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Self-Reports of Safety

- Safety research relies extensively on self-reports
  - 55/90 studies measured predictors and criteria via self-report (Christian et al., 2009)

- Impression management (IM) as a method bias
  - Motivation to impression manage
  - Salient social consequences and costs (Edwards, 1957; Baumeister, 1982; Leary & Kowalski, 1990; Podsakoff et al., 2012)

- Related issues:
  1. Substance and style of impression management scales (Connelly & Chang, 2016)
  2. Use of anonymous safety surveys to eliminate/limit bias
Primary Study Questions

- Can we trust employees to provide honest, unbiased responses to self-report measures of safety?
- How much are self-report measures of safety-related constructs influenced by impression management?
- Study 1 & 2 & 3: Estimate biasing effect of IM
- Study 2: Substance vs. style of IM
- Study 3: Anonymous vs. identified subsamples
Method: Study 1, 2, & 3

- **Study 1**
  - 757 university lab personnel surveyed
  - Impression management scale (Paulhus, 1991)
  - Confirmatory factor analyses (Williams & McGonagle, 2016)

- **Study 2**
  - 123 university lab personnel surveyed
  - Additional measures:
    - Larger impression management scale (Blasberg et al., 2014)
    - Personality inventory (Gosling et al., 2003)
  - Partial correlations

- **Study 3**
  - 107 oil and gas personnel in Qatar
  - Identified \((n = 96)\) vs. anonymous \((n = 11)\)
  - Unlikely virtues (Weekley, 2006)
  - Partial correlations
Study 1 – Results

- Final retained model: Unconstrained (i.e., freely estimated) method factor loadings
  - Impression management
  - Unmeasured method factor

- Unconstrained vs. baseline models significantly different

- Variance reduction rate (VRR): % of variance in the relationships among safety constructs attributable to method factors

- Impression management – Largest reductions for factor correlations with safety climate (average VRR = 28%)

- Unmeasured method factor – Largest reductions for factor correlations with safety compliance (IM + unmeasured factor [average VRR = 34%])
Study 2 – Results

- Partial correlation comparisons
  - Zero order correlations vs. partial correlations (controlling for IM and personality)
  - Estimate effects based on VRRs

- Impression management – Largest reductions for correlations with safety outcomes (average VRR = 74%)

- Personality – Accounted for ~12% of the variance in relationships between IM and safety constructs
  - All relationships between IM and safety constructs remained significant when controlling for personality
Study 3 – Results

- Unlikely virtues scale accounted for less variance in safety relationships than in Study 1 & 2 (average VRR = 11%)

- Largest reductions for correlations with safety knowledge (average VRR = 24%)

- Unlikely virtues accounted for no variance in relationships among safety outcomes
## Study 3 – Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Unlikely Virtues</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$n$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anonymous subsample</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identified subsample</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>VRR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$n$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full sample</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identified subsample</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Conclusions

- Impression management as a method bias?
  - Results generally support a biasing effect of IM
  - Study 1 – Largest biasing effect for safety climate
  - Study 2 – Largest biasing effect for safety outcomes
  - Study 3 – Comparatively smaller biasing effect (safety salience?)

- Study 2 – IM related to safety measures even after controlling for personality trait variance

- Study 3 – Inconsistent evidence of differences between anonymous and identified subsamples
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