CORRECTION



## Correction to: Investigating the Construct Validity of Performance Comments: Creation of the Great Eight Narrative Dictionary

Andrew B. Speer<sup>1</sup> · Michael G. Schwendeman<sup>1</sup> · Caitlynn C. Reich<sup>1</sup> · Andrew P. Tenbrink<sup>1</sup> · Sydney R. Siver<sup>1</sup>

Published online: 5 December 2018 © Springer Science+Business Media, LLC, part of Springer Nature 2018

## Correction to: J. Bus. Psychol. (2018) https://doi.org/10.1007/s10869-018-9599-9

A correction has been made to Table 8 from the original online version of Speer, Schwendeman, Reich, Tenbrink, and Siver, which has been updated to include asterisks indicating statistical significance for each numerical value within the table, per the original table footnote. Additionally, updates have been made to include all regression weights for relevant predictors and the correct  $R^2$  values for the column pertaining to the Achieves Results outcome. Finally, the sample size for the data pertaining to this table is now included within the footnote.

The online version of the original article can be found at https://doi.org/ 10.1007/s10869-018-9599-9

- Andrew B. Speer speerworking@gmail.com
- Andrew P. Tenbrink andrew.tenbrink@wayne.edu
- Sydney R. Siver ssiver93@gmail.com

Michael G. Schwendeman schwendeman.michael@gmail.com

Caitlynn C. Reich caitlynn.reich@wayne.edu

<sup>1</sup> Department of Psychology, Wayne State University, 5057 Woodward Ave, Detroit, MI 48202, USA

Predictor	Achieves Results	Interpersonal Effectiveness	Coaching & Development	Exhibits Company Values	Problem Solving	Innovation
Step 1						
Overall Numerical Rating	.41**	.39**	.42**	.34**	.38**	.39**
Step 2						
Lead & Deci	.08	.22**	.16**	.15**		
Supp & Co		04	06			
Inter & Pres		.03				
Analy & Int	.09				.14**	.07
Create & Con					.03	.10
Org & Plan	01				.00	
Adapt & Cop						
Enter & Perf	01				.00	
$\Delta R^2$	.02*	.05**	.02**	.02**	.03**	.03**
$R^2$	.21**	.23**	.21***	.16**	.19**	.19**

Table 8Regressing Developmental Performance Dimensions onto Overall Numerical Ratings and Hypothesized Narrative Valence Scores

*Note.* N=499. \*\* p < .01, \* p < .05. Predictors were only included if hypothesized to be related to the developmental performance dimension. Shown are standardized regression weights. Change in  $R^2$  is from Model 1 (just Overall Numerical Rating) to Model 2 (Overall Numerical Rating + relevant Narrative Scores).  $R^2$  reported in last row is for Model 2

**Publisher's Note** Springer Nature remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.