

User Manual

Roles QRN



User Manual - Roles

Everything you need to know to
get started with Roles



Table of Contents

1.	<i>Introduction</i>	2
1.1	Intended Purpose	2
1.2	Q1000 Roles (QRI)	2
1.3	Areas of Application.....	4
1.4	Possibilities and Limitations	4
1.5	Certified Users	4
2.	<i>Use</i>	5
2.1	Purchase	5
2.2	Scoring.....	5
3.	<i>Definitions of Roles</i>	6
3.1	General	6
4.	<i>Research Data</i>	12
4.1	Theoretical Background.....	12
4.2	Description of the Research Group.....	13
4.3	Ranking the Roles	13
5.	<i>Literature</i>	16



1. Introduction

1.1 Intended Purpose

Q1000 Roles (QRI) offers information about the roles that someone can occupy in a team. These roles are: Analyst, Resource Investigator, Controller, Coordinator, Team Worker, Specialist, Winner, Performer, Innovator.

The questionnaire can be used for a variety of purposes, such as mobility and reintegration programmes. The people who can make use of this questionnaire are psychologists, career advisers, career counsellors, HR advisers, trainers/coaches, and other experts in the field of work. In addition, Q1000 Roles (QRI) can be used in team assessments (e.g., to identify possible 'gaps' in the team or assess the compatibility between team members).

The instrument is not intended to be used as a basis for selection decisions. However, the results can be used to get a more nuanced profile of a job candidate. The questionnaire provides insight into a person's preferred roles, how they fit within a team, and how they prefer to collaborate.

1.2 Q1000 Roles (QRI)

Q1000 Roles assess someone's fit with 9 different roles. The report provides a description of each role, as well as the extent to which they suit the person in question. Thus, it can be indicated whether a role is a good fit, a somewhat good fit, or not a good fit. The result of the questionnaire consists of a description of someone's two most powerful roles. This description includes the definition of each role, as well as a list of suitable work activities and potential challenges. In addition, the report also provides insight into the two least powerful roles of a person.

The questionnaire takes about 15 minutes to complete. The results can be used to deepen your understanding of how people can contribute to a team.

1.2.1 Questions

The questions have an ipsative format, also known as 'forced choice' format. The question is always: *what suits you best?* The test-taker must choose between pairs of tasks that are related to different roles. To indicate their preference, the user must divide three points between each two tasks. This can be done by moving the slider appearing on the screen. The tasks receiving the highest number of points will be considered the preferred one. For example, if one task receives 3 points, and the other receives 0, this will indicate that first task fits the person really well, while the second does not fit them at all. It is also possible to assign 2 points to one task, and 1 point to the other task. However, it is not possible to assign the same number of points to both tasks (i.e., 1.5 points each).



Figure 1.1: Example Question Q1000 Roles (QRI)

1.2.2 Results

The roles are always measured with a set of questions (items). These items are grouped together to form 'scales'. The definitions of the scales are given in Chapter 4. Users can view their results down to the level of each question, to help them better interpret the findings in the report.

What's in it for you?

- Insight into someone's preferred role
- Insight into how someone fits best within a team
- Help in building balanced teams

1.2.3 Q1000 Roles and Other Instruments

The resulting profile provided by Q1000 Roles is based on a self-description of the candidate. To paint a complete picture of someone, it is advisable to use other instruments, as well. Questionnaires such as Q1000 Personality and Q1000 Motivation can be used to get insights into someone's personality traits and motivations. The profile emerging from Q1000 Roles can be added to this.

1.2.4 Facts and Figures

The questionnaire consists of a total of 36 questions. Each question asks the test-taker to choose between two different tasks. The final report includes 9 scores (i.e., one for each role). It takes about 15 minutes to complete the questionnaire. However, this is only an estimation, as there is no time limit for completing Q1000 Roles.



1.3 Areas of Application

1.3.1 Career Issues

Q1000 Roles can provide valuable information for career orientation, personal development, or mobility programs. For example, the tool can be used to determine the role in which an employee would be the most valuable to the organisation or the role in which they would like to grow.

1.3.2 Inflow and Career Advancement

With the help of Q1000 Roles, you can collect additional information for inflow and career advancement. Because this instrument uses an ipsative format, it is not suitable for selection decisions. We only recommend using Q1000 Roles to paint a more nuanced picture of the candidate. If you decide to use Q1000 Roles in a selection procedure, it is best to combine it with other assessment tools, such as cognitive ability tests (e.g., Q1000 Cognitive Abilities), structured interviews, or practical assessments. Q1000 Roles is especially valuable when used in team settings (e.g., to determine the best team composition).

1.4 Possibilities and Limitations

Due to its clear formulation, the questionnaire is suitable for assessing people with a wide range of education levels and (cultural) backgrounds. However, it must be considered that a low level of intelligence or a poor command of the test language (e.g., lower than B1 in terms of the Common European Framework) hinders the understanding of the questions. In such situations, a meaningful interpretation of the results is not possible. To read more about the possibilities and limitations, we also recommend reading the section about areas of application.

1.5 Certified Users

Users of Q1000 Roles are presumed to be aware of the requirements regarding responsible test use. For those who want to update their knowledge on this, there is an e-learning module available. Below, there is a summary of what a user is expected to know about responsible test use.

- The user is expected to have knowledge of basic statistical and technical concepts (e.g., reliability and norm scores) and how they should be analysed.
- In addition, it is important that the user is aware of the possibilities and limitations of the questionnaire and can effectively deal with them in practice.
- The user must know the intended purpose of Q1000 Roles (e.g., what each of the roles refer to and what the test can be used for).
- The user should be able to interpret test scores based on the reports and through their own analysis of scale scores and item scores.
- The user must be able to provide candidates with correct feedback on their test results.
- The user must be aware of common professional ethics rules and correctly apply them in practice.



2. Use

2.1 Purchase

2.1.1 Administration

The questionnaire can only be administered by a computer. In principle, additional instructions are not necessary. The candidate can find all the necessary information in the instructions screens. However, we do recommend that you provide candidates with the contact details of a process facilitator/certified test user. When taking a supervised assessment, we recommend that a certified test user or test assistant is present to guide the candidates and answer any questions they might have.

2.1.2 Analysing the Results

There are several ways to view the result of Q1000 Roles.

- **Detailed analysis.** When you click on 'Details' in the report, you will be able to see the candidate's answers and scores for each role. You can also find out how long it took the candidate to complete the questionnaire and how often they logged in.
- **Reporting.** The report includes an overview of all scores (i.e., including scores resulting from others' assessment of the candidate). The report begins with an overview of the candidates' two most powerful roles. This is followed by a description of their two least powerful roles. Finally, the report provides a brief description of each of the scores. To ease the interpretation, the scores are divided into three categories: (1) Low, (2) Mid, (3) High.

2.2 Scoring

2.2.1 Scoring

As previously explained (see Section 1.2.1), each question requires the candidate to choose between two tasks related to different roles (i.e., by allocating points). All points allocated to tasks that are related to the same role are summed up. Each sum represents a raw score for one of the nine roles.

2.2.2 Standardisation

Due to the forced choice format of the questionnaire, standardisation based on a norm group is not possible. This is because the score is determined by always comparing the candidate's choice between two tasks. Thus, the test results represent a ranking of the person's preferences for certain roles, rather than how their preferences compare to those of others. This means that the scoring categories are used to compare one person's scores against each other. For instance, a 'low' score means that the candidate allocated fewer points to that role, compared to the other roles. Similarly, a 'high' score means that the candidate allocated a great number of points to that role. All other scores are placed into the 'mid' category.



3. Definitions of Roles

3.1 General

There are 9 different roles:

1. Analyst
2. Resource Investigator
3. Controller
4. Coordinator
5. Team Worker
6. Specialist
7. Winner
8. Performer
9. Innovator

3.1.1 Analyst

If this role suits you, you enjoy researching problems and evaluating ideas. You provide an overview of the situation and can easily spot the weaknesses of a plan. If this role does not suit you, you will find it less important to fully understand the subject matter.

Definition

Analysts get to the bottom of problems. They thoroughly evaluate ideas and suggestions. They strive to get a complete understanding of the situation by contemplating, describing, and explaining. They quickly see the weak spots of a plan or argument. In this way, they can save the team from making wrong decisions. Analysts also try to get a good overview of the situation at hand, because it helps them to better understand the problem.

High Score

You fit well in organisations where you have to make complicated decisions or solve complex problems. You are inclined to look for an overview of the situation, and this can come in handy.

Challenges

- Try to suppress the tendency to be overcritical and give more chance to new or less developed ideas.
- Try to suppress the urge to compete with others in complex or challenging discussions.
- Try to refrain from bringing up new problems or rejecting other people's solutions, if this hampers the decision-making process.

Low Score

You don't fit as well in an organisation where you have to make complicated decisions or solve complex problems. Perhaps you are more practical and or prefer to make faster decisions. However, complex problems might not always have an easy fix.



3.1.2. Resource Investigator

In this role, you are always looking for new information and useful contacts. If this role does not suit you, you will be less focused on innovation and prefer to let others give input instead.

Definition

Resource Investigators are always on the lookout for new information and interesting contacts. They are good at finding ideas and resources outside their immediate work environment, and they bring them to the attention of the team. They are also excellent at making and maintaining new contacts.

High Score

You fit well in an organisation that follows new developments and trends and responds quickly to opportunities. The organisation can benefit from your exploratory and inquisitive attitude and your ability to build and maintain a vast network.

Challenges

- Try to make your commitment less dependent on the stimuli in your environment. Try to stick to agreements and promises, even if they do not feel challenging anymore.
- Try to be more focused more on what you need to do. Be less guided by your own interests and focus on what is relevant to your team.
- Try not to get over-enthusiastic. Use your teammates as a touchstone and take their ideas and plans seriously.

Low Score

You don't fit as well in an organisation that follows new developments and trends or that responds quickly to opportunities. You are not focused on building and maintaining a vast network.

3.1.3 Controller

If you like to ensure that everything is well prepared, goes according to plan, and is executed in detail, then this role suits you. If you sometimes overlook details, this role might not suit you as much.

Definition

Controllers have an excellent eye for detail. In a team, they ensure that tasks are well prepared, run according to plan, and are carried out in detail. Controllers are also very careful not to overlook anything. They do this by regularly checking whether everything is correct. In doing so, they sense what is urgent and what is not.

High Score

Certain tasks require a high degree of accuracy, as mistakes are very costly. Positions with great responsibility are a good fit for you. An example of such a position is that quality assurance officer.

Challenges



- Try to let go of your own norms and give more space to people with a looser working style or a more adventurous nature.
- Try to keep your anxiety in check to prevent discouraging other team members.
- Try to let go of your focus on details at times and opt for a more general direction.

Low Score

Some organisations require a high degree of perfection from their employees, because mistakes are very costly. These organisations don't seem to be a good fit for you. The same goes for a position as a quality assurance officer, with a keen eye for detail.

3.1.4 Coordinator

If this role suits you, you like to act as a leader and get the best out of the team. If this role is less suitable for you, you prefer to let others decide on objectives and plans.

Definition

Coordinators set out procedures and clarify objectives. They also listen to the other team members' views to get an overview of what everyone wants. Coordinators encourage each team member to contribute. They know everyone's talents and try to use them as much as possible. In this way, they strive to get the best out of the team.

High Score

A leadership role is a good fit for you. You look for consensus, but you can also make decisions on your own, if necessary. By nature, you are strongly focused on decision-making.

Challenges

- Try to remain open to new insights or questions, even if they don't immediately fit with the plan.
- Try to suppress your tendency to make decisions. Sometimes, it is important to slow down and give more space to the process.
- Pay more attention to team dynamics. Don't stick to a rigid division of roles if this does not suit the dynamics of your team.

Low Score

A managerial role is less suitable for you. You are not the kind of person who monitors the decision-making. You may prefer to leave this to someone else.

3.1.5 Team Worker

In this role, you ensure harmony and unity and preserve a good atmosphere in your team. If you prefer to do nothing to avoid tensions and confrontations, this role will not suit you as much.

Definition

Team Workers strive to create unity (i.e., 'us' is more important than 'I'). Thus, they try to avoid tensions and confrontations as much as possible. Team Workers value harmony, having a positive atmosphere, and ensuring high group morale. They promote team spirit by setting an example for the team (i.e., through their own behaviour).



High Score

You fit well within an organisation where cooperation and team spirit are paramount.

Challenges

- Try not to run away from confrontations or conflicts, but to play an active role in them by naming the bottlenecks.
- Try to take less responsibility for the group atmosphere. Sometimes, it is inevitable for the harmony to be temporarily disrupted, especially when the team has to solve a problem.
- Try to exert influence in a direct way. So, don't make alliances with someone else to get things your way, but express your opinion directly.

Low Score

You don't fit as well in an organisation where collaboration and team spirit are essential. Perhaps you prefer to work individually, or you simply find group morale less important.

3.1.6 Specialist

If you like to add an expert point of view to the decision-making process or if you are a true professional, then this role suits you. The Specialist role doesn't suit you as well if you don't want to become an expert (i.e., 'specialist') in one subject.

Definition

Specialists are dedicated professionals who provide the team with expert knowledge in their field. They prefer to concentrate on one subject and try to understand it as deeply as possible. Their expertise can be an important source of innovation in products and services, and they play a central role in ensuring professional quality standards.

High Score

You fit well in an organisation where there is a need for an expert in a certain field. It is important to you that you are given the space to keep your knowledge up to date.

Challenges

- Don't try to present yourself exclusively as an expert in your team. Be open, make sure you are broadly informed about what is going on in your team and try to contribute to matters that are further removed from your field of expertise.
- Be open to your teammates' contributions. Avoid dismissing other people's creativity by acting as the one and only specialist.
- Try to suppress the urge to concentrate solely on your field of expertise. Show commitment to your team.

Low Score

You don't fit as well in an organisation where there is a need for an expert in a certain field. You have a broader interest and prefer to explore multiple topics rather than focus on one.

3.1.7 Winner

This role suits you if you like to work towards results with a large dose of energy and aspire to be the best. If you are less driven to win, then this role is less suitable for you.

Definition

Winners have a good dose of energy and a strong urge to perform. They are quick to act and enjoy feeling challenged. Winners want to achieve results and, above all, to win. Because of their drive, they also push their teammates to perform. They are not afraid to make unpopular decisions. This can be an advantage in times when the organisation experiences major changes.

High Score

A competitive work environment suits you well, because you enjoy being challenged. In addition, you are not only challenging yourself, but you also drive others to get things done.

Challenges

- Try to keep your drive and energy in check to avoid pressuring others. Especially if your formal position allows you that space, self-control is very important.
- Try to show more tolerance towards people who are less focused on results. This is also important if colleagues are more focused on processes and procedures.
- Try to temper your competitive nature. Avoid useless battles over who is the greatest expert and dedicate yourself to the common good. Let others shine and celebrate their successes.

Low Score

A competitive work environment is not a good fit for you. You would rather not compare yourself with your colleagues. Thus, it may be difficult for you to work in a team that is strongly focused on competition.

3.1.8 Performer

If this role suits you, you ensure that decisions are followed up by concrete work and you monitor the progress. If this role doesn't suit you, you'd rather not keep an eye on the schedule. Even if you might run out of time, you prefer not to push yourself.

Definition

Performers ensure that decisions are followed by concrete work. They structure the tasks and clarify the objectives for everyone involved. In doing so, they pay close attention to achieving the set goals. Performers also persist in the event of setbacks. They ensure that projects are completed according to the plan.

High Score

You fit well in a position that involves arranging and organising people's work. You will ensure a clear schedule and a solid work structure.

Challenges

- Try to be open to unexpected ideas and opportunities. Show flexibility instead of always sticking to your initial plans.
- Try to keep less constructive criticism to yourself and think in terms of possibilities instead of limitations.
- Try to suppress your tendency to get to work quickly and arrange things if goals and intended results are not yet completely clear.

Low Score

You don't fit in a position that involves arranging and organising people's work. You prefer to leave the planning and decision-making to your colleagues.

3.1.9 Innovator

If you are very creative and come up with original ideas and solutions, this role suits you. This role is less suitable for someone who doesn't distinguish themselves through originality and imagination.

Definition

Innovators are creative and distinguish themselves through their originality and imagination. They use their imagination to come up with alternatives or solutions to complex problems. Therefore, they can also be a constant source of inspiration. Often, innovators prefer to work individually.

High Score

You fit well in an organisation where you are given a lot of freedom, for example to look for new opportunities in a certain market. You can also use this space to find creative solutions to complex problems.

Challenges

- Keep looking for a connection with the needs of your team. Avoid getting lost in your own topics of interest.
- Try to be open to the critical thinking of others. Don't crawl into your shell in the face of criticism.
- Try to not get intimidated by dominant, extraverted teammates. Keep participating and contributing.

Low Score

You don't fit as well in an organisation where innovation is high on the agenda. Some organisations need to innovate continuously to stay on top in a dynamic market. Such an organisation needs creative thinkers, and this role does not suit you as well.



4. Research Data

4.1 Theoretical Background

A team role refers to the role that a person assumes within a team. How that role is fulfilled has to do with the personality traits and professional competence of the person, as well as their social position, status, and organisational context. With Q1000 Roles, the focus is mainly on a person's preference for a specific role and the associated tasks.

There are many different types of roles. Ever since the 1930s (e.g. Mead, 1934; Lewin, 1951, Holland, 1985, Belbin, 1981), a great deal of research has been done on the division of roles within organisations and the person-role-fit. Mumford (2006) compared several related typologies (see table below). In the rightmost column, the QRI role has been added for comparison.

Mumford et al, 2006	Benne & Sheats, 1948	Bales, 1950	Belbin, 1993	McCann & Margerison, 1991	Barry, 1991	Dubrin, 1995	Parke, 1996	QRI
Contractor	initiator-contributor, information seeker, opinion seeker, energizer	Asks for orientation, asks for opinion, asks for suggestions, gives direction	Co-ordinator Shaper	Advisor	Organizing	Collaborator, Summarizer	Collaborator	Coordinator Analyst
Creator			Planner	Creator	Envisioning			Innovator
Contributor	information giver, opinion giver, elaborator	Gives their opinion, gives suggestions	Specialist					Specialist
Completer	procedural technician, recorder		Completer Finisher	Concluder, Controller		Knowledge contributor	Contributor	Performer Controller
Critic	evaluator-critic	Shows tension, shows antagonism, disagrees	Monitor Evaluator	Reporter		Challenger	Challenger	Winner
Cooperator	follower, compromiser							
Communicator	encourager	Shows solidarity, tension release, agrees	Teamworker	Upholder	Socializing	People supporter, Listener		Team Worker
Calibrator	harmonizer, gatekeeper, group-observer, standard setter					Process observer, Conciliator, Gatekeeper	Communicator	
Coordinator			Resource investigator	Explorer	Sensation			Resource Investigator



4.2 Description of the Research Group

The data was collected over 5 years (2016 to 2021). The sample includes 8691 individuals. 52% identify as men and 48% identify as women. Their age ranges from 17 to 68, with an average of 40 years old. For 4109 people, the purpose of the assessment is also known. The questionnaire was most often used for development purposes (43%), followed by selection (30%), outplacement and reintegration (5%), or admission (4%). For the rest of the sample, a different purpose applied (17%). The educational background is only known for 3687 people. Out of this group, 23% completed MBO education (levels 1 to 4), 44% completed HBO education, and 33% completed WO education.

Scale	M(X)	SD(X)
Analyst	11.93	2.39
Resource Investigator	12.49	2.55
Controller	9.04	2.86
Coordinator	13.69	2.10
Team Worker	12.49	2.83
Specialist	11.66	2.75
Winner	12.62	2.29
Performer	12.53	2.22
Innovator	11.55	2.97

Table 4.1: Means (M) and standard deviations (SD)

The means are all fairly similar (i.e., average value is 12), with the lowest score for Controller (9) and the highest score for Coordinator (13). Thus, Controller seems to be relatively less popular compared to other roles.

4.3 Ranking the Roles

Using the same research group, we also investigated how often the different roles emerge as the most or least suitable for people. In the table below, you can see that Team Worker is more often ranked as the most suitable role. This is the case for about 1 in 5 people. A less common role is that of Controller. This role was ranked as the least suitable for 40% of the research group. This is also in line with the lower mean of this roles. Yet, it is still striking that this seems to be the least preferred role for such a large group. Contrary to this, the role of Controller is less often identified as the least appropriate role (2%). However, we tend to see an overall even distribution of roles.

Scale	Highest (%)	Lowest (%)
Analyst	10.3	4.8
Resource Investigator	11.5	7.9
Controller	2.4	39.5
Coordinator	16.2	1.7
Team Worker	19.3	7.0
Specialist	11.1	10.0



Winner	8.9	6.7
Performer	9.7	5.2
Innovator	10.6	17.2

Table 4.2: Ranking of the roles

4.4 Standardisation

As indicated earlier, Q1000 Roles is an ipsative questionnaire. Due to its forced choice format, standardisation using a norm group is not possible. This is because the score is determined by always comparing the candidate's choice between two tasks. Thus, the test result represents a ranking of the person's preferences for certain roles, rather than how their preferences compare to those of others. The categorization of scores is therefore an absolute one (i.e., a fixed, chosen classification). However, we checked the distribution of the three scoring categories (i.e., low, mid, high) (see Table 4.3). Most of the roles have a fairly similar distribution of scores. Low scores are the least common, with an average of 22% (except for Controller). Contrary to this, mid scores are the most common (43%). Finally, high scores appear in approximately 29% of the cases. As mentioned, Controller is the outlier here. This role is the least attractive one for a large proportion of respondents (i.e., 70% have a score that falls into the 'low' category).

Scale	Low (%)	Middle (%)	High (%)
Analyst	26	50	24
Resource Investigator	20	45	34
Controller	70	25	5
Coordinator	6	41	53
Team worker	23	42	35
Specialist	32	44	23
Winner	16	49	34
Performer	17	52	31
Innovator	36	40	24

Table 4.3: Distribution of QRI scores across categories

4.5 Reliability

The internal consistency of this type of questionnaire cannot be determined because of the interdependence of the answers (i.e., if a role is rated very highly, the other roles are automatically rated lower). However, test-retest data is available. The main challenge in interpreting test-retest data is that someone's preference for certain roles can vary across life stages, experiences, and organisational cultures. Nonetheless, the results give a positive indication of the reliability of the test. All correlations are significant and largely greater than .50, indicating a big overlap between the two measurements. For Controller, the correlation is as high as .70. This seems to be consistent with the assumption that this role has a strong personality component.

Scale	Test-retest
Analyst	.54
Resource Investigator	.68
Controller	.70



Coordinator	.43
Team Worker	.55
Specialist	.63
Winner	.38
Performer	.47
Innovator	.63

Table 4.4: Test-retest correlations between roles. Correlations equal or higher than .50 are considered large.



5. Literature

Ashforth, B. E. (2001). Role transitions in organisational life: An identity-based perspective. Mahwah, NY: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Ashforth, B. E., & Saks, A. M. (2000). Personal control in organisations: A longitudinal investigation with newcomers. *Human Relations* 53, 311-339.

Bales, R.F. (1950): 'A Set of Categories for the Analysis of Small Group Interaction' in *American Sociological Review*, Vol. 15, No. 2, p. 257-263

Bandura, A. (1977). Principles of behaviour modification. Social learning theory: Prentice Hall.

Belbin, R.M. (2010): Team Roles at Work, Butterworth-Heinemann.

Benne, K.D.; Sheats, P. (1948): 'Functional Roles of Group Members' in *Journal of Social Issues*, Volume 4, Issue 2, p. 41-49

Crant, J. M. (2000). Proactive behaviour in organisations. *Journal of Management* (26), 435-462.

De Meuse, K. & Dai, G. & Hallenbeck, G. (2010). Learning agility: A construct whose time has come. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research*. 62. 119-130.

Erez, A., & Judge, T. A. (2001). Relationship of core self/evaluations to goal/setting, motivation and performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology* 86, 1270-1279.

Hall, D. T. (2002). Careers in and out of organisations. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Hall, D. T., & Mirvis, P. H. (2001). Reconceptualizing mentoring at work: A developmental network. *Academy of Management Review* (26), 264-288.

Hofstee, W. K. (1999). Principles of Assessment. Lisse: Swets & Zeitlinger.

Holland, J.L. (1985): Making Vocational Choices. A Theory of Vocational Personalities and Work Environments, Englewood Cliffs

Lewin, K. (1951) Field theory in social sciences. New York: Harper & Brothers.

Margerison, C.J.; McCann, D.J. (1990): Team Management. Practical New Approaches, W.H. Allen

McCall, M. W., Lombardo, M. M., & Morrison, A. M. (1988). The lessons of experience: How successful executives develop on the job. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.

Mead, G.H. (1934). Mind, Self, and Society. Ed. by Charles W. Morris. University of Chicago Press.

Mumford, T.V.; Campion, M.A.; Morgeson, F.P. (2006): 'Situational Judgment in Work Teams: A Team Role Typology' in Weekley, J.A.; Ployhart, R.E. *Situational Judgment Tests. Theory, Measurement, and Application*, Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers



Wanberg, C. R., & Banas, J. T. (2000). Predictors and outcomes of openness to changes in a reorganizing workplace. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 132-142.

