



**The McQuaig Word Survey®
Competency Analysis**

February, 2002

By

Scott C. Thomas

MICA Organizational Psychologists, L.L.C.
20 North Wacker Drive, Suite 1760
Chicago, IL 60606
Tel: (312) 236-9351 Fax: (312) 236-4701

Table of Contents

Project Summary3
Summary Tables.....5
Appendix A7

Project Summary

The goal of this project was to explore what our assessment database could tell us regarding the relationship of The McQuaig Word Survey® with competencies and work behaviours. The analyses conducted for this project looked at how The Word Survey correlated with various other inventories. Specifically, the three main profile types of The Word Survey (Leader, Expert, Transition) and each of The Word Survey scales (both Attempted and Real for Dominance, Relaxed, Sociable, and Compliance) were correlated with scales from the LEA, NEO-PI, Thurstone Mental Awareness Test and Myers-Briggs inventories. After removing anyone who did not have a Word Survey score and data on at least one other measure, the sample size included 98 individuals.

Only statistically significant (not likely due to chance) results are reported here. However, it should be noted that some qualitative analyses were utilized to supplement the statistical findings based on our knowledge of managerial best practice competencies. The qualitative analyses were deemed necessary in order to translate personality traits into core competency areas.

In general, there were several key trends that were inferred from the profile-specific results:

- First, Leaders generally possessed a high degree of skill in numerous competency areas relevant to upper management (e.g., tactical skill in making business decisions, strategic thinking, management focus, etc.). However, this profile type was also associated with low levels of interpersonal skill in relation to coworkers (low empathy scores and low scores on collaboration and teamwork). So, while Leaders seem to be skilled in many competency areas relevant to management and executive positions, there may be an interpersonal trade-off associated with these skills.
- Second, Experts generally possess the interpersonal skills that Leaders may lack, but they also typically lack the management competencies that Leaders possess. While they are often quick learners and very agreeable to work with, they may not have the vision and tough-mindedness to handle a high-level managerial position. At the very least, this should be discussed when evaluating an individual who falls into the Expert category.

Regarding the four main Word Survey scales, there were also some important trends. The four scales will not be broken down into Real and Attempted because there were no meaningful differences found that would necessitate such a breakdown:

- High scores on the Dominance scale were highly related to the Leader profile type in that they correlated with many higher-level managerial competency areas (e.g., strategic vision, management focus, feedback orientation, etc.).
- However, the same concerns apply as with Leaders, in that interpersonal skills may be a concern with individuals who score highly on the Dominance scales. High scores on the Sociable scales were related to competencies such as risk taking, persuasiveness, and collaboration building.
- High scores on the Sociable scales may also indicate a problem with structure or authority.
- Individuals scoring highly on the Relaxed scale were generally conservative, self-sufficient, and flexible. However, these individuals were also typically averse to risk taking and would not likely be skilled in competencies such as entrepreneurial spirit.
- High scores on the Compliance scales were associated with consensus building, collaboration and teamwork, structure orientation, as well as rational decision-making and problem solving.
- The potential downside of individuals with high scores on the Compliance scales includes a lack of skill in competencies like persuasiveness, influencing others, management focus, and strategic vision.

Finally, we conducted analyses to examine whether the middle range of the McQuaig scales indicated areas of competence. We conducted analyses regarding a three-category breakdown of each scale: high scorers (above 45), middle scorers (38-45), and low scorers (below 31). However, there were no significant findings regarding middle scorers.

General Summary of the Results From This Study

LEADERS	EXPERTS	TRANSITION
<p>This profile type was typically associated with high skill levels in the following core competency areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Persuasiveness • Tactical Skill in Making Business Decisions • Feedback-orientation • Management Focus • Rational & Systematic Decision Making • Coaching & Development • Influencing Others • Strategic Thinking <p>This profile type was typically not associated with the following core competency areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Collaboration & Teamwork • Extraversion • Empathy for Coworkers 	<p>This profile type was typically associated with high skill levels in the following core competency areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Empathy for Coworkers • Ability to Learn • Agreeableness • Introversion <p>This profile type was typically not associated with the following core competency areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Management Focus • Extraversion • Persuasiveness • Feedback Orientation • Strategic Thinking • Tactical Skill in Making Business Decisions • Tough Mindedness • Influencing Others 	<p>This profile type was typically associated with high skill levels in the following core competency areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Extraversion • Collaboration/ Cooperation with Coworkers <p>This profile type was typically not associated with the following core competency areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tactical Skill in Making Business Decisions • Management Focus

DOMINANCE-ACCEPTING	SOCIABLE-ANALYTICAL	RELAXED-DRIVING	COMPLIANT-INDEPENDENT
<p>The Dominant profile type was typically associated with high scores in the following core competency areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Feedback Orientation • Management Focus • Persuasiveness • Tactical Skill in Making Business Decisions • Influencing Others • Strong General Leadership Skills • Risk Taking <p>The Accepting profile type was typically associated with high scores in the following core competency areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conservatism • Collaboration & Teamwork • Empathy for Coworkers • Extraversion 	<p>The Sociable profile type was typically associated with high scores in the following core competency areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Persuasiveness • Influencing Others • Extraversion • Excitement Seeking • Empathy for Coworkers • Interpersonal Skill and Versatility • Collaboration & Teamwork • Risk Taking <p>The Analytical profile type was typically associated with high scores in the following core competency areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conservatism • Personal Restraint • Structure Orientation • Tactical Skill in Making Business Decisions • Strategic Thinking • Self Starter in Work Projects 	<p>The Relaxed profile type was typically associated with high scores in the following core competency areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conservatism • Personal Restraint • Flexibility & Versatility • Intelligence • Self Sufficiency • Introversion <p>The Driving profile type was typically associated with high scores in the following core competency areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Risk Taking • Acts quickly without thinking • Sociability • Entrepreneurial Spirit 	<p>The Compliant profile type was typically associated with high scores in the following core competency areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conservatism • Personal Restraint • Structure Orientation • Collaboration & Teamwork • Consensus Building <p>The Independent profile type was typically associated with high scores in the following core competency areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Persuasiveness • Influencing Others • Feedback Orientation • Management Focus • Risk Taking • Acts quickly without thinking

Appendix A- Specific Results of the Current Study

**All listed results were statistically significant

- Sample Descriptive Statistics:

⇒ Profile Frequency:

- 77 Leaders
- 14 Experts
- 7 Transition

⇒ Mean Grade Point Average: 3.35/4.00

⇒ Gender Frequency: 77 males and 21 females

- Thurstone Results Summary:

⇒ Mean scores by profile type:

- Leaders (N=44): 37.93 Language, 28.20 Quantitative, 66.11 Total
- Experts (N=11): 44.00 Language, 31.82 Quantitative, 75.82 Total
- Transition (N=2): 40.50 Language, 35.50 Quantitative, 76.00 Total

- ANOVA Results

⇒ Statistically significant differences between profile types on LEA:

- Persuasiveness (p= .038) with Leaders scoring 31.7 points higher on average on the scale than Experts (p= .034).
- Outgoing (p= .009) with Leaders scoring 27.9 points lower on average than Transition (p= .024).
- Tactical (p= .023) with Leaders scoring 28.1 points higher on average than Transition (p= .023).
- Feedback (p= .009) with Leaders scoring 41.1 points higher on average than Experts (p= .007).

- Management ($p = .041$) with Leaders scoring 26.1 points higher on average than Experts ($p = .054$).
 - Dominance (marginally significant, $p = .058$) with Leaders scoring 27.8 points higher on average than Experts ($p = .097$).
 - Cooperation ($p = .003$) with Leaders scoring 38.9 points lower than Transition ($p = .004$).
 - Empathy ($p = .013$) with Leaders scoring 37.6 points lower on average than Experts ($p = .012$).
- Correlations:
 - Statistically significant correlations between:
 - Attempted Dominance and LEA: Outgoing (-.33), Feedback (.46), Management (.39), Dominance (.49)
 - Attempted Sociable and LEA: Conservative (-.29), Self (-.25), Persuasiveness (.31), Outgoing (.54), Excitement (.40), Restraint (-.43), Structuring (-.32), Tactical (-.25), Empathy (.38)
 - Attempted Relaxed and LEA: Conservative (.35), Persuasive (-.371), Outgoing (-.29), Excitement (-.40), Restraint (.62), Management (-.32)
 - Attempted Compliant and LEA: Conservative (.35), Persuasive (-.40), Excitement (-.39), Restraint (.31), Structuring (.27), Feedback (-.37), Management (-.32), Dominance (-.40), Cooperation (.47), Consensual (.25)
 - Real Dominant and LEA: Persuasiveness (.29), Restraint (-.25), Tactical (.26), Feedback (.39), Management (.39), Dominance (.39), Cooperation (-.37), Authority (-.33), Empathy (-.25)
 - Real Sociable and LEA: Persuasiveness (.29), Outgoing (.38), Excitement (.35), Restraint (-.41), Structuring (-.30), Tactical (-.26), Dominance (-.29), Empathy (.30)
 - Real Relaxed and LEA: Conservative (.32), Persuasive (-.45), Excitement (-.43), Restraint (.63), Management (-.35)
 - Real Compliant and LEA: Persuasiveness (-.31), Feedback (-.27), Management (-.25), Cooperation (.24), Authority (.25)

- Myers-Briggs Data:
- ⇒ Statistically significant results between profile types on the Myers-Briggs personality inventory:
 - T/F Numeric Inventory ($p = .06$, marginally significant) with Leaders scoring 10.45 points higher on average than Experts (Note: $>100=T$).
 - J/P Numeric Inventory ($p = .06$, marginally significant) with Leaders scoring 8.62 points lower on average than Experts; also, Experts scored 17.26 points higher on average than Transitions (Note: $>100=J$).
- ⇒ Statistically Significant Correlations between McQuaig Word Survey scale scores and Myers-Briggs inventories:
 - Attempted Dominance and T/F numeric inventory (.34)
 - Attempted Sociable and E/I numeric inventory (.24)
 - Attempted Relaxed and J/P numeric inventory (.23)
 - Attempted Compliant and E/I numeric inventory (-.30), T/F numeric inventory (-.24), and J/P numeric inventory (.24)
 - Real Dominance and T/F numeric inventory (.31)
 - Real Sociable and E/I numeric inventory (.38)
 - Real Relaxed and E/I numeric inventory (-.33)
 - Real Compliant and T/F numeric inventory (-.28)