

Copyright is owned by the Author of the thesis. Permission is given for a copy to be downloaded by an individual for the purpose of research and private study only. The thesis may not be reproduced elsewhere without the permission of the Author.

Cognitive ability and job performance in a New Zealand service organisation

A thesis presented in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree

Master of Science

in

Industrial/Organisational Psychology

at Massey University, Manawatu,

New Zealand.

Catherine Mann

2011

## Abstract

This study investigated cognitive ability and job performance theoretically and empirically. A New Zealand government organisation tested job candidates' verbal, numeric and abstract abilities during their selection procedure and appraised employees' task, contextual and team performance as part of their performance management system. The service-based organisation provided scores on these variables for 43 recently hired employees. There was partial support for the hypothesis that cognitive abilities were related, as numeric reasoning scores correlated significantly with verbal reasoning ( $r = .38, p = .018$ ) and abstract reasoning scores ( $r = .36, p = .023$ ). Verbal reasoning scores did not correlate significantly with abstract reasoning scores ( $r = .24, p = .128$ ), though this was probably due to low power. Individual task and contextual performance ratings correlated with each other as hypothesised ( $r = .32, p = .036$ ), supporting the theory that some performance processes relate to both task and contextual performance. Team dynamics were expected to obscure simple linear relationships between team performance and individual-level variables and, as hypothesised, team performance did not correlate significantly with task or contextual performance, or cognitive abilities. Abstract reasoning did not show significant positive correlations with task or contextual performance, contrary to expectations, indicating that participants already had job-related experience. Numeric reasoning was not expected to relate to task or contextual performance as work was service based and not likely to require numeric ability, which was borne out in the non-significant correlations. Verbal ability scores correlated positively with task performance ratings ( $r = .44; p < .001$ ), supporting the hypothesis that verbal ability would be associated with task performance in a service organisation. Verbal reasoning scores did not correlate with contextual performance ratings. Implications of these results for criterion-related validity, as well as cognitive ability and job performance theories are discussed along with limitations of the study and suggestions for future research.

### **Acknowledgements**

I am grateful to my supervisor, Dr Gus Habermann, for all his support and advice. My thanks also go out to the participating organisation, in particular the Human Resources manager, for all her time and effort in providing me with data and information about the organisation. OPRA Consulting Ltd and Psytech International Ltd, especially Paul Englert, Sarah Burke, Sue Sommerville and Paul Wood, have been very accommodating, introducing me to the participating organisation and providing access to test materials and supporting me with other miscellaneous assistance with many aspects of the project.

I would also like to thank in particular Eleanor and Ben Sutton, as well as Michael Woodward, Sheila and Stewart Mann for their incredibly constructive comments and suggestions on drafts. Finally, I am very grateful to the Mann family, Sutton family and Woodward family for their love and support that helped me complete this thesis in the wake of the Christchurch earthquakes.

Catherine Mann

7<sup>th</sup> April, 2011

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Title page	i
Abstract	ii
Acknowledgements	iv
Table of Contents	v
List of Figures	v
List of Tables	vi
<b>Introduction</b>	<b>1</b>
<hr/>	
<b>1.1 Overview</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>1.2 Intelligence</b>	<b>3</b>
1.2.1 Conceptualisations of intelligence	3
1.2.2 Theories of multiple intelligences	6
1.2.3 Models of intellectual development	9
1.2.4 The psychometric approach to intelligence	12
1.2.5 Carroll's three-stratum theory	18
1.2.6 Debate around psychometric <i>g</i>	22
1.2.7 Measuring cognitive abilities	25
<b>1.3 Job performance</b>	<b>30</b>
1.3.1 Defining job performance	30
1.3.2 Dimensions of job performance	35
1.3.3 Measuring job performance	40
<b>1.4 Relationship of cognitive ability and job performance</b>	<b>47</b>
1.4.1 Antecedents of job performance	47
1.4.2 Relationship of cognitive ability to individual job performance	48
1.4.3 Relationship of cognitive ability to team performance	51
1.4.4 Limitations	53
<b>1.5 Research objectives</b>	<b>56</b>
<b>Method</b>	<b>59</b>
<hr/>	
<b>2.1 Participant's characteristics</b>	<b>59</b>
<b>2.2 Instruments</b>	<b>60</b>
2.2.1 Internet reasoning test	60
2.2.2 Adaptive general reasoning test	68
2.2.3 Performance appraisal ratings	73
2.2.4 Organisation's use of instruments	75
<b>2.3 Variables</b>	<b>76</b>
<b>2.4 Data collection method</b>	<b>78</b>
<b>2.5 Research design</b>	<b>78</b>

<b>2.6 Data analysis</b>	<b>79</b>
<b><u>Results</u></b>	<b><u>80</u></b>
<b>3.1 Univariate variable analyses and evaluation of adequacy</b>	<b>80</b>
3.1.1 Participant characteristics	81
3.1.2 Cognitive ability test scores	82
3.1.3 Job performance ratings	83
3.1.4 Participant characteristics and cognitive ability scores	86
3.1.5 Participant characteristics and job performance variables	86
<b>3.2 Hypotheses</b>	<b>88</b>
3.2.1 Relationships among cognitive ability subtest scores	88
3.2.2 Relationships among job performance dimensions	88
3.2.3 Relationships between cognitive abilities and job performance ratings	89
<b>3.3 Summary of key results</b>	<b>92</b>
3.3.1 Results indicating caution is required in interpretation	92
3.3.2 Results relating to hypotheses	93
<b><u>Discussion</u></b>	<b><u>96</u></b>
<b>4.1 Key findings</b>	<b>96</b>
4.1.1 Cognitive abilities	96
4.1.2 Job performance ratings	97
4.1.3 Cognitive abilities and job performance dimensions	100
<b>4.2 Limitations</b>	<b>104</b>
<b>4.3 Contributions and Implications</b>	<b>107</b>
<b>4.4 Future research</b>	<b>108</b>
<b>4.5 Conclusion</b>	<b>109</b>
<b><u>Appendices</u></b>	<b><u>110</u></b>
<b>6.1 Appendix one: Guilford's Structure of intellect model</b>	<b>110</b>
<b>6.2 Appendix two: Cognitive ability testing procedures</b>	<b>111</b>
6.2.1 Internet reasoning test	111
6.2.2 Adaptive general reasoning test	117
<b>6.3 Appendix three: IRT2 reference group characteristics</b>	<b>118</b>
6.3.1 Verbal reasoning reference group	118
6.3.2 Numeric reasoning reference group	121
6.3.2 Abstract reasoning reference group	125
<b>6.4 Appendix four: Gower index of similarity</b>	<b>128</b>
6.4.1 Method	128
6.4.2 Results and disucussion	130
<b><u>References</u></b>	<b><u>132</u></b>

## List of figures

Figure 1.2: Item characteristic curve with item difficulty set at 0	28
Figure 1.3: Relationships between criterion relevance, deficiency and contamination	42

## List of tables

Table 2.1: Research variables	77
Table 3.1: Participant's ages and length of service	81
Table 3.2: Cognitive ability score distributions	83
Table 3.3: Number and percent of participants receiving different levels of performance ratings	83
Table 3.4: Number and percent of participants receiving each combination of job performance ratings, and corresponding overall performance percent	84
Table 3.5: Distribution statistics for job performance ratings	85
Table 3.6: Means and standard deviations of cognitive ability scores for men and women	86
Table 3.7: Pearson correlations for non-nominal participant characteristics, cognitive ability scores and job performance ratings	87
Table 3.8: Mean reasoning ability scores by job performance ratings	91
Table 6.1: Education levels of IRT2 verbal reasoning subtest reference group participants	118
Table 6.2: Industry sector worked in by participants of IRT2 verbal reasoning subtest reference group	118
Table 6.3: Ethnicity of participants of IRT2 verbal reasoning subtest reference group	120
Table 6.4: Occupation type of participants of the IRT2 verbal reasoning subtest reference group	120
Table 6.5: Type of organisation worked for by participants of IRT2 verbal reasoning subtest reference group	121
Table 6.6: Education levels of IRT2 numeric reasoning subtest reference group participants	121
Table 6.7: Industry sector worked in by participants of IRT2 numeric reasoning subtest reference group	122
Table 6.8: Ethnicity of participants of IRT2 numeric reasoning subtest reference group	123
Table 6.9: Occupation type of participants of the IRT2 numeric reasoning subtest reference group	124
Table 6.10: Type of organisation worked for by participants of IRT2 numeric reasoning subtest reference group	124
Table 6.11: Education levels of IRT2 abstract reasoning subtest reference group participants	125
Table 6.12: Industry sector worked in by participants of IRT2 abstract reasoning subtest reference group	125
Table 6.13: Ethnicity of participants of IRT2 abstract reasoning subtest reference group	126

Table 6.14: Occupation type of participants of the IRT2 abstract reasoning subtest reference group	127
Table 6.15: Type of organisation worked for by participants of IRT2 abstract reasoning subtest reference group	128
Table 6.16: Gower indices for cognitive ability subtest scores	130
Table 6.17: Gower indices for job performance ratings	131
Table 6.18: Gower indices for cognitive ability subtest scores and overall performance ratings	131