



## Validation study

### Customer Service Advisors in the call centre of a financial services provider: Understanding how cdaq predicts performance

**Date of study: October 2006**

#### **Method**

The research consisted of a criterion-related validity study, relating cdaq dimensions to the performance of Customer Service Advisors (CSAs). The purpose of the study was to understand how the different cdaq dimensions predict the different aspects of performance within the role. 101 CSAs completed cdaq online and received feedback on their profiles. For each of the respondents the following performance data was collected:

1. Overall rating
2. Competency
3. Customer management data

The customer management data collected was as follows:

- First point of contact (FPOC) resolution
- Call quality (based on calls rated by team managers)
- Average call handling time deviation
- Adherence to policy
- Call shape (a combination of hold and 'not ready' time)

#### **Results**

The analysis revealed that the overall performance rating was significantly related to the following cdaq dimensions, shown on page 2.

*Relationships between cdaq dimensions and overall performance*

cdaq dimension	Relationship with overall performance	Interpretation
Internal – External	-.22*	Employees with an ‘Internal’ preference are more likely to receive a higher overall rating
Same – Difference	-.23*	Employees with a ‘Same’ preference are more likely to receive a higher overall rating
Options - Procedures	.21*	Employees with a ‘Procedures’ preference are more likely to receive a higher overall rating

Significance levels: \*p<.05, \*\*p<.01

Based on this data we could conclude that those cdaq respondents who scored more highly on ‘Internal’, ‘Same’ and ‘Procedures’ were more likely to receive a higher overall rating in their organisational context.

*Relationships between cdaq dimensions and competency ratings*

Competency	cdaq dimension	Correlation	Interpretation
Build pride and passion	Accept - Evaluate	-.22*	Advisers who are rated more highly on this competency are more likely to have an ‘Accepting’ preference
Build talent and capability	Same-Difference	-.24*	Advisers who are rated more highly on this competency are more likely to have a ‘Same’ preference.
	Perfecting-Optimising	.23*	Advisers who are rated more highly on this competency are more likely to have an ‘Optimising’ preference
Protect and enhance our reputation	Internal-External	-.37**	Advisers who are rated more highly on this competency are more likely to have an ‘Internal’ preference

In terms of the customer management data the following relationships were identified:

*Relationships between cdaq dimensions and customer management data*

Performance measure	cdaq dimension	Correlation	Interpretation
Call quality	Same - Difference	-.26*	Advisers with a ‘Same’ preference are likely to have their calls rated more highly
Call shape	Perfecting - Optimising	.26*	Advisers with an ‘Optimising’ preference are likely to be rated more highly in this area