

Construction and Validation
Report for the
Step One Survey IITM

Profiles International, Inc.

Profiles Office Park
5205 Lake Shore Drive
Waco, Texas 76710-1732
254.751.1644
www.profilesinternational.com
Copyright © 2004

TABLE OF CONTENTS

DEVELOPING THE STEP ONE SURVEY.....	3
THE BACKGROUND OF HONESTY TESTING.....	3
OVERT INTEGRITY TESTS.....	3
PERSONALITY-BASED MEASURES	3
VALIDITY ISSUES.....	4
RELIABILITY ISSUES	4
ADVERSE IMPACT ISSUES	4
CONCEPTUAL CONCERNS	4
THE STEP ONE SURVEY	5
THE STUDY	5
STUDY RESULTS.....	6
DESIGN OF THE SOS	6
Section I of the original SOS Test Booklet	7
Section II of the original SOS Test Booklet.....	7
Distortion Scale of the original SOS	8
The Step One Survey II	8
DISCUSSION.....	8
References	9
NORMING AND VALIDATION STUDIES FOR THE STEP ONE SURVEY II	10
INTRODUCTION	10
DESCRIPTION OF STATISTICAL METHODOLOGY.....	10
STATISTICAL RESULTS: SOS II	11
TABLE I: Description of Norming (Employee) Sample.....	11
TABLE II: Description of Comparative (Parolee) Sample	11
TABLE III: Scale Reliabilities	12
VALIDITY STUDIES.....	12
TABLES IV-VII: Construct Validity Studies	12
TABLE VIII: Gender.....	13
TABLE IX: Ethnicity	14
TABLE X: Age Groups.....	15
THE DISTORTION SCALE SCORE.....	15
SUMMARY.....	16
Using the STEP ONE SURVEY II.....	16
TABLE XI - Step One Survey II Quick Reference Guide	17

DEVELOPING THE STEP ONE SURVEY

THE BACKGROUND OF HONESTY TESTING

Honesty testing, a multimillion-dollar industry (Tompson, 1981), is designed to curb employee theft, which has been reported to cost organizations as much as \$9 per employee each day. Originally, these types of instruments were developed as an alternative to the polygraph, the use of which was limited by the Employee Polygraph Protection Act signed into law on June 29, 1988.

Honesty tests have undergone much evolution over the years, with psychological testing practices becoming the focus of new test development. The Step One Survey II™ (SOS II) is the latest test developed that measures constructs demonstrated to relate to reliable and honest behavior as well as attitudes associated with acceptable work ethics.

The Step One Survey II™ is a two-part survey, designed for pre-employment selection. Part One consists of direct admission questions. These are essential inquiries that could be asked during an interview, but which some interviewers might be uncomfortable asking. Part Two surveys attitudes toward integrity, drug use, reliability and work ethics. But before we can cover the details related to the SOS II in Part Two of this Technical Manual, a further discussion of integrity testing in general would prove useful.

Historically speaking, honesty tests fall into two distinct groups. Sackett et al. (1989) labeled these types as overt integrity tests and personality-based measures.

OVERT INTEGRITY TESTS

Overt integrity tests, as a group, mix admission and theft-type items targeted to reveal unacceptable attitudes toward employee theft and similar forms of dishonesty in the workplace. With only a few exceptions, there is no attempt to disguise the purpose of the test. Most include a lie scale to detect faking good. These tests were developed as an alternative to the polygraph examination.

PERSONALITY-BASED MEASURES

Personality-based measures usually use standard personality test items first published as scales on the CPI, MMPI, or 16PF mixed with theft items used on overt integrity tests. The rationale is to soften the honesty items and thus disguise them. In general, the composition of the personality-based test items provides information on performance, tenure, reliability, interpersonal cooperation and drug avoidance. Some purport to reveal hostility toward authority, thrill seeking attitudes, conscientiousness, confusion due to vocational identity, social insensitivity, non-conformance, irresponsibility, self-restraint and acceptance of convention. They all include a distortion-type scale to detect faking good.

VALIDITY ISSUES

Sackett and Harris (1984) reviewed 41 validation studies and grouped the different validation strategies used into five categories: polygraph comparisons, future behavior (predictive validity), theft admissions, shrinkage reduction and comparisons of contrasted groups. Results of the five studies, cited in Sackett and Harris (1984) and Sackett et al. (1989), indicated that honesty tests significantly differentiate between honest and dishonest people. When honesty testing is used prior to employment, employers are attempting to detect potentially dishonest employees. Therefore, honesty tests should be administered to job applicants only as part of the *selection* process and the Step One Survey II must never be used with people who are currently employed by your organization. As with all test reviews, the specific results of validity analyses must be applied to the test being considered by the consumer. See page 12 of this manual to review the results of our analysis of the SOS II.

RELIABILITY ISSUES

Quality honesty tests must be reliable. Their high reliability coefficients compare very well with reliability of other tests in the ability domain (Gatewood & Field, 1987). As with all test reviews, the specific results of reliability analyses must be applied to the test being considered by the consumer. See page 12 of this manual to review the results of our analysis of the SOS II.

ADVERSE IMPACT ISSUES

Adverse impact studies, reviewed by Sackett and Harris (1984) and Sackett et al. (1989), reported no discrimination against protected groups in their samples. In fact, some studies reported results in favor of females and African-Americans. Only age had a significant impact on test performance in their studies. Generally speaking, applicants in their teens or early twenties were more likely to score poorly on honesty tests. As with all test reviews, the specific results of adverse impact analyses must be applied to the test being considered by the consumer. See page 13 of this manual to review the results of our analysis of the SOS II.

CONCEPTUAL CONCERNS

Comparisons with polygrapher judgments should be dismissed out-of-hand (Sackett et al., 1984). A criterion in which results are so flawed as to be outlawed by the federal government for pre-employment use cannot serve as a meaningful basis for validation of any instrument. In other words, it is not appropriate to compare an honesty test like the SOS II, or any psychometrically-based test, with polygraph tests, if only because the polygraph is not considered a valid measure of honesty for selection processes in the business setting.

Predicting how human beings will act in the future is a difficult task. No one can be sure what or why another person thinks in certain patterns. Past behavior may predict future behavior, but the relationship is by no means perfect, nor should one expect it to be. It is only a clue for determining how an individual will act and react on the job. This is the reason that employers check past employer recommendations, run background checks and contact personal references before making a hiring decision. It is assumed by the employer that if complimentary reports are received from these sources, the same type of behavior(s) will take place on the job if and when the individual is hired by the company. The honesty test is therefore an integral *part* of the selection process, providing additional information from the applicant himself that may help in determining whether the motivations and opinions stated reflect a quality of character that has been proven to relate to the attitudes of fairness, respect and responsibility.

THE STEP ONE SURVEY

To understand the Step One Survey II, one must investigate its roots in the original Step One Survey. The objective of the original SOS (released in 1996) was to add another dimension to the investigative phase of the hiring process with information as to an applicant's attitudes in the areas of *integrity, substance abuse, reliability* and *work ethic*. These constructs may be defined as "ways of thinking on the part of the applicant that cannot be directly or practically observed by the interviewer." Just as with employer recommendations, background checks and personal references, the only criterion available is past behavior(s).

The challenge in developing the SOS was to identify individuals whose past behavior(s) in the targeted areas were deemed unacceptable by their employers and society in general. Many other studies have used incarcerated convicts as a standard (Sackett et. al., 1984). The reported flaw in this methodology is that those incarcerated with no chance for release would not take the exercise seriously. Those close to release may try to fake good to enhance their chances for parole.

THE STUDY

The designers of the Step One Survey chose the methodology of *Contrasting Groups* for the validity study. Parolees formulated the group to represent past behaviors unacceptable in society and the workplace. This controlled for the long-term convict and, since participants had already been paroled, it also controlled for those who may try to fake good to get released from prison.

To represent past behaviors acceptable by society and the workplace, a population of employees rated as "ideal" by their supervisors were chosen. Participants had to have been on the job for at least one year and rated as superior in the four targeted areas (*integrity, substance abuse, reliability* and *work ethic*).

A questionnaire was created containing items with high content and face validity to be administered to the two populations. It was determined that since past studies using items

originally appearing on the CPI, MMPI and 16PF resulted in lower reliability scores such items would not be used in this study. Instead, items were designed asking the opinions of the participants about different issues pertinent to the targeted areas. A distortion scale was also added to help detect answering in such a way as to over-represent one's capability for "model" behavior.

Arrangements were made with the Texas Department of Corrections to administer the new instrument to over 200 convicted criminals as they were released from prison. Age, race, sex and offense information was gathered for EEOC purposes. Their offenses grouped generally as 50% theft, 35% substance abuse, 5% other (kidnapping, murder, weapons offenses, etc.) and 10% unknown. At the same time, arrangements were made to administer the exact same instrument to current employees of a major retailer. This population comprised over 400 employees.

As with the parolee sample, age, race and sex information for the current employee sample was gathered for EEOC purposes. Once all instruments from both populations were received, the data were forwarded to Dr. Earl McCallon and Dr. Randy Schumacker at the University of North Texas. They were instructed to complete a Construct and Concurrent Validation Study in tandem with Reliability, Adverse Impact and Standardization Studies.

STUDY RESULTS

As previously stated, personality-based honesty tests are broader in focus (Sackett et al., 1989) and report less reliable internal consistency coefficients, while overt honesty tests such as Stanton, Reid Report, Personnel Selection Inventory, Wilkerson Audit, Phase II and others result in consistently high internal consistency reliability. The Step One Survey internal consistency reliability estimates calculated for each scale ranged from .84 to .87, comparable to overt honesty tests.

The Step One Survey also successfully differentiated between the two groups. Using a nine-point, or *stanine*, scale in which a score of 1 is low and a score of 9 is high, over half of the parolees scored 1 on the **Integrity** scale. On the other three scales, 40% of parolees scored 3 or less.

DESIGN OF THE SOS II

To accomplish the purposes of the Step One Survey II, it was decided to divide the instrument into two sections. The first section has 54 items and inquires about information on self-reported behaviors and admissions, while the second section of 78 items focuses upon behaviorally based attitudes. Together they combine self-admission questions, interview questions, personality-based questions and distortion questions. Because the sections compliment each other, it is important for the user to consider the results from both sections in the decision-making process.

SECTION I OF THE SOS II TEST BOOKLET

One of the most useful groups of items included in overt honesty tests are those that ask for the applicant to self-report on past behaviors. These are referred to as admissions questions. A second concept included on many personality-based honesty tests is the use of interview questions. Since the purpose of the Step One Survey II is to help the interviewer in the investigative hiring process, a decision was made to mix these two types of questions into a separate section to precede the psychometric items. Identified as Section I, it consists of 54 items appearing on the final instrument.

Examples:

SOS II Question: How long were you employed in your most recent or current job?

- A. 0 - 2 months
- B. 3 - 6 months
- C. 7 - 12 months
- D. 1-2 years
- E. 3-5 years
- F. Longer than 5 years

SOS II Question: Have you ever filed a medical claim even though you were not sick or injured?

- A. Once
- B. More than one time
- C. No
- D. I'm not sure

Since the purpose of the Step One Survey II is to furnish the interviewer with more information in order to make a better quality decision, the report offers suggested verbal interview questions based on the answers to the items in Section I.

SECTION II OF THE SOS II TEST BOOKLET

Section II contains 78 items. It measures behaviorally based attitudes concerning Integrity, Substance Abuse, Reliability and Work Ethic.

Examples of these attitude-measuring items include:

- A. There are many things about people that really annoy me.
- B. It would bother me to stretch the truth a little.
- C. It doesn't hurt to steal company property if the company has lots of money.
- D. It is okay to use illegal drugs on the job as long as it doesn't cause safety problems.

Applicants taking the test would mark their agreement or disagreement for each item, the accumulation of which generates raw scores for analysis by the test engine to be converted into final scores.

DISTORTION SCALE OF THE SOS II

Because the final instrument was designed to be used with job applicants, it was important to include some way to determine if the applicant was revealing his or her true feelings and not what he or she considered to be the “correct” answer. Therefore, a scale labeled Distortion was incorporated throughout the instrument.

If the applicant responds positively to a majority of items on this scale, the accumulated results could be considered an indication of the applicant’s intention to demonstrate an impression of a virtuous (and by implication, idealistic) demeanor. This impression is often referred to as “looking good,” which implies an effort on the applicant’s part to express a “perfect” image on the test.

The distortion scale was designed to detect potential untruths in the applicant’s responses on Section II of the survey. If the score obtained on this scale suggests a distortion problem, the user is asked to weigh carefully the accuracy of the applicant’s responses.

THE STEP ONE SURVEY II REVISIONS

The Step One Survey II, while composed of a new list of test questions, follows the same format of direct admissions, distortion and attitude-based items as the previous version of the test. The revision of the test items adheres to the same priorities for reliability, validity and content. The decisions that lead to the development of the original SOS correspond with the priorities involved in the development of the Step One Survey II and shall be referred to often in Part Two of this Construction and Validation Report.

Before that begins, however, a few more discussion points have been addressed that apply to both the original and the Step One Survey II.

DISCUSSION

There may be a question as to why parolees were used as one of the contrasting groups because they are a subgroup that may not actually represent applicants seen by employers. Another question might be that all the Step One Survey does is segregate and isolate this subgroup from “normal” applicants, not discerning who will steal from the employer if hired. Some thoughts on these questions follow:

Parolees were chosen to represent a group of individuals whose past behavior(s) indicate patterns of thinking unacceptable by society or in the workplace, by virtue of their criminal records. Even those asking the questions would agree that in all probability there are numerous individuals in our society who have not been convicted or gone to prison even though they think in the same anti-social patterns. Unfortunately, there is no way to differentiate these applicants from those with so-called “normal” attitudes since the interviewer cannot tell which applicants think in these unacceptable patterns. Therefore, using a group known to have these types of attitudes establishes a needed baseline for comparison. Using the parolees’ group scores as a baseline does not keep an individual parolee who does not think in these

unacceptable patterns from obtaining a high score on any of the Step One Scales. We are dealing with trends of behavior here and the idea is to differentiate between the trends for two contrasting groups of test takers.

It was not the intended purpose of the Step One Survey to make an absolute judgment about applicants who will steal if hired by the user-company. No honesty-test instrument can make that claim. In fact, no one can be totally accurate about what another person will do in any given situation, because no one can tell what another person is truly feeling or thinking at any given time.

The purpose of the SOS II is to help the interviewer by furnishing valuable information as to how an applicant thinks in four targeted areas. Test results are only a part of the hiring decision. There are no cut-off scores, no pass-fail scores. The final decision, after reviewing test results, remains with the interviewer.

It is suggested that the user weigh test results as only one-third (33%) of the decision process. The balance is suggested to be evenly divided between history (resume, references, background checks, physicals, etc.) and interview results. This combination gives the user a balanced and comprehensive view of the applicant.

REFERENCES

- Gatewood, R. D., & Feild, H. S. (1987). **Human Resource Selection**. New York: The Dryden Press.
- Gorman, Christine (1989). "Honestly, can we trust you?" **Time**, p 44.
- McCallon, Earl, & Schumacker, Randall, (1996). **Construction and Validation of the Step One Survey**. Waco, Texas: Prepared for Profiles International, Inc.
- Sackett, P. R., Burris L. R., & Callahan, C. (1989). "Integrity testing for personnel selection: an update." **Personal Psychology**, **42**, 491-529.
- Sackett, P. R., & Harris, M. M. (1984). "Honesty testing for personnel selection: A review and critique." **Personal Psychology**, **37**, 221-245.
- Tompor, S. (1981). "More employers attempt to catch a thief." **The Wall Street Journal**, August 3, 1995.

NORMING AND VALIDATION STUDIES FOR THE STEP ONE SURVEY II

INTRODUCTION

This manual presents the results of statistical analysis for the **Step One Survey II** instrument. The studies described in this report are follow-up studies to a series of studies that determined the factorial structure of the SOS instrument and presented selected validity and impact analyses. New test items have been developed for this version of the SOS and therefore statistical analysis has been required to establish the reliability and validity of the new product. This project collected new data in the fall of 2003.

These data consisted of test results for two distinct samples:

- 354 currently employed individuals in the workforce (referred to as the norming group/sample in this study)
- and 38 recent prison parolees

The format of this study mirrors that of the study conducted in 1996 at the University of North Texas for the original SOS and seeks to achieve comparable results and provide similar implications. The current study sought to determine the best measurement items on the four scales underlying the attitudes portion of the SOS II instrument, calculate norms for our sample of currently employed individuals in the workforce and analyze the performance of the parolee groups on these norms. Since our alterations of the content of the items on these scales would be expected to impact the reliability and validity estimates of the scales established by earlier studies, new reliability coefficients have been calculated. New content validity studies have also been conducted. These results are presented in this manual.

This study was conducted using the strict standards and guidelines established in the industry for test development.

DESCRIPTION OF STATISTICAL METHODOLOGY

Once the statistical analyses had been performed, norms for the SOS II were calculated using our sample of currently employed individuals in the workforce. Raw scores were converted to stanine (standard nine-point) scores. The parolee group's results were then determined and compared to the norming (employee) sample. It was hypothesized that the relative performance of the parolee group would be lower than that of the norming (employee) group.

STATISTICAL RESULTS: SOS II

TABLE I: DESCRIPTION OF NORMING (EMPLOYEE) SAMPLE

COMPOSITION OF NORMING (EMPLOYEE) SAMPLE WITH REGARD TO AGE AND GENDER (N=354)

Variable/Category	N	Percent
Age (1 respondent non-reporting)		
15-24	11	3.1
25-34	48	13.6
35-44	72	20.3
45-54	110	31.7
55-64	92	26.0
65+	20	5.6
Gender (1 respondent non-reporting)		
Male	240	67.8
Female	113	31.9

TABLE II: DESCRIPTION OF COMPARATIVE (PAROLEE) SAMPLE

COMPOSITION OF NORMING (EMPLOYEE) SAMPLE WITH REGARD TO AGE, GENDER AND ETHNICITY (N=38)

Variable/Category	N	Percent
Age		
15-24	2	5.3
25-34	7	18.4
35-44	12	31.6
45-54	15	39.5
55-64	2	5.3
65+	0	0.0
Gender		
Male	30	78.9
Female	8	21.1
Ethnicity (1 respondent non-reporting)		
African American	27	71.1
Hispanic	3	7.9
White	4	10.5
Other	3	7.9

TABLE III: SCALE RELIABILITIES

TABLE III gives the performance data for the norming (employee) group on each scale and the internal consistency estimate (alpha coefficient) for each scale. It can be noted that these estimates ranged from .76 to .84. These norms determine the baseline by which our comparative sample (parolees) has been contrasted.

MEANS, STANDARD DEVIATIONS AND ALPHA RELIABILITY COEFFICIENTS (N=354)

Scale	No. Items	Mean	S.D.	Alpha Coefficient
Integrity	15	65.5	6.6	.83
Substance Abuse	15	69.1	6.0	.84
Reliability	19	74.7	7.1	.77
Work Ethic	21	80.1	8.0	.76

VALIDITY STUDIES

TABLES IV-VII: CONSTRUCT VALIDITY STUDIES

TABLE IV presents the results of comparing scores of our samples (employee and parolee; N=354) between the SOS and SOS II sets of test questions. It can be noted that on each scale, the samples' scores between tests showed no significant differences. *This demonstrates that the constructs represented by each test's set of items remain intact from one version to the next for both samples.* Correlations are significant at the .01 level.

		SOS 2
SOS	Pearson Correlation	.814
	Sig.	.000
	N	354

		SOS2
SOS	Pearson Correlation	.638
	Sig.	.000
	N	354

		SOS2
SOS	Pearson Correlation	.783
	Sig.	.000
	N	354

		SOS2
SOS	Pearson Correlation	.676
	Sig.	.000
	N	354

TABLE VIII: GENDER

TABLE VIII presents the results of comparing average scale scores for male and female subjects on each of the four scales. These analyses indicated no statistical difference in average scores between the two groups on any of the four scales.

ANOVA BY GENDER

SOS II	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Integrity					
Between Groups	2.386	1	2.386	.055	.815
Within Groups	15239.184	351	43.416		
Total	15241.569	352			
Reliability					
Between Groups	23.103	1	23.103	.462	.497
Within Groups	17570.438	351	50.058		
Total	17593.541	352			
Substance Abuse					
Between Groups	3.313	1	3.313	.091	.763
Within Groups	12731.429	351	36.272		
Total	12734.742	352			
Work Ethic					
Between Groups	8.341	1	8.341	.131	.717
Within Groups	22383.422	352	63.589		
Total	22391.763	353			

TABLE IX: ETHNICITY

TABLE IX presents an analysis of average scale score differences by three ethnic groups: African American, Hispanic, and White. These were the only ethnic groups with a sufficient number of subjects for statistical analysis purposes; no Asians were present among the sample group. The analyses indicated no statistically significant differences among the ethnic groups on the four SOS II scales.

ANOVA BY ETHNICITY

SOS II	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Integrity					
Between Groups	238.318	3	79.439	.709	.554
Within Groups	3699.574	33	112.108		
Total	3937.892	36			
Reliability					
Between Groups	516.315	3	172.105	1.686	.189
Within Groups	3369.428	33	102.104		
Total	3885.743	36			
Substance Abuse					
Between Groups	191.311	3	63.770	.597	.621
Within Groups	3524.000	33	106.788		
Total	3715.311	36			
Work Ethic					
Between Groups	912.316	3	304.105	2.342	.091
Within Groups	4285.157	33	129.853		
Total	5197.473	36			

TABLE X: AGE GROUPS

TABLE X presents the results of an analysis of average scale scores by the following age groups: 15 to 24 years of age, 25 to 34, 35 to 44, 45 to 54, 55 to 64 and 65+ years old. Mean score differences reflect no statistically significant differences between age groups. The table provided details our analysis.

ANOVA BY AGE GROUP

SOS II		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Integrity	Between Groups	273.334	4	68.333	.725	.579
	Within Groups	5658.528	60	94.309		
	Total	5931.862	64			
Reliability	Between Groups	299.334	4	74.833	.780	.543
	Within Groups	5759.028	60	95.984		
	Total	6058.362	64			
Substance Abuse	Between Groups	648.971	4	162.243	1.242	.303
	Within Groups	7839.014	60	130.650		
	Total	8487.985	64			
Work Ethic	Between Groups	904.931	4	226.233	1.120	.356
	Within Groups	12119.431	60	201.991		
	Total	13024.362	64			

* The mean difference is significant at the .05 level. (none found)

** The mean difference is significant at the .01 level. (none found)

No significant differences were found among age groups for any of the SOS II scales.

THE DISTORTION SCALE SCORE

The Distortion score refers to the **dependability of the results of this section, not the honesty of the individual**. A low score on this scale suggests that the results MAY have been distorted. It is possible that for some reason the applicant may have misrepresented their responses in the “look good” direction. This could possibly happen because of an attempt to portray a picture of how they would like to be seen, rather than an accurate picture of who they are. An unusual pattern of responses could also cause a low distortion score.

With a Distortion score of 6, 7, 8 or 9, no distortion was detected. With Distortion scores in the 3 to 5 range, the results may reflect a somewhat “polished” version of reality. However, no obvious distortion was noted.

When the Distortion score reaches the lower end of the scale, 1 or 2, then the **Step One Survey II** results should not be a part of the decision-making process for that individual. He or she may have been actively seeking to “look better” than is accurate, representative and forthright.

The suggested interview questions found in the **Step One Survey II** report should be pursued in all cases when an individual continues to be considered for a position. When the applicant has openly admitted to a behavior, the discussion of that behavior may prove fruitful to the hiring process.

SUMMARY

This report summarized the results of norming, reliability, validation, and impact studies for the **STEP ONE SURVEY II™**. An earlier factor analysis study identified the four scales that encompass the basic constructs of the SOS II. Factors were named Integrity, Substance Abuse, Reliability, and Work Ethic. The earlier study also demonstrated the ability of these constructs to distinguish between a prison parolee sample and a sample of currently employed workers.

The present study for the SOS II used the original factor analysis data to identify the constructs used in this version of the test. Reliability estimates were calculated for each scale. The resulting internal consistency reliability coefficients ranged from .76 to .84.

Norms were then calculated using a sample of currently employed individuals in the workplace and a contrasting prison parolee group.

A series of discriminate validity studies were also conducted with the norming (employee) sample using the gender, race and age variables. No significant mean differences were found on these variables.

USING THE STEP ONE SURVEY II

The Step One Survey II generates a report for the user that summarizes the applicant’s self-admissions, his or her attitudes (section two of the test form) and also provides additional information integral to the interviewing session and the selection process in general. The Step One Survey II User Guide details the SOS II report and is available separately from this document.

TABLE XI - STEP ONE SURVEY II QUICK REFERENCE GUIDE

LOW	THE SOS II PART 2 - ATTITUDE SCALES	HIGH
<p>Expresses a low level of respect for the property of others</p> <p>Tends to rationalize larcenous behavior</p> <p>Accepts a situational perspective concerning theft</p>	<p>Integrity This score represents an applicant's attitudes concerning theft of money, property, data or time.</p> <p>High Integrity scores represent a clear understanding of the conventional wisdom concerning theft and property/asset ownership.</p> <p>At the low end, an individual is less likely to express attitudes of respect for the material, monetary and abstract (soft assets) property of others.</p>	<p>Respects property</p> <p>Avoids rationalizing larcenous behavior</p> <p>Socially responsible</p>
<p>Takes an open-minded approach concerning illegal drug use</p> <p>Tends to rationalize drug use on the job</p> <p>Tends to disregard the safety issues associated with drug use in the workplace</p>	<p>Substance Abuse This score represents an applicant's attitudes concerning personal use or distribution of illegal chemical substances.</p> <p>High Substance Abuse scores represent a lack of self-identification with drug-oriented behavior.</p> <p>Lower scores suggest an open attitude concerning drug use that is often associated with those who use or distribute illegal substances.</p>	<p>Condemns illegal drug use</p> <p>Understands the safety issues related to drug use on the job</p> <p>Does not create rationalizations for drug use</p>
<p>Is not particularly trustful of the motivations of others</p> <p>Tends to rationalize cautious behavior</p> <p>Possesses a care-free attitude about tardiness & accountability</p>	<p>Reliability This score represents an applicant's attitudes concerning the following of procedures in the workplace.</p> <p>High Reliability scores represent a solid understanding of what is expected of an employee to be considered prompt, trustworthy and accountable.</p> <p>A low scorer tends to express a lack of appreciation for rules and restrictions, whether he or she actually obeys the rules or not.</p>	<p>Has confidence in the motivations of others</p> <p>Appreciates promptness</p> <p>Understands the importance of accountability</p>
<p>Prefers a great amount of personal freedom at work</p> <p>Tends to rationalize careless performance</p> <p>Attitude about authority may be quite casual</p>	<p>Work Ethic This score represents an applicant's attitudes concerning his or her perception of the relative value of work and supervisory relationships.</p> <p>High Work Ethic scores represent a clear understanding of what is expected of an employee to be considered principled and compliant in the workplace.</p> <p>A low scorer tends to express a lack of appreciation for the principles typically considered to be representative of ethical and compliant behavior in the workplace.</p>	<p>Accepts the restraints of typical office procedure</p> <p>Understands the need for compliance with rules and standards</p> <p>Understands that their superiors may play a different role than they do</p>