets of the HEXACO Extraversion factor, (i.e., Expressiveness Social Boldness, Liveliness, and Sociability), the first three seem least relevant to Networking Ability. Expressiveness addresses the quantity of interaction with others, Social Boldness concerns the person’s comfort with attention from others, and Liveliness deals with the energy that a person has. Sociability, which primarily concerns the amount of time and enjoyment someone receives from being around other people, would appear likely have the strongest relationship with Networking Ability. Consequently, I present the following hypothesis:

**Hypothesis 2:** The Sociability facet of Extraversion is positively related to both self- and supervisor-rated Networking Ability.

**Agreeableness**

As discussed above, in differentiating Extraversion from Agreeableness, some have stated that Extraversion refers to social impact, whereas Agreeableness deals with the maintenance of positive relations with others (Jensen-Campbell & Graziano, 2001). Agreeableness has been argued to be the development of effortful control, particularly the regulation of anger, when handling frustration in interactions with others (Ahadi & Rothbart, 1994; Jensen-Campbell, Gleason, Adams, & Malcolm, 2003). Wiggins (1991) suggested that agreeable individuals are motivated to maintain intimacy and solidarity in relationships, and Watson, David, and Suls (1999) noted that Agreeableness is negatively related to hostility.

Agreeableness may allow individuals to negotiate in ways that capitalize on the advantages of group interactions (Jensen-Campbell & Graziano, 2001). Similarly, Barrick, et al. (2001) argued that Agreeableness has been found to predict performance only in jobs where being helpful, cooperative, and nurturing with others are particularly important. Berry and Hansen (2000) noted that the results of their study suggest that those high on Agreeableness interact with others (in dyads) in a more objectively positive manner, creating a more positive experience for other people. Berry, Willingham, and Thayer (2000) found that self-reported Agreeableness was the strongest predictor of the FFM of a friend’s irritation (i.e., a negative relationship) in friendship dyads.
Koole, Jager, VandenBerg, Vlek, and Hofstee (2001) found that those scoring high on Agreeableness were more cooperative in the utilization of collective resources. In addition, those high on Agreeableness were more responsive to feedback, having more self-restraint when the common resource was threatened. Similarly, Graziano, Jensen-Campbell, and Hair (1996) found that those high on Agreeableness preferred constructive conflict resolution strategies over power assertion tactics, while persons low on Agreeableness preferred power assertion tactics. Also, Graziano, Hair, and Finch (1997) found that individuals high on Agreeableness were less competitive during a group task.

Others have found Agreeableness related to conflict resolution (i.e., Jensen-Campbell & Graziano, 2001) and emotional control in promotion of interpersonal harmony (i.e., Tobin, Graziano, Vanman, & Tassinary, 2000). In addition, a child’s Agreeableness has been argued to be related to making friends and cooperating in the classroom (Sneed, 2002). Also, disagreeable (i.e., low on Agreeableness) persons have been argued to be socially oriented toward hostility, valuing the self’s interests above that of others (Robinson & Wilkowski, 2006). Robinson and Wilkowski (2006) also contended that a disagreeable person’s interpersonal approach might be more effective in contexts with uncertain moral codes or unstructured social relationships, whereas an agreeable individual’s strategy might be better in situations involving clear and unanimous rules for moral conduct and well-defined social relationships.

Most studies have demonstrated that Agreeableness is associated with more interpersonal forms of coping. Zellars and Perrewé (2001) found that Agreeableness was related to having nonjob-related conversations with coworkers and decreased depersonalization of others. O’Brien and DeLongis (1996) found that agreeable persons tended to use less confrontational and more support seeking forms of coping. Agreeableness also has been associated with self-blame (Lee-Baggley et al., 2005) and (modestly) with disengagement (Watson & Hubbard, 1996) forms of coping. Brebner (2001) found that Agreeableness was unrelated to either task-focused, emotion-focused, or avoidance coping. In sum, these findings appear to suggest that persons high on Agreeableness tend to use interpersonal ways of coping with stressors.

Clearly, Agreeableness, along with Extraversion, highlights interpersonal aspects of personality. Rather than social impact (i.e., Extraversion), Agreeableness has been described as the ability to relate to others in a positive manner. However, as mentioned in the description of the HEXACO model, the HEXACO construct of Agreeableness includes the pole from patient to irritable, rather than from sensitive to tough, as is the case in the FFM. The difference is reflected in the HEXACO Agreeableness facet of Patience, with the NEO-PI-R (Costa & McCrae, 1992) not having an exactly similar facet (i.e., the closest ones being Cooperation, Trust, and Sympathy). It could be that the presence of “toughness” in the FFM Agreeableness factor is why Robinson and Wilkowski (2006) argued that a disagreeable person might function better in a more unstructured social context.

However, aside from their contention, it appears that high Agreeableness is most likely to have a positive impact on the Interpersonal Influence dimension of political skill. Agreeable persons do not appear to have more social contact with others, more understanding of social interactions, or more sincerity. However, it seems that highly agreeable persons are more likely to have less overt conflict or power struggles with coworkers, and, thus, are more likely to be able to sway others opinions. There seems to be less research supporting the view that a person’s self-reports of Interpersonal Influence would be strongly correlated with Agreeableness than that another person’s report of someone’s Interpersonal Influence would be associated with Agreeableness.
Of the four HEXACO facets of Agreeableness (i.e., Forgiveness, Gentleness, Patience, and Flexibility), the first three seem least likely to be predictive of Interpersonal Influence. Forgiveness measures a person’s likelihood of holding a grudge after being wronged, Gentleness concerns a person’s attitude toward complaining or judging, and Flexibility addresses the taking of advice and criticism. On the other hand, I believe that Patience, which measures an individual’s readiness with getting angry at others, is likely to have the strongest relationship with Interpersonal Influence. Finally, as with Extraversion, Ferris et al (2007) maintained that Agreeableness was related to three of the political skill dimensions, including Interpersonal Influence. Therefore, I propose the following hypothesis:

Hypothesis3: The Patience facet of Agreeableness is positively associated with Interpersonal Influence. This relationship is stronger for supervisor-rated Interpersonal Influence than for self-rated Interpersonal Influence.

Conscientiousness and Openness to Experience

The present study does not posit relationships between Conscientiousness or Openness to Experience and political skill dimensions. As noted by others (e.g., Ladd & Henry, 2000; Organ, 1994), Conscientiousness is an impersonal personality trait, and little research has connected Conscientiousness to any clear interpersonal tendencies. Also, the effects of openness on political skill are proposed to be accounted for (i.e., mediated by) Reactive Responding dimensions, as discussed below.

Honesty-Humility

The Honesty-Humility factor of the HEXACO Model of personality has demonstrated significant negative correlations with Machiavellianism, Social Adroitness, and Self-Monitoring (Ashton & Lee, 2001; Ashton & Lee, 2005; Ashton et al., 2000). Some scholars have suggested that Machiavellianism can be thought of as a strategy of deflection when the likelihood of retaliation is low (e.g., Wilson, Near, & Miller, 1996). As noted by Hochwarter (2003), Ferris, Russ, and Fandt (1989) suggested that Machiavellianism could be related with political behavior. Self-monitoring also has been demonstrated to be related to the Political Skill Inventory (Ferris et al., 2005).

This evidence appears to suggest a negative association between Honesty-Humility and the PSI. Clearly, of the four dimensions of political skill, it seems likely that the strongest correlation of Honesty-Humility would be with Apparent Sincerity. The four Honesty-Humility facets include Sincerity, Fairness, Greed Avoidance, and Modesty. Of the two Honesty-Humility facets that had the highest loadings on the factor (i.e., Greed Avoidance and Sincerity), the facet that had the strongest negative correlations with Social Adroitness (−.39) and Self-Monitoring (−.41) was Sincerity (Ashton & Lee, 2005). Therefore, the present study will assess the relationship between Sincerity (HEXACO) and Apparent Sincerity (PSI), elucidating, to some degree, whether the perceptible sincerity of the politically skilled person is negatively related to actual sincerity.

Hypothesis 4: The Sincerity facet of Honesty-Humility is negatively related to both self- and supervisor-rated Apparent Sincerity.

Proactive Personality

A recent analysis (i.e., Liu et al., 2007) of the antecedents of political skill found that Proactive Personality was predictive of political skill. However, the study by Liu et al (2007) not only did not examine the relationship between Proactive Personality and a particular dimension(s), but also it did not assess the relationship(s) in the context of competitive prediction of political skill dimensions. Therefore, in order to build on previous research, the present study
also will consider the influence of Proactive Personality on the dimensions of political skill. Although less research has been conducted on Proactive Personality than on FFM personality traits, there are a few studies that appear to support a relationship between Proactive Personality and the Networking Ability dimension of the PSI.

Lambert, Eby, and Reeves (2006) found that Proactive Personality was related to networking intensity, but unrelated to networking quality (i.e., network diversity and value). Another study (i.e., Harvey, Blouin, & Stout, 2006) demonstrated that, in the presence of interpersonal conflict, those high on Proactive Personality had decreased well-being and performance. Finally, utilizing the Networking Ability dimension of the PSI, a structural equation modeling analysis by Thompson (2005) indicated that the impact of proactive personality on job performance is through Networking Ability. Therefore, given this initial evidence, it appears that Proactive Personality is likely to have its strongest relationship with Networking Ability.

Hypothesis 5: Proactive Personality is positively related to both self- and supervisor-rated Networking Ability.

SES and Reactive Responding

As discussed above, a substantial amount of research has linked an individual’s SES to important health and behavioral outcomes (see for review Adler et al., 1994), and many have investigated potential explanations for these relationships. Some (i.e., Taylor, 1998; Taylor & Seeman, 1999) have proposed mechanisms which attempted to explain these relationships. As argued above, the multidimensional construct of Reactive Responding, as conceptualized in this study, is proposed as a self-regulatory mechanism that is negatively related to SES. Therefore, I propose the following hypothesis:

Hypothesis 6: SES is negatively related to Reactive Responding.

Openness and Reactive Responding

Recently, Roberts, Walton, and Viechtbauer (2006) conducted a meta-analysis of longitudinal personality studies and found that individuals generally experience the greatest increase of their lifetime in Openness to Experience during the years between ages 10 and 20. McCrae and colleagues (McCrae et al., 2002) demonstrated similar results in an analysis of 12-18 year olds, finding that Openness increased for both boys and girls during that period, and noting that the increase apparently continues into college (see Robins, Fraley, Roberts, & Trzesniewski, 2001). McCrae and colleagues (2002) argued that during adolescence both the individual’s capacity to understand the world as well as their interest in it is increased, resulting in differentiated moral judgment and a more thoroughly integrated self. Similarly, concerning personality traits that more dramatically increased in young adulthood (ages 20-40), Roberts and colleagues (2006) argued that life experiences and lessons are the most likely reasons for these changes.

Taken together, I maintain that adolescence is the phase in life when individuals are most able to increase their levels of Openness, which aids in the proper adjustment and maturity into adulthood. However, the effect that Openness has on measures of adjustment to adult life in organizations (e.g., political skill) is mediated by the experiences of adolescence. More specifically, in relation to the present study, measures of Reactive Responding, which is developed during adolescence, mediate the relationship between Openness to Experience and a person’s understanding of the social climate in adulthood (i.e., Social Astuteness and Networking Ability).
In support of this contention, Costa and McCrae (1980) found that, over a ten-year period, men who scored high on Openness were more likely to have moved, become divorced, get demoted at work, quit their job, or become involved in a lawsuit. Whitbourne (1986) found that Openness predicted identity flexibility (readiness to initiate a life change), and identity flexibility predicted actual life changes.

Openness to Experience has been shown to be more positively correlated with ego development than the other Big Five dimensions (McCrae & Costa, 1980), and persons high on Openness to Experience have been found to engage in more current and past self-identity exploration (Tesch & Srull, 1984) and to have a greater willingness to consider future life changes (Whitbourne, 1986). Berzonsky and Sullivan (1992) found that Openness and normative-oriented identity (e.g., being closed or rigid) loaded on a single factor, and they suggested that normative-oriented individuals have an identity that is self-protective, shielding the person from having to consider dissonance-inducing experiences and information that might endanger important views of the self.

One study examined the relationship between Five Factor dimensions (with particular emphasis on Openness) and individuals values (i.e., Dollinger, Leong, & Ulicni, 1996). The authors found that Openness was positively related to the value of being broadminded and, across three samples, Openness was positively associated with composites of values that represented maturity and self-direction and negatively associated with composites representing restrictive conformity. They concluded that most people, including those not high on Openness, valued qualities that they already possessed, and that future research should consider the impact of developmental experiences on Openness (Dollinger et al., 1996). Finally, McCrae (1996) argued, “the personality dimension that most centrally influences social and interpersonal phenomena is Openness” (p. 323).

Similarly, Caspi, Bem, and Elder (1989) reported on the tracing of the development of interaction styles from childhood to adulthood (30 years later). The authors concluded that individuals’ selection and creation of environments is guided by their disposition in a way that gives personality causal force in the course of life. Also, Buss (1987) maintained that differences in personality influence the types of social environments people select into, the kinds of responses evoked from others, and the way individuals attempt to manipulate the environment and persons with whom they interact.

The empirical and theoretical evidence suggests that Openness to Experience in youth can influence reaction to the environment in which one is placed. I contend that the flexible, change-oriented nature of individuals high on Openness allows such individuals to respond to the adjustment into adulthood in an adaptive, self-regulative fashion (“un”-Reactive Responding), permitting them to adapt to the adult, organizational world despite the difficulties posed by past experiences. Whereas, individuals low on Openness experience the environmental challenges of their youth and respond in a manner which is self-protective and less explorative of their identity (Reactive Responding), leading to greater difficulty adjusting to the life of working adults in an organization.

Of the four dimensions of Openness (i.e., Aesthetic Appreciation, Inquisitiveness, Unconventionality, and Creativity), the first two appear least pertinent to the present study because of their connection to art appreciation and science/intellectual matters, respectively. Also, Unconventionality, the dislike of being considered “mainstream,” seems more prone to desirability responding and less connected to Reactive Responding than Creativity, which
concerns an individual’s imagination and ability to find new ways of doing things. Therefore, Creativity will be utilized in the present study.

**Hypothesis 7A: The Creativity facet of Openness is negatively related to Short-Term Goal Orientation, Emotional Action, Restricted Social Experiences, and Constrained Options.**

**Hypothesis 7B: The relationship between the Creativity facet of Openness and political skill dimensions is mediated by the Reactive Responding dimensions of Short-Term Goal Orientation, Emotional Action, Restricted Social Experiences, and Constrained Options.**

**Conscientiousness and Short-Term Goal Orientation**

Those high on Conscientiousness have been described as hardworking, organized, and achievement-oriented (Block, 1961; Digman, 1990). Barrick and colleagues (2001) demonstrated that Conscientiousness was the strongest predictor within the FFM of performance across occupations. It is possible that the relationship between Conscientiousness and performance is due to an association between Conscientiousness and goals. Porath and Bateman (2006) found that self-regulation tactics mediated the relationship between goal orientations and job performance, and Barrick, Mount, and Strauss (1993) found that goal setting partially mediated the relationship between Conscientiousness and job performance.

Although Porath and Bateman (2006) did not measure Conscientiousness, Conscientiousness has been positively associated with self-regulation (Jensen-Campbell et al., 2002). In addition, although the relationship was not direct, Gellatly (1996) found that persons higher in Conscientiousness set higher personal goals. Of the four facets of the HEXACO model of Conscientiousness (i.e., Organization, Diligence, Perfectionism, and Prudence), Perfectionism and Prudence seem less related to goal orientation. Perfectionism concerns a person’s attention to detail, and Prudence measures a person’s (lack of) rashness. Organization addresses an individual’s orderliness or tidiness, and seems less likely to be associated with Short-Term Goal Orientation than Diligence, which refers to the effort a person puts to a task. Therefore, I believe Diligence will be strongly related to goal setting.

**Hypothesis 8: The Diligence facet of Conscientiousness is negatively associated with Short-Term Goal Orientation.**

**Reactive Responding and Political Skill.**

Kolodinsky and colleagues (2004) called for research to investigate the contextual antecedents of political skill. Reactive Responding speaks to a portion of the effects of context in the development of the individual, because, as noted above, Reactive Responding is an attempt to measure the psychosocial affects of the low SES environment. The economically disadvantaged have been thought to have insufficient social capital available to help them rise above poverty (Portes, 1998). Relationships formed for the purpose of increasing the social capital of some also are effectively excluding others (Portes & Landolt, 1996). In differentiating social support from social capital, social support allows those low in SES to “get by,” whereas social capital assists individuals in “getting ahead” (Warr, 2006).

For those low in SES, social networks, particularly those that bridge divergent networks (i.e., weak ties) (Granovetter, 1973), can be particularly important because they can provide bridges to overcoming the obstacles of their present environment (Aguilera & Massey, 2003; Warr, 2006). After presenting the results of a study of economically disadvantaged women, Warr (2006) argued that the art of social capital for those low in SES involves participation in bridging and bonding networks and learning to socialize in vertical networks in unfamiliar social settings. Reactive Responding is a measure that, to a certain extent, on the low pole, measures how well individuals low in SES are able “get ahead” of the difficulties they face.
The relationship between Reactive Responding and political skill can be explained, in part, by the effects of the environment on the development of the individual. Reductions in poverty have been related to decreased childhood behavioral disorders (Costello, Compton, Keeler, & Angold, 2003), whereas exposure to violence has been associated with increased behavioral aggressiveness (Anderson et al., 2003). Higher childhood SES has been associated with adulthood maintenance of social contacts and organizational level, which could be thought of as a measure of profession, one aspect of SES (Forret & Dougherty, 2001). Also, possessing an advanced education, another aspect of SES, was related to networking behaviors (Forret & Dougherty, 2001). These results support the finding by Michael and Yukl (1993) that one’s level within an organization is important to networking, suggesting that as an individual moves higher up the organizational hierarchy, a greater amount of establishing relationships and playing an active role in decisions is important.

Having low peer acceptance and a lack of friendships in childhood has been related to adjustment problems, psychopathological symptoms, and low self-esteem in early adulthood (Bagwell, Newcomb, & Bukowski, 1998). Children who had low acceptance among their peers have been demonstrated to have lower quality friendships than those who were more accepted (Parker & Asher, 1993), and children with more difficulties with their peers have been found to be at increased risk for difficulties later in life (Parker & Asher, 1987). Individuals whose social experiences in youth provided little benefit for their future growth likely experienced difficulty in their relations with the peers of their youth.

In regard to self-regulation, Baumeister, DeWall, Ciarocco, and Twenge (2005) found that being socially excluded led a person to have difficulty with future self-regulation abilities, and Vohs, Baumeister, and Ciarocco (2005) demonstrated that self-presentations under challenging conditions resulted in impaired future self-regulation. However, in the Baumeister et al. study, increasing the person’s self-awareness removed the self-regulatory failure, and in the Vohs et al. study, self-presentations in familiar or normal settings depleted fewer resources.

These results indicate that persons who reactively respond to their environment are likely to have a decreased ability to move up the organizational hierarchy, and they engage in less networking (Forret & Dougherty, 2001). They also are likely to have difficulties regulating and presenting themselves in unfamiliar settings, which may include the organizational setting. However, increasing a person’s self-awareness improved their regulatory abilities when they were socially excluded (Baumeister et al., 2005). The self-awareness within the individual could be analogous to the Social Astuteness that a person can have (outside of the individual) in social settings. Similarly, the importance of social networks to the economically disadvantaged (low SES) (Aguilera & Massey, 2003; Warr, 2006) indicate the importance of Networking Ability to the success of such persons. Therefore, I propose the following hypotheses:

Hypothesis 9A: Short-Term Goal Orientation has a negative relationship with Social Astuteness.
Hypothesis 9B: Short-Term Goal Orientation has a negative relationship with Networking Ability.
Hypothesis 10A: Restricted Social Experiences has a negative relationship with Social Astuteness.
Hypothesis 10B: Restricted Social Experiences has a negative relationship with Networking Ability.
Hypothesis 11A: Emotional Action has a negative relationship with Social Astuteness.
Hypothesis 11B: Emotional Action has a negative relationship with Networking Ability.
Hypothesis 12A: Constrained Options has a negative relationship with Social Astuteness.  
Hypothesis 12B: Constrained Options has a negative relationship with Networking Ability.

Political Skill Dimensions and the Stress Process

The current section of the paper explores how political skill can affect the stress process. In line with previous research (e.g., Carlson & Perrewé, 1999; Perrewé et al., 2004), the current study conceptualizes stress within the organizational context as a progression from stressors to strains to behavior. There is a small amount of research that has investigated how political skill may function in the stress process. However, there are some constructs and studies within both the stress and the political skill literatures that merit attention.

Political Skill as a Moderator of the Stress Process

Control is a topic within stress research that many have thought has the potential to alleviate workplace strain (e.g., Karasek, 1979, 1990; Schaubroeck & Merritt, 1997). Perceived control in the workplace is the extent to which individuals believe they have the necessary resources to control the pace and quality of their work. One of the most widely cited theories of job stress is the Job Demands-Job Control model posited by Karasek (1979). According to the model, an individuals’ demands and control can vary independently in any given job, and particular combinations can produce negative (e.g., strain), positive (e.g., learning or low strain), or passive (e.g., learned helplessness) outcomes.

When individuals are provided high decision latitude (control), learning (with high demands) or low strain (with low demands) occurs. Similarly, Fox, Dwyer, and Ganster (1993) found that a high workload had a positive effect on well-being when combined with high perceived control. Also, Tetrick and LaRocco (1987) demonstrated that control moderated the negative relationship between perceived role stress and satisfaction. In short, when a person desires to act within the organizational setting, a sense of personal control appears to often provide the individual with both decreased strain, and an avenue toward obtaining positive work outcomes.

Political skill has been proposed by some to be a type of personal control in the workplace. Perrewé, Ferris, Frink, and Anthony (2000) suggested that political skill may reduce an individual’s strain at work because of the increased sense of control. Further, Perrewé and colleagues (2004) argued that political skill represents a type of interpersonal control because of the success that the politically skilled person likely has with influencing others. Understanding also has been thought to be a type of control (Tetrick & LaRocco, 1987), and politically skilled persons have an enhanced understanding of people and social interactions (Ferris et al., 2005; Perrewé et al., 2000). Although the relationship between strain and behavior was not examined, Perrewé and colleagues (2004) found that political skill moderated the relationship between role stressors and physiological (i.e., systolic and diastolic blood pressure), subjective health (i.e., somatic complaints) and psychological (i.e., anxiety) measures of strain.

The contention that political skill would serve as a moderator of the relationship between stressors and strain appears to be supported by the Conservation of Resources (COR) theory of stress. A meta-analysis by Halbesleben (2006), using social support as a resource, found that social support moderated relationships between workplace demands and job burnout. Recently, another theory of workplace stress has been posited that also considers the resources available to the individual, the Job Demands-Resources model (e.g., Bakker, Demerouti, De Boer, & Schaufeli, 2003; Bakker, Demerouti, & Euwema, 2005).
Using this model, Mauno, Kinnunen, and Ruokolainen (2006) found that job resources affect motivational outcomes (e.g., job satisfaction, organizational commitment), whereas job demands affect strain-based outcomes. Therefore, although more traditional job stress theory and research (e.g., Fox et al., 1993; Hobfoll, 1989; Karasek, 1990) indicates that resources likely would moderate the relationship between stressors and strain, stress research utilizing this model (e.g., Bakker et al., 2005; Mauno et al., 2006) suggests that resources (e.g., political skill), instead, are more proximal predictors (or moderators) of workplace behavior outcomes (e.g., job performance).

**Political Skill as an Antecedent of Stressors**

In addition, the Cognitive Activation Theory of Stress (CATS) (Ursin & Eriksen, 2004) would appear to suggest a different role for political skill in the stressor-strain-behavior relationship. As described above, according to CATS, an “alarm” occurs within the individual whenever expectancies are not met (e.g., when something is missing, when there is an imbalance, or when there is a threat). Therefore, the ability to cope with the alarm comes from a positive outcome expectancy (Ursin & Eriksen, 2004). If the individual has a positive outcome expectancy, then the response is adaptive. However, sustained high levels of arousal (“alarm”), resulting from a lack of control, are a risk to the person’s health, and Brosschot and colleagues (2006) elaborated on the cognitive aspects of CATS by suggesting that the uncontrollability of a stressor is represented by perseverative cognition.

Political skill provides the individual with the expectancy of a positive outcome. The politically skilled person believes that he or she is able to achieve the desired personal or organizational goals. Consequently, according to CATS (Ursin & Eriksen, 2004), it seems likely that the politically skilled person would not experience the sustained stress activation that constitutes a stressor. Similarly, they Perrewé and colleagues (2004) argued that those high in political skill are more activated than those low in political skill, and Perrewé and colleagues (2000) suggested that political skill allows managers to perceive their environment as less stressful.

In addition, when demonstrating the moderation by political skill of stressor-strain relationships, Perrewé and colleagues (2004) did not examine the potential for political skill to be an antecedent of stressors. Finally, Carlson and Perrewé (1999) found that a model of social support, as an antecedent of the stressors to work-family conflict relationship, fit better than a model of social support as either a moderator of the relationship, a mediator of the relationship, or a direct predictor of work-family conflict. The empirical and theoretical research presented above suggests that political skill also could serve as an antecedent of workplace stressors.

**Workplace Stress**

Within the present study, the stress process is conceptualized by three different constructs: stressors, strain, and behavior. Some evidence suggests that interpersonal conflict at work is among the most important of workplace stressors (e.g., Keenan & Newton, 1985). In addition, political skill is considered to be a social-cognitive competency that is related to interpersonal matters. Over several studies Spector and Jex (1998) demonstrated the validity and reliability of the *Interpersonal Conflict at Work Scale*, a measure of interpersonal stressors. Convergent validity across the studies was modest, indicating, as expected, that these self-reported stressors have some bearing on the objective environment, and some reflection of mechanisms internal to the individual (Spector & Jex, 1998). Frone (2000) furthered the construct of interpersonal conflict at work by modifying the Spector and Jex (1998)
Interpersonal Conflict at Work Scale so that it separately measured interpersonal conflict with coworkers from that of interpersonal conflict with one’s supervisor.

Burnout is a strain construct that has received a substantial amount of research attention over the past couple of decades (see for review Halbesleben & Buckley, 2004). Burnout occurs when an employees feel emotionally exhausted, depersonalizes their job and coworkers, and has diminished views of personal accomplishment (or efficacy) on the job (Maslach, 1982). Using the Job-Demands and Resources model, Schaufeli and Bakker (2004) found that job resources were related to depersonalization and that job demands (stressors) and resources were associated with emotional exhaustion. Also, significant negative correlations between emotional exhaustion and job performance (behavioral outcome) have been found in some studies (e.g., Wright & Cropanzano, 1998), but not found consistently in others (see for review Halbesleben & Buckley, 2004; e.g., Keijsers, Schaufei, Le Blanc, Zwerts, & Miranda, 1995).

One of the most important and widely researched outcomes in the organizational sciences is job performance. Although a substantial amount of research over many decades has investigated predictors of task-related job performance (see for review Schmidt & Hunter, 1998), others have more recently contended that there are domains of performance that are unrelated or weakly related to task performance (e.g., Borman & Penner, 2001; Campbell, 1990; Organ & Paine, 1999), and these have been termed “contextual performance” (Borman & Motowidlo, 1993).

Task performance has been argued to include duties that make one job different from another, and contextual performance is comprised of the dimensions of interpersonal facilitation and job dedication, behaviors directed toward supporting others or the organization, respectively (Borman & Motowidlo, 1993; Van Scotter et al., 2000). The present study will utilize both task performance and this two dimension conceptualization of contextual performance, rated by the supervisor, as behavioral outcomes. One study (i.e., Jawahar et al., in press) demonstrated that political skill has a stronger relationship with contextual than with task performance.

Does the Role of Political Skill Depend on the Rater?

However, one final (speculative) possibility is that the determination of political skill’s moderation and/or prediction of stressor-strain-behavior relationships is purely methodological. Within the stressor-strain-behavior process, behavior is viewed by those with whom the politically skilled person interacts, but stressors and strains are internal to the individual. Therefore, one possibility is that self-reports of political skill are either antecedents or moderators of stressor-strain relationships, and that other-reports of political skill are moderators or antecedents of behavior outcomes. The finding by Keijsers and colleagues (1995) of a positive relationship between burnout and supervisor-reported performance may suggest the potential for the moderation or direct prediction of supervisor-rated political skill on supervisor ratings of performance.

Consequently, I have developed two pairs of competing hypotheses for these possibilities. The first pair of competing hypotheses addresses whether self-reported political skill is an antecedent or moderator of stressor-strain relationships (Hypotheses 14A and 14B), and the second pair of hypotheses considers whether supervisor-reported political skill is a moderator of the strain-behavior relationship or a direct predictor of behavioral outcomes (Hypotheses 15A and 15B). These two pairs of hypotheses are preceded by a proposal that self- and supervisor-reports of political skill have differential prediction in the stressor-strain-behavior relationship.
There is minimal research that would suggest which of the four dimensions of political skill play the most prominent role in the stress process. Within the stress literature, one study (Swickert et al., 2002) found that the relationship between Extraversion and stress (i.e., daily hassles) was mediated by the perceived availability of support (e.g., belonging), rather than by enacted support (e.g., social interaction) or network characteristics (e.g., network size). Although political skill does not measure a person’s feelings of “belonging,” it would seem that belonging would be most associated with Networking Ability and Interpersonal Influence. Within the social capital literature, one study (Yip et al., 2007) demonstrated that trust affected well-being and health through a person’s social network and social support. This evidence also points to a connection with Networking Ability. Therefore, I will utilize the Networking Ability dimension in the hypotheses below. In line with previous research, I also contend that supervisor-rated Networking Ability will have a stronger relationship, whether direct or via moderation, with contextual performance than with task performance.

**Hypothesis 13:** Self- and supervisor-reported Networking Ability have differential prediction in interpersonal conflict at work-burnout-performance relationships.

**Hypothesis 14A:** Self-reported Networking Ability is negatively related to interpersonal conflict at work.

**Hypothesis 14B:** Self-reported Networking Ability moderates the relationship between interpersonal conflict at work and burnout, such that those high on Networking Ability will experience less burnout than those low on Networking Ability.

**Hypothesis 15A:** Supervisor-reported Networking Ability is directly related to performance.

**Hypothesis 15B:** Supervisor-reported Networking Ability moderates the relationship between burnout and performance, such that those high on Networking Ability will experience increased performance.

**Hypothesis 16:** Supervisor-reported Networking Ability is more strongly related to contextual performance than task performance.
CHAPTER 3
METHOD

The present study includes one sample, utilizing participants presently employed at a large, public university, including only non-academic, staff employees with employer-provided access to email. Employees provided self-reports of all measures, except task and contextual performance, via a questionnaire. Reports of political skill and task and contextual performance were gathered from the supervisor (of the focal employee).

Participants in both the self- and supervisor-report questionnaires were solicited via a mass e-mail sent to most staff employees of the organization. The electronic message stated that their voluntary participation was requested for research, and that by participating they would be eligible in a cash lottery drawing. A link to the electronic survey was included in the e-mail message. The questionnaire was completed by the participant on the individual’s computer, and survey responses were stored in a password-protected online survey database.

Employees completing a self-report questionnaire provided their own and their immediate supervisor's full name and department. Publicly available information obtained via the Internet was used to gather e-mail addresses for the supervisors. Supervisors that were listed by multiple self-report respondents were sent requests to complete a survey about their subordinates one at a time as they completed each survey, with each supervisor reporting on a maximum of three employees. When supervisors had multiple subordinate respondents, the order in which requests to the supervisors were sent was alphabetical by the last name of the subordinate. Participants in the supervisor-rated questionnaire were sent an email message that, in addition to the above details in the self-report message, stated the name of the employee whom they were requested to evaluate. The supervisor also wrote the employee’s name on the questionnaire.

Measures

HEXACO

The HEXACO personality measure has two primary instruments by which it can be measured. One, the HEXACO-PI (Lee & Ashton, 2004), has both a full 192-item questionnaire and a half-length questionnaire of approximately 100 items. These instruments are not public domain, but are copyrighted (Ashton et al., 2007), and, thus, cannot be altered. Another measure of the HEXACO, the IPIP-HEXACO (Ashton et al., 2007), has been developed to provide researchers with a public domain instrument that can be utilized as the researcher deems appropriate (e.g., using only some items or assessing only some factors or facets of the model).

This measure has been found to be a valid and reliable measure of the HEXACO structure and constructs at both the factor and the facet levels (Ashton et al., 2007). Consequently, due to the number of constructs utilized in the present study, the time that would be required of participants to complete a nearly one hundred item measure, and the desire of the researcher to only assess one of the four facets of each trait, the IPIP-HEXACO is utilized. The international personality item pool (IPIP) is intended to provide public domain measures of individual differences as developed jointly by researchers worldwide (Goldberg, 1999). All HEXACO measures utilized in this research are five-point scales and they have been taken from the IPIP website (Goldberg, 2007). The Cronbach alphas for the IPIP-HEXACO facets from Ashton and colleagues (2007) are reported below.

Anxiety. The facet of Anxiety ($\alpha = .84$) includes five items, such as “I get upset by unpleasant thoughts that come into my mind” and “I remain calm under pressure (R)”. 
Sociability. The facet of Sociability ($\alpha = .85$) contains five items, such as “I usually like to spend my free time with people” and “I rarely enjoy being with people (R)”.

Patience. The Patience facet ($\alpha = .88$) uses five items, such as “I am usually a patient person.” and “I get irritated easily (R)”.

Sincerity. The facet of Sincerity ($\alpha = .78$) includes five items, such as “I don't pretend to be more than I am” and “I put on a show to impress people (R)”.

Diligence. The Diligence facet ($\alpha = .81$) includes five items, such as “I get started quickly on doing a job” and “I hang around doing nothing (R)”.

Creativity. The Creativity facet ($\alpha = .84$) contains five items, such as “I have a vivid imagination” and “I seldom experience sudden intuitive insights (R)”.

Although it would provide greater support for the hypothesized model, the present study is unable to longitudinally measure personality traits during adolescence and behaviors during adulthood. However, McCrae and colleagues (2002) contended that adult measures of personality traits (including Openness) can be meaningfully used to assess personality in early adolescents.

Proactive Personality
As demonstrated by previous research (i.e., Liu et al., 2007; Parker, 1998), a shortened six-item version of the Bateman and Crant (1993) Proactive Personality scale is a valid and reliable measure of Proactive Personality. Parker (1998) demonstrated a Coefficient alpha of .85 and Liu and colleagues (2007) found an alpha of .75 using the same scale. Consequently, this six-item, seven-point measure of Proactive Personality is utilized in the present research, including items such as “If I see something I don't like, I fix it” and “No matter what the odds, if I believe in something I will make it happen”.

Socio-Economic Status
Because Reactive Responding is believed to begin during youth and continue into adulthood, the present study will measure both present and past (i.e., childhood) socio-economic status (SES). As noted by others, SES is a multidimensional construct (i.e., Laaksonen, Rahkonen, Martikainen, & Lahelma, 2005), consisting of, primarily, income, education, and profession (i.e., Duncan, Daly, McDonough, & Williams, 2002). Present SES is measured via income (personal and household), education, and profession, and past SES is assessed via family’s social class during youth and parent’s highest level of education.

Income. Respondents were asked what their income has averaged per year over the past 3 years at both the personal and the household level. Respondents wrote the dollar amount.

Education. Respondents indicated whether their highest level of education is high school, associates degree (or some college), technical degree, bachelors degree, masters degree, or doctoral degree. They also completed the same question for their parent or former guardian who has the highest education.

Profession. Respondents indicated whether they are self-employed, a manager (makes important company decisions), a supervisor (supervises employees), and/or an employee (non-supervisory). Participants marked all answers that apply. Also, respondents reported the name of their profession, as well as the profession of their family’s or former guardian’s primary source of income.

Family’s social class. The social class of the respondent’s family during his or her youth is measured in a manner similar to Whitely, Dougherty, and Dreher (1991). Respondents indicated whether their family was a member of the underclass, working poor, working class, middle class, upper class, or elite.
Reactive Responding

The seven point measure for Reactive Responding was investigated in one pilot study (i.e., Meurs, 2007). I tested a 23-item version of Reactive Responding that was conceptually similar to that developed by Taylor and colleagues (Taylor, 1998; Taylor & Seeman, 1999). However, an exploratory factor analysis indicated (based upon both the scree plot shown in Appendix B and the factor pattern matrix) that there were four factors of Reactive Responding, rather than the seven proposed by Taylor and colleagues (Taylor, 1998; Taylor & Seeman, 1999). In addition, several items did not demonstrate clear loadings on any of the four factors.

Finally, the (internal consistency) reliabilities of three of the resulting factors were low (.59, .64, .59), and for one was modest (.73), according to accepted standards of measurement (Nunnally, 1978). Therefore, based on the theoretical discussion above and these results, I have reconceptualized Reactive Responding as a four-dimensional construct, removing items that did not load on the resulting factors, modifying some items to form a closer alignment with their theoretical nature, and adding items to each factor (the pattern of loadings indicated only 2-4 items were loading on each construct) to achieve five items for each dimension.

Short-term goal orientation. The low SES environment is believed to discourage the development of long-term goals. This dimension measures the extent to which a person neglects the development and maintenance of long-term goals. Example items of this five-item measure are “I have clear, long-term desires that I work hard to achieve (R)” and “I do not usually set goals far in advance.”

Restricted social experiences. Those low in SES are also thought to have had social experiences when they were young that were lacking, and provided little assistance when they entered adult life. This measure includes five items, such as “When I was growing up, I often socialized with a variety of different people” and “I learned early in life how to handle a variety of social situations (R).”

Emotional action. Low SES environments are believed to promote the use of emotional reactions to situations, rather than inhibition and emotion regulation. Emotional Action is a five-item measure that includes items such as “If people make me angry, I usually do not mind letting them see my anger” and “Especially when I am angry, I stop to think before I act (R).”

Constrained options. Persons who are low in SES are thought to frequently be placed in situations where there are few alternatives from which to choose. Consequently, they believe their choices are few if any and, therefore, develop a response to their environment that involves insufficient consideration of alternatives, preferring instead to choose the most obvious path. Constrained Options is a five-item measure and sample items include “When there is a problem, I always consider several alternative solutions (R)” and “In most situations, there is only one way to go.”

Political Skill

The 18-item, seven point Political Skill Inventory developed and validated by Ferris and colleagues (2005) serves as the foundation for the political skill measure in this study. In order to provide an equal number of items in each dimension, a total of six items were added to the Political Skill Inventory published by Ferris and colleagues (2005), three to Apparent Sincerity, two to Interpersonal Influence, and one to Social Astuteness. The PSI contains four dimensions; Social Astuteness, Networking Ability, Interpersonal Influence, and Apparent Sincerity. Each will be reviewed below. Cronbach alphas from one of the samples (study 2, sample 3) reported by Ferris et al. are reported in each dimension.
Social astuteness. The Social Astuteness dimension ($\alpha = .71$) of the PSI describes how well the individual understands social settings and the people in them. It is measured via six items, such as “I understand people very well” and “I pay close attention to peoples’ facial expressions.”

Networking ability. Networking Ability ($\alpha = .76$) examines how successful the person is at building advantageous relationships with others. Six items measure this dimension, such as “I am good at using my connections and network to make things happen at work” and “I spend a lot of time and effort at work networking with others.”

Interpersonal influence. The Interpersonal Influence dimension ($\alpha = .73$) assesses how well the individual can persuade others, as well as adapt their persuasion to various persons. Six items are in this measure, such as “I am able to make most people feel comfortable and at ease around me” and “I am good at getting people to like me” measure this dimension.

Apparent sincerity. Apparent Sincerity ($\alpha = .66$) concerns the genuineness and sincerity that individuals display to others. Six items measure this dimension, such as “I try to show a genuine interest in other people” and “It is important that people believe I am sincere in what I say and do.”

Interpersonal Conflict at Work
The present study used a modified form of the Interpersonal Conflict at Work Scale (Spector & Jex, 1998), specifically, Frone’s (2000) two four-item measures of interpersonal conflict at work. One measure addresses the conflict the employee experiences with his or her boss, and the other assesses the conflict experienced with coworkers. The scale is a five point measure ranging from never to very often, and sample items include “How often do you get into arguments with your supervisor?” and “How often are coworkers rude to you at work?” Frone (2000) demonstrated a Cronbach alpha of .86 for conflict with supervisor and .85 for conflict with coworkers.

Burnout
The present study utilized a measure of burnout, a longer-term measure of strain, that examines the physical, cognitive, and emotional components of burnout. The seven point Shirom-Melamed Burnout Measure (SMBM) was developed based upon COR theory (Melamed, Shirom, Toker, Berliner, & Shapira, 2006), has been used in previous research (Melamed, Shirom, Toker, & Shapira, 2006), and has been argued to be a more theoretically valid measure of burnout than the more widely-used Maslach Burnout Inventory (Shirom & Melamed, 2006). This measure is 14 items containing three dimensions, including six items for Physical Fatigue (e.g., “I feel physically drained”), five items for Cognitive Weariness (e.g., “I have difficulty concentrating”), and three items for Emotional Exhaustion (e.g., “I feel I am not capable of investing emotionally in coworkers and customers”). Melamed and colleagues (2006) reported a Coefficient alpha of .91 for the SMBM.

Job Performance
One of the most important and widely studied outcomes in organizational research is job performance. The present study measured the two widely recognized types of performance, task and contextual performance. Performance was rated by the employee’s supervisor.

Task performance. The present study measured the employee’s task performance utilizing a five-item, seven point measure developed by Greenhaus, Parasuraman, and Wormley (1990) and adapted by Tsui, Pearce, Porter, and Tripoli (1997). Although Tsui and colleagues (1997) did not report an internal reliability estimate for this scale in particular, the authors noted that this and
two other scales each had reliabilities between .83 and .96. Sample items include “Employee's ability to perform core job tasks” and “Employee's accuracy when performing core job tasks”. Contextual performance. The present study utilized the conceptualization of contextual performance adopted by Van Scotter, Motowidlo, and Cross (2000), containing both interpersonal facilitation and job dedication dimensions measured on a five point scale. Interpersonal Facilitation includes the helpful and cooperative interpersonal aspects of contextual performance and is measured with seven items, such as the extent to which the employee “praises coworkers when they are successful” and “talks to others before taking actions that might affect them.” Van Scotter and colleagues (2000) demonstrated a Cronbach alpha of .89 for Interpersonal Facilitation. Job Dedication measures a person’s persistence and initiative taking and includes eight items such as the extent to which the individual “works harder than necessary” and “exercises personal discipline and self-control.” Van Scotter and colleagues (2000) demonstrated a Cronbach alpha of .94 for Job Dedication.

Control Variables
Although researchers have had some disagreement over whether NA is a substantive or nuisance variable in stress research (e.g., Brief, Burke, George, Robinson, & Webster, 1988; Judge, Erez, & Thoresen, 2000; Spector, Zapf, Chen, & Frese, 2000), I believe that in the present study, NA has the potential to act as a nuisance in the model of Networking Ability’s influence in the stress process. Therefore, I controlled for NA, as measured by the Positive and Negative Affect Schedule (PANAS) (Watson et al., 1988), in analyses of the influence of self-reported political skill in the stress process. The PANAS is a five-point scale composed of ten items each to measure NA and PA. Watson and colleagues (1988) demonstrated Cronbach alphas for NA between .84 and .87. In addition, because the stressor utilized in the present study concerns interpersonal conflict, agreeableness (via the patience facet) also is controlled in these analyses.

Conscientiousness has been demonstrated to be the strongest personality predictor of performance (Barrick et al., 2001). Also, tenure has been related to performance ratings (Ali & Davies, 2003). Therefore, I controlled for these two constructs (controlling for Conscientiousness via the Diligence facet) in my analyses of the influence of supervisor-reported political skill in the stress process. Persons who are high on agreeableness maintain more positive relations with others and are less likely to report interpersonal conflict (Jensen-Campbell & Graziano, 2001).

Analysis
Apart from the hypothesis concerning the relationship between SES and Reactive Responding, the hypotheses concerning the prediction of political skill dimensions were tested using a SEM measurement model in AMOS 6.0. The hypotheses concerning the role of political skill (i.e., the dimension of Networking Ability) in the stress process were examined in regression and correlation analyses separate from the model of the prediction of political skill.
CHAPTER 4
RESULTS

The following section first will review the descriptive statistics and intercorrelations of the variables in the study. Then, the results concerning the antecedents of political skill will be reviewed. Next, the tests regarding how political skill affects the stress process will be given. Finally, the results section will conclude with an examination of the post hoc analyses in this study.

Descriptive Statistics and Intercorrelations

3,272 persons were contacted via a mass email message for the self-report questionnaire, and 839 responded, equaling a response rate of 25.64%. Of those who provided the name of their supervisor on the self-report questionnaire (N= 643), 495 requests were personally sent to supervisors, with the remaining 148 comprising duplicate supervisor entries, undeliverable email addresses, and other factors preventing contact. 315 supervisor responses were received (i.e., 63.63% response rate), containing 272 (i.e., 86.35% of total responses) unique supervisor-subordinate dyads. No supervisor rated more than three subordinates.

Table 1 reports the means, standard deviations, intercorrelations, and coefficient alpha (α) internal consistency reliability estimates of all variables. 73.4% of the self-report respondents were female, the average age was 42.08 years, and the average tenure with the organization was approximately 7 years and 6 months.

As can be seen on Table 1, significant relationships were found between many personality traits, such as the .44 (p<.01) correlation between Creativity and Proactive Personality and the -.50 (p<.01) correlation between Patience and Anxiety. However, all other significant correlations were slight to moderate in nature, being between .08 and .33. Most personality variables also were significantly and modestly correlated with dimensions of Reactive Responding and self-rated political skill. Reactive Responding dimensions had significant, though modest intercorrelations, ranging from .24 to .36. However, the dimension of Restricted Social Experiences had significant relationships with all three of the other dimensions (i.e., -.22, -.26, and -.26). Reactive Responding dimensions also had significant and negative correlations with most self-rated political skill dimensions. These political skill dimensions also demonstrated significant and moderate (.38 to .56) intercorrelations. Finally, coefficient alpha’s were respectable for most variables in the study, with only two (i.e., Sincerity and SES) falling below .70. The low coefficient alpha for SES could be due to its multidimensional and formative, rather than reflective, nature.

Confirmatory factor analyses (CFA) were conducted on the multidimensional constructs of Reactive Responding and self-rated political skill. Amos 6.0 was used to accomplish the CFA. Concerning political skill, two models were compared, a one factor model and a four factor model. The four factor model (χ²= 1996.31, df= 248, N=728, CFI=.84, RMSEA=.098) demonstrated modestly better fit than the one factor model (χ²= 2150.37, df= 253, N=728, CFI=.83, RMSEA=.102) using a chi-square difference test (Δχ²= 154.06, Δdf= 5, p< .001). Similarly, although the scree plot in Figure 4 displays a strong first factor for political skill, it also suggests a four factor solution. These results concur with the findings of prior research (e.g., Ferris et al., 2005), and suggest that political skill is better represented using four factors. However, in the present study, neither solution demonstrated what would be considered a good fit of the data, with CFIs below .90 and RMSEAs above .08. This lack of good fit could be due to the large
number of items (i.e., 24) in the measure or to the use of items not included in previous political skill measures.

Concerning Reactive Responding, a one factor solution and a four factor solution were compared. The four factor model ($\chi^2 = 558.09, df = 164, N = 701, CFI = .92, RMSEA = .06$) demonstrated better fit than the one factor model ($\chi^2 = 1088.75, df = 170, N = 701, CFI = .81, RMSEA = .09$) using a chi-square difference test ($\Delta\chi^2 = 530.66, \Delta df = 6, p < .001$). In addition, the scree plot in Figure 5 indicates a strong first factor, but also a four factor solution. These results support the findings of a pilot study (i.e., Meurs, 2007) and the scree plot of the associated results in Appendix B. Further, they suggest that Reactive Responding is better represented using four factors.

**Analysis of Hypotheses Concerning Antecedents of Political Skill**

In the analysis of the hypotheses concerning the antecedents of political skill, single indicators were used for the latent variables, controlling for the error variance and unreliability of the indicators. Hypotheses 1-5 and 7-12 were tested using a SEM design in Amos 6.0. First, the overall theorized model was tested and compared against alternative models. Three models were compared each for self- and supervisor-reported political skill dimensions, including the theorized model, a more saturated model, and a less saturated model. The more saturated model included all possible paths from personality variables to Reactive Responding dimensions and all possible paths from dimensions of Reactive Responding to dimensions of political skill. The less saturated model removed Reactive Responding as a mediator between personality variables and political skill dimensions, thus suggesting that personality has only direct relationships with political skill dimensions. The less saturated model replaced the paths from Creativity to Reactive Responding dimensions with paths from Creativity to both Social Astuteness and Networking Ability. Although not hypothesized, these models are theoretically reasonable.

As can be seen in Table 2, compared to the less saturated model, the theorized model displayed better fit for self-reported political skill, using a chi-square difference test ($\Delta\chi^2 = 330.66, \Delta df = 11, p < .001$). However, the more saturated model demonstrated better fit than the theorized model according to the chi-square difference test ($\Delta\chi^2 = 650.24, \Delta df = 30, p < .001$). This evidence suggests a lack of support for the hypothesized model of the antecedents of self-reported political skill dimensions.

Table 3 displays the results for models using supervisor-reported political skill. Compared to the less saturated model, the theorized model displayed better fit for supervisor-reported political skill, using a chi-square difference test ($\Delta\chi^2 = 296.79, \Delta df = 11, p < .001$). However, the more saturated model demonstrated better fit than the theorized model according to the chi-square difference test ($\Delta\chi^2 = 649.14, \Delta df = 30, p < .001$). These results suggest a lack of support for the hypothesized model of the predictors of supervisor-reported political skill dimensions.

The specific hypotheses contained in this model will be discussed below. Hypothesis 1 was not supported as Anxiety was not related to self-report Interpersonal Influence and was positively associated with supervisor-reported Interpersonal Influence ($\beta = .29, p < .01$). Hypothesis 2 received support because Sociability was positively related to the Networking Ability dimension of self-rated ($\beta = .35, p < .001$) and supervisor-rated ($\beta = .27, p < .001$) political skill. Hypothesis 3 received support because Patience was positive related to self-rated ($\beta = .49, p < .001$) and supervisor-rated ($\beta = .42, p < .001$) Interpersonal Influence, with the sizes of the effect suggesting a stronger relationship with supervisor-rated Interpersonal Influence. Hypothesis 4 was not supported, as Sincerity was positively related to self-reported Apparent Sincerity ($\beta = .11,$...
p<.05) and unrelated to supervisor-reported Apparent Sincerity. Proactive Personality was related to self-reported (β= .29, p<.001) Networking Ability, but not supervisor-reported Networking Ability, partially supporting hypothesis 5.

Hypothesis 7A was partially supported as Creativity was negatively associated with Reactive Responding dimensions, including Short-Term Goal Orientation (β= -.32, p<.001), Emotional Action (β= -.31, p<.001), and Constrained Options (β= -.51, p<.001). However, Creativity was positively related to Restricted Social Experiences (β= .36, p<.001), contrary to the hypothesis. Hypothesis 7B argued that Reactive Responding dimensions mediate the relationships between Creativity and political skill dimensions (i.e., Social Astuteness and Networking Ability. However, as will be discussed below concerning the results for Hypotheses 9-12, only the Reactive Responding dimensions of Short-Term Goal Orientation and Constrained Options were found to have the hypothesized relationships with either Networking Ability or Social Astuteness. Short-Term Goal Orientation demonstrated a significant relationship with self-reported Social Astuteness (β= -.29, p<.001) and Constrained Options had a significant relationship with self-reported Social Astuteness (β= -.13, p<.01). When a path was added to the theorized SEM model from Creativity to Social Astuteness a significant relationship was demonstrated (β= .35, p<.001), and the paths from Creativity to Short-Term Goal Orientation and Constrained Options remained significant.

It is worth noting that the first step (i.e., that the independent variable is related to the dependent variable) in the four-step mediation procedure of Baron and Kenny (1986) has been shown to be unnecessary (Edwards & Lambert, 2007), and, thus, has not been included in the present analysis. Kenny, Kashy, and Bolger (1998) indicated that mediation occurs when the independent variable is correlated with the mediator and the mediator has a unique effect on the dependent variable. The present analysis met these conditions. In addition, because the path from Creativity to Social Astuteness was significant in the presence of the mediation effects, this suggests that the Short-Term Goal Orientation and Constrained Options dimensions of Reactive Responding partially mediate the relationship between Creativity and Social Astuteness (Baron & Kenny, 1986). Also, in support of Hypothesis 8, Diligence was negatively related to Short-Term Goal Orientation (β= -.31, p<.001).

Hypotheses 9-12 argued for relationships between Reactive Responding dimensions and the Social Astuteness and Networking Ability dimensions of political skill. In support of hypothesis 9A, Short-Term Goal Orientation was negatively associated with self-reported Social Astuteness (β= -.29, p<.001), and in support of hypothesis 12A, Constrained Options demonstrated a negative relationship with self-reported Social Astuteness (β= -.13, p<.01). The only other significant relationship between Reactive Responding dimensions and self-reported political skill was that between Restricted Social Experiences and Social Astuteness, which was in the opposite direction hypothesized (β= .22, p<.001). Having a negative relationship with supervisor-reported Social Astuteness (β= -.16, p<.05), Constrained Options was the only dimension of Reactive Responding to have a significant relationship with a supervisor-reported political skill dimension.

To test Hypothesis 6, that SES was negatively related to Reactive Responding, bivariate correlations were assessed, as displayed in Table 4. Reactive Responding was not significantly associated with personal or household income or profession (as measured by status of being a manager, a supervisor, or an employee). However, Reactive Responding demonstrated a negative correlation with education (β= -.09, p<.05) and, contrary to the hypothesis, positive correlations with Family’s Social Class (β= .11, p<.01) and parent’s education (β= .12, p<.001). Thus,
Reactive Responding was not significantly associated with SES. Concerning the relationships of particular dimensions of Reactive Responding with SES, Education was related to Emotional Action (β = -.10, p < .05) and Constrained Options (β = -.14, p < .01); Family’s Social Class (β = .14, p < .01) and Parents Education (β = .14, p < .01) were positively related to Restricted Social Experiences; being a manager was negatively related to Emotional Action (β = -.09, p < .05); and Restricted Social Experiences was positively (β = .09, p < .05) and Constrained Options was negatively (β = -.12, p < .01) related to SES.

**Analysis of Hypotheses Concerning Political Skill’s Role in the Stress Process**

The hypotheses that address political skill’s affect in the stress process will be analyzed via correlation and multiple and moderated regression using SPSS 15. Hypothesis 13 argued that self- and supervisor-reports of Networking Ability, the dimension believed to play a role in the stress process, have differential prediction in relationships in the stress process. Differential prediction can be demonstrated by considering the correlations between self-and supervisor-reports of Networking Ability. Because both self- and supervisor-reports are of the same construct (i.e., Networking Ability), it is expected that there should be a modest correlation between the two. However, a very strong correlation would suggest that self- and supervisor-reports do not have differential prediction. As can be seen on Table 1, the correlation between self- and supervisor-reports of Networking Ability is .31 (N= 308, p < .001). This appears to represent a modest, but not strong correlation, and would suggest support for Hypothesis 13.

Further support can be found by considering the intercorrelations among each of the self- and supervisor-rated political skill dimensions, suggesting discriminant validity, and by examining the correlations between the self- and supervisor-ratings of a particular dimension of political skill, suggesting convergent validity. As can be seen in Table 5, moderate correlations were found among the self- (i.e., average of .49) and supervisor-ratings (i.e., average of .63) of different dimensions of political skill, demonstrating modest support for discriminant validity of the political skill measure’s dimensions. In addition, correlations between the self- and supervisor-reports of a political skill dimension were modest, ranging from .15 to .34 (i.e., average of .25), failing to demonstrate strong convergent validity between self- and supervisor ratings of political skill dimensions. The modest support for the discriminant but not strong support for the convergent validity of political skill dimensions suggests further support for Hypothesis 13.

Hypotheses 14A, 15A, and 16 were tested using multiple regression. Controlling for the effects of Patience and Negative Affectivity, Hypothesis 14A was not supported, as self-reported Networking Ability did not have a significant relationship with interpersonal conflict at work. However, Hypothesis 15A was supported, as, when controlling for the effects of Diligence and Tenure, supervisor-reported Networking Ability had a significant relationship with both Task Performance (β = .51, p < .001) and Contextual Performance (β = .60, p < .001).

Hypotheses 14B and 15B were tested via moderated regression. Controlling for Patience and Negative Affectivity and main effects, hypothesis 14B was not supported, because the self-reported Networking Ability-Interpersonal Conflict at Work interaction did not have a significant relationship with Burnout. Hypothesis 15B also was not supported, as the supervisor-reported Networking Ability-Burnout interaction did not have a significant effect on either Task or Contextual Performance. Hypothesis 16 was supported, as can be seen on Table 1, because supervisor-reported Networking Ability had a stronger relationship with Contextual Performance (β = .58, p < .001) than Task Performance (β = .51, p < .001). The results for hypotheses 14-16 are
displayed in Tables 6 through 11, and Table 12 provides a summary of the results from the hypotheses tests.

Post Hoc Analyses

Because several of the hypotheses in the model of political skill antecedents and the model of how political skill affects the stress process were unsupported and the model of political skill antecedents had poor fit, as measured by CFI and RMSEA, post hoc analyses were conducted. These analyses should be interpreted cautiously, given the potential for Type I errors when conducting exploratory analyses. In addition, because these are not hypothesized relationships, it needs to be acknowledged that when a post hoc relationship is labeled “significant” it is actually a reflection of a large coefficient relative to standard error.

Post Hoc Analyses of the Antecedents of Political Skill Dimensions

For the model of political skill antecedents, the post hoc analysis removed some unsupported paths and added some paths that, according to modification indices, would provide a better fitting model. When possible, theory and previous empirical research was also taken into account when adding or removing paths. Because Anxiety was unrelated to self- and supervisor-reported Interpersonal Influence, that path was removed from the model, and the modification indices suggested adding a path between Anxiety and Emotional Action. This path concurs with theory, because persons high on Neuroticism (i.e., the personality factor from which Anxiety is drawn) are more socially anxious and are emotionally unstable (Costa & McCrae, 1987; McCrae & John, 1992). This path was significant ($β = .34$, $p < .001$).

The path from Sociability to Networking Ability was retained, and paths from Sociability to both Restricted Social Experiences and Interpersonal Influence were added. These paths were supported not only by modification indices, but also by theory, which suggests that Extraverts are more social (John, 1990) and that they find work relationships to be more rewarding (Watson & Clark, 1997), when compared to those low on Extraversion. These paths were significant for Restricted Social Experiences ($β = .45$, $p < .001$) and both self- ($β = .52$, $p < .001$) and supervisor-ratings ($β = .17$, $p < .001$) of Interpersonal Influence. Based on theory and modification indices, no paths were added or removed for Patience or Sincerity. A path was added from Proactive Personality to Social Astuteness. This relationship was made on the basis of modification indices and the argument that Social Astuteness is a social type of situational judgment effectiveness. Situational judgment effectiveness has been found to be an important component for Proactive Personality’s ability to prediction work perceptions and outcomes (Chan, 2006). This relationship was significant for both self- ($β = .31$, $p < .001$) and supervisor-reports ($β = .11$, $p < .01$) of Social Astuteness. The relationships that Creativity and Diligence had with Reactive Responding dimensions remained unchanged.

The generally unsupportive results of the hypothesized model presented above concerning hypotheses 9-12 and the implications from the modification indices suggest a model that argues for more direct relationships between personality and political skill dimensions, as also can be seen by some of the post hoc changes discussed above. Consequently, although the paths from Creativity to Reactive Responding dimensions were retained, a path from Restricted Social Experiences to Social Astuteness was the only retained relationship between Reactive Responding dimensions and political skill dimensions. This path was retained not only due to the implications of the modification indices, but also because political skill is an interpersonal regulatory construct and the interpersonal relationships from an individual’s youth are likely to affect their later social adjustment to organizational life (Lehman et al., 2005; Taylor et al., 2004). As noted above, Restricted Social Experiences demonstrates relationships that are the
opposite of those hypothesized, and this continued through to the present post hoc model, where it had a positive relationship with both self- (β = .21, p < .001) and supervisor-reported (β = .09, p < .05) Social Astuteness.

The resulting model of the antecedents of political skill dimensions is displayed in Figure 6. Compared to the hypothesized model, the post hoc model demonstrated much improved fit for both self- (χ² = 354.95, df = 58, N = 839, CFI = .90, RMSEA = .08) and supervisor-reported (χ² = 126.03, df = 58, N = 273, CFI = .94, RMSEA = .07) political skill dimensions.

Because of the direct relationships found between personality and political skill dimensions, one could question whether Reactive Responding dimensions have relationships with political skill dimensions. Therefore, a data-driven analysis was conducted that analyzed relationships between Reactive Responding and political skill, in the absence of personality trait variables. Little research has been conducted using the current operationalization of Reactive Responding. Thus, this analysis was unable to take theory into account, but the resulting model was suggested through modification indices, working from a null model to the present model displayed in Figure 7, and used self-reported political skill dimensions as the outcome. In the resulting model, only two dimensions of Reactive Responding demonstrated relationships with political skill, namely Restricted Social Experiences and Short-Term Goal Orientation. Both of these dimensions had significant relationships with three of the four political skill dimensions, Social Astuteness, Interpersonal Influence, and Networking Ability, but not with Apparent Sincerity. The resulting model demonstrated good fit for self-reported political skill (χ² = 36.25, df = 10, N = 609, CFI = .99, RMSEA = .07), but not as good of fit for supervisor-rated political skill (χ² = 113.40, df = 10, N = 273, CFI = .86, RMSEA = .16).

Post Hoc Analyses of the Affect of Political Skill in the Stress Process

Because neither hypotheses 14A nor 14B were supported, post hoc analyses were conducted. Although it is still argued that self-reports, rather than supervisor-reports, of political skill would have an effect on interpersonal conflict at work or the interpersonal conflict at work-burnout relationship, a number of other relationships were tested.

First, although Networking Ability did not have a relationship with Interpersonal Conflict at Work, it was examined whether Networking Ability had a relationship with either one of the two dimensions of Interpersonal Conflict at Work, namely Conflict with Supervisor and Conflict with Coworkers. However, Networking Ability was not a significant predictor of either. In addition, it was tested whether another dimension of political skill had a relationship with Interpersonal Conflict at Work. Interpersonal Influence was the only construct demonstrated to be a significant predictor of Interpersonal Conflict at Work (β = -.09, p < .05). The Interpersonal Influence dimension of political skill describes someone who has profound abilities of persuading others (Ferris et al., 2005) and is interpersonally flexible (Pfeffer, 1992). Thus, of the four dimensions of political skill it seems reasonable that this dimension would have the strongest negative relationship with an interpersonal stressor, such as Interpersonal Conflict at Work.

Next, the moderation of the Interpersonal Conflict at Work-Burnout relationship (i.e., hypothesis 14B) was examined. It was first tested whether Networking Ability moderated relationships between Interpersonal Conflict at Work and specific components of Burnout (i.e., Physical, Cognitive, and Emotional Burnout). Networking Ability only moderated the relationship between Interpersonal Conflict at Work and Physical Burnout (β = .06, p < .05). A simple slopes test indicated that low (one standard deviation below mean), medium (at mean), and high (one standard deviation above mean) slopes were all significantly different from zero.
(p<.001). Then, it was investigated whether Networking Ability significantly moderated relationships between either component of Interpersonal Conflict at Work (i.e., Conflict with Supervisor and Conflict with Coworkers) and Burnout, but it did not. Finally, it was examined whether the other political skill dimensions (i.e., Social Astuteness, Interpersonal Influence, and Apparent Sincerity) moderated relationships between Interpersonal Conflict at Work and Burnout; however, none of them did.

In summary, supporting hypothesis 15A, it was found that supervisor-reported Networking Ability predicted performance. The post hoc analysis showed that self-reported Networking Ability moderated the relationship between Interpersonal Conflict at Work and Physical Burnout and that self-reported Interpersonal Influence had a direct relationship with Interpersonal Conflict at Work. These relationships are demonstrated in Figure 8, and the interaction of self-reported Networking Ability and Interpersonal Conflict at Work on Physical Burnout is illustrated in Figure 9. For purposes of illustration, Figure 9 is graphed from two standard deviations below to two standard deviations above the mean.
The present study investigated the personality and learned behavior prediction of dimensions of political skill. It also analyzed how political skill affected the stress process. In this section, I will first discuss the results concerning my hypothesized and post hoc relationships concerning the prediction of political skill dimensions. I also will consider some possible explanations for the insignificant findings in my research. Then, I will do the same for the effects of political skill in the stress process, reviewing the hypothesized and post hoc relationships that address how political skill affects the stress process and discussing possible explanations for my insignificant results. Finally, I will consider the strengths and limitations of the present research, and conclude by discussing the directions for future research and implications from the results of this study.

Findings Concerning the Antecedents of Political Skill

In short, it was demonstrated that although the hypothesized model displayed better fit than when compared to alternative models, personality constructs generally had direct relationships with Reactive Responding and political skill dimensions. These findings were contrary to the predictions that Reactive Responding would mediate some of the relationship between personality traits and political skill, but supportive of some of the hypotheses. However, as discussed above, the findings indicated that the Short-Term Goal Orientation and Constrained Options dimensions of Reactive Responding partially mediated the relationships between Creativity and political skill (Baron & Kenny, 1986).

It was also indicated in the post hoc model that five of the six HEXACO personality constructs in the present study had direct relationships with Reactive Responding dimensions, but Sincerity and Proactive Personality only had direct relationships with political skill. It was investigated whether, in the absence of personality trait constructs, Reactive Responding had relationships with political skill, and the post hoc results suggested that Restricted Social Experiences and Short-Term Goal orientation did. In addition, apart from respondents’ education, SES was not found to be negatively related to Reactive Responding.

A number of the unsupported hypotheses concerning the relationships between personality, learned behaviors, and political skill warrant further attention. First, Anxiety was not found to be related to Interpersonal Influence. This result is surprising, given that previous research (i.e., Ferris et al., 2005) has demonstrated a strong connection between anxiety and Interpersonal Influence. The post hoc results did show a relationship between Anxiety and Emotional Action, and previous research has not investigated anxiety-or emotion-related learned behaviors (e.g., Emotional Action) in the context of personality and political skill. Consequently, one explanation is that Anxiety’s effect on the individual’s behavior is primarily on Emotional Action.

Sincerity was not found to be negatively related to the Apparent Sincerity dimension of political skill. On the contrary, Sincerity was positively related to self-reported Apparent Sincerity. This finding could suggest that either Apparent Sincerity has substantial overlap with to actual sincerity or that the measure of the Sincerity trait is not measuring actual sincerity, but is influenced by self-perceptions, such as self-deception (Paulhus, 1986; Sackheim & Gur, 1979), making it roughly equivalent to a socially-desirable presentation of sincerity (Paulhus & Reid, 1991). Although some Apparent Sincerity items (e.g., “It is important that people believe I am sincere in what I say and do.”) could be interpreted as actual sincerity by the respondent, because
Sincerity was not found to be related to supervisor-reported Apparent Sincerity, it would seem that the latter explanation is more likely. However, no clear conclusions can be drawn from these results.

Apart from education, SES and its dimensions were unrelated to Reactive Responding. When analyzing the particular dimensions of either construct, no consistent pattern emerged that would suggest one aspect of either SES or Reactive Responding is solely responsible for making this relationship insignificant. Restricted Social Experiences demonstrated positive relationships with SES, indicating that it might be one of the primary influences for these insignificant relationships. Previous research has demonstrated inconsistent relations between Reactive Responding and SES using prior conceptualizations of Reactive Responding (Taylor, 1998). Apart from Family’s Social Class, the measures of SES used in this study have received widespread use in the social sciences and are unlikely to be flawed. Consequently, the most likely explanation for these results is that, despite the strong theoretical research underpinning the Reactive Responding-SES relationship, the current operationalization of Reactive Responding, much like formulations by other researchers, is an inaccurate representation of the theory behind it.

Clearly, the operationalization of the Restricted Social Experiences dimension is flawed. For a person high on Restricted Social Experiences, three of the five items imply that the respondent did not learn adequate social skills in youth to prepare for adulthood, while two items indicate that the respondent did not socialize with a variety of people in youth. One explanation for the reversed-pattern of relationships with many other constructs could be that persons high on Restricted Social Experiences believe that someone’s upbringing could never adequately prepare him or her for the interpersonal world of adulthood, because it is or appears much more complex and subjective than the social life of one’s youth. Another possibility is that the study’s sample contains persons who, for the most part, have adjusted to the work-world and make internal attributions (Weiner, 1985) for their successful adjustment, rather than suggesting that the environment of their youth prepared them for adulthood. Finally, not interacting with a variety of persons, as indicated by those high on Restricted Social Experiences, could indicate that successful adjustment to the social world in both youth and adulthood involves finding commonalities with other individuals, and the political skill literature appears to indicate that this is the case (Ferris et al., 2007). These arguments seem to suggest that the Restricted Social Experiences dimension might have measured the opposite of that intended, namely the social life of those high on SES, as evidenced by the positive correlation between Family’s Social Class and Restricted Social Experiences found in the present study.

Although Reactive Responding dimensions partially mediated some relationships between Creativity and political skill, some hypothesized relationships did not receive support. Short-Term Goal Orientation was not found to have a negative relationship with the Networking Ability dimension of political skill. It could be that the majority of Short-Term Goal Orientation’s relationship with political skill is with the Social Astuteness dimension. In addition, Restricted Social Experiences had a positive relationship with self-reported Social Astuteness and no relationship with Networking Ability, relationships that could be due to the flawed operationalization of Restricted Social Experiences discussed earlier. Of the hypothesized relationships that Emotional Action and Constrained Options would have with Social Astuteness and Networking Ability, the only significant finding was that Constrained Options was related to Social Astuteness.
Thus, two post hoc analyses were conducted concerning the antecedents of political skill. One found that, in the presence of Reactive Responding, personality had several relationships with Reactive Responding and Political skill, but that the only relationship from Reactive Responding to political skill was between the Restricted Social Experiences and Social Astuteness dimensions. Concerning the relationships found between personality and Reactive Responding, Anxiety, Patience, and Creativity were dimensions of the HEXACO model of personality that were found to have relationships with Emotional Action, with Anxiety having a negative and Patience and Creativity having positive relationships with Emotional Action. Creativity and Diligence were both related to Short-Term Goal Orientation, and Creativity also had a relationship with Constrained Options. Finally, demonstrating the opposite sign of the hypothesized relationships, Creativity and Sociability were positively associated with Restricted Social Experiences.

Because of the lack of relationships demonstrated between Reactive Responding and political skill, another post hoc analysis investigated whether, in the absence of personality, Reactive Responding would have relationships with political skill. The results from this post hoc analysis suggested that the Restricted Social Experiences and Short-Term Goal Orientation dimensions of Reactive Responding have relationships with three of the four political skill dimensions, but not the Apparent Sincerity dimension. Restricted Social Experiences had modest and positive and Short-Term Goal Orientation demonstrated modest and negative associations with these political skill dimensions.

The lack of support for the mediation by Reactive Responding of the personality-political skill relationship could be due to a number of potential explanations. For instance, one possibility is that despite some theoretical and empirical evidence to the contrary (e.g., Caspi et al., 1989), personality differences may have primarily a direct (i.e., non-mediated) influence on political skill. Much research has been devoted to relating personality to important workplace outcomes (Perrewé & Spector, 2002) and these studies have predominantly investigated direct or moderated relationships (e.g., Barrick & Mount, 1991; Borman et al., 2001). Another potential explanation is that the effect of personality on political skill is not through Reactive Responding, but through another learned behavior, such as an individual’s attributional tendencies motivated by the stress of adjusting to organizational life (Perrewé et al., 2004; Zellars, Perrewé, Hochwarter, & Ferris, 2004). Finally, due to the recent development of the measure of Reactive Responding, another possibility is that it does not accurately reflect the theory of Reactive Responding, but that future measures could provide a stronger link between personality and political skill.

In summary, it appears that personality traits have an effect on political skill, particularly the more social (i.e., Sociability) and proactive (i.e., Proactive Personality) components of personality traits, as shown in the hypothesized and post hoc tests. These findings are in line with the emerging research field on antecedents of political skill (e.g., Ferris et al., 2007; Lambert et al., 2006; Liu et al., 2007; Thompson, 2005). In addition, post hoc analyses demonstrated that personality had a number of relations with learned behaviors, and this too concurs with previous research (e.g., Buss, 1987; Caspi et al., 1989; McCrae et al., 2002). Finally, when personality was removed from the model of antecedents, Reactive Responding had relationships with political skill.

Findings Concerning How Political Skill Affects the Stress Process

Regarding the affect of political skill in the stress process, although self-reported Networking Ability was not found to have a direct effect on Interpersonal Conflict at Work,
other-rated Networking Ability was a significant predictor of both task and contextual performance. In addition, self-rated and other-rated Networking Ability were not found to be moderators of the Interpersonal Conflict at Work-Burnout and the Burnout-Job Performance relationships, respectively. The post hoc analysis revealed that self-reported Interpersonal Influence was associated with Interpersonal Conflict at Work and that self-reported Networking Ability moderated the Interpersonal Conflict at Work-Physical Burnout relationship.

Aside from its post hoc moderation of the Interpersonal Conflict at Work-Physical Burnout relationship, self-reported Networking Ability was not found to be a factor in a stressor-strain relationship (i.e., Interpersonal Conflict at Work-Burnout) as either a direct predictor of perception of stressors or as a moderator of the stressor-strain relationship. It is unclear why self-reported Networking Ability would moderate the relationship between a stressor and physical burnout, as this social-related moderator would seem more likely to have an influence on relationships between stressors and emotional or cognitive burnout, the other aspects of burnout measured in this study. It is particularly difficult to explain given, as Figure 9 illustrates, that those high on Networking Ability have increased physical burnout in the presence of increased Interpersonal Conflict at Work, when compared to low levels of interpersonal conflict, and this relationship also was significant, though not as strong, for those with average and low levels of Networking Ability. However, apart from the Shirom-Melamed measure of burnout (Shirom & Melamed, 2006), the physical aspects of burnout generally have gone untested by organizational scientists. Therefore, it is possible that self-perceptions of the size of one’s social network might increase feelings of physical tiredness or fatigue, due to the need to maintain existing contacts and establish new social ties. In other words, the Networking Ability dimension of political skill might not only reflect the presence of the ability to develop and maintain effective and advantageous social relations, but self-reports of Networking Ability also could measure the job- or career-related pressure felt by individuals to develop their networking skills and to sustain an ever-increasing number of social contacts.

Because a person’s Networking Ability concerns building friendships, alliances, and coalitions (Ferris et al., 2005), it could be that this dimension is best measured by those whom the politically skilled person has included in his or her network. Consequently, one possibility for why self-reported Networking Ability had no other significant effects in stressor-strain relationships in this study is that Networking Ability is likely to have its greatest ability to predict work outcomes through other-reports (e.g., supervisor-reports).

The post hoc analysis revealed that Interpersonal Influence had a significant relationship with Interpersonal Conflict at Work, decreasing individuals’ perceptions of Interpersonal Conflict at Work. This relationship seems plausible given that persons high on Interpersonal Influence are able to “exert a powerful influence on those around them” (Ferris et al., 2005, p. 129) and be “flexible” (Pfeffer, 1992) in their behavior with others. Thus, being able to influence coworkers and to adapt his or her behavior to the situation, those high on Interpersonal Influence perceive fewer stressors in the environment than those low on Interpersonal Influence.

Supervisor-reports of Networking Ability did have an influence on strain-behavior relationships, resulting in strong, direct relationships on both Task and Contextual Performance, but no moderating effects. In addition, as indicated in the bivariate correlations in Table 1, self-reported Networking Ability had a significant association with Contextual Performance. Some evidence from prior research indicates that the Networking Ability dimension of political skill might be the strongest predictor of work outcomes. For instance, a recent study found that Networking Ability was the only dimension of the four to be related to income (i.e., Blickle et
Consequently, findings from the present research, which added items to the Political Skill Inventory used in the aforementioned study and in most other recent political skill research, appear to suggest some consistency between the present measure of political skill and that used in prior research. However, the finding that Interpersonal Influence has a direct relationship with a workplace stressor might suggest that the present measure provides a more equal operationalization of the four dimensions than prior measures, but future work is still needed in this emerging area of research.

In summary, although the hypothesized relationships for self-reports of Networking Ability were not significant, supervisor-reports were a strong predictor of supervisor-rated task and contextual performance, with the strongest relationship being with contextual performance. In the post hoc analysis, self-reports of Interpersonal Influence emerged as having a negative relationship with the interpersonal stressor used in this study and self-reports of Networking Ability were found to moderate the stressor-strain relationship, such that persons high on Networking ability had increased Burnout in the presence of heightened Interpersonal Conflict at Work. These results seem to suggest that other-reports of political skill have direct relationships with outcomes, but that self-reports could have either direct or moderating relations with their criteria.

**Strengths and Limitations**

The present study has several strengths. First, as recommended by many researchers (e.g., Murphy & Dzieweczynski, 2005), facets of personality were used as predictors. Second, some (e.g., Hough & Oswald, 2005) have suggested that situational characteristics need to be considered when assessing the relationships between personality and outcomes, and this study included a measure of regulatory learned behaviors that is believed to be formed from the situations one encounters in youth (i.e., Reactive Responding). Also, although most personality research in the organizational sciences uses the Five Factor Model, the HEXACO model, which has been demonstrated to be a superior model of personality, was used in this study. In addition, the present study moved beyond the use of SES as a control variable, as is common in the organizational sciences, to investigate how SES and a regulatory construct based upon differences in experiences related to SES have a substantive influence on an important phenomenon that occurs within organizations (i.e., political skill).

Furthermore, a new measure of political skill was tested and appears to be a valid measure. It might provide a stronger multidimensional explanation of political skill than previous measures, because it includes an equal number of items representing each dimension of political skill. Also, this study moved beyond previous political skill research, by considering the prediction of dimensions of political skill, as well as how the dimensions affect the stress process.

Moreover, supervisor-reports were gathered on the criteria, namely political skill and task and contextual performance. This method of data collection rules out any biases from using the same rater for independent and dependent variables. In addition, the supervisor response rate was quite high (i.e., 63.63%) and a large percentage (i.e., 86.35%) of the supervisor data was composed of unique supervisor-subordinate dyads. These strengths of the supervisor data could be seen as making the associated results more compelling.

However, the study also has some limitations that deserve attention. First common method variance is an alternative explanation for these results. Concerning the receipt of ratings from the same source, some have indicated that the presence of generally inflated correlations across constructs suggests that common method variance would be a concern (i.e., James, Gent,
Hatter, & Corey, 1979), but a review of Table 1 does not suggest such is the case. Yet, common source bias cannot be ruled out as an explanation for the results of the study, particularly concerning the significant relationship found in support of Hypothesis 13 (i.e., supervisor-rated Networking Ability association with supervisor-rated task and contextual performance). In addition, all self-ratings and all supervisor-ratings were provided at the same time and using the same method (i.e., questionnaire). Thus, these influences could result in a common method bias, and this could be an explanation for the strong relationships found among the supervisor-reported items (i.e., Networking Ability, Task Performance, and Contextual Performance).

Also, the generalizeability of the data may be limited, due to the sample being drawn from one organization. Although this is a large and diverse organization, organizational effects on the results of the study cannot be eliminated. In addition, almost three-quarters (i.e., 73.4%) of the sample was female, and this may limit the generalizeability of the results to a more evenly distributed population.

Another limitation of this study is that some measures (i.e., Reactive Responding and SES) rely on participants to accurately recall and portray events and situations from many years previous. Apart from conducting longitudinal research over the life-course, it would be impossible to collect data on these measures any other way. However, because there are limits on the person’s ability to recall information from many years earlier and there is the potential for biases in these subjective evaluations, the results concerning SES and Reactive Responding need to be cautiously interpreted.

**Direction for Future Research**

Given the limitations of the present study and the unsupported hypotheses discussed earlier, many opportunities for future research exist for organizational scholars. Certainly, future research could assess these relationships using multiple raters and obtaining the data via more than one method. Alleviating any concerns of common method variance could more firmly establish this area of research in the eyes of the organizational research community. In addition, replicating this study in other organizations or with a sample with a greater percentage of men would improve the generalizeability of these relationships.

Longitudinal research could be particularly helpful given the impact that individual growth and development has been demonstrated to have on a variety of aspects of personality (Roberts, 2006; Roberts et al., 2006). This type of research also would more firmly establish the potential connection between SES, learned behaviors (e.g., Reactive Responding), and adaptation to organizational life (e.g., political skill). Finally, longitudinal research would be beneficial to research concerning the stress process, as it could speak to the much-neglected aspect of *time* in individual stress research.

The lack of significant results for several relationships in this study opens many doors for future research. Anxiety has received a substantial amount of research attention, particularly through research on the broader traits of Negative Affectivity and Neuroticism (Perrewé & Spector, 2002). Although Anxiety was not found to be related to Interpersonal Influence, the post hoc results demonstrated that it was related to Emotional Action. Future research should consider how trait Anxiety relates to behaviors. It could be that Anxiety’s effect on individual-level workplace outcomes (e.g., citizenship behaviors or performance) is through emotion-related learned behaviors, such as Emotional Action.

Future research should consider how to best measure the trait of Sincerity. The results of the present study suggest that the current HEXACO operationalization of Sincerity might be confounded with self-perception biases (e.g., social desirability responding). It is possible that
future research may find that, because it is so open to self-biases, Sincerity is best measured through observation of behavior either in a laboratory setting or as evidenced in other-reports. Another avenue for future research concerns the construct of Reactive Responding. Although based on a substantial amount of theoretical and empirical research in the health and behavioral sciences, in both this and other studies, the construct of Reactive Responding has not yet received unambiguous support for its operationalization, nor for its hypothesized antecedents and criteria. Concerning its antecedents, Reactive Responding has not been consistently related to SES (Taylor, 1998), and, because the foundation of Reactive Responding is believed to be its relation to low SES, it is vital that future research in this area link Reactive Responding to SES. There is little evidence suggesting that current measures of SES are flawed. Instead, it appears that Reactive Responding needs to be reconceptualized.

One possible reconceptualization is that Reactive Responding might need to have more fine-grained relationships with SES. In other words, much like organizational researchers (e.g., Hogan et al., 1996) purport that the bandwidth of personality predictors and criteria need to match, the bandwidth of SES and Reactive Responding needs to be addressed. This research could take many forms. For instance, it is possible that certain Reactive Responding dimensions (e.g., Constrained Options) relate to certain SES dimensions (e.g., education), as the results of this study seem to suggest (see Table 4).

Another possibility is that Reactive Responding needs to be restructured to more accurately reflect the differences in low SES experience. For example, some low SES persons have a rural background, while some have an urban upbringing; some are members of an ethnic minority, while others are not. To the extent that each of these situations is different from the others, Reactive Responding could be tailored to each in order to more accurately address whether persons in that type of an environment are developing maladaptive regulatory patterns based on their situation.

Regarding its operationalization, the present study generally found relationships the opposite of those hypothesized for the Restricted Social Experiences dimension, and future research needs to seriously consider how to best capture the social restrictions placed upon those in a low SES environment in a questionnaire. This could be challenging for organizational researchers, because the typical samples in our studies are comprised of individuals who have achieved some level of success in their organizational life. Thus, there is likely at least a restriction of range in regulatory behaviors (e.g., Reactive Responding), if not a bias against their reporting due to self-presentation concerns. Political skill research has demonstrated that individuals’ ability to successfully manage their social lives at work is vital to evaluations of performance. Thus, it is important that research can address the social-related learned behaviors that serve as political skill’s antecedents.

The results of the present study also provide avenues for future research concerning the predictors and criteria of Reactive Responding. Although the post hoc results showed several significant relationships between personality and Reactive Responding, it is possible that Reactive Responding has other antecedents, such as childhood abuse or neglect, general mental ability, or attributional tendencies. These other predictors should be investigated in order to provide a more complete understanding of the nature and development of Reactive Responding. In addition, although two of the four dimensions of Reactive Responding were demonstrated to have relationships with political skill, this was only when personality traits were removed from the model. Thus, future research should test relationships between Reactive Responding and
other criteria, such as job satisfaction/performance, leadership behaviors, reputation, and other measures of adjustment to organizational life.

Overall, concerning research related to Reactive Responding and SES, rather than the use of SES as a control variable, future organizational research needs to consider how SES has a substantive impact on the individual, particularly with regard to the regulatory behavior patterns stemming from different SES environments. While SES has rose to prominence as an important construct in the psychological, health, and educational sciences, its presence has been conspicuously lacking in organizational research. Although this absence could be due to the likelihood that most samples used in organizational studies contain a limited range of past and present SES, future organizational research needs to examine the effects on the individual of this construct that has received such widespread attention across the social sciences. Individuals throughout the spectrum of SES participate in organizations, and organizational scholars need to consider themselves responsible to all of these individuals in their research (Wright & Wright, 1999, 2002).

One other avenue regarding the personality prediction of political skill concerns the third level of personality. As constructed by McAdams and Pals (2006) and discussed earlier, aside from the dispositional (i.e., level one) and social cognitive (i.e., level two) aspects of personality, there is a third level that concerns personal narratives. These narratives or life stories are ways which individuals express meaning or unity in their identity and everyday life; however, no such constructs were included in this study. Future research could examine relationships between personal narratives and Reactive Responding and political skill. It could be that leaving the third level of personality out of the present study has lead to spurious or weak relationships between personality, Reactive Responding, and political skill, but there is no known organizational research that would suggest this is the case. In fact, as far as this researcher is aware, no prominent conceptual models in the organizational sciences have integrated personal narratives into their schema. Future research should consider the importance of personal narrative in predicting individual-level, workplace outcomes.

Concerning the influence of political skill in the stress process, the present study opens several potential doors for future research. For instance, little organizational research has been conducted on physical burnout. In the post hoc analysis, self-rated Networking Ability was related to greater physical burnout in the presence of increased Interpersonal Conflict at Work, especially for those with high levels of Networking Ability. As indicated above, future research could consider how self-rated political skill (e.g., Networking Ability) measures the pressures that one feels concerning the ever-present need in organizational life to forge new and maintain current social networking ties. It is possible that self-reports of political skill are not discriminating between abilities (i.e., what I am able to do) and felt pressures to perform (i.e., what I must do), and future research could attempt to separate these elements of the political landscape of organizations.

As discussed above, the other findings from the analyses of political skill in the stress process appear to both support the advantages of the measure of political skill used in the current research and suggest that its results may support those of prior research. However, although the measure of political skill used in the present study appears to be valid, future research needs to further validate or refine it, as indicted above. Items were added to the Political Skill Inventory (CITE Ferris et al, 2005), but the results do not appear to diminish the importance of networking (i.e., Networking Ability) to the construct of political skill.
Finally, future research should consider other predictors and moderators of the stress process. Although much research attention has been given to the stress process, little research has examined how social-cognitive or self-regulatory behaviors (e.g., Reactive Responding and political skill) affect the stress experiences of the individual. The present study tested political skill and some have examined the regulation of attention (i.e., Hochwarter, Meurs, Perrewé, Royle, & Matherly, 2007) and self-efficacy (i.e., Schaubroeck & Merritt, 1997), but future research could test the effect of other regulatory or social cognitive behaviors on the stress process, such as Reactive Responding or other domain-specific skill sets or personal strivings.

**Implications for Practice**

The findings of the current study also provide some implications for practice. First, from the perspective of an employee, the results indicate that those who are more proactive and more sociable will develop greater political skill, which, in turn, is related to higher ratings of performance. Second, those who develop their ability to build effective and advantageous partnerships and alliances are likely to be viewed by superiors as better performers than their counterparts who do not. Moreover, employees who are interpersonally flexible and able to influence a range of individuals in the workplace are going to perceive fewer stressors in their environment.

Also, the relationships found in the present study between personality, Reactive Responding, and political skill could be used by human resource professionals in a selection context. Individuals’ adaptive regulatory tendencies (i.e., low on Reactive Responding or high on political skill) could be tested prior to joining an organization. Persons with more adaptive regulatory behaviors would be more likely to be successful in a stressful work environment.

In addition, these relationships could assist organizational leaders in an employee development context. It has been argued that political skill can be trained (Harris, Kacmar, Zivnuska, & Shaw, 2007), and it would seem likely that this could apply to other regulatory constructs as well (e.g., Reactive Responding). Although personality traits are unlikely to be changed in the short-term, regulatory patterns of behavior are argued to be more proximal predictors of important workplace outcomes for the individual. Thus, their development is likely to have profound affects on the individual and the organization, as appears to be the case in the strong relationship between an employee’s Networking Ability and job performance found in the present research. Although the results of this study were inconclusive regarding the link between SES and Reactive Responding, a substantial body of research would suggest these two are related. Consequently, practitioners need to recognize the importance of SES as an indicator that an employee might be more likely to have a reactive response to workplace events.

**Conclusions**

The current study provides a more complete personality and learned behavior explanation for political skill, and it investigated how political skill affects the stress process. When including the post hoc analyses, a number of significant associations were found that grant insight into these relationships and paved avenues for future research. Understanding influences on the development of political skill and its use in the stress process is beneficial to organizational scholars and practitioners alike. Hopefully the present study represents only the beginning of these promising areas of research.
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Note: Path coefficients are standardized regression weights using self-reported political skill.
Note: Path coefficients are standardized regression weights using self-reported political skill.
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Note: Path coefficients are standardized regression weights.
Note: Figure illustrated over +/- two standard deviations.

FIGURE 9 – THE INTERACTIVE RELATIONSHIP OF INTERPERSONAL CONFLICT AT WORK AND NETWORKING ABILITY ON PHYSICAL BURNOUT
### TABLE 1 – MEANS, STANDARD DEVIATIONS, COEFFICIENT ALPHA RELIABILITIES, AND INTERCORRELATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Sincerity</th>
<th>Anxiety</th>
<th>Sociability</th>
<th>Patience</th>
<th>Diligence</th>
<th>Creativity</th>
<th>Proactive</th>
<th>Interpersonal Influence - Self</th>
<th>Networking Ability - Self</th>
<th>Social Astuteness - Self</th>
<th>Apparent Sincerity - Self</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sincerity</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>824</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anxiety</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>-2.24(**)</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>813</td>
<td>822</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociability</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>.10(**)</td>
<td>.18(**)</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>822</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patience</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>.35(**)</td>
<td>-0.50(**)</td>
<td>.30(**)</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diligence</td>
<td>4.39</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>.31(**)</td>
<td>-0.08(*)</td>
<td>.17(**)</td>
<td>.26(**)</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creativity</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>-1.00(**)</td>
<td>.18(**)</td>
<td>.16(**)</td>
<td>.21(**)</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proactive</td>
<td>5.25</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>-0.08(*)</td>
<td>.21(**)</td>
<td>.16(**)</td>
<td>.33(**)</td>
<td>.44(**)</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal Influence - Self</td>
<td>5.71</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>.13(**)</td>
<td>-0.18(**)</td>
<td>.46(**)</td>
<td>.31(**)</td>
<td>.27(**)</td>
<td>.29(**)</td>
<td>.40(**)</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Networking Ability - Self</td>
<td>4.65</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>-1.40(**)</td>
<td>.39(**)</td>
<td>.22(**)</td>
<td>.18(**)</td>
<td>.20(**)</td>
<td>.39(**)</td>
<td>.56(**)</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Astuteness - Self</td>
<td>5.14</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>-0.11(**)</td>
<td>.27(**)</td>
<td>.17(**)</td>
<td>.22(**)</td>
<td>.310(**)</td>
<td>.45(**)</td>
<td>.53(**)</td>
<td>.54(**)</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apparent Sincerity - Self</td>
<td>6.05</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>.23(**)</td>
<td>.15(**)</td>
<td>.17(**)</td>
<td>.18(**)</td>
<td>.32(**)</td>
<td>.45(**)</td>
<td>.38(**)</td>
<td>.49(**)</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

1. Correlations were calculated using pairwise deletion. Thus pairwise sample (N) are given.
2. Coefficient alpha reliabilities are given along the diagonal.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Restricted Social Experiences</th>
<th>Emotional Action</th>
<th>Constrained Options</th>
<th>Short-Term Goal Orientation</th>
<th>SES</th>
<th>Networking Ability - Supervisor</th>
<th>Interpersonal Conflict</th>
<th>Burnout</th>
<th>Negative Affectivity</th>
<th>Tenure</th>
<th>Contextual Performance - Supervisor</th>
<th>Task Performance - Supervisor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sincerity</strong></td>
<td>.08(**)</td>
<td>-.15(**)</td>
<td>-.20(**)</td>
<td>-.15(**)</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>-.12(**)</td>
<td>-.28(**)</td>
<td>-.30(**)</td>
<td>.12(**)</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>730</td>
<td>722</td>
<td>715</td>
<td>717</td>
<td>598</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>736</td>
<td>713</td>
<td>764</td>
<td>824</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Anxiety</strong></td>
<td>-.18(**)</td>
<td>.43(**)</td>
<td>.20(**)</td>
<td>.14(**)</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.11(**)</td>
<td>.41(**)</td>
<td>.57(**)</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>727</td>
<td>719</td>
<td>712</td>
<td>714</td>
<td>596</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>733</td>
<td>710</td>
<td>761</td>
<td>822</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sociability</strong></td>
<td>.35(**)</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.11(**)</td>
<td>-.19(**)</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>.23(**)</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.30(**)</td>
<td>-.20(**)</td>
<td>.09(**)</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>729</td>
<td>722</td>
<td>714</td>
<td>716</td>
<td>599</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>734</td>
<td>710</td>
<td>761</td>
<td>822</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Patience</strong></td>
<td>.21(**)</td>
<td>-.45(**)</td>
<td>-.23(**)</td>
<td>-.26(**)</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.13(*)</td>
<td>-.20(**)</td>
<td>-.44(**)</td>
<td>-.51(**)</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.18(**)</td>
<td>.12(*)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>730</td>
<td>722</td>
<td>715</td>
<td>717</td>
<td>598</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>736</td>
<td>714</td>
<td>764</td>
<td>824</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Diligence</strong></td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>-.20(**)</td>
<td>-.29(**)</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>-.09(*)</td>
<td>-.33(**)</td>
<td>-.17(**)</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.23(**)</td>
<td>.16(**)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>724</td>
<td>716</td>
<td>709</td>
<td>711</td>
<td>595</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>729</td>
<td>708</td>
<td>756</td>
<td>819</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Creativity</strong></td>
<td>.20(**)</td>
<td>-.17(**)</td>
<td>-.28(**)</td>
<td>-.25(**)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.16(**)</td>
<td>-.08(*)</td>
<td>.11(*)</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>730</td>
<td>722</td>
<td>715</td>
<td>717</td>
<td>597</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>734</td>
<td>714</td>
<td>763</td>
<td>823</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proactive</strong></td>
<td>.17(**)</td>
<td>-.10(**)</td>
<td>-.32(**)</td>
<td>-.37(**)</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.21(**)</td>
<td>-.14(**)</td>
<td>.18(*)</td>
<td>.15(**)</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>731</td>
<td>722</td>
<td>715</td>
<td>717</td>
<td>598</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>736</td>
<td>714</td>
<td>764</td>
<td>824</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interpersonal Influence - Self</strong></td>
<td>.30(**)</td>
<td>-.20(**)</td>
<td>-.26(**)</td>
<td>-.27(**)</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>.31(**)</td>
<td>-.16(**)</td>
<td>-.32(**)</td>
<td>-.23(**)</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.23(**)</td>
<td>.17(**)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>733</td>
<td>725</td>
<td>718</td>
<td>720</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>739</td>
<td>718</td>
<td>739</td>
<td>755</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Networking Ability - Self</strong></td>
<td>.21(**)</td>
<td>-.14(**)</td>
<td>-.17(**)</td>
<td>-.24(**)</td>
<td>.08(*)</td>
<td>.31(**)</td>
<td>-.10(**)</td>
<td>-.24(**)</td>
<td>-.17(**)</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.13(*)</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>727</td>
<td>719</td>
<td>712</td>
<td>715</td>
<td>594</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>734</td>
<td>713</td>
<td>734</td>
<td>749</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social Astuteness - Self</strong></td>
<td>.26(**)</td>
<td>-.15(**)</td>
<td>-.22(**)</td>
<td>-.32(**)</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>.13(*)</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.18(**)</td>
<td>-.14(**)</td>
<td>.13(*)</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>726</td>
<td>717</td>
<td>712</td>
<td>712</td>
<td>595</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>731</td>
<td>712</td>
<td>729</td>
<td>746</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Apparent Sincerity - Self</strong></td>
<td>.10(**)</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.14(**)</td>
<td>-.17(**)</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>.13(*)</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.16(**)</td>
<td>-.07(*)</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>723</td>
<td>715</td>
<td>708</td>
<td>711</td>
<td>593</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>729</td>
<td>710</td>
<td>727</td>
<td>743</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>305</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).
* . Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).
1 Correlations were calculated using pairwise deletion. Thus pairwise sample (N) are given.
2 Coefficient alpha reliabilities are given along the diagonal.
TABLE 1 – MEANS, STANDARD DEVIATIONS, COEFFICIENT ALPHA RELIABILITIES, AND INTERCORRELATIONS CNTD.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Sincerity</th>
<th>Anxiety</th>
<th>Sociability</th>
<th>Patience</th>
<th>Diligence</th>
<th>Creativity</th>
<th>Proactive</th>
<th>Interpersonal Influence - Self</th>
<th>Networking Ability - Self</th>
<th>Social Astuteness - Self</th>
<th>Apparent Sincerity - Self</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Restricted Social</td>
<td>4.69</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>.08(*)</td>
<td>-.18(**)</td>
<td>.35(**)</td>
<td>.21(**)</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>.20(**)</td>
<td>.17(**)</td>
<td>.30(**)</td>
<td>.21(**)</td>
<td>.26(**)</td>
<td>.10(**)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experiences</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>730</td>
<td>727</td>
<td>729</td>
<td>730</td>
<td>724</td>
<td>730</td>
<td>731</td>
<td>733</td>
<td>727</td>
<td>726</td>
<td>723</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Action</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>-.15(**)</td>
<td>.43(**)</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.45(**)</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.17(**)</td>
<td>-.10(**)</td>
<td>-.20(**)</td>
<td>-.14(**)</td>
<td>-.15(**)</td>
<td>-.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>722</td>
<td>719</td>
<td>722</td>
<td>722</td>
<td>716</td>
<td>722</td>
<td>722</td>
<td>725</td>
<td>719</td>
<td>717</td>
<td>715</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constrained Options</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>-.20(**)</td>
<td>.20(**)</td>
<td>-.11(**)</td>
<td>-.23(**)</td>
<td>-.20(**)</td>
<td>-.28(**)</td>
<td>-.32(**)</td>
<td>-.26(**)</td>
<td>-.17(**)</td>
<td>-.22(**)</td>
<td>-.14(**)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>715</td>
<td>712</td>
<td>714</td>
<td>715</td>
<td>709</td>
<td>715</td>
<td>715</td>
<td>718</td>
<td>712</td>
<td>711</td>
<td>708</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short-Term Goal</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>-.15(**)</td>
<td>.14(**)</td>
<td>-.19(**)</td>
<td>-.26(**)</td>
<td>-.29(**)</td>
<td>-.25(**)</td>
<td>-.37(**)</td>
<td>-.27(**)</td>
<td>-.24(**)</td>
<td>-.32(**)</td>
<td>-.17(**)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orientation</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>717</td>
<td>714</td>
<td>716</td>
<td>717</td>
<td>711</td>
<td>717</td>
<td>717</td>
<td>720</td>
<td>715</td>
<td>712</td>
<td>711</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SES</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>.08(*)</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>598</td>
<td>596</td>
<td>599</td>
<td>598</td>
<td>595</td>
<td>597</td>
<td>598</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>594</td>
<td>595</td>
<td>593</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Networking Ability -</td>
<td>4.94</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.23(**)</td>
<td>.13(*)</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>.31(**)</td>
<td>.31(**)</td>
<td>.13(*)</td>
<td>.13(*)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>307</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal Conflict</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>-.12(**)</td>
<td>.11(**)</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.20(**)</td>
<td>-.09(*)</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.16(**)</td>
<td>-.10(**)</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>736</td>
<td>733</td>
<td>734</td>
<td>736</td>
<td>729</td>
<td>734</td>
<td>736</td>
<td>739</td>
<td>734</td>
<td>731</td>
<td>729</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burnout</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>-.28(**)</td>
<td>.41(**)</td>
<td>-.30(**)</td>
<td>-.44(**)</td>
<td>-.33(**)</td>
<td>-.16(**)</td>
<td>-.21(**)</td>
<td>-.32(**)</td>
<td>-.24(**)</td>
<td>-.18(**)</td>
<td>-.16(**)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>713</td>
<td>710</td>
<td>710</td>
<td>714</td>
<td>708</td>
<td>714</td>
<td>713</td>
<td>718</td>
<td>713</td>
<td>712</td>
<td>710</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative Affectivity</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>-.30(**)</td>
<td>.57(**)</td>
<td>-.20(**)</td>
<td>-.51(**)</td>
<td>-.17(**)</td>
<td>-.08(**)</td>
<td>-.14(**)</td>
<td>-.23(**)</td>
<td>-.166(**)</td>
<td>-.14(**)</td>
<td>-.07(*)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>764</td>
<td>761</td>
<td>761</td>
<td>764</td>
<td>756</td>
<td>763</td>
<td>764</td>
<td>739</td>
<td>734</td>
<td>729</td>
<td>727</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure (in months)</td>
<td>90.42</td>
<td>107.78</td>
<td>.12(**)</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.09(**)</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>-.11(**)</td>
<td>-.18(**)</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.13(**)</td>
<td>-.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>824</td>
<td>822</td>
<td>822</td>
<td>824</td>
<td>819</td>
<td>823</td>
<td>824</td>
<td>755</td>
<td>749</td>
<td>746</td>
<td>743</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contextual Performance</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>.18(**)</td>
<td>.23(**)</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.15(**)</td>
<td>.23(**)</td>
<td>.13(*)</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Supervisor</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>301</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task Performance -</td>
<td>5.96</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>.12(*)</td>
<td>.16(**)</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>.17(**)</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>303</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>305</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).
* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).
1 Correlations were calculated using pairwise deletion. Thus pairwise sample (N) are given.
2 Coefficient alpha reliabilities are given along the diagonal.
### TABLE 1 – MEANS, STANDARD DEVIATIONS, COEFFICIENT ALPHA RELIABILITIES, AND INTERCORRELATIONS CNTD.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Restricted Social Experiences</th>
<th>Emotional Action</th>
<th>Constrained Options</th>
<th>Short-Term Goal Orientation</th>
<th>SES</th>
<th>Networking Ability - Supervisor</th>
<th>Interpersonal Conflict</th>
<th>Burnout</th>
<th>Negative Affectivity</th>
<th>Tenure</th>
<th>Contextual Performance - Supervisor</th>
<th>Task Performance - Supervisor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Restricted Social</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experiences</td>
<td>737</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Action</td>
<td>-.22(***</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>727</td>
<td>729</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constrained Options</td>
<td>-.26(***</td>
<td>.36(***</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>720</td>
<td>715</td>
<td>722</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short-Term Goal</td>
<td>-.26(***</td>
<td>.24(***</td>
<td>.34(***</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orientation</td>
<td>722</td>
<td>715</td>
<td>710</td>
<td>724</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SES</td>
<td>.10(*)</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>-.12(**)</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>602</td>
<td>595</td>
<td>593</td>
<td>591</td>
<td>603</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Networking Ability</td>
<td>.14(*)</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>.17(**)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.93</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Supervisor</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>312</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal Conflict</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>.19(**</td>
<td>.11(**</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>721</td>
<td>713</td>
<td>706</td>
<td>708</td>
<td>590</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>743</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burnout</td>
<td>-.19(***</td>
<td>.31(***</td>
<td>.26(***</td>
<td>.31(***</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>.32(***</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>700</td>
<td>694</td>
<td>687</td>
<td>688</td>
<td>572</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>709</td>
<td>720</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative Affectivity</td>
<td>-.18(***</td>
<td>.34(***</td>
<td>.23(***</td>
<td>.22(***</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>.22(***</td>
<td>.54(**</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>721</td>
<td>712</td>
<td>706</td>
<td>709</td>
<td>588</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>727</td>
<td>706</td>
<td>771</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure (in months)</td>
<td>-.13(***</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>.11(***</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>.14(*)</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>737</td>
<td>729</td>
<td>722</td>
<td>724</td>
<td>603</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>743</td>
<td>720</td>
<td>771</td>
<td>839</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contextual Performance</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>-.16(**)</td>
<td>-.18(**)</td>
<td>.17(**)</td>
<td>.58(**</td>
<td>-.25(***</td>
<td>-.20(**</td>
<td>-.13(*)</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Supervisor</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>306</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task Performance</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>.23(**)</td>
<td>.51(**</td>
<td>-.23(**</td>
<td>-.12(*)</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>.80(***</td>
<td>.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Supervisor</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>308</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).
*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).
1 Correlations were calculated using pairwise deletion. Thus pairwise sample (N) are given.
2 Coefficient alpha reliabilities are given along the diagonal.
### Table 2 – Fit Statistics for Alternative Structural Models Using Self-Reported Political Skill

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
<th>$Df$</th>
<th>CFI</th>
<th>RMSEA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Theorized</td>
<td>1417.76</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More Saturated</td>
<td>767.52</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Saturated</td>
<td>1748.42</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: n=839. $\chi^2$ = chi-square statistic. $df$ = degrees of freedom. CFI = comparative fit index. RMSEA = root mean square error of approximation.*
TABLE 3 – FIT STATISTICS FOR ALTERNATIVE STRUCTURAL MODELS USING SUPERVISOR-REPORTED POLITICAL SKILL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>CFI</th>
<th>RMSEA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Theorized</td>
<td>1195.46</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More Saturated</td>
<td>546.32</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Saturated</td>
<td>1492.25</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: n=839. $\chi^2$ = chi-square statistic. $df$ = degrees of freedom. CFI = comparative fit index. RMSEA = root mean square error of approximation.
## TABLE 4 – BIVARIATE CORRELATIONS BETWEEN REACTIVE RESPONDING DIMENSIONS AND SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS DIMENSIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Restricted Social Experiences</th>
<th>Emotional Action</th>
<th>Constrained Options</th>
<th>Short-Term Goal Orientation</th>
<th>Reactive Responding</th>
<th>Manager</th>
<th>Supervisor</th>
<th>Employee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Restricted Social Experiences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Action</td>
<td>-.24(**)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constrained Options</td>
<td>-.29(**)</td>
<td>.38(**)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short-Term Goal Orientation</td>
<td>-.26(**)</td>
<td>.22(**)</td>
<td>.35(**)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reactive Responding</td>
<td>.22(**)</td>
<td>.64(**)</td>
<td>.56(**)</td>
<td>.62(**)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>-.09(*)</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>.20(**)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>-.59(**)</td>
<td>-.71(**)</td>
<td>-.29(**)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Income</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>.36(**)</td>
<td>.11(**)</td>
<td>-.29(**)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household Income</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>.32(**)</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>-.23(**)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>-.10(*)</td>
<td>-.14(**)</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>-.10(*)</td>
<td>.22(**)</td>
<td>.11(**)</td>
<td>-.18(**)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family’s Social Class</td>
<td>.14(**)</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>.11(**)</td>
<td>.14(**)</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents Education</td>
<td>.13(**)</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>.09(*)</td>
<td>.10(*)</td>
<td>.12(**)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SES</td>
<td>.09(*)</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>-.12(**)</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>.37(**)</td>
<td>.11(**)</td>
<td>-.26(**)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).  
*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).  
Listwise N=575
## TABLE 4 – BIVARIATE CORRELATIONS BETWEEN REACTIVE RESPONDING DIMENSIONS AND SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS DIMENSIONS CNTD.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Personal Income</th>
<th>Household Income</th>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Family’s Social Class</th>
<th>Parents Education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Restricted Social Experiences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Action</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constrained Options</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short-Term Goal Orientation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reactive Responding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Income</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household Income</td>
<td>0.60(∗∗)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>0.29(∗∗)</td>
<td>0.18(∗∗)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family’s Social Class</td>
<td>0.17(∗∗)</td>
<td>0.14(∗∗)</td>
<td>0.21(∗∗)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents Education</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.26(∗∗)</td>
<td>0.50(∗∗)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SES</td>
<td>0.67(∗∗)</td>
<td>0.62(∗∗)</td>
<td>0.62(∗∗)</td>
<td>0.65(∗∗)</td>
<td>0.57(∗∗)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).
*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).
Listwise N=575
### TABLE 5 – BIVARIATE CORRELATIONS BETWEEN POLITICAL SKILL DIMENSIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Interpersonal Influence - Self</th>
<th>Networking Ability - Self</th>
<th>Social Astuteness - Self</th>
<th>Apparent Sincerity - Self</th>
<th>Interpersonal Influence - Supervisor</th>
<th>Networking Ability - Supervisor</th>
<th>Social Astuteness - Supervisor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal Influence - Self</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Networking Ability - Self</td>
<td>.557(***)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Astuteness - Self</td>
<td>.526(****)</td>
<td>.542(****)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apparent Sincerity - Self</td>
<td>.447(****)</td>
<td>.377(****)</td>
<td>.489(****)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal Influence - Supervisor</td>
<td>.334(****)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Networking Ability - Supervisor</td>
<td>.310(****)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.620(****)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Astuteness - Supervisor</td>
<td>.208(****)</td>
<td>.756(****)</td>
<td>.671(****)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apparent Sincerity - Supervisor</td>
<td>.145(*)</td>
<td>.653(****)</td>
<td>.455(****)</td>
<td>.608(****)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).  
*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).  
† Correlations were calculated using pairwise deletion. Thus pairwise sample (N) are given.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step/Variable</th>
<th>Interpersonal Conflict at Work β</th>
<th>β</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Step 1:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patience</td>
<td>-.11*</td>
<td>-.10*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative Affectivity</td>
<td>.17**</td>
<td>.17**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Networking Ability</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall AdjR^2 = .06
\Delta R^2 = .00
(df) = (2, 710) (1, 709)

* p < .05 two-tailed
** p < .01 two-tailed
### TABLE 7 – RESULTS OF REGRESSION ANALYSES FOR SELF-REPORTED NETWORKING ABILITY AND INTERPERSONAL CONFLICT AT WORK ON BURNOUT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step/Variable</th>
<th>Burnout</th>
<th>Burnout</th>
<th>Burnout</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\beta$</td>
<td>$\beta$</td>
<td>$\beta$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 1:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patience</td>
<td>-.21**</td>
<td>-.17**</td>
<td>-.17**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative Affectivity</td>
<td>.43**</td>
<td>.39**</td>
<td>.39**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 2:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal Conflict at Work</td>
<td>.19**</td>
<td>.20**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Networking Ability</td>
<td>-.12**</td>
<td>-.12**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 3:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal Conflict at Work X Networking Ability</td>
<td></td>
<td>.04</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall Adj$R^2$ | .32 | .37 | .37 |
$\Delta R^2$ (df) | .05 | .00 |     |
(2, 681) | (2, 679) | (1, 678) |

* $p < .05$ two-tailed
** $p < .01$ two-tailed
TABLE 8 – RESULTS OF REGRESSION ANALYSES FOR SUPERVISOR-REPORTED NETWORKING ABILITY ON TASK PERFORMANCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step/Variable</th>
<th>Task Performance</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>β</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Step 1:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diligence</td>
<td>.15**</td>
<td>.11*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Networking Ability</td>
<td>.51**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall AdjR(^2)</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΔR(^2)</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(df)</td>
<td>(2, 299)</td>
<td>(1, 298)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05 two-tailed
** p < .01 two-tailed
### TABLE 9 – RESULTS OF REGRESSION ANALYSES FOR SUPERVISOR-REPORTED NETWORKING ABILITY ON CONTEXTUAL PERFORMANCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step/Variable</th>
<th>Contextual Performance</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>β</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 1:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>-0.15**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diligence</td>
<td>0.23**</td>
<td>0.19**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 2:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Networking Ability</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.60**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall AdjR²</strong></td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΔR²</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(df)</td>
<td>(2, 297)</td>
<td>(1, 296)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05 two-tailed
** p < .01 two-tailed
### TABLE 10 – RESULTS OF REGRESSION ANALYSES FOR SUPERVISOR-REPORTED NETWORKING ABILITY AND BURNOUT ON TASK PERFORMANCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step/Variable</th>
<th>Beta 1</th>
<th>Beta 2</th>
<th>Beta 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 1:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diligence</td>
<td>.14*</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 2:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burnout</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Networking Ability</td>
<td>.52**</td>
<td>.51**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 3:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burnout X Networking Ability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Overall AdjR²             | .02    | .28    | .28    |
| ΔR²                       | .27    | .00    |        |
| (df)                      | (2, 289) | (2, 287) | (1, 286) |

* p < .05 two-tailed
** p < .01 two-tailed
TABLE 11 – RESULTS OF REGRESSION ANALYSES FOR SUPERVISOR-REPORTED NETWORKING ABILITY AND BURNOUT ON CONTEXTUAL PERFORMANCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step/Variable</th>
<th>Contextual Performance</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>β</td>
<td>β</td>
<td>β</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 1:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.15**</td>
<td>-.14**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diligence</td>
<td>.23**</td>
<td>.14**</td>
<td>.14**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burnout</td>
<td>-.14**</td>
<td>-.13**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Networking Ability</td>
<td>.59**</td>
<td>.59**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 3:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burnout X Networking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall AdjR²</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΔR²</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(df)</td>
<td>(2, 287)</td>
<td>(2, 285)</td>
<td>(1, 284)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05 two-tailed
** p < .01 two-tailed
### TABLE 12 – SUMMARY OF HYPOTHESES TESTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypotheses</th>
<th>Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hypothesis 1:</strong> The Anxiety facet of Emotionality is negatively related to both self- and supervisor-rated Interpersonal Influence.</td>
<td>Not supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hypothesis 2:</strong> The Sociability facet of Extraversion is positively related to both self- and supervisor-rated Networking Ability.</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hypothesis 3:</strong> The Patience facet of Agreeableness is positively associated with Interpersonal Influence. This relationship is stronger for supervisor-rated Interpersonal Influence than for self-rated Interpersonal Influence.</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hypothesis 4:</strong> The Sincerity facet of Honesty-Humility is negatively related to both self- and supervisor-rated Apparent Sincerity.</td>
<td>Not supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hypothesis 5:</strong> Proactive Personality is positively related to both self- and supervisor-rated Networking Ability.</td>
<td>Partially supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hypothesis 6:</strong> SES is negatively related to Reactive Responding.</td>
<td>Not supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hypothesis 7A:</strong> The Creativity facet of Openness is negatively related to Short-Term Goal Orientation, Emotional Action, Restricted Social Experiences, and Constrained Options.</td>
<td>Partially supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hypothesis 7B:</strong> The relationship between the Creativity facet of Openness and political skill dimensions is mediated by the Reactive Responding dimensions of Short-Term Goal Orientation, Emotional Action, Restricted Social Experiences, and Constrained Options.</td>
<td>Partially supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hypothesis 8:</strong> The Diligence facet of Conscientiousness is negatively associated with Short-Term Goal Orientation.</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hypothesis 9A:</strong> Short-Term Goal Orientation has a negative relationship with Social Astuteness.</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hypothesis 9B:</strong> Short-Term Goal Orientation has a negative relationship with Networking Ability.</td>
<td>Not supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hypothesis 10A:</strong> Restricted Social Experiences has a negative relationship with Social Astuteness.</td>
<td>Not supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hypothesis 10B:</strong> Restricted Social Experiences has a negative relationship with Networking Ability.</td>
<td>Not supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hypothesis 11A:</strong> Emotional Action has a negative relationship with Social Astuteness.</td>
<td>Not supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hypothesis 11B:</strong> Emotional Action has a negative relationship with Networking Ability.</td>
<td>Not supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hypothesis 12A:</strong> Constrained Options has a negative relationship with Social Astuteness.</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hypothesis 12B:</strong> Constrained Options has a negative relationship with Networking Ability.</td>
<td>Not supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hypothesis 13:</strong> Self- and supervisor-reported Networking Ability have differential prediction in interpersonal conflict at work-burnout-performance relationships.</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hypothesis 14A:</strong> Self-reported Networking Ability is negatively related to interpersonal conflict at work.</td>
<td>Not supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hypothesis 14B:</strong> Self-reported Networking Ability moderates the relationship between interpersonal conflict at work and burnout, such that those high on Networking Ability will experience less burnout than those low on Networking Ability.</td>
<td>Not supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hypothesis 15A:</strong> Supervisor-reported Networking Ability is directly related to performance.</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hypothesis 15B:</strong> Supervisor-reported Networking Ability moderates the relationship between burnout and performance, such that those high on Networking Ability will experience increased performance.</td>
<td>Not supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hypothesis 16:</strong> Supervisor-reported Networking Ability is more strongly related to contextual performance than task performance.</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX A
SUMMARY OF HYPOTHESES

H 1: The Anxiety facet of Emotioanality is negatively related to both self- and supervisor-rated Interpersonal Influence.

H 2: The Sociability facet of Extraversion is positively related to both self- and supervisor-rated Networking Ability.

H 3: The Patience facet of Agreeableness is positively associated with Interpersonal Influence. This relationship is stronger for supervisor-rated Interpersonal Influence than for self-rated Interpersonal Influence.

H 4: The Sincerity facet of Honesty-Humility is negatively related to both self- and supervisor-rated Apparent Sincerity.

H 5: Proactive Personality is positively related to both self- and supervisor-rated Networking Ability.

H 6: SES is negatively related to Reactive Responding.

H 7A: Creativity is negatively related to Short-Term Goal Orientation, Emotional Action, Restricted Social Experiences, and Constrained Options.

H 7B: The relationship between Creativity and political skill dimensions is mediated by the Reactive Responding dimensions of Short-Term Goal Orientation, Emotional Action, Restricted Social Experiences, and Constrained Options.

H 8: Diligence is negatively associated with Short-Term Goal Orientation.

H 9A: Short-Term Goal Orientation has a negative relationship with Social Astuteness.

H 9B: Short-Term Goal Orientation has a negative relationship with Networking Ability.

H 10A: Restricted Social Experiences has a negative relationship with Social Astuteness.

H 10B: Restricted Social Experiences has a negative relationship with Networking Ability.

H 11A: Emotional Action has a negative relationship with Social Astuteness.

H 11B: Emotional Action has a negative relationship with Networking Ability.

H 12A: Constrained Options has a negative relationship with Social Astuteness.

H 12B: Constrained Options has a negative relationship with Networking Ability.

H 13: Self- and supervisor-reports of Networking Ability have differential prediction in interpersonal conflict at work-burnout-performance relationships.

H 14A: Self-reported Networking Ability is negatively related to interpersonal conflict at work.

H 14B: Self-reported Networking Ability moderates the relationship between interpersonal conflict at work and burnout, such that those high on Networking Ability will experience less burnout than those low on Networking Ability.

H 15A: Supervisor-reported Networking Ability is directly related to performance.

H 15B: Supervisor-reported Networking Ability moderates the relationship between burnout and performance, such that those high on Networking Ability will experience increased performance.

H 16: Supervisor-reported Networking Ability is more strongly related to contextual performance than task performance.
The graphic is a scree plot displaying the eigenvalues against the factor number. The plot shows a significant drop in eigenvalues for the first few factors, followed by a much flatter line for subsequent factors. This indicates that the initial factors are the most significant contributors to the variance in the data.

**FIGURE 10 – SCREE PLOT OF PILOT STUDY FOR REACTIVE RESPONDING**
### APPENDIX C

**SELF-REPORT QUESTIONNAIRE**

**Section 1 – About Yourself in General**

*Instructions:* The following are phrases describing people's behaviors. Please use the rating scale below to describe how accurately each statement describes *you*, circling the corresponding number.


Facets items chosen from: [http://ipip.ori.org/newHEXACO_PI_key.htm](http://ipip.ori.org/newHEXACO_PI_key.htm)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very Inaccurate</th>
<th>Moderately Inaccurate</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Moderately Accurate</th>
<th>Very Accurate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) I don't pretend to be more than I am. <strong>Sincerity</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) I worry about things. <strong>Anxiety</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) I love to chat. <strong>Sociability</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) I am usually a patient person. <strong>Patience</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) I get started quickly on doing a job. <strong>Diligence</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) I have a vivid imagination. <strong>Creativity</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7) I am not easily disturbed by events. <strong>Anxiety</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8) I rarely feel angry with people. <strong>Patience</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9) I play a role in order to impress people. <strong>Sincerity</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10) I usually like to spend my free time with people. <strong>Sociability</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11) I work hard. <strong>Diligence</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12) I get upset by unpleasant thoughts that come into my mind. <strong>Anxiety</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13) I have difficulty imagining things. <strong>Creativity</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14) I keep others at a distance. <strong>Sociability</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15) I get irritated easily. <strong>Patience</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16) I put on a show to impress people. <strong>Sincerity</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17) I love to think up new ways of doing things. <strong>Creativity</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18) I hang around doing nothing. <strong>Diligence</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19) I get stressed out easily. <strong>Anxiety</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20) I seem to derive less enjoyment from interacting with people than others do. <strong>Sociability</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21) I pretend to be concerned for others. <strong>Sincerity</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22) I am full of ideas. <strong>Creativity</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23) I am easily annoyed. <strong>Patience</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24) I do just enough work to get by. <strong>Diligence</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25) I rarely worry. <strong>Anxiety</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26) I get angry easily. <strong>Patience</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27) I push myself very hard to succeed.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section 2 – About Yourself in General

Instructions: The following set of questions relate to you. Please read the question. Then, circle the number that corresponds to your level of agreement with the statement, using a scale of 1 to 7, with 1 meaning that you “Strongly Disagree” with the statement and 7 meaning that you “Strongly Agree” with the statement.


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Slightly Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Slightly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) If I see something I don't like, I fix it.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) No matter what the odds, if I believe in something I will make it happen.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) I love being a champion for my ideas, even against others' opposition.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) I excel at identifying opportunities.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) I am always looking for better ways to do things.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) If I believe in an idea, no obstacle will prevent me from making it happen.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Section 3 – About Yourself in General


Instructions: The following section consists of a number of words that describe different feelings and emotions. In the space provided next to each word, indicate the degree to which you generally feel this way – that is, how you feel on the average. Please use the 1-5 scale below when assigning points to the feeling.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very slightly or not at all</th>
<th>A little</th>
<th>Moderately</th>
<th>Quite a bit</th>
<th>Extremely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1------------------2------------------3------------------4------------------5

______ Interested  
______ Hostile  
______ Nervous  
______ Distressed  
______ Enthusiastic  
______ Determined  
______ Excited  
______ Proud  
______ Attentive
Section 4 – About Yourself at Work

**Instructions**: Using the following scale, please circle the number next to each item that best describes how much you agree with each statement about yourself in your work environment.


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Slightly Disagree</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Slightly Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1) I am good at getting people to like me.

2) I am able to make most people feel comfortable and at ease around me.

3) It is easy for me to develop good rapport with most people.

4) I am able to communicate easily and effectively with others.

5) It is not difficult for me to influence people at work.

6) I am able to effectively adapt my communication style to most social situations.

7) At work, I know a lot of important people and am well connected.

8) 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.

9) I spend a lot of time and effort at work developing connections with others.

10) I am good at using my connections and network to make things happen at work.

11) I am good at building relationships with influential people at work.

12) I spend a lot of time and effort at work networking with others.

13) I pay close attention to peoples’ facial expressions.
### Section 5 – About Yourself at Work

**Instructions:** Below are a number of statements that describe different feelings that you may feel at work. Please indicate how often, in the past 30 workdays, you have felt each of the following feelings:


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Physical Fatigue: 1-6</th>
<th>Cognitive Weariness: 7-11</th>
<th>Emotional Exhaustion: 12-14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Never or almost never</td>
<td>Very Infrequently</td>
<td>Quite Infrequently</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) I feel tired.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) I have no energy for going to work in the morning.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) I feel physically drained.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) I feel fed up.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) I feel like my “batteries” are “dead.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) I feel burned out.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7) My thinking process is slow.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8) I have difficulty concentrating.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9) I feel I'm not thinking clearly.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10) I feel I'm not focused in my thinking.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11) I have difficulty thinking about complex things.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12) I feel I am unable to be sensitive to the needs of coworkers and customers.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13) I feel I am not capable of investing emotionally in coworkers and customers.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14) I feel I am not capable of being sympathetic to coworkers and customers.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Section 6 -- About Yourself at Work


<p>| | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) How often do you get into arguments with your supervisor at work?</td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>Rarely</td>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>Quite Often</td>
<td>Very Often</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) How often does your supervisor yell at you at work?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) How often is your supervisor rude to you at work?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) How often does your supervisor do nasty things to you at work?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) How often do coworkers yell at you at work?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) How often are coworkers rude to you at work?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7) How often do coworkers do nasty things to you at work?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8) How often do you get into arguments with coworkers at work?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Section 7 -- About Yourself Now and Your Past Experiences

Instructions: The following set of questions relate to you. Please read the question. Then, circle the number that corresponds to your level of agreement with the statement, using a scale of 1 to 7, with 1 meaning that you “Strongly Disagree” with the statement and 7 meaning that you “Strongly Agree” with the statement.


Also see: [http://www.maces.ucsf.edu/Research/Psychosocial/notebook/RR-42.html](http://www.maces.ucsf.edu/Research/Psychosocial/notebook/RR-42.html)

<p>| | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Restricted Social Experiences: 1-5</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Slightly Disagree</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Slightly Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Action: 6-10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constrained Options 11-15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short-Term Goal Orientation: 16-20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) When I was growing up, I often socialized with a variety of different</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) The social skills I learned when I was young were helpful to me as I became an adult.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) When I was a teenager, I spent almost all of my time with people who were a lot like me.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) I learned early in life how to handle a variety of social situations.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) The social life I had as a teenager prepared me for interacting with coworkers.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) If people make me angry, I usually do not mind letting them see my anger.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7) I often respond emotionally when something upsetting happens.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8) Especially when I am angry, I stop to think before I act.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9) In a difficult situation, I have trouble hiding my emotions from others.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10) If I feel an intense emotion, I let it out no matter who is around me.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11) There is no point in trying to think about different ways to solve a problem.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12) When there is a problem, I always consider several alternative solutions.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13) When I have a decision to make and I see a way to go, I take it without thinking about other options.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14) In life, there are usually many practical alternatives from which to choose.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15) In most situations, there is only one way to go.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16) I have clear, long-term desires that I work hard to achieve.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17) I do not usually set goals far in advance.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18) It is important to me to take time to plan out where I am going in life.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19) I do not think often about my long-term goals.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20) I try to think about the here-and-now and the distant future when making plans.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Section 8 – Your Family During Childhood**

*Instructions:* Please mark the category or fill in the blank to indicate which of the following is most accurate of your experiences prior to becoming an adult.

1) When growing up, my family’s social class was:
   a. Under-class ______ ("We lived on welfare or below the poverty line.")
   b. Working poor ______ ("We lived just above the poverty line.")
   c. Working-class ______ ("My parent(s) had a good blue collar or lower white collar job.")
   d. Mid-level ______ ("My parent(s) had a white collar or high blue collar job.")
   e. Upper-level ______ ("My parent(s) were professionals or business owners.")
   f. Elite ______ ("My parent(s) inherited or earned sizeable assets.")

2) When growing up, my family’s or guardian’s primary income came from this profession: _____________

3) My parent or guardian with the highest level of education received this degree:
   
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>High School</th>
<th>Associates (or some college)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Technical</td>
<td>Bachelors (undergraduate)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters (graduate)</td>
<td>Doctoral (graduate)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4) So that we may validate and match your survey, please provide your full name and your supervisor’s full name. The survey is entirely confidential.

   Your Full Name: ________________________________  Your Department: ________________________________
   Your Supervisor’s Full Name: ________________________________

Section 9 – Demographics

The remaining questions are for statistical purposes only, but they are important to our research. Your willingness to complete them is greatly appreciated. We are only looking for patterns based on simple demographics.

   8) My highest level of education is:
      | High School | Associates (or some college) |
      | Technical | Bachelors (undergraduate) |
      | Masters (graduate) | Doctoral (graduate) |

   9) Are you male or female?   Male – 1       Female – 2

   10) What is your age?  # _______

   11) What is your race?
      | Caucasian (White) | 1 |
      | African-American (Black) | 2 |
      | Hispanic | 3 |
      | Asian | 4 |
      | Native American | 5 |
      | Other | 6 |

   Thank you for your time and attention!  We sincerely appreciate it!
**APPENDIX D**

**SUPERVISOR-REPORT QUESTIONNAIRE**

Please complete the following short survey about your subordinate: ________________________________

This survey is completely confidential.

---

### Section 1 – About Your Subordinate

Instructions: Please circle the number that best describes how much you agree with each statement about **this** subordinate.


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interpersonal Influence: 1-6</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Slightly Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Slightly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Networking Ability: 7-12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Astuteness: 13-18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apparent Sincerity: 19-24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) S/he is good at getting people to like him/her.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) S/he is able to make most people feel comfortable and at ease around him/her.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) It is easy for him/her to develop good rapport with most people.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) S/he is able to communicate easily and effectively with others.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) It is not difficult for him/her to influence people at work.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) S/he is able to effectively adapt his/her communication style to most social situations.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7) S/he knows a lot of important people and is well connected at work.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8) S/he has developed a large network of colleagues and associates at work who s/he can call on for support when s/he really needs to get things done.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9) S/he spends a lot of time and effort at work developing connections with others.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10) S/he is good at using his/her connections and network to make things happen at work.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11) S/he is good at building relationships with influential people at work.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12) S/he spends a lot of time and effort at work networking with others.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13) S/he pays close attention to peoples’ facial expressions.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14) S/he is particularly good at</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sensing the motivations and hidden agendas of others.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15) S/he understands people very well.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16) S/he always seems to instinctively know the right things to say or do to influence others.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17) S/he has good intuition or “savvy” about how to present himself/herself to others.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18) S/he is good at interpreting the behavior of others in social settings.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19) S/he is sincere when communicating with others.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20) S/he tries to show a genuine interest in other people.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21) S/he is good at getting others to believe s/he is being honest.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22) When communicating with others, s/he is genuine in what s/he says and does.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23) People believe s/he is sincere in what s/he says and does.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24) When interacting with others at work, s/he seems genuine.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Section 2 – Subordinate’s Performance

**Instructions:** Below are statements that are related to the dimensions of many company performance reviews. Please circle the number that most closely reflects your evaluation of the subordinate’s performance.


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>His or her…</th>
<th>Unsatisfactory</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Above Average</th>
<th>Very Good</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) …ability to perform core job tasks.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) …judgment when performing core job tasks.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) …accuracy when performing core job tasks</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) …job knowledge with reference to core job tasks</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) …creativity when performing core tasks.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


**Contextual Perform: Interpersonal Facilitation:** 1-7
**Contextual Perform: Job Dedication:** 8-15

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contextual Perform: Interpersonal Facilitation</th>
<th>Not at all Likely</th>
<th>Unlikely</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Likely</th>
<th>Extremely Likely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Statement</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Praises coworkers when they are successful.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Supports or encourages a coworker with a personal problem.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Talks to others before taking actions that might affect them.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Says things to make people feel good about themselves or the work group.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Encourages others to overcome their differences and get along.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Treats others fairly.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Helps someone without being asked.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Puts in extra hours to get work done on time.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Pays close attention to important details.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Works harder than necessary.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Asks for a challenging work assignment.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Exercises personal discipline and self-control.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Takes the initiative to solve a work problem.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Persists in overcoming obstacles to complete a task.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Tackles a difficult work assignment enthusiastically.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Thank you for your time and attention! We sincerely appreciate it!*
APPENDIX E
INTERNAL REVIEW BOARD APPROVAL LETTER

Florida State University

Office of the Vice President For Research
Human Subjects Committee
Tallahassee, Florida 32306-2742
(850) 644-8833 · FAX (850) 644-4392

APPROVAL MEMORANDUM

Date: 7/20/2007

To: James Meurs
Tallahassee, FL 32304

Dept.: COLLEGE OF BUSINESS

From: Thomas L. Jacobson, Chair

Re: Use of Human Subjects in Research
Work Behaviors and Attitudes Survey

The forms that you submitted to this office in regard to the use of human subjects in the proposal referenced above have been reviewed by the Human Subjects Committee at its meeting on 7/11/2007. Your project was approved by the Committee.

The Human Subjects Committee has not evaluated your proposal for scientific merit, except to weigh the risk to the human participants and the aspects of the proposal related to potential risk and benefit. This approval does not replace any departmental or other approvals which may be required.

If the project has not been completed by 7/9/2008 you must request renewed approval for continuation of the project.

You are advised that any change in protocol in this project must be approved by resubmission of the project to the Committee for approval. The principal investigator must promptly report, in writing, any unexpected problems causing risks to research subjects or others.

By copy of this memorandum, the chairman of your department and/or your major professor is reminded that he/she is responsible for being informed concerning research projects involving human subjects in the department, and should review protocols of such investigations as often as needed to insure that the project is being conducted in compliance with our institution and with DHHS regulations.

This institution has an Assurance on file with the Office for Protection from Research Risks. The Assurance Number is IRB00000446.

cc: Pamela Perrewe
HSC No. 2007.483
APPENDIX F
INFORMED CONSENT FORM

I freely, voluntarily, and without element of force or coercion, consent to be a participant in the research project entitled “Work Behaviors and Attitudes Survey.” This research is part of a larger program of study that seeks to address a number of issues that employees face at work.

This research is being conducted by James Meurs, who is a Ph.D. Student in the College of Business at Florida State University. I acknowledge that the purpose of this research project is to better understand how individuals behave in organizations. I understand that if I participate in the project I will be asked questions about my thoughts about others and myself, and general information about others and my behaviors.

I understand that my participation will involve filling out an approximately 20 minute questionnaire about how I interact with others at work and my attitudes toward work. I recognize that my participation is totally voluntary and I may stop participation at any time without penalty. I understand that I do not have to answer a question if I do not feel comfortable answering it. All of my responses to the questions will be kept confidential to the extent allowed by law. My name will not appear on any of the results. No individual responses, only group findings, will be reported.

I understand that my responses to the survey will be entered into a data base without any identifying information. I understand that all surveys will be stored at Florida State University in a private office and will be destroyed by July 01, 2008.

I understand that this consent may be withdrawn at any time without prejudice, penalty, or loss of benefits to which I am otherwise entitled. There are no foreseeable risks or discomforts if I agree to participate in this study.

I understand that I may contact James Meurs, Florida State University, College of Business, Room 401, (850) 644-9735, or James Meurs’ major professor, Dr. Pamela Perrewé, Florida State University, College of Business, 350 RBA, (850) 644-7848, or Florida State University’s Human Subjects Committee, (850) 644-8673, for answers to questions about this research or my rights. Group results will be sent to me upon my request.

I give my consent to participate in this study.

_________________________________   ____________________
(Signature)       ( Date)
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