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ABSTRACT

IN THE KNOW OR OUT OF THE LOOP: EXAMINING THE IMPACT OF (NOT) KNOWING HIGH POTENTIAL DESIGNATION

Elizabeth A. Hanrahan Ph.D.
Department of Psychology
Northern Illinois University, 2020
Lisa M. Finkelstein, Director

The cultivation and development of high-potential employees has been a main focus of most talent management sectors of organizations, regardless of field or context. While practitioners have been moving in this space for quite a while, academicians are only recently starting to conduct investigations on high-potential employees. There are many critical aspects of best in class high potential programs – the accurate identification of high-potential employees being one of the first pivotal steps.

High potential identification can be tricky for several reasons: the very definition of potential is oftentimes unclear, traditional selection decisions made for high potential can be biased, and few reliable assessments have been developed with the sole purpose of selecting employees into high potential talent programs. Talent management executives are often concerned with the value their high-potential employees can add to organizations – value that necessitates correct identification. While high potential identification has received some attention from academics, how employees react to high potential designation has not been studied in depth. Researchers and practitioners alike should begin to consider how high potential
designation can impact the individual as these labels can have significant impacts on the employees and their work.

This set of studies marks a novel contribution to the field as it is the first investigation to experimentally manipulate high potential designation, as well as consider the moderating impact of actual potential, measured by a validated assessment. Results from these studies also shed light on the question organizations often struggle with: Should we be transparent with our high potential programs and inform employees who is (not) high potential?

The results from study one indicate that employees designated as high potential, compared to those who are not high potential, report higher levels of procedural fairness. When employees believed they were high potential and were told they were not perceived fairness issues in the process they thought was used to determine their high potential status; these individuals were also more likely to report lower levels of self-efficacy. At high levels of high potential perception, procedural justice mediates the relationship between high potential designation and perceived psychological contract breach.

Study two results indicate that employees who were told they were high potential, compared to not, reported higher levels of job satisfaction. Additionally, self-efficacy was a mediator between high potential designation and decision accuracy, organizational trust, affective commitment, and job satisfaction. Results in study two revealed that perceived psychological contract breach was a significant mediator between high potential designation and decision accuracy, effort, organizational trust, affective commitment, and job satisfaction.

Overall, less support was found for the designation group that received no information regarding their high potential status. Further, self-efficacy analyses revealed mixed support. In
study two, mixed evidence was found for affective commitment. Lastly, little evidence was found to support hypotheses involving career salience.
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CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY AND LITERATURE REVIEW

Organizations want to invest resources in employees who will reciprocate in turn. Managers often want to allocate more resources to those individuals on their team who have the greatest likelihood of adding value; high potential employee development programs seek to do just that. In 1994, 42% of the major corporations surveyed reported having high potential programs (Silzer, Slider, & Knight, 1994). In 2003, estimates (Wells) cited that over half of large corporations have processes in place for identifying potential future leaders. Just a few years later, 100% of 20 major corporations reported using high potential programs (Silzer & Church, 2010). Clearly, adopting and implementing high potential programs is seen as a key strategic goal for the majority of organizations.

While high potential employee programs are becoming increasingly popular in the private sector, research on high-potential employees is sorely lacking. Academicians have acknowledged large gaps in this literature, especially with regards to selecting high-potential employees into high potential programs (Collings, Cascio, & Mellahi, 2017; Buckingham & Vosburgh, 2001; Finkelstein, Costanza, & Goodwin, 2018; Fulmer & Bleak, 2008). Research examining star performers – high-potential employees – in organizations has been largely absent from the talent management literature. Some research indicates that nearly half of all high-potential employees are misidentified (Cappelli & Keller, 2014; Martin & Schmidt, 2010). Identification aside, there is a sparsity of research that examines the impact of labeling an employee as high potential versus not. While some practitioners urge organizations to be
transparent in their high potential designation decisions (Korn Ferry, 2015), research has found there may be detrimental reactions from employees who are not identified as high potential (e.g., Björkman, Ehrnrooth, Makela, Smale, & Sumelius, 2013; Gelens, Hofmans, Dries, and Pepermans, 2014). For those organizations that have high potential programs, they face a common dilemma: Do we tell or not tell our employees who is (not) high potential?

The pair of studies in this dissertation, in part, examines how individuals who know they have either been identified, not identified, or are unaware of their high potential status react to their designation. The identification of high potentials is certainly a complex process. First and foremost, what is meant by “potential” must be carefully conceptualized. Here, potential is defined as an anticipated set of actions an employee will perform in the future. What separates high potential status from personnel selection is that the former is done in anticipation of an employee taking on additional, subsequently more difficult, perhaps even unknown job positions. Traditional selection decisions, on the other hand, typically involve crafting specified job descriptions and assessing candidates based off those prescribed required experiences or skills.

To illustrate, consider the differences between Organization X’s hiring for a vacant marketing position versus Organization X’s development of a high potential program. When hiring for an open marketing position, candidates are assessed against critical capabilities for the marketing job. However, designating an individual on that marketing team as a high potential involves considering them for higher-level leadership positions in the future, not just their ability to meet the requirements for a particular role. Thus, the complex process of high potential talent designation goes beyond that of a one-off job selection.
How, then, do we measure a concept that inherently attempts to predict success later on in life? Importantly, there are varying indicators of potential, one of them being past performance. However, high potential and ratings of past performance are not synonymous (Finkelstein et al., 2018). While it may be one of the most common assessments of managers for selecting their team into high potential programs, relying on past performance data alone invites the risk of halo error (e.g., Balzer & Sulsky, 1992). Past performance is also based on the success of an individual in a particular role thus, it does not lend itself as a valid proxy for high potential as job performance ratings do not tap into performance in unknown, future leadership roles or positions. Further, some managers or executives believe that they know potential when they see it. However, Silzer and Church (2010) discuss the importance of moving away from instinctual or gut feelings when selecting individuals as high-potential employees.

Presently, we do not currently have a clear, robust understanding of the psychological responses that occur as a result of being labeled as a high potential employee. Some researchers have theorized that not informing high potentials of their status may lead to frustration due to lack of acknowledgment of effort, while publicizing those considered high potential could decrease the motivation of employees not included (Björkman, Ehrnrooth, Mäkelä, Smale, & Sumelius, 2013). In fact, some researchers have explored the relationship between high potential talent designation and justice perceptions (Gelens, Hofmans, Dries, & Pepermans, 2014). Some consulting firms recommend that high potential status be shared amongst the work force (Korn Ferry, 2014), while preliminary research reveals that there can be serious consequences for individuals who do not receive a high potential designation (e.g., Björkman et al., 2013; Gelens
et al., 2014). Currently, there is mixed results and recommendations regarding the transparency of high potential programs.

This work is critical as it provides deeper insight into the psychological reactions of high-potential employees. Researchers benefit from this work as it adds to the high potential literature overall. Practitioners and organizations alike will benefit from a deeper insight into how employees respond to (not) being labeled a high potential employee, as well as impacts designation could have on employee performance. The contributions of these studies include (a) using a first-time experimental survey design wherein high potential designation is randomly assigned, (b) exploring the outcomes affected by not telling employees the outcome of a high potential identification program, and (c) investigating both the negative and positive aspects of transparency in a high potential program. Additionally, this is the first set of studies to investigate the real-world phenomena of misidentification of high-potential employees. While these studies are of great value to organizations and practitioners, they also move the high potential literature forward and begin to fill the research gaps currently highlighted by other academics.

The purpose of the first study in this dissertation is to investigate how high potential designation (random assignment: told high potential, told not high potential, not told anything) impacts perceived contract breach and self-efficacy. High potential perception is a construct measured by two variables: the Vaya Development Survey (VDS; validated high potential assessment) and self-high potential employee overlap (extent to which individuals see themselves as similar to high-potential employees). VDS/self-high potential employee overlap is proposed to moderate the relationship between designation and procedural justice, which is
proposed to mediate the relationship between designation and contract breach. Running in parallel, career salience (the extent to which an individual is invested in their job long-term) was explored as a moderator of the designation – procedural justice relationship. With regards to self-efficacy, VDS (test one) and self-high potential employee overlap (test two) is thought to moderate the relationship between designation and self-efficacy.

The purpose of the second study in this dissertation is twofold: to investigate how high potential designation impacts affective reactions to an employee’s organization and how designation can affect their performance on the job. The model test for the second study is depicted below. High potential designation, a randomly assigned variable (conditions: told high potential, told not high potential, not told anything) is proposed to affect performance variables (decision accuracy and decision effort) and reactions to the organization (organizational trust, affective commitment, and job satisfaction) through two mediators: self-efficacy and perceived psychological contract breach. The levels reported on these two mediators are moderated by high potential perception, as measured by the VDS. The specific theoretical supports for each study are described in detail next.

**Psychological Reaction to High Potential Designation (Study One)**

The psychological reaction experienced by an employee following a high potential designation has not yet been explored in research. In this dissertation, I investigated the impact that high potential perception has on self-efficacy and perceived contract breach. Several moderating variables were examined as well: high potential perception (VDS and overlap) and work-role salience. Further, the perceived validity of a high potential assessment (described in
detail later in this chapter) was examined. The following section provides an overview of the published studies on high potential designation. The model for the first study is displayed below.

![Study One Model](image)

**Figure 1. Study One Model**

**Existing Literature on Employee Reactions to High Potential Designation**

Currently, only two (non-qualitative) empirical studies in the organizational literature have directly examined employee reactions to high potential designation. However, each of these studies are somewhat limited. As this dissertation expands upon this previously conducted research, and as this new line of research is in its infancy, these two studies are described in detail next.

Björkman and colleagues (2013) collected data from Finnish employees who self-reported whether they had been identified as belonging to a “talent pool.” The researchers subsequently coded this qualitative data into three categories: those who perceived that they had
been designated as high-potential employees, those who did not know if they had been designated or not, and those who perceived that they had not been designated as high potential talent. Drawing from SET, Björkman et al. (2013) predicted group differences on a number of dependent variables, including the acceptance of increasing performance demands, commitment to building competencies, support of strategic priorities, identification with their work unit, identification with their larger organization, and turnover intentions.

Individuals who reported knowing that they belonged to a talent pool, compared to those who did not perceive themselves as having been designated as high potential talent, had higher commitment to increasing performance demands, building competencies, supporting strategic priorities, identification with their unit, and lower turnover intentions. The only non-supported hypothesis was that individuals who perceived they had been identified as high potential talent did not differ from those who perceived as not being designated as high potential talent on identification with their larger organization.

Similar relationships were found when comparing individuals who thought they were identified as high potential talent with those who reported not knowing their status, excluding any significant group differences on turnover intentions. The researchers speculated that the non-significant differences between organization commitment (high potential versus not high potential groups) and turnover intentions (high potential versus not knowing groups) might indicate that high-potential employees are open to leaving organizations if their needs go unmet.

Björkman et al. (2013) theorize that this increase in performance and positive attitudes following a high potential label would reinforce a supervisor’s positive feelings toward the employee, which would then feed back into an employee’s desire to continue performing highly.
Interestingly, there were no significant group differences between those perceived as having not been identified as high potential talent and those who did not know their status. Björkman and colleagues (2013) speculate that this could be due to a “sour grapes” effect wherein individuals who think they did not make the cut for high potential downplay their interest or importance of high potential talent. They call for more research in this area.

In the qualitative interview portion of their study, Björkman et al. (2013) found evidence that individuals not identified as high potential (or belonging to a talent pool) perceived unfairness in access to developmental activities and felt less support from their managers. Additionally, they also reported a lower motivation towards their own future development than did individuals who had been identified as high potential, who actually pushed for more development than they already had access to.

While this study marked a major contribution to the field, it has several limitations. Most importantly, participants subjectively reported whether they were “part of a talent pool” or not. Thus, Björkman et al. (2013) were not able to assess accuracy for high potential designation, nor did they instruct participants to clearly differentiate between being a “high potential” and simple “part of a talent pool.” There may also be an issue of common method variance, as participants provided ratings for both the independent (grouping) and dependent (attitude) variables. Lastly, the authors report a concern that their Nordic samples may not generalize to the Anglo-American population and call for additional research to be conducted using such samples. They also call for experimental manipulation of high potential designation.

In the second study to examine participant reactions to high potential designation, Gelens et al. (2014) investigated whether high potential designation affected job satisfaction and work
effort. Their participants were identified by their organization as either junior or senior level high-potential employees. This study also examined the effects of workplace justice on those relationships. Gelens et al. (2014) collected archival data from organizations in order to determine high potential talent designation. Like Björkman et al. (2013), Gelens et al. (2014) also draw from SET to support their hypotheses (they use a similar mediator of perceived distributive justice). They collected data from employees in Belgium.

Specifically, they hypothesized that individuals identified as high potential talent would report higher levels of job satisfaction and higher levels of work effort than those not identified as high potential. With regards to organizational justice, they hypothesized that individuals identified as high potential would report more favorable perceptions of distributive justice than those not identified. They also hypothesized that that group difference would lead to higher levels of job satisfaction for those identified as high potential talent and that they would also show higher work effort. Additionally, they also hypothesized that when procedural justice perceptions are low, versus high, perceived distributive justice would have a stronger impact on job satisfaction and work effort.

They found that perceived distributive justice partially mediated the relationship between high potential designation and job satisfaction and work effort. Those who were identified as high potential, compared to those not designated, perceived higher levels of distributive justice. Interestingly, the researchers found that differences between junior high-potential employees and non-designated employees were non-significant, while the senior high-potential employees versus the non-designated employees did show significantly different relationships. Gelens et al. (2014) speculate that this may be due to senior level high-potential employees having access to
more resources and opportunities for development activities. Gelens et al. (2014) make a call for future research to investigate this through experimental studies.

The work by Gelens et al. (2014) adds additional important knowledge to the study of high potential programs to the literature. However, it has a few limitations. As all employees in the organization from which they sampled knew their high potential status, investigating relationships for those who do not know their high potential status was not possible; as not all organizations explicitly tell their employees their high potential designation, further investigation on that topic is needed. This study may have also been somewhat limited by the high potential talent procedures of the organization from which they recruited participants. In this organization, they make a distinction between junior high-potential employees and senior high-potential employees. From the definitions provided by the researchers of this process, it appears that the junior-level high-potential employees have more of the classic components of potential than the senior-level high-potential employees (i.e., lack experience, show tremendous potential, are being groomed for high-level management/executive positions). However, Gelens et al. (2014) did not find significant differences between junior level high-potential employees and those designated as not high potential. Similar to Björkman et al. (2013), Gelens et al. (2014) call for the experimental manipulation of high potential status. This pair of proposed studies seeks to do just that.

**High Potential Designation Groups**

Importantly, I must make the distinction here regarding an employee being told they are not a high potential employee versus not knowing whether they have been labeled as high potential. As discussed, in one of the only investigations conducted on high potential designation
and employee reactions, Björkman et al. (2013) did not find significant group differences in their collected dependent variables for individuals who were not high potential versus those who did not know their status. Further, little background research provides a baseline for the direction of these effects. In addition, there are several conflicting outcomes that are possible for individuals who either are not high potential or are not aware of their status.

For instance, I believe the argument could be made that being told you are not high potential is worse than not knowing your status. However, I can also visualize the argument that not being given any information could cause more negative reactions than being told a definitive answer regarding an individual’s high potential status. Thus, the relationship between individuals who are specifically told that they are not high potential, compared to those who do not know their potential designation, is exploratory in this dissertation as there is little background literature on this and I could see several outcomes occurring. Specific exploratory questions regarding these group differences are presented later in the chapter.

**High Potential Perception**

An intriguing concept, not yet studied by researchers, is whether or not employees view themselves as high-potential employees. It is plausible that employees form these views of themselves both through internal assessments and attributions they make about themselves, but also the comments or feedback they receive from others. This is a topic that warrants consideration in the high potential literature as perception of oneself can directly impact their performance at work.

The theoretical mechanism that underpins this area is the self-fulfilling prophecy. The self-fulfilling prophecy has been applied mainly to the stereotype and discrimination literature
(e.g., gender stereotypes and math performance Weinstein, Gregory, & Strambler, 2004).

However, there have been links between SFP and performance in interviewing (Dipboyle, 1982) as well as in leadership/management expectations (Bargh & Chartrand, 1999).

One important aspect of SFP is the notion of a perception (stereotype) and behavior link (Chen & Bargh, 1997). William James (1890) coined the principle of ideomotor action, which purports that thinking about movement “awakens in some degree actual movement” (p. 526). Other researchers have theorized that simply perceiving violent media images and stories leads to an increase in aggressive actions (Berkowitz, 1984; Carver, Ganellen, Froming, & Chambers, 1983). In this dissertation, I investigate two measures of high potential perception (examined as moderators in studies one and two): participants’ perceived overlap of themselves to the concept of a high potential employee and a validated assessment. Few validated assessments specific to high potential currently exist. Furthermore, the measures that do exist (i.e., personality inventories by Hogan Assessments, learning agility assessments from Korn Ferry), are typically marketed towards consultant or business use, not researchers. In this dissertation, I utilized the VDS. The construction and validation of the VDS is discussed in detail below.

Potential is a muddled variable. The nature of predicting high potential is difficult as researchers can often find themselves inadvertently confusing predictor for criterion variables (e.g., measuring learning agility to identify individuals as high potential, then later predicting learning agility again). Part of verifying that predictors of high potential are reliable and valid requires studied participants to display high potential tendencies or evidence. Currently, the majority of organizations that have high potential programs fail to adopt a formal, rigorous assessment process.
In 2013, Church and Rotolo surveyed 84 organizations well known for their talent management practices. In total, only 46 of those organizations reported using formal assessments with their high potential talent pool, and only 23 reported using assessments to identify employees for the high potential program. Stakeholders involved in the majority of high potential assessment still believe that they know potential when they see it and thus do not feel the need for another assessment (Church & Rotolo, 2013; Dries, 2013; McCall, 2010). What impact does this lack of rigor have on accuracy of high potential identification? Some researchers have estimated that nearly half of all high potential designations are incorrect (Cappelli & Keller, 2014; Martin & Schmidt, 2010). As organizations invest a great deal into employees in their high potential programs, misidentification is a costly error to commit.

Thus far, researchers in this field have made use of archival data, manager ratings, or even self-reported ratings of potential (Karaveli & Hall, 2003). As with any selection process, reliable and validated measures should be used in conjunction with other evidence before making decisions regarding employment or high potential status designation. The challenges associated with creating a high potential assessment is that the measure must tap into known indicators of potential yet be general enough it can be implemented to employees in various lines of work, contexts, and sectors.

As Finkelstein et al. (2018) discuss, high potential designations can also be based on non-potential factors. High potential identification can be influenced by a rater’s prototype for what a leader should look like (Epitropaki, Martin, Tram-Quon, & Topakas, 2013). That is, one manager may think that a leader should always be assertive and command the attention of the room, thus they may be biased towards individuals who are more likely to listen than talk over.
others when identifying high potentials on their team, regardless of a direct report’s actual potential.

Particularly troubling with leader schemas or prototypes is concerns relating to (lack of diversity). For example, researchers have illustrated that Caucasian individuals are typically part of a leadership prototype (Chung-Herrera & Lankau, 2005) and relatively older workers are thought to be more leader-like than younger workers (Finkelstein, Ryan, & King, 2013). Likewise, typical biases that emerge in general hiring contexts can also serve as biases for the high potential designation process. For example, attractive applicants are more likely to be hired than less attractive applicants (e.g., Hosoda, Stone-Romero, & Coats, 2003) and individuals who are highly charismatic or high on impression management are likely to positively sway performance decisions for themselves (Feldman & Weitz, 1991).

Although high potential cannot be measured directly, indicators of potential can be assessed. Specifically, Finkelstein and colleagues (2018) discuss the following indicators of potential: cognitive abilities, personality, social competence, growth and learning competencies, learning agility, developmental readiness, and typical intellectual engagement. Not every assessment for high potential identification taps into each of these indicators, but a robust assessment should hit on at least a few of these. A detailed account of the measure of high potential used in this study follows next.

The Vaya Group, a boutique, tailored management consulting firm, has over 25 years of experience identifying, assessing, and developing high-potential employees. Consultants at Vaya Group created a high potential measure, named the Vaya Development Survey (VDS; Vaya Group, 2018) for the identification and assessment of high-potential employees. The VDS helps
companies take a targeted and systematic approach toward identifying and developing top talent early in their career path as well as at all levels of the organization.

The VDS is a self-assessment tool that measures a specific set of interests, motivations, and preferences of employees. Items on the VDS serve as either indicators of potential or derailers of potential (derailer items are reverse scored). See Table 1 for example items. The assessment focuses on four sub-themes of potential: Aspiration, Learning Agility, People Agility, and Fit. Inductive theory building was used when creating the VDS model for high potential. Consultants at Vaya Group utilized qualitative content derived from key stakeholders to arrive at these four core themes for successful high potential programs.

The four sub-themes were selected based on semi-structured interviews with HR leaders and C-suite executives from several different Fortune 500 companies. All of the stakeholders involved had vast experience regularly selecting people into high potential programs. A systematic, qualitative approach was used when assessing response content from stakeholders. Their responses were recorded verbatim, coded for general themes, and more than one Vaya consultant coded each interview. Vaya Group’s high potential model expands on previously used models of high potential used by other organizations. The four core sub-themes of the VDS are described in detail next.

The sub-theme of Aspiration focuses on whether employees have a clear ambition and desire to lead. Components of this sub-theme include the level of initiative the employee takes, how assertive they are at work, and whether they display clear ambition to advance in their organization. Aspiration is a commonly used indicator for high-potential employees.
Learning Agility focuses on employees’ curiosity and openness to learning. Components of this sub-theme include seeing the value in exploring alternative approaches to solving problems, being open and flexible to change, and proactively seeking feedback from others. Learning agility has been a hot button topic in the practitioner space as of late. In addition, a few, but not a majority of organizations include this in their high potential models. Vaya Group believes that learning agility is a good indicator of high potential as high-potential employees are often given stretch assignments and asked to learn quickly while on the job. As mentioned by Finkelstein et al. (2018), learning agility is often used as an indicator of potential. Dries, Vantilborgh, and Pepermans (2012) also found learning agility to be predictive of high potential designation.

The sub-theme People Agility focuses on employees’ inclination to engage with and help others. Components of this sub-theme includes a desire to connect with others and a willingness to display empathy with their colleagues, as well as a commitment to collaborate with their peers and invest in growing their networks. Through stakeholder interviews, Vaya consultants learned that interpersonal skills were often a reason why an individual was not being selected into a high potential program. Thus, People Agility was included in the VDS. Finkelstein and colleagues (2018) discuss social competence as an indicator of high potential. They posit that social effectiveness, the ability for an employee to navigate office politics, is an important ability for leaders. The VDS focuses on the inclination to truly connect and collaborate with colleagues – not merely be a charismatic person.

Finally, the most unique sub-theme in the VDS is Fit. Fit refers to the extent to which an employee exhibits company values or feels alignment between their own values and those of the
company. The components of Fit include aligning oneself with the culture of the organization and actively role modeling the company’s values. Organizational fit plays a role in employee retention and is linked to decreased levels of turnover (O’Reilly, Chatman, & Caldwell, 1991). High-potential employees have a high rate of turnover (Hamori, Cao, & Koyuncu, 2012), thus, this is an important facet of high potential to assess. In addition, stakeholders indicated that their organizations would like to invest in employees who see a long organizational tenure with the company. Thus, Fit was included in the VDS as another indicator of potential. See Table 1 below for example items from each of these components.

Table 1. VDS Subscale Names and Sample Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VDS Subscale</th>
<th>Sample Item</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aspiration: Indicator</td>
<td>I seek out leadership positions within teams.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aspiration: Derailer</td>
<td>I think becoming a leader isn’t necessary for my career. *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People: Indicator</td>
<td>I seek out opportunities to collaborate with others.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People: Derailer</td>
<td>I sometimes feel like colleagues slow me down. *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning: Indicator</td>
<td>I challenge myself to get better every day.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning: Derailer</td>
<td>I only act on feedback that I agree with. *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fit: Indicator</td>
<td>I align myself with where the company is going.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fit: Derailer</td>
<td>I sometimes forget to put the company first. *</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: *Indicates items are reverse scored.
During the initial item creation stage, Vaya group contacted Subject Matter Experts (SMEs) and asked for their input. The SMEs involved in item pool creation has a combined average of 15 years of experience in executive assessment, leadership coaching, talent management, and developing high potential models. Items were created based upon best practices yielded by psychometric research. Items included were straightforward, did not include jargon, free of double negatives, single-barreled, and written at a general high school reading level (Tay & Jebb, 2017).

Testing the construct validity of the VDS was done with an online sample of employed individuals (n = 300). This validity study examined the performance of all items in the original item pool. Items were kept or discarded based upon psychometric standards. These analyses ranged from descriptives (means, standard deviations, item range/skewness) to item “goodness” (item-total correlations/differentiation). During the factor analysis stage, items were also examined to have appropriate factor loadings (moderate loadings are typically measured at .40 or higher).

The VDS has discriminant validity with unrelated constructs like counterproductive workplace behaviors \(r = -.35, p < .001\) and physical symptoms at work \(r = -.31, p < .001\). The VDS has convergent validity with somewhat similar constructs like personality scores (Hogan Personality Inventory) \(r = .35, p < .001\) and organizational citizenship behaviors \(r = .38, p < .001\).

With regards to criterion validity, the VDS has been shown to reliably predict job performance \(b = .24, t(302) = 4.39, p < .001\) and high potential designation \(b = .34, t(306) = 6.25, p < .001\), as well as explains a significant amount of variance in those outcome measures.
(job performance: $R^2 = .06, F(1, 306) = 19.24, p < .001$; high potential designation: $R^2 = .11, F(1, 206) = 39.01, p < .001$). Across several samples and studies, the VDS has shown consistent high reliability ($\alpha > .90$).

Thus far, the VDS has been tested across several samples, both research-based and piloting with Fortune 50 clients (n > 600). Furthermore, analyses for adverse impact show no evidence for predictive bias for gender, race (minorities vs. white), and age predicting both job performance and high potential designation.

In this dissertation, high potential perception refers to two variables: the VDS and a participant’s perception of overlap between themselves and a typical high potential employee. The specific hypotheses that include high potential perception are included in the next sections.

**Career Identification**

Along a similar vein to high potential perception, a related moderating variable was tested – the construct of career identification. London (1983, 1985; London & Move, 1987) proposed a theory of career motivation that includes three facets: (1) career resilience – adapting to changing circumstances; (2) career insight – being realistic regarding oneself and career perceptions; and (3) career identity – the extent to which an employee defines themselves through their work. Career identity is considering to be the direction (or intentions to behave in certain ways) as a result of motivation (Noe, Noe, & Bachhuber, 1990). London and Noe (1997) assert that career identity can influence organization-level perceptions (i.e., opportunities for advancement or leadership); these researchers also theorize that career resilience, career insight, and career identity could impact psychological contracts. London and Noe (1997) also theorize that employees with varying levels of career resilience/insight/identity could differentially
respond to change; specially, they purport that individuals with lower levels of motivation would have elevated negative reactions to change than employees with higher levels of motivation.

Career identification was measured through work-role salience, or the extent to which an individual feels personally connected to and invested in their career long-term. Work-role salience will likely play a role in their psychological reaction to high potential designation. Specifically, I believe that the greater career identification an employee reports, the more likely they are to have stronger (positive or negative) reactions to a high potential designation. For instance, an Employee A who has high work-role salience versus Employee B who reports low work-role salience, will be differentially affected by a (not) high potential designation. As work-role salience and high potential perception play similar roles in the model for study one, the specific hypotheses related to work-role salience is presented in the next section with the high potential perception hypotheses.

**Fairness of Process and Employee Reactions**

Researchers have previously acknowledged that the process by which outcomes are determined, not solely the outcomes themselves, is one of the most important factors when determining perceived organizational justice (Lind & Tyler, 1988). The perceived fairness of the process by which outcomes are achieved is known as procedural justice. Leventhal (1980) describes six determinants of procedural justice: (1) consistency – procedures are consistent across people and across time; (2) bias-suppression – individuals with conflicts of interest should not be key decision makers; (3) accuracy – information used is sound; (4) correctability – opportunities present to amend unfair decisions; (5) representativeness – people affected by the
process are represented via the process; and (6) ethicality – allocation process aligns with the moral and ethical values of the perceiver.

Numerous studies have been conducted on the relationship between procedural justice and performance decisions. Examining this research is relevant to the high potential employee space, as that label often affords employees with similar benefits as a promotion would: status, challenging work assignments, and great responsibility (Campbell, Dunnette, Lawler, & Weicz, 1970; Igbaria & Greenhaus, 1992; Rosenbaum, 1984). Greenberg (1996) has demonstrated that reported fairness affects an individual’s ability to accept decisions, with those who report higher levels of fairness having less difficulty accepting a decision than those who perceive lack of fairness with the approach to the decision. This critical role of perceived fairness has been documented across different decision levels, including compensation (Folger & Konovsky, 1989) and layoffs (Brockner et al., 1994).

Researchers have theorized that longer tenures in a singular role can serve as a violation of an employee’s perceived psychological contract, negatively impacting their commitment and increasing levels of turnover (Taylor, Audia, & Gupta, 1996). This perception may be due to promotions and developmental opportunities being viewed as one of the most critical rewards an organization grants their employee bases. Other researchers have demonstrated that employees who feel as if they lack career mobility or developmental prospects report lower organizational committed, job satisfaction, career satisfaction and similarly report greater levels of withdrawal, turnover intentions, and absenteeism (De Souza, 2002; Igbaria & Greenhouse, 1992; Johnston, Griffeth, Burton, & Carson, 1993; Law & Schaubroeck, 2000; Quarles, 1994; Schwarzwald, Koslowsky, & Shalit, 1992).
In addition to gathering data using a validated assessment tool, participants were asked to rate the perceived fairness of the VDS. This was measured using procedural justice. This process is vital to test in relation to the overall psychological process that occurs following a high potential designation. If employees do not agree with their high potential designation, they may begin to question the process used to arrive at their status. I propose the following moderating hypotheses relating to procedural justice:

Hypothesis 1: The positive association between high potential designation and procedural justice will be moderated by an individual’s high potential perception, such that individuals with high potential perception will experience a stronger positive association between designation and procedural justice than those with low high potential perception.

Hypothesis 2: The positive association between high potential designation and procedural justice will be moderated by an individual’s career salience/high potential perception such that individuals with higher levels in these variables will experience a stronger positive association between designation and procedural justice than those with lower levels of these variables.

As procedural justice represents an employee’s perception of the way organizations allocate their resources, it is unsurprising that researchers have found positive correlations with other organizational reactions, like organizational commitment (e.g., Martin & Bennett, 1996;
Compared to other types of organizational justice like distributive justice, procedural justice is related to perceptions of the entire organization, rather than outcome focused (Cropanzano & Folger, 1991; Sweeny & McFarlin, 1993). Other researchers have validated the claim that procedural justice, compared to other types of organizational justice, is more strongly related to organization-level perceptions (e.g., Folger & Konovsky, 1989; Konovsky, Folger, & Cropanzano, 1987; Lowe & Vodanovich, 1995; Masterson, Lewis, Goldman, & Taylor, 2000; McFarlin & Sweeney, 1992; Sweeney & McFarlin, 1993; Sweeney, McFarlin, & Inderrieden, 1990).

For this reason, it is appropriate to expect that procedural justice would relate to contract breach. One study found that anticitizenship behaviors were more likely for employees who reported low procedural justice and perceived a contract breach (Kickul, Neuman, Parker, & Finkl, 2001). A study conducted by Kickul, Lester, and Finkl (2002) demonstrated that psychological contract breach and procedural justice interacted to negatively affect job satisfaction and in-role job performance, with perceived breach present and low procedural justice.

Researchers (e.g., Morrison & Robinson, 1997, Rousseau, 1995) have documented that the extent to which and employee reacts negatively following a contract breach can be impacted by their cognitive assessment of the process used to arrive at decisions. In Morrison and Robinson’s (1997) development of breach violation, they predicted an interacting effect between breach and perceptions of fairness. Similarly, Folger’s referent cognitions theory (Folger, 1986) theorized that, “In a situation involving outcomes allocated by a decision maker, resentment is maximized when people believe they would have obtained better outcomes if the decision maker
has used other procedures that should have been implemented (Cropanzano & Folger, 1989, pg. 293). When employees perceive fair processes, and did not receive a favorable outcome, they tend to experience less anger or resentment than those who perceive an unfairness.

As Tekleab, Takeuchi, and Taylor (2005) note, there is a strong body of research that connects organizational justice within social exchange theory. For instance, procedural justice tends to predict perceived organizational support, a social exchange relationship that exists between organization and employee (Masterson et al., 2000; Wayne, shore, Bommer, & Tetrick, 2002). In their review, Cropanzano, Rupp, Mohler, and Schminke (2001, pg. 24) state, “fair treatment is posited to create closer, open-ended social exchange relationships, these types of relationships product obligations for the employee to repay the supervisor or the organization. Hence, performance [follows]”.

In this first study, I investigated the mediator of procedural justice to partially explain the proposed relationship between high potential designation and contract breach. Specifically, I propose:

*Hypothesis 3: Procedural justice partially mediates the relationship between high potential designation and contract breach.*

I also wanted to examine the relationship between procedural justice and contract breach, examining two separate moderators. The moderator high potential perception, measured by VDS or overlap, is also examined in these relationships. Specifically:
Hypothesis 4: Procedural justice partially mediates the relationship between designation and contract breach, with high potential perception moderating the relationship between designation and contract breach.

Hypothesis 5: Procedural justice partially mediates the relationship between designation and contract breach, with career salience moderating the relationship between designation and contract breach.

As stated previously, the group of participants that are randomly assigned to the no information condition is exploratory. Thus, I pose the following exploratory question related to contract breach and this group:

Exploratory Question 1: Is there is difference in contract breach reported by those who do not know their status versus those designated as not high potential?

Further, given that there is more than one individual difference variable (i.e., career salience and high potential perception), I wish to explore whether a three-way interaction between those two individual difference variables, together with designation, affects procedural justice. Specifically:

Exploratory Question 2: Is there a three-way interaction between designation, career salience, and high potential perception on procedural justice?
Efficacy Reactions

Performance evaluations – positive and negative – are likely to influence how we feel about certain activities. For instance, a student who hears, “You have a gift in math” is likely to feel more efficacious in completing math homework later that night, compared to students who are told, “Math is hard for you.” Similarly, I believe that high potential designation can affect an employee’s evaluation of their own abilities at work, particularly for those who know they are high potential. Having an employer reveal to an employee that they have achieved a special star status is akin to telling a student they are gifted in math. Thus, it is reasonable to expect that knowing one’s high potential status would affect how one feels about their job. In this dissertation, self-efficacy is used to assess this belief.

Self-efficacy has been defined as: “people’s judgments of their capabilities to organize and execute courses of action required to attain designated types of performance” (Bandura, 1986, pg. 391). Pajares (2000) describes self-efficacy as an individual’s ratings on their perceived ability to complete tasks in the right way.

Researchers have documented the power of self-efficacy on the self-fulfilling prophecy across a variety of contexts. In one study, Isreali divers engaged in self-efficacy boosting tasks around no longer suffering from seasickness. After a 5-day training course, the individuals who engaged in the self-efficacy boosting exercises reported less sea sickness and received higher performance rantings than those who did not; the authors described this experience as an example of a “verbal placebo” (Eden & Zuk, 1995). Taken together, the research on self-efficacy supports the notion that providing employees with a high potential status could affect their self-efficacy beliefs.
In addition to designation affecting self-efficacy, I propose that high potential perception will moderate this relationship. Specifically:

*Hypothesis 6: There will be a significant interaction between high potential perception and designation on self-efficacy. The positive association between high potential designation and self-efficacy will be strengthened by an individual’s high potential perception such that individuals with high potential perception will experience a stronger positive association between designation and efficacy beliefs than those with low high potential perception.*

As addressed earlier in this chapter, the randomly assigned designation group that receives no information regarding their high potential status is exploratory. In regard to self-efficacy, I explored:

*Exploratory Question 3: Is there a difference in self-efficacy reported by those who do not know their status versus those designated as not high potential?*

As a whole, the first study in this dissertation seeks to examine the psychological process an employee experiences following a high potential designation. This initial study offers a strong foundation on which to build off of for study two, described in the next chapter.
High Potential Designation Impact on Employees and Performance (Study Two)

The second study in this dissertation seeks to examine the impact of high potential designation on employee’s perceptions of their organization as well as their performance on a job-relevant task. I believe that these outcome variables are partially mediated by self-efficacy and contract breach, the dependent variables in study one. Like study one, high potential perception is also investigated as a moderator. Work-role salience was also included as a moderating variable. Procedural justice is not included in study two as the aim of the first study was to examine the underlying processes of high potential designation reaction, while study two aims to examine the impact of high potential designation at a broader level. See below for the model for study two.

Figure 2. Study Two Model
Social Exchange Theory

One way to logically examine the impact of high potential designation is by viewing it through the lens of social exchange theory. Social exchange theory (SET; Blau, 1964) purports that behavior results from exchanges that maximize benefits and minimize costs between parties. Applied to the workplace, SET suggests that employees will respond positively when organizations support and invest in them (Cropanzano & Mitchell, 2005). This line of thinking has garnered empirical support. For example, one study illustrated that employees who receive less favorable treatment than others are more likely to report lower levels of organizational affective commitment (Marescaux, De Winne, & Sels, 2013). Additionally, when employees do not feel supported, they report stronger turnover intentions (Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002).

Related to high potentials, when individuals are designated as high potential, they will likely feel valued by their organization. In turn, employees will be more likely to reciprocate with attitudes and behaviors that benefit the organization (Kuvaas & Dysvik, 2010). Research has shown that, indeed, high-potential employees do feel the need to reciprocate positively to their organizations (Höglund, 2012).

Related to SET, research on psychological contract, specifically violation and breach of contracts, is directly applicable to employee reactions to high potential designation. A psychological contract can be generally defined as an “individual beliefs, shaped by the organization, regarding terms of an exchange agreement between individuals and their organization” (Rousseau, 1995, p. 9). Although psychological contracts are expectations from both employees and organizations, the bulk of the research has been focused on how employees react to (un)met expectations from their organizations. While not a legal contract, a plethora of
empirical studies have shown that the violation or breach of the psychological contract can have detrimental effects for both the employee and the organization. Reneging on this psychological contract can serve as an abrupt, unpleasant reminder to employees that may cause them to behave negatively or pull back from their typical or optimal levels of performance.

The majority of the psychological contract breach research draws upon SET as an underlying theoretical rationale for employee behavior following contract breach. Bal, De Lange, Jansen, and Van der Velde (2008) hypothesized that contract breach indicates that an employer is not holding up their end of the bargain, thus, employees will respond with negative emotional reactions (like anger and frustration). I believe that not receiving high potential status could be perceived by employees as a psychological contract breach. A healthy literature exists that supports the idea that negative employee reactions following a perceived contract breach. Bal et al. (2008) replicated findings by Zhao, Wayne, Glibkowski, and Bravo (2007) that illustrated that perceived psychological contract breach was strongly (negatively) related to trust, job satisfaction, and affective commitment. As well as having detrimental impacts on an individual worker, research has illustrated negative organizational consequences following psychological contract breach as well.

In their meta-analysis, Zhao and team (2007) investigated the relationship between perceived psychological contract breach and affective reactions (violation, mistrust), work attitudes (job satisfaction, organizational commitment, turnover intentions), work behaviors (measures of actual job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and turnover intentions, organizational citizenship behaviors, and in-role performance). Overall, they found that perceived psychological contract breach had a significant negative impact on nearly all work-
related outcomes they hypothesized. They also examined psychological contract breach versus unmet expectations and found that breach was a stronger predictor of workplace outcomes. Additionally, a common thread of negative emotions following psychological contract breach was reported. In their examination, the only non-significant finding was that perceived psychological contract breach did not relate to actual turnover (however, intentions to quit was significant).

Zhao et al. (2007) suggest that employers assess employee needs and make genuine attempts at fulfilling their share of promises in psychological contracts. It is especially important for employers to be proactive in making sure expectations of a psychological contract are fulfilled, as employees are more likely than employers to perceive a psychological contact breach (Lester, Turnley, Bloodgood, & Bolino, 2002). Related to high potential programs, this recommendation could mean that organizations need to carefully consider the impact of being transparent about their high potential decisions and, if they have decided to inform their workforce, need to tactfully communicate the results.

In a similar study on contract breach, Turnley and Feldman (2000) found that employees who perceived a psychological contract breach were more likely to have higher intentions to quit, neglect their in-role job duties, and decrease their frequency of organizational citizenship behaviors versus those who did not perceive a breach. They also found support for a partial mediation of these relationships by unmet expectations and job dissatisfaction. Breach, overall, has a negative relation to job performance (Bal, Chiaburu, & Jansen, 2010).

Within the organizational literature, similar themes emerge. Swailes and Blackburn (2016) conducted a qualitative study about employee reactions to talent pools. Overall, compared
to employees who were selected to be part of an identified talent pool, those employees who were not in talent pools reported having less support from their manager, more concerns that selection into the talent pool was unfair, were displeased about development opportunities, felt lower amounts of motivation to develop, and had lower levels of organizational commitment. In a somewhat similar investigation, Marescaux et al. (2013) illustrated other negative effects of employee differentiation (i.e., separating employees into talent/performance tiers) at work. Specifically, those who were in lower talent/performance tiers reported lower levels of affective commitment compared to others. In their meta-analysis, Zhao et al. (2007) also found a significant relationship between breach and commitment. These negative affective commitment reactions are understandable – it is likely that employees put their name in the ring for high potential pools when they feel they are high potential. Hearing from others that they were not selected is likely to result in negative consequences for both the individual employee as well as the organization.

This second study of this dissertation includes high potential perception, as described in the previous sections. Similar to the previous high potential perception hypotheses, I predict an interaction between high potential perception and contract breach. Specifically:

*Hypothesis 7: The positive association between high potential designation and contract breach will be moderated by an individual’s high potential perception such that individuals with high potential perception will experience a stronger positive association between designation and contract breach than those with low high potential perception.*
Self-Fulfilling Prophecy

In addition to providing a foundation of high potential perception, SFP can also help explain the process by which high potential identification can impact employee actions that have a broader impact on their organization and their work. An integral part of the SFP is one’s ability to believe that they are (not) able to complete a task well. In this dissertation, I used self-efficacy as a proxy for this element of the self-fulfilling prophecy. Self-efficacy has been defined as, “people’s judgments of their capabilities to organize and execute courses of action required to attain designated types of performance” (Bandura, 1986, pg. 391). Pajares (2000) describes self-efficacy as an individual’s ratings on their perceived ability to complete tasks in the right way.

Bandura (1982) articulated the three ways in which self-efficacy affects learning and performance. One, self-efficacy affects the goals that employees identify. Those who possess relatively low levels of self-efficacy are likely to set low achievement bars for themselves, versus those who have high self-efficacy. Two, self-efficacy influences the effort that employees exert while on the job. Those with higher levels of self-efficacy tend to believe that they will be successful in new endeavors, and thus, they are willing to work hard and learn how to perform those new tasks. Those with relatively lower levels of self-efficacy may be uncertain if their efforts will lead to success and thus expend less effort overall on novel tasks. Vroom (1964) articulates that self-efficacy may also be related to the relationship between effort and performance through expectancy theory. And third, self-efficacy influences the persistence that employees approach difficult tasks with. Similar to what was previously discussed, when employees are more confident in their abilities, they are more willing to tackle challenging, new tasks, compared to those who have lower levels of self-efficacy. Taken together, we can expect
employees with higher levels of self-efficacy to set high goals, expend more effort and learn, and be willing to take on challenging, new tasks. Employees with lower levels of self-efficacy may tend to set unchallenging goals, expend less effort to learn, and shy away from complex problems. Self-efficacy is a consistent predictor of overall job performance (Bandura & Locke, 2003).

Bandura (1977) identified four main sources of self-efficacy (past performance, vicarious experience, verbal persuasion, and emotional cues). Past performance, the extent to which you have already been successful at a task previously, is the most critical source of self-efficacy. That is, if employees have already done a task well, they should feel confident they should be able to recreate that success. Vicarious experience contributes to self-efficacy through observing others be successful at tasks, like seeing a co-worker give an influential speech. Verbal persuasion contributes to self-efficacy when you can convince others they are effective at certain tasks. The Pygmalion effect, a form of the self-fulfilling prophecy, states that believing in something strongly enough can make it true. Emotional cues, things like physiological symptoms, can be present when employees expect to fail at something.

Other research has also documented that higher levels of self-efficacy are related to higher effort in tasks as well as greater levels of persistence (Parajes, 2002). Meta-analyses have demonstrated a strong relationship between both self-efficacy and academic performance (r = .34; Multon, Brown, & Lent, 1991), as well as self-efficacy and work-related performance (r = .38; Stajkovic & Luthans, 1998).

As discussed in previous sections, not all high-potential employees know that they have been designated as so. Sometimes this is the mere unintended outcome of a company where
high-potential employees are not strictly regulated. Other times, however, this is a deliberate move on the part of the organization to keep employees in the dark about their status. As previously discussed, research has illustrated that telling employees of their high potential status can lead to mixed results – sometimes the outcome is positive, other times the outcome is detrimental to both the employee and the organization.

In the context of knowing one’s high potential designation, SFP could result in employees feeling and performing better, simply by knowing they have been labeled as a star (Eden, 1984). In their qualitative interview study, Björkman et al. (2013) did not collect job performance information, however, they did theorize that the self-fulfilling prophecy would be evident for individuals in talent pools, with those identified receiving an additional bump than those not identified.

In addition, the work by Gelens et al. (2014) investigated the relationship between work effort and high potential designation, with perceived fairness moderating the level of work effort displayed by participants. Previous research has demonstrated that general self-efficacy has a positive impact on job-search activity for individuals seeking reemployment. In one study, participants underwent a 2.5 week self-efficacy boosting behavioral workshop. Those who were randomly assigned to the boost experimental group, compared to the control group, engaged in more job-search activity. The researchers theorized that boosting general self-efficacy empowers individuals to increase their effort on concentrated tasks through intensifier their motivation to achieve specific goals (Eden & Aviram, 1993).

This second part of the proposed dissertation seeks to answer how transparency in high potential designation programs can either hurt or help work performance-related variables. In the
second of this proposed pair of studies, I examined how random assignment of high potential status (high potential, not high protentional, no information given) impacts participants’ accuracy in a decision-making task, as well as their exerted effort. As high-potential employees assume more responsibility and take on leadership roles, their decision-making skills will be put to the test. As I believe that self-efficacy can be impacted by high potential designation, general self-efficacy will likely relate to one’s ability to correctly make decisions, as well as exert effort in a decision-making task.

Previous literature has found significant positive relationships between reported self-efficacy and trust towards an employee’s organization (e.g., Ruder, 2003). In one intervention study, Ugwu, Onyishi, and Rodríguez-Sánchez (2014) investigated the connection between employee self-efficacy and organizational trust and how they relate to overall employee engagement. They found that both self-efficacy and organizational trust were predictive of positive job behaviors and concluded that employee empowerment should be the focus of intervention programs that seek to enhance overall employee engagement. Researchers in Hong Kong found that trust in organizational leaders and self-efficacy was related to high job satisfaction and lower levels of work stress or stress symptoms (Liu, Siu & Shi, 2010).

Specific to job satisfaction, research across multiple job roles and industries have revealed a strong positive association between self-efficacy and satisfaction with one’s job. In a series of studies conducted on teachers, researchers found that self-efficacy was related to high job satisfaction, and that both of these constructs were related to lower motivation to leave their organization (Skaalvik & Skallvik, 2017). Similar relationships have been documented in other studies on teachers (e.g., Klassen & Chiu, 2010). In one intervention study for employees with
chronic physical conditions that hindered their job performance, researchers randomly assigned participants to control and experimental groups. The experimental group aimed to provide employees with a group training program that focused on how to best maintain their job performance. They found that employees in the experimental group reported higher levels of self-efficacy, which then related to decreased fatigue symptoms reports and greater job satisfaction. They also found that employees in the experimental group, compared to those in the control group, were more likely to look for multiple solutions to solving a complex business problem (Varekamp, Verbeek, de Boer, & van Dijik, 2011). Meta-analyses have revealed a consistent, strong relationship between self-efficacy and job satisfaction ($r = .45$ for generalized self-efficacy; Judge, Bono, & Joyce, 2001).

Relatedly, researchers have examined the relationship between self-efficacy and commitment. In one study of Korean dental hygienists, researchers demonstrated that higher levels of self-efficacy were related to higher levels of organizational commitment. They also reported higher levels of job satisfaction. Self-efficacy, organizational commitment, and job satisfaction were then found to be negatively related to turnover intentions (Kim, Choi, & Seong, 2012). Studies conducted on bank employees (e.g., Saleem, Ghayas, & Adil, 2012) revealed a similar relationship between general self-efficacy and organizational commitment. A 2011 study by Cetin revealed that self-efficacy was a significant predictor of organizational commitment. They posited this relationship was found due to the positive psychological capital (i.e., hope or optimism) that higher levels of self-efficacy could induce. Other literature has demonstrated that high self-efficacy employees seek out challenging tasks and engage more deeply with their career goals, which in turn increases their organizational commitment (Ballout, 2009). A meta-
analysis, focused on the relationship between teacher self-efficacy and commitment, revealed consistent positive findings, with greater magnitude relationships found when specified self-efficacy measures were used (Chestnut & Burley, 2015).

Specifically, I propose that self-efficacy acts as a mediator in study two:

**Hypothesis 8:** High potential designation is positively related to decision accuracy, effort, organizational trust, affective commitment, and job satisfaction. Self-efficacy partially mediates the relationship between high potential designation and decision accuracy, decision effort, organizational trust, affective commitment, and job satisfaction.

As described above, I believe there will be a relationship between high potential perception and self-efficacy. As high potential perception (both the VDS and Overlap variables) are self-reported, I believe that participants who believe they have greater similarity to high-potential employees will in turn have a stronger relationship between designation and self-efficacy. Relatedly, I predict the following interaction hypothesis:

**Hypothesis 9:** There will be a significant relationship between high potential perception and self-efficacy. The positive association between high potential designation and self-efficacy will be moderated by an individual’s high potential perception such that
individuals with high potential perception will experience a stronger positive association between designation and efficacy beliefs than those with low high potential perception.

Organizations may want to be honest and transparent in their high potential designations as it will likely give a boost to those who are designated as high potential. The other side of this coin, however, is that that transparency results in a significantly large proportion of a workforce uncovering that they were not designated as high potential. Not receiving high potential designation can have detrimental consequences; the second part of the second study in this dissertation will focus on possible detrimental effects of telling people that they are not high potential. Currently, the majority of businesses choose not to tell their employees who has (not) been designated as high potential (Korn Ferry, 2014) – with many leaders voicing concerns that telling those who are not high potential will wish to leave the company, or become less engaged and thus, have lower levels of performance.

As discussed by Dries and Gieter (2014), not receiving a high potential designation could signal to an employee that they are receiving unfavorable treatment from their employer, especially if they believe that they are a high performing employee. Björkman et al. (2013) discuss potential implications for employees who do not receive the high potential designation (assuming that the process is made public). They argue that if an employee feels that they have been wrongly rejected from a high potential status, they are highly likely to act out, react negatively, or have decreased performance.

Previous research and practitioner insights have illustrated a slew of negative effects that informing employees of their (non) high potential status can have: decreased motivation, lower
productivity, and disillusionment with their employer (Brookmire, 2014); increased turnover or thoughts of leaving their company (Korn Ferry, 2015; UNC Executive Development, 2016); increased feelings of frustration and sensitivity to fairness, which some speculate could lead to legal issues; and employees feeling like there are castes of “haves” and “have nots” (Telpner, 2018). Not to mention, there are well-documented and researched negative effects perceived contract breach has on job-related tasks: increased turnover intentions, decreased in-role performance (Zhao et al., 2007), and neglect of job duties (Turnley & Feldman, 2000). For this second investigation, I am interested in examining how contract breach impacts employee reactions to the organization (as measured by organizational trust, affective commitment, and job satisfaction) as well as performance (accuracy in decision making and decision effort). The reactions to the organization dependent variables will all be assessed using often used, validated scales (see Appendices). The partial mediating role of contract breach related to these dependent variables is as follows:

Hypothesis 10: Contract breach partially mediates the relationship between high potential designation and decision accuracy, decision effort, organizational trust, affective commitment, and job satisfaction.

At the designation group level, I predict that receiving a high potential designation (versus designated as not high potential) will positively influence participant ratings across all of the dependent variables. Specific to organizational ratings, I propose:
Hypothesis 11: Individuals who receive a high potential designation will report more favorable organizational ratings (organizational trust, affective commitment, and job satisfaction) than those who are told they are not high potential.

Similarly, specific to performance, I propose:

Hypothesis 12: Individuals who receive a high potential designation will have higher decision accuracy scores and higher decision effort than those who are told they are not high potential.

As mentioned previously in this introduction, the no information given designation group has not yet been explored in studies and I could foresee differing outcomes regarding that group. Thus, I propose the following exploratory questions:

Exploratory Question 4: Is there is difference in organizational ratings (organizational trust, affective commitment, and job satisfaction) reported by those who do not know their status versus those designated as not high potential?

Exploratory Question 5: Is there is difference in performance (decision accuracy and decision effort) for those who do not know their status versus those designated as not high potential?
As a whole, the second study in this dissertation builds on the foundation provided by the first study to examine how high potential designation affects employee’s perception of their organization as well as their performance in a work-relevant task. The hypotheses that test the full moderated mediation models are listed below.

*Hypothesis 13: Self-efficacy partially mediates the relationship between designation and organizational ratings (organizational trust, affective commitment, and job satisfaction) and performance (decision accuracy and decision effort), with high potential perception moderating the relationship between designation and self-efficacy.*

*Hypothesis 14: Contract breach partially mediates the relationship between designation and organizational ratings (organizational trust, affective commitment, and job satisfaction) and performance (decision accuracy and decision effort), with high potential perception moderating the relationship between designation and contract breach.*
CHAPTER 2

METHOD

Method: Study One

Participants and Procedure

The first study addresses the psychological process through which employed individuals will react to a high potential status designation. A G*Power analysis, assuming a small to medium effect size (as there are no previous experimental designs of this study, a small to medium effect size is assumed), estimated that a minimum 350 individuals were needed. Four hundred participants were recruited online through Amazon’s Mechanical Turk (MTurk).

MTurk is a popular, online convenience sample that is often used in I/O research to secure a sample of employees. Research has shown that data collected online holds the same quality as data collected in labs (Gosling, Vazire, Srivastava, & John, 2004; Krantz & Dalal, 2000). Studies conducted on the integrity of MTurk data shows that it is often more reflective of the U.S. population, does not result in decreased attention from participants, and is appropriate for a variety of tasks and survey content (Berinsky, Huber, & Lenz, 2012; Buhrmester, Kwang, & Gosling, 2011; Callison-Burch, 2009; Paolacci, Chandler, & Ipeirotis, 2010). Participants received $1.50 for their participation and were entered into a pool to win a $100 Amazon gift card.

After granting consent, participants read a short vignette (see Appendix A) about the company they are employed by. This vignette was designed to be vague enough not to influence results one way or the other, but also provides enough information so that participants can
realistically make ratings or determinations about the constructs and variables used in this study. The same vignette is used for the second study. They then answered the self-high potential overlap question, and were then instructed to take a high potential assessment (the VDS). Following the VDS, participants were randomly assigned to one of three experimental conditions: told they are a high potential employee, told they are not a high potential employee, or not told anything about their results. Participants then responded to a series of questions regarding work-role salience, procedural justice, self-efficacy, and contract breach. Additionally, participants answered demographic questions. For each of these variables, participants were asked to consider the scenario they had read. Participants were debriefed and thanked for their time. See Appendix L for participant debriefs.

No attention checks were used in this study (or study two). Presently, there is not a clear consensus in the literature that attention checks are helpful, some studies even suggest that they can be a threat to validity (e.g., Curran, 2016; Curran & Hauser, 2015; Hauser & Schwarz, 2015). Attention checks can cause participants to active another, separate goal in their mind (i.e., thinking about how to correctly respond to an item that is very different from the other questions they are being presented with). Existing research illustrates that this pause, or increase in deliberation, can have significant differential impacts on judgment and decision making (e.g., Frederick, 2005; Stanovich & West, 2008). Other researchers have demonstrated that increased deliberation can lead to inconsistent or more biased decision making and less intuitive determinations (e.g., Dijksterhuis, Bos, Nordgren, & van Baaren, 2006). Even simple decisions, like rating preferences of certain pictures over others in a survey context, can be impacted by having increased deliberation, which is thought to be caused by including attention check items
(Nordgren & Dijksterhuis, 2009). Hauser and Schwarz (2015) demonstrated that attention checks were the catalyst for causing participants to deliberate more in their decisions, which resulted in different results than those who did not have to answer attention checks. Perhaps most concerning when it comes to including attention checks is that they are designed to highlight careless survey responders. However, they can actually negatively impact “good” respondents and not careless ones, who are unlikely to respond or recognized the attention check at all (Johnson, 2005). Thus, attention checks may cause more problems than they strive to solve (e.g., Buhrmester, Kwang, & Gosling, 2011; Paolacci & Chandler, 2014).

**Preliminary Analyses.** Preliminary analyses were conducted to deal with outliers, using the well-cited Mahalanobis method described by Maasschalk, Jouan-Rimbaud, and Massart (2000). Specifically, Mahalanobis distance was calculated by first creating a “random” variable (RV Chi square) for each participant with 7 degrees of freedom. A linear regression was run with the random variable as the DV and high potential designation, VDS, procedural justice, contract breach, and self-efficacy as the IVs. A table of chi-square statistics was used to determine cut off points for participants who had outlier-like patterns of data. I used df = 5 (number of IVs) and selected the value at $p < .001 – 20.52$. As a G*Power analysis indicated a minimum of 350 participants should be collected, 400 were recruited. Thirty participants, whose scores from the Mahalanobis distance exceeded 20.5, were eliminated from analyses. Little’s (1988) missing completely at random (MCAR) test can be performed to determine whether missing data in a sample is missing completely at random or not; the null hypothesis is that values are not missing at random, meaning you are looking for a non-significant result to this test. This test was non-significant ($X^2 (1201) = 12199.08, p = .12$), thus, we fail to reject the null hypothesis, indicating
that the data are likely to be missing in a random way. After the Mahalanobis test and eliminations, less than 3% of cases existed in this sample that contained missing values. Although there is no established cutoff about an acceptable rate of missing data in a sample for valid statistical inferences, this low amount would generally be termed acceptable and not require imputation. For instance, Schafer (1999) purported that data imputation only be using in cases with a missing rate that exceeded 5%. Bennett (2001) argued that results from analyses would only be biased with more than 10% of a sample missing. More recently, Tabachnick and Fidell (2012) asserted that it is the pattern of missing data (i.e., if the missing values are not at random) that has a larger impact or bias on results than the relative percentage of missing data. Thus, data imputation was not used on this study.

The final sample size for this study was 370 participants. All of the participants were employed, with the vast majority of the sample working full time (92.3%). The sample was mostly Caucasian (50.7%; 36% Asian; 4.7% Hispanic/Latino; 4.4% Black/African American; 2.4% Native American; 1.8% Other). The sample consisted of a majority of males (64%). Participants ages ranged from 19 to 74 ($M = 32.36$ years, $SD = 8.49$). Participants were randomly assigned to one of three high potential groups following the VDS: told they were high potential ($n = 116$), told they were not high potential ($n = 127$), and given no information ($n = 127$) about their high potential status.

**Measures**

**High Potential Perception – VDS.** An external indicator of high potential was measured by the Vaya Development Survey (VDS; Vaya Group, 2018), provided by the Vaya Group for confidential use. This 90-item inventory is highly reliable ($\alpha > .90$). The four subscales are also
highly reliable ($\alpha > .85$). The VDS also has sound content, construct, and criterion-related validity. See Appendix N for a deeper description of these validation studies. The average time to complete this assessment ($n > 700$) is 11 minutes. The instrument has been shown to be predictive of high potential identification as well as job performance. Adverse impact analyses show no evidence of predictive bias for gender, race, or age for the VDS predicting job performance and high potential designation. See Table 1 for example items. Study one revealed high internal consistency of the VDS, $\alpha = .88$.

**High Potential Perception – Self-High Potential Employee Overlap.** (Appendix D). The second measure of high potential perception, self-high potential overlap, was measured using the Inclusion of Other in Self (IOS) scale developed by Aron, Aron, and Smollen (1992). This scale comprises of seven Venn diagrams which depict the different degrees of perceived overlap between the self (employee) and other (high potential employee). Participants were asked to select the Venn diagram that best reflects their perceived level of overlap with a typical high potential employee.

**Work-Role Salience** (Appendix C). The individual difference moderator of career salience was measured by the Work-Role Salience scale, developed by Greenhaus and Sklarew (1981). This scale is reported to have high reliability ($\alpha > .86$). Items are scored on a 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 5 (*strongly agree*) scale. An example item of this scale is, “I enjoy thinking about and making plans for my future career.” Study one revealed sub-par internal consistency of work-role salience, $\alpha = .43$.

**Procedural Justice** (Appendix E). Perceived fairness of the VDS was assessed by procedural justice, using the scale developed by Colquitt (2001). This scale is reported to have
high reliability (α > .92). Items are scored on a 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree) scale. An example item of this scale is, “This procedure was free of bias.” Study one revealed high internal consistency of procedural justice, α = .84.

**Contract Breach** (Appendix F). Anticipated contract breach was assessed using an adapted version of the scale by Robinson and Morrison (2000). This scale is reported to have high reliability (α > .87). Items are scored on a 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree) scale. An example item of this scale is, “I will feel that my employer has come through in fulfilling the promises made to me when I was hired.” Study one revealed adequate internal consistency of contract breach, α = .73.

**Self-Efficacy** (Appendix G). Self-efficacy was assessed using the scale developed by Chen, Gully, and Eden (2001). This scale is reported to have high reliability (α > .86). Items are scored on a 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree) scale. This general self-efficacy scale is applicable for this investigation as this is a novel experience for participants. An example item of this scale is, “Even when things are tough, I can perform quite well.” Study one revealed high internal consistency of self-efficacy, α = .89.

**Method: Study Two**

**Participants and Procedure**

The second study addressed how high potential status designation affects employee’s reactions to their organization and performance. A G*Power analysis, assuming a small to medium effect size (as there are no previous experimental designs of this study, a small to medium effect size is assumed), estimated that a minimum of 350 individuals are needed. Four hundred participants were recruited online through Amazon’s Mechanical Turk (MTurk). MTurk
IDs were also checked to ensure no repeats were present from study one. Participants received $1.50 for their participation and were entered into a pool to win a $100 Amazon gift card.

After granting consent, participants read a short vignette (see Appendix A) about the company they are employed by, answered the self-high potential overlap question, and then instructed to take a high potential assessment (the VDS). Following the VDS, participants were randomly assigned to one of three experimental conditions: told they are a high potential employee, told they are not a high potential employee, or not told anything about their results. Participants then responded to a series of questions regarding self-efficacy, contract breach, organizational trust, affective commitment, job satisfaction, and an integrity situational judgment task. For each of these variables, participants were asked to consider the scenario they had read. Additionally, participants answered demographic questions. Participants were debriefed and thanked for their time. See Appendix L for participant debriefs. Study two’s methods are similar to the methods used in study one. The largest difference are the variables (i.e., no procedural justice, no career salience, and the addition of the new dependent variables, which are described later).

**Preliminary Analyses.** Preliminary analyses were conducted to deal with outlier data. Specifically, Mahalanobis distance was calculated by first creating a “random” variable (RV Chi square) for each participant with 7 degrees of freedom. A linear regression was run with the random variable as the DV and high potential designation, VDS, contract breach, organizational trust, affective commitment, job satisfaction, and self-efficacy as the IVs. A table of chi-square statistics was used to determine cut off points for participants who had outlier-like patterns of data. I used df = 8 (number of IVs) and selected the value at $p < .001 < 26.13$. Nine participants,
whose scores from the Mahalanobis distance exceeded 26.13 were eliminated from analyses. As stipulated in my proposal, missing data would be determined for cases and variables missing more than 50% of responses, after the Mahalanobis, no cases meeting that criteria were found. There were six participants who had more than 50% of their demographic questions answered (or just elected to not give their age, gender, and race), but as those demographic variables were not tested as part of the model, these cases would not be considered missing data that could differentially impact results. A G*Power analysis revealed that a minimum of 350 participants should be collected, so 400 total participants were recruited. Little’s (1988) missing completely at random (MCAR) test can be performed to determine whether missing data in a sample is missing completely at random or not; the null hypothesis is that values are not missing at random, meaning you are looking for a non-significant result to this test. This test was non-significant ($X^2 (9218) = 9432.43.08, p = .06$), thus, we fail to reject the null hypothesis, indicating that the data are likely to be missing in a random way. After the Mahalanobis test and eliminations, less than 3% of cases existed in this sample that contained missing values. Although there is no established cutoff about an acceptable rate of missing data in a sample for valid statistical inferences, this low amount would generally be termed acceptable and not require imputation. For instance, Schafer (1999) purported that data imputation only be using in cases with a missing rate that exceeded 5%. Bennett (2001) argued that results from analyses would only be biased with more than 10% of a sample missing. More recently, Tabachnick and Fidell (2012) asserted that it is the pattern of missing data (i.e., if the missing values are not at random) that has a larger impact or bias on results than the relative percentage of missing data.
Thus, data imputation was not used on this study. The final sample size after eliminating outliers was 391.

All of the participants were employed, with the vast majority of the sample working full time (86.7%). The sample was mostly Caucasian (63.9%; 9% Asian; 6.6% Hispanic/Latino; 8.4% Black/African American; 5.9% Native American; 2.3% Other). The sample was relatively evenly split between males (45.5%) and females (43.2%; 11.3% selected “Other” or chose not to select a gender). Participants ages ranged from 18 to 70 ($M = 35.89$ years, $SD = 11.59$).

Participants were randomly assigned to one of three high potential groups following the VDS: told they were high potential ($n = 119$), told they were not high potential ($n = 121$), and given no information ($n = 151$) about their high potential status. See Table 2 below in the results section for correlations of variables in study two.

**Measures**

**High Potential Perception – VDS ($\alpha = .88$)**. An indicator of high potential was measured by the Vaya Development Survey (VDS; Vaya Group, 2018), provided by the Vaya Group for confidential use. This 90-item inventory is highly reliable ($\alpha > .90$). The four subscales are also highly reliable ($\alpha > .85$). The VDS also has sound content, construct, and criterion-related validity; all of the validation work has been using the VDS as a single-factor scale and thus, it is used in these studies as a single-factor scale. The average time to complete this assessment ($n > 700$) is 11 minutes. The instrument has been shown to be predictive of high potential identification as well as job performance. Adverse impact analyses show no evidence of predictive bias for gender, race, or age for the VDS predicting job performance and high
potential designation. See Table 1 for example items. Study two revealed high internal consistency of the VDS, $\alpha = .90$.

**High Potential Perception – Self-High Potential Employee Overlap.** (Appendix D). The second measure of high potential perception, self-high potential overlap, was measured using the Inclusion of Other in Self (IOS) scale developed by Aron, Aron, and Smollen (1992). This scale comprises of seven Venn diagrams which depict the different degrees of perceived overlap between the self (employee) and other (high potential employee). Participants were asked to select the Venn diagram that best reflects their perceived level of overlap with a typical high potential employee.

**Contract Breach** (Appendix F). Anticipated contract breach was assessed using an adapted version of the scale by Robinson and Morrison (2000), as described above in study one. Study two revealed good internal consistency of contract breach, $\alpha = .81$.

**Self-Efficacy** (Appendix G). Self-efficacy was assessed using the scale developed by Chen, Gully, and Eden (2001), as described above in study one. Study two revealed high internal consistency of self-efficacy, $\alpha = .89$.

**Organizational Trust** (Appendix H). Organizational trust was measured using the 7-item scale developed by Gabarro and Athos (1976). Previous studies (Robinson, 1996) that have used this scale report strong reliabilities ($\alpha > .85$). Items are scored on a 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 5 (*strongly agree*) scale. An example item (reverse scored) for this scale is, “My employer is not always honest and truthful.” Study two revealed solid internal consistency of organizational trust, $\alpha = .84$. 
Affective Commitment (Appendix I). Affective commitment was measured using the 8-item scale developed by Meyer and Allen (1991); this scale is popular in research use and is often used to examine the specific components of commitment. Typical reliabilities for this scale are strong (\(\alpha > .86\)). Items are scored on a 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree) scale. An example item (reverse scored) for this scale is, “I do not feel a strong sense of belonging to my organization.” Study two revealed high internal consistency of affective commitment, \(\alpha = .86\).

Job Satisfaction (Appendix J). Anticipated job satisfaction was assessed using the 10-item scale developed by Macdonald and MacIntyre (1997). The reported reliability for this scale is acceptable (\(\alpha > .80\)). Items are scored on a 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree) scale. An example item is, “I will feel good about my job.” Study two revealed high internal consistency of job satisfaction, \(\alpha = .91\).

Situational Judgment Task (SJT) (Appendix K). Participant’s level of accuracy in their decision making was determined by counting the number of correct answers across 20 SJT items (Becker, 2005). This scale has been validated as a measure of integrity; participants will be explicitly instructed to select the answer that is the most likely course of action a high integrity employee would take. Higher scores indicate a greater level of accuracy in decision making. Study two revealed high internal consistency of the SJT, \(\alpha = .82\).

Effort. Effort was measured by the amount of time participants spent taking the survey, with longer times indicating greater effort. The use of time as a proxy for effort has been used in the ego depletion literature; the most critical feature behind the ego depletion theory is that acts of volition (i.e., filling out items on a survey) drawn upon a limited pool of resources –
sometimes thought of as strength or energy (e.g., Baumeister, Bratslavsky, Muraven, & Tice, 1998).
CHAPTER 3

RESULTS

Study One

See Table 2 below for correlations of variables in study one.

*Table 2. Study 1 Manipulation and Variables Correlations*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>M, SD</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>NoPo vs. YesPo</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>NoPo vs. NoInfo</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Procedural Justice</td>
<td>3.75, .71</td>
<td>.22**</td>
<td>.26**</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Work-Role Salience</td>
<td>3.33, .61</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.25**</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Contract Breach</td>
<td>2.57, .76</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.27**</td>
<td>-.15**</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Self-Efficacy</td>
<td>3.94, .66</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.43**</td>
<td>.45**</td>
<td>-.54**</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Overlap</td>
<td>4.75, 1.56</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.14**</td>
<td>.13*</td>
<td>-.20**</td>
<td>.27**</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>VDS</td>
<td>.51, .96</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.18**</td>
<td>.56**</td>
<td>-.58**</td>
<td>.55**</td>
<td>.38**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: n = 370. **Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level; *Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level. Means and standard deviations for variables (across all participants) are found in the first column. Scale reliabilities are on the diagonal.*

The results from this correlational analysis align with expected relationships. Note that NoPo vs. YesPo is dummy coded as NoPo = 0, YesPo = 1. NoPo vs. NoInfo is dummy coded as NoPo = 0, NoInfo = 1. There is a stronger, significant positive relationship between receiving a high potential designation (versus being told not high potential) and procedural justice. Likewise, individuals who received no information regarding their high potential designation (compared to those told they are not high potential) experienced greater procedural justice. There are no significant correlations with either of the dummy coded high potential designation grouping
variables and other variables in the study. The moderators in this study, high potential perception (VDS and overlap), also show expected relationships; high levels of VDS of overlap (greater high potential perception), related positively to procedural justice, work-role salience, and self-efficacy. The VDS, compared to overlap, had stronger relationships with these variables than overlap. Both VDS and overlap were negatively related to contract breach, as expected.

See Table 3 below for a description of the means and standard deviation of outcome variables by high potential designation group.

Table 3. Means and Standard Deviations of Outcome Variables by High Potential Manipulation Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>NoPo</th>
<th></th>
<th>YesPo</th>
<th></th>
<th>NoInfo</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedural Justice</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>0.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work-Role Salience</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>0.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract Breach</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>0.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Efficacy</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Hypothesis Testing.** Hypothesis 1: The positive association between high potential designation and procedural justice will be moderated by an individual’s high potential perception, such that individuals with high potential perception will experience a stronger positive association between designation and procedural justice than those with low high potential perception. This moderation hypothesis was tested using an interaction term in regression, as part of PROCESS model testing, as described in Hypothesis 4, which tests for moderated mediation of high potential designation and contract breach, moderated by high potential perception.
Hypothesis 1 is supported. During the PROCESS model testing, described in Hypothesis 3, an interaction term was created comparing the effect of high potential perception (VDS) and designation on procedural justice. This interaction was significant, $\Delta R^2 = .11$, $\Delta F(3, 237) = 9.23$, $p < .001$, $b = .11$, $t(237) = 4.55$, $p < .001$. Individuals higher on high potential perception (VDS) and designated as high potential, reported higher levels of procedural justice, compared to those designated as non-high potential. See Figure 3 below for a graphical representation of this significant interaction.

![Graph](image)

*Figure 3. Interaction between designation (NoPo vs. YesPo) and VDS on procedural justice*

During the PROCESS model testing, described in Hypothesis 4, an interaction term was created comparing the effect of high potential perception (overlap) and designation on procedural
justice. This interaction was significant, $\Delta R^2 = .11$, $\Delta F(3, 236) = 8.82$, $p < .001$, $b = .07$, $t(236) = 3.04$, $p < .01$. Individuals higher on high potential perception (overlap) and designated as high potential, reported higher levels of procedural justice, compared to their counterparts. See Figure 4 below for a graphical representation of this significant interaction.

![Figure 4](image)

**Figure 4.** Interaction between designation (NoPo vs. YesPo) and overlap on procedural justice

**Hypothesis 2:** The positive association between high potential designation and procedural justice will be moderated by an individual’s career salience/high potential perception such that individuals with higher levels in these variables will experience a stronger positive association between designation and procedural justice than those with lower levels of these variables.
This moderation hypothesis was tested using an interaction term in regression, as part of PROCESS model testing, as described in Hypothesis 5, which examined the mediating effect of procedural justice between high potential designation and contract breach, with high potential perception moderating that relationship.

Hypothesis 2 is not supported. During the PROCESS model testing, described in Hypothesis 5, an interaction term was created comparing the effect of high potential perception (VDS) and designation on procedural justice. The interaction term for designation (NoPo vs. YesPo) and career salience predicting procedural justice was non-significant, \( b = .20, t(236) = 1.37, p = .17 \). The interaction term for designation (NoPo vs. NoInfo) and career salience predicting procedural justice was also non-significant, \( \Delta R^2 = .35, \Delta F(3, 236) = 10.15, p < .001, b = .10, t(236) = .74, p = .46 \).

*Hypothesis 3: Procedural justice partially mediates the relationship between high potential designation and contract breach.* I believe that designation affects contract breach indirectly through the mediator of procedural justice. Following assigned designation, participants evaluated whether the assessment (the VDS) they took was free of bias; this determination impacts the perception of perceived psychological contract breach. Mediation was tested using Hayes’ PROCESS model 4 (Hayes, 2012).

Hypothesis three is supported. Hypothesis three requires two tests, one for each pair of dummy-coded designation groups (NoPo vs. YesPo and NoPo vs. NoInfo).

The first test is an examination of the mediating effect of procedural justice through high potential designation (NoPo vs. YesPo) and contract breach. Designation (NoPo vs. YesPo) is a significant predictor of procedural justice, \( b = .32, t(239) = 3.50, p < .001 \). There is a non-
significant direct effect of designation (NoPo vs. YesPo) on contract breach, \( b = -0.04, t(238) = -0.40, p = .69 \). The relationship between procedural justice and contract breach was significant, \( b = -0.24, t(238) = -3.54, p < .001 \). The indirect effect of designation (NoPo vs. YesPo) on contract breach was significant, \( b = -0.08, CI_{95} [-0.14, -0.02] \). Thus, there is evidence that procedural justice mediates the relationship between designation (NoPo vs. YesPo) and contract breach. See Figure 5 below for the statistical diagram of this mediation test.

* \( p < .05 \), ** \( p < .001 \). Designation is coded as 0 = NoPo, 1 = YesPo

The second test is an examination of the mediating effect of procedural justice through high potential designation (NoPo vs. NoInfo) and contract breach. Designation (NoPo vs. NoInfo) is a significant predictor of procedural justice, \( b = 0.38, t(238) = p < .001 \). There is a non-significant direct effect of designation (NoPo vs. NoInfo) on contract breach, \( b = 0.03, t(237) = 0.28, p = .78 \). The relationship between procedural justice and contract breach was significant, \( b = -0.22, t(237) = -3.09, p < .01 \). The indirect effect of designation (NoPo vs. NoInfo) on contract
breach was significant, $b = -.08$, CI$_{95}$ [-.16, -.02]. Thus, there is evidence that procedural justice mediates the relationship between designation (NoPo vs. NoInfo) and contract breach. See Figure 6 below for the statistical diagram of this mediation test.

Hypothesis 4: Procedural justice partially mediates the relationship between designation and contract breach, with high potential perception moderating the relationship between designation and contract breach. To test this moderated mediation hypothesis, I used model 7 of PROCESS (Hayes, 2012), which tests both the conditional indirect effect of high potential designation across the dependent variable through the mediator procedural justice, but also the direct effect of high potential designation on the dependent variable. Analyses for this hypothesis were conducted by creating two dummy-coded variables, comparing the high potential versus not high potential designation, and then comparing the not high potential designation versus
status unknown. The PROCESS model 7 with 50,000 bootstraps was used to conduct the analyses.

Hypothesis four is supported. As designation was a categorical variable with three levels (told high potential, told not high potential, no information given) and high potential perception was tested with two separate variables (overlap and VDS), the PROCESS model was run four times. Test one examines designation (NoPo vs. YesPo) and the VDS as a moderator. Test two examines designation (NoPo vs. YesPo) and overlap as a moderator. Test three examines designation (NoPo vs. NoInfo) and VDS as a moderator. Finally, test four examines designation (NoPo vs. NoInfo) and overlap as a moderator. The following results highlight the findings and level of support for moderated mediation across each of those four tests.

The first test involved testing the mediating effect of procedural justice between designation and contract breach. This first examination involved designation coded as 0 (told not high potential) and 1 (told high potential). High potential perception (VDS) was the moderator for this relationship.

Designation and VDS score significantly interacted to predict procedural justice, $b = .11$, $t(237) = 4.55, p < .001$. PROCESS provides three separate tests for the indirect effect of designation on contract breach, across three levels of the VDS. The three levels of the moderator (VDS) are low (-1SD), average, and high (+1SD). The bootstrapped confidence intervals were non-significant at the low levels of VDS (BootCI$_{95}$ [-.018, .04]); however, the bootstrapped confidence interval was significant at both the average (BootCI$_{95}$ [-.10, -.01]) and high levels of the VDS (BootCI$_{95}$ [-.30, -.06]). These results indicate that moderation does occur, at high levels of VDS, as predicted.
The second test involved testing the mediating effect of procedural justice between designation and contract breach. This second examination involved designation coded as 0 (told not high potential) and 1 (told high potential). High potential perception (overlap) was the moderator for this relationship.

Designation and overlap significantly interacted to predict procedural justice, $b = .16$, $t(237) = 2.73, p < .01$. PROCESS provides three separate tests for the indirect effect of designation on contract breach, across three levels of overlap. The three levels of the moderator (overlap) are low (-1SD), average, and high (+1SD). The bootstrapped confidence intervals were non-significant at the low levels of overlap (BootCI$_{95}$ [-.19, .32]); however, the bootstrapped confidence intervals were significant at both the average levels of overlap (BootCI$_{95}$ [=1.19, .55]) as well as at high levels of overlap (BootCI$_{95}$ [.30, .76]). These results indicate that moderation does occur, at high levels of overlap, as predicted.

The third test involved testing the mediating effect of procedural justice between designation and contract breach. This third examination involved designation coded as 0 (told not high potential) and 1 (no information given). High potential perception (VDS) was the moderator for this relationship.

Designation and VDS significantly interacted to predict procedural justice, $b = .07$, $t(236) = 3.04, p < .01$. PROCESS provides three separate tests for the indirect effect of designation on contract breach, across three levels of VDS. The three levels of the moderator (VDS) are low (-1SD), average, and high (+1SD). The bootstrapped confidence intervals were non-significant at the low levels of overlap (BootCI$_{95}$ [-.11, .01]); however, the bootstrapped confidence intervals were significant at both the average levels of VDS (BootCI$_{95}$ [-.12, -.07]) as well as at high levels
of VDS (BootCI95 [-.28, -.08]). These results indicate that moderation does occur, at high levels of VDS, as predicted.

The fourth test involved testing the mediating effect of procedural justice between designation and contract breach. This first examination involved designation coded as 0 (told not high potential) and 1 (no information given). High potential perception (overlap) was the moderator for this relationship.

Designation and overlap significantly interacted to predict procedural justice, $b = .16$, $t(236) = 2.87, p < .01$. PROCESS provides three separate tests for the indirect effect of designation on contract breach, across three levels of overlap. The three levels of the moderator (overlap) are low (-1SD), average, and high (+1SD). The bootstrapped confidence intervals were non-significant at the low levels of overlap (BootCI95 [-.08, .05]); however, the bootstrapped confidence intervals were significant at both the average levels of overlap (BootCI95 =-.17, -.01) as well as at high levels of overlap (BootCI95 [-.24, -.02]). These results indicate that moderation does occur, at high levels of overlap, as predicted.

**Hypothesis 5:** Procedural justice partially mediates the relationship between designation and contract breach, with career salience moderating the relationship between designation and contract breach. To test this moderated mediation hypothesis, I used model 7 of PROCESS (Hayes, 2012), which tests both the conditional indirect effect of high potential designation across the dependent variable through the mediator procedural justice, but also the direct effect of high potential designation on the dependent variable. Analyses for this hypothesis were conducted by creating two dummy-coded variables, comparing the high potential versus not high
potential designation, and then comparing the not high potential designation versus status unknown. The PROCESS model 7 with 50,000 bootstraps was used to conduct the analyses.

Hypothesis five is not supported. Hypothesis five requires two tests, which are described next.

The first test involved testing the mediating effect of procedural justice between designation and contract breach. This first examination involved designation coded as 0 (told not high potential) and 1 (told high potential). Career salience was the moderator for this relationship.

Designation and career salience score did not significantly interact to predict contract breach, $b = .20$, $t(236) = 1.37$, $p = .17$. PROCESS provides three separate tests for the indirect effect of designation on contract breach, across three levels of the career salience. The three levels of the moderator (career salience) are low (-1SD), average, and high (+1SD). The bootstrapped confidence interval were non-significant at the low levels of career salience (BootCI$_{95}$ [-.13, -.01]), at moderate levels of the career salience (BootCI$_{95}$ [-.13, -.02]), and at high levels of the career salience (BootCI$_{95}$ [-.19, -.03]). These results indicate that moderation does not occur.

The second test involved testing the mediating effect of procedural justice between designation and contract breach. This second examination involved designation coded as 0 (told not high potential) and 1 (no information given). Career salience was the moderator for this relationship.

Designation and career salience score did not significantly interact to predict contract breach, $b = .10$, $t(236) = .74$, $p = .46$. PROCESS provides three separate tests for the indirect
effect of designation on contract breach, across three levels of the career salience. The three levels of the moderator (career salience) are low (-1SD), average, and high (+1SD). The bootstrapped confidence interval was non-significant at the low levels of career salience (BootCI95 [-.15, -.007]), at moderate levels of the career salience (BootCI95 [-.15, -.001]), and at high levels of the career salience (BootCI95 [-.19, -.001]). These results indicate that moderation does not occur.

Hypothesis 6: There will be a significant interaction between high potential perception and designation on self-efficacy. The positive association between high potential designation and self-efficacy will be strengthened by an individual’s high potential perception such that individuals with high potential perception will experience a stronger positive association between designation and efficacy beliefs than those with low high potential perception. This moderation hypothesis was tested using an interaction term in regression.

Hypothesis 6 was largely not supported. This hypothesis requires four tests: 1) High potential designation (NoPo vs. YesPo) and VDS, 2) High potential designation (NoPo vs. YesPo) and Overlap, 3) High potential designation (NoPo vs. NoInfo) and VDS, and 4) High potential designation (NoPo vs. NoInfo) and Overlap.

The first test is for designation (NoPo vs. YesPo) and VDS. The interaction term between designation (NoPo vs. YesPo) and VDS, predicting self-efficacy, was non-significant, \( b = .001, t(236) = .03, p = .97 \).

The second test is for designation (NoPo vs. YesPo) and Overlap. The interaction term between designation (NoPo vs. YesPo) and VDS, predicting self-efficacy, was significant, \( b = \)}
.13, $t(236) = 2.36, p = .02$. See Figure 7 below for a graphical representation of this significant interaction.

![Figure 7. Interaction between designation (NoPo vs. YesPo) and overlap on self-efficacy](image)

The third test is for designation (NoPo vs. NoInfo) and VDS. The interaction term between designation (NoPo vs. NoInfo) and VDS, predicting self-efficacy, was non-significant, $b = -.02, t(236) = -1.24, p = .22$.

The third test is for designation (NoPo vs. NoInfo) and Overlap. The interaction term between designation (NoPo vs. NoInfo) and Overlap, predicting self-efficacy, was non-significant, $b = -.10, t(236) = 1.95, p = .05$. 
**Exploratory Analyses.** *Exploratory Question 1: Is there a difference in contract breach reported by those who do not know their status versus those designated as not high potential?* To test this exploratory question, an ANOVA compared those assigned to high potential status versus those assigned to not high potential status versus those not told their status. The dependent variable is a participant’s scale score on the contract breach measure.

The overall omnibus test revealed there was not a significant difference in contract breach across high potential designation groups, $F(3, 67) = .64, p = .52$. Thus, there is no significant mean group difference in contract breach by high potential designation (NoPo, YesPo, NoInfo).

*Exploratory Question 2: Is there a three-way interaction between designation, career salience, and high potential perception on procedural justice?* To test this exploratory question, a regression was performed.

This hypothesis requires four interaction tests: 1) High potential designation (NoPo vs. YesPo), career salience, and VDS predicting procedural justice, 2) High potential designation (NoPo vs. YesPo), career salience, and overlap predicting procedural justice, 3) High potential designation (NoPo vs. NoInfo), career salience, and VDS predicting procedural justice, and 4) High potential designation (NoPo vs. NoInfo), career salience, and overlap predicting procedural justice.

The first test examined the three-way interaction between high potential designation (NoPo vs. YesPo), career salience, and VDS on procedural justice. This three-way interaction was non-significant, $b = -.04$, $t(236) = -1.31$, $p = .19$. 
The second test examined the three-way interaction between high potential designation (NoPo vs. YesPo), career salience, and overlap on procedural justice. This three-way interaction was non-significant, \( b = -0.008, t(236) = -1.01, p = .94 \).

The third test examined the three-way interaction between high potential designation (NoPo vs. NoInfo), career salience, and VDS on procedural justice. This three-way interaction was non-significant, \( b = .002, t(236) = .06, p = .95 \).

The fourth test examined the three-way interaction between high potential designation (NoPo vs. NoInfo), career salience, and overlap on procedural justice. This three-way interaction was non-significant, \( b = -0.07, t(236) = -.80, p = .42 \).

**Exploratory Question 3: Is there a difference in self-efficacy reported by those who do not know their status versus those designated as not high potential?** To test this exploratory question, an ANOVA compared those assigned to high potential status versus those assigned to not high potential status versus those not told their status. The dependent variable is a participant’s scale score on the self-efficacy measure. Scheffé was used for post hoc tests.

The overall omnibus test revealed there was not a significant difference in self-efficacy across high potential designation groups, \( F(362) = 1.13, p = .33 \). Thus, there is no significant mean group difference in self-efficacy by high potential designation (NoPo, YesPo, NoInfo).
Discussion: Study One

The overarching purpose of study one was to explore the psychological reaction that occurs following high potential designation. Overall, the results from this study indicate that employees designated as high potential, compared to those who are not high potential, experience greater perceived fairness of the procedure used to determine high potential. When employees believed they were high potential and were told they were not, participants perceived greater fairness issues in the process they thought was used to determine their high potential status; these individuals were also more likely to report lower levels of self-efficacy. At high levels of high potential perception, procedural justice mediates the relationship between high potential designation and perceived psychological contract breach. These findings are expanded upon next.

Specifically, the main outcomes of interest were perceived contract breach and self-efficacy. Procedural justice was also investigated as a mediating variable between high potential designation and contract breach. For both contract breach and self-efficacy, the moderating effect of high potential perception (as measured by the VDS or overlap) was examined as well. Career identification was examined as a possible moderator. For the model of the first study, see Figure 1.

Study one revealed support for many of the predicted relationships. Participants assigned to the high potential designation group, compared to those assigned to the not high potential group, experienced higher perceptions of fairness in the high potential identification process. This is not surprising, as when employees receive positive ratings from their organization, there are less issues with justice or fairness issues (e.g., Björkman et al., 2013). This finding is
important when considering that the majority of employees will not be designated as high potential, as high potential programs are often competitive. Employees who know they have not been identified as high potential may be more likely to look for an external explanation as to why they were not selected; the perceived fairness or appropriateness of the methods used to determine high potential status may then come into question for those individuals.

When taking into account a participant’s potential score (as measured by the VDS), those who scored higher on that high potential measure and were designated as high potential perceived greater fairness in the procedure used than those who scored higher on the high potential measure (VDS) and were designated as not high potential. Similar effects were observed when participants rated their perception of the high potential level (overlap). A major concern for any organization should be the validity and accuracy of their high potential identification process. That is, organizations should be concerned with whether they are correctly identifying high-potential employees or not. These results underscore the importance of accurately identifying individuals as high potential or not; those who demonstrate qualities aligned with high-potential employees and are not identified as such may be more likely to perceive unfairness in the workplace.

These findings align with results from Björkman et al. (2013), who found that being designated as high potential related positively to positive workplace outcomes; along a similar vein, those who were not designated as high potential perceived greater unfairness in workplace processes (like access to developmental activities) than those who were designated as high potential.
Career identity has been shown to have positive relationships with workplace behaviors (e.g., Noe, Noe, & Bachhuber, 1990) and affects organization-level perceptions (e.g., London & Noe, 1997). I thought that those assigned to the high potential designation group would see themselves as more closely aligned to their career than those assigned to other designation groups. Generally, participants who received a high potential designation reported stronger levels of self-career alignment than others. However, no significant interaction was found between self-career alignment and perceptions of high potential process fairness. This could be due to the career salience scale that was used, which had poor internal consistency.

Perceptions of fairness (i.e., high potential identification) have been shown to be important for positive organizational ratings (e.g., Lind & Tyler, 1988). Within the high potential literature, Gelens et al. (2014) found results that supported their hypothesis that employees designated as high potential, compared to non-potential employees, had higher levels of distributive justice. Procedural justice is a common mediator tested throughout the psychological research between an independent variable and contract breach (Cropanzano & Folger, 1991). Results from study one add support to this finding in the literature by demonstrating that perceptions of process fairness acted as a mediator between the randomly assigned high potential statuses and the outcome of perceived psychological contract breach. As has been found in other studies in different contexts, higher levels of unfairness was positively related to perceiving a psychological contract breach. These results add to the exiting literature on fairness and justice in the workplace to highlight that procedural justice negatively related to contract breach in high potential contexts. Within the self-career alignment predictions, no evidence of meditation was found between high potential designation and perceived psychological contract breach. Again,
this this may be due to the low internal reliability of the career salience scale. The results from
the moderation tests of this mediation relationship are discussed next.

I expanded upon the commonly found (and supported here as well) causal relationship
between justice perceptions and perceived psychological contract breach by adding in a
moderation test. The results from these tests demonstrate support for the idea that moderation, at
high levels of high potential perception (VDS and overlap) occurs with process justice
perceptions mediating the relationship between high potential designation and perceived
psychological contract breach. These results introduce the importance of moderating
relationships of the justice and outcomes relationship. The support for these hypotheses may be
due to the supported finding that procedural justice is more likely to relate to organization-wide
perceptions rather than a singular outcome than other justice perceptions (e.g., Folger &
Kovnisky, 1989; Konovisky, Folger, & Cronesano, 1987; Lowe & Vodanovich, 1995;
Masterson, Lewis, Goldman, & Taylor, 2000; McFarlin & Sweeney, 1992; Sweeney &

With regards to self-efficacy, support was demonstrated for the not high potential
designation versus the yes high potential designation group and high potential perception
(overlap) to positively relate to self- efficacy ratings; in the not high potential designation group,
participants who rated themselves higher on high potential perception (overlap) reported lower
levels self- efficacy than those in the yes high potential designation group. In other words, when
participants thought they were characteristic of high-potential employees, but were told they
were not, had lower self- efficacy than those who were told they were high potential. This result
provides evidence for the intensifying hypothesis (Bal et al., 2010), wherein the theoretical basis
of social exchange theory predicts that violations to workplace expectations can have a stronger negative impact on employees who are more invested (in this case, perceive themselves to be high potential). Again, this result confirms the importance of correctly identifying high-potential employees.

The results from the three exploratory questions did not yield any significant findings. An overall group difference in perceived psychological contract breach, by high potential designation group, was not evident. Similarly, there were no overall group differences in self-efficacy, by high potential designation group. This finding is not overly surprising, as main effects or overall group differences were not the main focus of this study. Other hypotheses in study one reveal interaction effects and moderated mediation effects, which could wash out main effects when those groups are collapsed across one another. Further, no support for three-way interactions, between high potential designation, self-career alignment, and high potential perception, were found. This could be due to the poor internal consistency of the self-career alignment construct, or due to the fact that three-way interactions are often difficult to observe.

While much of the predicted relationships in study one were supported, several findings were not present in this investigation. There were no significant relationships found between high potential designation groupings and high potential perception (VDS) to predict levels of self-efficacy. Tests involving contract breach were more likely to be significant than tests involving self-efficacy. This may be due to the nature of a generalized self-efficacy measure being used. Further, there were inconsistent results with the self-career alignment variable, which may be due to the poor internal consistency of the variable used to assess that construct.
Taken as a whole, the results from study one provide evidence for high potential designation affecting fairness perceptions as well as organization-wide ratings and perceptions. The findings from study one underscore the importance of handing high potential designation and identification with care, as individuals who are not designated as high potential can have adverse reactions. The results for study two are covered next.

**Study Two**

See Table 4 for the correlations of variables in study two.

The results from this correlation align with expected relationships. Note that NoPo vs. YesPo is dummy coded as NoPo = 0, YesPo = 1. NoPo vs. NoInfo is dummy coded as NoPo = 0, NoInfo = 1. There is stronger significant positive relationship between receiving a high potential designation (versus being told not high potential) and procedural justice. Likewise, individuals who received no information regarding their high potential designation (compared to those told they are not high potential) experienced greater procedural justice. Both designation groups related negatively to contract breach, as expected. The relationship between the designation groups and other outcome variables was inconsistent; however, both related positively to job satisfaction. Both VDS and overlap, measures of high potential perception, related negatively to contract breach; they related positively to work-role salience, self-efficacy, organizational trust, affective commitment, job satisfaction, and SJT accuracy.

See Table 5 below for a description of the means and standard deviation of outcome variables by high potential designation group.
Table 4. Study 2 Manipulation and Variables Correlations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NoPo vs. YesPo</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NoPo vs. NoInfo</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedural Justice</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work-Role Salience</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract Breach</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Efficacy</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Trust</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affective Commitment</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Situational Judgment Task</td>
<td>6.09</td>
<td>6.70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duration</td>
<td>1862.18</td>
<td>3718.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overlap</td>
<td>4.98</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VDS</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Correlation is significant at the .05 level (2-tailed).
**Correlation is significant at the .01 level (2-tailed).
Table 5. Means & Standard Deviations of Outcome Variables by High Potential Manipulation Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>NoPo</th>
<th>YesPo</th>
<th>NoInfo</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedural Justice</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>3.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work-Role Salience</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>3.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract Breach</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>2.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Efficacy</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>4.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Trust</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>3.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affective Commitment</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>3.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>3.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Situational Judgment Task</td>
<td>4.43</td>
<td>6.89</td>
<td>6.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duration (in seconds)</td>
<td>1711.50</td>
<td>168.72</td>
<td>2505.64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To test for any simple group mean significance, I ran a one-way ANOVA with designation (three levels: NoPo, YesPo, NoInfo) as the factor and these variables as the dependent outcomes. Scheffe was used for all post-hoc tests. Significant results are reported next.

The overall omnibus test for procedural justice was significant, $F(387) = 22.52, p < .001$. Those in the NoPo group ($M = 3.43, SD = .83$) gave significantly lower ratings of procedural justice than those in the YesPo group ($M = 3.99, SD = .59$). Those in the NoInfo group ($M = 3.88, SD = .62$) gave significantly higher procedural justice ratings than those in the NoPo group ($M = 3.43, SD = .83$). The YesPo and NoInfo groups did not significantly differ from each other.

The overall omnibus test for contract breach was significant, $F(390) = 4.36, p = .01$. Those in the NoPo group ($M = 2.72, SD = .99$) gave significantly higher ratings of contract breach than those in the YesPo group ($M = 2.40, SD = .100$). Those in the NoInfo group ($M =
2.41, SD = .96) gave significantly lower contract breach ratings than those in the NoPo group (M = 2.72, SD = .99). The YesPo and NoInfo groups did not significantly differ from each other.

The overall omnibus test for organizational trust was significant, F(390) = 4.04, p = .02. Those in the NoInfo group (M = 3.92, SD = .91) gave significantly higher organizational trust ratings than those in the NoPo group (M = 3.61 SD = .96). The other designation groups did not significantly differ from each other.

The overall omnibus test for job satisfaction was significant, F(390) = 3.17, p = .04. Those in the NoPo group (M = 3.78, SD = .72) gave significantly lower ratings of job satisfaction than those in the YesPo group (M = 3.97, SD = .67). Those in the NoInfo group (M = 3.97, SD = .63) gave significantly higher job satisfaction ratings than those in the NoPo group (M = 3.78, SD = .72). The YesPo and NoInfo groups did not significantly differ from each other.

**Hypothesis Testing.** Hypothesis 7: The positive association between high potential designation and contract breach will be moderated by an individual’s high potential perception such that individuals with high potential perception will experience a stronger positive association between designation and contract breach than those with low high potential perception. This moderation hypothesis was tested using an interaction term in regression, as part of PROCESS model testing, as described in Hypothesis 14.

Hypothesis 7 is not supported. This hypothesis includes four tests: high potential designation (No Po vs. YesPo; NoPo vs. NoInfo) and high potential perception (VDS; Overlap). Each interaction test is described next.
High potential designation (NoPo vs. YesPo) and high potential perception (VDS) did not significantly interact to predict contract breach, $\Delta R^2 = .29$, $\Delta F(3, 235) = 28.64$, $p < .001$, $b = -.04$, $t(235) = -1.53$, $p = .13$.

High potential designation (NoPo vs. NoInfo) and high potential perception (VDS) did not significantly interact to predict contract breach, $\Delta R^2 = .25$, $\Delta F(3, 268) = 26.72$, $p < .001$, $b = -.04$, $t(268) = -1.46$, $p = .15$.

High potential designation (NoPo vs. YesPo) and high potential perception (Overlap) did not significantly interact to predict contract breach, $\Delta R^2 = .13$, $\Delta F(3, 224) = 10.45$, $p < .001$, $b = -.18$, $t(224) = -2.23$, $p = .05$.

High potential designation (NoPo vs. NoInfo) and high potential perception (Overlap) did not significantly interact to predict contract breach, $\Delta R^2 = .06$, $\Delta F(3, 238) = 4.69$, $p < .01$, $b = -.08$, $t(238) = -1.07$, $p = .23$.

**Hypothesis 8:** Self-efficacy partially mediates the relationship between high potential designation and decision accuracy, decision effort, organizational trust, affective commitment, and job satisfaction. I proposed that high potential designation affects these five dependent variables indirectly through the mediator of self-efficacy. One’s confidence in their ability to complete tasks will determine their performance across the above listed dependent variables; whether someone is told they are high potential or not will affect their self-efficacy. Mediation was tested using Hayes’ PROCESS model 4 (Hayes, 2012).

Hypothesis 8 is somewhat supported. This hypothesis requires 10 tests, where each combination of high potential designation (NoPo vs. YesPo; NoPo vs. NoInfo), the mediator (self-efficacy), and multiple dependent variables (SJT, duration, organizational trust, affective
commitment, and job satisfaction) are tested. The results from these tests are described in detail next. Designation is a dummy coded variable.

Test one is the examination of self-efficacy mediating the relationship between designation (NoPo vs. YesPo) and decision accuracy, as scored by the number of correct responses on the SJT. Designation (NoPo vs. YesPo) is a significant predictor of self-efficacy, $\Delta R^2 = .02$, $\Delta F(1, 228) = 4.94$, $p = .03$, $b = .19$, $t(229) = 2.22$, $p = .03$. There is a non-significant direct effect of designation (NoPo vs. YesPo) on SJT accuracy, $b = .95$, $t(228) = 1.12$, $p = .27$. The relationship between self-efficacy and SJT accuracy was significant, $b = 3.57$, $t(228) = 5.49$, $p < .001$. The indirect effect of designation (NoPo vs. YesPo) on SJT accuracy was significant, $b = .68$, CI$_{95}$ [.08, 1.31]. Thus, there is evidence that self-efficacy mediates the relationship between designation (NoPo vs. YesPo) and SJT accuracy. See Figure 8 below for the statistical diagram of this mediation test.

![Figure 8](https://example.com/figure8.png)

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .001$. Designation is coded as 0 = NoPo, 1 = YesPo
Test two is the examination of self-efficacy mediating the relationship between designation (NoPo vs. YesPo) and effort, as scored by amount of time spent on the survey. Designation (NoPo vs. YesPo) is a significant predictor of self-efficacy, $\Delta R^2 = .02$, $\Delta F(1, 229) = 4.38, p = .04, b = .17, t(229) = 2.09, p = .04$. There is a non-significant direct effect of designation (NoPo vs. YesPo) on effort, $b = 759.25, t(228) = 1.19, p = .23$. The relationship between self-efficacy and effort was non-significant, $b = 200.49, t(228) = .38, p = .70$. The indirect effect of designation (NoPo vs. YesPo) on effort was non-significant, $b = 34.88$, CI$_{95}$ [-35.92, 114.19]. Thus, there is no evidence that self-efficacy mediates the relationship between designation (NoPo vs. YesPo) and effort. See Figure 9 below for the statistical diagram of this mediation test.

Figure 9. Regression coefficient for the model testing the indirect effect between designation (NoPo vs. YesPo) and duration through self-efficacy.

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .001$. Designation is coded as 0 = NoPo, 1 = YesPo
Test three is the examination of self-efficacy mediating the relationship between designation (NoPo vs. YesPo) and organizational trust. Designation (NoPo vs. YesPo) is a significant predictor of self-efficacy, $\Delta R^2 = .02$, $\Delta F(1, 229) = 4.94$, $p = .03$, $b = .19$, $t(229) = 2.22$, $p = .03$. There is a non-significant direct effect of designation (NoPo vs. YesPo) on organizational trust, $b = .10$, $t(228) = 1.07$, $p = .29$. The relationship between self-efficacy and organizational trust was significant, $b = .63$, $t(228) = 9.26$, $p < .001$. The indirect effect of designation (NoPo vs. YesPo) on organizational trust was significant, $b = .12$, CI95 [0.02, 0.23]. Thus, there is evidence that self-efficacy mediates the relationship between designation (NoPo vs. YesPo) and organizational trust. See Figure 10 below for the statistical diagram of this mediation test.

![Figure 10](image.png)

**Figure 10.** Regression coefficient for the model testing the indirect effect between designation (NoPo vs. YesPo) and organizational trust through self-efficacy.

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .001$. Designation is coded as 0 = NoPo, 1 = YesPo
Test four is the examination of self-efficacy mediating the relationship between designation (NoPo vs. YesPo) and affective commitment. Designation (NoPo vs. YesPo) is a significant predictor of affective commitment, $\Delta R^2 = .02$, $\Delta F(1, 229) = 4.94$, $p = .03$, $b = .19$, $t(229) = 2.22$, $p = .03$. There is a non-significant direct effect of designation (NoPo vs. YesPo) on organizational trust, $b = -.01$, $t(228) = -.04$, $p = .97$. The relationship between self-efficacy and organizational trust was significant, $b = .56$, $t(228) = 7.10$, $p < .001$. The indirect effect of designation (NoPo vs. YesPo) on organizational trust was significant, $b = .11$, CI$_{95} [.02, .21]$. Thus, there is evidence that self-efficacy mediates the relationship between designation (NoPo vs. YesPo) and organizational trust. See Figure 11 below for the statistical diagram of this mediation test.

![Diagram](image)

**Figure 11.** Regression coefficient for the model testing the indirect effect between designation (NoPo vs. YesPo) and affective commitment through self-efficacy.

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .001$. Designation is coded as 0 = NoPo, 1 = YesPo
Test five is the examination of self-efficacy mediating the relationship between designation (NoPo vs. YesPo) and job satisfaction. Designation (NoPo vs. YesPo) is a significant predictor of job satisfaction, $\Delta R^2 = .02$, $\Delta F(1, 226) = 4.38, p = .04$, $b = .18$, $t(226) = 2.05, p = .04$. There is a non-significant direct effect of designation (NoPo vs. YesPo) on job satisfaction, $b = .08$, $t(225) = 1.03, p = .31$. The relationship between self-efficacy and job satisfaction was significant, $b = .68$, $t(225) = 12.07, p < .001$. The indirect effect of designation (NoPo vs. YesPo) on job satisfaction was significant, $b = .12$, CI$_{95}$ [.01, .24]. Thus, there is evidence that self-efficacy mediates the relationship between designation (NoPo vs. YesPo) and job satisfaction. See Figure 12 below for the statistical diagram of this mediation test.

Figure 12. Regression coefficient for the model testing the indirect effect between designation (NoPo vs. YesPo) and job satisfaction through self-efficacy. * $p < .05$, ** $p < .001$. Designation is coded as 0 = NoPo, 1 = YesPo
Test six is the examination of self-efficacy mediating the relationship between designation (NoPo vs. NoInfo) and decision accuracy, as scored by the number of correct responses on the SJT. Designation (NoPo vs. NoInfo) is a non-significant predictor of decision accuracy, $\Delta R^2 = .01$, $\Delta F(1, 240) = 1.86$, $p = .17$, $b = .14$, $t(241) = 1.72$, $p = .09$. There is a non-significant direct effect of designation (NoPo vs. NoInfo) on decision accuracy, $b = -.57$, $t(240) = -.71$, $p = .48$. The relationship between self-efficacy and decision accuracy was significant, $b = 4.03$, $t(240) = 6.73$, $p < .001$. The indirect effect of designation (NoPo vs. NoInfo) on decision accuracy was non-significant, $b = .57$, CI$_{95} [-.09, 1.27]$. Thus, there is no evidence that self-efficacy mediates the relationship between designation (NoPo vs. NoInfo) and decision accuracy. See Figure 13 below for the statistical diagram of this mediation test.

![Figure 13](image-url)

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .001$. Designation is coded as 0 = NoPo, 1 = NoInfo.
Test seven is the examination of self-efficacy mediating the relationship between designation (NoPo vs. NoInfo) and effort, as scored by the amount of time spent on the survey. Designation (NoPo vs. NoInfo) is a non-significant predictor of effort, $\Delta R^2 = .01$, $\Delta F(1, 241) = 1.50, p = .22$, $b = .10, t(241) = 1.22, p = .22$. There is a non-significant direct effect of designation (NoPo vs. NoInfo) on effort, $b = -274.41, t(240) = -1.50, p = .14$. The relationship between self-efficacy and effort was significant, $b = 326.80, t(240) = 2.26, p = .02$. The indirect effect of designation (NoPo vs. NoInfo) on effort was non-significant, $b = 32.66, CI_{95} [-19.81, 103.81]$. Thus, there is no evidence that self-efficacy mediates the relationship between designation (NoPo vs. NoInfo) and effort. See Figure 14 below for the statistical diagram of this mediation test.

---

**Figure 14.** Regression coefficient for the model testing the indirect effect between designation (NoPo vs. NoInfo) and effort through self-efficacy.

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .001$. Designation is coded as 0 = NoPo, 1 = NoInfo
Test eight is the examination of self-efficacy mediating the relationship between designation (NoPo vs. NoInfo) and organizational trust. Designation (NoPo vs. NoInfo) is a non-significant predictor of organizational trust, $\Delta R^2 = .01$, $\Delta F(1, 258) = 1.86$, $p = .17$, $b = .14$, $t(258) = 1.72$, $p = .09$. There is a significant direct effect of designation (NoPo vs. NoInfo) on organizational trust, $b = .22$, $t(257) = 2.52$, $p = .01$. The relationship between self-efficacy and organizational trust was significant, $b = .67$, $t(257) = 10.23$, $p < .001$. The indirect effect of designation (NoPo vs. NoInfo) on organizational trust was non-significant, $b = .09$, CI$_{95}$ [-.01, .21]. Thus, there is no evidence that self-efficacy mediates the relationship between designation (NoPo vs. NoInfo) and organizational trust. See Figure 15 below for the statistical diagram of this mediation test.

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .001$. Designation is coded as 0 = NoPo, 1 = NoInfo

---

**Figure 15.** Regression coefficient for the model testing the indirect effect between designation (NoPo vs. NoInfo) and organizational trust through self-efficacy.
Test nine is the examination of self-efficacy mediating the relationship between designation (NoPo vs. NoInfo) and affective commitment. Designation (NoPo vs. NoInfo) is a non-significant predictor of affective commitment, $\Delta R^2 = .01$, $\Delta F(1, 258) = 1.86$, $p = .17$, $b = .14$, $t(258) = 1.72$, $p = .09$. There is a non-significant direct effect of designation (NoPo vs. NoInfo) on affective commitment, $b = .08$, $t(257) = .84$, $p = .40$. The relationship between self-efficacy and affective commitment was significant, $b = .59$, $t(257) = 7.99$, $p < .001$. The indirect effect of designation (NoPo vs. NoInfo) on affective commitment was non-significant, $b = .57$, CI$_{95}$ [-.09, 1.27]. Thus, there is no evidence that self-efficacy mediates the relationship between designation (NoPo vs. NoInfo) and affective commitment. See Figure 16 below for the statistical diagram of this mediation test.

![Diagram of mediation test](image)

*Figure 16. Regression coefficient for the model testing the indirect effect between designation (NoPo vs. NoInfo) and affective commitment through self-efficacy.

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .001$. Designation is coded as 0 = NoPo, 1 = NoInfo
Test ten is the examination of self-efficacy mediating the relationship between designation (NoPo vs. NoInfo) and job satisfaction. Designation (NoPo vs. NoInfo) is a non-significant predictor of job satisfaction, $\Delta R^2 = .01$, $\Delta F(1, 252) = 1.86$, $p = .17$, $b = .13$, $t(252) = 1.56$, $p = .12$. There is a non-significant direct effect of designation (NoPo vs. NoInfo) on job satisfaction, $b = .10$, $t(251) = 1.58$, $p = .11$. The relationship between self-efficacy and job satisfaction was significant, $b = .66$, $t(251) = 13.30$, $p < .001$. The indirect effect of designation (NoPo vs. NoInfo) on job satisfaction was non-significant, $b = .09$, CI$_{95}$ [-.02, .20]. Thus, there is no evidence that self-efficacy mediates the relationship between designation (NoPo vs. NoInfo) and job satisfaction. See Figure 17 below for the statistical diagram of this mediation test.

\[ \text{Designation (NoPo vs. NoInfo)} \rightarrow \text{Self-Efficacy} \rightarrow \text{Job Satisfaction} \]

\[ b = .09 \quad \text{Indirect effect of Designation on Job Satisfaction} \]

\[ b = .66 \]

\[ b = .10 \]

\[ ** \]

\[ \text{Figure 17. Regression coefficient for the model testing the indirect effect between designation (NoPo vs. NoInfo) and job satisfaction through self-efficacy.} \]

\[ * p < .05, ** p < .001. \text{Designation is coded as 0 = NoPo, 1 = NoInfo} \]
The results from these ten mediation tests reveal that hypothesis eight was partially supported. Within the NoPo vs. YesPo designation group, most dependent variables (SJT accuracy, organizational trust, affective commitment, and job satisfaction) were significant outcomes of the mediation of designation and self-efficacy; effort was non-significant. Within the NoPo vs. NoInfo designation group, there were no significant results. See Table 6 below for a summary of the results of hypothesis eight.

Table 6. Hypothesis 8 Mediation Results Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test</th>
<th>Designation</th>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>Indirect Effect b</th>
<th>LCLI</th>
<th>UCLI</th>
<th>Mediation Evidence?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>NoPo vs. YesPo</td>
<td>SJT Accuracy</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>NoPo vs. YesPo</td>
<td>Effort</td>
<td>34.88</td>
<td>-35.92</td>
<td>114.19</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>NoPo vs. YesPo</td>
<td>Organizational Trust</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>NoPo vs. YesPo</td>
<td>Affective Commitment</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>NoPo vs. YesPo</td>
<td>Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>NoPo vs. NoInfo</td>
<td>SJT Accuracy</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>NoPo vs. NoInfo</td>
<td>Effort</td>
<td>32.66</td>
<td>-19.81</td>
<td>103.81</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>NoPo vs. NoInfo</td>
<td>Organizational Trust</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>NoPo vs. NoInfo</td>
<td>Affective Commitment</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>NoPo vs. NoInfo</td>
<td>Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hypothesis 9: There will be a significant interaction between high potential perception and designation on self-efficacy. The positive association between high potential designation and self-efficacy will be strengthened by an individual’s high potential perception such that individuals with high potential perception will experience a stronger positive association between designation and efficacy beliefs than those with low high potential perception. This
moderation hypothesis was tested using an interaction term in regression, as part of PROCESS model testing, as described in Hypothesis 13.

Hypothesis 9 is not supported. Hypothesis nine requires four tests; the pairs of designation (NoPo vs. YesPo and NoPo vs. NoInfo) and high potential perception (VDS and overlap) were each tested. Those results are described next.

Test one is the interaction between designation (NoPo vs. YesPo) and high potential perception (VDS) on self-efficacy. This interaction term was significant, $\Delta R^2 = .38$, $\Delta F(3, 227) = 42.38$, $p < .001$, $b = -.05$, $t(227) = -2.67$, $p = .01$. However, this beta value was significant in the opposite direction as had been predicted. See Figure 18 below for a graphical representation of this significant interaction.

![Figure 18. Interaction between designation (NoPo vs. YesPo) and VDS on self-efficacy](image-url)
Test two is the interaction between designation (NoPo vs. NoInfo) and high potential perception (overlap) on self-efficacy. This interaction term was non-significant, $\Delta R^2 = .12$, $\Delta F(3, 256) = 10.55, p < .001, b = -.03, t(256) = -.97, p = .55$.

Test three is the interaction between designation (NoPo vs. YesPo) and high potential perception (VDS) on self-efficacy. This interaction term was non-significant, $\Delta R^2 = .38$, $\Delta F(3, 227) = 42.38, p < .001, b = -.03, t(227) = -1.67, p = .10$.

Test four is the interaction between designation (NoPo vs. NoInfo) and high potential perception (overlap) on self-efficacy. This interaction term was non-significant, $\Delta R^2 = .12$, $\Delta F(3, 256) = 10.55, p < .001, b = -.05, t(256) = -.97, p = .33$.

Hypothesis 10: Contract breach partially mediates the relationship between high potential designation and decision accuracy, decision effort, organizational trust, affective commitment, and job satisfaction. I believe that high potential designation affects these five dependent variables indirectly through the mediator of contract breach. Mediation was tested using Hayes’ PROCESS model 4 (Hayes, 2012).

Hypothesis 10 is largely supported. Hypothesis 10 requires ten tests. These tests examine contract breach as the mediator between designation (NoPo vs. YesPo; NoPo vs. NoInfo) and multiple dependent variables (SJT accuracy, effort, organizational trust, affective commitment, and job satisfaction). The results from these ten tests are described next.

Test one is the examination of contract breach mediating the relationship between designation (NoPo vs. YesPo) and decision accuracy, as scored by the number of correct responses on the SJT. Designation (NoPo vs. YesPo) is a significant predictor of contract breach,
\Delta R^2 = .04, \Delta F(1, 213) = 8.06, p < .01, b = -.32, t(213) = -2.84, p = .01. There is a non-significant direct effect of designation (NoPo vs. YesPo) on SJT accuracy, \( b = .97, t(213) = -1.13, p = .25 \).

The relationship between contract breach and SJT accuracy was significant, \( b = -1.97, t(213) = -4.68, p < .001 \). The indirect effect of designation (NoPo vs. YesPo) on SJT accuracy was significant, \( b = .64, CI_{95} [.13, 1.22] \). Thus, there is evidence that contract breach mediates the relationship between designation (NoPo vs. YesPo) and SJT accuracy. See Figure 19 below for the statistical diagram of this mediation test.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Designation (NoPo vs. YesPo)} & \quad \rightarrow \quad \text{Contract Breach} \\
\downarrow & \quad \rightarrow \quad \downarrow \\
& \quad \rightarrow \quad \rightarrow \\
& \quad \rightarrow \\
\text{SJT Accuracy} & \qquad b = 0.97 \\
\end{align*}
\]

* \( p < .05 \), ** \( p < .001 \). Designation is coded as 0 = NoPo, 1 = YesPo

*Figure 19. Regression coefficient for the model testing the indirect effect between designation (NoPo vs. YesPo) and SJT accuracy through contract breach.*

**Test two is the examination of contract breach mediating the relationship between designation (NoPo vs. YesPo) and effort, as scored by amount of time spent on the survey.**

Designation (NoPo vs. YesPo) is a significant predictor of contract breach, \( \Delta R^2 = .04, \Delta F(1, 212) = 8.20, p < .01, b = -.32, t(212) = -2.86, p < .01 \). There is a non-significant direct effect of
designation (NoPo vs. YesPo) on duration, \( b = 610.37, t(212) = .95, p = .34 \). The relationship between contract breach and duration was non-significant, \( b = -583.31, t(212) = -1.49, p = .14 \). The indirect effect of designation (NoPo vs. YesPo) on duration was non-significant, \( b = 183.76, CI_{95} [-25.60, 439.57] \). Thus, there is no evidence that contract breach mediates the relationship between designation (NoPo vs. YesPo) and duration. See Figure 20 below for the statistical diagram of this mediation test.

![Diagram](image)

*Figure 20. Regression coefficient for the model testing the indirect effect between designation (NoPo vs. YesPo) and duration through contract breach.*  
* * \( p < .05 \), ** \( p < .001 \). Designation is coded as 0 = NoPo, 1 = YesPo

Test three is the examination of contract breach mediating the relationship between designation (NoPo vs. YesPo) and organizational trust. Designation (NoPo vs. YesPo) is a significant predictor of contract breach, \( \Delta R^2 = .04, \Delta F(1, 213) = 8.06, p < .01, b = -.32, t(213) = -2.84, p = .01 \). There is a non-significant direct effect of designation (NoPo vs. YesPo) on
organizational trust, $b = -0.01$, $t(213) = -0.22$, $p = 0.35$. The relationship between contract breach and organizational trust was significant, $b = -0.75$, $t(213) = -17.62$, $p < 0.001$. The indirect effect of designation (NoPo vs. YesPo) on organizational trust was significant, $b = 0.23$, $CI_{95} [0.08, 0.40]$. Thus, there is evidence that contract breach mediates the relationship between designation (NoPo vs. YesPo) and organizational trust. See Figure 21 below for the statistical diagram of this mediation test.
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Figure 21. Regression coefficient for the model testing the indirect effect between designation (NoPo vs. YesPo) and organizational trust through contract breach.

* $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.001$. Designation is coded as 0 = NoPo, 1 = YesPo

Test four is the examination of contract breach mediating the relationship between designation (NoPo vs. YesPo) and affective commitment. Designation (NoPo vs. YesPo) is a significant predictor of contract breach, $\Delta R^2 = 0.04$, $\Delta F(1, 213) = 8.06$, $p < 0.01$, $b = -0.32$, $t(213) = -2.84$, $p = 0.01$. There is a non-significant direct effect of designation (NoPo vs. YesPo) on
affective commitment, $b = .02$, $t(213) = -.17$, $p = .87$. The relationship between contract breach and affective commitment was significant, $b = -.54$, $t(213) = -11.02$, $p < .001$. The indirect effect of designation (NoPo vs. YesPo) on affective commitment was non-significant, $b = .17$, CI$_{95}$. Thus, there is evidence that contract breach mediates the relationship between designation (NoPo vs. YesPo) and affective commitment. See Figure 22 below for the statistical diagram of this mediation test.
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Figure 22. Regression coefficient for the model testing the indirect effect between designation (NoPo vs. YesPo) and affective commitment through contract breach.

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .001$. Designation is coded as 0 = NoPo, 1 = YesPo

Test five is the examination of contract breach mediating the relationship between designation (NoPo vs. YesPo) and job satisfaction. Designation (NoPo vs. YesPo) is a significant predictor of contract breach, $\Delta R^2 = .04$, $\Delta F(1, 213) = 8.06$, $p < .01$, $b = -.32$, $t(213) = -2.84$, $p < .01$. There is a non-significant direct effect of designation (NoPo vs. YesPo) on job satisfaction,
$b = .05$, $t(213) = .76$, $p = .54$. The relationship between contract breach and job satisfaction was significant, $b = -.51$, $t(213) = 10.61$, $p < .001$. The indirect effect of designation (NoPo vs. YesPo) on job satisfaction was significant, $b = .15$, CI$_{95} [.04, .26]$. Thus, there is evidence that contract breach mediates the relationship between designation (NoPo vs. YesPo) and job satisfaction. See Figure 23 below for the statistical diagram of this mediation test.

**Figure 23.** Regression coefficient for the model testing the indirect effect between designation (NoPo vs. YesPo) and job satisfaction through contract breach.  
* $p < .05$, ** $p < .001$. Designation is coded as 0 = NoPo, 1 = YesPo

Test six is the examination of contract breach mediating the relationship between designation (NoPo vs. NoInfo) and decision accuracy, as scored by the number of correct responses on the SJT. Designation (NoPo vs. NoInfo) is a significant predictor of contract breach, $\Delta R^2 = .03$, $\Delta F(1, 241) = 6.37$, $p = .01$, $b = -.31$, $t(241) = -2.55$, $p < .01$. There is a non-significant direct effect of designation (NoPo vs. NoInfo) on decision accuracy, $b = -.70$, $t(241) =$
-1.08, \( p = .38 \). The relationship between contract breach and decision accuracy was significant, \( b = -2.20, t(241) = -5.86, p < .001 \). The indirect effect of designation (NoPo vs. NoInfo) on decision accuracy was significant, \( b = .82, CI_{95} [.18, 1.30] \). Thus, there is evidence that contract breach mediates the relationship between designation (NoPo vs. NoInfo) and decision accuracy. See Figure 24 below for the statistical diagram of this mediation test.

**Figure 24.** Regression coefficients for the model testing the indirect effect between designation (NoPo vs. NoInfo) and decision accuracy through contract breach. *\( p < .05 \), **\( p < .001 \). Designation is coded as 0 = NoPo, 1 = NoInfo

Test seven is the examination of contract breach mediating the relationship between designation (NoPo vs. NoInfo) and effort, as scored by the amount of time spent on the survey. Designation (NoPo vs. NoInfo) is a significant predictor of contract breach, \( \Delta R^2 = .03, \Delta F(1, 240) = 6.50, p = .01, b = -.27, t(240) = -2.55, p = .01 \). There is a non-significant direct effect of designation (NoPo vs. NoInfo) on effort, \( b = -319.15, t(240) = -1.73, p = .09 \). The relationship
between contract breach and effort was significant, \( b = -291.52, t(240) = -2.58, p = .01 \). The indirect effect of designation (NoPo vs. NoInfo) on contract breach was significant, \( b = 77.39, CI_{95} [16.83, 158.56] \). Thus, there is no evidence that contract breach mediates the relationship between designation (NoPo vs. NoInfo) and effort. See Figure 25 below for the statistical diagram of this mediation test.
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*Figure 25. Regression coefficient for the model testing the indirect effect between designation (NoPo vs. NoInfo) and effort through contract breach.*

* \( p < .05, ** p < .001 \). Designation is coded as 0 = NoPo, 1 = NoInfo

Test eight is the examination of contract breach mediating the relationship between designation (NoPo vs. NoInfo) and organizational trust. Designation (NoPo vs. NoInfo) is a significant predictor of contract breach, \( \Delta R^2 = .03, \Delta F(1, 241) = 6.34, p = .01, b = -.31, t(241) = -.291.52, p = .01 \). There is a non-significant direct effect of designation (NoPo vs. NoInfo) on organizational trust, \( b = .10, t(241) = .74, p = .40 \). The relationship between contract breach and organizational trust was significant, \( b = -.23, t(241) = -19.524, p < .001 \). The indirect effect of
designation (NoPo vs. NoInfo) on organizational trust was significant, $b = .20$, CI$_{95} [0.05, 0.36]$. Thus, there is evidence that contract breach mediates the relationship between designation (NoPo vs. NoInfo) and organizational trust. See Figure 26 below for the statistical diagram of this mediation test.
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*Figure 26. Regression coefficient for the model testing the indirect effect between designation (NoPo vs. NoInfo) and organizational trust through contract breach. *$p < .05$, **$p < .001$. Designation is coded as 0 = NoPo, 1 = NoInfo*

Test nine is the examination of contract breach mediating the relationship between designation (NoPo vs. NoInfo) and affective commitment. Designation (NoPo vs. NoInfo) is a significant predictor of contract breach, $\Delta R^2 = .03$, $\Delta F(1, 241) = 6.36$, $p = .01$, $b = -.31$, $t(241) = -2.53$, $p = .01$. There is a non-significant direct effect of designation (NoPo vs. NoInfo) on affective commitment, $b = .10$, $t(241) = .10$, $p = .92$. The relationship between contract breach and affective commitment was significant, $b = -.23$, $t(241) = -12.68$, $p < .001$. The indirect effect
of designation (NoPo vs. NoInfo) on affective commitment was significant, $b = .15$, CI$_{95} [.03, .27]$. Thus, there is evidence that contract breach mediates the relationship between designation (NoPo vs. NoInfo) and affective commitment. See Figure 27 below for the statistical diagram of this mediation test.
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*Figure 27. Regression coefficient for the model testing the indirect effect between designation (NoPo vs. NoInfo) and affective commitment through contract breach. * $p < .05$, ** $p < .001$. Designation is coded as 0 = NoPo, 1 = NoInfo

Test ten is the examination of contract breach mediating the relationship between designation (NoPo vs. NoInfo) and job satisfaction. Designation (NoPo vs. NoInfo) is a significant predictor of contract breach, $\Delta R^2 = .03$, $\Delta F(1, 241) = 6.36$, $p = .01$, $b = -.26$, $t(241) = -2.52$, $p = .01$. There is a non-significant direct effect of designation (NoPo vs. NoInfo) on job satisfaction, $b = .02$, $t(241) = .35$, $p = .73$. The relationship between contract breach and job satisfaction was significant, $b = -.50$, $t(241) = -11.52$, $p < .001$. The indirect effect of designation
(NoPo vs. NoInfo) on job satisfaction was non-significant, $b = .13$, CI$_{95} [.03, .23]$. Thus, there is evidence that contract breach mediates the relationship between designation (NoPo vs. NoInfo) and job satisfaction. See Figure 28 below for the statistical diagram of this mediation test.
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*Figure 28. Regression coefficient for the model testing the indirect effect between designation (NoPo vs. NoInfo) and job satisfaction through contract breach.
* $p < .05$, ** $p < .001$. Designation is coded as 0 = NoPo, 1 = NoInfo

The results from these ten mediation tests reveal that hypothesis ten was largely supported. Within the NoPo vs. YesPo designation group, most dependent variables (SJT accuracy, effort, organizational trust, and job satisfaction) were significant outcomes of the mediation of designation and contract breach; affective commitment was non-significant. Within the NoPo vs. NoInfo designation group, all of the dependent variables were significant outcomes
of the mediation of designation and contract breach. See Table 7 below for a summary of the results of hypothesis ten.

Table 7. Hypothesis 10 Mediation Results Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test</th>
<th>Designation</th>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>Indirect Effect $b$</th>
<th>ULCI</th>
<th>LLCI</th>
<th>Mediation Evidence?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>NoPo vs. YesPo</td>
<td>SJT Accuracy</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>NoPo vs. YesPo</td>
<td>Effort</td>
<td>183.76</td>
<td>25.60</td>
<td>439.56</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>NoPo vs. YesPo</td>
<td>Organizational Trust</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>NoPo vs. YesPo</td>
<td>Affective Commitment</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>NoPo vs. YesPo</td>
<td>Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>NoPo vs. NoInfo</td>
<td>SJT Accuracy</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>NoPo vs. NoInfo</td>
<td>Effort</td>
<td>77.39</td>
<td>16.83</td>
<td>158.56</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>NoPo vs. NoInfo</td>
<td>Organizational Trust</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>NoPo vs. NoInfo</td>
<td>Affective Commitment</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.0005</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>NoPo vs. NoInfo</td>
<td>Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hypothesis 11: Individuals who receive a high potential designation will report more favorable organizational ratings (organizational trust, affective commitment, and job satisfaction) than those who are told they are not high potential. To test this hypothesis, three ANOVAs compared those assigned to high potential status versus those assigned to not high potential status. The dependent variables are participants’ scale scores for organizational trust, affective commitment, and job satisfaction.

Hypothesis 11 is partially supported. The overall omnibus group mean significance difference test for high potential designation (NoPo vs. YesPo) on organizational trust was non-significant, $F(240) = 2.65, p = .11.$
The overall omnibus group mean significance difference test for high potential designation (NoPo vs. YesPo) on affective commitment was non-significant, $F(240) = .39, p = .53$.

The overall omnibus group mean significance difference test for high potential designation (NoPo vs. YesPo) on job satisfaction was significant, $F(240) = 4.38, p = .04$. Individuals randomly assigned to the YesPo group ($M = 3.97, SD = .67$) reported significantly higher levels of job satisfaction than those randomly assigned to the NoPo group ($M = 3.78, SD = .72$).

**Hypothesis 12**: Individuals who receive a high potential designation will have higher decision accuracy scores and higher decision effort than those who are told they are not high potential. To test this hypothesis, two ANOVAs compared those assigned to high potential status versus those assigned to not high potential status. The dependent variables are participants’ decision accuracy on the SJT and the amount of time (effort) they spent answering the SJT questions.

Hypothesis 12 is not supported. There was only a trending significant group difference in designation (NoPo vs. YesPo) on decision accuracy, $F(240) = 3.41, p = .07$. Those who were assigned to the high potential designation group had (trending) higher accuracy scores ($M = 6.03, SD = 6.78$) than those who were assigned to the not high potential group ($M = 4.43, SD = 6.67$), but not significantly so.

There was not a significant group difference in designation (NoPo vs. YesPo) on decision effort, $F(240) = 1.58, p = .21$. 
Hypothesis 13: Self-efficacy partially mediates the relationship between designation and organizational ratings (organizational trust, affective commitment, and job satisfaction) and performance (decision accuracy and decision effort), with high potential perception moderating the relationship between designation and self-efficacy. To test this moderated mediation hypothesis, I used model 7 of PROCESS (Hayes, 2012), which tests both the conditional indirect effect of high potential designation across the dependent variables through the mediator self-efficacy, but also the direct effect of high potential designation on the dependent variables. Analyses for this hypothesis were conducted by creating two dummy-coded variables, comparing the high potential versus not high potential designation, and then comparing the not high potential designation versus status unknown. The PROCESS model 7 with 50,000 bootstraps was used to conduct the analyses.

Hypothesis 13 is not supported. In total, this hypothesis requires twenty separate tests. There are two high potential designation groups that are compared (NoPo vs. YesPo and NoPo vs. NoInfo), high potential perception is tested by two different variables (VDS and Overlap), and there are five different dependent variables (organizational trust, affective commitment, job satisfaction, SJT accuracy, and time spent on the survey). Each of these twenty moderated mediation tests is described next.

The first test involved testing the mediating effect of self-efficacy between designation and organizational trust. This first examination involved designation coded as 0 (told not high potential) and 1 (told high potential). High potential perception (VDS) was the moderator for this relationship.
Designation and VDS score significantly interacted to predict self-efficacy, $\Delta R^2 = .38$, $\Delta F(3, 227) = 42.38$, $p < .001$, $b = -.05$, $t(227) = -2.67$, $p < .01$. However, this was in the opposite direction as predicted. PROCESS provides three separate tests for the indirect effect of designation on organizational trust, across three levels of the VDS. The three levels of the moderator (VDS) are low (-1SD), average, and high (+1SD). The bootstrapped confidence intervals were significant at the low levels of VDS (BootCI_{95} [.07, .34]) and at moderate levels of the VDS (BootCI_{95} [02, .20]); however, the bootstrapped confidence interval was non-significant at high levels of the VDS (BootCI_{95} [-.12, -.06]). These results indicate that moderation does occur, at low and moderate levels of VDS, which was the opposite of what was predicted.

The second test involved testing the mediating effect of self-efficacy between designation and organizational trust. This second examination involved designation coded as 0 (told not high potential) and 1 (told high potential). High potential perception (overlap) was the moderator for this relationship.

Designation and VDS score did not significantly interact to predict self-efficacy, $\Delta R^2 = .15$, $\Delta F(3, 227) = 12.49$, $p < .001$, $b = -.03$, $t(227) = -.60$, $p = .54$. PROCESS provides three separate tests for the indirect effect of designation on organizational trust, across three levels of overlap. The three levels of the moderator (overlap) are low (-1SD), average, and high (+1SD). The bootstrapped confidence intervals were significant at the low levels of overlap (BootCI_{95} [.03, .29]) and at moderate levels of the overlap (BootCI_{95} [.04, .24]); however, the bootstrapped confidence interval was non-significant at high levels of overlap (BootCI_{95} [-.06, .26]). These results indicate that moderation does occur, at low and moderate levels of overlap, which was the opposite of what was predicted.
The third test involved testing the mediating effect of self-efficacy between designation and affective commitment. This third examination involved designation coded as 0 (told not high potential) and 1 (told high potential). High potential perception (VDS) was the moderator for this relationship. Designation and VDS score significantly interacted to predict self-efficacy, $\Delta R^2 = .38$, $\Delta F(3, 227) = 42.38$, $p < .001$, $b = -.05$, $t(227) = -2.67$, $p = .01$. However, this was in the opposite direction as predicted. PROCESS provides three separate tests for the indirect effect of designation on affective commitment, across three levels of VDS. The three levels of the moderator (VDS) are low (-1SD), average, and high (+1SD). The bootstrapped confidence intervals were significant at the low levels of VDS (BootCI$_{95}$ [.06, .31]) and at moderate levels of the VDS (BootCI$_{95}$ [.02, .18]); however, the bootstrapped confidence interval was non-significant at high levels of VDS (BootCI$_{95}$ [-.11, .06]). These results indicate that moderation does occur, at low and moderate levels of VDS, which was the opposite of what was predicted.

The fourth test involved testing the mediating effect of self-efficacy between designation and affective commitment. This fourth examination involved designation coded as 0 (told not high potential) and 1 (told high potential). High potential perception (overlap) was the moderator for this relationship.

Designation and overlap did not significantly interact to predict self-efficacy, $\Delta R^2 = .15$, $\Delta F(3, 227) = 12.49$, $p < .001$, $b = -.03$, $t(227) = -.60$, $p = .54$. PROCESS provides three separate tests for the indirect effect of designation on affective commitment, across three levels of overlap. The three levels of the moderator (overlap) are low (-1SD), average, and high (+1SD). The bootstrapped confidence intervals were significant at the low levels of overlap (BootCI$_{95}$ [.03, .26]) and at moderate levels of overlap (BootCI$_{95}$ [.03, .22]); however, the bootstrapped
confidence interval was non-significant at high levels of overlap (BootCI_{95} [-.06, .25]). These results indicate that moderation does occur, at low and moderate levels of overlap, which was the opposite of what was predicted.

The fifth test involved testing the mediating effect of self-efficacy between designation and job satisfaction. This fifth examination involved designation coded as 0 (told not high potential) and 1 (told high potential). High potential perception (VDS) was the moderator for this relationship.

Designation and VDS significantly interacted to predict self-efficacy, $\Delta R^2 = .38$, $\Delta F(3, 224) = 42.38$, $p < .001$, $b = -.05$ $t(224) = -2.69$, $p = .01$. PROCESS provides three separate tests for the indirect effect of designation job satisfaction, across three levels of VDS. The three levels of the moderator (VDS) are low (-1SD), average, and high (+1SD). The bootstrapped confidence intervals were significant at the low levels of VDS (BootCI_{95} [.07, .36]) and at moderate levels of the VDS (BootCI_{95} [.02, .21]); however, the bootstrapped confidence interval was non-significant at high levels of VDS (BootCI_{95} [-.14, .06]). These results indicate that moderation does occur, at low and moderate levels of VDS, which was the opposite of what was predicted.

The sixth test involved testing the mediating effect of self-efficacy between designation and job satisfaction. This sixth examination involved designation coded as 0 (told not high potential) and 1 (told high potential). High potential perception (overlap) was the moderator for this relationship.

Designation and overlap did not significantly interact to predict self-efficacy, $\Delta R^2 = .15$, $\Delta F(3, 224) = 12.49$, $p < .001$, $b = -.03$ $t(224) = -.48$, $p = .63$. PROCESS provides three separate tests for the indirect effect of designation job satisfaction, across three levels of overlap. The
three levels of the moderator (overlap) are low (-1SD), average, and high (+1SD). The bootstrapped confidence intervals were significant at the low levels of overlap (BootCI₉₅ [.02, .30]) and at moderate levels of the overlap (BootCI₉₅ [.03, .25]; however, the bootstrapped confidence interval was non-significant at high levels of overlap (BootCI₉₅ [-.08, .30]). These results indicate that moderation does occur, at low and moderate levels of overlap, which was the opposite of what was predicted.

The seventh test involved testing the mediating effect of self-efficacy between designation and SJT accuracy, as measured by the number of correct items on the SJT. This seventh examination involved designation coded as 0 (told not high potential) and 1 (told high potential). High potential perception (VDS) was the moderator for this relationship.

Designation and VDS significantly interacted to predict self-efficacy, $\Delta R^2 = .38$, $\Delta F(3, 227) = 42.38$, $p < .001$, $b = -.05$ ($t(227) = -.48$, $p = .01$. However, this was in the opposite direction as predicted. PROCESS provides three separate tests for the indirect effect of designation on SJT accuracy, across three levels of VDS. The three levels of the moderator (VDS) are low (-1SD), average, and high (+1SD). The bootstrapped confidence intervals were significant at the low levels of VDS (BootCI₉₅ [.43, 1.97]) and at moderate levels of the VDS (BootCI₉₅ [.12, 1.13]; however, the bootstrapped confidence interval was non-significant at high levels of VDS (BootCI₉₅ [-.70, .35]). These results indicate that moderation does occur, at low and moderate levels of VDS, which was the opposite of what was predicted.

The eighth test involved testing the mediating effect of self-efficacy between designation and SJT accuracy, as measured by the number of correct items on the SJT. This eighth
examination involved designation coded as 0 (told not high potential) and 1 (told high potential). High potential perception (overlap) was the moderator for this relationship.

Designation and overlap did not significantly interact to predict self-efficacy, $\Delta R^2 = .15$, $\Delta F(3, 224) = 12.49$, $p < .001$, $b = -.03$ $t(227) = -.60$, $p = .54$. PROCESS provides three separate tests for the indirect effect of designation on SJT accuracy, across three levels of overlap. The three levels of the moderator (overlap) are low (-1SD), average, and high (+1SD). The bootstrapped confidence intervals were significant at the low levels of overlap (BootCI$_{95}$ [.21, 1.65]) and at moderate levels of the overlap (BootCI$_{95}$ [.23, 1.38]); however, the bootstrapped confidence interval was non-significant at high levels of overlap (BootCI$_{95}$ [-.43, 1.49]). These results indicate that moderation does occur, at low and moderate levels of overlap, which was the opposite of what was predicted.

The ninth test involved testing the mediating effect of self-efficacy between designation and effort or duration, as measured by the total amount of time spent on the survey. This ninth examination involved designation coded as 0 (told not high potential) and 1 (told high potential). High potential perception (VDS) was the moderator for this relationship.

Designation and VDS significantly interacted to predict self-efficacy, $\Delta R^2 = .38$, $\Delta F(3, 227) = 42.38$, $p < .001$, $b = -.18$ $t(227) = -2.66$, $p = .01$. However, this was in the opposite direction as predicted. PROCESS provides three separate tests for the indirect effect of designation on duration, across three levels of VDS. The three levels of the moderator (VDS) are low (-1SD), average, and high (+1SD). The bootstrapped confidence intervals were non-significant at the low levels of VDS (BootCI$_{95}$ [-54.52, 184.47]), at moderate levels of VDS
The tenth test involved testing the mediating effect of self-efficacy between designation and effort or duration, as measured by the total amount of time spent on the survey. This tenth examination involved designation coded as 0 (told not high potential) and 1 (told high potential). High potential perception (overlap) was the moderator for this relationship.

Designation and overlap did not significantly interact to predict self-efficacy, $\Delta R^2 = .15$, $\Delta F(3, 227) = 12.49$, $p < .001$, $b = -.06$, $t(227) = -1.10$, $p = .27$. PROCESS provides three separate tests for the indirect effect of designation on duration, across three levels of overlap. The three levels of the moderator (overlap) are low (-1SD), average, and high (+1SD). The bootstrapped confidence intervals were non-significant at the low levels of overlap (BootCI$_{95}$ [-45.22, 145.58]), at moderate levels of overlap (BootCI$_{95}$ [-38.98, 111.07]), and at high levels of overlap (BootCI$_{95}$ [-52.52, 90.52]). These results indicate that moderation does not occur.

The eleventh test involved testing the mediating effect of self-efficacy between designation and organizational trust. This eleventh examination involved designation coded as 0 (told not high potential) and 1 (no information given). High potential perception (VDS) was the moderator for this relationship.

Designation and VDS did not significantly interact to predict self-efficacy, $\Delta R^2 = .12$, $\Delta F(3, 256) = 10.55$, $p < .001$, $b = -.03$, $t(256) = -1.67$, $p = .10$. PROCESS provides three separate tests for the indirect effect of designation on organizational trust, across three levels of the VDS. The three levels of the moderator (VDS) are low (-1SD), average, and high (+1SD). The bootstrapped confidence intervals were significant at the low levels of VDS (BootCI$_{95}$ [.03, .29])
and at moderate levels of the VDS (BootCI95 [.05, .20]); however, the bootstrapped confidence interval was non-significant at high levels of VDS (BootCI95 [-.10, .10]). These results indicate that moderation does occur, at low and moderate levels of VDS, which was the opposite of what was predicted.

The twelfth test involved testing the mediating effect of self-efficacy between designation and organizational trust. This twelfth examination involved designation coded as 0 (told not high potential) and 1 (not told anything). High potential perception (overlap) was the moderator for this relationship.

Designation and VDS score did not significantly interact to predict self-efficacy, $\Delta R^2 = .39$, $\Delta F(3, 256) = 50.81, p < .001$, $b = -.05$, $t(256) = -.60$, $p = .33$. PROCESS provides three separate tests for the indirect effect of designation on organizational trust, across three levels of overlap. The three levels of the moderator (overlap) are low (-1SD), average, and high (+1SD). The bootstrapped confidence intervals were significant at the low levels of overlap (BootCI95 [.03, .28]) and at moderate levels of the overlap (BootCI95 [.02, .23]); however, the bootstrapped confidence interval was non-significant at high levels of overlap (BootCI95 [-.14, .24]). These results indicate that moderation does occur, at low and moderate levels of overlap, which was the opposite of what was predicted.

The thirteenth test involved testing the mediating effect of self-efficacy between designation and affective commitment. This thirteenth examination involved designation coded as 0 (told not high potential) and 1 (not told anything). High potential perception (VDS) was the moderator for this relationship.
Designation and VDS did not significantly interact to predict self-efficacy, $\Delta R^2 = .39$, $\Delta F(3, 256) = 50.81, p < .001$, $b = -.03$, $t(256) = -1.67, p = .10$. PROCESS provides three separate tests for the indirect effect of designation on affective commitment, across three levels of VDS. The three levels of the moderator (VDS) are low (-1SD), average, and high (+1SD). The bootstrapped confidence intervals were significant at the low levels of VDS (BootCI$^{95}_{.03, .27}$) and at moderate levels of the VDS (BootCI$^{95}_{.01, .19}$); however, the bootstrapped confidence interval was non-significant at high levels of VDS (BootCI$^{95}_{-.09, .09}$). These results indicate that moderation does occur, at low and moderate levels of VDS, which was the opposite of what was predicted.

The fourteenth test involved testing the mediating effect of self-efficacy between designation and affective commitment. This fourteenth examination involved designation coded as 0 (told not high potential) and 1 (not told anything). High potential perception (overlap) was the moderator for this relationship.

Designation and overlap did not significantly interact to predict self-efficacy, $\Delta R^2 = .12$, $\Delta F(3, 256) = 10.55, p < .001$, $b = -.05$, $t(256) = -1.97, p = .33$. PROCESS provides three separate tests for the indirect effect of designation on affective commitment, across three levels of overlap. The three levels of the moderator (overlap) are low (-1SD), average, and high (+1SD). The bootstrapped confidence intervals were significant at the low levels of overlap (BootCI$^{95}_{.03, .26}$) and at moderate levels of overlap (BootCI$^{95}_{.02, .21}$); however, the bootstrapped confidence interval was non-significant at high levels of overlap (BootCI$^{95}_{-.12, .22}$). These results indicate that moderation does occur, at low and moderate levels of overlap, which was the opposite of what was predicted.
The fifteenth test involved testing the mediating effect of self-efficacy between designation and job satisfaction. This fifteenth examination involved designation coded as 0 (told not high potential) and 1 (not told anything). High potential perception (VDS) was the moderator for this relationship.

Designation and VDS did not significantly interact to predict self-efficacy, $\Delta R^2 = .39$, $\Delta F(3, 2560) = 50.81, p < .001, b = -.03$ $t(250) = -1.72, p = .09$. PROCESS provides three separate tests for the indirect effect of designation job satisfaction, across three levels of VDS. The three levels of the moderator (VDS) are low (-1SD), average, and high (+1SD). The bootstrapped confidence intervals were significant at the low levels of VDS (BootCI 95 [.02, .29]) and at moderate levels of the VDS (BootCI 95 [.004, .20]); however, the bootstrapped confidence interval was non-significant at high levels of VDS (BootCI 95 [-.10, .09]). These results indicate that moderation does occur, at low and moderate levels of VDS, which was the opposite of what was predicted.

The sixteenth test involved testing the mediating effect of self-efficacy between designation and job satisfaction. This sixteenth examination involved designation coded as 0 (told not high potential) and 1 (not told anything). High potential perception (overlap) was the moderator for this relationship.

Designation and overlap did not significantly interact to predict self-efficacy, $\Delta R^2 = .12$, $\Delta F(3, 250) = 10.55, p < .001, b = -.05$ $t(250) = -.96, p = .34$. PROCESS provides three separate tests for the indirect effect of designation job satisfaction, across three levels of overlap. The three levels of the moderator (overlap) are low (-1SD), average, and high (+1SD). The bootstrapped confidence intervals were significant at the low levels of overlap (BootCI 95 [.01,
and at moderate levels of the overlap (BootCI$_{95}$ [.004, .21]); however, the bootstrapped confidence interval was non-significant at high levels of overlap (BootCI$_{95}$ [-.15, .23]). These results indicate that moderation does occur, at low and moderate levels of overlap, which was the opposite of what was predicted.

The seventeenth test involved testing the mediating effect of self-efficacy between designation and SJT accuracy, as measured by the number of correct items on the SJT. This seventeenth examination involved designation coded as 0 (told not high potential) and 1 (not told anything). High potential perception (VDS) was the moderator for this relationship.

Designation and VDS did not significantly interact to predict self-efficacy, $\Delta R^2 = .39$, $\Delta F(3, 256) = 50.81, p < .001$, $b = -.03$ $t(256) = -1.67, p = .10$. PROCESS provides three separate tests for the indirect effect of designation on SJT accuracy, across three levels of VDS. The three levels of the moderator (VDS) are low (-1SD), average, and high (+1SD). The bootstrapped confidence intervals were significant at the low levels of VDS (BootCI$_{95}$ [.18, 1.77]) and at moderate levels of the VDS (BootCI$_{95}$ [.08, 1.24]); however, the bootstrapped confidence interval was non-significant at high levels of VDS (BootCI$_{95}$ [-.58, .62]). These results indicate that moderation does occur, at low and moderate levels of VDS, which was the opposite of what was predicted.

The eighteenth test involved testing the mediating effect of self-efficacy between designation and SJT accuracy, as measured by the number of correct items on the SJT. This eighteenth examination involved designation coded as 0 (told not high potential) and 1 (not told anything). High potential perception (overlap) was the moderator for this relationship.
Designation and overlap did not significantly interact to predict self-efficacy, $\Delta R^2 = .12$, $\Delta F(3, 256) = 10.55, p < .001, b = -.05, t(256) = -.97, p = .33$. PROCESS provides three separate tests for the indirect effect of designation on SJT accuracy, across three levels of overlap. The three levels of the moderator (overlap) are low (-1SD), average, and high (+1SD). The bootstrapped confidence intervals were significant at the low levels of overlap (BootCI$_{95}$ [.17, 1.38]) and at moderate levels of the overlap (BootCI$_{95}$ [.11, 1.38]); however, the bootstrapped confidence interval was non-significant at high levels of overlap (BootCI$_{95}$ [-.86, 1.44]). These results indicate that moderation does occur, at low and moderate levels of overlap, which was the opposite of what was predicted.

The nineteenth test involved testing the mediating effect of self-efficacy between designation and effort or duration, as measured by the total amount of time spent on the survey. This nineteenth examination involved designation coded as 0 (told not high potential) and 1 (not told anything). High potential perception (VDS) was the moderator for this relationship.

Designation and VDS did not significantly interact to predict self-efficacy, $\Delta R^2 = .38$, $\Delta F(3, 256) = 49.72, p < .001, b = -.09, t(256) = -1.36, p = .17$. PROCESS provides three separate tests for the indirect effect of designation on duration, across three levels of VDS. The three levels of the moderator (VDS) are low (-1SD), average, and high (+1SD). The bootstrapped confidence intervals were non-significant at the low levels of VDS (BootCI$_{95}$ [-2.53, 160.08]), at moderate levels of VDS (BootCI$_{95}$ [-3.74, 115.04]), and at high levels of VDS (BootCI$_{95}$ [-49.27, 54.16]). These results indicate that moderation does not occur.

The twentieth test involved testing the mediating effect of self-efficacy between designation and effort or duration, as measured by the total amount of time spent on the survey.
This twentieth examination involved designation coded as 0 (told not high potential) and 1 (not told anything). High potential perception (overlap) was the moderator for this relationship.

Designation and overlap did not significantly interact to predict self-efficacy, $\Delta R^2 = .12$, $\Delta F(3, 256) = 11.02, p < .001$, $b = -.08 t(256) = -1.46, p = .14$. PROCESS provides three separate tests for the indirect effect of designation on duration, across three levels of overlap. The three levels of the moderator (overlap) are low (-1SD), average, and high (+1SD). The bootstrapped confidence intervals was significant at the low levels of overlap (BootCI$_{95}$ [.28, 166.69]), but non-significant at both moderate levels of overlap (BootCI$_{95}$ [-9.77, 115.58], and at high levels of overlap (BootCI$_{95}$ [-49.23, 88.65]). These results indicate that moderation does not occur.

The results from these twenty moderated mediation tests reveal no supportive evidence for hypothesis 13. Across both designation groups (YesPo vs. NoPo and NoPo vs. NoInfo), the +1SD of the moderators (VDS and overlap) confidence intervals contained zero, indicating no evidence for mediation at high levels of the moderator. In some cases, relationships were significant in the opposite hypothesized direction (i.e., mediation occurring at low levels of the moderator rather than higher levels). See Table 8 below for a summary of these moderated mediation results. The “Moderated Mediation” column represents the (lack of) presence of predicted moderated mediation.
Table 8. Hypothesis 13 summary moderated mediation results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test</th>
<th>Designation</th>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>Moderator</th>
<th>Effect (b)</th>
<th>ULCI</th>
<th>LLCI</th>
<th>Moderated Mediation?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>NoPo vs. YesPo</td>
<td>Organizational Trust</td>
<td>VDS</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>NoPo vs. YesPo</td>
<td>Organizational Trust</td>
<td>Overlap</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>NoPo vs. YesPo</td>
<td>Affective Commitment</td>
<td>VDS</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>NoPo vs. YesPo</td>
<td>Affective Commitment</td>
<td>Overlap</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>NoPo vs. YesPo</td>
<td>Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>VDS</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>-0.14</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>NoPo vs. YesPo</td>
<td>Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>Overlap</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>NoPo vs. YesPo</td>
<td>SJT Accuracy</td>
<td>VDS</td>
<td>-0.16</td>
<td>-0.70</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>NoPo vs. YesPo</td>
<td>SJT Accuracy</td>
<td>Overlap</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>-0.43</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>NoPo vs. YesPo</td>
<td>Duration</td>
<td>VDS</td>
<td>-8.83</td>
<td>-68.22</td>
<td>27.19</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>NoPo vs. YesPo</td>
<td>Duration</td>
<td>Overlap</td>
<td>14.67</td>
<td>-52.62</td>
<td>90.52</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>NoPo vs. NoInfo</td>
<td>Organizational Trust</td>
<td>VDS</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>NoPo vs. NoInfo</td>
<td>Organizational Trust</td>
<td>Overlap</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>-0.14</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>NoPo vs. NoInfo</td>
<td>Affective Commitment</td>
<td>VDS</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>NoPo vs. NoInfo</td>
<td>Affective Commitment</td>
<td>Overlap</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>NoPo vs. NoInfo</td>
<td>Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>VDS</td>
<td>-0.005</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>NoPo vs. NoInfo</td>
<td>Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>Overlap</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>-0.15</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>NoPo vs. NoInfo</td>
<td>SJT Accuracy</td>
<td>VDS</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>-0.58</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>NoPo vs. NoInfo</td>
<td>SJT Accuracy</td>
<td>Overlap</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>-0.86</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>NoPo vs. NoInfo</td>
<td>Duration</td>
<td>VDS</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>-49.27</td>
<td>54.16</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>NoPo vs. NoInfo</td>
<td>Duration</td>
<td>Overlap</td>
<td>17.26</td>
<td>-49.23</td>
<td>88.65</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8. Hypothesis 13 summary moderated mediation results

Note: Moderated mediation (No/Yes) corresponds to the significance level of the ULCI/LLCI; these are for the +1SD values of the moderator variable, as those were the significant hypothesized relationships.

Hypothesis 14: Contract breach partially mediates the relationship between designation and organizational ratings (organizational trust, affective commitment, and job satisfaction) and performance (decision accuracy and decision effort), with high potential perception moderating the relationship between designation and contract breach. To test this moderated mediation hypothesis, I used model 7 of PROCESS (Hayes, 2012), which tests both the conditional indirect effect of high potential designation across the dependent variables through the mediator contract
breach, but also the direct effect of high potential designation on the dependent variables. Analyses for this hypothesis were conducted by creating two dummy-coded variables, comparing the high potential versus not high potential designation, and then comparing the not high potential designation versus status unknown. The PROCESS model 7 with 50,000 bootstraps was used to conduct the analyses.

Hypothesis 14 is largely supported. In total, this hypothesis requires twenty separate tests. There are two high potential designation groups that are compared (NoPo vs. YesPo and NoPo vs. NoInfo), high potential perception is tested by two different variables (VDS and Overlap), and there are five different dependent variables (organizational trust, affective commitment, job satisfaction, SJT accuracy, and time spent on the survey). Each of these twenty moderated mediation tests is described next.

The first test involved testing the mediating effect of contract breach between designation and organizational trust. This first examination involved designation coded as 0 (told not high potential) and 1 (told high potential). High potential perception (VDS) was the moderator for this relationship.

Designation and VDS score did not significantly interact to predict contract breach, $\Delta R^2 = .29$, $\Delta F(3, 235) = 28.64$, $p < .001$, $b = .03$, $t(235) = -1.53$, $p = .13$. PROCESS provides three separate tests for the indirect effect of designation on organizational trust, across three levels of the VDS. The three levels of the moderator (VDS) are low (-1SD), average, and high (+1SD). The bootstrapped confidence intervals were non-significant at the low levels of VDS (BootCI$_{95}$ [-.05, .18]) and significant at moderate levels of the VDS (BootCI$_{95}$ [0.01, .21]) and at high levels...
of the VDS (BootCI95 [.03, .34]). These results indicate that moderation does occur, at moderate and high levels of VDS, as predicted.

The second test involved testing the mediating effect of contract breach between designation and organizational trust. This second examination involved designation coded as 0 (told not high potential) and 1 (told high potential). High potential perception (overlap) was the moderator for this relationship.

Designation and VDS score significantly interacted to predict contract breach, $\Delta R^2 = .13$, $\Delta F(3, 236) = 10.45, p < .001, b = -.18, t(236) = -2.07, p = .04$. PROCESS provides three separate tests for the indirect effect of designation on organizational trust, across three levels of overlap. The three levels of the moderator (overlap) are low (-1SD), average, and high (+1SD). The bootstrapped confidence intervals were non-significant at the low levels of overlap (BootCI95 [-.03, .16]) and significant at moderate levels of the overlap (BootCI95 [01, .23]) and at high levels of the overlap (BootCI95 [.02, .43]). These results indicate that moderation does occur, at moderate and high levels of overlap, as predicted.

The third test involved testing the mediating effect of contract breach between designation and affective commitment. This third examination involved designation coded as 0 (told not high potential) and 1 (told high potential). High potential perception (VDS) was the moderator for this relationship.

Designation and VDS score did not significantly interact to predict contract breach, $\Delta R^2 = .29$, $\Delta F(3, 235) = 28.64, p < .001, b = -.04, t(235) = -1.53, p = .13$. PROCESS provides three separate tests for the indirect effect of designation on affective commitment, across three levels of VDS. The three levels of the moderator (VDS) are low (-1SD), average, and high (+1SD). The
bootstrapped confidence intervals were non-significant at the low levels of VDS (BootCI_{95} [-.04, .15]), at the moderate levels of the VDS (BootCI_{95} [-.0008, .18]), and at high levels of VDS (BootCI_{95} [-.0001, .28]). These results indicate that moderation does not occur.

The fourth test involved testing the mediating effect of contract breach between designation and affective commitment. This fourth examination involved designation coded as 0 (told not high potential) and 1 (told high potential). High potential perception (overlap) was the moderator for this relationship.

Designation and overlap significantly interacted to predict contract breach, $\Delta R^2 = .13$, $\Delta F(3, 236) = 10.45, p < .001, b = -.18, t(236) = -2.07, p = .04$. PROCESS provides three separate tests for the indirect effect of designation on affective commitment, across three levels of overlap. The three levels of the moderator (overlap) are low (-1SD), average, and high (+1SD). The bootstrapped confidence intervals were non-significant at the low levels of VDS (BootCI_{95} [-.02, .13]), at the moderate levels of the VDS (BootCI_{95} [-.02, .19]), and at high levels of VDS (BootCI_{95} [-.03, .36]). These results indicate that moderation does not occur.

The fifth test involved testing the mediating effect of contract breach between designation and job satisfaction. This fifth examination involved designation coded as 0 (told not high potential) and 1 (told high potential). High potential perception (VDS) was the moderator for this relationship.

Designation and VDS did not significantly interact to predict contract breach, $\Delta R^2 = .29$, $\Delta F(3, 224) = 28.64, p < .001, b = -.04, t(224) = -1.66, p = .10$. PROCESS provides three separate tests for the indirect effect of designation job satisfaction, across three levels of VDS. The three levels of the moderator (VDS) are low (-1SD), average, and high (+1SD). The bootstrapped
confidence intervals were non-significant at the low levels of VDS (BootCI$_{95}$ [-.08, .20]) and significant at moderate levels of the VDS (BootCI$_{95}$ [.03, .23]) and at high levels of the VDS (BootCI$_{95}$ [.07, .38]). These results indicate that moderation does occur, at moderate and high levels of VDS, as predicted.

The sixth test involved testing the mediating effect of contract breach between designation and job satisfaction. This sixth examination involved designation coded as 0 (told not high potential) and 1 (told high potential). High potential perception (overlap) was the moderator for this relationship.

Designation and overlap significantly interacted to predict contract breach, $\Delta R^2 = .13$, $\Delta F(3, 224) = 10.45, p < .001$, $b = -.16$, $t(224) = -2.23, p = .03$. PROCESS provides three separate tests for the indirect effect of designation job satisfaction, across three levels of overlap. The three levels of the moderator (overlap) are low (-1SD), average, and high (+1SD). The bootstrapped confidence intervals were non-significant at the low levels of overlap (BootCI$_{95}$ [-.05, .21]) and significant at moderate levels of the overlap (BootCI$_{95}$ [.05, .27]) and at high levels of the overlap (BootCI$_{95}$ [.14, .53]). These results indicate that moderation does occur, at moderate and high levels of overlap, as predicted.

The seventh test involved testing the mediating effect of contract breach between designation and SJT accuracy, as measured by the number of correct items on the SJT. This seventh examination involved designation coded as 0 (told not high potential) and 1 (told high potential). High potential perception (VDS) was the moderator for this relationship.

Designation and VDS did not significantly interact to predict contract breach, $\Delta R^2 = .29$, $\Delta F(3, 235) = 28.64, p < .001$, $b = -.04$, $t(235) = 1.53, p = .13$. However, this was in the opposite
direction as predicted. PROCESS provides three separate tests for the indirect effect of designation on SJT accuracy, across three levels of VDS. The three levels of the moderator (VDS) are low (-1SD), average, and high (+1SD). The bootstrapped confidence intervals were non-significant at the low levels of overlap (BootCI_{95} [-.33, 1.02]) and significant at moderate levels of the overlap (BootCI_{95} [.15, 1.13]) and at high levels of the overlap (BootCI_{95} [.40, 1.77]). These results indicate that moderation does occur, at moderate and high levels of overlap, as predicted.

The eighth test involved testing the mediating effect of contract breach between designation and SJT accuracy, as measured by the number of correct items on the SJT. This eighth examination involved designation coded as 0 (told not high potential) and 1 (told high potential). High potential perception (overlap) was the moderator for this relationship.

Designation and overlap significantly interacted to predict contract breach, $\Delta R^2 = .13$, $\Delta F(3, 236) = 10.45, p < .001, b = -.18, t(236) = -2.07, p = .04$. PROCESS provides three separate tests for the indirect effect of designation on SJT accuracy, across three levels of overlap. The three levels of the moderator (overlap) are low (-1SD), average, and high (+1SD). The bootstrapped confidence intervals were non-significant at the low levels of overlap (BootCI_{95} [-.24, .95]) and significant at moderate levels of the overlap (BootCI_{95} [.19, 1.24]) and at high levels of the overlap (BootCI_{95} [.57, 2.32]). These results indicate that moderation does occur, at moderate and high levels of overlap, as predicted.

The ninth test involved testing the mediating effect of contract breach between designation and effort or duration, as measured by the total amount of time spent on the survey.
This ninth examination involved designation coded as 0 (told not high potential) and 1 (told high potential). High potential perception (VDS) was the moderator for this relationship.

Designation and VDS did not significantly interact to predict contract breach, $\Delta R^2 = .29$, $\Delta F(3, 210) = 29.04$, $p < .001$, $b = -.11$, $t(210) = -1.15$, $p = .25$. However, this was in the opposite direction as predicted. PROCESS provides three separate tests for the indirect effect of designation on duration, across three levels of VDS. The three levels of the moderator (VDS) are low (-1SD), average, and high (+1SD). The bootstrapped confidence intervals were non-significant at the low levels of overlap (BootCI$_{95}$ [-.56.85, 363.90]) and significant at moderate levels of the overlap (BootCI$_{95}$ [19.14, 405.48]) and at high levels of the overlap (BootCI$_{95}$ [30.95, 596.98]). These results indicate that moderation does occur, at moderate and high levels of overlap, as predicted.

The tenth test involved testing the mediating effect of contract breach between designation and effort or duration, as measured by the total amount of time spent on the survey. This tenth examination involved designation coded as 0 (told not high potential) and 1 (told high potential). High potential perception (overlap) was the moderator for this relationship.

Designation and overlap significantly interacted to predict contract breach, $\Delta R^2 = .13$, $\Delta F(3, 211) = 10.45$, $p < .001$, $b = -.18$, $t(211) = -2.53$, $p = .01$. PROCESS provides three separate tests for the indirect effect of designation on duration, across three levels of overlap. The three levels of the moderator (overlap) are low (-1SD), average, and high (+1SD). The bootstrapped confidence intervals were non-significant at the low levels of overlap (BootCI$_{95}$ [-63.11, 308.45]) and significant at moderate levels of the overlap (BootCI$_{95}$ [27.73, 449.30]) and at high levels of
the overlap (BootCI$_{95}$ [80.35, 867.62]). These results indicate that moderation does occur, at moderate and high levels of overlap, as predicted.

The eleventh test involved testing the mediating effect of contract breach between designation and organizational trust. This eleventh examination involved designation coded as 0 (told not high potential) and 1 (no information given). High potential perception (VDS) was the moderator for this relationship.

Designation and VDS did not significantly interact to predict contract breach, $\Delta R^2 = .25$, $\Delta F(3, 268) = 26.72$, $p < .001$, $b = -.04$, $t(268) = -1.46$, $p = .15$. PROCESS provides three separate tests for the indirect effect of designation on organizational trust, across three levels of the VDS. The three levels of the moderator (VDS) are low (-1SD), average, and high (+1SD). The bootstrapped confidence intervals were non-significant at the low levels of overlap (BootCI$_{95}$ [-.04, .16]) and significant at moderate levels of the overlap (BootCI$_{95}$ [.01, .19]) and at high levels of the overlap (BootCI$_{95}$ [.03, .32]). These results indicate that moderation does occur, at moderate and high levels of overlap, as predicted.

The twelfth test involved testing the mediating effect of contract breach between designation and organizational trust. This twelfth examination involved designation coded as 0 (told not high potential) and 1 (not told anything). High potential perception (overlap) was the moderator for this relationship.

Designation and VDS score did not significantly interact to predict contract breach, $\Delta R^2 = .06$, $\Delta F(3, 268) = 4.69$, $p < .01$, $b = -.08$, $t(268) = -1.07$, $p = .29$. PROCESS provides three separate tests for the indirect effect of designation on organizational trust, across three levels of overlap. The three levels of the moderator (overlap) are low (-1SD), average, and high (+1SD).
The bootstrapped confidence intervals were non-significant at the low levels of overlap (BootCI\(_{95}\) [-.003, .21]) and significant at moderate levels of the overlap (BootCI\(_{95}\) [.02, .23]) and at high levels of the overlap (BootCI\(_{95}\) [.02, .34]). These results indicate that moderation does occur, at moderate and high levels of overlap, as predicted.

The thirteenth test involved testing the mediating effect of contract breach between designation and affective commitment. This thirteenth examination involved designation coded as 0 (told not high potential) and 1 (not told anything). High potential perception (VDS) was the moderator for this relationship.

Designation and VDS did not significantly interact to predict contract breach, \(\Delta R^2 = .25, \Delta F(3, 268) = 26.72, p < .001, b = -.04, t(268) = -1.46, p = .15\). PROCESS provides three separate tests for the indirect effect of designation on affective commitment, across three levels of VDS. The three levels of the moderator (VDS) are low (-1SD), average, and high (+1SD). The bootstrapped confidence intervals were non-significant at the low levels of overlap (BootCI\(_{95}\) [-.02, .14]) and at moderate levels of the overlap (BootCI\(_{95}\) [-.0004, .16]); the bootstrapped confidence intervals were significant at high levels of the overlap (BootCI\(_{95}\) [.002, .27]). These results indicate that moderation does occur, at moderate and high levels of overlap, as predicted.

The fourteenth test involved testing the mediating effect of contract breach between designation and affective commitment. This fourteenth examination involved designation coded as 0 (told not high potential) and 1 (not told anything). High potential perception (overlap) was the moderator for this relationship.

Designation and overlap did not significantly interact to predict contract breach, \(\Delta R^2 = .06, \Delta F(3, 268) = 4.69, p < .001, b = -.08, t(268) = 1.07, p = .29\). PROCESS provides three
separate tests for the indirect effect of designation on affective commitment, across three levels of overlap. The three levels of the moderator (overlap) are low (-1SD), average, and high (+1SD). The bootstrapped confidence intervals were non-significant at the low levels of overlap (BootCI95 [-.008, .17]) and at high levels of overlap (BootCI95 [-.0007, .29]); however, the bootstrapped confidence interval was significant at moderate levels of overlap (BootCI95 [.0005, .20]). These results indicate that moderation does occur, at moderate levels of overlap, which is not what was predicted.

The fifteenth test involved testing the mediating effect of contract breach between designation and job satisfaction. This fifteenth examination involved designation coded as 0 (told not high potential) and 1 (not told anything). High potential perception (VDS) was the moderator for this relationship.

Designation and VDS did not significantly interact to predict contract breach, $\Delta R^2 = .25$, $\Delta F(3, 250) = 26.72$, $p < .001$, $b = -.03$, $t(250) = -1.38$, $p = .17$. PROCESS provides three separate tests for the indirect effect of designation job satisfaction, across three levels of VDS. The three levels of the moderator (VDS) are low (-1SD), average, and high (+1SD). The bootstrapped confidence intervals were non-significant at the low levels of overlap (BootCI95 [-.05, .19]) and significant at moderate levels of the overlap (BootCI95 [.02, .21]) and at high levels of the overlap (BootCI95 [.05, .35]). These results indicate that moderation does occur, at moderate and high levels of overlap, as predicted.

The sixteenth test involved testing the mediating effect of contract breach between designation and job satisfaction. This sixteenth examination involved designation coded as 0
(told not high potential) and 1 (not told anything). High potential perception (overlap) was the moderator for this relationship.

Designation and overlap did not significantly interact to predict contract breach, $\Delta R^2 = .05$, $\Delta F(3, 250) = 4.69$, $p < .01$, $b = -.06$, $t(250) = -.94$, $p = .34$. PROCESS provides three separate tests for the indirect effect of designation job satisfaction, across three levels of overlap. The three levels of the moderator (overlap) are low (-1SD), average, and high (+1SD). The bootstrapped confidence intervals were non-significant at the low levels of overlap (BootCI$_{95} [-.009, .23]$) and significant at moderate levels of the overlap (BootCI$_{95} [.04, .25]$) and at high levels of the overlap (BootCI$_{95} [.04, .38]$). These results indicate that moderation does occur, at moderate and high levels of overlap, as predicted.

The seventeenth test involved testing the mediating effect of contract breach between designation and SJT accuracy, as measured by the number of correct items on the SJT. This seventeenth examination involved designation coded as 0 (told not high potential) and 1 (not told anything). High potential perception (VDS) was the moderator for this relationship.

Designation and VDS did not significantly interact to predict contract breach, $\Delta R^2 = .25$, $\Delta F(3, 268) = 26.72$, $p < .001$, $b = -.03$, $t(268) = -1.46$, $p = .15$. PROCESS provides three separate tests for the indirect effect of designation on SJT accuracy, across three levels of VDS. The three levels of the moderator (VDS) are low (-1SD), average, and high (+1SD). The bootstrapped confidence intervals were non-significant at the low levels of overlap (BootCI$_{95} [-.23, 1.07]$) and significant at moderate levels of the overlap (BootCI$_{95} [.12, 1.19]$) and at high levels of the overlap (BootCI$_{95} [.35, 1.92]$). These results indicate that moderation does occur, at moderate and high levels of overlap, as predicted.
The eighteenth test involved testing the mediating effect of contract breach between designation and SJT accuracy, as measured by the number of correct items on the SJT. This eighteenth examination involved designation coded as 0 (told not high potential) and 1 (not told anything). High potential perception (overlap) was the moderator for this relationship.

Designation and overlap did not significantly interact to predict contract breach, $\Delta R^2 = .05$, $\Delta F(3, 268) = 4.69$, $p < .001$, $b = -.08$, $t(268) = -1.07$, $p = .29$. PROCESS provides three separate tests for the indirect effect of designation on SJT accuracy, across three levels of overlap. The three levels of the moderator (overlap) are low (-1SD), average, and high (+1SD). The bootstrapped confidence intervals were non-significant at the low levels of overlap (BootCI$_{95}$ [-.02, 1.26]) and significant at moderate levels of the overlap (BootCI$_{95}$ [.24, 1.37]) and at high levels of the overlap (BootCI$_{95}$ [.26, 2.10]). These results indicate that moderation does occur, at moderate and high levels of overlap, as predicted.

The nineteenth test involved testing the mediating effect of contract breach between designation and effort or duration, as measured by the total amount of time spent on the survey. This nineteenth examination involved designation coded as 0 (told not high potential) and 1 (not told anything). High potential perception (VDS) was the moderator for this relationship.

Designation and VDS did not significantly interact to predict contract breach, $\Delta R^2 = .25$, $\Delta F(3, 262) = 27.08$, $p < .001$, $b = -.07$, $t(262) = -.78$, $p = .43$. PROCESS provides three separate tests for the indirect effect of designation on duration, across three levels of VDS. The three levels of the moderator (VDS) are low (-1SD), average, and high (+1SD). The bootstrapped confidence intervals were non-significant at the low levels of overlap (BootCI$_{95}$ [-4.03, 149.51]) and significant at moderate levels of the overlap (BootCI$_{95}$ [19.59, 146.63]) and at high levels of
the overlap (BootCI$^{95}$ [21.29, 207.84]). These results indicate that moderation does occur, at moderate and high levels of overlap, as predicted.

The twentieth test involved testing the mediating effect of contract breach between designation and effort or duration, as measured by the total amount of time spent on the survey. This twentieth examination involved designation coded as 0 (told not high potential) and 1 (not told anything). High potential perception (overlap) was the moderator for this relationship.

Designation and overlap did not significantly interact to predict contract breach, $\Delta R^2 = .06$, $\Delta F(3, 262) = 4.71, p < .01$, $b = -.06$, $t(262) = -9.2, p = .36$. PROCESS provides three separate tests for the indirect effect of designation on duration, across three levels of overlap. The three levels of the moderator (overlap) are low (-1SD), average, and high (+1SD). The bootstrapped confidence intervals were non-significant at the low levels of overlap (BootCI$^{95}$ [-6.22, 150.00]) and significant at moderate levels of the overlap (BootCI$^{95}$ [19.29, 162.34]) and at high levels of the overlap (BootCI$^{95}$ [24.29, 192.80]). These results indicate that moderation does occur, at moderate and high levels of overlap, as predicted.

The results from these twenty moderated mediation tests reveal supportive evidence for hypothesis 14. Within the NoPo vs. YesPo high potential designation group tests, nearly all of the dependent variables, with both VDS and overlap as moderators, provided supporting evidence for the hypothesis. Affective commitment, for both the VDS and overlap, was non-significant. Likewise, within her NoPo vs. NoInfo high potential designation group tests, nearly all of the dependent variables, with both VDS and overlap as moderators, provided supporting evidence for the hypothesis. Again, affective commitment, only for overlap, was non-significant.
See Table 9 below for a summary of these moderated mediation results. The “Moderated Mediation?” column depicts the (lack of) presence of predicted moderated mediation.

Table 9. Hypothesis 14 summary moderated mediation results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test</th>
<th>Designation</th>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>Moderator</th>
<th>Effect (b)</th>
<th>ULCI</th>
<th>LLCI</th>
<th>Moderated Mediation?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>NoPo vs. YesPo</td>
<td>Organizational Trust</td>
<td>VDS</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>NoPo vs. YesPo</td>
<td>Organizational Trust</td>
<td>Overlap</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>NoPo vs. YesPo</td>
<td>Affective Commitment</td>
<td>VDS</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>-0.001</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>NoPo vs. YesPo</td>
<td>Affective Commitment</td>
<td>Overlap</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>NoPo vs. YesPo</td>
<td>Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>VDS</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>NoPo vs. YesPo</td>
<td>Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>Overlap</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>NoPo vs. YesPo</td>
<td>SJT Accuracy</td>
<td>VDS</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>NoPo vs. YesPo</td>
<td>SJT Accuracy</td>
<td>Overlap</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>NoPo vs. YesPo</td>
<td>Duration</td>
<td>VDS</td>
<td>236.63</td>
<td>30.95</td>
<td>596.98</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>NoPo vs. YesPo</td>
<td>Duration</td>
<td>Overlap</td>
<td>401.07</td>
<td>80.35</td>
<td>867.52</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>NoPo vs. NoInfo</td>
<td>Organizational Trust</td>
<td>VDS</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>NoPo vs. NoInfo</td>
<td>Organizational Trust</td>
<td>Overlap</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>NoPo vs. NoInfo</td>
<td>Affective Commitment</td>
<td>VDS</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>NoPo vs. NoInfo</td>
<td>Affective Commitment</td>
<td>Overlap</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>-0.001</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>NoPo vs. NoInfo</td>
<td>Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>VDS</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>NoPo vs. NoInfo</td>
<td>Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>Overlap</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>NoPo vs. NoInfo</td>
<td>SJT Accuracy</td>
<td>VDS</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>NoPo vs. NoInfo</td>
<td>SJT Accuracy</td>
<td>Overlap</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>NoPo vs. NoInfo</td>
<td>Duration</td>
<td>VDS</td>
<td>104.28</td>
<td>21.29</td>
<td>207.84</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>NoPo vs. NoInfo</td>
<td>Duration</td>
<td>Overlap</td>
<td>101.21</td>
<td>24.29</td>
<td>192.80</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note*: Moderated mediation (No/Yes) corresponds to the significance level of the ULCI/LLCI; these are for the +1SD values of the moderator variable, as those were the significant hypothesized relationships.

The results from the exploratory questions in study two are discussed next.

**Exploratory Question 4**: Is there is difference in organizational ratings (organizational trust, affective commitment, and job satisfaction) reported by those who do not know their status versus those designated as not high potential? To test this exploratory question, three ANOVAs compared those assigned to high potential status versus those assigned to not high potential
status versus those not told their status. The dependent variables are participants’ scale scores for organizational trust, affective commitment, and job satisfaction. Scheffé was used for post hoc tests.

While this exploratory analysis revealed some significant group differences, there was no consistent pattern across the three dependent variables.

There was an overall significant group difference in high potential designation (NoPo vs. YesPo vs. NoInfo) and organizational trust, $F(390) = 4.04, p = .02$. Those participants randomly assigned to the no information (NoInfo: $M = 3.92, SD = .91$) group had significantly higher ratings in organizational trust than those randomly assigned to the not high potential (NoPo; $M = 3.61, SD = .96$) group, $p = .02$. There were no other significant group differences for high potential designation group and organizational trust ratings.

There was not an overall significant group difference in high potential designation (NoPo vs. YesPo vs. NoInfo) and affective commitment, $F(390) = 1.07, p = .34$.

There was an overall significant group difference in high potential designation (NoPo vs. YesPo vs. NoInfo) and job satisfaction, $F(390) = 3.17, p = .04$. Those in the NoPo group ($M = 3.78, SD = .72$) gave significantly lower ratings of job satisfaction than those in the YesPo group ($M = 3.97, SD = .67$). Those in the NoInfo group ($M = 3.97, SD = .63$) gave significantly higher job satisfaction ratings than those in the NoPo group ($M = 3.78, SD = .72$). The YesPo and NoInfo groups did not significantly differ from each other.

**Exploratory Question 5:** Is there is difference in performance (decision accuracy and decision effort) for those who do not know their status versus those designated as not high potential? To test this exploratory question, an ANOVA compared those assigned to high
potential status versus those assigned to not high potential status versus those not told their status. The dependent variables are participants’ decision accuracy on the SJT and the amount of time (effort) they spent answering the SJT questions. Scheffe was used for post hoc tests.

This exploratory analysis did not reveal consistent results. The overall omnibus test for a group difference in high potential designation (NoPo vs. YesPo vs. NoInfo) and accuracy on the SJT was non-significant, $F(390) = 2.36, p = .10$.

Likewise, the overall omnibus test for a group difference in high potential designation (NoPo vs. YesPo vs. NoInfo) and duration was non-significant, $F(390) = 2.48, p = .09$.

Discussion: Study Two

The overarching purpose of the second study in this dissertation sought to examine the impact of high potential designation on employee’s perceptions of their organizations as well as their performance on a job-relevant task. Like in study one, contract breach and self-efficacy are included, this time as mediators. High potential perception (VDS and overlap), as well as career salience, were examined as moderators. The dependent variables that were examined include decision accuracy, effort or duration, organizational trust, affective commitment, and job satisfaction. For the model for study two, see Figure 2.

Support in line with predicted relationships for study two is somewhat mixed. Several of the findings did demonstrate evidence in line with predictions. At the overall group mean level, participants in the yes high potential group, compared to those in the no high potential designation group, reported higher levels of perceived satisfaction with their job. This result is consistent with findings from Björkman et al. (2013) and Gelens et al. (2014), wherein
employees who are designated as high potential are more likely to have positive experiences and like their jobs more than those who are not designated as high potential.

Overall, in study two, significant results were found only when comparing outcomes for the yes high potential designation group versus the no high potential designation group, compared to the no high potential designation group versus the no information group; self-efficacy ratings acted a mediating agent between high potential designation and decision accuracy, trust in the organization, commitment to the organization, and satisfaction with one’s job.

These findings add some support to the SET literature, which purports that employee behaviors are a result of exchanges that maximize benefits and minimize costs between individuals/parties (Blau, 1964). Generally applied to the workplace, SET would suggest that employees can be expected to respond positively when they feel their organizations support and invest in them (Cropanzano & Mitchell, 2005). The lack of empirical support for the no high potential designation group versus the no information group pairing could suggests that there is not a large enough difference in not knowing your high potential status compared to knowing you are not identified as high potential. In other words, these effects may only be present for those designated as high potential.

Results indicate that perceived psychological contract breach was a significant mediator between high potential designation and decision accuracy, the amount of time or effort expended in the survey, trust in the organization, commitment to the organization, and satisfaction with one’s job. Contract breach literature largely draws upon SET to explain findings (e.g., Bal, De Lange, Jansen, & Van der Velde, 2008). Contract breach is negatively related to organizational
trust, job satisfaction, and affective commitment (Zhao et al., 2007). This study is the first investigation into high potential designation or status as a possible catalyst for employees (not) perceiving a psychological contract breach. Results from this hypothesis suggest that high potential designation, regardless of knowing you are or are not, or not knowing your status, is related to contract breach.

The prediction that perceived psychological contract breach acted as a mediating construct between high potential designation and several outcomes, with high potential perception moderating, largely demonstrated results in line with hypotheses. For participants in the no high potential designation group versus the yes high potential designation group, both constructs for high potential perception (VDS and overlap) affected the mediating relationship between perceived psychological contract breach and perceived organizational trust, satisfaction with one’s job, decision accuracy, and effort throughout the survey. Similarly, for participants in the no high potential designation group versus the no information group, both construct for high potential perception (VDS and overlap) affected the mediating relationship between perceived psychological contract breach and perceived organizational trust, satisfaction with one’s job, decision accuracy, and effort throughout the survey. The extent to which participants wanted to stay with their organization long-term was only significant with the VDS moderator, not overlap. The inconsistent findings with regards to the affective commitment variable are discussed later in this discussion.

While support was found for several of the predicted relationships, discussed above, several predicted relationships did not present with support during study two. At the group mean level, there was no support for high potential designation group differences for the extent to
which a participant wanted to remain with their organization or perceived trust in their organization. The lack of significant group differences in perceived organizational trust and extent to which the employee wishes to stay with their organization long-term is somewhat surprising. Similarly, findings revealed no overall difference in high potential designation group and decision accuracy or effort in the survey. However, the main relationships of interest in this study were not main effects.

It should be also be noted that when measuring the overall group mean difference in high potential designation, the no high potential designation group versus the yes high potential designation group, the extent to which employees wanted to remain at their organization was non-significant.

There was also less support for self-efficacy as a mediating construct between perceived psychological contract breach and outcomes. There was also no evidence for self-efficacy acting as a mediating construct between high potential designation and several outcomes. This may, in part, be due to the general self-efficacy measure used in this study.

Overall, there was inconsistent evidence found for the construct of affective commitment. The lack of consistent empirical support for this variable is surprising, as this variable is often associated with contract breach (e.g., Zhao et al., 2007). This may be due to the vignettes used in the studies; support for affective commitment may have been found in organizational samples wherein employees reflect on their real jobs and perceptions of their organization.

No interaction between high potential perception (VDS or overlap) and high potential designation on perceived psychological contract breach emerged. Similarly, no interaction between high potential perception (VDS or overlap) and high potential designation on self-
efficacy was found in the direction predicted. This is inconsistent with the results from study one.
CHAPTER 4
GENERAL DISCUSSION

High potential employee programs are becoming increasingly commonplace in organizations across industries and business sectors (Silzer & Church, 2010; Silzer, Slider, & Knight, 1994; Well, 2003), but academic research in this area is sorely lacking. Presently, only two published studies, neither of them US-samples, have investigated the impact that high potential designation has on employees and the views they hold about their organizations or employers. High potential development programs are now typically considered necessary to attract and retain talent long-term (e.g., Grossman, 2011); while some companies have rushed to implement high potential employee programs, this can be detrimental to intentions, as some estimates report that a large majority of high-potential employees are misidentified (Cappelli & Keller, 2014; Martin & Schmidt, 2010).

The results from the two studies in this dissertation reveal that high potential designation can affect employee reactions to their organization (i.e., contract breach), assessment of their employer (i.e., organizational trust), and perceptions of their job (i.e., job satisfaction). Generally, stronger relationships were found between being designation as high potential versus not than not being designated as high potential versus not knowing your status. Unsurprisingly, those who know they are not high potential had stronger negative reactions to their employer and workplace than those who knew they were labeled as high potential. While the no information condition is a critical one to investigate, there are less consistent results surrounding this finding.
The no information category is likely more representative of most employees, as companies are not typically fully transparent with their high potential identification process. The results from these studies indicate that not knowing is sometimes better than knowing you are not high potential, but less positive than knowing you are high potential.

Further, stronger relationships were found for perceived psychological contract breach as a mediator than for self-efficacy. This may be due to the (general) self-efficacy measure used but could also indicate that considering whether a contract breach is present or not has a stronger impact on organizational and job ratings. The relationship between process fairness perceptions and perceived psychological contract breach has been well-documented and is supported in these studies within the high potential literature; process fairness perceptions were found to negatively relate to perceived psychological contract breach and generally mediate the relationship between high potential designation and organizational ratings. It may be the case that self-efficacy does not play as critical of a role throughout the high potential designation process. This finding was somewhat surprising, as you might logically conclude that a designation like high potential would impact an employee’s self-assessment of their own ability to complete tasks. Further, a general measure of self-efficacy was used, which one would logically think would be most appropriate for a vignette-based study. It may be that a vignette study is not the most effective design to assess this construct in particular.

Further, while other variables, like contract breach and procedural justice, did demonstrate alignment with a number of predicted relationships, their appropriateness for a vignette-based study is a limitation as well. Although the vignettes presented to participants were created with the intent to provide enough information (without swaying results one way or the
other) for participants to realistically be able to provide ratings on the variables included in this study, this is a limitation of the set of studies. Future investigations, in which high potential designation is manipulated (and thus requires a non-organizational sample), should consider other experimental designs that either do not include vignettes or vary the information provided in vignettes. Researchers should also consider asking participants to rate the level of comfort they felt, given the information they were provided, to see if they fell as if they do not have sufficient information to make judgments.

Career salience, the measure for career identification or self-career alignment, did not emerge with significant results, perhaps due to the measure used, which had poor internal consistency. Additionally, it may be the career salience does not play a role in high potential identification. Like self-efficacy, the study design may also not be appropriate to assess the role of career salience, which may emerge as a significant construct in a longitudinal organizational sample.

Furthermore, vignette and scenario-based studies are presented with a unique challenge. Researchers attempt to design a context wherein participants need to only respond to the information presented to them to make decisions or judgments that are asked of them. However, it is impossible to parse out whether participants are actually reflecting on their own personal experiences, the information only, or a combination thereof, when they are providing responses to items. In a review, Schatcher (2019) discusses how memories can impact performance on tasks that are not immediately relevant. He also discusses how memory might play a role in imagining future scenarios. He theorizes that episodic retrieval, activated when remembering past experiences, is activated when imaging similar future experiences. Thus, it is likely that
participants apply past knowledge, when they have it, to imagining future scenarios prompted by researchers in vignette studies. Overall, I have not found any literature that specifically currently tests this, but it is a limitation we should keep in mind when interpreting the results of studies that use vignettes.

As high potential perception moderators, both VDS and overlap showed evidence that a match between high potential designation and high potential perception resulted in stronger positive ratings; more support was shown for VDS than for overlap. This could, in part, be due to the fact that overlap was a single-item variable created for these studies while the VDS is a validated tool for high potential identification/selection and development. The VDS has also shown to be appropriate to use in a variety of work contexts and industries, whereas the variable overlap has not been widely used and tested.

**Limitations and Future Research**

As with any investigation, this dissertation has limitations. While this set of studies is novel in that is randomly assigns high potential designation, the experimental manipulation necessitates a non-organizational sample. While participants recruited through Amazon’s Mechanical Turk were all employed full-time, they did not share a common organization, or even industry. While this diverse sample could make the results more generalizable, organizational samples are likely to have greater external validity than laboratory or online survey studies. Of course, the inherent trade off when using organizational samples is the lack of ability to manipulate and randomly assigned high potential designation. Further, per the informed consent, participants were able to skip any and all items that they felt uncomfortable responding to. While there was no evidence for missing data having a broad impact on results, this could
have impacted some part of the participant experience. Future studies may want to consider the limitations of a vignette design or use different thresholds for missing data.

The two studies in this dissertation were novel as they introduced a validated measure of potential, the VDS. While the VDS has been validated for both assessment and development purposes, this assessment has not been testing with organizational samples. Further, this dissertation used the VDS survey as a bogus high potential test (as all participants took the survey but were randomly assigned to designation groups regardless of their answers). Future studies should explore the possibility of manipulating high potential designation through other processes, like the inclusion of different bogus tests or by delivering the high potential designation message to participants in a different manner. Further, more research should be conducted with other validated assessments (e.g., cognitive ability or personality factors) of high potential as a moderator. Many high potential identification programs utilize several variables to select or not select participants; it would be interesting to explore the moderating role of other individual characteristics as it pertains to reactions to a high potential designation. For instance, would employees high/low in Adjustment (a scale used by Hogan Assessments to assess an employee’s level of calmness during stressful situations) respond differently to being (not) designated as high potential? By conducting more investigations with different moderating variables, we will be able to create a more holistic understanding of how employees respond to high potential designation.

These studies utilized hypothetical scenarios for participants to consider while making ratings and responding to questions. Inherently, vignette studies have a significant limitation – while researchers design them to specifically be appropriate for the presented variables being
studied, participants may not feel that they are. Within the survey setting, asking participants to hypothesize the organizational reactions they would have to a hypothetical company is likely to be less impactful than gathering organizational data. Additionally, there is the possibility that the vignette used did not provide enough information for participants to reliably make determinations on certain constructs, like procedural justice or construct breach. Although the findings of the studies are in line with what you would expect to find with these variables (i.e., procedural justice was negatively related to contract breach), this should be examined more closely in other investigations. Studies conducted in the future could investigate this further by varying the scenario or vignette context and comparing the results to see whether certain information provided in the vignette is more appropriate than other information. Researchers may also consider asking participants to rate their comfort with making certain determinations (i.e., “Do you feel you were provided enough information to rate this?”). Further, future research should examine scenarios with different context or situations described. For instance, would the results have differed by varying the industry or level of job? It would be interesting to compare if certain job types versus others resulted in differential employee reactions to high potential designation.

This pair of studies is cross-sectional in nature. Although high potential designation was manipulated, the mediator and dependent variables were collected at the same time. Thus, mediation results should be considered within this context. As procedural justice is a well-documented mediator between an independent variable and contract breach, there is support in existing literature to suggest that this is a true mediation effect, however, without a temporal break between the independent variable and other variables, we cannot definitively determine
that mediation occurred. Future research would benefit from longitudinal studies that manipulate high potential designation and examine the impact that random assignment has, over time, on organizational ratings or performance variables.

This dissertation marks the first investigation into empirically examining one of the most common occurrences of high potential programs – individuals who are not explicitly told their status. As mentioned above, results are generally supportive that not knowing is worse than being told you are high potential, but not necessarily worse than being told you are not high potential. Future studies should explore this phenomenon further and in a more nuanced way. What would happen, for example, if someone were to learn of their high potential designation, but then later on not know if they were still labeled as such?

**Practical Implications**

A commonly asked question by HR professionals and executives is, “Should we tell our high potentials that they are high potential?” Publications and communications by global management consulting firms, like Korn Ferry, suggest that employers be transparent with their workforce (Korn Ferry, 2015); however, this advice may not be sound. In fact, of the limited studies published on high-potential employees, many of them highlight issues with being fully transparent regarding high potential designation status (e.g., Björkman, et al., 2013; Gelens, et al., 2014). In some cases, not having information regarding your high potential status was not negative. The results from these studies add to the growing body of research that knowing your high potential status is helpful, but typically only when you are actually high potential.
General Conclusion

High potential designation is an area that is ripe for research and further investigation. Practitioners and employers have been developing and running high potential leadership programs for decades, but researchers have only recently begun to begin investigating this area deeply. This pair of studies is the first to experimentally manipulate high potential designation. While the research design is novel and needed to further understand this space, there are still several limitations to these studies. Overall, the results from these studies indicate that receiving a high potential designation, compared to not, resulted in better perceptions of fairness and higher organizational ratings, like job satisfaction. Further research is needed to better understand these relationships and test these findings using expanded methodologies.
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APPENDIX A

VIGNETTE USED IN STUDIES 1 AND 2
Vignette Presented to all Participants – Study 1 & Study 2

Please consider the following scenario when answering questions in this study:

You were hired to work in a consulting firm, BrightVu, 5 years ago. BrightVu is medium in size, employing about 2,500 consultants with several different office locations across the US. Within your office, you are on a team of 10 consultants, all working under a single manager. You have had the same boss for the last five years, but there have been some personnel changes to your overall team during that time.

Your typical duties include researching market trends, delivering presentations to your team, and meeting deadlines for key clients. You spend the most of your day interacting with your fellow consultants, but also work closely with your boss, especially when handling tricky clients.

A significant portion of your job requires you to be able to sift through a large amount of information, be able to pinpoint critical data, and then make decisions on how to move forward. As someone on the team who has a few years of experience, your teammates and your boss often rely on your expertise to look for ways to help grow the business, while making sure you have made sound decisions.

Your boss has been satisfied with your performance. You’ve recently heard that some of your peers have been selected to be part of a High Potential development program and have observed that people in those programs often get promoted to senior consultant after graduating the development program.
Over your tenure, you have observed that those who gone through the High Potential development program are often put on the fast track to becoming managers and are sometimes given important projects to lead. These individuals seem to come out of the development program with much more confidence in their ability to act decisively and lead others. You’ve also begun to wonder – do you embody the typical characteristics of a high potential employee?

Some people in your organization have taken a High Potential assessment. This is the standard assessment that BrightVu uses, in part, when making determinations regarding which consultants should be selected into the High Potential development program. You will take this assessment next.
APPENDIX B

DESIGNATION MESSAGES
Designation Messages

High Potential: According to this validated assessment, you are High Potential.

Not High Potential: According to this validated assessment, you are not High Potential.

Not Told: These participants are not told any information prior to being shown the other variables for their study.
APPENDIX C

WORK-ROLE SALIENCE
Work-Role Salience

Instructions: Please rate your agreement with the following statements.

1. I intend to pursue the job of my choice, even if it cuts deeply into the time I have for my family.
2. I enjoy thinking about and making plans about my future career.
3. Planning for a specific career usually is not worth the effort; it doesn’t matter too much what you do. *
4. It is more important to have some leisure time after work than to have a job in my chosen field, be devoted to it, and be a success at it. *
5. I look at a career as a means of expressing myself.

* Indicates the item is reverse scored
High potential perception – Self-High Potential Employee Overlap

Instructions: Please choose a picture below that best describes your perception of your likeness (Self in graphs below) with a typical high potential employee (Other in graphs below).

When making your selection, please consider how much you feel like you are a high potential employee, feel like you can relate to other high-potential employees, and would feel welcome in a crowd of high-potential employees.
APPENDIX E

PROCEDURAL JUSTICE
Procedural Justice

Instructions: The following items refer to the procedure used to arrive at your high potential score. To what extent do you agree that you:

1. I have been able to express my views and feelings during those procedures.
2. I have had influence over the high potential rating arrived at by this procedure.
3. This procedure was applied consistently.
4. This procedure was free of bias.
5. This procedure was based on accurate information.
6. I was been able to appeal the high potential ratings arrived at by this procedure.
7. This procedure upheld ethical and moral standards.
APPENDIX F

CONTRACT BREACH
**Contract Breach**

*Instructions: Please rate your agreement with the following statements.*

1. Almost all the promises made by my employer during recruitment will have been kept so far. *
2. I will feel that my employer has come through in fulfilling the promises made to me when I was hired. *
3. So far my employer will have done an excellent job of fulfilling its promises to me. *
4. I will not have received everything promised to me in exchange for my contributions.
5. My employer will have broken many of its promises to me even though I’ve upheld my side of the deal.

* Indicates the item is reverse scored
APPENDIX G

SELF-EFFICACY
Self-Efficacy

Instructions: Please rate your agreement with the following statements.

1. I will be able to achieve most of the goals I have set for myself.
2. When facing difficult tasks, I am certain that I will accomplish them.
3. In general, I think that I can obtain outcomes that are important to me.
4. I believe I can succeed at most any endeavor to which I set my mind.
5. I will be able to successfully overcome many challenges.
6. I can perform effectively on many different tasks.
7. Compared to other people, I can do most tasks very well.
8. Even when things are tough, I can perform quite well.
APPENDIX H

ORGANIZATIONAL TRUST
Organizational Trust

Instructions: Please rate your level of agreement with the following statements.

1. I believe my employer has a high integrity.
2. I can expect my employer to treat me in a consistent and predictable fashion.
3. My employer is not always honest and truthful. *
4. In general, I believe my employer’s motives and intentions are good.
5. I don’t think my employer treats me fairly. *
6. My employer is open and upfront with me.
7. I am not sure I fully trust my employer. *

* Indicates the item is reverse scored
APPENDIX I

AFFECTIONAL COMMITMENT
Affective Commitment

Instructions: Please read the following questions and rate your agreement with each statement.

1. I would be very happy to spend the rest of my career with this organization.
2. I enjoy discussing my organization with people outside it.
3. I really feel as if this organization’s problems are my own.
4. I think that I could easily become as attached to another organization as I am to this one.
   *
5. I do not feel like ‘part of the family’ at my organization. *
6. I do not feel ‘emotionally attached’ to this organization. *
7. This organization has a great deal of personal meaning for me.
8. I do not feel a strong sense of belonging to my organization. *

* Indicates the item is reverse scored
APPENDIX J

JOB SATISFACTION
Job Satisfaction

Instructions: Consider the statements below and rate your agreement.

1. I will receive recognition for a job well done.
2. I will feel close to the people at work.
3. I will feel good about working at this company.
4. I will feel secure about my job.
5. I will believe management is concerned about me.
6. On the whole, I will believe work is good for my physical health.
7. My wages will be good.
8. All my talents and skills will be used at work.
9. I will get along with my supervisors.
10. I will feel good about my job.
APPENDIX K

SITUATIONAL JUDGEMENT TASK
Situational Judgment Task

Instructions: You will now be presented with a series of hypothetical workplace situations concerning integrity. After reading through the scenario, please mark the best response for the action an employee with high integrity would take.

1. Your work team is in a meeting discussing how to sell a new product. Everyone seems to agree that the product should be offered to customers within the month. Your boss is all for this, and you know he does not like public disagreements. However, you have concerns because a recent report from the research department points to several potential safety problems with the product.

   a. Which of the following do you think you would most likely do?

      i. Try to understand why everyone else wants to offer the product to customers this month. Maybe your concerns are misplaced.

      ii. Voice your concerns with the product and explain why you believe the safety issues need to be addressed.

      iii. Go along with what others want to do so that everyone feels good about the team.

      iv. Afterwards, talk with several other members of the team to see if they share your concerns.

2. You are an architect, and have been asked to work with a group of three other architects to design a new building. Each architect has created his or her own design, and you’re now meeting to discuss what to do. You have seen the other designs, and believe yours is the best.
The other architects seem to agree, but two of them want to make changes in the way the building looks. You think the changes reduce the quality of the design.

A. Of the following, which would you be most likely to do?

v. Work with the others to produce a design that everyone is fairly satisfied with.

vi. Let the others make the changes as they see high potential perception, as long as they don’t drastically alter the basic plan.

vii. Bring in your boss to help resolve the disagreement.

viii. Explain why you think the original design is better and refuse to change your mind unless better ideas are offered.

3. You’re the president of a small printing company and are considering promoting an employee to manager. There are three candidates for the position. Howard is highly qualified for the job, but you don’t find him very likable because he is so serious. Chris is slightly less qualified but is nicer to you and others than is Howard. Mary is the least qualified of the three, but is best liked by you and the other employees.

b. If you had to choose, who would you most likely promote?

i. Howard

ii. Chris

iii. Mary

iv. None of the above
4. You are a food server in a busy restaurant. It’s Friday night, and you have already put in 45 hours this week. The owner asks you to work tomorrow night, promising that you will be given a large dinner party which should get you a big tip.

c. Which of the following would you most likely say?

   i. “I’d rather not, thanks.”

   ii. “Sure!”

   iii. “I’m kind of tired, but I’ll do it if you can’t find someone else.”

   iv. “I’ll be happy to do it if you can guarantee the tip.”

5. You are a college professor, and two years ago you were given guaranteed job security. You’ve recently realized that this has decreased the quality of your work.

   d. What would you probably do?

      i. Realize that this is natural – high job security leads to lower quality work.

      ii. Accept that you’ve moved to a new career stage where working so hard is not that important.

      iii. Admit that you’ve gotten a little lazy, set some high goals, and get back to being productive.

      iv. Find some things outside the workplace (e.g., hobbies, community work) that can replace the value you used to put on work.

6. You’re a new manager and have noticed that your employees are not happy. You’ve hired two experts to advise you. After talking to employees, the experts give you their separate reports. One suggests that employees’ jobs be made more challenging so they won’t get
bored. The other suggests insurance plans be offered so people know the company cares about them.

e. Assuming that the reports make equally good arguments, what would you most likely do next?

i. Call the experts’ past customers and act on the advice of the expert with the better reputation.

ii. Call a meeting of department managers to see what others think should be done.

iii. Contact a third expert to get another opinion.

iv. Meet with each expert alone, and ask them what evidence there is that their approach is best.

7. You’re about to open the door to the building where you work, and you notice an older woman coming up behind you. She is carrying several packages.

f. What would you most likely do?

i. Hold the door for her out of courtesy.

ii. Walk into the building and let her get the door herself so as not to offend her.

iii. Ask her if she would like you to hold the door for her.

iv. If she says yes, do it. If not, don’t.

v. Tell her you’d like to hold the door for her and see what she says.

8. You’re a manager doing a performance evaluation for Jerry. Jerry has not performed well this year. He is mad because you gave him a rating of ‘‘3’’ (‘‘met expectations’’) on quality
of work, and he believes that he deserves a “5” (“exceeds expectations”). You believe the rating of “3” is fair and accurate, but Jerry threatens to go to your boss to complain.

g. What would you most likely do?

i. Tell Jerry to go to hell.

ii. Explain to Jerry why you gave him the rating that you did, but refuse to change your rating.

iii. Seek a compromise, such as giving Jerry a “4.”

iv. Schedule a meeting with your boss so that you and your boss can decide which rating is best.

9. LuAnn, one of your co-workers, comes to work wearing the ugliest blouse that you have ever seen. During a break she walks up to you and, after some small talk, asks, “How do you like my new blouse?”

h. If you had to say one of the following, which would you mostly likely say?

i. “It’s very pretty. Where did you get it?”

ii. “I don’t think clothing is a very good measure of a person. Let’s talk about you.”

iii. “Frankly, I don’t find it too attractive.”

iv. “You’re asking the wrong person – I’m not a very good judge of clothes.”

10. You’ve a new clerk in a clothing store and are being trained by Angie, a veteran employee. She quietly tells you that because employees are paid minimum wage, most people sometimes take home clothes for themselves. Employees who don’t are considered dumb and arrogant. At closing time, Angie hands you a scarf to take home.
i. Which of the following would you most likely do?
   i. Take home the scarf and keep your mouth shut.
   ii. Take home the scarf, but return it to the shelf later without letting other employees see you.
   iii. Politely tell Angie that you don’t need any more scarves.
   iv. Tell Angie that you don’t want to take home any clothes, now or ever.

11. You’re retiring from a successful business that you started, and must now decide who will replace you. Two of your children want the position and would probably do a fine job. However, three non-family employees are more qualified.

   j. Who would you most likely put in charge?
      i. The best performing non-family member, because the most qualified person deserves the job.
      ii. The lowest performing non-family member, because this won’t hurt your children’s feelings.
      iii. The highest performing child, because you have the right to do what is best for your kids.
      iv. The child you love the most, as long as he or she is able to do the job.

12. As a top boss in a large company, your job is to create and manage the company’s pay policies.

   k. Which of the following plans would you most likely favor, at least given what you know now?
i. A seniority plan where pay is based on how long an employee has been with the firm.

ii. A merit plan where pay is based on individual job performance.

iii. A work team plan where pay is based on the performance of the team and everyone on the team gets paid the same.

iv. A pro high potential perception-sharing plan where everyone shares pro high potential perceptions equally without regard to job performance.

13. You own a company and are trying to decide whether you should spend $15 million to begin selling products in China. You have heard everyone’s opinions, seen the data, and read all the reports. Now you must decide what to do.

1. How would you most likely make the decision?

   i. Go with your intuition because your gut feeling is seldom wrong.

   ii. Just decide, understanding you can probably change your mind if things don’t go as you hope.

   iii. Realizing that two heads are better than one, talk to a respected friend outside of work to see what he or she thinks should be done.

   iv. Make a list of the pros and cons, consider how likely each is to occur and, if the pros outweigh the cons, decide in favor of China.

14. Over lunch, two of your co-workers are gossiping about a new employee who is overweight and a bit slow in learning. Frank, one of your peers, turns to you and says “I hate working with fat, dumb people, don’t you?”

   m. Of the following, which would you most likely say?
i. “I prefer not to talk about people behind their backs.”

ii. “Lois would be alright if she would just lose some weight.”

iii. “You’re an idiot, Frank. Keep you damn opinions to yourself.”

iv. “Actually, I think Lois is very smart.”

15. You’re seated at a table on which there is a hat. A job interviewer puts a dollar under the hat and says, ‘‘I’m going to leave. You decide whether to take the dollar and if you want to tell me you took or didn’t take it. When I return, I’ll ask you if you took it and then guess whether you’re lying. If you tell the truth, you get fifty cents. If you lie and I guess you told the truth, you get the dollar. If you lie and I guess it, you get nothing.’’ He leaves.

n. What would you most likely do?

   i. Take the dollar and tell the recruiter you did not.

   ii. Take the dollar and tell the recruiter you took it.

   iii. Do not take the dollar and tell the recruiter you did not take it.

   iv. Do not take the dollar and tell the recruiter that you took it.

16. You are a nurse. Dr. Jones arrives to perform a heart operation, and you smell beer on his breath. You tell your supervisor, but she says that you should keep quiet.

   o. What would you most likely do?

      i. Listen to your boss – following the chain of command is essential to a hospital’s success.

      ii. Wait to see how Jones does during the operation. If he struggles, insist something be done.
iii. Trust the surgeon: smelling beer on someone does not mean they are 
drunk.

iv. Confront Jones. If he insists on operating, don’t participate and put your 
concerns in writing.

17. Two buyers are bidding to buy your company. Company A offers a high price and 
promises not to lay off any employees. Company B bids a lower price but offers you one 
million dollars to accept their bid. A lower price means less money for other owners and less 
job security for employees. However, you have your own future to think about.

p. What would you most likely do, and why?

i. Vote for selling to Company A because it is the fairest option for all 
   concerned.

ii. Vote for selling to Company B so you can take care of yourself and your 
    family.

iii. Vote for selling to Company A because your employees’ security is the 
    most important thing.

iv. Vote for Company B because it would be unfair for others to benehigh 
    potential perception at your expense.

18. You’ve been working hard over the last few years, putting in 60-hour weeks and doing 
what it takes to get ahead. You love your job, and your career is going just as you dreamed it 
would. One night over dinner, your husband/wife (or boyfriend/girlfriend) tells you that you 
must quit working so many hours or he or she will leave you. There are no children involved,
but this is a person that you love very much. On the other hand, you’re pretty sure that cutting back on hours will hinder your career.

q. Which of the following responses would you most likely make?

i. Listen to the person and try to understand their point of view. Explain to them how much you love them and why your relationship is so important to you. Cut back on hours so that your relationship won’t suffer, and explain the situation to your boss and co-workers.

ii. Ask the person why they are dissatisfied with the relationship, and carefully listen to their answer. Explain to them why work is so important to you, and try to work with them to find a way to build a stronger relationship. Continue working as you have over the last few years.

iii. Listen to the other person’s point of view and tell them your own. Then try to find a compromise solution. For example, if the other person wants you to work 40 hours and you want 60 hours, settle on 50 hours. As another example, perhaps you can work 60 hours some weeks and 40 hours other weeks.

iv. Assert your right to pursue your career in the manner you see high potential perception. Tell the person that if they can’t understand the way you feel, then your relationship must not mean very much to them.

19. A few days ago, one of your customers asked you when a certain shipment of your products would be delivered. You knew it would take at least two weeks until delivery, but to keep the customer from getting mad you told them it would be no more than one week.
a. Had this actually happened, what would you be most likely to do now?

v. Let it go this time, but resolve not to do this again. Confide in several people you trust about what you did, and listen to their advice.

vi. Talk to shipping and see if they can get the shipment there in under two weeks. Make clear to them that it must arrive in under 10 days.

vii. Call the customer back and tell them that you were mistaken and that the shipment will not arrive for at least two weeks.

viii. Understand that this sort of thing is necessary in business and that most everyone knows that promises such as this might not be kept.

20. It is a beautiful day outside – sunny, warm, and inviting. You are scheduled to work, but you are tempted to take the day off and go to the beach with some friends.

a. In all honesty, which of the following would you most likely do?

ix. Call in sick and go to the beach.

x. Go into work and work as hard as you usually do.

xi. Call your boss and tell him or her that you’d like to go to the beach, and see if your boss can find someone else to work for you.

xii. Go into work but do not work as hard as normal.
APPENDIX L

PARTICIPANT DEBRIEFS
First Participant Debrief

Thank you for participating in this study! At the beginning of this survey, you took a high potential assessment. You were randomly assigned to one of three groups: told you were high potential, told you were not high potential, or not given any information. Your actual score on the high potential assessment had no impact on this random assignment. If you would like to find out more information regarding your actual high potential score, please contact Liz Hanrahan at ehanrahan@vayapath.com.

Second Participant Debrief

Again, you were randomly assigned to one of three groups: told you were high potential, told you were not high potential, or not given any information. Your actual score on the high potential assessment had no impact on this random assignment.
**Demographics**

1. What is your age (in years)?

2. What is your gender?
   a. Female
   b. Male
   c. Other

3. Please choose the option from the following that best applies to your race/ethnicity:
   a. Caucasian/White
   b. Asian/Pacific Islander
   c. Black/African American
   d. Hispanic/Latino
   e. Mixed Race
   f. Native American/American Indian
   g. Other

4. What is your job title?

5. Please choose from the options that best applies to you:
   a. Full-time
   b. Part-time
   c. Retired
   d. Unemployed
6. How long (in years) have you been in your current position?

7. How many promotions have you had with your current employer?

8. In your current position, which quartile for performance would you say you fall in?
   a. Bottom 25%
   b. 26-49%
   c. 50-74%
   d. Top 25%

9. Have you ever held a manager position?
   a. No
   b. Yes

10. Have you ever been identified as a high potential employee before?
    a. No
    b. Yes