

# The International Profiler



## Technical Issues

## Background

The International Profiler is a questionnaire and feedback process based on 10 competencies and 22 related dimensions relevant to working in international roles. The competencies and dimensions have been developed on the basis of current research in the field of cross-cultural studies, combined with the practical experience of experts in the field and people working in international and multicultural settings. The research findings on which these dimensions have been constructed are listed in a separate document available from WorldWork.

The International Profiler has been designed as a ‘culture general’ development tool; in other words it looks at the qualities required to operate successfully in an unfamiliar cultural setting whatever that may be and not in a specific culture. It is intended for use as a development tool and is not suitable for selection purposes.

## The Questionnaire and Feedback Reports

The questionnaire has 80 questions each consisting of a stem and three questions, and the person completing the questionnaire is first asked to choose the question which best describes them or their behaviour, and then to select the second question in the same way. The first choice is then scored with a 5 or a 4 depending on how accurate they think it is, and in the same way the second is scored with a 3 or 4. The third choice is left un-scored. There are approximately 10 questions that load onto each of the 22 dimensions.

Two types of feedback report are available – the Standard Report and the more detailed Interpretive Report. The questionnaire, Standard Reports and Interpretive Reports are currently available in English, French, Italian, German and Polish. During the design phase the pilot version of the questionnaire was trialled with about 100 people from a range of different cultural backgrounds. The data from this was used to carry out an item analysis and to eliminate questions that were not contributing to the dimensions. Resulting from this a second version of the questionnaire was designed and is now in use.

## The Norm Base

As at May 2011 the norm base consists of information from approximately 7374 International Profiler questionnaires. 128 different nationalities are represented in the norm base, with the largest groups being Germans (18.9%), British (12.5%), and Americans (10.3%) and Italians (9.8%). A detailed analysis of the national make-up of the database is shown in Appendix A.

An analysis of the norm base according to the age of the people represented is shown in Appendix B.

Respondents filling in the questionnaire are not required to give their gender, but of those that have done so 65% were male and 35% were female.

## Reliability

The ‘Reliability’ of a questionnaire is a quantification of how consistently it measures the constructs it seeks to evaluate. The table in Appendix C reports the results of three Reliability studies that have been carried out. The first study was made using an internal consistency measure of Reliability (namely the Cronbach’s alpha test) using the whole database as at May 2011. The second used the same methodology but only used the questionnaires that were completed in English by people who reported that their native language was English. The difference between the levels of reliability from these two studies indicates the slight reduction in reliability that results from the inclusion of the different language versions of the questionnaire.

The third study was carried out with a group of University students at MIB School of Management in Trieste, Italy. The students completed the International profiler questionnaire before coming up to the School of

Management, and then completed it again, without having any feedback in between, approximately four to six weeks later as part of their course. The two sets of scores were then correlated together using a two-tailed test to arrive at the Pearson's correlation coefficient.

Ideally reliability coefficients should be around 0.7 or higher. When evaluating the alpha coefficients for the International Profiler it is important to consider the following effects on reliability coefficients:

- 🌀 The International Profiler Questionnaire is of a semi-ipsative and forced choice construction. This means that respondents are being asked to choose between scales when they complete the questionnaire. Internal consistency is essentially about the reliability with which respondents will endorse an item as being like them. In a non-forced choice questionnaire (e.g. a Likert scale where a respondent is asked to respond on a 1-5 scale) the respondent could choose 5 every time an item relating to the scale occurs. This will result in a high internal consistency co-efficient. However, in a forced choice questionnaire the respondent's choice will be affected by the items it is compared with. Thus respondents may choose 8 out of ten items relating to a scale, neglecting to choose two of the items because other items describe them better. This can have the effect of lowering the reported reliability of the scales. It is for this reason that many forced choice questionnaires do not report internal consistency coefficients at all, preferring test-retest coefficients instead.
- 🌀 The test-retest study is a more appropriate test of reliability for a questionnaire of the type used for the International Profiler. However, the testing conditions for the study detailed in Appendix C were less than ideal, because the first time the students completed the test was before they came up to the University and the second time was once they were engaged in their course work which involved some study of cross-cultural issues. Ideally, there should be no changes between the first and second times that respondents complete the questionnaire, but this change of circumstances may have resulted in lower correlation coefficients.
- 🌀 In normative personality questionnaire construction it is generally accepted that internal consistency coefficients should exceed 0.7. Personality questionnaires are expected to meet this standard because they are supposed to represent traits that are stable over different situations. The International Profiler, however, focuses on behaviour, not personality. In this instance behaviour will be affected by the interplay of underlying personality traits and contextual variables, so that it may be expected that there will be more variation due to situational contexts than with personality measures. Once again this can have the effect of lowering reliability coefficients.
- 🌀 Reliability is also affected by the domain of behaviour measured by a scale. Scales with a narrow range of behaviour will tend to have higher reliabilities than scales with a greater breadth of behaviour. It is for this reason that some questionnaires have many items that are the same and which are repeated as this can have the effect of raising the reliability coefficients. By contrast, the International Profiler was designed as a tool to be used in coaching and similar situations, where a broader scale, containing more than one simple construct, is an advantage. Such broader scales provide a better basis for a coaching discussion in which the meaning of the individual's scores are explored in depth and related to his or her particular context.

Given these caveats the reliability results for the International Profiler are more than adequate for a questionnaire of this construction and purpose, particularly when consideration is given to the advantages of a forced choice over a non-forced choice design. However, it is clear that some of the dimensions measured by the International Profiler are more reliable than others, and people qualified to provide feedback need to bear this in mind when discussing the results with respondents.

## Validity

WorldWork Ltd. is always seeking opportunities to carry out full validity tests, and will be pleased to work with any organisation willing to provide the necessary facilities to enable this to take place.

More than 7300 people have completed the questionnaire, and feedback has been provided to all of those people. From the experience of providing this we can say that the instrument has good face validity and people typically 'own' the information contained in the feedback profile, and recognise its relevance to working internationally. As such it provides a sound basis for developmental work.

## Inter-Dimensional Correlations

Appendix D shows the correlations between the 22 different dimensions represented in the International Profiler. This analysis was carried out using the whole database as at May 2011, and the correlations use the Pearson's correlation coefficient based on a two tailed-test.

In an ideal test, all the dimensions should be independent and no dimension should be closely correlated with any other. Correlations above 0.3 have been highlighted in the table by reversing out the text in white on a black background. These show where there is an interesting level of correlation between the dimensions, and licensed consultants will be able to understand and interpret these relationships. For example, the highest level of inter-dimensional correlation is between the two dimensions '*Inner Purpose*' and '*Focus on Goals*'. This indicates that the concepts underlying these two dimensions may be very similar.

## Analysis of the International Profiler Database by Nationality

Nationality	No. of Completed International Profilers	Percentage of Total International Profilers Completed
German	1396	18.93%
British	923	12.52%
American	760	10.31%
Italian	723	9.80%
French	383	5.19%
Chinese	260	3.53%
Polish	208	2.82%
Indian	158	2.14%
Mexican	146	1.98%
Swede	117	1.59%
Spanish	95	1.29%
Dutch	94	1.27%
Belgian	83	1.13%
Austrian	80	1.08%
Romanian	69	0.94%
Australian	65	0.88%
Brazilian	63	0.85%
Irish	61	0.83%
Canadian	57	0.77%
Portuguese	48	0.65%
Hungarian	46	0.62%
Czech	44	0.60%
Russian	42	0.57%
South African	40	0.54%
Denmark	38	0.52%
Serb and Montenegrin	37	0.50%
Other Nationalities	727	9.86%
Unknown	611	8.29%
<b>Total Number of Completed Profilers</b>	<b>7374</b>	<b>100.00%</b>
<b>Total Number of Countries Represented</b>	<b>128</b>	

## Analysis of the International Profiler Database by Age

Age Range*	Nos.	Percentage
Under 20	33	0.52%
20-29	1491	23.50%
30-39	2508	39.53%
40-49	1676	26.41%
50-59	559	8.81%
60+	78	1.23%
	<b>6345</b>	<b>100.00%</b>

## International Profiler - Reliability

	Internal Consistency		Test/Re-Test
	Alpha		Pearson
	All Data	English	Student Group
New Thinking	0.54	0.58	0.62
Welcoming Strangers	0.66	0.70	0.69
Acceptance	0.55	0.57	0.49
Flexible Behaviour	0.51	0.53	0.62
Flexible Judgment	0.26	0.26	0.21
Learning Languages	0.74	0.80	0.74
Inner Purpose	0.62	0.66	0.64
Focus on Goals	0.69	0.75	0.60
Resilience	0.36	0.39	0.53
Coping	0.57	0.63	0.80
Spirit of Adventure	0.61	0.63	0.72
Attuned	0.60	0.65	0.58
Reflected Awareness	0.42	0.43	0.41
Active Listening	0.51	0.52	0.64
Clarity of Communication	0.48	0.55	0.50
Exposing Intentions	0.49	0.55	0.58
Information Gathering	0.63	0.63	0.63
Valuing Differences	0.39	0.48	0.47
Rapport	0.34	0.38	0.69
Range of Styles	0.34	0.41	0.65
Sensitivity to Context	0.47	0.50	0.46
Creating New Alternatives	0.49	0.50	0.68
N	7,374	2,001	28

## Reliability

The 'Reliability' of a questionnaire is a quantification of how consistently it measures the constructs it seeks to evaluate. The table in Appendix C reports the results of three Reliability studies that have been carried out. The first study was made using an internal consistency measure of Reliability (namely the Cronbach's alpha test) using the whole database as at May 2011. The second used the same methodology but only used the questionnaires that were completed in English by people who reported that their native language was English. The difference between the levels of reliability from these two studies indicates the slight reduction in reliability that results from the inclusion of the different language versions of the questionnaire.

The third study was carried out with a group of University students at MIB School of Management in Trieste, Italy. The students completed the International profiler questionnaire before coming up to the School of Management, and then completed it again, without having any feedback in between, approximately four to six weeks later as part of their course. The two sets of scores were then correlated together using a two-tailed test to arrive at the Pearson's correlation coefficient.

Ideally reliability coefficients should be around 0.7 or higher. When evaluating the alpha coefficients for the International Profiler it is important to consider the following effects on reliability coefficients:

- 🌀 The International Profiler Questionnaire is of a semi-ipsative and forced choice construction. This means that respondents are being asked to choose between scales when they complete the questionnaire. Internal consistency is essentially about the reliability with which respondents will endorse an item as being like them. In a non-forced choice questionnaire (e.g. a Likert scale where a respondent is asked to respond on a 1-5 scale) the respondent could choose 5 every time an item relating to the scale occurs. This will result in a high internal consistency co-efficient. However, in a forced choice questionnaire the respondent's choice will be affected by the items it is compared with. Thus respondents may choose 8 out of ten items relating to a scale, neglecting to choose two of the items because other items describe them better. This can have the effect of lowering the reported reliability of the scales. It is for this reason that many forced choice questionnaires do not report internal consistency coefficients at all, preferring test-retest coefficients instead.
- 🌀 The test-retest study is a more appropriate test of reliability for a questionnaire of the type used for the International Profiler. However, the testing conditions for the study detailed in Appendix C were less than ideal, because the first time the students completed the test was before they came up to the University and the second time was once they were engaged in their course work which involved some study of cross-cultural issues. Ideally, there should be no changes between the first and second times that respondents complete the questionnaire, but this change of circumstances may have resulted in lower correlation coefficients.

- 🌀 In normative personality questionnaire construction it is generally accepted that internal consistency coefficients should exceed 0.7. Personality questionnaires are expected to meet this standard because they are supposed to represent traits that are stable over different situations. The International Profiler, however, focuses on behaviour, not personality. In this instance behaviour will be affected by the interplay of underlying personality traits and contextual variables, so that it may be expected that there will be more variation due to situational contexts than with personality measures. Once again this can have the effect of lowering reliability coefficients.
- 🌀 Reliability is also affected by the domain of behaviour measured by a scale. Scales with a narrow range of behaviour will tend to have higher reliabilities than scales with a greater breadth of behaviour. It is for this reason that some questionnaires have many items that are the same and which are repeated as this can have the effect of raising the reliability coefficients. By contrast, the International Profiler was designed as a tool to be used in coaching and similar situations, where a broader scale, containing more than one simple construct, is an advantage. Such broader scales provide a better basis for a coaching discussion in which the meaning of the individual's scores are explored in depth and related to his or her particular context.

Given these caveats the reliability results for the International Profiler are more than adequate for a questionnaire of this construction and purpose, particularly when consideration is given to the advantages of a forced choice over a non-forced choice design. However, it is clear that some of the dimensions measured by the International Profiler are more reliable than others, and people qualified to provide feedback need to bear this in mind when discussing the results with respondents.

## Validity

WorldWork Ltd. is always seeking opportunities to carry out full validity tests, and will be pleased to work with any organisation willing to provide the necessary facilities to enable this to take place.

More than 7300 people have completed the questionnaire, and feedback has been provided to all of those people. From the experience of providing this we can say that the instrument has good face validity and people typically 'own' the information contained in the feedback profile, and recognise its relevance to working internationally. As such it provides a sound basis for developmental work.

## Inter-Dimensional Correlations

Appendix D shows the correlations between the 22 different dimensions represented in the International Profiler. This analysis was carried out using the whole database as at May 2011, and the correlations use the Pearson's correlation coefficient based on a two tailed-test.

In an ideal test, all the dimensions should be independent and no dimension should be closely correlated with any other. Correlations above 0.3 have been highlighted in the table by reversing out the text in white on a black background. These show where there is an interesting level of correlation between the dimensions, and licensed consultants will be able to understand and interpret these relationships. For example, the highest level of inter-dimensional correlation is between the two dimensions *'Inner Purpose'* and *'Focus on Goals'*. This indicates that the concepts underlying these two dimensions may be very similar.

## Analysis of the International Profiler Database by Nationality

Nationality	No. of Completed International Profilers	Percentage of Total International Profilers Completed
German	1396	18.93%
British	923	12.52%
American	760	10.31%
Italian	723	9.80%
French	383	5.19%
Chinese	260	3.53%
Polish	208	2.82%
Indian	158	2.14%
Mexican	146	1.98%
Swede	117	1.59%
Spanish	95	1.29%
Dutch	94	1.27%
Belgian	83	1.13%
Austrian	80	1.08%
Romanian	69	0.94%
Australian	65	0.88%
Brazilian	63	0.85%
Irish	61	0.83%
Canadian	57	0.77%
Portuguese	48	0.65%
Hungarian	46	0.62%
Czech	44	0.60%
Russian	42	0.57%
South African	40	0.54%
Denmark	38	0.52%
Serb and Montenegrin	37	0.50%
Other Nationalities	727	9.86%
Unknown	611	8.29%
<b>Total Number of Completed Profilers</b>	<b>7374</b>	<b>100.00%</b>
<b>Total Number of Countries Represented</b>	<b>128</b>	

## Analysis of the International Profiler Database by Age

Age Range*	Nos.	Percentage
Under 20	33	0.52%
20-29	1491	23.50%
30-39	2508	39.53%
40-49	1676	26.41%
50-59	559	8.81%
60+	78	1.23%
	<b>6345</b>	<b>100.00%</b>

### International Profiler - Reliability

	Internal Consistency		Test/Re-Test
	Alpha		Pearson
	All Data	English	Student Group
New Thinking	0.54	0.58	0.62
Welcoming Strangers	0.66	0.70	0.69
Acceptance	0.55	0.57	0.49
Flexible Behaviour	0.51	0.53	0.62
Flexible Judgment	0.26	0.26	0.21
Learning Languages	0.74	0.80	0.74
Inner Purpose	0.62	0.66	0.64
Focus on Goals	0.69	0.75	0.60
Resilience	0.36	0.39	0.53
Coping	0.57	0.63	0.80
Spirit of Adventure	0.61	0.63	0.72
Attuned	0.60	0.65	0.58
Reflected Awareness	0.42	0.43	0.41
Active Listening	0.51	0.52	0.64
Clarity of Communication	0.48	0.55	0.50
Exposing Intentions	0.49	0.55	0.58
Information Gathering	0.63	0.63	0.63
Valuing Differences	0.39	0.48	0.47
Rapport	0.34	0.38	0.69
Range of Styles	0.34	0.41	0.65
Sensitivity to Context	0.47	0.50	0.46
Creating New Alternatives	0.49	0.50	0.68
N	7,374	2,001	28

## Cross Correlations of the International Profiler Dimensions

N = 7374		New Thinking	Welcoming Strangers	Acceptance	Flexible Behaviour	Flexible Judgement	Learning Languages	Inner Purpose	Focus on Goals	Resilience	Coping	Spirit of Adventure	Attuned	Reflected Awareness	Active Listening	Clarity of Communication	Exposing Intentions	Information Gathering	Valuing Differences	Rapport	Range of Styles	Sensitivity to Context	Creating New Alternatives
<b>New Thinking</b>	Pearson Correlation Sig. (2-tailed)	1	.020 .086	.045** .000	-.051** .000	.163** .000	-.008 .478	-.201** .000	-.110** .000	-.013 .270	-.112** .000	.301** .000	-.290** .000	-.165** .000	.073** .520	-.007 .747	-.004 .000	.055** .000	.111** .000	-.288** .000	-.052** .000	-.114** .000	.161** .000
<b>Welcoming Strangers</b>	Pearson Correlation Sig. (2-tailed)	.020 .086	1	.381** .000	-.095** .000	-.008 .474	.163** .000	-.309** .000	-.431** .000	-.067** .000	-.319** .000	.134** .000	.111** .000	-.010 .407	.070** .000	-.184** .000	-.295** .000	.152** .000	.160** .000	.153** .000	.239** .000	-.140** .000	.147** .000
<b>Acceptance</b>	Pearson Correlation Sig. (2-tailed)	.045** .000	.381** .000	1	.066** .000	.122** .000	.099** .000	-.468** .000	-.416** .000	-.092** .000	-.250** .000	-.044** .000	.104** .137	.017 .000	.150** .000	-.194** .000	-.231** .000	.152** .000	.257** .000	.121** .000	.155** .000	-.157** .000	.110** .000
<b>Flexible Behaviour</b>	Pearson Correlation Sig. (2-tailed)	-.051** .000	-.095** .000	.066** .000	1	-.034** .004	-.087** .004	-.204** .000	-.147** .000	-.051** .000	.048** .000	.094** .000	-.033** .000	-.127** .000	-.069** .000	-.013 .283	-.077** .000	.076** .000	-.059** .000	.281** .000	.041** .000	.066** .000	.066** .000
<b>Flexible Judgement</b>	Pearson Correlation Sig. (2-tailed)	.163** .000	-.008 .474	.122** .000	-.034** .004	1	-.034** .004	-.258** .000	-.148** .000	-.061** .000	-.110** .511	-.008 .000	-.055** .000	-.041** .000	.262** .000	-.058** .563	-.007 .001	.040** .000	.146** .000	-.048** .000	-.106** .000	-.090** .000	.091** .000
<b>Learning Languages</b>	Pearson Correlation Sig. (2-tailed)	-.008 .478	.163** .000	.099** .000	-.087** .000	-.034** .004	1	-.068** .000	-.210** .000	-.002 .892	-.118** .000	-.006 .591	-.176** .000	-.128** .030	.016 .162	-.111** .000	.162** .000	-.002 .838	-.047** .000	-.012 .294	-.234** .000	-.078** .000	-.078** .000
<b>Inner Purpose</b>	Pearson Correlation Sig. (2-tailed)	-.201** .000	-.309** .000	-.468** .000	-.204** .000	-.258** .000	-.068** .000	1	.514** .000	.065** .000	.145** .000	-.087** .000	-.046** .000	-.049** .000	-.190** .000	.183** .000	.148** .004	-.033** .000	-.185** .000	.075** .000	-.144** .000	.165** .000	-.078** .000
<b>Focus on Goals</b>	Pearson Correlation Sig. (2-tailed)	-.110** .000	-.431** .000	-.416** .000	-.147** .000	-.148** .000	-.210** .000	.514** .000	1	.114** .000	.235** .000	-.056** .000	-.202** .000	-.057** .000	-.207** .000	.231** .000	.292** .000	-.147** .000	-.213** .000	-.044** .000	-.202** .000	.154** .000	-.100** .000
<b>Resilience</b>	Pearson Correlation Sig. (2-tailed)	-.013 .270	-.067** .000	-.092** .000	-.051** .000	-.061** .892	-.002 .000	.065** .000	.114** .000	1	.237** .000	.024 .042	-.080** .000	.028** .016	-.161** .000	.007 .552	.028** .015	-.075** .000	-.085** .000	.017 .142	-.015 .209	.019 .100	-.070** .000
<b>Coping</b>	Pearson Correlation Sig. (2-tailed)	-.112** .000	-.319** .000	-.250** .000	.048** .000	-.110** .000	-.118** .000	.145** .000	.235** .000	.237** .000	1	-.129** .000	-.065** .000	-.049** .000	-.181** .000	.129** .000	.110** .000	-.151** .000	-.110** .995	.000 .000	-.114** .000	.155** .000	-.148** .000
<b>Spirit of Adventure</b>	Pearson Correlation Sig. (2-tailed)	.301** .000	.134** .000	-.044** .000	.094** .000	-.008 .511	-.006 .591	-.087** .000	-.056** .000	.024** .042	-.129** .000	1	-.106** .000	-.245** .000	-.084** .000	-.067** .000	-.164** .001	.037** .000	.116** .000	-.177** .000	.052** .000	-.041** .000	.165** .000
<b>Attuned</b>	Pearson Correlation Sig. (2-tailed)	-.290** .000	.111** .000	.104** .000	.061** .000	-.055** .000	-.176** .000	-.046** .000	-.202** .000	-.080** .000	-.065** .000	-.106** .000	1	.132** .000	.079** .000	-.280** .000	-.265** .000	.009 .437	.202** .000	.101** .000	.178** .000	.079** .000	.004 .723
<b>Reflected Awareness</b>	Pearson Correlation Sig. (2-tailed)	-.165** .000	-.010 .407	.017 .137	-.033** .005	-.041** .000	-.128** .000	-.049** .000	-.057** .000	.028** .016	-.049** .000	-.245** .000	.132** .000	1	.029** .013	-.041** .000	.061** .000	-.148** .000	-.075** .000	.221** .001	.040** .001	.007 .525	-.124** .000
<b>Active Listening</b>	Pearson Correlation Sig. (2-tailed)	.073** .000	.070** .000	.150** .000	-.127** .000	.262** .000	-.025** .030	-.190** .000	-.207** .000	-.161** .000	-.181** .000	-.084** .000	.079** .000	.029** .013	1	.000 .992	-.038** .001	.032** .006	.053** .000	.017 .138	-.042** .000	-.110** .000	.125** .000
<b>Clarity of Communication</b>	Pearson Correlation Sig. (2-tailed)	-.007 .520	-.184** .000	-.194** .000	-.069** .000	-.058** .162	.016 .000	.183** .000	.231** .000	.007 .552	.129** .000	-.067** .000	-.280** .000	-.041** .000	.992	1	.371** .000	-.099** .000	-.316** .000	.019 .108	-.168** .000	.034** .004	-.254** .000
<b>Exposing Intentions</b>	Pearson Correlation Sig. (2-tailed)	-.004 .747	-.295** .000	-.231** .000	-.013 .283	-.007 .563	-.111** .000	.148** .000	.292** .000	.028** .015	.110** .000	-.164** .000	-.265** .000	.061** .000	-.038** .001	.371** .000	1	-.266** .000	-.340** .000	-.040** .001	-.182** .000	.106** .000	-.222** .000
<b>Information Gathering</b>	Pearson Correlation Sig. (2-tailed)	.055** .000	.152** .000	.152** .000	-.077** .000	.040** .001	.162** .000	-.033** .004	-.147** .000	-.075** .000	-.151** .000	.037** .001	.009 .437	-.148** .000	.032** .006	-.099** .000	-.266** .000	1	.057** .000	-.036** .002	-.042** .000	-.252** .000	.031** .007
<b>Valuing Differences</b>	Pearson Correlation Sig. (2-tailed)	.111** .000	.160** .000	.257** .000	.076** .000	.146** .000	-.002 .838	-.185** .000	-.213** .000	-.085** .000	-.110** .000	.116** .000	.202** .000	-.075** .000	.053** .000	-.316** .000	-.340** .000	.057** .000	1	-.157** .000	.134** .000	-.078** .000	.365** .000
<b>Rapport</b>	Pearson Correlation Sig. (2-tailed)	-.288** .000	.153** .000	.121** .000	-.059** .000	-.048** .000	-.047** .000	.075** .000	-.044** .000	.017 .142	.000 .995	-.177** .000	.101** .000	.221** .000	.017 .138	.019 .108	-.040** .001	-.036** .002	-.157** .000	1	-.013 .269	-.003 .806	-.151** .000
<b>Range of Styles</b>	Pearson Correlation Sig. (2-tailed)	-.052** .000	.239** .000	.155** .000	.281** .000	-.106** .000	-.012 .294	-.144** .000	-.202** .000	-.015 .209	-.114** .000	.052** .000	.178** .000	.040** .001	-.042** .000	-.168** .000	-.182** .000	-.042** .000	.134** .000	-.013 .269	1	-.128** .000	.161** .000
<b>Sensitivity to Context</b>	Pearson Correlation Sig. (2-tailed)	-.114** .000	-.140** .000	-.157** .000	.041** .000	-.090** .000	-.234** .000	.165** .000	.154** .000	.019 .100	.155** .000	-.041** .000	.079** .000	.007 .525	-.110** .000	.034** .004	.106** .000	-.252** .000	-.078** .000	-.003 .806	-.128** .000	1	-.015 .203
<b>Creating New Alternatives</b>	Pearson Correlation Sig. (2-tailed)	.161** .000	.147** .000	.110** .000	.066** .000	.091** .000	-.078** .000	-.078** .000	-.100** .000	-.070** .000	-.148** .000	.165** .000	.004 .723	-.124** .000	.125** .000	-.254** .000	-.222** .000	.031** .007	.365** .000	-.151** .000	.161** .000	-.015 .203	1

\*\* Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed). \* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).  
Correlations over 0.3 (positive or negative) are shown in white with black background.