

INDEX

A

Abilities. *See* Candidate attributes
The Academy of Management Journal, 142
Accuracy issue: criticism regarding assessment accuracy, 142–144; effects of faking on, 146–149; “Why Assessments Are More Accurate Than People,” 144–146
Action-oriented competencies, 126*t*
Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), 154–155, 221
Anderson, M., 11–14
Applicant faking: assessment scores affected by, 148–149; failed efforts of, 147–148; low level of, 147; as not the same as lying, 147; research on assessment accuracy and, 146–149; self-awareness versus, 148
Applicants: data faked by, 147–149; drug screens of, 41, 42*fig.*, 185; ensuring similar treatment of all, 211–212; investigating, 43*t*, 44*t*, 184–185, 185; professional level job screening of, 228, 230; quality and number of, 182. *See also* Candidates; Hiring process
Assessment accuracy, 94–95
Assessment centers, 49*t*–50*t*, 70
“Assessment Length and Assessment Accuracy,” 168–169

Assessment. *See* Staffing assessment
Assessment tools. *See* Staffing assessment tools
Assessment validity. *See* Validity

B

Background investigation information, 222, 223–224
“Baseball and Staffing Assessment,” 138–139
Behavioral assessments: direct versus, 72–75; interviewing approach to, 13, 46*t*, 54–55, 186, 223
Behavioral-anchored rating scale (BARS), 186
Behavioral-based questions, 46*t*, 54–55
Behavioral-based structured interviews, 46*t*, 54–55, 186, 223
Binet, A., 158–159
Biodata inventories, 47*t*, 63–64
“A Brief History of Staffing Assessments,” 158–159
Brown, M., 1–3

C

Candidate attributes: being smart, reliable, confident, 84, 188–189; competency library on, 125, 126*t*;

- “Demographic Group Differences in Assessment Scores,” 191–193; measuring, 20–25; “No One is Good at Everything,” 121, 122–123; “A Place for Everyone,” 238, 239–241; problem-solving, 48*t*, 66–67, 190–193; psychometrics used to assess, 82, 83–86. *See also* Staffing assessment measurements
- Candidate pools: described, 30–31; parameters influencing assessments of, 31–33
- Candidates: accurate evaluation of information collected from, 80; assessment data faked by, 146–149; assessments as being offensive to, 160–167; collecting/interpreting data on, 136–139; creating conversation with, 214–215; ensuring that the assessing has right information from, 80; entry-level staffing assessment from perspective of, 224–227; genetic components of job performance and, 22–24, 26; hiring process and, 1–4, 152–157, 167–169, 175, 176–180, 215–235; investigating, 43*t*, 44*t*, 51–52, 184–185, 222, 223–224; measuring what they can do, 21–22; measuring what they have done, 20–21; measuring what they want to do, 24–25; offering recruiting information to, 214–215; “A Place for Everyone,” 238, 239–241; professional level staffing from perspective of, 232–235; in protected groups, 153; providing realistic job previews (RJPs) to, 214; psychometrics used to assess, 82, 83–86. *See also* Applicants; Data; Job performance predictions
- Civil Rights Act, 154
- Cognitive task simulations, 50*t*, 70–72
- Competency library, 125, 126*t*
- Competency modeling, 125–126
- Concurrent validity, 92–93
- Confidence, 188–189
- Construct validity: assessment design and role of, 97–98; described, 96–97
- Content validity: assessment effectiveness and role of, 110; described, 90–91; evaluating assessment, 133–134; legal and judicial use of, 98–99; validity case study and role of, 103, 104*t*–107*t*
- Context-specific measures: integrating to predict performance, 202; knowledge, skills, and ability testing for, 201–202; self-reported, 199–201
- Cortina, J. M., 85
- Cost issues: balancing assessment efficiency and cost savings, 175–176; estimating ROIs of assessments, 151; worth versus expense assessment, 150–152
- Costing Human Resources* (Cascio), 95
- Covert integrity questions, 62–63
- “A Crash Course in Psychometrics,” 82, 83–86
- “Creating an Integrated Electronic Entry-Level Job Application,” 219–223
- Credit reports, 44*t*, 51
- Criminal record checks, 43*t*, 51
- Criteria validation/optimization, 197–198
- Criteria validity: advantages of, 95–96; assessment effectiveness and role of, 110; described, 91–92; face versus, 88–90; legal and judicial use of, 98–99; predictive and concurrent types of, 92–93; primary assessment importance of, 132; validity case study and role of, 104*t*–107*t*, 108–109; validity coefficient variable of, 93–94
- Criticisms. *See* Staffing assessment criticisms
- Cronbach, L. J., 86
- Cronbach’s alpha (or alpha), 85
- Cross-cultural Qualifications Screen, 99–100, 104*t*–105*t*
- The Cult of Personality* (Paul), 157

“The Cult of Personality and the Realities of Staffing,” 157–158
Cultural Agility Behavioral Interview Guide, 100, 105*t*–106*t*
Cultural Empathy Personality Measure, 101, 106*t*
Culture and work environment fit inventories, 48*t*, 64–65

D

Data: applicant faking of, 147–149; criteria validation and optimization of, 197–198; electronic application, 218–219; experience and education, 221; monitoring over time, 156; norming, 195–197; systematically collecting and interpreting assessment, 136–137; work interests, 221–222. *See also* Candidates
“Demographic Group Differences in Assessment Scores,” 191–193
Direct assessments, 72–75
Drug screens, 41, 42*t*, 185

E

Education data, 221
Effectiveness. *See* Staffing assessment effectiveness
80 percent (or 4/5ths) guideline, 153
Electronic applications: “Creating an Integrated Electronic Entry-Level Job Application,” 219–223; tips on using, 218–219
Electronic recruiting agents, 44*t*, 56, 228
The Emotional Intelligence Fad, 129–130
Employee profiling, 131
Employees: assessment impact on retention of, 150–152, 182–183; dangers of profiling, 198–199; defining/describing behaviors through job analysis, 120, 124–128; HAV (Human Value Added) generated by, 34–36; post-hire

on-boarding feedback from, 231. *See also* Hiring process
Entry-level staffing process: “The Candidate’s Perspective” on, 224–227; considerations during, 215–216; differences between professional level and, 227; example of, 217*t*; hurdle 1: electronic application, 218–223; hurdle 2: behavioral interview, 223–224
Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC), 132, 153, 192
Ethnic populations, 153, 192
Experience data, 221

F

Face validity: assessment effectiveness and role of, 110; criteria versus, 88–90; described, 87; validity case study and role of, 102, 104*t*–107*t*
Fairness issue: “A Brief History of Staffing Assessments,” 158–159; as criticism of assessments, 158, 160; “The Cult of Personality and the Realities of Staffing,” 157–158
Faking. *See* Applicant faking
Feedback (post-hire on-boarding), 231
FEMA (U.S. Federal Emergency Management Association), 1–3
4/5ths (or 80 percent) guideline, 153

G

Galton, Sir F., 158, 159
Gender discrimination, 153, 192
“The Genetic Components of Job Performance,” 22–24, 26
Graphology, 143

H

Handwriting analysis, 143
HAV (Human Value Added), 34–36
High-fidelity job simulations, 49*t*–50*t*, 70
“High-impact” questions, 60

- Hiring decisions: assessments for reducing mistakes in, 237–239; Hurricane Katrina example of poor, 1–3; importance of, 3–4; increasing assessment validity to maximize accuracy of, 175, 176–180; responsibilities for, 213. *See also* Staffing assessments
- Hiring managers: assessments for reducing mistakes by, 237–239; decisions by, 1–4, 175, 176–180; giving ultimate responsibility to, 213
- Hiring process: assessments as adding too much time to, 167–169; designing assessment for entry-level, 215–227; designing assessment for professional level, 227–235; Internet technology using assessments and, 16*fig*; Internet technology without assessments using, 14–15*fig*, 16; legal issues to consider in, 152–157; “A Place for Everyone,” 238, 239–241; prior to Internet staffing technology, 14–15*fig*. *See also* Applicants; Employees; Hiring process
- “How to Take a Staffing Assessment: A Message to Candidates,” 163, 164–167
- Hurricane Katrina, 1–3
- I**
- Integrity and reliability tests, 47*t*, 62–63
- Intellectual competencies, 126*t*
- Intelligence quota (IQ), 84, 188
- Internal consistency method, 85
- International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 142
- Internet staffing technology: staffing process prior to, 14–15*fig*; staffing process using assessments and, 16*fig*; staffing process without assessments using, 14–15*fig*, 16
- Interpersonal competencies, 126*t*
- Interviews: behavioral-based questions used in, 46*t*, 54–55; motivational questions used in, 45*t*, 54; on-site assessments and, 230–231; phone, 230; situational questions used in, 45*t*, 54; structured and unstructured, 45*t*, 52–53, 55, 185–186. *See also* Staffing assessment tools
- Investigations: assessment through, 184–185; collecting background information, 222, 223–224; credit reports, 44*t*, 51; criminal record checks, 43*t*, 51; general information about, 51–52; reference checking, 43*t*, 51; Social Security verification, 43*t*, 51
- J**
- Jackson, M., 10
- Job analysis: content validity established through, 90–91; defining/describing critical employee behaviors through, 120, 124–128; job relevance documented by, 155. *See also* Jobs
- Job Analysis and Competency Modeling, 125–126
- Job performance: attending to the changing nature of, 127; balancing different types of, 126–127; distinguishing between maximal and typical, 127–128; genetic components of, 22–24, 26; identifying key outcomes of, 119–120, 121–124; impact of assessments over time on, 181*fig*–182; limitations of, 115; linking assessment processes to, 138–139; non-linear relationships between personality and sales, 205*fig*; performance variance of, 28–30; validity coefficient predicting, 27–28. *See also* Jobs
- Job performance data: ensuring accurate, 113–114; performance benchmarks as part of, 114–115

Job performance measurements: using right level of performance in, 111–112; statistically predictable, 112–113

Job performance predictions: assessment accuracy of, 142–146; assessment process used for, 119–139; context-specific measures for, 202; difficulties in measuring, 111–115; emotional intelligence fad for, 129–130; how assessments develop, 81 *fig*–83; psychometrics used for, 82, 83–86. *See also* Candidates

Job relevance, 154

Job simulations: high-fidelity, 49*t*–50*t*, 70; low-fidelity, 49*t*, 69–70

Job-performance-centric mindset, 131

Jobs: competency modeling for, 125–126; designing assessments for entry-level, 215–227; designing assessments for professional level, 227–235; providing candidates with requirements of, 220–221; providing realistic previews of, 214; staffing the ones that no one wants, 123–124. *See also* Job analysis; Job performance

Journal of Applied Psychology, 142

Journal of Organizational Behavior, 142

Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 142

K

Knowledge, skill, and ability tests: for ability to learn/solve problems, 190–193; on basic job requirements, 189–190; context-specific, 201–202; “Demographic Group Differences in Assessment Scores,” 191–193; general information on, 65–66; integrating context-specific self-reported and, 202; integrating measures of broad, 193–194; past learning achievement

measured by, 49*t*, 67–68; problem-solving aptitude measured by, 48*t*, 66–67

L

Legal issues: 4/5ths (or 80 percent) guidelines to assess risk, 153; job relevance, 154; legal risks of staffing assessments, 152–153; prohibited information, 154–157

Low base rate, 112

Low performance variance, 112

Low reliability performance measures, 112–113

Low-fidelity job simulations, 49*t*, 69–70

M

Maximal job performance, 127–128

Minority populations, 153, 192

Moneyball: (Lewis), 138, 139

Motivation measures, 82, 83–86

Motivational questions, 45*t*, 54

N

“No One is Good at Everything,” 121, 122–123

Non-linear scoring: described, 202–203;

“Non-Linear Job Performance: More Is Not Always Better,” 203–206; relationships between personality and sales performance, 205 *fig*

Norming, 195–197

Nunnally, J. C., 86

O

Oakland A's, 138

“Off-the-shelf” assessments, 200

Offensiveness issue: as criticism of assessments, 160–164; “How to Take a Staffing Assessment: A Message to Candidates,” 163, 164–167

On-site interviews/assessments, 230–231

Online assessment, 230

“The Operational Impact of Assessments,” 177, 180–183

Operational requirement questions:

1: will hiring managers accept assessment?, 134; 2: is the assessment easy to administer?, 135; 3: is the assessment easy to interpret?, 135; 4: is the assessment affordable?, 135–136; 5: how will candidates react to the assessment?, 136

Operational resources: assessment effectiveness and role of, 110; validity case study use of, 104*t*–107*t*

Optimization, 197–198

Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 142

Overt integrity questions, 62–63

P

Past learning achievement, 49*t*, 67–68

Paul, A. M., 157

Performance. *See* Job performance

Performance variance, 28–30

Personal touch points, 214

Personality: Cultural Empathy Personality

Measure of, 101; non-linear relationships between sales performance and, 205*fig*; psychometrics used to measure, 82, 83–86

Personality questionnaires, 47*t*, 61–62

Personnel Psychology, 142

Phone interviews, 230

Physical ability tests, 41, 42*t*

Physical exams: drug screens, 41, 42*t*; general information on, 41, 52; physical ability tests, 41, 42*t*

“A Place for Everyone,” 238, 239–241

Post-hire on-boarding feedback, 231

Pre-screening questionnaires, 46*t*, 57–61, 184, 211

Predictive validity, 92–93

Problem-solving aptitude, 48*t*, 66–67, 190–193

Professional level staffing process: candidate’s perspective on, 232–235; considerations during, 227–228; differences between entry-level and, 227; example of, 229; hurdle 1: sourcing, 228; hurdle 2: screening assessment, 228, 230; hurdle 3: phone interviews, 230; hurdle 4: in-depth online assessment, 230; hurdle 5: on-site interviews and assessments, 230–231; hurdle 6: verification, 231; hurdle 7: post-hire on-boarding feedback and development, 231

“Profiling and the Dangers of Cloning High-Performance Employees,” 198–199

Prohibited information issue, 154–157

Protected groups, 153, 192

Psychometrics, 82, 83–86

Q

Questionnaires: personality, 47*t*, 61–62; pre-screening, 46*t*, 57–61, 184, 211; self-reporting pre-screening, 184

Questions: behavioral-based, 46*t*, 54–55; covert and overt integrity, 62–63; “high-impact,” 60; motivational, 45*t*, 54; situational, 45*t*, 54

R

Raven’s Progressive Matrix, 88–90, 89*fig*

Realistic job previews (RJPs), 214

Reference checking, 43*t*, 51

Reliability: described, 84; methods for estimating, 85; performance measures with low, 112–113

Reliability (candidate trait), 188

Reliability coefficients, 85–86
Resume capture and reviews, 45*t*, 56
Resume screens: common types of, 55–56; electronic recruiting agents, 44*t*, 56, 228; resume capture and reviews, 45*t*, 56
The Role of Constructs in Psychological and Educational Measurement (Braun, Wiley, and Jackson), 98

S

Screening assessment, 228, 230
Self-report measures: biodata inventories, 47*t*, 63–64; context-specific, 199–201; culture and work environment fit inventories, 48*t*, 64–65; general information on, 56–57; integrating broad, 193–194; integrity and reliability tests, 47*t*, 62–63; localized scoring and accurately interpreting, 194–199; personality questionnaires, 47*t*, 61–62; pre-screening questionnaires, 46*t*, 57–61; pre-screening questionnaires used for, 184; situational judgment and, 49*t*, 69–70, 186–189; weighted application blanks, 46*t*, 58. *See also* Staffing assessment measurements; Staffing assessment tools
Self-report scoring/interpreting: criteria validation and optimization, 197–198; norming, 195–197; overview of issues involved in, 194–195; “Profiling and the Dangers of Cloning High-Performance Employees,” 198–199
Simulations: cognitive task, 50*t*, 70–72; high-fidelity job, 49*t*–50*t*, 70; low-fidelity job, 49*t*, 69–70
Situational judgment tests, 49*t*, 69–70, 186–189
Situational measures: cognitive task simulations, 50*t*, 70–72; general information

on, 69; high-fidelity job simulations, assessment centers, and work samples, 49*t*–50*t*, 70; low-fidelity job simulations, situational judgment tests, 49*t*, 69–70
Situational questions, 45*t*, 54
Smart/intelligence measures, 84, 188
Social Security verification, 43*t*, 51
Sourcing, 228
Spanish Language Skills Test, 101–102, 107*t*
Staffing assessment categories: behavioral versus direct, 72–75; eighteen group divisions of seven, 41, 42*t*–50*t*; interviews, 45*t*–46*t*, 52–55; investigations, 43*t*–44*t*, 51–52; issues involved in identifying, 39–40; knowledge, skill, and ability tests, 48*t*–49*t*, 65–68; physical exams, 41, 42*t*, 50; resume screens, 44*t*–45*t*, 55–56; self-report measures, 46*t*–48*t*–65, 56–58; seven general types of, 40–41; situational measures, 49*t*–50*t*, 69–72
Staffing assessment criticisms: 1: staffing assessments are not very accurate, 142–146; 2: staffing assessments can be faked by applicants, 146–149; 3: staffing assessment are not worth the cost, 150–152; 4: staffing assessments pose a legal risk, 152–157; 5: staffing assessments are unfair, 157–160; 6: staffing assessments are offensive to candidates, 160–167; 7: staffing assessments add too much time to hiring process, 167–169; answers to, 170
Staffing assessment design: balancing two competing objectives in, 175–176; construct validity role in, 97–98; for entry-level jobs, 215–227; job-relevance of, 156; principles of, 209–215; for professional jobs, 227–235

- Staffing assessment design principles: 1: establish multiple assessment hurdles, 210–211; 2: ensure similar treatment of applicants, 211–212; 3: giving hiring managers ultimate hiring responsibility, 213; 4: creating conversation with candidates, 214–215
- Staffing assessment effectiveness: choosing what assessments to use to ensure, 109–111, 120, 128–136; determined through validity, 86–109; maximizing cost savings and, 175–176; two basic requirements for, 80
- Staffing assessment measurements: “Demographic Group Differences in Assessment Scores,” 191–193; diagram showing types of, 20*fig*; genetic components of job performance, 22–24, 26; Raven’s Progressive Matrix, 88–90, 89*fig*; what candidates can do, 21–22; of what candidates have done, 20–21; what candidates want to do, 24–25. *See also* Candidate attributes; Self-report measures
- Staffing assessment methods: 1: no standardized assessments, 183; 2: self-report pre-screening questionnaires, 184; 3: applicant investigations, 184–185; 4: structured interviews, 185–186; 5: broad self-report and situational judgment measures, 47*t*, 49*t*, 56–65, 69–70, 184, 186–189; 6: broad knowledge and skills tests, 48*t*, 49*t*, 65–68, 189–190; 7: broad ability tests, 190–193; 8: integrating broad, knowledge, skills, and ability tests to predict performance, 193–194; 9: localized scoring to accurately interpret candidate responses, 194–199; 10: context-specific self-report measures, 199–201; 11: context-specific knowledge, skills, and ability tests, 201–202; 12: integrating context-specific self-report, knowledge, skills, and ability tests, 202; 13: advanced, non-linear scoring, 202–206; balancing two competing objectives when designing, 175–176; determining which one to use, 206–207; incrementally improving accuracy/efficiency of hiring decision, 176–180; “The Operational Impact of Assessments,” 177, 180–183. *See also* Staffing assessment selection
- Staffing assessment process: four general steps in, 119–120; linking job performance and, 138–139; step 1: identify key performance outcomes, 119–120, 121–124; step 2: use job analysis to define/describe critical employee behaviors, 120, 124–128; step 3: choose an effective assessment, 120, 128–136; step 4: appropriately collecting and interpreting assessment data, 120*d*, 136–139
- Staffing assessment selection: job-performance-centric mindset during, 129, 131; operational requirements considered during, 134–136; questions to ask during process of, 129; systematic process to, 128–129; tips on vendors to consider during, 131–134; validity and reliability issues of, 109–111. *See also* Staffing assessment methods
- Staffing assessment tools: credit reports, 44*t*, 51; criminal record checks, 43*t*, 51; drug screens, 41, 42*t*, 185; electronic recruiting agents, 44*t*, 56, 228; failure to understand or value, 4; knowledge, skill, and ability tests, 48*t*, 49*t*, 65–68, 189–193, 201–202; online assessment, 230; physical ability tests, 41, 42*t*; poor-quality or inappropriate use of, 5; post-hire on-boarding

feedback, 231; reference checking, 43*t*, 51; resume screens, 44*t*, 45*t*, 55–56; situational measures, 49*t*–50*t*, 69–72; Social Security verification, 43*t*, 51; sourcing, 228; verification, 231. *See also* Interviews; Self-report measures

Staffing assessment vendors: emotional intelligence fad followed by, some, 129–130; employee profiling technique used by, 131; providing data on validity, 110; tips on selecting, 131–134

Staffing assessments: accuracy of, 94–95; as difference between staffing success and failure, 14–16*fig*; financial value of, 34–36; how job performance is predicted using, 81*fig*–83; impact on job performance over time, 181*fig*–182; online, 230; reducing hiring mistakes through, 237–239; seven basic topics of, 6–7; staffing process using Internet technology and, 16*fig*; staffing process using Internet technology without, 14–15*fig*, 16; tracking and improving performance of, 137–138; two fundamental reasons for disregard of, 4–5; validity of, 27–28, 84; value under different conditions, 32*fig*–33; what is measured?, 20*fig*–25; when are they useful?, 27–36; why do they work?, 25–27, 36. *See also* Hiring decisions

Staffing failure: FEMA, 1–3; story of, 9–11

Staffing Jobs No One Wants, 123–124

Staffing success story, 11–14

Structured interviews: advantages and disadvantages of, 52–53, 185–186; behavioral-based, 186; different approaches to conducting, 55; maximizing time spent with candidates using, 185–186; measurements gained through, 45*t*

Swanson, I., 9–11

T

Tarnehan, R., 12–14

Telephone interviews, 230

Test-retest method, 85

Time issues: “Assessment Length and Assessment Accuracy,” 168–169; assessments as taking too much time, 167–168, 169

“Turbo-charging” assessment, 202–206

Typical job performance, 127–128

U

Unfairness issue: “A Brief History of Staffing Assessments,” 158–159; as criticism of assessments, 157, 158, 160; “The Cult of Personality and the Realities of Staffing,” 157–158

Unstructured interviews, 45*t*, 53

U.S. Federal Emergency Management Association (FEMA), 1–3

V

Validity: case study on estimating, 99–102, 103, 108–109; construct, 96–99; content, 90–91, 98–99, 104*t*–107*t*, 103, 110, 133–134; criteria, 88–90, 91–96, 104*t*–107*t*, 108–109, 110, 132; described, 27–28, 85; determining assessment efficiency through, 86–87; face, 87–90, 102, 104*t*–107*t*, 110; maximizing hiring accuracy through increasing assessment, 175, 176–180; psychometrics and concept of, 84

Validity case study: content validity role in, 103; criteria validity role in, 108–109; Cross-cultural Qualifications Screen, 99–100, 104*t*–105*t*; Cultural Agility Behavioral Interview Guide, 100, 105*t*; Cultural Empathy Personality Measure, 101, 106*t*; face validity role in, 102; operational resources, 104*t*–107*t*; Spanish Language

Skills Test, 101–102, 107*t*; summary of validation evidence, 104*t*–107*t*
Validity coefficients: as criteria validity variable, 93–94; differences between reliability and, 85–86; measurement ranges and meanings of, 28
Verification, 231

W

“When to Use Drug Screens,” 185
“Why Assessments Are More Accurate Than People,” 144–146
Work interests data, 221–222
Work samples, 49*t*–50*t*, 70, 222
Work styles, 222