

OMNIA PROFILE VALIDATION REPORT

Completed by

Jacquelyn Carver
Taylor Henry
Jared Hockenberry
Chelsea Leffler
Justin Schowerer

Under the Supervision of
Dr. Vipanchi Mishra
Organizational Consulting Center

West Chester University of Pennsylvania
2022

The first part in this project was to evaluate the reliability of the Omnia assessment. To accomplish this, data provided by Omnia for N=802 scored Omnia profile assessments was utilized. Using these scores, we evaluated the internal reliability of the Omnia assessment using three measures: coefficient alpha, coefficient alpha if item deleted, the item-total correlations for each item as well as percentage endorsement for each item by the respondents.

Coefficient alpha is a measure of internal reliability or consistency of the measure. A coefficient alpha of .80 or above is generally thought to indicate that the items are working together to measure the same construct (Nunnally & Bernstein, 1994, Cascio & Aguinis, 2019). The overall coefficient alpha for the OMNIA profile and the coefficient alpha for all of the subscales within the OMNIA profile are presented in Table 1.

Table 1: Coefficient Alphas for the Original Omnia Profile (Archival Sample, N=802)		
	Other	Self
Overall		
A: Assertiveness	.79	.79
B: Sociability	.86	.85
C: Pace	.81	.80
D: Structure	.75	.77
F: Perspective	.78	.76
Average	.80	.79

As indicated in Table 1, the overall average coefficient alpha was “0.80” for “How others see You” portion of the profile, and “0.79” for “How you see Yourself” version. Although these coefficient alphas approach the .80 guideline, they are still considered somewhat low for scales containing 19 to 20 items (Cortina, 1993). However, the subscale for “Structure” had alphas of 0.75 (Other) and 0.77 (Self), slightly lower than the 0.80 benchmark of recommended reliability. Similarly, the construct “Perspective” has alphas of 0.78 (Other) and .76 (Self). The construct “Assertiveness” contains alphas of 0.79 (Other) and 0.79 (Self), despite being slightly lower than 0.80 they are close enough to the recommended guideline. As one of the goals for the project was to improve internal reliability for the new profile, Constructs D and F, Structure and Perspective, were examined particularly closely for revision as their alphas were below .80.

Next, we examined the individual items within each subscale to determine which items were less statistically related to the others, using the *alpha if item deleted* score. If a word is very unrelated to the other words in the construct the coefficient alpha would increase if that word was deleted. We examined the words to determine which words would improve the coefficient alpha if they were removed from the scale and flagged them for further analysis. Table 2 shows the results of this analysis for all the constructs in the OMNIA profile.

Table 2: Cronbach's Alpha if item-deleted

	Other	Self
A: Impulsive	.79	.79
Self-centered	.79	.79
B: Outgoing	.86	.85
People person	.85	.85
C: Dependable	.82	.80
D: Tense	.76	.77
Doubting	.75	.78
Hesitant	.75	.78
Professional	.74	.77
Detail Oriented	.75	.75
F: Dominant	.78	.76
Aggressive	.78	.76
Dependable	.78	.77
Opinionated	.78	.76

As indicated in the Table 2, the subscale for “Assertiveness” saw a slight increase in coefficient alpha if the items “impulsive” and “self-centered” were removed. However, the increase was insignificant, and those items can be left in the measure with practically unnoticeable changes in internal validity. The subscale for Construct B, “Sociability” showed a similar pattern as Construct A, and the items “Outgoing” and “People Person” changed the alpha by a margin that was small enough where deleting those items from the study would make virtually no change to the internal validity as well. The subscale for Construct C, “Pace” indicated that the item “Dependable” showed a 0.01 increase in the coefficient alpha for the “Other” measure. This makes the item “Dependable” a word to consider substituting, even though the change is relatively small. The subscale for Construct D, “Structure” had multiple items that saw changes in coefficient alpha if removed. “Tense” shows a 0.01 increase in the “Other” category, making it an item to consider for substitution, however not of high concern. “Doubting” showed a similar 0.01 increase in the “Self” category, and again is worth noting but not of large significance. “Hesitant” also shows a 0.01 increase in the “Self” category. “Professional” shows an insignificant increase in the “Self” category and is an item that is of low concern considering it includes a decrease of 0.01 in the coefficient alpha of “Other”. Lastly, the item “Detail Oriented” showed an insignificant increase in the “Other” category, and a decrease in coefficient alpha of 0.02 in the “Self” category, so it is recommended to keep this item in the profile. For Construct F, items “Dominant”, “Aggressive”, “Dependable”, and “Opinionated” indicated that scale reliability would change to 0.78 if they were deleted for the “Other” version of the measure, however, “dependable” showed an increase of 0.01 if deleted from the “Self” version of the measure. Thus, this item may be a candidate for substitution.

Next, we examined the *item-total correlation* to determine the correlations between each item and the composite score for each construct to observe an item-total scale correlation. According to Item-total correlations that were below .30 were considered low (Pedhazur & Schmelkin, 1991) and such words were also flagged as possible candidates for replacement. Table 3 shows the results of this analysis.

Table 3: Corrected Item-Total Correlation

Assertiveness	Other	Self
Impulsive	.16	.16
Determined	.29	.30
Self-centered	.09	.16
Dominant	.25	-
Aggressive	.28	.29
Demanding	.26	.29
Driven	-	.25
Sociability		
People Person	0.28	-
Structure		
Tense	0.15	0.10
Hesitant	0.12	0.13
Doubting	0.13	0.06
Flexible	0.19	-
Professional	0.30	0.26
Conformist	0.29	0.28
Detail-Oriented	-	0.18
Pace		
Helpful	.29	-
Unhurried	.23	-
Dependable	.16	.19
Loyal	-	.15
Understanding	-	-
Perspective		
Dominant	.20	.26
Calm	.26	.24
Aggressive	.14	.13
Dependable	.19	.17
Opinionated	.22	.21

Table 3 represents items from each subscale that had item-total correlation below or close to the value of 0.30. Table 3 is constructed as follows; Bolded items indicate the construct examined. Beneath each bold term are items identified as concerning based on the results of the reliability analysis. Items are broken down into two categories, “Other” and “Self” to reflect the OMNIA Professional Development Report. Results are listed by their item-total correlation values obtained in the reliability analysis. Dashed lines represent an item was flagged on one version of the assessment and not in the other version. For example, “driven” is an item of no concern for the “Other” version of the report but retains a value of “.25” in the “Self” version of the measure, being below the .30 threshold. Some examples of items with low item-total correlation values in all subscales and across two versions include: impulsive, self-centered, tense, hesitant, doubting, dependable, aggressive, and opinionated.

We then examined the *mean response to an item* to determine the percentage of people that had endorsed or selected each item. A wide range in the percentage of people endorsing an item is indicative that the item is appropriately discriminating amongst raters. An average level of 50% response would

indicate that it was endorsed by half of the raters thus effectively differentiating among people. If an item is selected by almost everyone, or if it is not selected by anyone, it is not contributing to identify differences among respondents. Items that were endorsed by more than 90% of the sample or by less than 10% of the sample were also flagged for further analysis and possible replacement. Results of this analysis are presented in Table 4.

Table 4: Percentage of People that Endorsed an item		
	Other	Self
Assertiveness		
Impulsive	0.06	-
Self-Centered	0.04	0.06
Aggressive	0.08	0.10
Demanding	0.09	-
Structure		
Tense	0.04	0.07
Conformist	0.07	0.08
Hesitant	0.04	0.09
Doubting	0.02	-
Professional	0.91	-
Pace		
Loyal	0.90	0.94
Unhurried	0.09	-
Perspective		
Dominant	.12	.12
Aggressive	.08	.10

As indicated in Table 4, for the subscale for the construct “assertiveness” had four items that were flagged for possible revision. Impulsive, self-centered, aggressive and demanding. These items were selected because they all were selected less than 10% of the time, either in the “self” or “other” category. The subscale for construct “sociability” had no items selected for possible revision because all of the items were selected more than 10% of the time and less than 90%. The subscale for construct “structure” had five items that were chosen for potential revision. The items tense, conformist, hesitant and doubting were all chosen less than 10% of the time by participants in either the “self” or “other” category. The item professional was chosen 91% of the time, which is above the 90% cutoff point. The subscale for construct “pace” had two items for possible revision. Loyal was chosen more than 90% of the time in both the “self” and “other” categories. Unhurried was selected 9% of the time in the “other” category, which is

below the 10% cut off point. For the construct “Perspective” subscale, “aggressive” was chosen less than 10% of the time for both “self” and “other” versions.

Following these analyses, Table 5 was created to show which items were flagged for item-correlation value below .30, a higher Cronbach’s alpha if item-deleted, and a very low or very high percentage of endorsement by raters. This combination allowed us to select words with the lowest internal validity as possibilities for replacement. Items were flagged as a ‘3’ for high concern, ‘2’ for moderate concern, and ‘1’ for low concern. For Cronbach’s alpha if item deleted, items that did increase the alpha only did so by .01. For this reason, these items were flagged with a 1 for low concern. For inter-item correlation, items that fell below .30 were flagged. Items that fell just below .30, at .20 - .29, were flagged as low concern, items that fell between .10 and .20 were flagged as moderate concern, and items that were below .10 were flagged as a high concern item. Finally for endorsement, items that fell at or just above .10 (or at or above .90) were given a 1 for low concern with concern increasing as items approached .00 (or 1.00).

As depicted in Table 5, for the subscale for Construct A: Assertiveness, three items were flagged for concern. ‘Impulsive’ was given a moderate level of concern as it had an inter-item correlation below .30 (.16 for both Self and Other) and an endorsement percentage of 12% for self and 6% for other. ‘Self-centered’ was also flagged with moderate concern with an inter-item correlation of .16 for Self and .09 for Other as well as an endorsement of 6% and 4% for Self and Other, respectively. ‘Aggressive’ was flagged as a low concern for having a low endorsement percentage with 1% for self and 8% for other.

For the subscale for Construct B: Sociability, very few items were flagged across the three measures. ‘People Person’ presented with the most concern and was flagged as low concern overall. ‘People Person’ showed a very slight increase in alpha if deleted and an inter-item correlation of .28 for Self (only slightly below .30 cut off).

For the subscale for Construct C: Pace had two total words flagged: dependable and loyal. ‘Dependable’ showed a slight increase in alpha if item deleted for Other from .81 to .82 and had a low inter-item correlation for both self and other with .19 and .16 respectively making it a moderate concern item. ‘Loyal’ was flagged as a moderate concern as it had a low inter-item correlation for self at .15 and was endorsed by most individuals with 94% endorsement for Self and 90% for Other.

For the subscale for Construct D: Structure had several words flagged. ‘Tense’ was flagged with high concern with an alpha if deleted increase for Other of .75 to .76, a low inter-item correlation of .15 for Self and .01 for Other, and very low endorsement at 7% for Self and 4% for Other. ‘Hesitant’ was also flagged as a high concern item with an alpha if deleted increase for Other of .77 to .78, an inter-item correlation of .12 for Self and .13 for Other, and endorsement percentages at 9% for Self and 4% for Other. ‘Conformist’ was flagged as low concern. Although it had a low endorsement percentage with 8% for Self and 7% for Other, the inter-item correlation fell just below .3 at .28 for Self and .27 for Other and the alpha did not change if item was deleted. The last item flagged was ‘Doubting’ with moderate concern as the alpha for Self showed an increase from .77 to .78 if the item was deleted, the inter-item correlation was .13 for self and .06 for Other, and the endorsement percentage for Other was only 2% of individuals.

Finally, for the subscale for Construct F: Perspective had three words flagged. ‘Dominant’ showed a low inter-item correlation as .20 for Other and .26 for Self and had a low endorsement at 12% for both categories. It was flagged as a moderate concern ‘Dependable’ was also flagged as it showed an increase in Cronbach’s alpha for Self from .76 to .77 if item deleted and had a low inter-item correlation of .19 for Other and .17 for Self. ‘Aggressive’ had a low inter-item correlation of .14 for Other and .13 for Self as well as a low endorsement percentage at 8% for Other and 10% for Self. ‘Aggressive’ was marked as a low concern item during the Construct A: Assertiveness analysis, however because it was also shown to be a concern item for Construct F it was now flagged for moderate concern.

Table 5: Items for Potential Revision

Composite: Other			Composite: Self		
Correlations	% Endorsing	Alphas	Correlations	% Endorsing	Alphas

Loyal		1*		2	2*	
Persevering						
Fascinating						
Decisive						
Obliging						
Courteous						
Impulsive	2	3		2		
Detail-Oriented				2		
Stimulating						
Conscientious						
Perfectionist						
Convincing						
Patient						
Grateful						
Even-Tempered						
Tense	2	3	1	2	2	
Orderly						
Diplomatic						
Relaxed						
Competitive						
Self-starter						
Receptive						
Enterprising						
Polite						
Willing						
Stable						
Conformist	1	2		1	2	
Tolerant						
Professional	1	1*		1		
Gentle						
Outgoing						
Bold						
Compliant						
Good-natured						
Agreeable						
Serious						
Helpful	1					
Appealing						
Dynamic						
Devoted						
Attractive						
Impressive						
Assertive						
Prudent						

Ambitious						
Determined	1			1		
Self-centered	3	3		2	3	
Eloquent						
Dominant	1	1		1	1	
Cautious						
Calm	1			1		
Inspiring						
Laid-back						
Sociable						
Self-conscious						
Amusing						
Entertaining						
Aggressive	2	3		2	2	
Tranquil						
Meticulous						
Demanding	1	2		1		
Hesitant	2	3		2	2	1
Personality Plus						
Understanding						
Adventurous						
Doubting	2	3		3		1
People Person	1					
Unhurried	1	2				
Extroverted						
Dependable	2		1	2		1
Careful						
Flexible	2					
Risk-taker						
Opinionated	1			1		
Charming						
Courageous						
Satisfied						
Fashionable						
Popular						
Sympathetic						
Poised						
Driven				1		

Note. 3=high concern, 2=moderate concern, 1=some concern, * Indicates a large percentage of respondents were endorsing the item.

Table 6 was created based on the analysis shown in Table 5 and detailed above. In the left column are the words that were most frequently flagged during analysis. The right column contains possible replacement suggestions for each of the flagged items.

Table 6: Omnia Replacement Word Candidates

Construct A (Old)	Concern	Construct A (Assertiveness) Replacement Candidates
Impulsive	Moderate	Spontaneous, Automatic, Unprompted, Sudden
Self-centered	Moderate	Self-seeking, Self-sufficient, Independent, Self-absorbed, Inconsiderate
Aggressive	Low	Firm, Strong-willed, Invasive, Intrusive
Construct B (Old)	Concern	Construct B (Sociability) Replacement Candidates
People Person	Low	Friendly, Social, Outgoing
Construct C (Old)	Concern	Construct C (Pace) Replacement Candidates
Dependable	High	Reliable, Consistent
Loyal	Moderate	Honest, Trustworthy, Dedicated
Construct D (Old)	Concern	Construct D (Structure) Replacement Candidates
Tense	High	Strained, Rigid
Hesitant	High	Timid, Adverse, Uncertain
Conformist	Low	Traditionalist, Conservative
Doubting	Moderate	Skeptical, Suspicious, Critical
Construct F (Old)	Concern	Construct F (Perspective) Replacement Candidates
Dominant	Moderate	Authoritative
Aggressive	Moderate	Firm, Strong-willed, Invasive, Intrusive
Dependable	High	Reliable, Consistent

Convergent Validation Results

This section of the report describes the collection and evaluation of a convergent validation dataset to support the validity of the New Omnia Profile. Convergent validity is established when similar constructs are highly related (Campbell & Fiske, 1959). Composite scores on the New Omnia Profile and the HEXACO Personality Inventory, Aggression Measure and Core Self-Evaluation measure were compared for a sample of job incumbents to determine whether subscales of each test were related (i.e., correlated) according to a theoretically predicted pattern.

Sample Demographics

Demographic characteristics of the sample are presented in Table 1. Of the data collected, none were eliminated due lack of completion or insufficient information. Results yielded a total of 553 cases, or $N=553$. Majority of the participants were male (55%), 44% identified themselves as female and 0.4% identified themselves within the Non-binary or Other Category.

Table 2 reflects the ethnic distribution of the participants. In this sample, 75% of the participants identified themselves as White or Caucasian, 6.5% identified as Asian and 6.7% identified as African American. A total of 7.5% of the individuals selected more than one option for ethnicity, and were classified under multiple ethnicity category. The average age of the participants was $M=38.51$ years with a standard deviation of $SD=12.51$. Additionally, most of the participants (86.6%) worked 30 or more hours per week.

The Occupational titles of participants are presented in Table 3. Of those listed, 21% of participants identified as working in the field of accounting or finance, 13% worked in IT, 11% in Law,

Business/Management and Marketing/Sales respectively, 10% each in Human Resources and Engineering, and additional 13% identified themselves in the Other category.

Table 7: Demographic Data for Convergent Validation Sample

Gender	N	Percent
Male	304	55
Female	247	44.7
Non-Binary/Other	2	.4
Race/Ethnicity		
Asian	36	6.5
Black or African American	37	6.7
White or Caucasian	415	75
Hispanic, Latino/a or Spanish	24	4.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	0	0
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	0	0
Middle Eastern or North African	0	0
Multiple Ethnicities	39	7.5
Job Title		
Accounting/Finance	117	21
Law	64	11
Business Administration/Management	57	11
I.T.	72	13
Marketing/Sales	57	11
Human Resources	54	10
Engineering and Production	55	10
Other	77	13

Administration Procedures

Data was collected via Prolific.co, a participant recruitment website and the survey was administered via the Qualtrics platform. Participants were asked to complete the survey to the best of their ability. The survey included various questionnaires requiring respondents to complete multiple choice or Likert scale items which are described below.

The survey included four measures broken down into the following sections: the OMNIA profile assessment incorporating existing profile items as well as the new replacement words, the HEXACO personality measure (Ashton & Lee, 2009), a measure of aggression (Buss & Perry in 1992), and a measure of core self-evaluation (Judge, Erez, Bono & Thoresen, 2003). Part-one included OMNIA profile, in which participants were asked to choose from different lists of adjectives that best described themselves both from self perspective as well as how someone at work might perceive them. More than one answer could be chosen from each list. The next section included the HEXACO measure, in which, participants rated how well they agreed with a given statement by selecting from a scale of 1 to 5, with 1 = *Strongly Disagree* to 5 = *Strongly Agree*. Part-three was composed of an aggression measure, that was comprised of questions related to feelings about oneself. These included, but were not limited to statements about confidence, success, doubt, and satisfaction. The last questionnaire included core self-evaluation items. Similar to the HEXACO measure, these items were also rated on a scale of 1-5, varying from 1 = *Strongly Disagree* to 5 = *Strongly Agree*. Lastly, participants were also asked to respond to demographic questions related to age, gender, ethnicity, current work hours and occupational title.

Relationship of Omnia Profile Constructs with other Personality Factors

The Omnia Profile is designed to measure four primary constructs, Assertiveness, Sociability, Pace and Structure. They are defined as follows: Construct A, *Assertiveness*, refers to the way individuals

set and approach goals. A person scoring high on this construct is more willing to take risks as opposed to being focused on security and avoiding conflict. Construct B, *Sociability*, is indicative of how individuals interact with the world around them. That is, it reflects whether they are reserved or more outgoing. Construct C *Pace* reflects an individual's natural pace. Those low on Construct C are less patient, seek variety, tend to be flexible, and are effective at multitasking. Patient people are more methodical, systematic and tend to seek stability. Finally, Construct D, *Structure*, indicates how individuals handle responsibility. People who need structure are compliant, seek feedback, are concerned with meeting expectations and attend to detail. Independent individuals are defined as being decisive, resilient, results-oriented and informal in their approach to tasks. In addition to the primary constructs, the Omnia Profile offers a measure of Energy Construct E and Perspective, Construct F. Construct E indicates the level of alertness depending on number of words chosen to describe oneself and Construct F indicates individuals' awareness of the consequences of their behavior.

The HEXACO (Ashton & Lee, 2009) is a measure of personality factors of Extraversion, Openness to Experience, Agreeableness, Conscientiousness and Honesty-Humility dimension.

Honesty-Humility: Persons with very high scores on the Honesty-Humility scale avoid manipulating others for personal gain, feel little temptation to break rules, are uninterested in lavish wealth and luxuries, and feel no special entitlement to elevated social status. Conversely, persons with very low scores on this scale will flatter others to get what they want, are inclined to break rules for personal profit, are motivated by material gain, and feel a strong sense of self-importance.

Emotionality: Persons with very high scores on the Emotionality scale experience fear of physical dangers, experience anxiety in response to life's stresses, feel a need for emotional support from others, and feel empathy and sentimental attachments with others. Conversely, persons with very low scores on this scale are not deterred by the prospect of physical harm, feel little worry even in stressful situations, have little need to share their concerns with others, and feel emotionally detached from others.

Extraversion: Persons with very high scores on the Extraversion scale feel positively about themselves, feel confident when leading or addressing groups of people, enjoy social gatherings and interactions, and experience positive feelings of enthusiasm and energy. Conversely, persons with very low scores on this scale consider themselves unpopular, feel awkward when they are the center of social attention, are indifferent to social activities, and feel less lively and optimistic than others do.

Agreeableness (versus Anger): Persons with very high scores on the Agreeableness scale forgive the wrongs that they suffered, are lenient in judging others, are willing to compromise and cooperate with others, and can easily control their temper. Conversely, persons with very low scores on this scale hold grudges against those who have harmed them, are rather critical of others' shortcomings, are stubborn in defending their point of view, and feel anger readily in response to mistreatment.

Conscientiousness: Persons with very high scores on the Conscientiousness scale organize their time and their physical surroundings, work in a disciplined way toward their goals, strive for accuracy and perfection in their tasks, and deliberate carefully when making decisions. Conversely, persons with very low scores on this scale tend to be unconcerned with orderly surroundings or schedules, avoid difficult tasks or challenging goals, are satisfied with work that contains some errors, and make decisions on impulse or with little reflection.

Openness to Experience: Persons with very high scores on the Openness to Experience scale become absorbed in the beauty of art and nature, are inquisitive about various domains of knowledge, use their imagination freely in everyday life, and take an interest in unusual ideas or people. Conversely, persons with very low scores on this scale are rather unimpressed by most works of art, feel little intellectual curiosity, avoid creative pursuits, and feel little attraction toward ideas that may seem radical or unconventional.

The Aggression Questionnaire (Buss & Perry, 1992) is a psychological assessment of aggression that includes four sub-traits: physical aggression, verbal aggression, anger, and hostility. As defined by (Buss & Perry, 1992), physical and verbal aggression, which involve hurting or harming others, represent the instrumental or motor component of behavior. Anger, which involves physiological arousal and preparation for aggression, represents the emotional or affective component of behavior. Hostility, which

consists of feelings of ill will and injustice, represents the cognitive component of behavior. For this validation study, we only used verbal, anger and hostility subscales of this measure.

Core Self-Evaluation, according to Judge et al. (1997) is a fundamental appraisal of one's worthiness, effectiveness, and capability as a person. It is a broad term used to encompass four well established traits in the realm of psychology including: self-esteem, self-efficacy, neuroticism, and locus of control. Self-esteem is defined as the overall value that one places on oneself as a person (Harter, 1990). Generalized self-efficacy is defined as an evaluation of how well one can perform across a variety of situations (Locke, McClellan, & Knight, 1996). Neuroticism is defined as the tendency to have a negativistic cognitive/explanatory style and to focus on negative aspects of the self (Watson, 2000); and Locus of control is defined as beliefs about the causes of events in one's life-locus is internal when individuals see events as being contingent on their own behavior (Rotter, 1966). Individuals who exhibit a high core self-evaluation will maintain confidence in their own thoughts and abilities. While those with a low core self-evaluation will display the opposite; a low level of confidence, reflecting on their abilities as an individual.

To evaluate the convergent validity of the Omnia Profile, we needed to delineate the predicted theoretical linkages between dimensions on the OMNIA profile and other instruments. Based on careful evaluation of construct definitions, we attempted to link Omnia and other personality constructs based on their respective meanings. A matrix representing the predicted relationships among the constructs on the four measures is presented in Table 4. Because the dimensions on the Omnia Profile do not completely parallel the five traditional personality measures found in the HEXACO, these linkages were clearer and better defined in some cases than in others. For example, Extraversion scores on the HEXACO measure are more likely to be positively related with sociability and assertiveness constructs of the OMNIA profile. However, predicting the relationship between Openness as defined in the HEXACO and Pace construct of the OMNIA profile is not as straightforward.

Table 8. Expected correlations of OMNIA profile with other personality constructs					
Construct	Assertiveness	Sociability	Pace	Structure	Perspective
Emotionality	negative	negative	negative	positive	negative
Extraversion	positive	positive	negative	negative	positive
Openness	positive	positive or uncorrelated	negative	negative	negative
Agreeableness	negative	positive	positive	positive	positive
Conscientiousness	positive	negative	positive	positive	positive
Honesty-Humility	negative	negative	positive	positive	positive
Core Self-Evaluation	positive	positive	positive	positive	positive
Aggression	positive	positive	negative	negative	negative

Reliability Results

We assessed the internal consistency reliability of the new Omnia Profile. Establishing internal reliability for a scale is the first step towards achieving validity. Overall, the new profile has reliable coefficient alphas. As indicated in Table 7, the overall coefficient alpha for the OMNIA profile was 0.93 for "How Others See You" portion and 0.94 for "How You See Yourself" portion for the new scale. Notably, the Average coefficient alpha was .81 for the "How Others See You" portion and .83 for the "How You See Yourself" section of the new profile. These alphas indicate that the items on the scale are measuring similar constructs. Coefficient alphas for subscales above .80 are considered reasonable for

reliability (Nunnally & Bernstein, 1994). For the new dataset, the Omnia Profile largely meets the criterion, with only three subscales below .80.

The average coefficient alphas for the original Omnia Profile were .80 for the Other section and .79 for the Self section (see Table 7). Improvements were shown for the new Omnia Profile with an average coefficient alpha of .81 for the Other portion and .83 for the Self portion. Table 8 also shows that there were less items in the new Omnia Profile that should be deleted in order to improve alpha. It is noteworthy that in the new Omnia Profile that there were no words that were endorsed less than 10% or more than 90% for both the Self and Other sections as indicated in Table 7.

Table 9. Psychometric Properties of the Old and New Omnia Profile

Coefficient Alpha						
	Archive-Other	Old-Other	New-Other	Archive-Self	Old Self	New-Self
Overall	.93	.92	.93	.93	.93	.94
A	.79	.82	.84	.79	.82	.83
B	.86	.74	.83	.85	.85	.85
C	.81	.86	.85	.80	.85	.86
D	.75	.81	.77	.76	.73	.83
F	.78	.75	.77	.76	.76	.75
Avg. (A-F)	.80	.80	.81	.79	.80	.83

Table 10. Number of Items that Should be Deleted to Improve Alpha

	Archive-Other	Old-Other	New-Other	Archive-Self	Old-Self	New-Self
A	2	1	1	2	1	1
B	2	1	0	2	0	0
C	1	1	1	1	0	1
D	5	1	3	5	1	1
F	4	1	1	4	1	1
Total	13	5	6	13	3	4

Table 11. Number of Words Endorsed by Less Than 10% or More Than 90% of the Sample

	Archive-Other	Old-Other	New-Other	Archive-Self	Old-Self	New-Self
# of Words	12	2	0	7	6	0

Table 12. Correlations with Intended Construct Below .30

	Archive-Other	Old-Other	New-Other	Archive-Self	Old-Self	New-Self
A	6	3	1	6	3	1
B	1	3	2	0	0	0

C	6	2	1	6	1	1
D	3	2	8	2	9	2
F	5	5	4	5	5	5
Total	21	15	16	19	17	9

Because coefficient alpha is a function of the length of a scale as well as the average correlation between items, it is helpful to inspect the inter-item correlations in addition to the coefficient alphas. The average inter-item correlations for the Omnia constructs are presented in Table 11. A good inter-item correlation is regarded at 0.30 or higher. The table demonstrates that each construct comes close or exceeds this criterion. A respectable inter-item correlation provides evidence for high levels of internal consistency within the new Omnia profile assessment.

Table 13. Average Inter-Item Correlations for the Omnia Profile

	Other	Self
A: Assertiveness	.43	.41
B: Sociability	.41	.44
C: Pace	.44	.46
D: Structure	.34	.41
F: Perspective	.34	.35
Average (A-F)	.39	.41

Convergent Validity Results

The Aggression Scale, HEXACO Personality Measure, and Core Self-Evaluations Scale (CSE) were used to test for convergent validity of the Omnia Profile. Intercorrelations of the Omnia Profile Constructs and these three measures are presented in Table 12. Based on Cohen's (1992) recommendations, correlations with absolute values greater than .30 were considered large while those from .20 to .30 were considered medium and any correlations less than .20 were considered small. Correlations that were found to be significant at $p < .05$ or $p < .01$ were identified in the table. A total of 100 correlations were analyzed between the Omnia Profile Constructs A, B, C, D, and F for both Other and Self against the scales selected for convergent validity including three scales of the Aggression Questionnaire: Verbal, Anger, and Hostility, the CSE, and the six scales of the HEXACO Personality Assessment: Honesty-Humility, Emotionality, Extraversion, Agreeableness, Conscientiousness, and Openness to Experience. A total of 60 correlations were found to be significant in this analysis; 25 of these correlations matched the predicted direction while 10 correlations varied in direction against the prediction.

For the Aggression Questionnaire, Verbal Aggression, Anger, and Hostility were all expected to correlate positively with Construct A: Assertiveness and were also expected to positively correlate with Construct B: Sociability. While the results did show a large significant correlation between Verbal Aggression and Construct A ($r = .33$ for Other and $r = .32$ for Self at $p < .01$), Anger did not show a significant relationship and Hostility showed a significant negative relationship with Assertiveness ($r = -.13$ for Other and $r = -.09$ for Self at $p < .01$). Of the three Aggression scales, only Hostility showed a significant negative relationship to Sociability, $r = -.09$ for Other ($p < .05$) and $r = -.12$ for Self ($p < .01$). Anger had a non-significant positive relationship to Sociability, $r = .06$ for Other and $r = .002$ for Self and Verbal Aggression showed a positive relationship to this construct ($r = .174$ for Other and $r = .153$ for Self at $p < .01$).

Of the six HEXACO scales, most of the correlation results were in line with the predicted direction. Only two correlations showed deviation from the predictions: Emotionality/Sociability and Agreeableness/ Sociability. Emotionality was predicted to have a negative correlation to Sociability however it was found to have a small negative correlation for the Other scale at $r = -.003$ and a small positive correlation to Self at $r = .03$ and neither of these correlations were found to be significant.

Agreeableness was also expected to positively correlate with Sociability but showed a small correlation at $r = .033$ for Other and $r = .022$ for Self and was not found to be statistically significant.

The HEXACO Personality Assessment contains six scales, and each scale contains four subscales. Since several subscales were expected to correlate with Omnia Profile constructs, correlation analysis was also conducted on the HEXACO subscales. The results of this analysis are presented in Table 13. Note that this table only shows the subscales that were hypothesized to correlate the highest with the Omnia Profile constructs. As predicted, Dependence had a negative correlation with Assertiveness ($r = -.16$ for Other and $r = -.14$ for Self at $p < .01$) and a negative correlation with Perspective ($r = -.09$ for Other and $r = -.09$ for Self at $p < .05$) which were both in line with the predictions. However, it was also predicted that Dependence would correlate negatively with both Pace and Structure and results instead showed a non-significant, positive, and weak relationship with both constructs. For the other subscales depicted in Table 13, all correlations matched the predicted correlations. Social Self-Esteem correlated with Assertiveness at $r = .31$ for Other and $r = .32$ for Self ($p < .01$) and with Sociability at $r = .25$ for Other and $r = .28$ for Self ($p < .01$). Social Boldness had similar results, correlating with Assertiveness at $r = .50$ for Other and $r = .48$ for Self ($p < .01$) and correlating with Sociability at $r = .47$ for Other and $r = .44$ for Self ($p < .01$). The HEXACO subscale for Sociability and the Omnia Profile construct for Sociability showed a large correlation as well at $r = .43$ for Other and $r = .41$ for Self ($p < .01$).

A positive correlation was predicted between all of the OMNIA constructs and Core Self-evaluation measure and results were consistent with the predictions. For example, for Construct B: Sociability and the Core Self-Evaluation, results indicated that there was a medium statistically significant relationship ($r = .20$ for Other and $r = .24$ for Self at $p < .01$). Interestingly, the strongest correlation found between the Core Self-Evaluations Scale and the Omnia Profile Constructs was for Construct A: Assertiveness at $r = .32$ for Other and $r = .31$ for Self ($p < .01$). On the other hand, while CSE correlated positively with structure, the correlation was weak and not statistically significant.

Overall, the majority of the obtained correlations were in line with the predicted correlations. This supports the construct validity for the Omnia Profile based on its related correlations with the Aggression Questionnaire, the HEXACO Personality Assessment, and the Core Self-Evaluations scale.

**Table 14. Personality Profile Composite Score Correlations with
The Aggression, HEXACO, and Core Self-Evaluations Measures**

Construct	A Assertiveness		B Sociability		C Pace		D Structure		F Perspective	
	Other	Self	Other	Self	Other	Self	Other	Self	Other	Self
Aggression Scale										
Verbal Aggression	.33**	.32**	<i>.17**</i>	<i>.15**</i>	<i>-.19**</i>	<i>-.21**</i>	<i>-.03</i>	<i>-.02</i>	<i>.07</i>	<i>.03</i>
Anger	<i>.08</i>	<i>.07</i>	<i>.06</i>	<i>.002</i>	<i>-.24**</i>	<i>-.30**</i>	<i>.01</i>	<i>.02</i>	<i>-.07</i>	<i>-.13**</i>
Hostility	<i>-.13**</i>	<i>-.09**</i>	-.09*	-.12**	<i>-.19**</i>	<i>-.28**</i>	<i>.03</i>	<i>.08</i>	<i>-.17**</i>	<i>-.23**</i>
HEXACO										
Honesty – Humility	<i>.01</i>	<i>-.06</i>	<i>-.11**</i>	<i>-.14**</i>	<i>.13**</i>	<i>.12**</i>	<i>.08</i>	<i>.03</i>	<i>.09*</i>	<i>.05</i>
Emotionality	-.14**	-.11**	<i>-.003</i>	<i>.03</i>	<i>-.003</i>	<i>-.05</i>	.17**	.18**	<i>-.04</i>	<i>-.08</i>
Extraversion	.45**	.44**	.47**	.47**	.11*	.19**	<i>-.04</i>	<i>-.04</i>	<i>.29**</i>	<i>.35**</i>
Agreeableness	<i>-.06</i>	-.09*	<i>.03</i>	<i>.02</i>	.31**	.38**	<i>-.01</i>	<i>-.02</i>	<i>.11**</i>	<i>.17**</i>
Conscientiousness	<i>.28**</i>	<i>.29**</i>	<i>.07</i>	<i>.08</i>	<i>.17**</i>	<i>.22**</i>	.33**	.36**	.29**	.33**
Openness to Experience	<i>.15**</i>	<i>.18**</i>	.17**	.16**	<i>.07</i>	<i>.07</i>	<i>.07</i>	<i>.08</i>	<i>.15**</i>	<i>.18**</i>
CSE Scale	<i>.32**</i>	<i>.31**</i>	.20**	.24**	<i>.15**</i>	<i>.25**</i>	<i>.002</i>	<i>.005</i>	.25**	.31**

**Table 15. Omnia Profile Composite Score Correlations with
HEXACO Subscales**

Construct	A Assertiveness		B Sociability		C Pace		D Structure		F Perspective	
	Other	Self	Other	Self	Other	Self	Other	Self	Other	Self
Dependence	-.16**	-.14**	.01	.04	-.01	-.06	.05	.02	-.09*	-.09*
Social Self-Esteem	.31**	.32**	.25**	.28**	.16**	.24**	.005	.005	.25**	.32**
Social Boldness	.50**	.48**	.47**	.44**	-.03	.01	-.01	-.01	.26**	.30**
Sociability	.31**	.28**	.43**	.41**	.06	.11**	-.10*	-.10*	.17**	.21**
Liveliness	.32**	.32**	.33**	.36**	.14**	.22**	-.02	-.02	.24**	.29**
Organization	.12**	.10*	-.02	-.03	.09*	.12**	.17**	.18**	.15**	.16**
Diligence	.38**	.40**	.19**	.18**	.14**	.18**	.25**	.27**	.30**	.34**

Criterion Validation Results

Criterion Sample Data Collection

Data for criterion validation was collected via current clients of OMNIA working in the Sales industry. Individual clients were contacted by OMNIA for participation in this study, upon agreement, criterion surveys were sent to employees of XX clients. Upon completion of the survey, subordinate's were asked to enter supervisor name which generated an survey participation email that was directly sent to the supervisor. The subordinate survey included the OMNIA profile and demographic measures. The supervisor survey included measures related to sales performance, organizational citizenship behavior and overall performance.

Criterion Sample Demographics

Demographic information of 271 subordinates who completed the OMNIA profile is presented in Table 14. The original sample size was N= 311, but 40 participants failed attention checks and were removed from final data analysis. In this sample, there were more males (52%) than females (48%). 80.8% of the participants identified as white, 67.2% of the participants were 36 years or older, with only 5.5% of the participants being younger than 25 years old and 27.3% within the age range of 26-35 years. Almost 75% of the participants reported having ten or more years of experience within the field and 12.2% of the participants had under five years of experience. Additionally, 30.3% of the participants reported working 31-40 hours per week while 69% reported working 40 hours or more per week.

Table 16. Subordinate Demographics (Criterion Data, N = 271)

	N	Percent
Gender		

Male	141	52.0%
Female	129	47.6%
Race/Ethnicity		
American Indian or Alaskan Native	1	0.4%
Asian	13	4.8%
Black or African American	7	2.6%
Hispanic, Latinx, or Spanish	17	6.3%
Middle Eastern or North African	2	0.7%
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific islander	2	0.7%
White	219	80.8%
Multiple Ethnicities	10	3.7%
Age		
Younger than 25	15	5.5%
26-35 years	74	27.3%
36-45 years	53	19.6%
46-55 years	70	25.8%
Older than 55	59	21.8%
Experience		
0-1 years	8	3.0%
1-2 years	5	1.8%
2-5 years	20	7.4%
5-10 years	36	13.3%
10 years or more	202	74.5%
Tenure with Company		
0-3 months	17	6.3%
3-6 months	22	8.1%
6-12 months	30	11.1%
1-2 years	30	11.1%
2-5 years	57	21%
5-10 years	54	19.9%
10 years or more	61	22.5%
Work Hours per Week		
0-20 hours	0	0%
21-30 hours	2	0.7%
31-40 hours	82	30.3%
40 hours or more	187	69%

Demographic information for the 45 supervisors of 271 subordinates who completed the OMNIA profile are presented in Table 15. In this sample, there were more males (53%) than females (47%). 90% of the survey participants identified as white, 89% of the participants were 36 years or older, with only 11% of the participants being younger than 35 years old. 92% of the participants reported having ten or more years of experience within the field and 4% of the participants had under five years of experience. 10% of the participants reported working 31-40 hours per week while 90% reported working 40 hours or more per week.

Table 17. Supervisor Demographics (Criterion Data, N = 45)

	N	Percent
Gender		
Male	24	53%

Female	21	47%
Race/Ethnicity		
American Indian or Alaskan Native	0	0%
Asian	1	2%
Black or African American	1	2%
Hispanic, Latinx, or Spanish	1	2%
Middle Eastern or North African	0	0%
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	0	0%
White	40	90%
Multiple Ethnicities	2	4%
Age		
Younger than 25	0	0%
26-35 years	5	11%
36-45 years	16	35%
46-55 years	13	29%
Older than 55	11	25%
Experience		
0-1 years	0	0%
1-2 years	1	2%
2-5 years	1	2%
5-10 years	2	4%
10 years or more	41	92%
Tenure with Company		
0-3 months	1	2%
3-6 months	1	2%
6-12 months	3	6%
1-2 years	5	12%
2-5 years	8	17%
5-10 years	5	12%
10 years or more	22	49%
Work Hours per Week		
0-20 hours	0	0%
21-30 hours	0	0%
31-40 hours	5	10%
40 hours or more	40	90%

Reliability Results

Table below shows the coefficient alpha results for the New Omnia Profile. As depicted in Table 16, the average for both “How others see You” and “How you see Yourself” were above the .80 recommendation (Nunnally & Bernstein, 1994; U. S. Department of Labor, 1999) with 0.84 and 0.86, respectively. Additionally, the overall coefficient alpha of the New Omnia Profile for the “Self” version was 0.95 and 0.93 for the “Other” version. The reliability of this sample is higher than the scores of the original Omnia Profile sample which showed average reliabilities of 0.80 and 0.79 for Other and Self version respectively.

The individual Omnia Profile constructs also showed an increase in the coefficient alphas between the initial reliability scores and those measured in the New Omnia Profile sample. Specifically, Assertiveness increased from 0.79 for Other to 0.87 and from 0.79 for Self to 0.88. Sociability increased from 0.86 for Other to 0.87 and from 0.85 for Self to 0.90. For Pace, the Other score moved from 0.81 to 0.84 and, for Self, from 0.80 to 0.84. Structure increased from 0.75 for Other to .83 and 0.77 for Self to 0.87. Finally, perspective increased from 0.78 for Other and 0.76 for Self to 0.79 and 0.83, respectively.

Table 18. Coefficient Alphas for the New Omnia Profile (Criterion Sample, N = 271)

	Other	Self
Overall	.93	.95
A: Assertiveness	.87	.88
B. Sociability	.87	.90
C. Pace	.84	.84
D. Structure	.83	.87
F. Perspective	.79	.83
Average (A-F)	.84	.86

Next, we computed correlations between OMNIA constructs. As shown in Table 17 below, overall the constructs showed large, positive correlations at $p < .01$ level of significance with each other. For example, Construct A: Assertiveness was positively correlated with Sociability at $r = 0.71$, with Pace at $r = 0.40$, Structure at $r = 0.55$, and Perspective at $r = 0.78$. Construct B: Sociability was correlated with Pace at $r = 0.48$, Structure at $r = 0.39$, and Perspective at $r = 0.65$. Construct C: Pace was correlated with Structure at $r = 0.63$ and Perspective at $r = 0.73$. And Construct D: Structure was correlated with Construct F: Perspective at $r = 0.75$.

Table 19. New Omnia Profile Internal Correlations (Criterion Data, N=271)

Construct	A Assertiveness	B Sociability	C Pace	D Structure	F Perspective
A: Assertiveness					
B. Sociability	.71**				
C. Pace	.40**	.48**			
D. Structure	.55**	.39**	.63**		
F. Perspective	.78**	.65**	.73**	.75**	

Note: *Indicates significance at $p < .05$, ** Indicates significance at $p < .01$.

Criterion-Related Validity Results

Descriptive statistics regarding supervisor ratings of performance are presented in Table 18. Supervisors rated their subordinates on organizational citizenship behaviors (OCBI & OCBO) which are defined as positive behaviors in the workplace (such as helping coworkers, etc.) displayed in the past month on a scale from 1 = *never* to 5 = *many times*. Supervisors also rated their subordinates on task performance in the past month using the same scale. Additionally, supervisors rated subordinates on sales performance on a scale from 1 = *unsatisfactory* to 5 = *outstanding*. Supervisors also rated the overall performance of each subordinate (Overall 1) and rated the subordinates performance compared to all other subordinates in the company (Overall 2) using a scale ranging from 1 = *worst among the company* to 7 = *best among the company*. The Omnia Compatibility Rating (OCR) is an index of how strongly OMNIA recommends a person for a particular position. A higher OCR rating should be associated with higher supervisor ratings. These ratings were computed for each subordinate by OMNIA using their proprietary software. The means and standard deviations for each of the performance behaviors are listed in Table 18. Ratings across performance dimensions varied from $M = 3.20$ to $M = 5.60$ indicating above average performance for the sample on all dimensions.

Table 20. Summary of Supervisory Performance Ratings (Criterion Sample, N = 166)		
	Mean	Standard Deviation
Dimension		
Sales Performance	3.26	.57
OCBI	3.85	.82
OCBO	4.22	.70
Overall Employee Performance	5.57	1.33

Table 19 depicts the criterion-related validity results of Constructs A, B, C, D, and F of the New Omnia Profile with OCR scores and supervisor performance ratings of performance.

Construct A: Assertiveness showed the most significant correlation with Sales Performance at $r = 0.24$, $p < .01$. This construct was also positively correlated at $p < .05$ level of significance with OCB-I at $r = 0.18$ and Overall Performance 1 at $r = .02$. Assertiveness did not show a significant correlation with Task Performance, OCB-O, or Overall Performance 2.

Construct B: Sociability was not significantly correlated with any of the performance ratings. However, the correlation between Sociability and Sales Performance was approaching significance at $r = 0.14$, $p < .07$.

Construct C: Pace was also not significantly correlated with any of the performance ratings and, unfortunately, none of these correlations were found to be approaching significance.

Construct D: Structure was only significantly correlated with Sales Performance at $r = 0.16$, $p < .05$. However, it was approaching significance with both Overall Performance measures with Overall Performance 1 at $r = 0.15$, $p < .06$ and Overall Performance 2 at $r = 0.14$, $p < .08$. It was not significantly correlated or approaching significance with Task Performance or OCB-O.

Construct F: Perspective was correlated with both OCB-I and OCB-O at $r = 0.19$, $p < .05$. Correlations with Sales Performance were also $r = 0.19$ at $p < .05$. Perspective was not correlated with Task Performance or Overall Performance 2 but was approaching significance in its correlation to Overall Performance 1 at $r = 0.15$, $p < .06$.

Table 21. Omnia Profile and Criterion Correlations (Criterion Data, N=166)						
		A	B	C	D	F
Dimension	OCR	Assertiveness	Sociability	Pace	Structure	Perspective
OCB - I	.15*	.19*	.14	.12	.11	.20***
Sales Performance	.19*	.30**	.18*†	.06	.10	.21**
OCB - O	.04	.14	.08	.13	.17*	.23**
Overall Performance 1	.06	.17*	.11	.09	.17*	.17*

Note. * Indicates significance at $p < .05$, **Indicates significance at $p < .01$ † Indicates significance at $p < .10$

Correlations Between OMNIA Composite Scores and Demographic Variables

Correlations between subordinate demographic variables and Omnia Profile Construct self-scores were computed to see if profile scores vary by demographics. Demographic variables were coded with the largest percentage group as 1, and all other groups as 0. Coding description is provided below in Table 22.

Results of the analysis indicate that correlations for gender were all positive, suggesting that males scored higher than women on all constructs. This is especially true for Construct F Perspective with

a significant correlation of $r = .11$ ($p < .05$). This could mean that “Perspective” is not accurately capturing how women display this construct in the workplace. With respect to ethnicity, non-whites scored higher on Construct B - Sociability, however whites scored higher in all other constructs, specifically significant correlation was obtained with Construct C- Pace ($r = .12$, $p < .05$). This could be due to cultural differences and views regarding productivity, time management, and pace of life. With respect to age, those 36 years old or above significantly scored higher on Construct D-Structure ($r = .14$, $p < .05$) and Construct F-Perspective ($r = .12$, $p < .05$) than those who were 35 years old or younger.

Years of work experience had significant correlations with Constructs A-Assertiveness ($r = .16$, $p < .01$), Construct D- Structure ($r = .15$, $p < .01$) and Construct F- Perspective ($r = .18$, $p < .01$). The more years of work experience a subordinate had significantly improved their scores; however, this makes sense that those with more experience score higher than those with less experience. Additionally, work hours correlated significantly with Construct A- Assertiveness ($r = .19$, $p < .01$), Construct B- Sociability ($r = .11$, $p < .05$), and Construct F- Perspective ($r = .13$, $p < .05$). This also could be due to cultural values and perceptions of leadership, worth and the 40-hour work week.

Table 20 depicts the correlations between demographic variables and the OCR score for the Omnia Profile. As indicated in the table, none of the demographic data collected in this sample correlated significantly with the OCR score. The correlation between experience and OCR indicated a positive relationship that was approaching significance at $p < 0.97$. Given that OCR indicates job fit, it seems appropriate that experience within the role would be approaching significant correlation with OCR. The lack of correlation between OCR and demographic variables indicates that there is no legal cause for concern. Most importantly, there was no significant correlation between OCR and Race/Ethnicity nor OCR and Gender. This lack of correlation would indicate there would be no adverse impact to the respondents by using the OCR score to predict job fit.

Table 22. Correlations between OMNIA Composite Scores and Demographics (Criterion Data, N=271)

Demographic	OCR	A Assertiveness	B Sociability	C Pace	D Structure	F Perspective
Gender	-.02	.04	.02	.10	.01	.11*
Ethnicity/Race	-.05	.04	-.01	.12*	.06	.06
Age	-.04	.07	.09	.04	.14*	.12*
Experience	.10	.16**	.10	.07	.15**	.18**
Work Hours	.08	.19**	.11*	.07	.05	.13*

Note. * Indicates significance at $p < .05$, ** Indicates significance at $p < .01$

Ethnicity is coded 1 for white and 0 for non-whites, so a positive correlation indicates that whites score higher. Gender is coded 1 for males and 0 for females, so a positive correlation indicates that males score higher. Age is coded 1 for 36 years old and above and 0 is coded for 35 years old or below. Experience is coded as 1 for 10 years or more experience, and 0 as less than 10 years of experience. Work hours are coded 1 for 40 or more hours per work week and 0 for 40 hours or less per work week.

References