1 – INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background

During the past three years, Hogan Assessment Systems (hereafter “Hogan”) witnessed an increase in the number of requests for competency-based reports as more organizations develop and use competency models. To identify relationships between commonly used competencies and personality, we developed the Hogan Competency Model (HCM). This model provides a foundation for (a) updating the competency section of Hogan’s job analysis tool, the Job Evaluation Tool (JET); (b) developing algorithms that drive client competency-based reports; (c) providing a structure for coding criterion data in the Hogan archive, and (d) updating the synthetic validity evidence used for validity generalization (VG).

This report outlines the development of the HCM and describes how the Hogan Research Division (hereafter “HRD”) uses the model to conduct personality-related research. The HCM has three advantages. First, we designed the model to have minimal overlap between competencies, allowing us to better measure specific behaviors. Second, we designed competencies to target specific areas of performance. In contrast, many models target several behaviors with a single competency. This lack of specificity contaminates measurement and subsequent prediction of the competency. Finally, our development process centered on a review of twenty-one competency models used across academic, commercial, and government settings. This both assures that the model is comprehensive and that it can be easily compared to and used in conjunction with other competency models.

1.2 History and Development of Competency Modeling

Global markets require organizations to simultaneously work within different locations, legal environments, and cultures. One strategy for facing this challenge is restructuring jobs, such as reducing management layers and relying on work teams, to increase adaptability and responsiveness (Ashkenas, Ulrich, Jick, & Kerr, 1995; Howard, 1995; Keidel, 1994). As a result, traditional task-based job analysis procedures may lack the flexibility required to identify the knowledge, skills, and abilities essential for success in many jobs (Barnes-Nelson, 1996; Olian & Rynes, 1991; Sanchez, 1994). Therefore, organizations often use competency models to align many of their Human Resource Management applications.

The work of David McClelland (1973) set the stage for the widespread growth of competencies. McClelland argued that aptitude tests, almost universally used to predict performance, do not serve their intended purpose well and are prone to cultural biases. Also, he argued that other traditional measures, such as examination results and references, are equally poor at predicting job success. Instead, McClelland suggested that individual competence might provide a more promising alternative for predicting performance. He described competencies as representing groups of behaviors underlying individual characteristics that enable superior job performance.

Competencies appear in educational, training, employment, and assessment contexts, where often a primary goal is identifying individual characteristics that lead to success (Boyatzis, Stubbs, & Taylor, 2002; Rubin et al., 2007; Spencer & Spencer, 1993). Companies can link individual characteristics
to competencies that represent critical job components. Then they can use this information to select individuals with these characteristics and guide development and training efforts.

The 1980s witnessed a growth in using competencies to identify and predict leadership effectiveness and long-term success (Boyatzis, 1982; McClelland & Boyatzis, 1982). These applications led to the development of high-level management and leadership competency models (Hollenbeck, McCall, & Silzer, 2006) and competency-based selection tools, such as behavioral event interviews (Boyatzis, 1994; McClelland, 1998; Spencer, McClelland, & Spencer, 1994). Competencies also provide a structure for linking performance with cognitive ability and personality (Heinsman, de Hoogh, Koopman, & van Muijen, 2007), coaching employees to overcome dysfunctional behavior (Boyatzis, 2006), and selecting and developing high potential employees (McClelland, 1994).
2 – DEVELOPMENT OF HOGAN COMPETENCY MODEL

2.1 Competency Evaluation Tool (CET)

The Competency Evaluation Tool (CET), which most recently contained items representing 56 competencies, is a standard part of the JET. Although the CET has undergone several changes, ranging at times from 41 to 65 competencies, the 56-item version was in place for 5 years prior to the changes described in this report. The CET asks Subject Matter Experts (SMEs) to indicate the degree to which each competency relates to successful performance in the job or job family under study. SMEs, anyone that is familiar with the job’s requirements and characteristics that lead to high performance, typically include supervisors, high performing incumbents, and co-workers. Direct reports, trainers, and customers have also served as JET SMEs. SME ratings provide a basis for structural models used to examine comparability of job domains and their competencies across jobs (J. Hogan, Davies, & R. Hogan, 2007).

Although the CET remains a useful and integral part of Hogan’s job analysis process, an increasing amount of work based on client’s competency models lead to a critical review of the most recent 56-item version of the CET. We concluded that three areas needed to be addressed. First, some competency definitions required revision because they (a) included multiple concepts, (b) overlapped significantly with other competencies, and/or (c) were unclear. Second, some competencies that companies commonly included in their models were missing from the 56-item version of the CET. Third, there was no underlying structure to the model. As outlined in section 2.2, we incorporated the Domain Model of performance (Hogan & Warrenfeltz, 2003; Warrenfeltz, 1995) into the HCM as the main structure of the taxonomy.

2.2 Domain Model

Researchers can use the Domain Model to effectively classify existing competencies into a comprehensive and meaningful performance model (Hogan & Warrenfeltz, 2003; Warrenfeltz, 1995), leading to easier interpretations of and comparisons across models. The Domain Model contains four domains:

- **Intrapersonal Skills** - Intrapersonal skills develop early in childhood and have important consequences for career development in adulthood. Core components include core-self esteem, resiliency, and self-control. Intrapersonal skills form the foundation on which careers develop.

- **Interpersonal Skills** - Interpersonal skills concern building and sustaining relationships. Interpersonal skills can be described in terms of three components: (a) an ability to put oneself in the position of another person, (b) an ability to accurately perceive and anticipate other’s expectations, and (c) an ability to incorporate information about the other person’s expectations into subsequent behavior.

- **Technical Skills (work skills)** - Technical skills differ from Intrapersonal and Interpersonal skills in that they are (a) the last to develop, (b) the easiest to teach, (c) the most cognitive, and (d) the least dependent upon dealing with other people. Technical skills involve...
comparing, compiling, innovating, computing, analyzing, coordinating, synthesizing, and so on.

- Leadership Skills - Leadership skills can be understood in terms of five components that depend upon intrapersonal, interpersonal, and technical skills. First, leadership skills entail an ability to recruit talented people to join the team. Second, one must be able to retain talent once it has been recruited. Third, one must be able to motivate a team. Fourth, effective leaders are able to develop and promote a vision for the team. Finally, leadership skill involves being persistent and hard to discourage.

R. Hogan and Warrenfeltz (2003) suggest that the four domains form a natural, overlapping developmental sequence, with the latter skills (e.g., Leadership Skills) depending on the appropriate development of the earlier skills (e.g., Intrapersonal Skills). Each of the performance domains can be further decomposed into various performance dimensions or competencies. Table 2.1 outlines the complete domain model, illustrating the links between common competencies associated with each domain and Five Factor Model (FFM) personality measures. Each competency in the HCM falls under one of the four domains.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metaconcept</th>
<th>Domain</th>
<th>Example Competency</th>
<th>FFM Measurement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>Achievement</td>
<td>Surgency/Extraversion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Building Teams</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Business Acumen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Decision Making</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Delegation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Employee Development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Initiative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Managing Performance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Resource Management</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getting Ahead</td>
<td>Technical</td>
<td>Analysis</td>
<td>Openness to Experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Creating Knowledge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Decision Making</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Political Awareness</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Presentation Skills</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Problem Solving</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Safety</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Technical Skill</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Training Performance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Written Communication</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interpersonal</td>
<td>Building Relationships</td>
<td>Agreeableness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>Surgency/Extraversion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Consultative Skills</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cooperating</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Influence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Interpersonal Skill</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Organizational Citizenship</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Service Orientation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Teamwork</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Trustworthiness</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getting Along</td>
<td>Intrapersonal</td>
<td>Dependability</td>
<td>Conscientiousness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Detail Orientation</td>
<td>Emotional Stability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Flexibility</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Following Procedures</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Integrity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Respect</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Risk Taking</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Stress Tolerance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Work Attitude</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.3 Creating the HCM

HRD designed the HCM to align with other well known competency models and personality measures. The development of the HCM included five steps. First, we reviewed the competency definitions in the 56-item version of the CET, flagging competencies that measured multiple constructs or overlapped with other competencies. Next, we reviewed 21 academic, commercial, and government competency models and compared them to the CET (see Appendix A for a list of the models). Three HRD researchers independently mapped the original 56 competencies to each comparison model. Based on all available information from the first two steps, we eliminated redundant competencies, clarified definitions, and added frequently occurring and missing competencies. Fourth, we obtained feedback from non-Industrial/Organizational (I/O) professionals on the revised list of competencies. Finally, four HRD researchers again independently mapped the revised competency model to each of the 21 comparison models. The resulting model included 58 competencies in addition to the 4 domains. The following sections further delineate these steps.

2.3.1 Competency Definitions

We began by examining the competencies and definitions on the 56-item version of the CET. First, HRD identified overlapping competencies by examining competency definitions and correlating CET ratings obtained on a sample of over 500 jobs. Results indicated that several competencies overlapped both conceptually and statistically. For example, Trustworthiness and Integrity overlapped significantly, as did Adaptability and Flexibility. Furthermore, other models often treated these and other pairings as one competency.

Next, we reviewed competency definitions. We flagged competency definitions that (a) included the competency name in the definition, (b) contained multiple concepts, (c) overlapped with other competencies, or (d) were generally unclear. For example, Innovation was defined as “finding innovative solutions...,” and the definition of Planning/Organizing addressed multiple concepts (resource management and time management) but not aspects of organization typically addressed by similar competencies in other models.

2.3.2 Competitor and Academic Competency Models

Next, we reviewed 21 independent competency models and compared the CET to the identified models. These models came from academic, commercial, and government sources. We identified competency models using three strategies. First, we conducted a literature search for publications outlining relevant competency models (e.g. Tett, Guterman, Bleir, & Murphy, 2000). Next, we contacted partner organizations, including clients and distributors, and asked for their competency models. Finally, we contacted companies and competitors with well advertised or commonly used models (e.g. SHL, Bartram, 2005). We only reviewed complete models containing complete competency definitions. Our final sample consisted of six commercial models, twelve academic models, and three from government agencies. Appendix A presents a complete list of the models.
2.3.3 Competency Mapping

Competency mapping consisted of three phases.

Phase 1: I/O Professionals. Three HRD researchers independently mapped the CET to each competency in the 21 comparison models. Raters indicated if the competencies in the other models mapped directly to a Hogan competency, more than one Hogan competency, or none. In addition, each rater maintained a list of frequently occurring competencies that mapped poorly to Hogan competencies or were not included in the Hogan model. We aggregated the results and the raters met to resolve conflicts and reach a final consensus. Based on these final results and our previous review of competency definitions (section 2.3.1), we eliminated redundant competencies, clarified definitions, and added missing competencies.

Phase 2: Non I/O Professionals. To better represent individuals who will use the model in the future, we asked four non-I/O professionals to provide feedback on the revised list of competencies. Our goal was to ensure that all competencies were easy for the target population to understand and use. We obtained feedback from non-I/O professionals with extensive business experience and expertise in different areas (IT, Finance, Sales, and Operations). First, each individual independently mapped each competency into the Domain Model, noting if each competency fell under one primary domain and potentially a secondary domain. Second, they provided recommendations for the content and phrasing of the competency names and definitions. The raters successfully placed forty-three of the competencies into the same domain, indicating high rater agreement. Furthermore, no rater noted any problems with the competency model names and definitions, indicating that the model is intuitive and not overly laden with I/O jargon.

Phase 3: Re-mapping: I/O Professionals. Finally, four HRD researchers again independently mapped the revised competency model to each of the 21 comparison models and met to reach a final consensus. The number of competencies that mapped to the comparison models greatly increased from phase 1. However, we found a few definitions that needed further revision and identified four additional competencies for inclusion. For example, because 7 of the 21 comparison models contained Valuing Diversity, we added it to the Hogan model. The resulting competency model includes 58 competencies plus names and definitions for the 4 components of the Domain Model. Appendix B presents the resulting HCM.

After finalizing the model, we calculated the frequency of use for each competency across all 21 comparison competency models. Appendix C presents these results. Overall, each Hogan competency averaged 7 mappings. We mapped each model to the Hogan model a minimum of three times. This represents over 12,480 individual comparisons of the Hogan model to the comparison models. This finding provides further support for the comprehensiveness of the Hogan model. Also, we calculated the domain use frequency. Interpersonal, Leadership, and Technical skills contain a similar number of competencies, whereas Intrapersonal skill is the most frequently used domain.
3 – USING THE HOGAN COMPETENCY MODEL

3.1 Job Analysis

The JET contains five sections. The first four align with Hogan inventories (the HPI, HDS, MVPI, and HBRI); the fifth is the Competency Evaluation Tool (CET). The CET asks SMEs to indicate the degree to which each of the listed competencies relates to successful performance in the job or job family under study. Raters evaluate each competency using a five-point scale ranging from “0” (Not associated with job performance) to “4” (Critical to job performance). Critical competencies must receive an average score of at least “3” (Important to performance). These ratings serve a number of purposes, such as identifying competencies to use in synthetic validation for the HPI and HDS, showing similarities across roles in job comparison studies, determining the importance of an organization’s existing competency model components, or serving as the foundation for creating a new competency model to represent and drive performance for a job or job family.

3.2 Competency Mapping Studies

As more companies use competency models for a variety of purposes, the need to align personality instruments with customized competency models continues to grow. Although competency models invariably differ across organizations, similarities often exist. HRD developed the HCM to capture these similarities by continually reviewing a wide range of existing competency models throughout the development process. As a result, HRD can easily map HCM competencies to the vast majority of competencies presented in other models.

During the mapping process, Hogan SMEs, consisting of expert Ph.D. and Masters-level practitioners, evaluate both competency models and indicate which HCM competencies align with each of the client’s competencies. Often, client competencies are broad and align with multiple HCM competencies. When that is the case, HRD can combine HCM competencies to adequately align with the client’s model. During the mapping process, HRD resolves disagreements among SMEs through a group decision-making task where they discuss the disagreement(s) and come to a consensus as to which HCM competency best aligns with the corresponding client competency.

Competency mapping studies serve a number of purposes, such as identifying personality scales that are predictive of performance for a job or aligning CET results to verify that competencies in a client’s existing model are important for performance. Competency mapping studies may also be the first step in more comprehensive studies, such as those described in sections 3.3, 3.4, and 3.5. By first aligning HCM competencies with competencies in a client’s model, HRD can more effectively use JET data and data in the Hogan archive to answer critical research questions.

3.3 Criterion-Related Research

Aguinis, Henle, and Ostroff (2001) described criterion-related validity in terms of the relationship between the predictor (e.g., HPI Scales) and some criterion measure (e.g., job performance), with the goal of answering the basic question: how accurate are test scores in predicting criterion performance? Criterion-related validity not only provides the most direct evidence of relationships between predictor scores and job performance, but serves as the foundation for VG studies and the development of off-the-shelf selection solutions. As such, researchers have conducted criterion-
related validation studies using Hogan assessments on over 250 jobs and job families over the last 30 years. The Hogan archive contains data and results from these studies, which cover a range of industries, organizations, and jobs.

The Uniform Guidelines state that “evidence of the validity of a test or other selection procedure by a criterion-related validity study should consist of empirical data demonstrating that the selection procedure is predictive of or significantly correlated with important elements of job performance” (29 C.F.R. §§ 1607.5 (B)). Ratings gathered from performance rating forms serve as the most commonly used and often most informative source of criterion data. HRD frequently uses CET results to inform the creation of performance rating forms for criterion-related validation studies. Specifically, we use CET ratings to identify the 10-15 most important competencies for a job or job family. Then, HRD writes performance-related items for each competency, assuring that performance ratings gathered from criterion-related validation are both comprehensive and job relevant.

3.4 Synthetic Validity/Job Component Validity

Mossholder and Arvey (1984) defined synthetic validity as “the logical process of inferring test-battery validity from predetermined validities of the tests for basic work components” (p. 323). If we know the key components of a job, we can review prior criterion-related studies predicting those components. We then “synthesize” the valid predictors of the key job components into an assessment battery for the new job (Balma, 1959; Lawshe, 1952). Brannick and Levine (2002) point out that synthetic validity allows us to build validity evidence from small samples with common job components. Although not popular at its inception, published research on synthetic validity has become increasing more common (e.g., Hoffman, Holden, & Gale, 2000; Jeanneret & Strong, 2003; Johnson, Carter, Davison, & Oliver, 2001; McCloy, 1994, 2001; Scherbaum, 2005).

J. Hogan, Davies, and R. Hogan (2007) outline the process Hogan uses for synthetic validity. Synthetic validation involves (a) identifying the important components of a job or jobs comprising a job family, (b) reviewing prior research on the prediction of each component, and (c) aggregating correlations across multiple studies for each component to form a test battery (Scherbaum, 2005). Because the concept of synthetic validity has evolved over 50 years, Hogan uses interchangeably the terms criteria, performance dimensions, job components, work components, competencies, and domains of work. Thus, the competencies in the HCM serve as job components and provide a structure for coding data in the Hogan archive.

The first step in synthetic validation is conducting a job analysis where SMEs identify the important components of a job. Using data in the Hogan archive, HRD developed and maintains a synthetic validity table that shows relationships between assessment results and each HCM competency. These results represent relationships between predictor scores and competency performance across organizations, industries and jobs. The most recent update to this table occurred during the summer and fall of 2009 when HRD mapped performance results from thousands of criteria measures collected from over 260 jobs onto the HCM competencies. HRD then conducted a series of meta-analyses (see Hunter & Schmidt, 2004) to combine results across studies. These meta-analyses provide stable estimates of the relationships between results on both the HPI and HDS and job performance ratings aligned with the HCM competencies.
3.5 Competency-Based Reports

Hogan generates two types of competency-based reports. First, client-specific reports present results in terms of predictive scores on client competency models. HRD uses competency mapping and both local criterion-related research and archival data to create predictor scales from HPI, HDS, and MVPI results. Second, off-the-shelf competency-based reports, such as the Safety report and the High Potential report, present predictor scores on competency models that are specific to areas of performance but generalize across jobs. For example, safety is an important component of many jobs. Hogan developed a Safety Competency model containing six dimensions that represent different components of safe behavior. HRD then used archival data to create predictor scales for each dimension from HPI results.

3.6 Conclusions

Competency models have several advantages. First, when coupled with job analysis, the use of competencies ensures that organizations focus on job relevant behaviors. This both increases the predictive accuracy of a selection system and minimizes legal risk. Second, competency-based reports present personality assessment results using language that is familiar to the client. Third, they allow organizations to streamline their selection process by focusing on competencies that (a) are often assessed using other selection instruments, thereby increasing the predictive accuracy of the overall selection system by assessing competencies through multiple methods; and (b) are important for a number of jobs, thereby allowing the organization to determine an applicant’s fit with multiple jobs at once. Finally, they allow organizations to streamline interventions with existing employees, such as development/training efforts and performance assessment across departments and functions.

The HCM represents a significant improvement in Hogan’s ability to provide clients with effective and easy to use competency based solutions. These solutions allow clients to align personality assessment results with other organizational interventions aimed at hiring successful employees and developing existing employees. HRD developed the HCM using a unique and elaborate process to ensure that the model (a) comprehensively covers the majority of behaviors required for success across organizations, industries, and jobs; (b) easily maps onto the majority of competencies in existing models; and (c) can be used to produce results that are both easy to use and understand.
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### Appendix A: Academic and Company Competency Models

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Model Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Model</td>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Model Type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Select International</td>
<td>Internal Company Source</td>
<td>Commercial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career One Stop (U.S. Department of Labor-sponsored Web site)</td>
<td><a href="http://www.careeronestop.org">www.careeronestop.org</a></td>
<td>Governmental</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O*NET</td>
<td><a href="http://www.onetcenter.org">www.onetcenter.org</a></td>
<td>Governmental</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of Personnel Management</td>
<td><a href="http://www.opm.com">www.opm.com</a></td>
<td>Governmental</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix B: Hogan Competency Model (2009)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competency Number</th>
<th>Competency</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Domain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Achievement Orientation</td>
<td>Driven to accomplish goals and complete tasks</td>
<td>Intrapersonal Skill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Active Listening</td>
<td>Listens and restates the ideas and opinions of others to improve mutual understanding</td>
<td>Interpersonal Skill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Ambiguity Tolerance</td>
<td>Deals comfortably with unclear situations and problems</td>
<td>Intrapersonal Skill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Building Relationships</td>
<td>Develops collaborative relationships to facilitate current or future goals</td>
<td>Interpersonal Skill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Building Teams</td>
<td>Assembles cohesive groups based upon required skills, goals, and tasks</td>
<td>Leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Business Acumen</td>
<td>Demonstrates keen insight and application of business policies and procedures</td>
<td>Leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Caring</td>
<td>Displays sensitivity towards the attitudes, feelings, or circumstances of others</td>
<td>Intrapersonal Skill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Citizenship</td>
<td>Goes beyond job requirements to help the organization</td>
<td>Interpersonal Skill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Competitive</td>
<td>Driven to exceed the performance of others</td>
<td>Intrapersonal Skill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Decision Making</td>
<td>Uses sound judgment to make timely and effective decisions</td>
<td>Leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Delegation</td>
<td>Assigns work based on task and skill requirements</td>
<td>Leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Dependability</td>
<td>Performs work in a consistent and timely manner</td>
<td>Intrapersonal Skill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Detail Orientation</td>
<td>Performs work with care, accuracy, and attention to detail</td>
<td>Intrapersonal Skill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Employee Development</td>
<td>Provides support, coaching, training, and career direction to peers and subordinates</td>
<td>Leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Financial Acumen</td>
<td>Demonstrates keen insight and application of budgeting, financial policies and procedures</td>
<td>Work Skill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Flexibility</td>
<td>Willing to receive and accept new ideas, approaches, and strategies</td>
<td>Intrapersonal Skill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Following Procedures</td>
<td>Adheres to directions, policies, and/or legal guidelines</td>
<td>Intrapersonal Skill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Goal Setting</td>
<td>Identifies short-term objectives and steps to achieve them</td>
<td>Work Skill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Industry Knowledge</td>
<td>Demonstrates an understanding of industry knowledge and trends</td>
<td>Work Skill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Influence</td>
<td>Persuades others to a desired result</td>
<td>Interpersonal Skill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Information Analysis</td>
<td>Gathers, organizes, and analyzes diverse sources of information</td>
<td>Work Skill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Initiative</td>
<td>Takes action without the direction of others</td>
<td>Intrapersonal Skill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Innovation</td>
<td>Generates creative ideas and perspectives</td>
<td>Work Skill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competency Number</td>
<td>Competency</td>
<td>Definition</td>
<td>Domain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Managing Change</td>
<td>Effectively implements new methods and systems</td>
<td>Leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Managing Conflict</td>
<td>Manages hostility between individuals or groups when disagreements occur</td>
<td>Leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Managing Performance</td>
<td>Monitors performance providing feedback for improvement as needed</td>
<td>Leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Motivating Others</td>
<td>Fosters energy for and provides direction towards organizational goals</td>
<td>Leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Negotiation</td>
<td>Explores alternatives to reach outcomes acceptable to all parties</td>
<td>Interpersonal Skill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Oral Communication</td>
<td>Expresses himself/herself effectively through verbal communication</td>
<td>Interpersonal Skill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Organizational Commitment</td>
<td>Demonstrates loyalty and dedication to the organization</td>
<td>Interpersonal Skill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Perseverance</td>
<td>Pursues goals despite obstacles and/or challenges</td>
<td>Intrapersonal Skill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Planning/Organizing</td>
<td>Coordinates and directs routine activities effectively</td>
<td>Intrapersonal Skill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Political Awareness</td>
<td>Recognizes and works within the political environment of an organization</td>
<td>Work Skill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Presentation Skills</td>
<td>Effectively presents ideas and information to others</td>
<td>Work Skill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Problem Identification</td>
<td>Detects errors, gaps, and potential flaws in goals and tasks</td>
<td>Work Skill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Problem Solving</td>
<td>Identifies solutions given available information</td>
<td>Work Skill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Professionalism</td>
<td>Acts in accordance with job-related values, principles, and standards</td>
<td>Intrapersonal Skill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Quality Orientation</td>
<td>Emphasizes producing quality products and/or meeting quality standards</td>
<td>Work Skill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Resource Management</td>
<td>Coordinates people and materials to maximize productivity and efficiency</td>
<td>Leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td>Accepts personal accountability for actions regardless of outcomes</td>
<td>Intrapersonal Skill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Risk Management</td>
<td>Takes appropriate chances to achieve goals while considering possible negative consequences</td>
<td>Intrapersonal Skill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Safety</td>
<td>Follows safety precautions and displays safe on-the-job behavior</td>
<td>Work Skill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Sales Ability</td>
<td>Effectively demonstrates, promotes, and sells products and services</td>
<td>Work Skill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Self Confidence</td>
<td>Believes in oneself to accomplish tasks/goals</td>
<td>Intrapersonal Skill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Self Development</td>
<td>Actively acquires knowledge, skills, and abilities to remain current with job requirements</td>
<td>Intrapersonal Skill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Service Orientation</td>
<td>Creates customer loyalty through courteous, timely, and helpful service</td>
<td>Interpersonal Skill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Social Engagement</td>
<td>Enjoys and seeks out interactions with others</td>
<td>Interpersonal Skill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Strategic Planning</td>
<td>Develops strategies to accomplish long-term goals</td>
<td>Leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Stress Tolerance</td>
<td>Handles pressure without getting upset, moody, or anxious</td>
<td>Intrapersonal Skill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competency Number</td>
<td>Competency</td>
<td>Definition</td>
<td>Domain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Talent Management</td>
<td>Recruits, rewards, and retains individuals with critical skills and abilities</td>
<td>Leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Teamwork</td>
<td>Collaborates with others to achieve goals</td>
<td>Interpersonal Skill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>Time Management</td>
<td>Plans work to maximize efficiency and minimize downtime</td>
<td>Intrapersonal Skill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Trustworthiness</td>
<td>Acts with honesty and integrity</td>
<td>Intrapersonal Skill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>Valuing Diversity</td>
<td>Respects, values, and leverages individual differences</td>
<td>Interpersonal Skill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>Vigilance</td>
<td>Remains alert and focused when performing monotonous tasks</td>
<td>Intrapersonal Skill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>Work Attitude</td>
<td>Displays a positive disposition towards work</td>
<td>Intrapersonal Skill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>Work Ethic</td>
<td>Exhibits hard work and diligence</td>
<td>Intrapersonal Skill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>Written Communication</td>
<td>Effectively expresses him or herself through written communication</td>
<td>Work Skill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>Interpersonal Skills</td>
<td>Gets along well with others, is tactful, and behaves appropriately in social situations</td>
<td>Work Skill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>Intrapersonal Skills</td>
<td>Demonstrates the appropriate motivation, attitude, and self-control to effectively perform on the job</td>
<td>Work Skill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>Demonstrates general leadership ability and effectiveness</td>
<td>Leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>Work Skills</td>
<td>Uses existing technology and job-relevant abilities to perform tasks</td>
<td>Work Skill</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix C

### C.1 Frequency of Competency Mapping

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competency</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Achievement Orientation</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>1.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active Listening</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>2.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambiguity Tolerance</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>2.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Relationships</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>3.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Teams</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>3.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Acumen</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>4.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caring</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>4.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizenship</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>4.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competitive</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>5.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision Making</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>6.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delegation</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>7.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependability</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>7.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detail Orientation</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>8.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Development</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>10.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Acumen</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>11.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexibility</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>12.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Following Procedures</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>13.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal Setting</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>14.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industry Knowledge</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>14.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Influence</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>15.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Analysis</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>16.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiative</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>17.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovation</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>18.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing Change</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>19.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing Conflict</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>20.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing Performance</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>22.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivating Others</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>23.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negotiation</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>24.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral Communication</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>24.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Commitment</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>25.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perseverance</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>25.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning/Organizing</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>27.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Awareness</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>28.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation Skills</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>28.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem Identification</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>28.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem Solving</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>30.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professionalism</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>31.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality Orientation</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>32.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competency</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Valid Percent</td>
<td>Cumulative Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource Management</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>33.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>34.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk Management</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>34.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>35.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales Ability</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>36.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self Confidence</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>36.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self Development</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>39.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Orientation</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>40.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Engagement</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>40.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Planning</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>42.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stress Tolerance</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>43.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talent Management</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>45.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teamwork</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>46.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time Management</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>47.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trustworthiness</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>48.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valuing Diversity</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>49.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vigilance</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>49.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Attitude</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>50.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Ethic</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>50.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written Communication</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>51.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Match</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>35.82</td>
<td>35.82</td>
<td>87.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple Match</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>12.02</td>
<td>12.02</td>
<td>99.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-consensus</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>832</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C.2 Frequency of Domain Mapping

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intrapersonal Skill</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>18.51</td>
<td>18.51</td>
<td>18.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal Skill</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>7.93</td>
<td>7.93</td>
<td>26.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>14.30</td>
<td>14.30</td>
<td>40.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Skill</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>11.18</td>
<td>11.18</td>
<td>51.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Match/Multiple</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>48.08</td>
<td>48.08</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>832</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>