

Assessment Council News (ACN)

Presidential Message

By Julia Bayless, President

Hello IPAC! Welcome to our final issue of the Assessment Council News (ACN) for 2011. Can you believe another year is almost over? Me neither! Here are some highlights from IPAC, a sort of year in review, if you will:

Educational Opportunities

2011 was a year of great learning opportunities, from webinar offerings through the 2011 Conference in Washington, DC. Members can access recordings of previous webinars, conference presentation slides, and much more on the IPAC website.

All the activity in 2011 bodes well for 2012 – stay tuned for details on upcoming opportunities to network with fellow assessment professionals and sharpen skills throughout the coming year.

Forum

In addition to the conference, active listserve, and other events this year, there have been several active committees and working groups involved in creating opportunities for IPAC members and non-members. Opportunities for sharing increased also due to our growth in membership this year – we've welcomed more than 50 new members in calendar 2011 alone! There are lots of ways to get involved in IPAC, contribute to the field, and share your expertise...consider contacting a Board Member today to find the best fit for you!

Best Practices

We published our latest monograph in the IPAC series in 2011, building on the tradition of excellence in assessment established in our long history as IPMAAC. Along with our monograph and webinar series, the IPAC conference highlighted best practices in the field and allowed sharing of expertise in readily applicable and highly pragmatic terms.

Resources

Take a moment to log in to the members-only portion of the IPAC website to see all of the great resources available to you, and while you're there make sure your membership for 2012 is up to date.



December 2011

Inside this issue:

Presidential Message	1
IPAC Membership News	3
James C. Johnson Student Paper Competition 2011-12	4
Legal Update	7
Situational Judgment Tests	11
News of the Councils	15
Upcoming Conferences and Workshops	17
2011 IPAC Officers and Board Members	18
2011 IPAC Committee Chairs	19
About the ACN	20

(Continued on page 2)

(Continued from page 1)

Indulgence Requested

Please allow me to reflect (and gush) a bit on the people who made this year one of our best yet. It has been an outstanding year for IPAC, and it is due to the active participation, dedication, and passion of our IPAC membership. Thank you for a tremendous year! A special debt of gratitude is also owed to the IPAC leadership team for 2011: **Warren Bobrow, Jeff Feuquay, Lee Frier, Reid Klion, Christine Parker, Marianne Tonjes, and Mike Willihnganz**. This team of dedicated professionals provided unfailing guidance and support for the IPAC organization, and we are a better organization today because of them.

Our outgoing Board Members **Mike Willihnganz** and **Christine Parker** have served faithfully on the Board for several years, and we will greatly miss their insights, ideas, and very presence on the Board. We are glad to be re-welcoming our Financial Officer **Reid Klion** to another two-year term – his constancy and vigilance are tremendous assets to the management of IPAC. We also welcome two new leaders for 2012 – President Elect **Shelley Langan** and Board Member **Deb Whetzel**...2012 is certain to be an amazing year!

In addition to the IPAC Board, the IPAC Committee Chairs have demonstrated a level of commitment and a desire to contribute to the field that is nothing short of benchmark-setting. Many thanks to **Jayanthi Polaki** (ACN), **Deb Whetzel** (Conference Chair), **Jeff Feuquay** (Continuity), **Warren Bobrow** (Innovations), **Mike Willihnganz** (Nominations/Elections), **Lynne Jantz** (Policies and Procedures), **Dennis Doverspike** (Professional and Scientific Affairs), and **Lee Friedman** (University Liaison/Student Paper) for setting and maintaining a standard of excellence.

It has been a privilege to serve the IPAC organization as President this year – thank you to everyone who made it possible to exceed the ambitious goals we set for ourselves. I am grateful for the opportunity to have been a part of building this association, and I look forward IPAC's bright future! Thank you for your ongoing support of IPAC!



**IPAC 2011-12 James C. Johnson
Student Paper Competition**
Details on Page 4 & 5

Membership News

By Julia Bayless, Membership Chair and President

We have seen terrific growth in the IPAC organization in 2011, and we are delivering on the promises of membership to continue and encourage that growth – providing educational opportunities, a forum for sharing, best practices in the field, and resources for the assessment community. If you have not already done so, please take a moment to renew your membership for the coming year so you don't lose a minute of all that membership has to offer! You can renew your membership and update your contact information by logging into the members-only portion of the IPAC website at www.ipacweb.org.

We have a goal of significant membership growth for 2012; if you would like to be a part of the membership committee and have a more active role in helping IPAC meet its strategic goals, please send an e-mail to membership@ipacweb.org.

Stay tuned to the ACN and the IPAC website (www.ipacweb.org) for updates on the latest and greatest IPAC has to offer. Please contact any of the IPAC Board Members or Committee Chairs (listed on the IPAC website) with any questions or suggestions – thanks for your continued support!



DENNIS A. JOINER & ASSOCIATES

Situational Judgment Tests Available for Rent or Lease

Tests available for all organizational levels:

- Supervisory Situations
- Management Situations
- Law Enforcement Supervisory and Management Situations
- Fire Service Company Officer and Chief Officer Situations
- Human Relations / Interpersonal Skills / Customer Service

We also still provide custom knowledge tests and assessment centers

DENNIS A. JOINER & ASSOCIATES
joinerda@pacbell.net or (916) 967-7795

THE ANNUAL JAMES C. JOHNSON STUDENT PAPER COMPETITION (2011-2012)

IPAC is offering the James C. Johnson Student Paper Award that will recognize the achievements of students in the field of personnel management. Graduate, undergraduate, and former students are invited to submit research papers to be judged on the basis of their contribution to the field. The award winner will present the winning paper at IPAC's Annual Conference in Las Vegas, NV, July 22-25, 2012. The winner will receive up to \$600 in conference related travel expenses, free conference registration, one-year membership in IPAC, and recognition in the widely read IPAC newsletter. In addition, the University Department where the student's research was completed will receive a \$500 grant and a plaque commemorating the student's IPAC award achievement.

Competition Rules

Papers must be theses, dissertations, or other student papers that describe original research conducted by the author while a student. Papers submitted must have been written within two years of the entry deadline, may not have been previously submitted to this competition, and must have been written as a student. Papers should address either substantive or methodological issues in areas such as the following:

- ◆ Personnel Selection
- ◆ Employment Tests
- ◆ Job Analysis
- ◆ Employee Performance Evaluation
- ◆ Assessment of Productivity or Organizational Effectiveness
- ◆ Assessment of Training Outcomes
- ◆ Other Related Topics

Deadline

All manuscripts for the 2011-2012 competition must be e-mailed no later than March 21, 2012 to:

Dr. Lee Friedman
LMI
13481 Falcon View Court
Bristow, VA 20136
Tel (571) 331-1388
Email: leefriedman1406@yahoo.com

Procedure for Submission

A. The following must be included in each entry in order to be accepted:

1. A hard copy of a completed cover sheet mailed to Dr. Friedman's work address (see following page)
2. An electronic version (soft copy) of the paper e-mailed to Dr. Friedman.

B. Submissions are not to exceed 20 double-spaced pages of text (not including references or tables.) All papers should include a description of each of the following:

1. Research Problem
2. Methodology
 - a. Research Problem
 - b. Sampling
 - c. Instruments Used
3. Data Analysis
4. Findings/Conclusions

Judging of Entries

The papers will be reviewed anonymously by a panel of academicians and practitioners. Papers will be judged on the contribution to the field of personnel assessment, including an evaluation of the scientific merit as well as the degree to which the research addresses issues of practical importance to the practice of personnel assessment.

Awards

Winner presents paper at 2012 IPAC Conference
Up to \$600 reimbursement for travel to Conference
Free Conference registration
Free one year IPAC membership
Recognition in IPAC's newsletter
\$500 grant awarded to winner's university
Plaque awarded for winner's achievement

Please mail this cover sheet directly to Dr. Lee Friedman, LMI, 13481 Falcon View Court, Bristow, VA 20136. Please e-mail your paper to leefriedman1406@yahoo.com

Deadline: March 21, 2012

**2012 JAMES C. JOHNSON STUDENT PAPER COMPETITION
COVER SHEET**

Name _____

Address _____

Daytime Telephone Number (_____) _____ - _____ Fax (_____) _____ - _____

E-mail: _____

College or University where paper was done. (Indicate whether graduate or undergraduate).

Date paper was completed _____

Title of paper _____

Who else worked with you on this paper and in what capacity? (Include your advisor's name)

I certify that the paper being submitted represents my own original work and that I was primarily responsible for the research design and execution of the research described therein. I also understand that presenting this paper in person at IPAC is as important a factor in being the Student Paper Competition winner as having been selected as the winner.

Therefore, if my paper is selected as the winner, I will prepare a presentation based upon it to be given by myself at the IPAC Conference in Las Vegas, NV, July 22 - 25, 2012. In turn, I will make all necessary arrangements to present my paper in person whenever it is scheduled at the Conference.

Signature

Date

Beyond instinct. Beyond intuition.
We provide illumination.



Face it. Trying to identify the perfect candidates for the critical positions in your organization is a serious challenge.

As leaders in Human Resources for the Public Safety Sector, I/O Solutions will help you pinpoint the highest caliber people for your positions – whether you’re recruiting raw talent or promoting from within.

Visit our Web site at IOSolutions.org and browse through our comprehensive catalog of HR programs – from testing and evaluations to analysis, study guides and much more.



I/O Solutions. The search is over.

THE PUBLIC SAFETY SELECTION SPECIALISTS™ PRODUCTS & SERVICES:

- National Criminal Justice Officer and Firefighter Selection Inventories
- National Public Safety Dispatcher Selection Inventory
- EMT Basic, Intermediate and Paramedic Examinations
- Personnel Report (Integrity/Ethics)
- Video-based Law Enforcement Examination
- Physical Ability Testing Programs
- Law Enforcement and Fireservice Promotional Examinations and Assessment Centers
- Online Employment Applications, Examination Purchase, Administration and Scoring
- And much more...

LEGAL UPDATE

By Richard Tonowski, Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC)

This has been an important year regarding class action employment discrimination suits, mostly favoring employers. We can now see how events are playing out following *Wal-Mart v. Dukes*.

In the Ninth Circuit, home of the original allegations against Wal-Mart, several of those events have transpired:

1. Class certification in a case similar to *Wal-Mart*, although involving only about 750 claimants, was reversed in *Ellis v. Costco* (No. 07-15838, 9th Cir. 9/18/2011). The appellate court seemed to be going a bit beyond Wal-Mart by explicitly endorsing the *Daubert* standard for expert evidence at the class certification stage. More specifically, "rigorous analysis" at the certification stage demands not only an examination of whether expert testimony is admissible, but whether it backs up the argument for class certification. The court also may have gone against Wal-Mart in suggesting punitive damages may be consistent with certification of a class for injunctive relief under Rule 23(b)(2). *Wal-Mart* seems to have been stating that monetary damages were inappropriate under this rule. However, along the long road to the Supreme Court, EEOC (among others) had argued that punitive damages did not depend on individual claims for relief. They reflect the defendant's bad behavior as a whole, and so punitive damages may have the "indivisible nature" for relief under 23(b)(2) mentioned in *Wal-Mart*.
2. The Ninth Circuit will be seeing a case again because the U.S. Supreme Court vacated a verdict in *Chinese Daily News v. Wang* (No. 10-1202, U.S. 10/3/2011). Reporters had sued in a class action to get overtime pay under federal and California law. The wrinkle is that class certification under either Rule 23(b)(2) or Rule 23(b)(3) is valid for monetary damages under state law. The latter rule specifically allows for monetary relief, but commonality is more easily established under 23(b)(2) for just injunctive relief that would more easily span the particulars of each claimant's situation. Previously the Ninth Circuit had upheld the class and subsequent verdict for the class because, in the appellate court's view, 23(b)(2) had been satisfied and so there was no need to consider 23(b)(3). But since the Ninth Circuit's previous view of 23(b)(2) is not good law, it must now determine if the class was properly certified. One point that may need further resolution is whether the individualized determinations or "indivisible nature" of relief is at play in wage and hour cases (Donelon, 2011).
3. *Dukes v. Wal-Mart* (No. 3:01-cv-02252, N.D. Calif., 10/27/2011) has been re-introduced. It proposes a smaller but still large (90,000) class limited to California. The named plaintiffs include Betty Dukes and four other current or former employees of Wal-Mart and Sam's Club. Attorneys for the plaintiffs promised new statistics and new information. A defense-side commentator suggested

that the class was still too large to be coherent.

Bernay (2011) noted Wal-Mart is not limited to employment cases. Decertification of classes based on *Wal-Mart* have occurred in suits involving overcharges for title insurance and loss of property value due to released industrial toxins. And even if allegations among class members raise common questions, the lack of a common answer that inhibits efficient resolution of class claims dooms certification.

Not to be overlooked is the Supreme Court's continued support for arbitration agreements in lieu of EEO litigation and its non-support of class actions in arbitration. *AT&T Mobility v. Concepcion* knocked out California requirements that arbitration be inclusive of class actions, or else the arbitration agreement would be unenforceable. There has been some indication that California courts will read application of *Concepcion* narrowly, while the defense bar is looking to expand application.

EEOC does not have to play by Rule 23. It sues in Title VII cases under § 706 (representing one or more individual claimants) or § 707 (pattern or practice cases where the allegation is that discrimination is standard operating procedure). The first follows the *McDonnell-Douglas* framework. The second follows *Teamsters v. United States*, 431 U.S. 324 (1977). Under *Teamsters* the trial has two phases. In the first, EEOC has to prove pattern or practice unlawfully affecting a class of employees. If so, the court can conclude that all members of the class are victims. The second phase involves adjudication of individual claims. EEOC wants punitive damages to be assessed if it prevails in Phase I. DeGroff and Maatman (2011) have been following *EEOC v. JBS USA, LLC*, No. 10-CV-02103 (D. Colo.), a religious discrimination case against Muslims with allegations of discrimination, harassment, and retaliation. EEOC sued under both §§ 706 and 707. So far, the court has ruled that the harassment claims were by their nature individualized and not amenable to pattern and practice. And the matter of punitive damages would have to wait until Phase II, individualized claims. For the defense, this is important because if punitive damages were awarded in Phase I, it goes into Phase II for individual claims already assessed damages for wrongdoing to the class as a whole.

There has been debate as to whether class actions promote EEO or simply facilitate the transfer of money from employers to claimants. The plaintiff-side argument has been that without class actions it would be financially unfeasible to file individual suits, and so the wrongdoers keep to their ways without penalty. The defense sees the threat of class actions as leverage to force settlement in meritless claims. An employer faced with the possibility of a massive class action award will settle rather than risk an unfavorable outcome in

(Continued on page 8)

(Continued from page 7)

court. Such payoffs become an unwarranted cost of doing business, unrelated to whether the employer follows EEO law or not.

Yet to be seen is the impact on expert testimony in class actions, particularly the implicit bias theory offered by several psychologists and sociologists. The extreme skepticism regarding the “social framework” in the *Wal-Mart* opinion was not echoed in the Ninth Circuit’s handling of experts in *Costco*; district court will have to sort the relevance and persuasiveness of the testimony regarding class certification on remand. Likely the use of theory with little or no case-specific evidence is in trouble. We need to see more on how social science is applied. In a recent single-claimant sexual harassment case in the construction industry, *EEOC v. Boh Brothers Construction Co.* (E.D. La., 3/28/2011), the trial judge initially would not allow an expert to testify on social science findings. After attending a judicial training conference, he reversed himself and allowed the expert—but only to indicate what social science had to provide as background to the case, not to argue a position for the claimant. This seems like a return to some of the original thinking on social framework as a nonpartisan means of informing the trier of fact on ways the facts in the case could be viewed.

References

Bernay, A. (2011, September 14). 3 months after Wal-Mart v. Dukes. *Law360*. www.law360.com

DeGross, C. & Maqatman, Jr., G.L (2011, August 11). Split bifurcation ruling in EEOC religious discrimination and retaliation case. *Syefarth Shaw Workplace Class Action Litigation*. www.workplaceclassaction.com.

Donelon, B. J. (2001, July 28). Much to Dukes about nothing. *Law360*. www.law360.com.



This article first appeared in the December 2011 Quarterly Newsletter of the Personnel Testing Council of Metropolitan Washington (PTC/MW, www.PTCMW.org). It is being re-printed with the permission of Dr. Tonowski and PTC/MW. Dr. Tonowski also writes a monthly column, Legal Update, that is published on the PTC/MW website around the first of each month.

Custom Solutions

Personnel
Selection,
Classification
& Promotion

Education
Assessment
& Accountability

Strategic
Human
Capital
Management

Survey
Research

Modeling
& Simulation

Credentialing

Program
Evaluation
& Policy
Analysis

Employee
Development
& Training

HumRRO
Human Resources Research Organization

66 Canal Center Plaza, Suite 700 Alexandria, Virginia 22314

www.humrro.org

CODESP

Cooperative Organization for the Development of Employee Selection Procedures



- Item Bank
- Item Analysis
- Online Testing
- Webinars/Training
- Job Description Builder
- Job Analysis Questionnaires
- Classification/Recruitment Services
- Interviews & Other Selection Materials

*Most services:
\$1,850/year!*

www.codesp.com

Online HR Solutions

714-374-8644

tests@codesp.com



Would you like to serve on the ACN editorial team?

To learn more, please contact IPAC-ACN Editor,

Jay Polaki at jpolaki@ccbcmd.edu or

(443) 840-5638.

Situational Judgment Tests: An Overview of Current Research

By Deborah L. Whetzel and Teresa L. Russell, Human Resources Research Organization (HumRRO)

Situational judgment tests (SJTs) are designed to assess an applicant's judgment regarding a situation encountered in the work place (Weekley & Ployhart, 2006). SJT items present respondents with work-related situations and a list of plausible courses of action. Respondents are asked to evaluate each course of action for either the likelihood that they would perform the action or the effectiveness of the action. An illustrative SJT item is presented here:

You are facing a project deadline and are concerned that you may not complete the project by the time it is due. It is very important to your supervisor that you complete the project by the deadline. It is not possible to get anyone to help you with the work. Please rate the effectiveness of each possible course of action:

- A. Ask for an extension of the deadline.
- B. Let your supervisor know that you may not meet the deadline.
- C. Work as many hours as it takes to get the job done by the deadline.
- D. Explore different ways to do the work so it can be completed by the deadline.
- E. Give your supervisor an update and express your concern about your ability to complete the project by the deadline.

Method vs. Construct

The distinction between methods and constructs has been an area of concern in personnel selection for decades (Arthur & Villado, 2008; Schmidt & Chan, 2006). Constructs refer to the psychological or behavioral domain being sampled (e.g., general mental ability, conscientiousness, and psychomotor ability). Methods refer to the specific process or technique by which multiple constructs are measured simultaneously (e.g., interviews, assessment centers, and biodata). For example, an employment interview targeted at measuring conscientiousness would also likely assess oral communication skills. This lack of precision regarding assessed constructs poses two problems. First, it is difficult to explain which constructs predict job performance. Attempts to identify constructs measured using SJTs have not yielded interpretable factors (Chan & Schmitt, 2002; Gillespie, Oswald, Schmitt, Manheim, & Kim, 2002; Pulakos, Schmitt, & Kee-

nan, 1994). Second, it may be difficult to build new measures that have the same characteristics as existing measures.

Single-response SJTs, described by Motowidlo, Crook, Kell, and Naemi (2009) represent a possible method for more accurately identifying constructs measured by the SJT. In these SJTs, each critical incident serves as an "item." Thus, effectiveness ratings are made for each incident. As opposed to traditional SJTs in which the response options likely measure various dimensions, these items represent single behavioral episodes, and thus, can be categorized into performance dimensions.

In sum, traditionally developed SJTs are methods of measurement, largely because they measure several constructs simultaneously. Single-response SJTs offer promise of being able to pinpoint constructs assessed by SJTs and further research will inform which constructs are best measured using this method.

PSYCHOMETRIC CHARACTERISTICS OF SJTs

Scoring of SJTs

SJT items typically have no definitive "correct" answer, as defined by a body of knowledge or expertise. Consequently, there are several ways to score SJTs, each of which may lead to different estimates of validity (Bergman, Dragow, Donovan, Jennings, & Juraska, 2006). In their comparison of empirical, theoretical and expert-based keys, Bergman et al. found that none of the keys showed subgroup differences by sex and all of the keys showed discriminant validity. The authors concluded that the validity of an SJT depends in part on its scoring and that poor choices could lead to the conclusion that SJTs are not valid when it may be that the scoring key is not valid.

Reliability

Estimating the reliability of SJTs is problematic for several reasons. First, as mentioned above, SJTs typically assess multiple constructs and are often construct heterogeneous at the item level. When items lack clear factor loadings, it makes the creation of homogenous scales difficult. Thus, the scale and item heterogeneity makes coefficient alpha an inappropriate reliability index (Cronbach, 1951). Test-retest reliability is a more appropriate reliability estimate for SJTs but it is rarely reported. Parallel form reliability also is rare because it requires the use of different item content to measure the same constructs.

As mentioned above, because single-response SJTs are likely to measure fewer constructs than traditional SJTs, their reliability may be reasonably estimated using coefficient alpha. In Motowidlo et al.'s study, correlations among pairs of judges ranged from .68 to .95 with a mean

(Continued on page 12)

(Continued from page 11)

of .81 and the alpha reliability for the mean of their judgments was .98.

In a study comparing SJT formats and scoring keys, Waugh and Russell (2005) found that response format affected reliability such that selecting best-worst response options yielded lower levels of reliability than having respondents rate the effectiveness of each option. The authors note that this is likely due to having more responses to score.

Validity

Construct validity. Several meta-analyses (Christian, Edwards, & Bradley, 2010; McDaniel et al., 2001; McDaniel, Hartman, Whetzel & Grubb, 2007) have been conducted to summarize validity evidence relevant to the constructs assessed by SJTs.

Christian et al. (2010) identified and classified the construct domains assessed by SJTs into a content-based typology and conducted a meta-analysis to determine the criterion-related validity of each construct domain. SJTs were found to measure leadership and interpersonal skills most often. SJTs that measured teamwork skills and leadership had relatively high validities for predicting job performance. Although based on few studies, they found that (a) matching the predictor constructs with criterion facets increased the magnitude of criterion-related validity; and (b) video-based SJTs tended to have higher levels of criterion-related validity than paper-based SJTs, holding constructs constant.

McDaniel et al. (2007) investigated the effects of two types of response instructions: knowledge and behavioral tendency. Knowledge instructions ask respondents to select the correct or best possible response or to rate the effectiveness of responses. Behavioral tendency instructions ask the respondent to select the response that represents what the respondent would likely do or to rate the likelihood that they would perform an action. They correlated scores using each type of instruction with scores on cognitive ability and personality. They found that SJTs with behavioral tendency instructions tend to be more correlated with personality than SJTs with knowledge instructions. SJTs with knowledge instructions were more highly correlated with cognitive ability than SJTs with behavioral tendency instructions.

Criterion-related validity. Meta-analyses have been conducted examining the criterion-related validity of SJTs (Christian et al, 2010; McDaniel et al., 2001; McDaniel et al., 2007). McDaniel et al. (2007) found that the validity of SJTs across 118 coefficients was .26 ($N = 24,756$), regardless of instruction type. We note that most of the studies included in the meta-analysis relied on concurrent designs. Thus, it is possible that some of the conclusions drawn in this review may not hold for SJTs used to screen job applicants.

Subgroup Differences

Subgroup differences are a key concern when implementing any selection system. Whetzel, McDaniel, and Nguyen (2008) provided a systematic review of mean race and sex differences in SJT performance. The mean differ-

ences were expressed as standardized mean differences (d). A d of one indicates that one group is one standard deviation above the mean of another. Their meta-analysis showed that, on average, White test takers performed better on SJTs than Black ($d = .38$), Hispanic ($d = .24$), and Asian ($d = .29$) test takers. Female examinees performed slightly better than male test takers ($d = -.11$).

McDaniel, Psocka, Legree, Yost, and Weekley (2011) evaluated two adjustments to common scoring approaches for SJTs. This is an important piece of research because the often conflicting goals of increasing validity and minimizing adverse impact were achieved. The first adjustment, applicable to SJTs using Likert scales, controlled for elevation and scatter (Cronbach & Gleser, 1953). Because Black respondents tend to exhibit a preference for extreme responses on Likert scales, the adjustment for scatter substantially reduced White-Black mean score differences. Furthermore, this adjustment also reduced the score elevation associated with the coaching strategy of avoiding extreme responses (Cullen, Sackett, & Lievens, 2006). Item validity is shown to have a U-shaped relationship with item means with higher validities associated with higher rated levels of effectiveness (Waugh & Russell, 2006; Putka & Waugh, 2007). Thus, given the U-shaped relationship, the second adjustment involved dropping items with midrange item means. This permitted the SJT to be shortened, sometimes dramatically, without necessarily harming validity. In sum, the use of McDaniel et al.'s (2011) adjustments for elevation and scatter shows great promise for achieving the often conflicting goals of increasing validity and reducing adverse impact of SJTs.

Pearlman, Allen, Putka, Hooper, and Waters (2010) found similar results. Using an SJT developed to predict performance in Officer Candidate School, they originally obtained mean score differences between Whites and Blacks of .73 and .74 for the SME- and consensus-keyed responses, respectively. The differences decreased to .32 and .38, respectively when the keys were standardized. The Hispanic-White difference was virtually eliminated using the standardized key. Likewise, they found a similar pattern for sex differences. Males scored higher than females by .44 SD using the unstandardized SME and consensus keys, and this effect size dropped to .16 and .12, respectively using the standardized keys. In sum, SJTs are popular selection methods because of their validity. Although they have some adverse impact on minority groups, the magnitude is less than that typically found with cognitive ability tests, and newer scoring methods have shown some promise for minimizing subgroup differences while retaining validity.

REVIEW OF RESEARCH REGARDING VIDEO-BASED SJTS

A number of studies have been conducted comparing video-based vs. written SJTs. As mentioned above, Christian et al. (2010)'s meta-analysis found that video based SJTs had higher validity than paper-based SJTs, but their sample of video-based SJTs was very small ($k = 2, 4,$ and 5 for various constructs). Chan and Schmitt (1997) conducted a laboratory experiment comparing both media and

(Continued on page 13)

(Continued from page 12)

found that a video-based SJT had significantly less adverse impact than a written SJT and students perceived the video-based SJT to have more face validity than the written SJT. Richman-Hirsch, Olson-Buchanan, and Drasgow (2000) found similar results in that students reacted more favorably to a multimedia SJT measuring conflict resolution skills than to a written SJT of the same construct.

Two studies investigated the validity of a video-based SJT in high-stakes admission decisions (Lievens, Buyse, & Sackett, 2005; Lievens & Sackett, 2006). Lievens et al. found that when the criterion included both cognitive and interpersonal domains, the video-based SJT showed incremental validity over cognitively-oriented measures for curricula that included interpersonal courses, but not for other curricula. This study demonstrates the importance of differentiating not only predictor constructs, but criterion domains. Lievens and Sackett (2006) found that the video-based SJT has a lower correlation ($r = .11$; $N = 1,159$) with cognitive ability than the written version ($r = .18$; $N = 1,750$). For predicting interpersonally-oriented criteria, the video-based SJT has higher validity ($r = .34$) than the written version ($r = .08$).

In sum, video-based SJTs show a high degree of promise for predicting performance in high-stakes settings, thus providing additional support for their use. Of course, one must weigh the cost of their development in the decision to use such tests. The cost of actors, videographers, studios, etc. may make this expense fairly prohibitive compared to traditional paper-and-pencil SJTs.

RESEARCH-BASED RECOMMENDATIONS FOR PRACTICE

As the use of SJTs gain in popularity, we provide several research-based recommendations for practice:

Use knowledge instructions (e.g., how effective is this response?) primarily because the evidence to date, although limited, suggests that SJTs with knowledge instructions are faking resistant.

Ask the respondent to rate each response option on a Likert scale of effectiveness. If the SJT has 10 scenarios each with five response options, one has 50 potentially scorable items when the respondent rates each response. If the respondent is asked for the best response, one would only have 10 potentially scorable responses. The larger number of items likely will increase the reliability of the SJT.

Video-based SJTs have been shown to predict performance. Alternatives to live actors may decrease their cost. For example, the use of avatars enables greater flexibility because one can change a scene without having to reshoot a scene with actors, videographers, etc.

References

Arthur, W. & Villado, A. J. (2008). The importance of distinguishing between constructs and methods when comparing predictors in personnel selection research and practice. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 93*, 435-442.

Bergman, M.E., Drasgow, F., Donovan, M.A., Henning, J.B., Juraska, S. (2006). Scoring situational judgment tests: Once you get the data, your troubles begin. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment, 14*, 223-235.

Chan, D., & Schmitt, N. (1997). Video-based versus paper-and-pencil method of assessment in situational judgment tests: Subgroup differences in test performance and face validity perceptions. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 82*, 143-159.

Chan, D., & Schmitt, N. (2002). Situational judgment and job performance. *Human Performance, 15*, 233-254.

Christian, M.S., Edwards, B.D., Bradley, J.C. (2010). Situational judgment tests: Constructs assessed and a meta-analysis of their criterion-related validities. *Personnel Psychology, 63*, 83-117.

Cronbach, L. J. (1951). Coefficient alpha and the internal structure of tests. *Psychometrika, 16*, 297-334.

Cronbach, L.J. & Gleser, G.C. (1953). Assessing similarities between profiles. *Psychological Bulletin, 50*, 456-473.

Cullen, M.J., Sackett, P.R., & Lievens, F.P. (2006). Threats to the operational use of situational judgment tests in the college admission process. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment, 14*, 142-155.

Gillespie, M.A., Oswald, F.L., Schmitt, N., Manheim, L., Kim, B. (2002, April). *Construct validation of a situational judgment test of college student success*. Paper presented at the 17th annual convention of the Society for industrial and organizational Psychology, Toronto, Canada.

Lievens, F., Buyse, T. & Sackett, P.R. (2005). The operational validity of a video-based situational judgment test for medical college admissions: Illustrating the importance of matching predictor and criterion construct domains. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 90*, 442-452.

Lievens, F. & Sackett, P.R. (2006). Video-based versus written situational judgment tests: A comparison in terms of predictive validity. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 91*, 1181-1188.

McDaniel, M.A., Hartman, N.S., Whetzel, D.L. & Grubb, W.L., III (2007). Situational judgment tests, response instructions and validity: A meta-analysis. *Personnel Psychology, 60*, 63-91.

McDaniel, M. A., Psotka, J., Legree, P. J., Yost, A. P., & Weekley, J. A. (2011, January 24). Toward an Understanding of Situational Judgment Item Validity and Group Differences. *Journal of Applied Psychology*. Advance online publication. doi: 10.1037/a0021983

McDaniel, M. A., Morgeson, F. P., Finnegan E. B., Campion, M. A., & Braverman, E. P. (2001). Predicting job performance using situational judgment tests: A clarification of the literature. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 86*, 730-740.

Motowidlo, S.J., Crook, A.E., Harrison, J.K. & Naemi, B. (2009). Measuring procedural knowledge more simply with a single-response situational judgment test. *Journal of Busi-*

(Continued on page 14)

(Continued from page 13)

ness and Psychology, 24, 281-288.

Pearlman, K, Allen, M.T. Putka, D.J., Hooper, A.C., & Waters, S.D. (2010). Situational judgment test (pp. 44-50). In T.L. Russell & TR Tremble (Eds.). *Development and Validation of Measures for Selecting Soldiers for the Officer Candidate School*, Alexandria, VA: Human Resources Research Organization (FR-09-38)

Pulakos, E. D., Schmitt, N., & Keenan, P.A. (1994). *Validation and implementation of the FBI special agent tentry-level selection system*. Alexandria, VA: Human Resources Research Organization (FR-PRD-94-20).

Putka, J. D., & Waugh, G. W. (2007, April). *Gaining insight into situational judgment test functioning via spline regression*. Paper presented at the meeting of the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology Conference, New York, NY.

Richman-Hirsch, W. L., Olson-Buchanan, J. B., & Drasgow, F. (2000). Examining the impact of administration medium on examinee perceptions and attitudes. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 85, 880–887.

Schmitt, N., & Chan, D. (2006). Situational judgment tests: Method or construct? In J. Weekley & R.E. Ployhart (Eds.), *Situational judgment tests* (pp. 135-156). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Waugh, G.W., & Russell, T.L. (2005, April). A comparison of situational judgment test formats, scoring key developers, and scoring algorithms. In F.L. Oswald (Chair), *Understanding and Improving Situational Judgment Tests*. Symposium conducted at the meeting of the Society for Industrial-Organizational Psychology, Los Angeles.

Waugh, G. W., & Russell, T. L. (2006, May). *The effects of content and empirical parameters on the predictive validity of a situational judgment test*. Paper presented at the meeting of the Society of Industrial and Organizational Psychology, Dallas, TX.

Weekley, J. A., & Ployhart, R. E. (2006). *An introduction to situational judgment testing*. In J.A. Weekley & R.E. Ployhart (Eds.) *Situational judgment tests*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Whetzel, D.L., McDaniel, M.A., & Nguyen, N.T. (2008). Subgroup differences in situational judgment test performance: A meta-analysis. *Human Performance*, 21, 291-309.

Authors' note: Correspondence concerning this article may be directed to Deborah L. Whetzel at DWhetzel@humrro.org.



News of the Councils

American Psychological Association (APA) — The 2011 conference will be held May 19-22 in Orlando, FL. For more information, visit their website at www.apa.org.

Chicago Industrial/Organizational Psychologists (CI/OP) — CI/OP is a society of human resources professionals from the Greater Chicago area who meet to discuss current issues in I/O psychology. CI/OP generally has Friday afternoon sessions from 1:00 p.m. to 5:00 p.m. featuring several speakers addressing a topic. For more information and to confirm meeting dates and topics, visit their website at www.ciop.net.

Cooperative Organization for the Development of Employee Selection Procedures (CODESP) — CODESP is a public consortium that provides online HR products and services including an item bank, multiple-choice test generator (paper and online format), interviews, supplemental application forms, and writing and performance exercises. Our online testing service provides instant scoring and item analysis. Most of our services are only \$1,850/year. We also provide recruitment and classification services by contract. For more information call 714-374-8644 or visit www.codesp.com

Gateway Industrial-Organizational Psychologists (GIOP) — GIOP is a group of psychologists and human resources professionals in the metropolitan St. Louis area. The group offers programs and conferences on a wide range of topics. For more information, visit the GIOP website at www.giop.org.

International Public Management Association for Human Resources (IPMA-HR) — For more information, visit the IPMA-HR website at www.ipma-hr.org.

Metropolitan New York Association for Applied Psychology (METRO) — For more information, call the MetroLine at (212) 539-7593 or visit METRO's website at www.metroapppsy.com.

Mid-Atlantic Personnel Assessment Consortium (MAPAC) — MAPAC is a non-profit organization of public sector personnel agencies involved and concerned with testing and personnel selection issues. For details on MAPAC, visit the MAPAC webpage at www.ipacweb.org.

Minnesota Professionals for Psychology Applied to Work (MPPAW) — MPPAW is an organization consisting of a broad range of practitioners, consultants, and professors who meet to encourage an open exchange of information relevant to psychology as applied to work and human resources management. For more information, visit the MPPAW website at www.mppaw.org.

Personnel Testing Council of Metropolitan Washington (PTC/MW) — PTC/MW offers monthly luncheon programs and publishes an informative newsletter. See the 2011 calendar for scheduled

(Continued on page 16)

(Continued from page 15)

luncheon speakers or visit the PTC/MW website accessible through the IPAC website at www.ipacweb.org.

Personnel Testing Council of Northern California (PTC/NC) — PTC/NC offers monthly training programs addressing topics and issues that are useful and relevant to personnel practitioners of all levels of expertise. The monthly programs are typically scheduled for the second Friday of each month and alternate between Sacramento and the Bay area. The monthly programs feature speakers who are active contributors to the personnel assessment field. For more information regarding PTC/NC programs, visit the PTC/NC website accessible through the IPAC website at www.ipacweb.org.

Personnel Testing Council of Southern California (PTC/SC) — PTC/SC serves as a forum for the discussion of current issues in personnel selection and testing; encourages education and professional development in the field of personnel selection and testing; advocates the understanding and use of fair and non-discriminatory employment practices; and encourages the use of professionally sound selection and testing practices. For more information regarding luncheon meetings, workshops, upcoming conferences, or membership, visit the PTC/SC website accessible through the IPAC website at www.ipacweb.org.

Society for Human Resource Management (SHRM) — The 2011 conference is scheduled for June 26-29, Las Vegas, NV. Contact www.shrm.org/education for a current listing of seminars and conferences.

Society for Industrial/Organizational Psychology (SIOP) — The 2011 conference is scheduled for April 14-16, Chicago, IL. For more information, visit the SIOP website at www.siop.org.

Western Region Intergovernmental Personnel Assessment Council (WRIPAC) — WRIPAC comprises public agencies from the western region of the United States who have joined together to promote excellence in personnel selection practices. WRIPAC has three meetings each year that are typically preceded by a training offering. Additionally, WRIPAC has published a monograph series and job analysis manual. Additional information may be obtained by visiting WRIPAC's website at www.wripac.org.

Western Region Item Bank (WRIB) — WRIB is a cooperative organization of public agencies using a computerized test item bank. Services include draft test questions with complete item history, preparation of "printer ready" exams, and exam scoring and item analysis. Membership includes more than 160 agencies nationwide. For more information, call (909) 387-5575. For more information, visit the website at www.co.san-bernardino.ca.us.

Upcoming Conferences and Workshops

January

- 6 HR Leadership Forum. Breakfast Meeting. Speaker to be announced. Arlington, VA. Contact: www.hrleadershipforum.org Reservations required.
- 10-12 Federal Committee on Statistical Methodology. Research Conference. Washington, DC. Contact: www.fcsm.gov
- 25-27 American Society for Training & Development. Conference. "TechKnowledge." Las Vegas, NV. Contact: www.astd.org
-

February

- 3 HR Leadership Forum. Breakfast Meeting. Dr. David Finegold, Rutgers University. "Skills of the 21st Century Workforce: The Evolving Talent Development Systems in India and China." Arlington, VA. Contact: www.hrleadershipforum.org Reservations required.
- 23-26 Society of Psychologists in Management. Conference. Charleston, SC. Contact: www.spim.org .
- 26-29 Association of Test Publishers. Annual Conference. "Innovations in Testing." Palm Springs, CA. Contact: www.testpublishers.org
-

March

- 2 HR Leadership Forum. Breakfast Meeting. Sondra Barbour, Lockheed Martin. "Merging Diverse Organizational Cultures and the Role of HR." Arlington, VA. Contact: www.hrleadershipforum.org Reservations required.
- 2-6 American Society for Public Administration. Annual Conference. Las Vegas, NV. Contact: www.aspanet.org
- 4-7 Society for Human Resource Management. Conference. "Employment Law & Legislation." Washington, DC. Contact: www.shrm.org

If you have regional organization news or an item to add to the calendar, please contact the Editor by e-mail at ipolaki@ccbcmd.edu or by telephone at (443) 840-5638.

(Some of the information in this calendar was reprinted with permission from the PTC/MW Newsletter which was compiled by Lance W. Seberhagen, Seberhagen & Associates.)

2011 IPAC Officers

President
Julia Bayless

Director, Talent Development
Sodexo
9801 Washingtonian Blvd, Suite 106
Gaithersburg, MD 20878
(301) 987-4343
(301) 987-4177 (fax)
Julia.Bayless@sodexo.com

President-Elect
Jeffrey P. Feuquay

I/O Psychologist & Attorney
Managing Consultant, Psychology-Law
Center, LLC
108 W. Walnut
Nevada, MO 64772
(417) 667-5076
JFeuquay@PsychLawCenter.com

Past President
Mike Willihnganz

Director of Administrative Services
Placer County Water Agency (PCWA)
144 Ferguson Road
P.O. Box 6570
Auburn, CA 95604
(530) 823-4956
mwillihnganz@pcwa.net

Financial Officer
Reid Klion

Chief Science Officer
pan—A TALX Company
11590 North Meridian St., Suite 200
Carmel, IN 46032
(317) 814-8808
(317) 814-8888 (fax)
financial@ipacweb.org

Secretary
Marianne Tonjes

Executive Director
CODESP
20422 Beach Blvd. Suite 310
Huntington Beach, CA 92648-4377
(714) 374-8644
marcodesp@aol.com

2011 IPAC Board Members

Warren Bobrow

All About Performance, LLC
5812 W. 76th Street
Los Angeles, CA 90045-1616
(310) 670-4175
(501) 635-9850 (fax)
warren@allaboutperformance.biz

Christine Parker

PDRI, a PreVisor Company
1300 N 17th Street, Suite 100
Arlington, Virginia 22209
(202) 243-9314
(443) 445-6911 (fax)
chris.parker@pdri.com

Lee Frier

Owner/Consultant
Smart Solutions Consulting LLC
9132 E. Calle Diego
Tucson, AZ 85710
(520) 225-0052
lfrier@ssconllc.com



2011 IPAC Committee Chairs

Assessment Council News Editor

Jay Polaki

Director, Employment
Community College of Baltimore County
800 South Rolling Road
Baltimore, MD 21228
(443) 840-5638
(443) 840-4877 (fax)
jpolaki@cCBCMD.edu

Electronic Communications Network

Bill Waldron

President
Waldron Consulting Group, LLC
4111 Canoga Park Drive
Brandon, FL 33511
(813) 413-1682
elcomnet@ipacweb.org

Policy and Procedures Committee

Lynne Jantz

Director, Selection & Classification
Las Vegas Metro Police Dept
101 Convention Center Dr.
Suite P 200
Las Vegas, NV 89109
(702) 828-3981
(702) 828-3980 (fax)
L2899J@lvmpd.com

Bemis Memorial Award Nomination

Julia M. Bayless

Director, Talent Development
Sodexo
9801 Washingtonian Blvd, Suite 106
Gaithersburg, MD 20878
(301) 987-4343
(301) 987-4177 (fax)

Innovations in Assessment Award

Warren Bobrow

Principal
All About Performance, LLC
5812 W. 76th St.
Los Angeles, CA 90045
(310) 670-4175
warren@allaboutperformance.biz

Professional and Scientific Affairs Committee

Dennis Doverspike

Professor of Psychology
Psychology Department
University of Akron
Akron, OH 44325
(330) 972-8372
(330) 972-5174 (fax)
dd1@uakron.edu

Continuity Committee

Jeffrey P. Feuquay

I/O Psychologist & Attorney
Managing Consultant, Psychology-Law
Center, LLC
108 W. Walnut
Nevada, MO 64772
(417) 667-5076
JFeuquay@PsychLawCenter.com

Membership & Committee Services

Julia M. Bayless

Director, Talent Development
Sodexo
9801 Washingtonian Blvd, Suite 106
Gaithersburg, MD 20878
(301) 987-4343
(301) 987-4177 (fax)
membership@ipacweb.org

University Liaison/Student Paper Committee

Lee Friedman

Senior Fellow
LMI
13481 Falcon View Court
Bristow, VA 20136
(571) 331-1388
leefriedman1406@yahoo.com

Conference Chairperson

Deborah L. Whetzel

Manager, Personnel Selection and Development
HumRRO
66 Canal Center Plaza, Suite 700
Alexandria, VA 22314-1591
(703) 706-5605
(703) 548-5574 (fax)
dwhetzel@humrro.org

Nominations/Bylaws Committee

Mike Willihnganz

Director of Administrative Services
Placer County Water Agency (PCWA)
144 Ferguson Road
P.O. Box 6570
Auburn, CA 95604
(530) 823-4956
mwillihnganz@pcwa.net



About the ACN

The ACN is the official newsletter of the International Personnel Assessment Council, an association of individuals actively engaged in or contributing to the professional, academic, and practical field of personnel research and assessment. It serves as a source of information about significant activities of the Council, a medium of dialogue and information exchange among members, a method for dissemination of research findings and a forum for the publication of letters and articles of general interest. The Council has approximately 300 members.

The ACN is published on a quarterly basis: March, June, September, and December. Respective closing dates for submissions are February 1, May 1, August 1, and November 1.

Submissions for Publication: Prospective authors are invited to send in their articles, research reports, reviews, reactions, discussion papers, conference reports, etc., pertaining to the field of personnel research and assessment. Topics for submission include, but are not limited to:

- Technical
- Practical – lessons learned, best practices
- Legal
- Technology/Tools
- Statistics/Measurement
- Book reviews

Articles and information for inclusion should be submitted directly to the Editor via e-mail, at jpolaki@mdta.state.md.us. Articles will be accepted only by electronic submission (Word compatible). Submissions should be written according to the *Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association*, 5th edition. The editor has the prerogative to make minor changes (typographical/grammatical errors, format, etc.); substantial changes will be discussed with the author. Submissions more than 1500 words should include an abstract of maximum 100 words, preferably with three keywords.

If you have questions or need further information, please contact the editor.

Editor

Jay Polaki

Director, Employment
Community College of Baltimore County
800 South Rolling Road
Baltimore, MD 21228
Tel (443) 840-5638
Fax (443) 840-4877
jpolaki@cbbc.md.edu

Associate Editors

Legal Update

Richard F. Tonowski

Chief Psychologist
Office of General Counsel/Research
and Analytic Services
U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity
Commission
131 M Street NE Room 5NW16H
Washington DC 20507-0003
Tel 202-663-4752
Fax 202-663-4196
richard.tonowski@eeoc.gov

Professional and Scientific Affairs

Dennis Doverspike

Professor of Psychology
Psychology Department
University of Akron
Akron, OH 44325
(330) 972-8372
(330) 972-5174 (fax)
dd1@uakron.edu
dennisdoverspike@gmail.com



Advertising Rates

Advertisement Size	Advertisement Dimensions	Cost per Advertisement	Cost for 4 Issues
Full Page	7.5" x 9.75"	\$50	\$200
Half Page	7.5" x 4.875"	\$25	\$100
Business Card Size	3.5" x 2"	\$12.50	\$50