

**Measuring Distinct Social Skills via Multiple Speed Assessments –  
A Behavior-Focused Personnel Selection Approach**

**Online Supplementary Material**

**Online Supplement S1**

*Variance Components and Reliability Estimates of Ratings. Comparing Results Across  
Samples and Different Exclusion Criteria*

Variance component	Main results	Sample 1	Sample 2	Sample 3	Applying exclusion criteria	Missings imputed
<i>N</i> (number of observations)	589 (5,268)	202 (1,616)	191 (1,802)	196 (1,868)	489 (3,912)	589 (7,068)
$\sigma^2$ assessee	18.15	20.05	16.64	16.69	18.89	13.89
$\sigma^2$ assessee $\times$ skill dimension	19.55	17.32	19.33	18.74	16.03	22.04
$\sigma^2$ assessee $\times$ exercise	62.29	62.63	64.03	64.57	65.08	64.07
Estimated $G(q,1)$	.53	.57	.56	.45	.50	.55
Estimated $G(q,2)$	.69	.72	.72	.62	.67	.71

*Note.* Results refer to the amount of reliable variance in %. Estimated  $G(q,k)$  = reliable variance subtotal/(reliable variance subtotal + unreliable variance subtotal/ $k$ ). Assessors were nested in exercises. Exercises were nested in dimensions. All assessees and assessors were nested within subsamples. In the model with the exclusion criteria, we excluded (a) all participants who did not have multiple skills assessed via two exercises per skill.

**Online Supplement S2***Overview of Skill Dimension Ratings: Correlations with Age and Gender*

Dimension Rating	<i>N</i>	Age correlation	Age <i>p</i> -value	Gender correlation	Gender <i>p</i> -value
1 Assertiveness: Persuasion	589	.07	.07	.04	.33
2 Assertiveness: Unreasonable	202	.03	.68	-.05	.51
3 Warmth: Crisis	589	-.01	.76	.17	< .01
4 Warmth: Bad news	535	.02	.63	.14	< .01
5 Resilience: Presentation	387	-.05	.34	-.04	.46
6 Resilience: Mistake	341	.11	.04	.01	.83

*Note.* These results refer to skill dimension ratings across all samples (pairwise deletion) and their correlations with age (in years) and gender (0 = male, 1 = female).

**Online Supplement S3***Variance Components and Reliability Estimates of Ratings Including Other Components*

Variance component	Total variance (%)	Total between- assessee variance (%)	Reliable variance (%)	Reliable dimension variance (%)
<b>Reliable variance</b>				
$\sigma^2$ assessees	7.99	9.56	18.15	26.36
$\sigma^2$ assessee $\times$ skill dimension	8.61	10.30	19.55	28.40
$\sigma^2$ assessee $\times$ exercise	27.42	32.80	62.29	45.24
<b>Unreliable variance</b>				
$\sigma^2$ assessor *	6.96	8.28		
$\sigma^2$ assessee $\times$ assessor + residual	32.65	39.06		
<b>Other components</b>				
$\sigma^2$ skill dimension	11.02			
$\sigma^2$ exercise $\times$ dimension	1.29			
$\sigma^2$ subsample	0.62			
$\sigma^2$ subsample $\times$ skill dimension	0.58			
$\sigma^2$ subsample $\times$ exercise $\times$ dimension	2.86			
Estimated $G(q,1)$			.53	.61
Estimated $G(q,2)$			.69	.75

*Note.*  $N = 589$ . Estimated  $G(q,k) = \text{reliable variance subtotal} / (\text{reliable variance subtotal} + \text{unreliable variance subtotal} / k)$ . Assessors were nested in exercises. Exercises were nested in dimensions. All assessees and assessors were nested within six subsamples (i.e., three samples  $\times$  two majors). For the reliable dimension variance (i.e., dimension-level scores), all variance components concerning exercises were divided by the number of exercises that assessed a given skill dimension (i.e., 2).

\* This variance component contributed primarily to unreliable variance because assessees were not fully crossed with assessors. This contribution to between-assessee variance was rescaled.