Selecting the Ethical Employee: Measuring Personality Facets to Predict Integrity Behaviour

by

Christopher Harding

A thesis submitted to the Faculty of Graduate and Postdoctoral Affairs in partial fulfillment of

the requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts

in

Psychology

Carleton University

Ottawa, Ontario

© 2018

Christopher Harding

Abstract

Selecting employees that act with integrity is paramount for organizations such as the Canadian Armed Forces (CAF) where integrity-related behaviour can impact public safety and national security. Currently, the Military Police, an occupation within the CAF, utilize a high-cost, time consuming Integrity Assessment Centre (IAC); however, personality assessment tools have the potential to be a less resource intensive way to predict integrity behaviour. The primary goal of this thesis was to examine whether facets of disinhibition, a relatively unexplored maladaptive trait, could add incremental variance above facets of conscientiousness in predicting integrity among Military Police applicants ($n = 151$) attending an IAC. Hierarchical linear models were conducted using a self-report assessment of integrity, and the IAC results, as outcomes.

Disinhibition added incremental variance in the prediction of the IAC integrity scores, but not to the self-report assessment, which indicates that including maladaptive facets of personality has value when predicting behavioural assessments of integrity.

Acknowledgements

The process of writing this thesis has been an incredibly rewarding but challenging experience and I would not have been successful without the help and inspiration I received from colleagues, friends and family. From the heart, a special thank you to the following:

Thank you to my committee members, Dr. Greg Sears and Dr. Kate Dupré who set aside time from their busy schedule to be a part of this project, and who provided valuable insight and feedback. LCol Cindy Suurd Ralph, whose positive attitude and support helped me to make it over the finish line. Retired LCol Damian O’Keefe, who gave me a better perspective, and who is a constant inspiration. Retired LCol Gary Ivey, who set an example with his exceptional work ethic and who always supported me. Dr. Wendy Darr, who provided wisdom and guidance throughout this long process. My advisor, Dr. Bernadette Campbell, who helped develop me into a proper researcher. Thank you Bernadette, I am forever grateful. And finally, to Dr. Christine Frank who suffered alongside me, always with a smile on her face, even when I greeted her first thing in the morning with questions about transforming data. Thank you Christine, with you by my side anything is possible.

We are nothing without the people in our lives, and I am blessed to have some truly remarkable people in mine.

Table of Contents

Abstract.....	ii
Acknowledgements.....	iii
List of Tables	vi
List of Figures	vii
List of Appendices	viii
Selecting the Ethical Employee: Measuring Personality Facets to Predict Integrity Behaviour	1
Research Overview	3
Defining Integrity.....	5
Integrity Testing for Employee Selection	6
Importance of Integrity in the Canadian Armed Forces.....	10
Personality and Employee Behaviour	13
Exploring Conscientiousness and Integrity.....	14
Disinhibition and Integrity	17
The Role of Self-Regulation in the Integrity Personality-Behaviour Relationship	19
Current Study Hypotheses.....	22
Hypothesis 1A	22
Hypothesis 1B.....	23
Hypothesis 1C.....	23
Hypothesis 2A	23
Hypothesis 2B.....	23
Methods.....	23
Participants	23
Procedure.....	24
Measures.....	25
Conscientiousness.....	25
Disinhibition	25
Regulatory Focus	26
Integrity Score: Situational Judgement Test of Integrity.....	26
Integrity Score: Integrity Assessment Centre.....	27
Results.....	28
Data Cleaning.....	28

Preliminary Analyses	31
Main Analyses.....	35
Discussion.....	44
Consideration of Model Fits.....	45
Gender as a Confounding Variable	46
Examination of IAC and SJTI.....	47
Disinhibition as an Integrity Predictor	48
Conscientiousness as an Integrity Predictor.....	51
Combining Maladaptive and Adaptive Personality Measures	53
Regulatory Focus and Mediation	53
Implications for Selection	57
Conclusion.....	61
References.....	63

List of Tables

Table 1. Means, standard deviations, and alphas for model variables.....	31
Table 2. Correlation Table	33
Table 3. Confirmatory factors analysis fit indices for disinhibition and conscientiousness.....	35
Table 4. Regression results for disinhibition predicting SJTI scores.....	36
Table 5. Regression results for disinhibition predicting IAC scores	36
Table 6. Regression results for disinhibition and conscientiousness predicting SJTI scores	38
Table 7. Regression results for disinhibition and conscientiousness predicting IAC scores.....	39

List of Figures

Figure 1. Multiple mediation model between disinhibition and SJTI	41
Figure 2. Multiple mediation model between conscientiousness and SJTI	42
Figure 3. Multiple mediation model between disinhibition and IAC	43
Figure 4. Multiple mediation model between conscientiousness and IAC	44

List of Appendices

Appendix A: Conscientiousness Facets	77
Appendix B: Disinhibition Facets.....	79
Appendix C: Modified Regulatory Focus at Work Scale	81
Appendix D: Situational Judgement Test of Integrity with Scoring Key	82

Selecting the Ethical Employee: Measuring Personality Facets to Predict Integrity Behaviour

From product development to customer service, successful organizations seek to find advantage in all areas to remain competitive. Arguably the greatest advantage that can be had is in human capital -- qualified and capable personnel who possess traits such as intelligence, experience, and integrity, which can act as resources to accomplish organizational goals (Gabčanová, 2011). Efforts toward optimizing human capital within an organization begin with employee recruitment and selection, and one technique for selecting the optimal employee from a pool of potential candidates is the utilization of psychometric selection tests (Catano, Wiesner, Hackett, & Methot, 2010). Psychometric selection tests are varied, and examples of widely accepted tests include cognitive ability assessments, verbal reasoning assessments, and personality assessments. Personality assessments can be used to decrease the statistical likelihood of selecting candidates with undesirable traits such as tendencies towards tardiness and dishonesty, or to increase the likelihood of selecting candidates with desirable traits such as diligence, emotional stability and optimism (Anderson, 2017; Thomas & Scroggins, 2006). Although using personality as a predictor of job performance has great potential, to date the validity evidence is mixed (Morgeson et al., 2007). More work needs to be done to assess the predictive validity of personality assessments for specific types of selection decisions. Focused research into the selection of personality traits relevant to integrity is imperative in the effort to develop measures to predict behavioural outcomes that are deemed to be crucial to organizational health.

Integrity is a desirable personality trait to select for in organizations (Verhezen, 2008), and an absolute necessity for certain roles where high value assets are at stake, or the public safety is at risk, such as the military or policing (Miller, 2010). There is a growing body of

research focused on improving both the measurement of integrity, and the use of the integrity construct in selection decisions (Alliger & Dwight, 2000; Becker, 1998; Karren & Zacharias, 2007; Ones, 1993; Wanek, 1999). To be sure, important advances have been made in (a) refining the definition of the integrity construct, (b) attempting to clearly distinguish integrity from similar other constructs, and (c) improving the measurement of integrity as a meaningful predictor of key integrity-related work outcomes. At the same time, there are important gaps in our understanding of the integrity construct, and its use as a basis for personnel selection. First, assessments of integrity-related personality traits and measurements of integrity-related behaviour have mostly been conducted separately, making it difficult to properly evaluate the relationship between them. Overt integrity tests focus primarily on past behaviours, and covert tests examine personality traits *presumed* to be linked to overt integrity behaviours and later linked to more ‘distal’ work performance behaviours such as absenteeism (Ones, Viswesvaran, & Schmidt, 1993). A concurrent assessment of the relationship between integrity personality and integrity behaviours may be a more convincing demonstration of the predictive validity of an integrity personality test. Second, there is far from consensus in the field concerning the specific personality traits that, when combined, best reflect ‘integrity’. Although numerous covert measures of integrity personality already exist, they have typically focused on the positive aspects of personality, primarily conscientiousness. There may be a benefit to increasing our focus on the negative or maladaptive aspects of personality as they relate to integrity (Guenole, 2014). Third, most of the focus in the integrity literature has been rather narrow in scope, with researchers primarily using various combinations of personality traits to predict integrity-related outcomes. Missing are attempts to glean a deeper understanding of the process(es) by which personality traits impact important integrity behaviours. Truly understanding the relationship

between personality and integrity behaviour may require researchers to broaden their focus to search for some of the mechanisms through which personality traits exert their influence on integrity behaviours.

Research Overview

In this study I examined the ability of two integrity-related personality factors, conscientiousness and disinhibition, to predict integrity-related behaviour assessed at the same time point. To begin to expand our understanding of the integrity construct and its relationship with actual behaviour, *regulatory focus* was examined as a potential mediator of the relationship between integrity-related personality and integrity behaviour.

The overall goal of this research is to improve organizations' ability to select for integrity, with an understanding that in order to be legally defensible within Canada, personality measures used for selection must, at the very least, be reliable and valid (Catano et al., 2010; Assessment Oversight Policy Development Directorate, 2007; Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology, 2003). The present study will contribute to the existing literature on integrity measurement for selection, by examining whether or not a significant positive relationship exists between measures of integrity personality and integrity outcomes. Using a sample of applicants for the Military Police occupation in the Canadian Armed Forces (CAF), I measured a subset of their personality traits, as well as their performance on two assessments, to determine the correlation between integrity personality and integrity outcomes. Integrity outcomes were measured using a *situational judgment test of employee integrity* (SJTI), and the results of an *Integrity Assessment Centre* (IAC), which is currently being utilized in the CAF for Military Police applicants. The sample was particularly suitable because a job analysis was completed on the Military Police occupation to determine what integrity behaviour was critical

for the job, and the IAC was built from the findings of that job analysis (Tanner & Klammer, 2006).¹ By assessing the integrity-relevant personality traits of these applicants, correlations between integrity personality and the outcome of the IAC (yielding integrity behaviour) can be directly analyzed. This study expands on previous research, which has shown conscientiousness to be linked to integrity by narrowing the focus and measuring specific integrity-relevant facets of conscientiousness. The maladaptive or dark side of conscientiousness (disinhibition) was also examined as a predictor of integrity behaviour, including a test of its incremental predictive validity, over and above conscientiousness alone. Finally, the influence of *regulatory focus* was explored as a potential mediator of the relationship between integrity personality and integrity behaviour. Regulatory focus represents the inclination towards focusing one's efforts on the promotion of positive outcomes and/or the prevention of negative outcomes. According to regulatory focus theory (Higgins, 1997), we all self-regulate in the pursuit of goals and behaviour, and there are two distinct foci used in self-regulation. A promotion focus is associated with growth, approach behaviours, and maximizing positive outcomes. A prevention focus is associated with following the rules, avoidance behaviours or minimizing negative outcomes. Regulatory focus was assessed as a potential mediator between integrity-related personality traits and integrity behaviour with the prediction that regulation of behaviour, either through promotion or prevention focus, may explain some of that relationship.

The results of this research may contribute to the existing literature on the relationship between integrity-related traits and integrity outcomes, through consideration of maladaptive

¹ Research has shown that the correlations between personality and job performance tend to be higher when the personality trait being assessed tends to 'match' the specific performance demands of the job. For example, in general, 'Extraversion' is not a very strong predictor of job performance. But, for certain kinds of jobs (e.g., sales), extraversion is a very strong predictor of future job performance (Barrick & Mount, 1991; Tett, Jackson, & Rothstein, 1991).

personality measures, and regulatory focus as a mediator. In addition, this work used a unique sample of participants -- Military Police applicants, attending an integrity based assessment centre,-- which resulted in a quantitative measure of integrity outcomes. Ultimately, by identifying personality traits that are predictive of integrity, organizations may be able to increase their human capital by enhancing their ability to select employees who are statistically more likely to act with integrity. Also, with the expectation that personality partially predicts how much an individual regulates their behaviour, and that in turn, partially predicts their integrity-related behaviour, by considering regulatory focus, we may increase our knowledge about the mental processes through which integrity personality might influence integrity behaviour.

Defining Integrity

Defining moral behaviour is a difficult task, and what constitutes morals and ethics is not stable or consistent across time and cultures (Ahmed & Kun Young Chung, 2003; Haidt & Joseph, 2005; Singhapakdi, Vitell, & Leelakulthanit, 1994). Individuals and organizations almost certainly have their own idea of what integrity means, or at least have a general understanding of how their society and culture tends to define integrity (e.g. honourable, moral, virtuous). For the average person, a general, shared understanding of the integrity construct is sufficient for most purposes. For organizations that wish to measure and quantify integrity and use the results in selection decisions, a more precise understanding of integrity is needed. In their research, organizational psychologists have conceptualized integrity in several ways, but have yet to reach a clear consensus with respect to how to define integrity. Still, much progress has been made and key themes have emerged such as honesty, fairness and adherence to ethical standards despite external pressures (Barnard, Schurink, & De Beer, 2008; Becker, 1998).

For the purpose of this study, integrity is also defined in line with the current CAF standards for ‘Values and Expected Behaviours of DND Employees and CAF Members’ (Department of National Defence and Canadian Forces, 2014). In short, CAF members must be *honest, fair and adhere to the highest ethical standards at all times*, regardless of law, direction from superiors, or personal consequences. The Department of National Defence’s (DND) version of integrity is comparable with other accepted definitions of integrity used in social science research, but specifies the role of integrity in relation to a public servant and the workplace. One of the outcome measures, the IAC, was designed to measure this exact definition of integrity, and the situational judgement test of integrity utilized as a second outcome measure of integrity also tests the key principles outlined in DND’s definition of integrity. Becker (1998) based the situational judgement test of integrity on Ayn Rand’s objectivist conceptualization of integrity which he described as “loyalty, in action, to rational principles and values” (Rand, 1964). Becker further elaborated that “integrity is the principle of being principled, practicing what one preaches regardless of emotional or social pressure, and not allowing any irrational consideration to overwhelm one's rational convictions” (Becker, 1998, p. 157). The situational judgement test of integrity was chosen as a dependent variable because Becker’s concept of integrity theoretically fits with the CAF definition, and because it has been demonstrated to predict integrity-relevant outcomes such as status as a team leader, rates of promotion and career progress (Becker, 2005).

Integrity Testing for Employee Selection

Personality tests that specifically focus on integrity began to gain prominence after the Second World War and by the nineties there were over 40 off-the shelf integrity tests available to organizations in the United States alone (Ones & Viswesvaran, 1998). Integrity tests can

typically be separated into two categories, *overt* and *covert*. Overt tests assess integrity behaviour directly by asking respondents to report on past dishonest behaviours and attitudes related to such behaviours, such as whether they have ever stolen, and how they feel about stealing. With overt integrity tests, the purpose of the test is obvious to the test-taker. Overt integrity tests such as the Reid Report are commonly used as a selection tool for jobs where employees are responsible for cash or merchandise (e.g., retail) or to select for employee traits such as 'self-restraint', with the goal of improved customer service (Vangent Inc., 2017).

Overt integrity tests can be valuable for selection purposes, but they also have drawbacks such as demonstrated lower validity when predicting absenteeism compared to covert personality tests (Ones et al., 1993). Because overt measures ask about an individual's personal experiences, possibly requiring them to revisit a traumatic experience, they may also be perceived as intrusive, and may cause embarrassment or distress in the test-taker (Dwight & Alliger, 1997). Some overt tests may also be costly, requiring substantial training and ability on behalf of the administrator to be effective, and inefficient, since they may only be administered to one individual at a time. An example is the structured interview, and most notable is the polygraph test which is typically used as part of a battery of tests for key public safety roles such as law enforcement and national security. Polygraph tests include direct integrity-related questions about past behaviour as well as current attitudes, with the additional feature of suggesting whether the applicant is being truthful, by assessing physiological reactions that occur while responding (National Research Council, 2003). Polygraph tests attempt to remove the problem of faking but they can also lead to false positives or negatives (Karren & Zacharias, 2007). A testament to the difficulties of utilizing polygraph tests for employee selection - the U.S. Congress passed the Employee Polygraph Protection Act (EPPA) in 1988 which made it illegal

for public companies to use polygraph tests for pre-employment screening because of the potential to damage careers based on “false positives” (United States Congress, 1988). There are ongoing efforts towards creating a test that can accurately detect deception, including devices that utilize MRI imaging and heart rate monitoring, but for now the consensus is that the error rates are too significant, and the risks of misclassifying innocent responses, or failing to detect guilty responses are too high for practical use in employee selection (American Psychological Association, 2004).

Another disadvantage of the overt integrity test is their susceptibility to impression management or potential dishonesty on the part of the test-taker (Sacket & Wanek, 1996). Because respondents are aware of what the test is assessing, and are aware of the “right” answer, the potential for faking is high. Impression management is of particular concern for this study where participants are drawn from a Military Police applicant pool, in the midst of an assessment center. Indeed, the research shows that in ‘high stakes’ situations, where applicants are highly motivated to perform well, test-takers are significantly more likely to try and ‘fake good’ (Hough, 1998; Rosse, Stecher, Miller, & Levin, 1998). Research participants asked to try to fake good and beat a selection test were more successful in faking the overt integrity test (Employee Integrity Index), than on a covert test (The Personnel Reaction Blank), and this effect was amplified when the applicants were coached on how to approach the tests (Alliger, Lilienfeld, & Mitchell, 1996). Coaching has never been more of an issue since the advent of easy access to internet search engines like Google, where it can now be expected that job applicants will successfully search for strategies to ‘beat’ selection tests. As such, using more low cost, time effective, and less obvious to fake covert style measures, as described below, may be more productive for selection purposes (Alliger & Dwight, 2000).

Covert, or ‘disguised purpose’ integrity tests are typically self-report, personality-based measures intended to capture integrity-related traits more indirectly. Covert tests measure a broad set of personality traits such as dependability, reliability and achievement orientation, which have been theorized and in some cases, demonstrated to be particularly relevant to integrity outcomes (Berry, Sackett, & Weimann, 2007). All personality tests are susceptible to some level of response distortion, but in contrast to overt tests, the desired response is much less obvious with covert integrity tests, which serves to minimize deception on behalf of the applicant (Alliger & Dwight, 2000).

Commonly-used covert integrity tests include the Reliability Scale of the Hogan Personality Series, the PDI Employment Inventory (PDI-EI), as well as personality-oriented tests such as the Personal Characteristics Inventory (PCI) (Berry et al., 2007). Ones and colleagues (1993) completed a comprehensive meta-analysis of 25 different covert integrity measures utilized in more than 180 studies, and their findings suggested that covert personality tests are effective at measuring integrity. The meta-analysis focused on personality facets such as neuroticism and conscientiousness, and found that the personality measures used were valid predictors of integrity-related behaviours such as violence, tardiness and absenteeism. In addition, covert integrity testing may be more suited for large organizations such as the CAF, as they require less training to administer, can be administered to large groups (unlike a polygraph test), they are less susceptible to impression management, and they capture broad elements of personality which may additionally be predictive of a variety of important factors beyond integrity, such as job performance (Schmidt & Hunter, 1998). Furthermore, self-report personality-based integrity tests have been found to be valid and reliable tools that are ideal when looking to add incremental validity to a pre-employment selection model that already

utilizes cognitive ability testing, as is common practice in the CAF (Schmidt, Oh, & Shaffer, 2016; Wanek, 1999).

When developing a selection tool, there is always a concern with adversely impacting the participant by inadvertently discriminating, although with covert integrity assessments there appear to be fewer differences overall in response patterns as a function of race, age and gender (Berry et al., 2007; United States Office of Personnel Management, 2017). Nonetheless, some small but significant age and gender differences have been noted in past integrity testing research. Younger respondents score lower on integrity measures than older people (Ones et al., 1993), and women tend to score somewhat higher than men on integrity-relevant personality assessments (Iddekinge, Taylor, & Edison, 2005). Thus it may be beneficial to assess whether there are age or gender effects in analyses assessing integrity.

Importance of Integrity in the Canadian Armed Forces

In the CAF, employees represent Canadian values at home and abroad, and the role of the military is more socially complex than it has ever been. The Canadian military is engaged in both peacekeeping and wars of counterinsurgencies abroad, both of which involve interaction with local populations, and which cannot be successful without soldiers consistently acting with integrity, so as to be beyond reproach. Moreover, at its core, the military's role is to eliminate threats and maintain order in 'worst case' scenarios. To that end, military members receive extensive training on weapons handling and spend a portion of their career carrying or utilizing weapons not permitted for use by the public due to their lethality, such as fully automatic rifles. Integrity in military leadership is also critical because of the absolute power military leaders wield. There is no other position where a leader has the power to order someone else into harms way. Even a police officer can take off his badge and walk away -- in the military, refusing a

lawful order is a punishable offence that can have serious consequences. With such grave responsibility in the hands of many CAF members, the importance of ensuring a baseline of integrity cannot be overstated. Consequently, it is imperative that applicants to such an organization possess a certain level of integrity before even being considered.

The emphasis on integrity in the context of warfare, and amongst militias, has existed throughout history with use of such terms as ‘codes of conduct’, ‘conventions’ or, ‘treaties’ which are intended to define ethical guidelines on an individual level, within militaries, and between nations respectively. Integrity has always been part of the CAF ethos, but the professionalism and integrity of soldiers became more evident, specifically defined and fundamental to the CAF following the ‘Somalia Affair’ (Bercuson, 2009). The Somalia Affair was centered around the shooting of two individuals who attempted to steal food from a Canadian-monitored base in Somalia, as well as the beating and ultimate death of a teenage boy who was in the custody and care of Canadian soldiers. A Ministerial Inquiry was initiated in reaction to the Somalia Affair, and what the Commission of Inquiry described in their 1997 report was a military that lacked an appropriate focus on integrity, as well as the checks and balances necessary to ensure ethical behaviour under all circumstances (Commission of inquiry into the deployment of Canadian Forces to Somalia, 1997).

The motivation to find better, and more scientifically-valid ways to select for integrity is one of the highest priorities of the CAF today. In response to the tragic events signified by the Somalia Affair, the CAF has re-doubled its focus on selecting for, and emphasizing the importance of integrity as a core military competency. Tools such as criminal record checks, in addition to five-, seven-, or ten-year verified background checks for security clearance are now routine in the selection process (necessary to obtain Confidential, Secret and Top Secret

clearance respectively). These background verifications serve an important purpose, and past criminal behaviour is widely considered one of the best predictors of future criminal behaviour (Loeber & Farrington, 1998). It has also been argued that more recent, high-frequency, habitual past behaviours are more predictive of future behaviour than infrequent past behaviours (Franklin, 2013). A single, specific criminal incident that happened in the past may not be the best predictor of an applicant's future integrity behaviour. Accordingly, the CAF has been eager to supplement its 'integrity-testing toolbox', working to find additional ways to select for integrity, over and above criminal record searches and background checks.

A significant advance in this area was the development of the CAF's IAC. Used in the selection of CAF Military Police, the IAC represents one of the most important innovations the CAF has made in the area of integrity selection to date. The assessment centre consists of integrity-related interviews and integrity-challenging scenarios that mimic real life situations for Military Police. The outcome of this 3-day assessment centre was used as one of the primary measures of integrity behaviour in this study. Assessment centres are used to select for competencies that are difficult to assess for using conventional methods (Guenole, Chernyshenko, Stark, Cockerill, & Drasgow, 2012). Depending on the competency being measured, assessment centres can be valid predictors of job performance with demonstrated criterion-related validity values between .25 and .39 (Arthur, Day, McNelly, & Edens, 2003).

Although generally considered a success, due to having strong construct and face validity, the integrity portion of the Military Police Assessment Centre has not yet been successfully validated against outcomes (Jalbert, 2017). This is a common problem reported by individuals responsible for assessment centers, where the measures are robust and outcomes are narrow (M. Girard, personal communication, August 3, 2017). The IAC is also exceedingly

resource intensive, and therefore it is only being utilized for Military Police selection in the Canadian Armed Forces. Thus, the CAF is interested in developing an easily administered scientific measure of integrity that can be implemented for recruitment in all occupations, and in the short term as a supplement to information gathered in the assessment centre. The primary aim of this study is to examine the ability of the selected integrity-based personality measures to predict key integrity behaviours. Given concurrent efforts directed at developing a new measure of integrity for use in CAF selection, identifying personality traits with the strongest association with integrity will be invaluable towards creating an integrity-focused personality selection assessment tool that can be used more broadly within the Canadian Armed Forces.

Personality and Employee Behaviour

Personality tests used for selection are intended to capture elements of an individual's personality deemed particularly relevant to the specific job or culture of an organization (e.g., extraversion in a salesperson). Additionally, personality tests have been used successfully to select personality traits related to workplace behaviour (Catano et al., 2010). The Big Five, particularly conscientiousness, is widely considered a success in predicting broad behavioural outcomes such as job performance, but it may be beneficial to further refine the Big Five approach by measuring narrower facets of personality, especially when attempting to predict specific behaviour such as absenteeism or theft (Paunonen & Jackson, 2000).

Some researchers have made the argument that more specific or 'narrower' personality facets are actually better predictors of specific aspects of work performance. For example, achievement (a narrow facet of conscientiousness) is a stronger predictor of workplace productivity than is conscientiousness as a whole (Paunonen, Rothstein, & Jackson, 1999). Although, as a personality trait, integrity may be considered narrower than any one of the Big

Five, researchers have argued that integrity is a compound trait which includes some elements of the Big Five, as well as some unique personality facets not captured by the Big Five alone (Schneider, Hough, & Dunnette, 1996). For example, when measured by dedicated personality-based integrity assessments such as the Personnel Reaction Blank, or the Reliability Scale of the Hogan Personality Series, integrity is positively correlated with conscientiousness, agreeableness, and emotional stability, but the variance in integrity is only partially explained by these traits, suggesting there may be other factors at play. Moreover, studies have shown that dedicated integrity assessments are a much better predictor of behaviours such as counterproductive workplace behaviours (CWBs) than the combination of conscientiousness, agreeableness, and emotional stability (Berry et al., 2007). Together these findings suggest that there is more to the personality-based measurement of integrity than conscientiousness, agreeableness and emotional stability alone. In fact, some have suggested that the role of self-control in the integrity construct is not adequately captured by the Big Five traits, signifying that researchers should begin to focus on this aspect of integrity to a greater extent (Berry et al., 2007; Sackett & Wanek, 1996). Elements of self-control, and specifically how much an individual regulates their behaviour, was considered in this research through the choice of facets being measured, and through the use of a regulatory focus scale. Personality was assessed as an antecedent to regulatory focus – particularly one's range of disinhibition and conscientiousness.

Exploring Conscientiousness and Integrity

Research findings suggest that conscientiousness is one of the strongest predictors of integrity-relevant traits, and/or integrity-relevant behaviour, typically measured through overt assessments (Arrigo & Claussen, 2003; Becker, 1998; Ones et al., 1993; Wanek, Sackett, & Ones, 2003). Ones and colleagues (1993) looked at agreeableness, emotional stability and

conscientiousness and found their integrity composite² correlated highest with conscientiousness ($r = .85$). Conscientiousness is the personality trait that has been most researched in relation to the integrity construct. Conscientiousness is conceptually aligned with integrity as can be seen in various definitions of personality-based integrity, some of which include references to ‘conscientiousness’ (Catano, Frances, O’Keefe, & Sutherland 2017). For example, Sackett and Wanek’s (1997) definition of integrity includes trustworthiness, dependability, reliability, honesty, and conscientiousness. Likewise, when conscientiousness is defined in the literature, it typically includes descriptors that are directly related to integrity traits, such as responsible, cautious, thorough, proactive, and organized (Carver & Scheier, 2008). Some more work-oriented definitions of conscientiousness focus explicitly on the tendency to consistently work hard and put in full effort toward achieving optimum work performance and organizational goals (McCrae & Oliver, 1992). Definitions of conscientiousness have also included an inclination toward following organizational policies and rules without supervision, attention to detail, focus, and consistency towards completing tasks (Catano et al., 2010, p. 393). As described, conscientiousness is a broad personality factor, consisting of many facets depending on the theory at play, such as carefulness and responsibility. Given the strong association between conscientiousness and integrity traits, it may be beneficial to break conscientiousness down further and explore the narrower facets of conscientiousness to identify which facets are most strongly linked to integrity behaviour.

Although there are a variety of personality facets that have been associated with conscientiousness as it relates to integrity, the focus in this study is on the specific facets of

² The integrity composite was a combination of overt integrity measures, namely the PSI, Reid Report, and the Stanton Survey (Ones et al., 1993)

dependability, cautiousness, and achievement. Becker (2005) noted that dependability is a narrow facet that relates to integrity. Dependability is a measure of an individual's tendency to be reliable and trustworthy. Dependability was chosen as a facet of interest because it directly aligns with the ethical ethos of the CAF as it includes accountability, adherence to rules and regulations, as well as self-discipline (Dudley, Orvis, Lebiecki, & Cortina, 2006). Cautiousness is a measure of one's concern for the risks involved in the actions one takes (Darr & Klammer, 2016), which makes it a particularly suitable measure for predicting integrity relevant behaviour for roles where the risks are numerous and behaviours are impactful, such as that being assessed in this study. Although cautiousness is imperative in roles where there are great risks involved, such as those in the CAF, cautiousness alone is not enough. Individuals must also embody another important aspect related to integrity behaviour—inclination to perform to the best of one's abilities to achieve optimal outcomes. Risks are reduced, and goals are achieved, when organizations hire individuals who complete tasks to the best of their abilities, and who aspire to be skillful, focused, and disciplined in their efforts. Dedication to performing one's role intently is captured through achievement. Achievement was selected as a key facet in this study because it covers an important aspect of integrity - an individual's tendency to strive towards desired goals, and includes a desire to be skillful and capable to ensure the highest quality work in pursuit of those goals (Darr & Klammer, 2016).

Ones and Viswesvaran (2001) found a more significant link between the specific facets of achievement and CWB, as well as dependability and CWB, (they did not separate cautiousness), compared to integrity tests, as a whole, and CWB. There needs to be more research at the facet level to support these particular facets but achievement, dependability and cautiousness were chosen specifically because they are theoretically linked to integrity, they each

fit with the CAF definition of integrity, and they are directly relevant to the workplace, which aligns them well with the definitions of integrity used to develop the outcome measures in this study. In this research, I was interested in how well the facets of conscientiousness predict integrity behaviour as measured by the situational judgement test of integrity, and the results of the IAC.

Although conscientiousness tends to be highly correlated with integrity, it does not account for all of the variance in integrity. Conscientiousness does not always predict counterproductive workplace behaviours as well as integrity indicating there may be other factors at play (Berry et al., 2007). Ones and Viswesvaran (2001) found that conscientiousness was actually a better predictor of integrity as measured, but they too agreed that there is more to integrity than conscientiousness alone. Integrity-related personality includes the positive qualities discussed, but should also reflect an absence of particular negative qualities. Much less research has examined the ‘maladaptive’ or ‘dark’ side of integrity in terms of assessing traits that are likely not good expressions of integrity in particular contexts (Guenole, 2014). By incorporating traits that reflect a lack of integrity into the predictive model, the proposed study begins to address this shortcoming in the literature on personality-based measures of integrity for selection.

Disinhibition and Integrity

Though much research focuses on the ability of positive personality traits to predict integrity, negative personality traits may also predict lower integrity behaviour, or the absence of integrity. Studies in maladaptive or dark traits, such as narcissism and Machiavellianism, show promise in predicting counterproductive work behaviour and work performance (O'Boyle, Forsythe, Banks, & McDaniel, 2012; Pilch & Turska, 2015). One maladaptive personality trait

that may predict integrity behaviour is disinhibition. Disinhibition is particularly suitable for this study because it represents the maladaptive side of conscientiousness. Disinhibition manifests in being consistently in the moment, without being constrained by concerns of the past or future. Disinhibition is revealed in behaviour that is driven by internal and external stimuli (i.e. immediate pain/pleasure), and not by considerations of past experiences or future outcomes (Guenole, 2014; Krueger, Derringer, Markon, Watson & Skodol, 2012). The facets of disinhibition assessed in the current study were *irresponsibility*, *risk-taking* and *impulsivity*. These facets were selected because they all represent aspects of self-control (or lack thereof) and recent research has demonstrated a significant relationship between lack of self-control and diminished integrity-related behaviour (Tangney, Baumeister, & Boone, 2004; Bazzay, 2012).

Those who possess the trait of irresponsibility tend to exhibit a blatant “disregard for, and failure to honour financial and other obligations or commitments, as well as a lack of respect for, and lack of follow-through on agreements and promises” (American Psychiatric Association, 2013, p. 765). In many ways the irresponsibility trait stands in contrast to the dependability trait being examined in this study, which makes it particularly interesting to examine in a model that includes dependability. For organizations like the CAF, selecting out individuals who are too high on the trait of risk-taking may be important because those individuals tend to “engage in dangerous, risky, and potentially self-damaging activities, unnecessarily and without regard for consequences. They are prone to boredom and thoughtless initiation of activities to counter boredom, and display a lack of concern for their physical limitations and denial of the reality of personal danger” (American Psychiatric Association, 2013, p. 764).

Another personality trait that may be implicated in personal integrity is impulsivity, and it is a particularly relevant facet to consider when selecting individuals for organizations like the

CAF as an individual who is impulsive tends to “act on the spur of the moment in response to immediate stimuli, acts on a momentary basis without a plan or consideration of outcomes, and has difficulty establishing and following plans” (American Psychiatric Association, 2013, p. 764). Counter to the traits of cautiousness, and dependability - impulsiveness and risk-taking were hypothesized to predict low levels of integrity behaviour because self control and the ability to do what is ‘right’, and to make decisions that are morally correct regardless of the situation or one’s natural impulses, are critical elements of integrity behaviour as defined and measured in this study.

The Role of Self-Regulation in the Integrity Personality-Behaviour Relationship

One of the central guiding questions in this study was whether, and to what extent, the combination of specific integrity-related personality traits can predict integrity-related behaviours. In particular, I considered both positive or adaptive traits, and negative or maladaptive traits, as predictors of integrity behaviour in a sample of CAF Military Police applicants. The results of this study may contribute to the CAF’s ongoing efforts to enhance the way it measures integrity for selection purposes. Another goal of the research was to begin to broaden our theoretical understanding of the concept of integrity by looking more closely at the potential mechanisms through which integrity personality may be related to specific integrity behaviour. To that end, regulatory focus was considered as a potential mediator of the relationship between integrity personality and integrity behaviour.

Regulatory focus is a specific type of self-control/regulation process that people use in the pursuit of everyday goals. (Wallace, Johnson & Frazier, 2008). According to regulatory focus theory, we all regulate our behaviour through two coexisting regulatory systems -- regulation of behaviour with a focus on maximizing positive outcomes (promotion focus), and regulation of

behaviour with a focus on minimizing negative outcomes (prevention focus). A *promotion focus* regulates *nurturance needs* and involves striving for ideals through advancement and accomplishment, while a *prevention focus* regulates *security needs* and involves cautiously fulfilling duties and obligations. In general, promotion focus can be viewed as acting to *achieve positive* outcomes, whereas prevention focus can be viewed as acting to *avoid negative* outcomes (Higgins, Roney, Crowe, & Hymes, 1994). Meta-analytic findings indicate that promotion focus and prevention focus are orthogonal constructs (Lanaj, Chang, & Johnson, 2012), suggesting that individuals can't simply be classified as preferring one focus over another. Indeed, individuals might regulate their behaviour with both a strong promotion focus and a strong prevention focus, or with a strong promotion focus and a weak prevention focus, or any combination of the two. Consequently, prevention and promotion focus were examined separately in this research.

Both prevention and promotion focus may act as mediators in the personality-integrity relationship such that personality can influence what cognitive processes individuals utilize (e.g., prevention and promotion focus) which in turn can influence how an individual actually behaves. For example, someone high on conscientiousness, or more specifically high on the cautiousness and achievement facets, may have a strong motivation to achieve personal goals which in turn increases their likelihood of using a promotion focus which relates to working towards personal goals through accomplishments. Additionally, someone who is high on conscientiousness, or more specifically cautiousness, may be more likely to use a prevention focus as it related to cautiously fulfilling duties and obligations. On the maladaptive side, disinhibition was expected to negatively predict promotion focus as those who are high on disinhibition, and more specifically irresponsibility, may be less motivated to achieve personal goals. Disinhibition may also negatively predict prevention focus, as those who are high on risk-taking and impulsivity

may be less likely to take a cautious approach (i.e., prevention focus) even when appropriate to do so. Regulatory focus has also been found to be connected with integrity. In the last decade, researchers have been increasingly interested in the role of regulatory focus in work settings (Hoyle, 2010; Lanaj et al., 2012). Here, the Regulatory Focus at Work Scale (RWS; Wallace & Chen, 2006) was utilized to measure regulatory focus. The RWS has been validated through exploratory and confirmatory factor analysis where it was found to predict organizational citizenship behaviour and safety performance, both of which are related to integrity (Wallace et al., 2008). Under the same conditions in a work setting, regulatory focus is generally stable over time and predicts work-related perceptions and attitudes (Wallace & Chen, 2006). As an example of how regulatory focus predicts perceptions and attitudes – someone high in promotion focus might perceive achievements (i.e. promotion, surpassing quota's etc.) as enormously valuable, and they may have the attitude that getting many things done quickly is important.

A meta-analysis by Gorman and colleagues (2012) showed that both prevention and promotion focus are positively linked to integrity-related outcomes, such as organizational citizenship behaviour and counterproductive workplace behaviours and that they are related to conscientiousness, which is a key predictor of integrity, although prevention focus appears to be more closely conceptually aligned to integrity overall (Gorman, et al., 2012). As a prevention focus strategy at work involves adherence to responsibilities, rules and policies, and in a work/organization context there are often clear rules around what constitutes acceptable or ethical behaviour, prevention focus was expected to have a notably stronger mediating effect on personality (facets of conscientiousness and disinhibition) towards integrity than promotion focus in the context of this study.

Regulatory focus represents a potential missing link between understanding and action, and as such it was anticipated that it would help to explain the relationship between personality and integrity behaviour. Assessing regulatory focus as a mediator is a foray into further understanding the generative mechanisms through which integrity relevant personality traits influence integrity behaviour. Consequently, it was hypothesized that regulatory focus (prevention and promotion) would have a mediating effect on the relationship between personality and integrity outcomes. If regulatory focus helps to explain the relationship between personality and integrity as expected, it would demonstrate an aspect of the complex nature of predicting integrity outcomes and add to the pool of research required to effectively select employees for integrity.

Current Study Hypotheses

The *primary objective* of this research is to examine which integrity-related personality facets best predict integrity behaviours. Following are the hypotheses and questions that form the basis of this exploratory analysis.

Hypothesis 1A. *Disinhibition* facets (irresponsibility, risk-taking, and impulsivity) will be significant negative predictors of integrity behaviour, with higher levels of disinhibition predicting lower integrity behaviour scores.

Exploratory question 1A. Which specific disinhibition facets are the best predictors of integrity behaviour?

Hypothesis 1B. *Conscientiousness* facets (dependability, achievement and cautiousness combined) will be significant positive predictors of integrity behaviour, such that higher levels of conscientiousness will predict higher scores on integrity behaviour measures.

Exploratory question 1B. Which specific conscientiousness facets are the best predictors of integrity behaviour?

Hypothesis 1C. After accounting for the influence of conscientiousness facets in predicting integrity behaviour, disinhibition facets will explain additional variance above and beyond that accounted for by conscientiousness alone.

The *secondary objective* of this research is to assess Regulatory Focus as a potential mediator of the link between personality and integrity behaviour.

Hypothesis 2A. Promotion focus will mediate the relationship between all measured personality facets and integrity behaviour, such that part of the link between personality and integrity will be explained by the tendency to adopt a promotion focus.

Hypothesis 2B. Prevention focus will mediate the relationship between all measured personality facets and integrity behaviour, such that part of the link between personality and integrity behaviour will be explained by the tendency to adopt a prevention focus.

Methods

Participants

The sample was comprised of 151 English-speaking CAF applicants who attended a 3-day Military Police Integrity Assessment Centre (IAC) in Borden, ON between January 2016 and September 2017. In addition to the IAC, participants completed an Integrity Survey. Demographic questions included in the survey were gender (male, female and other) and age. The mean age of the sample was 27 years ($SD = 6.21$ years) and 86.4% were male. Correlations

revealed that gender and age were significantly related to the outcomes of interest, so each was included as a covariate in the models.

An a priori analysis completed for the most complex proposed analysis for a multiple regression with six predictors (dependability, achievement, cautiousness, irresponsibility, risk-taking and impulsivity) and a small-medium effect size ($f^2 = .09$) indicated that a final sample size of 239 was necessary for adequate power ($\beta = 1-.95$; Erdfelder, Faul, & Buchner, 1996). As the sample consists of 151 participants - with an estimated effect size of .09 and six predictors the power would be .78 which is close to the .80 level recommended by Cohen (1988). Power for the multiple mediation model with three predictors would be more robust (.88).

Procedure

Participants were brought to a room set up for research at the IAC. There were approximately 30 participants per testing session and each participant was given a chair, ample desk space and a pencil/eraser. Participants were given an opportunity to read the informed consent form and then asked if they had any questions. It was reiterated that the process was voluntary and they could withdraw at any time. It was also reiterated that anything captured in the survey would in no way effect their career or the outcome of the IAC. All remaining participants were asked to read the first page of the Integrity Survey. Participants were then asked one last time if they wished to complete the survey. Participants were reminded that the survey would take approximately 40 minutes, but they could take as much time as needed. Upon completion of the survey all participants carried on with the Military Police IAC. A trusted colleague, who is a staff member of the assessment centre, and a Personnel Selection Officer in the CAF, administered the survey and then sent the anonymized results to my office.

Measures

Conscientiousness. Thirty questions drawn from the International Personality Item Pool (IPIP) were used to measure the three facets of conscientiousness, *dependability*, *cautiousness* and *achievement*. Participants were asked to rate how accurately statements described them using a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 = ‘Very Inaccurate’ to 5 = ‘Accurate’ (Oregon Research Institute, 2015). There were ten items each measuring dependability (e.g., “I try to follow the rules”), achievement (e.g., “I go straight for the goal”), and cautiousness (e.g., “I choose my words with care”). The specific statements/questions used to measure conscientiousness are available at Appendix A.

Disinhibition. The facets of disinhibition measured were *irresponsibility*, *risk-taking* and *impulsivity*. Disinhibition facets were measured using 27 items of the Maladaptive Personality Trait Model and Inventory for DSM5 (MPTM; Krueger et al., 2013). For each disinhibition item, participants were asked to rate the degree to which the statements described them, on a 4-point scale ranging from 0 = ‘Very False or Often False’ to 3 = ‘Very True or Often True’. Seven statements focused on *irresponsibility* (e.g., “I make promises that I don’t intend to keep”). Fourteen items were used to capture the trait of risk-taking (e.g., “I do what I want regardless of how unsafe it might be”), and six statements focused on *impulsivity* (e.g., “Even though I know better, I can’t stop making rash decisions”). The specific statements/questions used to measure disinhibition are available at Appendix B.

Regulatory Focus. The Regulatory Focus at Work Scale (RWS; Wallace & Chen, 2006) was used to measure promotion and prevention focus at work. Using a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 = ‘Never’ to 5 = ‘Very Often’, participants were asked to rate how often they focus on specific thoughts and activities while they are working. Promotion-focus items include, for example “Getting a lot of work finished in a short amount of time”, whereas “Following rules and regulations at work” is a sample prevention-focus item. Because a significant proportion of the study sample had not yet accumulated a great deal of formal work experience, the RWS items were modified to refer to experiences at ‘school’ and at ‘work’. The specific statements/questions used to measure regulatory focus are available at Appendix C.

Integrity Score: Situational Judgement Test of Integrity. A slightly modified version of Becker’s (2005) Situational Judgment Test of Integrity (SJTI) was used to measure integrity behavioural intentions.³ Situational judgement tests are designed to capture specific constructs by presenting hypothetical scenarios to applicants and having them choose a path of action from a limited set of options (National Research Council, 2015).

The SJTI consists of 18 scenario-based questions, each presenting an ethical dilemma that demands a decision or course of action. For each hypothetical scenario, respondents are presented with four potential options for resolving the situation, and they must choose the option that best describes what he or she would most likely do in that situation. The SJTI includes a scoring key for each possible option, available at Appendix D, with possible scores of “-1” for a

³ For the present study, the items in Becker’s (2005) SJTI were modified to improve the applicability to students. These modifications included deleting two scenarios. One scenario was deleted because no correct response was identified in Becker (2005). The other scenario was not included because it could not be appropriately modified.

low integrity response, “0” for a neutral response, and “1” for a high integrity response, resulting in a total score ranging between -18 (low integrity) and +18 (high integrity).

Integrity Score: Integrity Assessment Centre. The Integrity Assessment Centre (IAC) score was utilized as the primary behavioural outcome measure in this study, and was built using the following similar definition of integrity: “... the individual’s ability to be honest, trustworthy, and truthful. Individuals who act with integrity are able to be trusted, and are not likely to steal, cheat or lie. They should have strong moral principles, which allow them to resist temptations of an unethical or illegal nature” (Tanner & Klammer, 2006, p. 4). The development of the IAC strictly followed The International Congress on Assessment Center Methods guidelines (Rupp et al., 2015) which outlined that assessment tools must be valid, directly job-related, reliable, and recorded in a way that can be examined by an impartial third party if necessary (Tanner & Klammer, 2006).

Designed to assess several key competencies, with integrity as the vital competency of concern, the IAC includes several measures of integrity, which simulate real-world scenarios. Role-playing exercises scored by trained observers, structured interviews, and other tools are used to determine an overall integrity score between 1(low) and 5 (high) for each candidate. A minimum integrity score of 3 is required to be considered suitable for employment in the Military Police. Approximately one out of every four candidates is found unsuitable on the Military Police Assessment Center (Jalbert, 2017). To ensure a candid response from candidates, it is important that the measures in the IAC are kept strictly confidential, therefore a scoring key for this measure is not provided. Only the final score is provided, linked to the results of the participants’ surveys.

Results

Data Cleaning

Prior to conducting analyses, the data were checked for outliers, skewness, and kurtosis (± 3.29 SDs was the cut-off for all three; Cohen, Cohen, West, & Aiken, 2003). There were no outliers on either measure of integrity (IAC and SJTI scores), prevention focus, promotion focus, cautiousness, dependability, or risk-taking. There was a single outlier on achievement (zscore = -3.79). To assess whether the outlier had a substantial impact on the regression model, I conducted two regression analyses—one with and one without the outlier—with all three facets of conscientiousness predicting integrity (IAC). Though the relation between achievement and integrity was stronger when the outlier was included, the association was not substantially changed (i.e., no change in statistical significance or magnitude of association). To ensure there was no undue influence, the difference in fits (DFFITS) diagnostic and difference in betas (DFBETAS) diagnostic were computed. DFFITS is a diagnostic test that can be used to assess the influence of a data point on a regression model. That is, how much do the regression coefficients change if the outlier is removed. The suggested DFFITS cut-off for medium sized samples is less than ± 1 (Cohen et al., 2003). None of the DFFITS values in the model exceeded one. DFBETAS assesses the influence of a single point on a specific regression coefficient and was examined for the achievement regression coefficient. That is, how much does the achievement regression coefficient change if the outlier is removed? Again, for medium sample sizes the suggested cut-off is ± 1 , and again none of the values exceeded 1. Given that the outlier did not appear to have undue influence on the regression model nor achievement's relation with IAC it was decided to not adjust the outlier. Impulsivity also had a single outlier (zscore = 3.98). Again, two regression analyses were conducted—one with and one without the outlier—with

impulsivity, risk-taking, and irresponsibility predicting integrity (IAC scores). There was no significant change in the relation between impulsivity and IAC scores. Additionally, inspection of the DFFITS and DFBETAS suggested that the outlier did not have a strong influence on the regression model nor the association between impulsivity and integrity and was therefore not adjusted. Last, there were two outliers on irresponsibility (z scores = 5.77; 4.34). Again, two regressions were conducted with the three disinhibition facets predicting integrity (IAC scores). Though the relation weakened slightly when the outliers were excluded from the analysis, the statistical significance did not change. Examination of the DFBETAS⁴ for the irresponsibility coefficient indicated that the outlier did not have a strong impact and was therefore not removed or adjusted.

Next, I examined skewness and kurtosis. Neither of the integrity measures had any skewness or kurtosis issues nor did promotion focus, prevention focus, risk-taking, or cautiousness. Achievement was mildly and negatively skewed ($z_{\text{skew}} = -4.35$) but not kurtotic. In order to eliminate skewness one can transform the data using a square root, log, or reciprocals transformation depending on the severity of the skew (Field, 2009). The goal of transforming is to simplify the relation between your independent and dependent variable and to ensure that the skewness is not artificially strengthening or weakening the association between your variables (Osborne, 2002). A reflected square root transformation of achievement scores resolved the skew ($z_{\text{skew}} = 2.62$)⁵. In order to assess whether the skewness affected the association between achievement and the outcome variables or the other two facets of conscientiousness a set of

⁴ The DFFITS was not examined again as it is a global measure of influence and was examined for impulsivity with no problematic cases identified.

⁵ For all variables +1 was added to all the scores prior to transformation as 0 cannot be a value when using a square root or log transformation.

correlations were run between achievement, cautiousness, dependability, and the two integrity measures. Transforming achievement did not change its relationship with the other variables of interest (the raw and transformed correlation coefficients did not vary more than .01), and statistical significance did not change, therefore I decided to use the raw data. Dependability was also mildly and negatively skewed ($z_{\text{skew}} = -3.65$) but not kurtotic. Performing a reflected square root transformation resolved the skew ($z_{\text{skew}} = 2.86$). Once again a set of correlations was conducted examining the relation between dependability and the integrity outcomes as well as the other two facets of conscientiousness. There was little difference (the raw and transformed correlation coefficients only differed by .01) between the transformed and raw variable in their associations with the other variables and therefore I decided again to use the raw data.

Impulsivity was moderately and positively skewed ($z_{\text{skew}} = 5.25$) but not kurtotic. A square root transformation did not fix the skew so a log transformation was conducted which did resolve the skew ($z_{\text{skew}} = 2.58$). Correlations comparing the associations between the raw and transformed impulsivity variable and irresponsibility, risk-taking, and the two integrity variables were conducted. With little difference between the associations (the largest difference between the raw and transformed correlation coefficients was .04) it was decided to use the raw data. Last, irresponsibility was severely skewed and kurtotic ($z_{\text{skew}} = 13.09$; $z_{\text{kurtosis}} = 24.24$). Neither a square root, log, nor reciprocal transformation was able to resolve the skew or kurtosis though it was greatly improved with a reciprocal transformation ($z_{\text{skew}} = 6.52$; $z_{\text{kurtosis}} = 3.35$). Closer inspection of the variable revealed 57.4% of participants scored a zero (the lowest score possible). Though I considered dichotomizing the variable ($0 = 0$; $> 0 = 1$) MacCallum, Zhang, Preacher, and Rucker (2002) recommend not dichotomizing even severely skewed variables in favour of the use of transformations. Therefore, I again conducted a series of correlation analyses

to examine the association between the raw and transformed irresponsibility scores and risk-taking, impulsivity, and the two integrity outcomes. Again, there was little difference between the raw and transformed correlation coefficients (coefficients did not vary more than .01) thus it was decided to use the raw data.

Preliminary Analyses

See Table 1 for the mean, standard deviation, and Cronbach's alpha for the study variables. Notably, on average, scores on conscientiousness were quite high ($M = 4.32$ out of a possible 5), and generally the scores on disinhibition were quite low ($M = .81$ out of a possible 3), which may be a population artifact whereby recruits are already a select sample of the broader population, they have already been screened for criminal backgrounds and are highly motivated to present a positive image. This will be further explored in the discussion.

Table 1.
Means, standard deviations, and alphas for model variables.

Variable	Scaling	M(SD)	α
Conscientiousness	1-5	4.32(.35)	.88
<i>Dependability</i>	1-5	4.58(.32)	.75
<i>Achievement</i>	1-5	4.41(.37)	.69
<i>Cautiousness</i>	1-5	3.96(.56)	.82
Disinhibition	0-3	0.81(.30)	.88
<i>Irresponsibility</i>	0-3	0.13(.20)	.64
<i>Risk-taking</i>	0-3	1.32(.43)	.85
<i>Impulsivity</i>	0-3	0.40(.40)	.81
Promotion Focus	1-5	4.11(.58)	.81
Prevention Focus	1-5	4.56(.41)	.83
Integrity Assessment Centre	1-5	3.55(.39)	----
Situational Judgment Test of Integrity	-18 to +18	12.53(2.59)	----

Next, a series of correlations were conducted to assess the associations between the variables of interest and to determine whether there may be any issues of multicollinearity. Any correlations greater than .80 would be considered problematic (Abu-Bader, 2016). The SJTI and the IAC were weakly correlated and as such each hypothesis was tested twice, once per integrity

outcome measure. SJTI scores were positively correlated with conscientiousness and its three facets, and negatively correlated with disinhibition and its three facets. IAC scores were positively correlated with conscientiousness and its three facets, and negatively correlated with disinhibition and two of its facets, irresponsibility and impulsivity, but not with risk-taking. The IAC score was not significantly correlated with promotion or prevention focus. SJTI scores were positively and significantly related to prevention focus and positively but only marginally related to promotion focus ($p < .10$; see Table 2 for correlations). Conscientiousness was significantly and positively correlated with promotion focus and prevention focus, while disinhibition was only significantly and negatively correlated with prevention focus.

Table 2.
Correlation Table

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
1 IAC	1.00											
2 SJTI	.23*	1.00										
3 Conscientiousness	.29*	.34*	1.00									
4 Dependability	.24*	.36*	.85*	1.00								
5 Achievement	.24*	.24*	.75**	.57**	1.00							
6 Cautiousness	.25*	.27**	.87**	.63**	.40**	1.00						
7 Disinhibition	-.20*	-.26**	-.64**	-.50**	-.29**	-.70**	1.00					
8 Irresponsibility	-.36**	-.36**	-.68**	-.61**	-.58**	-.54**	.58**	1.00				
9 Risk-Taking	-.08	-.16*	-.42**	-.32**	-.08	-.54**	.92**	.31**	1.00			
10 Impulsivity	-.27**	-.27**	-.71**	-.54**	-.46**	-.71**	.72**	.61**	.43**	1.00		
11 Prevention	.07	.18*	.61**	.55**	.53**	.46**	-.30**	-.44**	-.13	-.44	1.00	
Focus												
12 Promotion Focus	.10	.16 ⁺	.43**	.41**	.40**	.30**	-.09	-.27**	.04	-.26*	.60**	1.00

+ $p < .10$, * $p < .05$, ** $p \leq .001$

Next, because a theoretical framework has already been established for the disinhibition subscales (e.g., Kreugar et al. 2012) and conscientiousness subscales (Oregon Research Institute, 2015 confirmatory factor analyses (CFAs) were conducted to assess model fit. Three CFAs were conducted: one CFA for the conscientiousness facets, one CFA for the disinhibition facets, and one CFA to assess both the conscientiousness and disinhibition facets together in one model. This was done to assess whether the three facets of conscientiousness and the three facets of disinhibition better loaded on their respective factors rather than a single overarching personality factor whereby the three conscientiousness facets would load positively, and the three disinhibition facets would load negatively. The CFAs were conducted using MPLUS with a Maximum Likelihood extraction method. Because I expected the factors to be related I used a GEOMIN rotation. Model fit was evaluated using the following four indices for consensus and convergence: the Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA), the Comparative Fit Index (CFI), the Tucker-Lewis Index (TLI) and the Standardized Root Mean Square Residual (SRMR). The full CFA containing all conscientiousness and disinhibition items showed poor model fit. The TLI and CFI indices, in particular, fall far below the suggested cut-off. The fit of the model is improved when the two factors are run separately indicating that disinhibition and conscientiousness should be kept as separate factors during hypothesis testing. However, overall the model fit for the two factors is not ideal. Though both factors are fairly close to the cut-offs for RMSEA and SRMR, they do still fall below the suggested cut-offs for CFI and TLI (See Table 3). The scales could have been modified in an attempt to increase model fit, but as the subscales were previously validated by other researchers, and improving fit does not necessarily confirm that the model is correctly specified, the decision was made to use the scales in their

original form (Kenny, 2015). Additionally, it was determined that modifying the scales would make this study less comparable to previous research.

Table 3.

Confirmatory factors analysis fit indices for disinhibition and conscientiousness

	Disinhibition	Conscientiousness	Full Model	Suggested Cut-off*
CFI	.73	.74	.48	>.95
RMSEA	.08	.07	.09	<.06
SRMR	.09	.08	.09	<.08
TLI	.71	.72	.46	>.95

*Suggested cut-offs were based on recommendations from Hu and Bentler (1999)

Main Analyses

A *t*-test revealed gender differences in integrity scores such that women scored significantly higher than men on both the SJTI ($M_{men} = 12.33$, $SD = 2.57$; $M_{women} = 13.90$, $SD = 2.38$), $t(147) = -3.29$, $p = .001$, and the IAC ($M_{men} = 3.52$, $SD = .36$; $M_{women} = 3.81$, $SD = .45$), $t(143) = -2.56$, $p = .01$. There were no gender differences on prevention focus, $t(147) = -.63$, $p = .53$, or promotion focus, $t(147) = -.34$, $p = .74$. The correlations were not significant between age and SJTI, $r(144) = .11$, $p = .21$, nor IAC, $r(144) = .09$, $p = .28$. Age was significantly negatively correlated with prevention focus $r(142) = -.23$, $p = .006$ and promotion focus $r(142) = -.31$, $p < .001$ such that older respondents tended also to report lower levels of both prevention and promotion focus. Therefore, gender was controlled for in all analyses in which integrity behaviour was the outcome and age was controlled for in all analyses where prevention or promotion focus were outcomes.

To test hypothesis 1A, that the three facets of disinhibition - irresponsibility, risk-taking, and impulsivity - predict integrity, I conducted two hierarchical linear regressions, one for each measure of integrity. In each model, gender was entered at step 1, and risk-taking, impulsivity, and irresponsibility were entered in the second block.

SJTI. Overall the model explained 14.8% of the variance in SJTI scores with 10.4% of the variance accounted for by the block of disinhibition facets. When examined separately, neither risk-taking nor impulsivity made a significant unique contribution to the prediction of SJTI scores. Irresponsibility was, however, a significant predictor of integrity, uniquely accounting for 5% of the variability in SJTI scores. Those who reported higher levels of irresponsibility also tended to score lower on the SJTI.

Table 4.

Regression results for disinhibition predicting SJTI scores

	R^2	ΔR^2	$B(SE)$	β	t	p	95% C.I.		sr^2
							<i>LL</i>	<i>UL</i>	
Step 1	.04								
Gender			1.57 (.61)	.21	2.56	.01	0.36	2.78	0.04
Step 2	.15*	.10*							
Risk-taking			-.06(.53)	-.01	-0.12	.91	-1.14	1.01	0.00
Impulsivity			-.34(.67)	-.05	-0.50	.62	-1.66	0.98	0.00
Irresponsibility			-3.72(1.26)	-.29	-2.95	.004	-6.22	-1.22	0.05

* $p < .05$

IAC. Overall the model explained 17.3% of the variance in IAC scores with 10.4% of the variance accounted for by the disinhibition facets. Risk-taking and impulsivity did not uniquely contribute to the prediction of IAC, but irresponsibility did. Those who reported higher levels of irresponsibility also scored lower at the IAC, accounting for 5% of the variability in IAC scores.

Table 5.

Regression results for disinhibition predicting IAC scores

	R^2	ΔR^2	$B(SE)$	β	t	p	95% C.I.		sr^2
							<i>LL</i>	<i>UL</i>	
Step 1	.07*								
Gender			.30(.09)	.26	3.29	.001	.12	.47	0.07
Step 2	.17*	.10*							
Risk-taking			.09(.08)	.10	1.22	.23	-.06	.24	0.01
Impulsivity			-.08(.10)	-.08	-.77	.44	-.27	.12	0.00
Irresponsibility			-.57(.18)	-.30	-3.10	.002	-.93	-.21	0.05

* $p < .01$

According to hypotheses 1B and 1C, the three facets of conscientiousness (dependability, achievement, and cautiousness) were expected to significantly predict integrity, with disinhibition adding to the explained variance, over and above the contribution of conscientiousness alone. To test these models, two hierarchical linear regressions were conducted with each measure of integrity (SJTI and IAC). In step 1 gender was entered into the model, in step 2 the three facets of conscientiousness were included in the model and in step 3 the three facets of disinhibition were added.

SJTI. The complete set of predictors explained 17.9% of the variance in integrity as measured by the SJTI. After controlling for the effect of gender, the conscientiousness facets accounted for an additional 11.3% of the variance in SJTI scores. An examination of the unique contributions of each conscientiousness facet revealed that only dependability was a significant unique predictor in the model. Higher levels of dependability were related to higher levels of integrity, as measured by the situational judgment test. Contrary to expectations, however, adding the block of disinhibition facets to the model did not significantly improve the prediction of integrity. Neither risk-taking nor impulsivity were significant unique predictors of integrity, but it is worth noting that irresponsibility did approach statistical significance as a unique predictor of integrity ($p = .08$). Those who reported higher levels of irresponsibility also tended to score lower on the situational judgment test of integrity.

Table 6.

Regression results for disinhibition and conscientiousness predicting SJTI scores

	<i>R</i> ²	ΔR^2	<i>B</i> (<i>SE</i>)	β	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>	95% <i>C.I.</i>		<i>sr</i> ²
							<i>LL</i>	<i>UL</i>	
Step 1	.04*								
Gender			1.57(.61)	.21	2.56	.01	.36	2.78	.04
Step 2	.16*	.11*							
Dependability			2.45(.92)	.30	2.65	.01	0.63	4.27	.04
Achievement			.24(.69)	.03	0.34	.73	-1.13	1.60	.00
Cautiousness			.11(.48)	.02	0.22	.83	-0.84	1.05	.00
Step 3	.18*	.02							
Dependability			2.21(.95)	.25	2.13	.04	.15	3.90	.03
Achievement			-.28(.76)	-.04	-.37	.71	-1.78	1.21	.00
Cautiousness			-.13(.60)	-.03	-.22	.83	-1.32	1.06	.00
Risk-taking			.06(.59)	.01	0.11	.91	-1.10	1.23	.00
Impulsivity			-.11(.77)	-.02	-0.14	.89	-1.62	1.41	.00
Irresponsibility			-2.61(1.45)	-.20	-1.80	.08	-5.48	.27	.02

* $p < .01$

IAC. The complete set of predictors accounted for 17.9% of the variance in integrity as measured by the IAC results. After controlling for gender, the block of conscientiousness facets explained an additional 6.2% of the variance in integrity. Individually, none of the predictors were statistically significant. In Step 3, the disinhibition facets made a significant, incremental contribution to the variance explained (+ 4.7%). Although risk-taking and impulsivity were not statistically significant individual predictors, irresponsibility made a unique contribution to the explanation of the variability in IAC scores, accounting for 3% of the variance. Those who reported higher levels of irresponsibility also tended to score lower on the IAC.

Table 7.

Regression results for disinhibition and conscientiousness predicting IAC scores

	<i>R</i> ²	ΔR^2	<i>B</i> (<i>SE</i>)	β	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>95% C.I.</i>		<i>sr</i> ²
							<i>LL</i>	<i>UL</i>	
Step 1	.07*								
Gender			.30(.09)	.26	3.29	.001	.12	.47	.07
Step 2	.13**	.06*							
Dependability			.09(.14)	.07	0.65	.52	-.18	.36	.00
Achievement			.13(.10)	.13	1.34	.18	-.06	.33	.01
Cautiousness			.07(.07)	.10	1.01	.31	-.07	.21	.01
Step 3	.18**	.05*							
Dependability			.01(.14)	.01	.07	.94	-.26	.28	.00
Achievement			.01(.11)	.01	.08	.94	-.21	.22	.00
Cautiousness			.07(.09)	.10	.79	.43	-.11	.24	.00
Risk-taking			.12(.08)	.13	1.39	.17	-.05	.28	.01
Impulsivity			-.02(.11)	-.03	-0.21	.83	-.25	.20	.00
Irresponsibility			-.52(.21)	-.27	-2.45	.02	-.94	-.10	.03

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .001$

Next I tested hypotheses 2A and 2B -- that promotion focus and prevention focus would mediate the link between personality (i.e., conscientiousness and disinhibition) and integrity. Because promotion and prevention focus are orthogonal and theoretically unrelated, they were included in the same model. Thus, I conducted a multiple mediation analysis. Gender and age were included as covariates in the model. Mediation effects were tested using the Sobel test and bootstrapping methods with the *MEDIATE* macro designed for SPSS by Hayes (2014) to conduct the multiple mediation analysis. The associations between disinhibition and integrity as well as conscientiousness and integrity were expected to be indirectly related through prevention and promotion focus. The results of each model are reported below, for each measure of integrity (SJTI and IAC).

Situational Judgment Test of Integrity. Multiple mediation analyses were conducted to examine the possibility that the disinhibition-integrity and conscientiousness-integrity

relationships might be at least partially explained by individual differences in regulatory focus (promotion and prevention focus).

Disinhibition. The findings of the mediation analysis revealed a significant, negative relationship between disinhibition and prevention focus ($B = -.42$, $SE = .23$, $t = -3.81$, $p < .001$). Perhaps not surprisingly, those with stronger disinhibited personality traits tend to be less likely to follow the rules, and to engage in other avoidance behaviours to minimize negative outcomes. Disinhibited personality traits, were not, on the other hand, related to promotion focus, such as behaviours directed at maximizing positive outcomes ($B = -.17$, $SE = .16$, $t = -1.07$, $p = .29$). While a significant direct, negative association was found between disinhibition and integrity ($B = -1.53$, $SE = .78$, $t = -1.96$, $p = .05$) no evidence of mediation was found for either promotion focus ($B = .85$, $SE = .48$, $t = 1.77$, $p = .08$) or prevention focus ($B = .28$, $SE = .67$, $t = .41$, $p = .68$). The indirect effects confirm that the association between disinhibition and SJTI is not mediated by promotion focus (effect = $-.15$, $SE = .20$, 95% C.I. $[-.65; .15]$) or prevention focus (effect = $-.12$, $SE = .31$, 95% C.I. $[-.81; .52]$; see Figure 1).

* $p < .05$

** $p < .001$

Figure 1. Multiple mediation model between disinhibition and SJTI

Conscientiousness. The findings of the mediation analysis showed that conscientious scores positively and significantly predicted prevention focus ($B = .69$, $SE = .08$, $t = 8.59$, $p < .001$) and promotion focus ($B = .63$, $SE = .12$, $t = 5.21$, $p < .001$). While conscientiousness significantly predicted SJTI ($B = 2.20$, $SE = .76$, $t = 2.90$, $p = .004$) neither promotion focus ($B = .60$, $SE = .47$, $t = 1.27$, $p = .21$) nor prevention focus ($B = -.31$, $SE = .71$, $t = -.43$, $p = .67$) predicted SJTI scores when conscientiousness was in the model. The indirect effects confirm that the association between conscientiousness and SJTI is not mediated by promotion focus (effect = $.38$, $SE = .32$, 95% C.I. $[-.24; 1.08]$) or prevention focus (effect = $-.21$, $SE = .52$, 95% C.I. $[-1.33; .80]$; see Figure 2).

* $p < .05$

** $p < .001$

Figure 2. Multiple mediation model between conscientiousness and SJTI

Integrity Assessment Centre Results.

Disinhibition. The findings of the mediation analysis showed that disinhibition scores negatively and significantly predicted promotion focus ($B = -.45$, $SE = .11$, $t = -4.07$, $p < .001$) but not prevention focus ($B = -.21$, $SE = .16$, $t = -1.32$, $p = .19$). Disinhibition does not predict IAC scores ($B = -.19$, $SE = .12$, $t = -1.61$, $p = .11$), nor does promotion ($B = .09$, $SE = .07$, $t = 1.32$, $p = .19$) or prevention focus ($B = -.05$, $SE = .10$, $t = -.48$, $p = .63$). The indirect effects confirm that the association between disinhibition and IAC is not mediated by promotion focus (effect = $-.02$, $SE = .03$, 95% C.I. $[-.09; .02]$) prevention focus (effect = $.02$, $SE = .05$, 95% C.I. $[-.08; .12]$; see Figure 3).

* $p < .001$

Figure 3. Multiple mediation model between disinhibition and IAC

Conscientiousness. The findings of the mediation analysis showed that conscientiousness scores positively and significantly predicted promotion focus ($B = .68$, $SE = .12$, $t = 5.48$, $p < .001$) and prevention focus ($B = .70$, $SE = .08$, $t = 8.91$, $p < .001$). Conscientiousness predicted IAC scores ($B = .38$, $SE = .11$, $t = 3.33$, $p = .001$). Promotion ($B = .05$, $SE = .07$, $t = .78$, $p = .43$) and prevention focus ($B = -.17$, $SE = .11$, $t = -1.59$, $p = .11$) do not predict IAC scores when conscientiousness is in the model. The indirect effects confirm that the association between disinhibition and IAC is not mediated by promotion focus (effect = .03, $SE = .05$, 95% C.I. [-.05; .13]) prevention focus (effect = -.11, $SE = .07$, 95% C.I. [-.04; .13]; see Figure 4).

* $p < .01$

** $p < .001$

Figure 4. Multiple mediation model between conscientiousness and IAC

Discussion

Finding scientifically valid ways to select employees who are statistically more likely to act with integrity is important for any workplace, and it is particularly vital in organizations like the CAF where ethical decision-making can impact public safety or national security. Enhancing our understanding of the role that personality plays in integrity behaviour, in an effort to increase the predictive potential of administered personality assessments, is one path to improving integrity selection within organizations. To do this requires examining the personality-integrity relationship from different angles (e.g., examining indirect links between the two factors; potential mediators or moderators). Whereas past research has predominantly examined adaptive

personality factors in relation to integrity, the present study examined both adaptive (i.e., conscientiousness) and maladaptive (i.e., disinhibition) personality factors to assess whether measuring maladaptive personality adds to a predictive model already including adaptive personality. In particular, irresponsibility, impulsivity, risk-taking, achievement, dependability and cautiousness were examined as potential predictors of two integrity outcomes measures – the results of an Integrity Assessment Centre (IAC) and a Situational Judgement Test of Integrity (SJTI). The findings suggest that irresponsibility and dependability are the best facet-level predictors of integrity. This study also examined prevention and promotion focus as potential mediators of the relationship between personality and integrity outcomes. Although personality predicted both prevention and promotion focus, neither prevention nor promotion focus predicted integrity suggesting the absence of mediation.

Consideration of Model Fits

Prior to testing my hypotheses, three confirmatory factor analyses were conducted to determine whether conscientiousness and disinhibition facets ought to be combined into one personality factor or kept separate during hypothesis testing; one assessing model fit with the conscientiousness and disinhibition facets together, allowing for correlations between the facets, one model only containing dependability, cautiousness, and achievement, and one only containing irresponsibility, impulsivity, and risk-taking. The fit of the model that included both conscientiousness facets and disinhibition facets was worse than the fit of the models examining conscientiousness facets and disinhibition facets separately. The findings suggest that dependability, achievement, cautiousness, irresponsibility, risk-taking, and impulsivity better predict their respective personality factors separately rather than an overarching personality construct. These results support the theory that conscientiousness and disinhibition are measuring

different aspects of personality. Though model fit was better for the CFAs examining the conscientiousness facets and disinhibition facets individually, it was noted that the fit was not ideal (i.e., did not meet suggested cut-offs). Although the model fit did not meet the suggested cut-offs, the Cronbach's alpha for the combined conscientiousness and combined disinhibition measures revealed high levels of internal consistency reliability, and the discord between model fit and reliability does not necessarily indicate that the scale should not be used (Stanley & Edwards, 2016).

Gender as a Confounding Variable

Prior to the main analyses I assessed whether gender was related to integrity scores. Research findings examining gender differences in integrity measurement have been mixed with some research showing women scoring higher than men, and other findings showing no gender differences (e.g., Miller & Jones, 2012; Ones et al., 1998). These findings suggest that the gender differences in integrity may be context specific (Huang & Hung, 2015). There appears to be evidence that women score higher than men on integrity measures in job application settings. For example, Ones and colleagues (1998) found in a large sample of applicants seeking employment, that women scored significantly higher than men on overt integrity tests. Given this, we expected there to be gender differences in the current study given that the participants of this study were in the midst of an application process for the Military Police. In line with the results of Ones and colleagues (1998) the results of the current study also found that gender significantly predicted both the IAC and the SJTI results.

After finding statistically significant differences between men and women on scores of integrity (i.e., women scored higher), gender was controlled for in all further analyses in order to more accurately assess the unique predictive variance provided by personality. In this study

participants were applying for a highly specialized role and the gender differences in the current study may be because women with exceptionally high integrity are applying to the Military Police. Approximately 13.6% of applicants were women (compared to 15.3% women CAF-wide; Department of National Defence, 2018), indicating only a very select percentage of women from the general population were seeking the role. Logically, women with particularly high integrity would be driven to apply for a position where their primary role is upholding the laws that govern society, but that same logic could apply to men. Perhaps there are differences in motivation for applying to the Military Police that have an impact. For example, men may be more motivated by social reasons such as having friends and family who are already police officers (Lester, 1983), where women may be applying for more altruistic reasons such as a desire to help people (Perlstein, 1972). Given the findings of Ones and colleagues' research (1998), and the findings of the current study it appears important to at least consider gender when measuring integrity.

Examination of IAC and SJTI

One of the central results of this study is that the two integrity outcomes (i.e., IAC and SJTI results) were only weakly related. This small association was anticipated and part of the motivation for including two outcome measures. Where the SJTI measures situation judgement using scenario-based multiple-choice questions, the IAC is a score given by a third party (i.e., trained assessors) based on the participant's behavioural integrity during multiple controlled scenarios and during interviews. The lack of overlap between the two outcome measures may be indicative of the difference between a paper and pencil self-report assessment (e.g., SJTI), and a robust scenario-based measure (e.g., IAC). Although the SJTI is intended to measure integrity behaviour, it might be more accurate to describe it as a measure of behavioural 'intentions'

because the participant is not actually performing the behavior but instead indicating what they would do in the given scenario, unlike the IAC which is designed to capture behaviour in the moment. Past research has demonstrated that intention only explains some of the variance in actual behaviour (Sheeran, 2002). Thus, the lack of correlation between the two integrity measures is likely explained by their method of assessment.

A less integral but important difference is that, although both integrity outcomes were designed to measure a similarly defined version of workplace integrity, the SJTI is a general measure of integrity in work situations while the IAC is specifically designed to measure integrity for one occupation (e.g., Military Police). Finally, the lack of correlation between integrity outcomes could also indicate one or both is not actually measuring integrity, but more likely it is evidence of the extremely broad nature of integrity where both measures are capturing important but not certainly overlapping aspects of integrity.

Disinhibition as an Integrity Predictor

As hypothesized, the model containing disinhibition facets was a significant predictor of both integrity outcomes even when controlling for gender.⁶ Additionally, when added to a model containing gender and the conscientiousness facets, the disinhibition facets significantly added to the amount of variance predicted in IAC scores (but not SJTI scores) which provides some evidence that disinhibition facets are an independent construct and not only the inverse of conscientiousness facets. Interestingly, while disinhibition significantly added to the prediction of IAC scores, over and above the contribution of conscientiousness and gender, this was not the case for the SJTI. The differences in findings may be due to the previously noted differences in the outcome measures. Additionally, disinhibition is an indicator of living in the moment without

⁶ Gender was found to significantly predict SJTI scores but not IAC scores.

being constrained by concerns for the future (Guenole, 2014; Krueger, Derringer, Markon, Watson & Skodol, 2012) and the SJTI involves picking a response that is best suited to a given scenario, essentially encouraging the participants to spend time giving thought to their future actions. This set up is more future-oriented than the IAC scenarios which captures ad lib responses ‘in the moment’ and may explain the lack of association between disinhibition facets and the SJTI.

At the facet level, the only significant predictor of integrity outcomes was irresponsibility, with higher irresponsibility predicting lower integrity. When entered into the model containing only gender as a control and the other facets of disinhibition, irresponsibility predicted both SJTI and IAC scores. However, when controlling for conscientiousness, irresponsibility predicted IAC scores but not SJTI scores (though it was approaching significance with $p = .08$). One of the reasons irresponsibility did not significantly predict SJTI scores may be due to the normality of the variable. In this study well over half of respondents achieved a score of zero on irresponsibility, (therefore has low variability) resulting in a restricted, almost dichotomous, variable (i.e., no irresponsibility versus some level of irresponsibility).⁷ The non-normality of the variable may have artificially impacted the results, however measures were taken to ensure that this was not the case (e.g., running the models with and without outliers, checking skew).

Irresponsibility as measured is intended to capture a blatant disregard for obligations, rules and regulations, which is a key element of both integrity outcome measures (American Psychiatric Association, 2013, p. 765). However, the SJTI presents multiple choices, allowing

⁷ It is worth noting that all of the individuals who scored zero on irresponsibility were successful in the integrity portion of the IAC (i.e., achieved integrity scores higher than 3)

respondents to see the ‘responsible’ choice(s) versus the ‘irresponsible’ choice(s), as opposed to the IAC which included having individuals respond to scenarios purely of their own volition and in the moment, which may have increased the measurable impact of being irresponsible.

There are several potential reasons worth considering as to why risk-taking and impulsivity were not significant predictors of the integrity outcome measures in this study. First, impulsivity was only weakly correlated with the integrity outcomes and moderately correlated with both risk-taking and irresponsibility. Thus, it is likely that while impulsivity contributed to the overall model variance in predicting integrity, it did not uniquely contribute (i.e., based on the semi-partial correlation) due to its overlap with the other two facets (Cohen et al, 2003). It appears that impulsivity does not add predictive variance above and beyond the other two facets. Risk-taking on the other hand was not correlated with the IAC and only weakly correlated with the SJTI. Risk-taking may have not significantly predicted SJTI for the same reason as impulsivity (i.e., too much conceptual overlap with the other predictors). Additionally, it may be that risk-taking is simply not related to integrity. Individuals high on the trait of risk-taking have a tendency to engage in dangerous activity, sometimes to alleviate boredom, without concern for their physical limitation or personal danger (American Psychiatric Association, 2013, p. 764). Risk-taking is linked to counterproductive workplace behaviours (Cullen & Sackett, 2004), and was argued to potentially negatively predict integrity outcomes in this study due to its theoretical connection with self-control, but it may be problematic as a predictor in this study as the SJTI and the IAC do not measure the physical aspect of risk taking, at least not for the participant themselves (e.g., participants on the IAC may be expected to show concern for bystanders or perpetrators but not themselves). In fact, taking personal risk for the safety of others, regardless of how careless, could in some cases be considered a virtue. Furthermore, it is possible that those

with a high risk tolerance are naturally drawn to roles such as the Military Police. The finding that irresponsibility was a significant predictor of IAC results and a marginally significant predictor of SJTI results suggests that when developing measures for personality facets deemed particularly integral to integrity, it may be worth approaching it from different angles (i.e., examining both adaptive and maladaptive aspects) to ensure that it is more fully captured.

Conscientiousness as an Integrity Predictor

As hypothesized, the model containing only conscientiousness facets significantly predicted both integrity outcome measures even when controlling for gender. When only gender and the conscientiousness facets were in the model, dependability was the only significant predictor and only for the SJTI. When irresponsibility, risk-taking and impulsivity were entered into the model, dependability remained a significant predictor of the SJTI scores. Notably, where irresponsibility predicted the IAC but not SJTI when all facets were in the model, dependability had the opposite relationship. Dependability was developed as a measure of an individual's tendency to be reliable and trustworthy, and irresponsibility is its maladaptive counterpart. It may be that when it comes to integrity intentions, dependability is key while irresponsibility is more linked to behavioural integrity. This could potentially be occurring because during a paper and pencil test such as the SJTI (which measures integrity intentions) participants have time to maximize their responses towards high integrity outcomes, while in the IAC (which measures direct behaviour) the ability to not do the wrong thing in the moment plays a more important role. In other words, the SJTI's 'read then consider four possibilities' approach essentially diminishes the influence of irresponsibility because it gives participants time and requires that they consider the appropriate response, while the IAC's 'ad lib in the immediate moment'

approach diminishes the influence of dependability because they do not always have time to consider the ideal approach, and consideration of outcomes is a key aspect of dependability.

Achievement and cautiousness were not significant predictors for either outcome, in any of the models (i.e., with or without the disinhibition facets in the model). Achievement is a measure of an individual's tendency to work diligently towards accomplishing goals and includes a desire to be highly competent. Although achievement is a strong predictor of workplace productivity (better than a model containing all conscientiousness facets) (Paunonen et al., 1999) and is deemed particularly relevant to integrity and counter productive workplace behaviours (Berry et al., 2007; Ones & Viswesvaran, 2001) there was no significant relationship found in this study. Achievement is not as clearly linked to integrity as it is defined in this study, where the focus is on honesty, fairness and adherence to ethical standards (Department of National Defence and Canadian Forces, 2014; Becker, 1998). Additionally, although conscientiousness is a leading predictor when it comes to integrity research, and achievement is an integral aspect of conscientiousness, it may be that desire and drive to achieve one's goals through competence and effort is not directly related to integrity. Although, given past research and the evidence presented so far, it is more likely that achievement explains only certain aspects of integrity, which lends credence to using a facet level approach when developing a personality based integrity assessment for selection. Much like with the disinhibition facets, achievement was correlated (albeit weakly) with integrity and there was moderate overlap between achievement and the other facets (as well as irresponsibility), so it is likely that where achievement did contribute somewhat to overall model variance, that variance was shared with other facets and not uniquely predicted by achievement. Findings are in line with past research

which has demonstrated achievement orientation is a valid albeit sometimes weak predictor of integrity (Ones & Viswesvaran, 2001).

Cautiousness is theoretically linked with integrity and denotes one's concern for the risks in the actions they take (Darr & Klammer, 2016) which should play an important role in integrity, and the IAC in particular, but in the current study it was not predictive of either integrity outcome. Once again significant overlap between the facets is likely the reason that cautiousness did not uniquely predict integrity. Cautiousness was highly correlated with dependability and moderately correlated with irresponsibility (the two significant predictors of integrity outcomes). It may be that cautiousness does not need to be included when dependability or irresponsibility are in the model.

Combining Maladaptive and Adaptive Personality Measures

Results for including both maladaptive and adaptive facets to predict integrity were mixed. Disinhibition facets did explain additional variance above and beyond that accounted for by the conscientiousness facets alone for the IAC, and irresponsibility remained significant at the facet level. Disinhibition facets did not significantly add above and beyond that accounted for by the conscientiousness facets in predicting the SJTI. There is evidence that, should personality assessments be used in lieu of the IAC, or as a pre-screening tool in the future, measuring irresponsibility is a valuable tool to ensure candidates with the most integrity potential are being considered.

Regulatory Focus and Mediation

When looking at prevention and promotion focus as potential mediators of the relationship between personality and integrity behaviour, conscientiousness positively and significantly predicted prevention and promotion focus, while disinhibition negatively and

significantly predicted prevention focus only, but neither regulatory foci predicted the outcome measures and therefore there is no mediation. Even at the correlation level both prevention and promotion focus did not have a significant relationship with the integrity outcome measures. Considering these findings, it may be that regulatory focus is a measure of an individual's tendency to regulate themselves through promotion and prevention focus, towards their own benefit, but not necessarily to the benefit of others which is a central component of integrity behaviour as measured. Key personality facets that are most theoretically linked to regulatory focus also did not predict integrity outcomes (i.e., cautiousness and prevention focus, achievement and promotion focus) which might further indicate that the outcome measures are not capturing behaviours and intentions that are generally considered relevant to integrity, such as achievement.

Strengths & Limitations

The difficulty of operationalizing, measuring and ultimately validating 'integrity' is a limitation of this study, and is problematic for any research on integrity as a personality construct (Muchinsky, 2003, p. 91). A strength of this study, intended to address this problem, was the utilization of two integrity outcome measures that take a very different approach. The SJTI is a self-report, multiple choice, scenario based, paper-pencil assessment used to capture what individuals would choose to do in a given scenario. The SJTI is generically focused on the workplace and because of the format it required minimal resources including personnel to administer and time, making it a good fit to be utilized during the IAC. The IAC is a firmly defined, robust and focused assessment centre designed by the CAF to assess integrity for the Military Police. Candidates receive scores on the IAC based on their performance in situations designed to be objective, which is arguably more accurate than self-report.

Another strength of the study is that it was conducted with a specialized, hard to access, population— individuals applying to be part of the Military Police branch of the CAF. Though the results are not generalizable to every population, they are generalizable to other militaries and are highly valuable as a contribution to current CAF and Military Police efforts towards developing a valid and legally defensible personality based integrity selection tool. The CAF is already measuring conscientiousness for selection, and results imply that certain facets integral to conscientiousness such as achievement, may not be the best predictors while some facets, such as dependability, should be weighted more heavily when considering integrity behaviour as an outcome.

Although the population allowed for unique analyses directly beneficial to the CAF, it may have lead to low variability on the dependent variables. Limited variability in personality and integrity measures as well as the skewed independent variables may be due to the distinctiveness of the population. That is, the candidates were pre-selected for the IAC and therefore had already passed pre-selection testing (e.g., aptitude testing, personality testing, police background check, initial interviews) to reach the assessment centre phase. Given that pre-selection aims to select candidates with particular traits, the group is likely to be rather homogenous on the variables being assessed. However, given that this is the goal of the IAC, finding personality variables that are still able to predict integrity outcomes, even in a homogenous sample, is valuable and ultimately worth the effort despite the challenges presented. For the current study, considering the population, delving into the facet level was considered the best way to measure personality as it allows for a more nuanced picture of what is and is not predicting within the broader facets.

In addition to being pre-selected for particular traits for the assessment centre, the individuals assessed were highly motivated to succeed. Therefore, it can be expected they would ‘put their best foot forward’ on the personality assessment and behavioural assessments. As described by Sackett and Wanek (1996), individuals can “fake good”, which may be especially true when individuals are highly motivated to do so (Hough, 1998; Rosse, Stecher, Miller, & Levin, 1998). Ultimately the fact that the sample had passed several selection hurdles already, had self-selected to join the Military Police, and were highly motivated to perform, may also have contributed to the range of scores being narrow. Strategies to deal with ‘faking good’ include simply telling participants that faking is detectable, but the effectiveness of using ‘warnings’ to reduce faking is mixed (Robson, Jones & Abraham, 2008) and there is ethical concerns with deceiving participants, which would be particularly ironic for an assessment of integrity. Another method is to utilize a social desirability scale or scales which are intended to measure how motivated a participant is to present a positive image of themselves (van de Mortel, 2008). Recent research lends evidence to the potential that utilizing social desirability scales may be an effective way to correct for faking in high stakes personality testing, such as university admissions (Sjöberg, 2015; van de Mortel, 2008). Given that evidence, it may be valuable to measure socially desirable responding and control for it in future analyses.

Another limitation, tied to the unique population being sampled, is that recruitment is difficult in such a small population and therefore the study was slightly underpowered for the multiple regression models, but not the mediation models. The small sample size was primarily due to the exclusive nature of the assessment centre. The assessments are only conducted three or four times annually, the number of candidates per assessment cycle is small, and the Military Police branch started moving away from using the assessment centre part way through data

collection, due to the copious resources the process requires to produce candidates. It is possible that a larger sample may have improved the ability to find relationships between some of the variables. However, with a final sample size of 151 participants, the estimated power for multiple regression with six predictors was .78 which is close to the .80 level recommended by Cohen (1988). Additionally, the power for the multiple mediation model was more robust (.88).

A final limitation or general issue with conducting research on predicting behaviour using personality is the relevance of moderators that inevitably influence that relationship. Many things have been demonstrated to influence integrity behaviour outside of personality alone, from the level of fatigue experienced by the individual (Bolino & Klotz, 2015; Harvey & Keashly, 2003) to organizational factors such as group dynamics (O'Boyle, Forsyth & O'Boyle, 2010). Context logically plays an important role. Existing as a soldier in a warzone in a foreign country is so dramatically different from what most people experience on a daily basis that any research conducted outside of that context should acknowledge the limitation when trying to understand behaviours in that particular context. Using the IAC as an outcome measure sought to overcome the issue of context as the scenarios that were scored during the IAC were created to mimic the specific context in which applicants would experience on the job. Of course, it was a context within a context, or simulated scenarios within a selection centre, which undoubtedly influenced how people behaved in the moment.

Implications for Selection

This research was intended to address several gaps in our understanding of integrity, and its use as a basis for personnel selection. First, as only some aspects of conscientiousness and disinhibition were significant predictors of integrity behaviour, results imply there is a benefit to taking a facet level approach. The argument for using narrower facets is amplified by the fact

that facets offer a more theoretically and practically precise measure of personality as it relates to integrity which improves explanation potential and face validity overall, both of which are important when developing selection assessments. Secondly, there is minimal research linking personality with integrity relevant behaviour, and the research to date typically utilizes self-report for integrity outcome measures. Research where an empirical connection has been made between personality and integrity relevant behaviour in the workplace typically focus on traditional conscientiousness (Kolz, 2008; Farhadi, Fatimah, Nasir, & Shahrazad, 2012), with some branching out to related personality traits such as risk-taking (O'Neill & Hastings, 2010) and impulsivity (Trice, 2012). This research was intended to add to the burgeoning body of literature around integrity prediction using personality by providing a concurrent assessment of the relationship between personality and integrity behaviours in a selection setting while utilizing a non-self-report integrity outcome measure already accepted as best practice for the organization of primary interest. A relationship between personality and relevant integrity outcomes was found, further validating the potential future use of personality measures with the intention of selecting for integrity potential. Thirdly, although conscientiousness is typically considered when looking for personality traits to predict integrity, there is currently no consensus on what combination of personality traits best reflect integrity, and few studies have addressed the potential of negative or maladaptive traits as integrity predictors. This research expanded on past findings related to the use of conscientiousness as a predictor of integrity, and by adopting a facet level approach, highlighted particular facets of conscientiousness, such as dependability. Results also provided evidence that there is benefit to looking at the maladaptive side of conscientiousness through such facets as irresponsibility, in order to create a more robust predictive assessment of integrity. Additionally, in the context of selection of Military Police in

the Canadian Armed Forces, the results provide some evidence as to what personality facets to focus on, namely irresponsibility and dependability, if a streamlined paper-based personality assessment is to be devised as a replacement or supplement to the resource intensive IAC.

Future Directions

Although prevention and promotion focus failed to mediate the personality-integrity association in the present study, the relationship between personality, intentions, and behaviour has been considered in psychological literature for some time (Fishbein & Ajzen, 1975). It is likely that many mediators are relevant in the relationship between personality and integrity. As argued by MacKinnon, Fairchild and Fritz (2007), a more vigorous multi-mediator model may be the better approach to understanding the dynamics at play, and might be a good start for future research on mediation of personality towards integrity behaviour. An example of a variable that has potential for future research on mediation of personality towards integrity is workplace alienation (Yildiz & Alpkın, 2015). Although not yet clearly demonstrated in an organization setting, research has demonstrated a correlational effect between conscientiousness and alienation (Mahoney & Quick, 2000), where higher conscientiousness is correlated with lower alienation, and disinhibition and alienation, where higher disinhibition is correlated with higher alienation (Leblanc & Tolor, 1972). Alienation may be a good mediator as individuals who are alienated have lower perceived organizational fit, and alienation has been shown to be related to increased willingness to act in a way that is contradictory to organizational goals and ethos (Yildiz & Alpkın, 2015).

Although the focus in integrity selection research is typically towards developing a personality-based pre-selection assessment, the assessment's utility cannot be determined without accurate assessments of integrity behaviour. The best integrity outcome measures are

objective behaviours, for example, employee theft, sick time or specifically in the case of Military Police, a recorded reprimand for demonstrating some form of low integrity. There may be some benefit to looking back at personality testing for Military Police members who are demonstrating low integrity in their role to see if there is a predictive relationship, with the caveat that collecting longitudinal data on personnel for the purpose of validating selection testing is accompanied by difficulties such as low rate of recorded incidences, retention and confidentiality. While self-report measures of integrity are easier to assess they may also be biased by socially desirable responding or may not predict actual behaviour. As seen in the current study there was only a weak correlation between the SJTI, a self-rated integrity intentions measure, and the IAC, a third party objective rating. Future research should continue to focus on developing integrity measures that are easy to utilize, with low cost, and are strongly correlated to real world integrity behaviours and outcomes of concern. In order to create more enhanced measures it may be beneficial to break integrity down into smaller, more manageable, components (e.g., honesty, adherence to rules) rather than attempt to measure integrity as a singular construct.

A central goal of this research was to examine what was happening at the facet level and the results indicate that the broad traits typically focused on in the literature might not be as relevant as narrower facets. Future research should continue to explore relationships at the facet level when examining integrity in order to identify additional personality factors that are relevant to behavioural integrity. This will also require researchers to better define integrity in line with the narrower facets and will lead to greater understanding of what integrity is and how to measure it. Additionally, the findings of the current study suggest there may be a benefit to considering maladaptive traits in addition to adaptive traits which adds to the current personality

assessment research. Further exploration of maladaptive aspects of personality for selection would be valuable and could substantially add to predictive models intended to ensure greater integrity potential in employees.

Conclusion

The findings of the current study suggest that dependability may be an integral facet within conscientiousness in predicting integrity-related intentions. The findings also suggest that irresponsibility is the strongest contributor to predicting the IAC integrity score, an *objective* score based primarily on integrity behaviour. Currently, it is unclear why there is a disconnect between the SJTI integrity assessment and the IAC integrity score, although the difference in measurement approach (self-report behavioural intention versus observed behaviours) may explain the disconnect. These results do provide evidence that including maladaptive traits that negatively predict the desired trait can provide important information. Regulatory focus does not appear to play a role in the association between personality and integrity.

The results of this study support the idea that there is a benefit to breaking down broad traits such as conscientiousness, examining associations at the facet level, and looking outside of current paradigms when attempting to build personality assessments for selection purposes. Breaking down broad personality traits into smaller components is a natural evolution of the science of personality, not repetition and confirmation but instead moving towards ever greater detail and precision. Looking at the facet level can help to pinpoint exactly what aspects of personality are able to predict behavioural patterns.

Organizations succeed or fail based on the people they hire and human capital may be the greatest advantage an organization can have. Hiring the highest quality employee begins with recruitment and selection. Personality assessments can be used to select candidates for desirable

traits and eliminate candidates who have qualities that are deemed detrimental to the overall health and productivity of the organization. Integrity is arguably one of the most important traits for any organization and is unquestionably pivotal for positions where individuals are representing the law and responsible for the safety of others. The level of responsibility given to individuals in roles such as the Military Police comes with an even greater responsibility for the organizations that hire them - to utilize the most up to date and scientifically valid means of selection to ensure that they are hiring the best among us for highly sensitive roles, those whom objectively demonstrate the level of integrity deemed essential for the role.

References

- Abu-Bader, S. H. (2016). *Using statistical methods in social science research: With a complete SPSS guide* (2nd ed). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Ahmed, M., & Kun Young Chung, E. J. (2003). Business students' perception of ethics and moral judgement: A cross-cultural study. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 43(1-2), 89-102. doi: 10.1023/A:1022915316112
- Alliger, G. M., & Dwight, S. A. (2000). A meta-analytic investigation of the susceptibility of integrity tests to faking and coaching. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 60(1), 59-72. doi: 10.1177/00131640021970367
- Alliger, G., Lilienfeld, S., & Mitchell, K. (1996). The susceptibility of overt and covert integrity tests to coaching and faking. *Psychological Science*, 7(1), 32-39. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-9280.1996.tb00663.x
- American Psychiatric Association. (2013). *Diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders* (5th ed.). Washington: American Psychiatric Publishing.
- American Psychological Association. (2004). *The Truth About Lie Detectors (aka Polygraph Tests)*. Retrieved from <http://www.apa.org/research/action/polygraph.aspx>
- Anderson, M. (2017). *Personality Assessment in Personnel Selection*, (White Paper). Retrieved from the Cognitive Process Profile website: <https://www.cpp.com/download/item/3a0113ec03b94aafb25c05b413559b70>
- Arrigo, B. A., & Claussen, N. (2003). Police corruption and psychological testing: A strategy for preemployment screening. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, 47(3), 272 –290. doi: 10.1177/0306624X03047003003

Arthur, W., Day, E., McNelly, T., & Edens, P. (2003). A meta-analysis of the criterion-related validity of assessment centre dimensions. *Personnel Psychology*, 56(1), 125-154.

doi :10.1111/j.1744-6570.2003.tb00146.x.

Assessment Oversight Policy Development Directorate, Public Service Commission of Canada, Government of Canada. (2007). *Testing in the Public Service of Canada. Standards for the development and use of tests for appointment purposes*. Retrieved from:

<https://www.canada.ca/en/public-service-commission/services/public-service-hiring-guides/testing-public-service-canada.html#toc1>

Barnard, A., Schurink, W., & De Beer, M. (2008). A conceptual framework of integrity. *SA Journal of Industrial Psychology*, 34(2), 40-49.

Barrick, M. R., & Mount, M. K. (1991). The Big Five personality dimensions and job performance: A meta-analysis. *Personnel Psychology*, 44(1), 1-26. doi: 10.1111/j.1744-6570.1991.tb00688.x

Bazzy, J. D. (2012). *Integrity, self-control, and the impact of ego depletion on counterproductive behaviour* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). The University of Tennessee, Knoxville, Texas.

Becker, T. (1998). Integrity in organizations: Beyond honesty and conscientiousness. *The Academy of Management Review*, 23(1), 154-161. doi: 10.2307/259104

Becker, T. (2005). Development and validation of a situational judgement test of employee integrity. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 13(3), 225-232. doi: 10.1111/j.1468-2389.2005.00319.x

Bercuson, D. (2009). Up from the ashes: The re-professionalization of the Canadian Forces after the Somalia Affair. *Canadian Military Journal*, 9(3), 31-39.

- Berry, C., Sackett, P., & Weimann, S. (2007). A review of recent developments in integrity test research. *Personnel Psychology*, 60(2), 271-301. doi: 10.1111/j.1744-6570.2007.00074.x
- Bolino, M., Klotz, A. (2015). The paradox of the unethical organizational citizen: The link between organizational citizenship behavior and unethical behavior at work. *Current Opinion in Psychology*, 6, 45-49. doi: 10.1016/j.copysyc.2015.03.026
- Carver, C. S., & Scheier, M. F. (2008). *Perspectives on personality* (6th ed.). Boston, MA: Pearson Education Inc.
- Catano, V. M., Francis, R. E., O'Keefe, D. F., & Sutherland, S. M. (2017). *Development of a short, personality-based measure of integrity*. Manuscript submitted for publication.
- Catano, V. M., Wiesner, W. H., Hackett, R. D., & Methot, L. L. (2010). *Recruitment and Selection in Canada* (4th ed.). Toronto, CA: Nelson Education Ltd.
- Cohen, J., Cohen, P., West, S. G., & Aiken, L. S. (2003). *Applied multiple regression/correlation analysis for the behavioral sciences* (3rd ed.). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.
- Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences* (2nd ed.). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.
- Commission of inquiry into the deployment of Canadian Forces to Somalia., Minister of Public Works and Government Services Canada, Government of Canada (1997). *Dishonoured legacy: The lessons of the Somalia Affair*. Retrived from: http://publications.gc.ca/collections/collection_2015/bcp-pco/CP32-65-1997-1-eng.pdf
- Cullen, M. J., & Sackett, P.R. (2004) Personality and Counterproductive Workplace Behaviour. In M. Barrick & A.M. Ryan (Eds.), *Reconsidering the Role of Personality in Organizations* (pp. 150-178). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

- Darr, W. & Klammer, J. (2016). Personality and destructive leadership: Potential for selection. In D. Watola, & D. Woycheshin (Eds.), *Negative Leadership: International Perspectives* (pp. 87-118). Kingston, Ontario: Canadian Defence Academy Press.
- Department of National Defence and Canadian Forces, Government of Canada. (2014). *The DND and CAF Code of Values and Ethics. National Defence and the Canadian Armed Forces*. Retrieved from: <http://www.forces.gc.ca/en/about/code-of-values-and-ethics.page>
- Dudley, N., Orvis, K., Lebiecki, J., & Cortina, J. (2006). A meta-analytic investigation of conscientiousness in the prediction of job performance: Examining the intercorrelations and the incremental validity of narrow traits. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 91*(1), 40-57. doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.91.1.40
- Dwight, S. A., & Alliger, G. M. (1997). Reactions to overt integrity test items. *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 57*(6), 937-948. doi: 10.1177/0013164497057006004
- Erdfelder, E., Faul, F., & Buchner, A. (1996). GPOWER: A general power analysis program. *Behaviour Research Methods, Instruments, & Computers, 28*(1), 1-11. doi: 10.3758/BF03203630
- Farhadi, H., Fatimah, O., Nasir, R., & Wan Shahrazad, W.S. (2012) Agreeableness and conscientiousness as antecedents of deviant behavior in workplace. *Asian Social Science, 8*(9). doi:10.5539/ass.v8n9p2
- Field, A. (2009). *Discovering statistics using SPSS: And sex and drugs and rock 'n' roll*. (3rd ed.). London: Sage Publications.
- Fishbein, M., Ajzen, I. (1975). *Belief, Attitude, Intention, and Behaviour: An Introduction to Theory and Research*. Reading: Addison-Wesley

- Franklin, K. (2013, January 3). "The best predictor of future behaviour is...past behaviour" Does the maxim hold water? *Psychology Today*. Retrieved from:
<https://www.psychologytoday.com/blog/witness/201301/the-best-predictor-future-behaviour-is-past-behaviour>
- Gabčanová, I. (2011). The employees - The most important asset in the organizations. *Human Resources Management & Ergonomics*, 5, 1-12.
- Gorman, A. C., Meriac, J. P., Overstreet, B. L., Apodaca, S., McIntyre, A. L., Park, P., & Godbey, J. N. (2012). A meta-analysis of the regulatory focus nomological network: Work-related antecedents and consequences. *Journal of Vocational Behaviour*, 80(1), 160-172. doi: 10.1016/j.jvb.2011.07.005
- Guenole, N. (2014). Maladaptive personality at work: Exploring the darkness. *Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, 7(1), 85-97.
- Guenole, N., Chernyshenko, O., Stark, S., Cockerill, T., & Drasgow, F. (2012). More than a mirage: A large-scale assessment centre with more dimension variance than exercise variance. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 86(1), 5-21. doi: 10.1111/j.2044-8325.2012.02063.x
- Harvey, S., Keashly, L. (2003). Predicting the risk for aggression in the workplace: Risk factors, self-esteem and time at work. *Social Behavior and Personality: an international journal*, 31(8), 807-814. doi: 10.2224/sbp.2003.31.8.807
- Haidt, J., & Joseph, C. (2005). The moral mind: How five sets of innate intuitions guide the development of many culture-specific virtues, and perhaps even modules. In P. Curruthers, S. Laurence, & S. Stich (Eds.), *The Innate Mind*, (pp. 367-392). New York: Oxford University Press.

- Higgins, E. (1997). Beyond pleasure and pain. *American Psychologist*, 52(12), 1280-1300. doi: 10.1037//0003-066X.52.12.1280
- Higgins, E., Roney, C., Crowe, E., & Hymes, C. (1994). Ideal versus ought predilections for approach and avoidance: Distinct self-regulatory systems. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 66(2), 276-286. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.66.2.276
- Hough, L. (1998). Effects of intentional distortion in personality measurement and evaluation of suggested palliatives. *Human Performance*, 11(2-3), 209-244. doi: 10.1080/08959285.1998.9668032
- Hoyle, R. (2010). Personality and self-regulation. In R. Hoyle (Ed), *Handbook of personality and self-regulation* (1-18). Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Hu, L., & Bentler, P. M. (1999). Cutoff criteria for fit indexes in covariance structure analysis: Conventional criteria versus new alternatives. *Structural Equation Modeling*, 6(1), 1-55. doi: 10.1080/10705519909540118
- Huang, J. H. (2013). Gender differences and behavioural integrity: From a social contract perspective. *Journal of Management & Organization*, 19(1), 86-100, doi: 10.1017/jmo.2013.6
- Iddekinge, V. C., Taylor, M., & Edison, C. (2005). Broad versus narrow facets of integrity: Predictive validity and subgroup differences. *Human Performance*, 18(2), 151-177. doi: 10.1207/s15327043hup1802_3
- Jalbert, A. (2017). *Construct and criterion-related validation of the military police assessment centre (MPAC) for military police (MP) selection (U)*. Manuscript submitted for publication.

- Karren, R. J., & Zacharias, L. (2007). Integrity tests: Critical issues. *Human Resources Management Review*, 17(2), 221-234. doi: 10.1016/j.hrmr.2007.03.007
- Kenny, D. A. (2015). *Measuring Model Fit*. Retrieved from: <http://davidakenny.net/cm/fit.htm>
- Kolz, A. R. (2008). Personality predictors of retail employee theft and counterproductive behavior. *Journal of Professional Services Marketing*, 19(2), 107-114. doi: 10.1300/j090v19n02_06
- Krueger, R., Derringer, J., Markon, K., Watson, D., & Skodol, A. (2012). Initial construction of a maladaptive personality trait model and inventory for DSM-5. *Psychological Medicine*, 42(9), 1879-1890. doi: 10.1017/S0033291711002674
- Lanaj, K., Chang, C.-H., & Johnson, R. E. (2012). Regulatory focus and work-related outcomes: A review and meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin*, 138(5), 998-1034. doi: 10.1037/a0027723
- Leblanc, R. F., & Tolor, A. (1972). Alienation, distancing, externalizing, and sensation seeking in prison inmates. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 39(3), 514. doi: 10.1037/h0034016
- Lester, D. (1983). Why do people become police officers: A study of reasons and their predictions of success. *Journal of Police Science and Administration*, 11(2), 170 – 174.
- Loeber, R., & Farrington, D. (Eds.). (1998). *Serious & Violent Juvenile Offenders. Risk Factors and Successful Interventions*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications Inc.
- MacCallum, R. C., Zhang, S., Preacher, K. J., & Rucker, D. D. (2002). On the practice of dichotomization of quantitative variables. *Psychology Methods*, 7(1), 19-40. doi: 10.1037//1082-989X.7.1.19

- MacKinnon, D. P., Fairchild, A.J., & Fritz, M.S. (2010). Mediation Analysis. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 58, 593-614. doi: 10.1146/annurev.psych.58.110405.085542
- McCrae, R. R., & Oliver, J. P. (1992). An introduction to the Five-Factor Model and its applications. *Journal of Personality*, 60(2), 175-215. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-6494.1992.tb00970.x
- McFerran, B., Aquino, K., & Duffy, M., (2010). How Personality and Moral Identity Relate to Individual's Ethical Ideology. *Business Ethics Quarterly*, 20(1), 35-56.
- Mahoney, M.J., & Quick, B.G. (2000). Personality correlates of alienation in a university sample. *Psychological Reports*, 87(3), 1094-1100. doi: 10.2466/pr0.2000.87.3f.1094
- Miller, S. (2010). Integrity systems and professional reporting in police organizations. *Criminal Justice Ethics*, 29(3), 241-257. doi: 10.1080/0731129X.2010.524036
- Miller, A., & Young-Jones, A. (2012). Academic integrity: online classes compared to face-to-face classes. *Journal of Instructional Psychology*, 39(3), 138-145.
- Morgeson, F. P., Campion, M. A., Dipboyle, R. L., Hollenbeck, J. R., Murphy, K., & Schmitt, N. (2007). Reconsidering the use of personality tests in personnel selection contexts. *Personnel Psychology*, 60(3), 683-729. doi: 10.1111/j.1744-6570.2007.00089.x
- National Research Council. (2003). *The polygraph and lie detection*. Retrieved from: <https://www.nap.edu/read/10420/chapter/1>
- National Research Council. (2015). Measuring human capabilities: An agenda for basic research on the assessment of individual and group performance potential for military accession. Washington, DC: The National Academies Press. <https://doi.org/10.17226/19017>.

- O'Boyle, E., Forsyth, D., & O'Boyle, A. (2010). Bad Apples or Bad Barrels: An examination of group- and organizational- level effects in the study of counterproductive work behavior. *Group and Organizational Management*, 36(1), 39-69. doi: 10.1177/1059601110390998
- O'Boyle, E., Forsythe, D., Banks, G., & McDaniel, M. (2012). A meta-analysis of the Dark Triad and work behaviour: A social exchange perspective. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 97(3), 557-579. doi: 10.1037/a0025679
- O'Neill, T. & Hastings, S.E. (2011). Explaining workplace deviance behavior with more than just the "Big Five". *Personality and Individual Differences*, 50(2), 268-273. doi: 10.1016/j.paid.2010.10.001
- Ones, D. S. (1993). *The construct validity of integrity tests*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). The University of Iowa, Iowa.
- Ones, D. S., & Viswesvaran, C. (1998). Integrity testing in organizations. In R. W. Griffin, A. O'Leary-Kelly, & J. M. Collins (Eds.), *Monographs in organizational behaviour and industrial relations, Vol. 23, Parts A & B. Dysfunctional behaviour in organizations: Violent and deviant behaviour* (pp. 243-276). London: Jai Press.
- Ones, D., & Viswesvaran, C. (2001). Integrity tests and other criterion-focused occupational personality scales (COPS) used in personnel selection. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 9(1-2), 31-39. doi: 10.1111/1468-2389.00161
- Ones, D., Viswesvaran, C., & Schmidt, F. (1993). Comprehensive meta-analysis of integrity test validities: Findings and implications for personnel selection and theories of job-performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 78(4), 679-703. doi: 0.1037/0021-9010.78.4.679

- Oregon Research Institute. (2015). *International Personality Item Pool*. Retrieved from the Oregon Research Institute website: <http://www.ipip.ori.org/>
- Osborne, J. (2002). Notes on the use of data transformations. *Practical Assessment, Research & Evaluation*, 8(6).
- Paunonen, S., & Jackson, D. (2000). What is beyond the Big Five? Plenty! *Journal of Personality*, 68(5), 821-835. doi: 10.1111/1467-6494.00117
- Paunonen, S., Rothstein, M., & Jackson, D. (1999). Narrow reasoning about the use of broad personality measures for personnel selection. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 20(3), 389-405. doi: 10.1002/(SICI)1099-1379(199905)20:3<389::AID-JOB917>3.0.CO;2-G
- Perlstein, G. (1972). Policewomen and policemen: A comparative look. *Police Chief*, 39, 72-74.
- Pilch, I., & Turska, E. (2015). Relationships between machiavellianism, organizational culture, and workplace bullying: Emotional abuse from the target's and the perpetrator's perspective. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 128(1), 83-93. doi: 10.1007/s10551-014-2081-3
- Rand, A. (1964). *The virtue of selfishness: A new concept of egoism*. New York, NY: Penguin Books.
- Robson, S. M., Jones, A. & Abraham, J. (2008). Personality, faking, and convergent validity: A warning concerning warning statements. *Human Performance*, 21, 89-106.
- Rosse, J., Stecher, M., Miller, J., & Levin, R. (1998). The impact of response distortion on pre-employment personality testing and hiring decisions. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 83(4), 634-644. doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.83.4.634
- Rupp, D. E., Hoffman, B. J., Bischof, D., Byham, W., Collins, L., Gibbons, A., ... Thornton, G. (2015). Guidelines and ethical considerations for assessment centre operations, *Journal of Management*, 41(4), 1244-1273. doi: 10.1177/0149206314567780

- Sackett P. R., & Wanek J. E. (1996). New developments in the use of measures of honesty, integrity, conscientiousness, dependability, trustworthiness, and reliability for personnel selection. *Personnel Psychology*, 49, 787–829. doi: 10.1111/j.1744-6570.1996.tb02450.x
- Sackett, P. R., & Wanek, J. E. (1997). Integrity testing: An overview. *Security Journal*, 8, 11-18.
- Schmidt, F., & Hunter, J. (1998). The validity and utility of selection methods in personnel psychology: Practical and theoretical implications of 85 years of research findings. *Psychological Bulletin*, 124(2), 262-274. doi: 10.1037/0033-2909.124.2.262
- Schmidt, F., Oh, I.-S., & Shaffer, J. A. (2016). The validity and utility of selection methods in personnel psychology: Practical and theoretical implications of 100 years of research findings. Unpublished Manuscript, Foc School of Business, Temple University, Philedelphia, United States. Retrieved from <https://ssrn.com/abstract=2853669>
- Schneider, R. J., Hough, L. M., & Dunnette, M. D. (1996). Broadsided by broad traits: How to sink science in five dimensions or less. *Journal of Organizational Behaviour*, 17(6), 639-655. doi: 10.1002/(SICI)1099-1379(199611)17:6<639::AID-JOB3828>3.0.CO;2-9
- Sheeran, P. (2002). Intention – behavior relations: A conceptual and empirical review. *European Review of Social Psychology*, 12(1), 1-36, doi: 10.1080/14792772143000003
- Singhapakdi, A., Vitell, S., & Leelakulthanit, O. (1994). A cross-cultural study of moral philosophies, ethical perceptions and judgements: A comparison of american and thai marketers. *International Marketing Review*, 11(6), 65-78. doi: 10.1108/026513
- Sjöberg, L. (2015). Correction for faking in self-report personality tests. *Scandinavian Journal of Psychology*, 56(5). doi: 10.1111/sjop.12231

Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology. (2003). *Principles for the validation and use of personnel selection procedures* (4th ed.). Retrieved from:

http://www.siop.org/_principles/principles.pdf

Stanley, L. M. & Edwards, M. C. (2016). Reliability and model fit. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 76(6), 976-985.

Tangney, J., Baumeister, R., & Boone, A. (2004). High self-control predicts good adjustment, less pathology, better grades, and interpersonal success. *Journal of Personality*, 72(2), 271-324. doi: 10.1111/j.0022-3506.2004.00263.x

Tanner, L., & Klammer, J. (2006). *The operating guide for conducting police branch assessment centres*. Borden: Canadian Forces Provost Marshal.

Tett, R. P., Jackson, D. N., & Rothstein, M. (1991). Personality measures as predictors of job performance: A meta-analytic review. *Personnel Psychology*, 44(4), 703-742. doi: 10.1111/j.1744-6570.1991.tb00696.x

Thomas, S., & Scroggins, W. (2006). Psychological testing in personnel selection: Contemporary issues in cognitive ability and personality testing. *Journal of Business Inquiry*, 5(1) 28-38.

Trice, B., (2012). *Affectivity and impulsivity as predictors of workplace deviance* (Masters Dissertation) Retrieved from Scholarworks Dissertations and Theses database. (Order No. 4253)

United States Congress (1988). *H.R.1212 - Employee Polygraph Protection Act of 1988*.

Retrieved from Congress.Gov: <https://www.congress.gov/bill/100th-congress/house-bill/1212>

- United States Office of Personnel Management. (2017). *Assessment decision guide*. Retrieved from <https://www.opm.gov/policy-data-oversight/assessment-and-selection/reference-materials/assessmentdecisionguide.pdf>
- van de Mortel, T. F. (2008). Faking it: social desirability response bias in self-report research. *Australian Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 25(4), 40-48.
- Vangent Inc. (2017). *The Reid Report*. Retrieved from http://www.creativeorgdesign.com/tests_page.php?id=204
- Verhezen, P. (2008). The (ir)relevance of integrity in organizations. *Public Integrity*, 10(2), 133-149. doi: 10.2753/PIN1099-9922100203
- Wallace, C., & Chen, G. (2006). A multilevel integration of personality, climate, self-regulation and performance. *Personnel Psychology*, 59(3), 529-557. doi: 10.1111/j.1744-6570.2006.00046.x
- Wallace, C., Johnson, P., & Frazier, L. (2008). An examination of the factorial, construct, and predictive validity and utility of the regulatory focus at work scale. *Journal of Organizational Behaviour*, 30(6), 805-831. doi: 10.1002/job.572
- Wanek, J. E. (1999). Integrity and honesty testing: What do we know? How do we use it? *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 7(4), 183-195. doi: 10.1111/1468-2389.00118
- Wanek, J., Sackett, P., & Ones, D. (2003). Towards an understanding of integrity test similarities and differences: An item-level analysis of seven tests. *Personnel Psychology*, 56(4), 873-894. doi: 10.1111/j.1744-6570.2003.tb00243.x

Yildiz, B., & Alpkın, L. (2015). A Theoretical Model on the Proposed Predictors of Destructive Deviant Workplace Behaviors and the Mediator Role of Alienation. *Procedia – Social Behavioral Sciences*, 210, 330-338.

Appendix A: Conscientiousness Facets

#	Items	Construct	Rating Scale
1	Try to follow the rules.	dependability (Conscientiousness)	very inaccurate = 1, moderately inaccurate = 2, neither inaccurate nor accurate = 3, moderately accurate = 4, very accurate = 5
2	Keep my promises.		
3	Pay my bills on time.		
4	Tell the truth.		
5	Misrepresent the facts. (R)		
6	Respect authority.		
7	Resist authority. (R)		
8	Would cheat on my taxes. (R)		
9	Do things by the book.		
10	Make plans and stick to them.		
11	Go straight for the goal.	achievement (Conscientiousness)	very inaccurate = 1, moderately inaccurate = 2, neither inaccurate nor accurate = 3, moderately accurate = 4, very accurate = 5
12	Work hard.		
13	Turn plans into actions.		
14	Plunge into tasks with all my heart.		
15	Do more than what's expected of me.		
16	Set high standards for myself and others.		
17	Demand quality.		
18	Am not highly motivated to succeed. (R)		
19	Do just enough work to get by. (R)		
20	Put little time and effort into my work. (R)		
21	Avoid mistakes.	cautiousness (Conscientiousness)	very inaccurate = 1, moderately inaccurate = 2, neither inaccurate nor accurate = 3, moderately accurate = 4, very accurate = 5
22	Choose my words with care.		
23	Stick to my chosen path.		
24	Jump into things without thinking. (R)		
25	Make rash decisions. (R)		
26	Like to act on a whim. (R)		
27	Rush into things. (R)		
28	Do crazy things. (R)		

29	Act without thinking. (R)		
30	Often make last-minute plans. (R)		

Appendix B: Disinhibition Facets

#	Items	Construct	Rating Scale
1	Others see me as irresponsible.	irresponsibility (DSM5 Disinhibition)	very false or often false = 0, sometimes or somewhat false = 1, sometimes true or somewhat true = 2, very true or often true = 3
2	I'm often pretty careless with my own and others' things.		
3	I make promises that I don't really intend to keep.		
4	I often forget to pay my bills.		
5	I've skipped town to avoid responsibilities.		
6	I just skip appointments or meetings if I'm not in the mood.		
7	I follow through on commitments. (R)		
8	People would describe me as reckless.	risk-taking (DSM 5 Disinhibition)	same as above
9	I avoid risky situations. (R)		
10	I avoid risky sports and activities. (R)		
11	I have no limits when it comes to doing dangerous things.		
12	I do a lot of things that others consider risky.		
13	I like to take risks.		
14	When I want to do something, I don't let the possibility that it might be risky stop me.		
15	I avoid anything that might be even a little bit dangerous. (R)		
16	I prefer to play it safe rather than take unnecessary chances. (R)		
17	I don't mind a little risk now and then.		
18	I do what I want regardless of how unsafe it might be.		
19	I never take risks. (R)		
20	I don't think about getting hurt when I'm doing things that might be dangerous.		
21	I hate to take chances. (R)		
22	I feel like I act totally on impulse.		same as above

23	I usually do things on impulse without thinking about what might happen as a result.	impulsivity (DSM 5 Disinhibition)	
24	Even though I know better, I can't stop making rash decisions.		
25	I always do things on the spur of the moment.		
26	I usually think before I act. (R)		
27	I am very impulsive.		

Appendix C: Modified Regulatory Focus at Work Scale

#	Items	Construct	Source and Modification	Rating Scale
PERSONALITY PREDICTOR MEASURES				
1	Following rules and regulations at work/school.	Self-regulatory Focus – Prevention Focus	Wallace, Johnson & Frazier (2008). Items in this scale have been modified to include the word “school” wherever applicable.	Rate how often you focus on these thoughts and activities when you are working (school or job-related) (0 = never; 1 = very rarely, 2 = occasionally, 3 = quite often, 4 = very often)
2	Completing work/school tasks correctly.			
3	Doing my duty at work/school.			
4	My work/school responsibilities.			
5	Fulfilling my work/school obligations.			
6	On the details of my work/school.			
7	Accomplishing a lot at work/school.	Self-regulatory Focus – Promotion Focus		
8	Getting my work done no matter what.			
9	Getting a lot of work finished in a short amount of time.			
10	Work/school activities that allow me to get ahead at work/school.			
11	My work/school accomplishments.			
12	How many job/school tasks I can complete.			

Appendix D: Situational Judgement Test of Integrity with Scoring Key

1. You work for a retail store that sells vacuum cleaners. Your boss holds a meeting with you and other sales associates to discuss how to sell a new vacuum brand. Everyone in the store seems to agree that the product should be suggested to customers over the other available brands.

However, you have concerns because a recent report from the research department points to several potential safety problems with the product. Which of the following do you think you would most likely do?

A. Try to understand why everyone else wants to offer the product to customers. Maybe your concerns are misplaced. [-1]

B. Voice your concerns with the product and explain why you believe the safety issues need to be addressed. [1]

C. Go along with what others want to do so that everyone feels good about the team. [-1]

D. Afterwards, talk with several other members of the sales team to see if they share your concerns. [0]

2. You and three other students in your engineering class are working on a project to design a new building. Each student has created his or her own design, and you're now meeting to discuss what to do. You have seen the other designs, and believe yours is the best. The other students seem to agree, but two of them want to make changes in your design. You think the changes reduce the quality of the design. Of the following, which would you be most likely to do?

A. Work with the others to produce a design that everyone is fairly satisfied with. [1]

B. Let the others make the changes as they see fit, as long as they don't drastically alter the basic plan. [0]

C. Bring in your Instructor to help resolve the disagreement. [-1]

D. Explain why you think the original design is better, and refuse to change your mind unless better ideas are offered. [0]

3. You are a food server in a busy restaurant. It's Friday night, and you have already put in 45 hours this week. The owner asks you to work tomorrow night, promising that you will be given a large dinner party which should get you a big tip. Which of the following would you most likely say?

A. "I'd rather not, thanks." [-1]

B. "Sure!" [1]

C. "I'm kind of tired, but I'll do it if you can't find someone else." [1]

D. "I'll be happy to do it if you can guarantee the tip." [0]

4. You are a university professor whose job security depends on the number of research publications produced each year. Two years ago you were given tenure, that is, guaranteed job

security. You've recently realized that this has decreased the number of research articles you publish each year. What would you probably do?

- A. Realize that this is natural – high job security leads to lower quality work. [-1]
- B. Accept that you've moved to a new career stage where working so hard is not that important. [-1]
- C. Admit that you've gotten a little lazy, set some high goals, and get back to being productive. [1]
- D. Find some things outside the workplace (e.g., hobbies, community work) that can replace the value you used to put on work. [-1]

5. You're a new manager and have noticed that your employees are not happy. You've hired two experts to advise you. After talking to employees, the experts give you their separate reports. One suggests that employees' jobs be made more challenging so they won't get bored. The other suggests insurance plans be offered so people know the company cares about them. Assuming that the reports make equally good arguments, what would you most likely do next?

- A. Call the experts' past customers and act on the advice of the expert with the better reputation. [-1]
- B. Call a meeting of department managers to see what others think should be done. [0]
- C. Contact a third expert to get another opinion. [-1]
- D. Meet with each expert alone, and ask them what evidence there is that their approach is best. [1]

6. You're about to open the door to the building where your class is located, and you notice an older woman coming up. She is carrying several packages. What would you most likely do?

- A. Hold the door for her out of courtesy. [1]
- B. Walk into the building and let her get the door herself so as not to offend her. [-1]
- C. Ask her if she would like you to hold the door for her. If she says yes, do it. If not, don't. [0]
- D. Tell her you'd like to hold the door for her and see what she says. [0]

7. As part of a group project you have to perform an evaluation of all the group members. Jerry has not performed well on the project. He is mad because you gave him a rating of "3" ("met expectations") on quality of work, and he believes that he deserves a "5" ("exceeds expectations"). You believe the rating of "3" is fair and accurate, but Jerry threatens to go to the professor to complain. What would you most likely do?

- A. Tell Jerry to go to hell. [-1]
- B. Explain to Jerry why you gave him the rating that you did, but refuse to change your rating. [1]
- C. Seek a compromise, such as giving Jerry a "4." [-1]
- D. Schedule a meeting with your professor so that you both can decide which rating is best. [1]

8. LuAnn, one of your fellow students, comes to class wearing the ugliest blouse that you have ever seen. During a break she walks up to you and, after some small talk, asks, “How do you like my new blouse?” If you had to say one of the following, which would you mostly likely say?

- A. “It’s very pretty. Where did you get it?” [0]
- B. “I don’t think clothing is a very good measure of a person. Let’s talk about you.” [0]
- C. “Frankly, I don’t find it too attractive.” [1]
- D. “You’re asking the wrong person – I’m not a very good judge of clothes.” [0]

9. You’re a new sales person in a clothing store and are being trained by Angie, a veteran employee. She quietly tells you that because employees are paid minimum wage, most people sometimes take home clothes for themselves. Employees who don’t are considered dumb and arrogant. At closing time, Angie hands you a scarf to take home. Which of the following would you most likely do?

- A. Take home the scarf and keep your mouth shut. [-1]
- B. Take home the scarf, but return it to the shelf later without letting other employees see you. [-1]
- C. Politely tell Angie that you don’t need any more scarves. [0]
- D. Tell Angie that you don’t want to take home any clothes, now or ever. [1]

10. Your term as president of Student Council is coming to an end, and you must now decide who will replace you. Two of your closest friends want the position and would probably do a fine job. However, three other students not in your social circle are also interested and are more qualified. Who would you most likely put in charge?

- A. The best performing student not in your social circle, because the most qualified person deserves the job. [0]
- B. The least qualified student not in your social circle, because this won’t hurt your closest friends' feelings. [-1]
- C. The most qualified close friend, because you have the right to do what is best for your buddies. [0]
- D. The most qualified of all students who've expressed an interest in the position [1]

11. You are trying to decide whether you should spend in excess of \$75,000 to pursue your future post-graduate education in the United Kingdom. You have heard everyone’s opinions, seen the data, and read reviews about the program and other students' experiences. Now you must decide what to do. How would you most likely make the decision?

- A. Go with your intuition because your gut feeling is seldom wrong. [0]

B. Just decide, understanding you can probably change your mind if things don't go as you hope. [-1]

C. Realizing that two heads are better than one, talk to a respected friend outside of work to see what he or she thinks should be done. [-1]

D. Make a list of the pros and cons, consider how likely each is to occur and, if the pros outweigh the cons, decide in favor of the United Kingdom. [1]

12. Over lunch, two of your fellow students are gossiping about a new student in your class who is overweight and a bit slow in learning. Frank, one of your peers, turns to you and says "I hate working with fat, dumb people, don't you?" Of the following, which would you most likely say?

A. "I prefer not to talk about people behind their backs." [1]

B. "Lois would be alright if she would just lose some weight." [-1]

C. "You're an idiot, Frank. Keep your damn opinions to yourself." [1]

D. "Actually, I think Lois is very smart." [0]

13. You're seated at a table on which there is a hat. A job interviewer puts a dollar under the hat and says, "I'm going to leave. You decide whether to take the dollar and if you want to tell me you took or didn't take it. When I return, I'll ask you if you took it and then guess whether you're lying. If you tell the truth, you get fifty cents. If you lie and I guess you told the truth, you get the dollar. If you lie and I guess it, you get nothing." He leaves. What would you most likely do?

A. Take the dollar and tell the recruiter you did not. [0]

B. Take the dollar and tell the recruiter you took it. [-1]

C. Do not take the dollar and tell the recruiter you did not take it. [1]

D. Do not take the dollar and tell the recruiter that you took it. [-1]

14. You are a student nurse observing operations as part of your training. Dr. Jones arrives to perform a heart operation, and you smell beer on his breath. You tell your supervisor, but she says that you should keep quiet. What would you most likely do?

A. Listen to your supervisor – following the chain of command is essential to a hospital's success. [0]

B. Wait to see how Jones does during the operation. If he struggles, insist something be done. [0]

C. Trust the surgeon: smelling beer on someone does not mean they are drunk. [-1]

D. Confront Jones. If he insists on operating, don't participate and put your concerns in writing. [1]

15. Two buyers are bidding to buy the apartment building that you currently live in. Company A offers a high price and promises not to increase rental and parking fees. Company B bids a lower price but offers one million dollars to the negotiating owner to accept their bid. A lower

price means less money for the other owners (not present during the negotiation) and less rental fee protection for tenants. If you were negotiating on behalf of the other two owners of the building, what would you most likely do, and why?

- A. Vote for selling to Company A because it is the fairest option for all concerned. [1]
- B. Vote for selling to Company B so you can take care of yourself and your family. [-1]
- C. Vote for selling to Company A because your tenants are the most important thing. [0]
- D. Vote for Company B because it would be unfair for the other owners to benefit at your expense. [0]

16. You've been working hard over the last few years, going to school and working full-time. You love your job, and school is going well. One night over dinner, your husband/wife (or boyfriend/girlfriend) tells you that you must quit working so many hours or he or she will leave you. There are no children involved, but this is a person that you love very much. On the other hand, you're pretty sure that cutting back on hours will hinder your career. Which of the following responses would you most likely make?

- A. Listen to the person and try to understand their point of view. Explain to them how much you love them and why your relationship is so important to you. Cut back on hours so that your relationship won't suffer, and explain the situation to your boss and co-workers. [0]
- B. Ask the person why they are dissatisfied with the relationship, and carefully listen to their answer. Explain to them why work is so important to you, and try to work with them to find a way to build a stronger relationship. Continue working as you have over the last few years. [0]
- C. Listen to the other person's point of view and tell them your own. Then try to find a compromise solution. For example, if the other person wants you to work 25 hours and you want 40 hours, settle on 30 hours. As another example, perhaps you can work 40 hours some weeks and 25 hours other weeks. [1]
- D. Assert your right to pursue your career in the manner you see fit. Tell the person that if they can't understand the way you feel, then your relationship must not mean very much to them. [-1]

17. A few days ago, one of your customers asked you when a certain shipment of your products would be delivered. You knew it would take at least two weeks until delivery, but to keep the customer from getting mad you told them it would be no more than one week. Had this actually happened, what would you be most likely to do now?

- A. Let it go this time, but resolve not to do this again. Confide in several people you trust about what you did, and listen to their advice. [0]
- B. Talk to shipping and see if they can get the shipment there in under two weeks. Make clear to them that it must arrive in under 10 days. [-1]
- C. Call the customer back and tell them that you were mistaken and that the shipment will not arrive for at least two weeks. [1]

D. Understand that this sort of thing is necessary in business and that most everyone knows that promises such as this might not be kept. [-1]

18. It is a beautiful day outside – sunny, warm, and inviting. You are scheduled to work, but you are tempted to take the day off and go to the beach with some friends. In all honesty, which of the following would you most likely do?

A. Call in sick and go to the beach. [0]

B. Go into work and work as hard as you usually do. [1]

C. Call your boss and say that you'd like to go to the beach, and ask if your boss can find someone else to work for you. [-1]

D. Go into work but do not work as hard as normal. [0]