



Quarterly

A publication of the Personnel Testing Council of Metropolitan Washington
Volume VI Number 1
March 2010

Quarterly Topic: Leader Assessment

President's

Message

What's In a Name? Learning from the SIOP Name Change



Eric Dunleavy
DCI Consulting

During the last few months I have had the opportunity to interact with a variety of practitioners, academics, and students in the Washington D.C. area. These interactions have varied from social to business driven to educational, and all provided the opportunity to discuss the interesting and innovative initiatives PTC/MW has planned for 2010. I was surprised to hear people from all three groups question whether PTC fully addresses their interests as I/O psychologists or HR managers. I realized that the name 'Personnel Testing Council' was taken literally. Several people assumed that PTC/MW only focused on testing issues, and not on other aspects of personnel psychology

or on more 'macro', 'organizational', or 'mainstream HR' topics like teams, leadership, surveys, employee attitudes, career planning, HR strategy, coaching, etc. One student told me that some students in their program chose not to submit research to PTC/MW's *Outstanding Student Contribution Award* last year because they don't do 'testing' research.

I consider this to be a very important misconception based on a literal interpretation of the PTC/MW name, and apparently one more common than I expected. In these situations I had the fortunate opportunity to clear up the misconception. I explained that PTC/MW represents and serves a community that is broader than simply testing experts, consisting of members (practitioners, academics, and students) with expertise in a diverse set of content areas. For example, in the last two years PTC/MW has hosted presentations on organizational surveys, senior executive leader research, strategic HR in the Obama administration, career paths (or succession planning), and team training. PTC/MW has also organized events

----- **CONTINUED ON PAGE 11**

Upcoming PTC/MW Luncheons and Workshops

March Workshop:

Hiring Reform and Internet Testing: Whether and How to Go Unproctored

Ken Lahti
PreVisor

Wed., Mar. 10, 2010

April Luncheon:

Procedural Steps in Conducting Common Item Equating

Paul Usala
U.S. Customs and Border Protection

Wed., Apr. 14, 2010

May Luncheon:

I/O Psychology's Role in Strategic Human Resources Outsourcing

Kevin Kramer
Accenture

Wed., May 12, 2010

June Workshop:

Wed., Jun. 9, 2010

**SIGN UP AT
WWW.PTCMW.ORG**



**FOR MORE
INFORMATION SEE
PAGE 2**

Inside this issue...

President's Message: <i>What's in a Name? Learning from the SIOP Name Change</i>	1
Legal Watch: <i>Heard Any "Good" Lawsuits Lately?</i>	3
October Workshop: <i>Career Paths - The Centerpiece of Effective Talent Management Systems</i>	4
Abstracting Leadership	6
Using Multi-rater Assessments of Leadership in Cross-Cultural Settings	8
Current Trends in Managerial Assessment: Assessment Centers and Situational Judgment Tests	13
Legal Commentary: <i>Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) Rules against Bank of America</i> ...	15
Presenting the 2010 PTC/MW Budget	16
Call for Nominations: <i>2010 Stephen E. Bemis Award</i>	18
Job Announcements	19
Member News.....	21
Professional Calendar	23

March Breakfast Workshop

Hiring Reform and Internet Testing: Whether and How to Go Unproctored

Ken Lahti, Ph.D.
PreVisor

Millions of candidates across thousands of organizations' assessment programs are being tested each year, sight-unseen, using unproctored internet testing (UIT). Is this useful? Legal? Ethical? Perhaps more importantly -- what does this mean for you? Dr. Ken Lahti (Vice President of Strategy and Content at PreVisor) will facilitate this workshop focused on the use of UIT in hiring. Participants will learn about UIT use in private-sector organizations and will discuss the contextual factors driving organizations to consider UIT...and their relevance and applicability in government hiring. The validity and utility of unproctored testing programs will be discussed, along with common challenges related to test security and accuracy. Dr. Lahti will share time-tested best practices for designing successful UIT programs, and we will also consider carefully when NOT to do UIT. We will discuss the evolution of confirmation testing and consider how best to integrate proctored testing with UIT from among several models. Along the way, Ken will share examples and insights from client assessment programs around the world, and participants' questions, comments, dissenting opinions, and stories from the field will be welcome throughout. Participants can expect to leave the workshop well-informed about the issues, challenges, and potential benefits of UIT, and should be better equipped to design internet-based hiring processes more broadly.

Featured Exhibitor:

PDRI, a PreVisor Company
www.PDRI.com

Wednesday, March 10, 2010

8:30 – 11:30 a.m.

George Mason University –Arlington Campus, Original Building, Room 317

\$25 for students, \$40 members, \$50 non-members

Renew Your PTC/MW Membership!!!

PTC/MW values your membership! 2010 promises to be another exciting year for PTC/MW filled with outstanding monthly speakers, a cross-PTC SIOP reception, a special full day Fall workshop, new editions of our Quarterly Newsletter, and more!

Dues for 2010 will remain \$30 for regular members and \$15 for full-time students. This is a bargain considering the many benefits provided to members.

To renew, visit our brand new PTC/MW website at www.PTCMW.org.



LEGAL WATCH

Heard Any “Good” Lawsuits Lately? *

Richard Tonowski

Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC)

Let’s define “good” as providing substantive guidance on employment test development and use.

There have been plenty of interesting EEO-related cases of late. The U.S. Supreme Court has allowed adverse impact theory (*Meacham v. Knolls Atomic Power Laboratory*, 2008) but denied mixed-motive theory for age discrimination cases (*Gross v. FBL Financial Services Inc.*, 2009). Retaliation protection has been extended to those who have not been directly involved in EEO charges (*Crawford v. Metropolitan Government of Nashville and Davidson County*, 2009) and may be extended again to people who are associated with the charging parties (*Thompson v. North American Stainless, LP*, 2009). Collective bargaining agreements to grieve and arbitrate EEO complaints in lieu of the formal legal process have been upheld (*14 Penn Plaza v. Pyett*, 2009). The U.S. Congress revised the law regarding the time period for filing EEO complaints in response to the *Ledbetter* decision (*Ledbetter v. Goodyear Tire*, 2007). In one of several post-*Ledbetter* cases that have similarly dealt with deadlines, a pending Chicago police hiring case will decide time limits on challenging a test found to have unlawful adverse impact (*Lewis v. City of Chicago*, 2009). Lower federal courts and state courts have also taken on some vital EEO legal issues.

But testing issues? Where are the ground-breaking legal cases and developments reshaping the field of employment testing? *Ricci* stirred up hopes and fears that the judicial view on sufficiently job-related tests had shifted (*Ricci v. DeSestafano*, 2009). Not likely. Then there’s the Fire Department of New York (FDNY) case (*U.S. v. City of New York*, 2010), where the judge granted the plaintiffs summary judgment because the city apparently had not learned the basics of content-oriented validation, despite being tutored at length by the Second Circuit in 1980. If appealed, the case may define when ignoring adverse impact becomes purposeful discrimination. *Ricci* and FDNY may become the navigation markers between the Scylla of disparate treatment and Charybdis of disparate impact. But none of these cases addresses how to test.

EEOC’s litigation may provide a glimpse of recent and upcoming trends affecting the field of testing. However, its big-ticket resolutions (e.g., the recent \$19M Outback

Steakhouse settlement; *EEOC v. Outback Steakhouse of Florida, Inc.*, 2009) only typify its dealings – with selection procedures that are perceived as overly-subjective, usually because of the absence of formal testing. Now, EEOC has concern with situations where there is persistent large adverse impact, even if there is a test in use that was validated long ago. One could wonder if the job or the applicant pool had changed over the years, but the test may be freezing the demographic situation while having lost its relevance. However, there are no current cases.

OFCCP is apparently having another banner year with entry-level hiring cases, but it generally does not disclose information on its cases (Cohen & Dunleavy, 2010). On those cases where it has, no new ground has been broken on testing issues.

So what’s out there that could change the status quo? Three recently published items explore concepts that have the potential to alter the litigation landscape:

- *Synthetic validity*. This concept has been poised for takeoff for years as a major validation strategy. Has its year finally arrived? The focal article in *Industrial and Organizational Psychology* renews expectations (Johnson et al., 2010); this article and the accompanying commentaries could point the applicability of tests beyond the constraints of transportability and add a more reassuring content base to meta-analytic validity generalization.
- *Adverse impact*. *Ricci* provided a situation where the nature of adverse impact and how it is statistically computed seemed confused. A recent book on the topic, not to mention numerous journal articles, should stimulate deeper thinking on this issue (Outtz, 2010). The ideal would be a bright-line rule that if the testing procedure did thus-and-such, it was good; if it didn’t, it wasn’t. The underlying complexity of adverse impact probably does not allow this degree of certainty. However, strengthening the professional consensus on what works to reduce it would certainly help.
- *Quality control*. This one owes its origin to a recent article by Gutman and Dunleavy (2009). Enforcement agencies such as EEOC have been loathe to become entangled in approving tests. Use of the test is not under agency control. Moreover, the business of using a test or policing test validation is not the agency’s business. However, if a “blue ribbon panel” of testing professionals were to agree on the quality of the test before it was used then that would indicate that the test met professional standards. Conversely, if the panel raised substantive issues with the test it would provide the “strong basis in evidence” to kill it. Now if only we, as a field, had a

* *Author’s Note*. The views expressed in this article are those of the author and do not necessarily reflect those of the EEOC.

LEGAL WATCH, FROM PAGE 3-----

mechanism to do this. Employers might shoulder the expense for a pre-use audit of the test, believing that the cost would be offset by decreased risk of litigation. If such efforts were organized under the auspices of a professional association(s), then the cumulative experience acquired from these audits could advance sound testing practice. Of course, a professional association could have the same reservations as a government agency in getting mixed up in this.

Significant professional developments in any of these three areas could influence employment testing litigation, more so than any pending or future test-related cases. Further, these developments will not necessarily result from the lack of interesting testing cases. In fact, the drought may intensify as the grounds for arguing over employment tests narrows. Testing litigation could eventually dry up.

Imagine that.

References

- Cohen, D., & Dunleavy, E.M. (2010). *A review of OFCCP enforcement statistics for fiscal year 2008*. Washington, DC: Center for Corporate Equality.
- Crawford v. Metropolitan Government of Nashville and Davidson County* (2009), U.S. Supreme Court No. 06-1595, 1/26/2009.
- EEOC v. Outback Steakhouse of Florida, Inc.* (2009), D. Colo., No. 06-CV-01935, 12/29/2009.
- Gross v. FBL Financial Services Inc.* (2009), U.S. Supreme Court No. 08-441, 6/18/2009.
- Gutman, A., & Dunleavy, E.M. (2009). On the legal front: The Supreme Court ruling in *Ricci v. DeStefano*. *The Industrial-Organizational Psychologist*, 47, 57-71.
- Ledbetter v. Goodyear Tire* (2007) 50 U.S. 618.
- Lewis v. City of Chicago* (2009), U.S. Supreme Court No. 08-974, cert. granted 9/30/2009.
- Johnson, J.W. et al. (2010). Validation is like motor oil: Synthetic is better, *Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, in press.
- Meacham v. Knolls Atomic Power Laboratory* (2008) 128 S.Ct. 2395.
- Oultz, J.L. (Ed.) (2010). *Adverse impact: Implications for organizational staffing and high stakes selection*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Ricci v. DeSestafano* (2009) 129 S. Ct. 2658.
- Thompson v. North American Stainless, LP* (2009). U.S. Supreme Court No. 09-291, petition for cert. pending.
- U.S. v. City of New York* (2010) E.D.N.Y. No. 07-cv-2067 (orders 7/22/2009, 1/13/2010, and 1/21/2010).
- 14 Penn Plaza v. Pyett* (2009), U.S. Supreme Court No. 07-581, 4/1/2009.

OCTOBER WORKSHOP

Career Paths: The Centerpiece of Effective Talent Management Systems

Gary W. Carter

Personnel Decisions Research Institutes (PDRI)

Kevin W. Cook

Development Dimensions International (DDI)

The purpose of this workshop was to show why career paths are important and how to develop career paths and integrate them into talent management systems to maximize the success of employees and organizations. Additional information can be found in Carter, Cook, and Dorsey (2009)

The Importance of Career Paths

Today's world of work is volatile and highly dynamic. It is impacted by quickly changing technology and a host of global factors impacting the mission environment and the skill sets that organizations need. Moreover, there has been a change in the nature of the implicit employment contract. Employees can no longer assume that their job will be there for decades, and employers can't assume that employees will stay with the same organization over a long period of time. In addition, societal and cultural changes have resulted in highly varied and complex career patterns and career goals.

In this dynamic climate, static career roadmaps are no longer sufficient. Organizations need to provide their employees with the wherewithal to have personal career Global Positioning Systems (GPSs). Employees need career paths and associated competency-based career development tools that will allow them to know what development steps they need to take to achieve their career goals. Just as a GPS monitors and adjusts routes, the career paths will constantly need to be monitored and adjusted by the organization and by individual employees as a result of changes in organizational mission or goals, changes in the competency profiles needed by the organization to meet the mission, evolving deployment needs, or changes in individual employee goals or life situations. Organizations need to show what paths employees can take to "get there from here" even as "there" changes.

Well-articulated career paths can help organizations achieve success in several important ways. First, they can help to align the interests and career goals of individual employees with the interests and mission of the organization. They can show how doing what is best for the organization can also be what is best for individual careers. Second, they provide a good

----- **CONTINUED ON NEXT PAGE**

framework for decisions about where to focus development time and money. By laying out the specific development needed at each career stage, they promote strategic thinking about development and discourage “flavor of the day” training. Third, they can serve to integrate an organization’s human capital and talent management processes. Finally, they show what the organization can offer employees in the long run. In other words, they lay out the value proposition offered by the organization.

What are Career Paths?

In its simplest form, a career path is “the sequence of work positions or roles that a person holds over the span of a lifetime” (Carter, Cook, & Dorsey, 2009, pp. 2-4). However, a fully developed career path includes a lot more than a basic list of positions or roles. While the specific content of career paths should be driven by the purposes for which they are being developed, they usually include five fundamental components:

- A sequential list of positions or roles
- Required or recommended qualifications
- Critical developmental experiences, such as courses, assignments, on-the-job experiences, etc.
- Competencies accrued, strengthened, or required at each stage of the career path
- Important career success factors or information about the sponsoring organization’s perspective on factors that are of key importance to career success.

In addition, career paths often include other information about the jobs comprising the paths, such as information about major duties/tasks, salaries, anticipated growth rates, number of anticipated openings over a specified period of time, etc.

During the workshop, participants participated in a group exercise during which they developed a career path for applied I/O Psychologists. Detailed information about how to develop career paths is provided in Carter et al. (2009).

Integrating Career Paths into Talent Management Processes

To be of maximal value to employees and the organization, career paths should be embedded in and serve to integrate human capital and talent management processes and programs, including those listed below.

- | | |
|--------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| • Recruitment | • Hiring |
| • Deployment | • Retention |
| • Strategic Workforce Planning | • Employee Development |
| • Promotion | • High Potential Talent Programs |
| • Succession Management | • Attrition |

For example, career paths can be linked to the strategic priorities of an organization by building in paths and jobs that will be needed in the future to reach the organization’s goals, and by including an estimate of the number of positions that will be needed for each job or role given the organization’s strategic direction. Paths designed in this way can be a very useful tool for strategic workforce planning. They can be used to identify the competency profiles that will be needed by the organization as a whole and by individual units, and the types and extent of employee development and/or hiring that will need to occur to ensure that the workforce has the competencies necessary to achieve the organization’s goals.

As part of the workshop, participants broke into small groups and discussed how to integrate career paths into recruiting/hiring, workforce planning and deployment, career development, and succession management programs.

References

Carter, G. W., Cook, K. W., & Dorsey, D. W. (2009). *Career paths: Charting courses to success for organizations and their employees*. Malden, MA: Blackwell/Wiley.

PTC

Call for Featured Exhibitors

PTC/MW is accepting requests to be a Featured Exhibitor at our one of our Workshops or Luncheons. Featured Exhibitors receive the following benefits:

- ✓ Recognition in all announcements for that event.
- ✓ Note of appreciation in the PTC/MW Quarterly Newsletter.
- ✓ Permission to display promotional or marketing materials at the event.
- ✓ Recognition at the event the PTC/MW President, Program Chair, or Training Chair
- ✓ List of the event registrants.
- ✓ Warm fuzzy feeling for supporting our cause.

We accept only one Featured Exhibitor per event.

Organizations interested in learning more about exhibitor opportunities should contact PTC/MW Training Chair, **Rose Hanson**, at Rose.Hanson@PDR.com or (703) 812-3042.

Abstracting Leadership

Robert Hogan and Joyce Hogan
Hogan Assessment Systems

The literature on leadership is complex, diverse, sprawling, inchoate, and perplexing. Because so much has been written on the subject, it must matter, and we agree. We think leadership is the most important problem in management science – when good leaders are in place, organizations and their members prosper, when bad leaders are in place, organizations and their members suffer. At the same time, we think the academic study of leadership has largely failed to deliver robust generalizations about leadership or recommendations regarding how to find it or develop it. We believe three problems afflict leadership research: (1) leadership is poorly defined, (2) the mainstream literature ignores personality, and (3) no attention is paid to ROI. Let's consider these points in turn.

Problem #1: The Definition of Leadership

In the academic literature, leadership is defined primarily in terms of the people who are in charge. The assumption is, if a person is a manager, president or CEO, he or she is by definition a leader. This is a mistake for at least two reasons. First, ask yourself how a person rises in a large, hierarchical, bureaucratic, male-dominated organization. The answer is, by playing politics, not by exercising leadership. It was said of Dwight Eisenhower, "He didn't become a politician because he was a general, he became a general because he was a politician." People typically rise in large organizations by pleasing their superiors with their loyalty and technical knowledge, not by displaying leadership skills. Second, the base rate of failure for managers in America is about 65%; thus, 65% of the people in "leadership" positions today will fail in one way or another. To the degree that leadership is defined in terms of who is in charge, the research won't lead to replicable conclusions – because success in any organization is idiosyncratic. Who wins in such pursuits will largely depend on the circumstances – the nature of the competition, the team of judges, the climate of the times, etc.

Problem #2: Situations versus Personality

Most major organizations in the United States, public or private, military or civilian, assume that almost anyone can be (or can learn to be) a leader, and will perform appropriately when put in charge of other people. People are promoted based on tenure and technical talent, with no consideration given to the possibility that some people have more talent for leadership than others. Sometimes this assumption is based on intellectual laziness, but among psychologists the assumption reflects the lingering effects of behaviorism and situationism – the view that what people do depends on where they are not

who they are. However, the average person understands that some people perform better in leadership positions than others, and the reason has to do with the kinds of persons they are (i.e., their personalities).

Problem #3: ROI-based Research

Most managers are evaluated by their bosses – the people who hired or promoted them and who have a vested interest in their doing well. However, many bad managers are skilled at pleasing their bosses, which drives the bosses' evaluations. It seems obvious to us that managers ought to be evaluated in terms of the performance of the group that they manage. Although this is rarely done, it is easy to do, and when done correctly, it turns out that effective managers have a distinctive personality style which varies systematically with the industry and their level in their organization. We discuss this in more detail below.

An Alternative Model of Leadership

The remainder of this discussion is organized in six parts. We define personality, we define leadership, then we show how personality impacts leadership, and how leadership (properly defined) impacts business unit performance. Then we analyze the crucial role of followers for business unit performance, and how to enhance their engagement.

Defining Personality. We believe that personality is related to leadership – who you are determines how you lead. But we need to define personality, and it should be defined from two perspectives: (1) how a person thinks about him or her self and (2) how others think about that person. We refer to (1) and (2) as the actor's and the observer's perspectives on personality, respectively, and it is important to keep them distinct. The actor's perspective is a person's identity, the story that he or she tells others about him or her self – it is an idealized self view. Although identity has been the major focus of personality research from Freud to the present, it has been a non-productive focus. After 150 years of research, there are no reliable generalizations to report, there is no measurement base, there is no taxonomy to organize the subject matter. How people think about themselves is almost impossible to study in a rigorous way; hence that study has led to no conclusions.

On the other hand, personality from the observer's perspective – a person's reputation – is easy to study and leads to some very useful generalizations. First, unlike identity, reputation is quite stable over time. Second, reputation has a well recognized taxonomy – it is called the Five-Factor Model (sometimes "the Big Five") of personality. Everyone's reputation can be described in terms of five dimensions: (1) Anxious vs. Confident, (2) Shy vs. Assertive, (3) Tough vs. Charming, (4) Careless vs. Conscientious, and

----- **CONTINUED ON NEXT PAGE**

(5) Narrow- minded vs. Open-minded. Third, these five dimensions predict a wide range of performance outcomes, including leadership, better than measures of cognitive ability. There is almost complete consensus in the research community that personality should be defined in terms of these five (large) dimensions, with finer distinctions within the five being possible and useful.

Defining Leadership. The conventional leadership literature focuses on charismatic or transformational leadership, and this focus has led to few reliable generalizations. We prefer a functional definition – because leadership has a job to do. The leader's job is to persuade otherwise selfish people to work together for a period of time to accomplish a common objective. Thus, we define leadership in terms of the ability to build and maintain a high performing team, and we think leadership should be evaluated in terms of the performance of the team, relative to the competition. Defining leadership this way has two useful consequences. On the one hand, the research literature becomes interpretable. On the other hand, this definition brings the issue of ROI into focus.

Personality and Leadership. We have now defined personality (as reputation) and leadership (as the ability to build a team). The next question concerns the links between personality and leadership. (We should note that for many years academic researchers maintained that this question was nonsense – because leadership was deemed to be a function of “the situation” – e.g., situational leadership.) In 2002, Tim Judge and colleagues published a landmark study. Using 20,000 managers from 5,000 organizations, representing every industry sector, he showed that personality, defined in terms of the Five-Factor Model, predicts rated leadership performance very substantially, and much better than measures of cognitive ability. For those of us who believe in data, this seals the case – personality and leadership are rather tightly connected. Good managers are Confident, Assertive, Conscientious, Open-minded, and not necessarily Charming.

Leadership and Business Unit Performance. In 2002, James Harter, Frank Schmidt, and Ted Hayes, three researchers funded by Gallup, published another landmark study. Using over 20,000 managers from over 5,000 organizations, representing every industry sector, they show three things. First, the personality of the manager impacts the morale of the work group. Second, when morale is up, good business results follow; when morale is down, bad results follow. Third, the link between the manager's personality and business unit performance is mediated by staff morale. This means that leadership is indirectly, and staff morale is directly, connected to ROI.

Understanding the Role of the Follower. Leadership involves getting results through other people – it is not

about the charisma of individual leaders, it is about persuading followers to adopt the leader's agenda. Work is a (sometimes painful) extension of everyday life. Personality psychology tells us that people have three overriding needs that govern their lives: (1) people need acceptance and respect, and they dread criticism and rejection; (2) people need status and the control of resources, and dread the loss of status and resources; and (3) people need structure and predictability in their lives, and find the lack of structure to be stressful. These needs are operating at work, during interaction with peers and management. Thus, good managers provide their staff with respect, allow them to control their own work, and make sense out of business activities. Bad managers do the opposite, and are unable to build a team.

The Lessons of Engagement. Engagement is the central factor underlying employee performance in modern business, and it is almost entirely a function of leadership. Senior leadership needs to establish a culture that recognizes, values, and facilitates engagement. First line supervisors and managers need to treat their employees in ways that minimally don't actively alienate them, and ideally in ways that encourage engagement. However, there is no cookie cutter approach to this. Rather, encouraging engagement puts specific demands on individual leaders, who must establish and maintain working relationships with their employees, one employee at a time. Some people are better able to do this than others, such people can be identified by their personality signature, and to the degree that organizations value ROI, they will pay attention to this research-based conclusion.

Concluding Remarks

Leadership is the most important problem in organizational science, and is crucial for the success of organizations and even countries. When good leaders are in place, organizations and their incumbents prosper; when bad leaders are in place, bad consequences follow.

References

- Harter, J.K., Schmidt, F.K., & Hayes, T.L. (2002). Business-unit-level relationship between employee satisfaction, employee engagement, and business outcomes: a meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 87*, 268-279.
- Judge, T. A., Bono, J. E., Ilies, R., & Gerhardt, M. W. (2002). Personality and leadership: A qualitative and quantitative review. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 87*, 765-780.

Using Multi-rater Assessments of Leadership in Cross-Cultural Settings

Marian N. Ruderman and Regina Eckert

Center for Creative Leadership (CCL)

Felix Brodbeck

Ludwigs-Maximilians-Universität

Multi-rater (360-degree) leadership assessments are used for both selection and developmental purposes in organizations. Indeed, 360-degree assessments are a unique opportunity for development because of the depth and breadth of feedback that they contain which can help leaders understand how others see them leading to improvements in their leadership competencies and behaviors. In a developmental setting, the feedback is given in a confidential format to only the individual rated.

In recent years, debate has arisen about the implications of using multi-rater feedback in a multinational environment. How can 360-degree assessments account for different understandings of leadership? Various studies and theories have shown that cultural influences need to be addressed—the description of good leadership can be culturally-contingent. In this article, we discuss the influence of culture on multi-rater leadership assessments for development and describe a 360-tool specifically developed for cross-cultural use: the Global Leader View. We review the construction of this instrument as well as the lessons we learned from its use in cross-cultural environments. It can be extremely difficult to be in a leadership role, if group members have vastly different expectations about how to effectively demonstrate leadership. Developmental feedback on the Global Leader View helps managers make sense of the impact of culture on leadership perceptions.

Background

Behavioral feedback is one of the most important elements for adult learning and development. In current leadership development initiatives, 360-degree feedback from a variety of raters is a popular method for developmental feedback to managers. This type of assessment and feedback is an important mechanism for giving managers a sense of how they are perceived by others around them. Feedback information from subordinates, bosses, peers, suppliers, vendors, and other groups highlights individual and organizational strengths and weaknesses (Morgeson, Mumford, & Campion, 2005). Multi-rater feedback provides individuals with an opportunity to see themselves as others do. It provides the individual leader with data confirming or disconfirming the self-view.

Previous research into 360-degree leadership assessments has argued that cultural factors influence the understanding of and hence the utility of such feedback. Indeed, culture influences both the rating

process and the interpretation of multi-rater assessment in various ways.

Cultural Influences in Perceptions of Effective Leadership

Looking at the process of 360-degree leadership feedback for development purposes, we need to be aware that culture has an impact on how leaders are perceived by others. Leadership categorization theory states that people have implicit prototypes of leadership, which in turn determine their expectations regarding a specific leader. The recognition of a leader thus depends on the fit of the leader's behavior with observers' expectations of good leadership (Epitropaki & Martin, 2004; Lord & Maher, 1991). In other words, leadership expectations are what we use to determine whether or not we are witnessing good leadership. The process of judging whether a person a) is a leader, and b) is a good leader, is a cognitive categorization process where observed attributes and behavior are compared with the leadership prototype. The higher the concurrence of the observers' prototype and the manager's attributes, the more easily a manager is recognized as a good leader (Kenney, Blascovich, & Shaver, 1994). In other words, culture is an important lens in the identification of leadership behaviors. People approve of leaders who act in a way that is consonant with what is expected.

As a result of this evaluation process, leaders themselves can try to be effective leaders, but the ultimate success of their leadership is determined by others in the system (Lord & Maher, 1991). In order to assure success, leaders need to know what the expectations of their observers are, as well as how their observers perceive them in relation to those leadership expectations. Thus, in order to be useful, developmental 360-degree assessments of leadership should measure both observers' prototypes of leadership (referred to as "leadership expectations") as well as how a leader is perceived (referred to as "leadership perceptions"). The categorization process of leadership becomes difficult when leaders and observers come from different cultures. Various studies about leadership styles and prototypes in different cultures have shown that leadership prototypes depend largely on the values and practices of the culture the individual has grown up in.

The GLOBE research project has studied leadership prototypes in 62 cultures around the world, finding that some contents of leadership prototypes seem to be universally accepted, yet the complete picture of what constitutes a good leader varies across cultures (Brodbeck, 2000; Chhokar, Brodbeck, & House, 2007; House, Hanges, Javidan, Dorfman, & Gupta, 2004). They found that there were uniformly six different perspectives from which people across the world conceived of leadership. People see leaders as more or

----- **CONTINUED ON NEXT PAGE**

less displaying visionary or charismatic characteristics, as leading in a more or less team oriented way, as generating more or less participation, acting in a more or less humane-oriented way, more or less authoritatively, or more or less autonomously as a hero. When the GLOBE team looked at the universality of these six dimensions, they found that visionary/charismatic, and team-based facets of leadership are seen as universally positive, while aspects of participative, humane-oriented, self-protective and autonomous leadership were more culturally dependent (Den Hartog et al., 1999). Thus, the same leaders might be perceived as a bad, average, or good leader depending on the culturally determined leadership prototypes of their observers (Schyns, 2006). The more different people's upbringing and early experience of leadership, the greater the variation in their leadership prototypes (Epitropaki & Martin, 2004).

Cross-Cultural Issues in Understanding 360-degree Feedback

Beyond its impact on leadership perception, culture challenges the traditional way of giving developmental feedback for 360-degree assessment. Traditionally, feedback on 360-degree instruments has focused on the discrepancy between self and observer ratings. This discrepancy is regarded as a lack of self-awareness with respect to the manager (Kulas & Finkelstein, 2007) and is of major interest for purposes of feedback. Participants whose self-ratings agree with those of others are seen as more self-aware. However, the applicability and generalizability of such conceptualizations has to be reconsidered with a cross-cultural perspective. Recent studies have shown that culture indeed influences the average discrepancy between self-perception and observers' perception (Atwater, Wang, Smither, & Fleenor, 2009; Eckert, Ekelund, Gentry, & Dawson, in press). If discrepancies are in fact driven by cultural values, they cannot be uniformly interpreted. A related issue has to do with rater agreement. High rater agreement is less important in European countries than in the United States (Atwater et al., 2005).

Perhaps the most important issue has to do with interpreting the values of scale scores either in an absolute or relative sense. A low behavioral rating on a dimension of leadership that is seen as unimportant in a particular cultural setting doesn't seem like a problem. Given that expected leadership styles have different valences in different cultures, it is important to take these valences into account.

In sum, these results suggest that cross-cultural deployment of 360-degree leadership assessments would profit from taking a non-normative perspective, basing assessment feedback not on the discrepancy between perceptions of different rater groups, but focusing instead on the discrepancy of what is expected from a leader, and how the leader is perceived as living up to these expectations. Such a concept of

measurement centers interpretation on the differences between expectations and perceptions within specific rater groups, rather than on comparing perceptions of different rater groups with each other.

The Global Leader View: A Cross-Cultural 360-Degree Leadership Assessment

The Global Leader View (GLV) was developed as a 360-degree leadership assessment specifically for cross-cultural use. The GLOBE research defined attributes and prototypes of leaders that make sense all over the world. While GLOBE's insights proved very valuable for contrasting culturally-contingent leadership expectations of different countries and regions, we were interested to devise an instrument that aids leadership development on an individual level. Based on the results of the GLOBE research project, we developed scales to assess the six different leadership prototypes with the goal of contrasting leadership expectations (leadership prototypes) with actual perception of leadership for an individual manager. We devised items based on the dimensions and attributes examined in the GLOBE survey and reworded so as to apply to individuals. Further the items were reviewed for ease of understanding and applicability to a managerial population. To contrast expectations and perceptions of leadership, we created dual response scales. Thus, in the GLV, each leadership attribute is rated twice: once in terms of contributions to expectations of a good leader and once in terms of the behaviors of the particular manager.

Feedback on the GLV is based on the notion that each of the six leadership dimensions is important to effective leadership *somewhere* in the world but not *everywhere*. Participants get feedback on each dimension (and the specific attributes that make it up) of leadership with regard to their raters' expectations of a good leader and their raters' perception of their own behavior. The feedback tells participants what is specifically valued by different rater groups in their own environment and is organized around four main questions:

- Do the raters and the participant expect the same things from a good leader?
- Do the participant and the raters perceive the participants behavior similarly?
- Does the participant's behavior match raters' expectations of a good leader?
- Do the raters differ from each other in their expectations and perceptions?

The point of the feedback is to help participants understand the extent to which their behavior matches raters' expectations of a good leader. Some of the lessons commonly learned have to do with the wide

MULTI-RATER ASSESSMENTS, FROM PAGE 9-----

variance of expectations and how to manage them. Participants often find that their raters disagree with each other on what contributes to good leadership. Other times participants learn that their particular style is very different from what is considered to be good leadership by their raters. This situation occurs frequently when raters come from a very different cultural background than the participant.

The feedback is used to help participants appreciate the boundaries of their own approach to leadership. By emphasizing the different leadership prototypes that exist, the participants are reminded that their view of the world of leadership is only one view and that the view has both strengths and weaknesses. They also learn to appreciate that their stakeholders in the organization may have other, equally valid views of leadership, and that ultimate success as a leader comes from managing these different views in an authentic fashion. The GLV feedback does not suggest that participants must change to meet the expectations of others; it does mean that they should *try* to better understand others' expectations about leadership and respective perceptions of their leadership behaviors. Once participants have information as to how others see them, they can decide what, if anything, they would like to do with the information. The feedback process typically leads into a goal setting process where participants can consider if and how they want to make changes.

Initial psychometric data reveal that the Global Leader View's factor structure is aligned well with the GLOBE dimensions. An SEM analysis of data of 1800 managers around the world (from Australia through Panama to Uganda) revealed a 6-factor structure with 4-6 items per factor (CFI > .92, RMSR < .05 for both perceptions and expectations, even though chi-square tests were significant). Internal consistency for each factor was above .70.

Overall the Global Leader View has shown to be a valid and useful tool to help leader development in a diverse and multicultural setting. Due to its reliance on a global body of research, rather than only Western (or US-American), content-based theories of leadership, it is extremely useful for leaders who have contact with a diverse range of cultures. Next steps in our research on the Global Leader View include the instrument's specific validation on leadership effectiveness measures as a function of discrepancy between expectations and perceptions, rather than relating to the discrepancy between self- and observer ratings, as traditional 360-degree instruments have conducted. Furthermore, we are planning validity analyses within cultural clusters from GLOBE and other cross-cultural studies, and analyses of the impact of general cultural values on leadership expectations and perceptions.

Conclusion

When using 360-degree assessments in a cross-cultural environment, they should be based on leadership theories that make no universal content assumptions of what good leadership is. Leadership categorization theory provides an alternative to content-driven theories of leadership, and this is a useful basis for this purpose. Moreover, cross-cultural leadership assessment should look at both the expectations, or ideals, that people have about leadership, and their perceptions of a specific leader. The Global Leader View was designed on these premises and our first experiences in using it have shown the utility of such feedback, not only for individual managers, but also for organizations as a whole.

References

- Atwater, L., Wang, M., Smither, J. W., & Fleenor, J. W. (2009). Are cultural characteristics associated with the relationship between self and others ratings of leadership? *Journal of Applied Psychology, 94*(4), 876-886.
- Atwater, L. E., Waldman, D. A., Ostroff, C., Robie, C., & Johnson, K. M. (2005). Self-other agreement: Comparing its relationship with performance in the U.S. and Europe. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment, 13*(1), 25-40.
- Brodbeck, F. C. (2000). Cultural variation of leadership prototypes across 22 European countries. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 73*(1), 1-29.
- Chhokar, J.S., Brodbeck, F. C., & House, R.J. (2007). *Culture and leadership across the world: The GLOBE Book of in-depth studies of 25 societies*. Mahwah, NJ: LEA Publishers. (2nd Edition, 2008).
- Den Hartog, D. N., House, R. J., Hanges, P. J., Ruiz-Quintanilla, S. A., Dorfman, P. W., & GLOBE co-authors. (1999). Culture specific and cross-culturally generalizable implicit leadership theories: Are attributes of charismatic/transformational leadership universally endorsed? *The Leadership Quarterly, 10*(2), 219-256.
- Eckert, R. H., Ekelund, B. Z., Gentry, W. A., & Dawson, J. (in press). "I don't see me like you see me, but is that a problem?" Cultural influences on rating discrepancy in 360-degree feedback instruments. *European Journal of Work & Organizational Psychology*.
- Epitropaki, O., & Martin, R. (2004). Implicit leadership theories in applied settings: Factor structure, generalizability, and stability over time. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 89*(2), 293-310.
- House, R. J., Hanges, P. J., Javidan, M., Dorfman, P. W., & Gupta, V. (Eds.). (2004). *Culture, leadership, and organizations: The GLOBE study of 62 societies*. Newbury Park: Sage.

----- **CONTINUED ON NEXT PAGE**

Kenney, R. A., Blascovich, J., & Shaver, P. R. (1994). Implicit leadership theories: prototypes for new leaders. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology, 15*(4), 409-437.

Kulas, J. T., & Finkelstein, L. M. (2007). Content and reliability of discrepancy-defined self-awareness in multisource feedback. *Organizational Research Methods, 10*(3), 502-522.

Lord, R. G., & Maher, K. J. (1991). *Leadership and information processing: Linking perceptions and performance*. London: Routledge.

Morgeson, F. P., Mumford, T. V., & Campion, M. A. (2005). Coming full circle: Using research and practice to address 27 questions about 360-degree feedback programs. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research, 57*(3), 196-209.

Schyns, B. (2006). The role of implicit leadership theories in the performance appraisals and promotion recommendations of leaders. *Equal Opportunities International, 25*(3), 188-199.

PTC

PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE, FROM COVER-----

targeting more traditional 'testing' topics like selection, legal-EEO issues, and job analysis.

I want to take this opportunity to emphasize that PTC/MW was founded on and continues to be deeply invested in the science and practice of employment testing. However, the PTC/MW community includes professionals who provide a broad range of IO/HRM services. In reality, it is impossible for any single name to fully capture what our membership base does, but it is what our membership does, is interested in, and is willing to share with the community that makes PTC/MW what it is today.

This issue parallels one that many in the PTC/MW community¹ have been monitoring – the Society of Industrial-Organizational Psychology (SIOP)'s proposed name change to the Society of Organizational Psychology (TSOP).² While some may view the name change as a trivial distinction, this issue produced strong disagreement among members. The vote also led to some great discussion about exactly what we do and what we want our society to do. Many of the same issues raised during the SIOP's name change vote are relevant to local I/O-HRM communities like PTC/MW (e.g., how to best communicate organizational goals and purpose to

¹ Over 85% of respondents to the most recent PTC/MW survey reported that they were also members of SIOP.

² Special thanks to Dana Glenn-Dunleavy for being a sounding board for this article; we have been discussing the pros and the cons of a potential SIOP name change for the last year. These are the dinner conversations that happen when two SIOP members marry each other.

members and potential members, satisfy a diverse member base, and increase visibility within the general HRM community).

I want to be clear that I am *not* suggesting that PTC/MW consider a name change. Rather, I think we can learn a few lessons from the recent SIOP vote. In the next section, I briefly summarize the SIOP name change vote, for those unfamiliar with the details, and then consider what we, PTC/MW, can learn from those results.

Background on the SIOP Bylaws Amendment

Changing SIOP's name is nothing new for many SIOP members. According to Highhouse (2007), there were movements to change the SIOP moniker in 1976 and 2004 (although the 1976 effort stalled before a member vote). In both cases the leading contender was "The Society of Organizational Psychology." The most recent attempt to change SIOP's name began about 18 months ago when the SIOP Executive Board determined that it was time to re-visit it changing it, particularly given that the name "SIOP" failed to garner more than 50 percent of the vote in 2004, even though it won the most votes.

There were many reasons offered for the possible name change. Landy (2008) summarized the major reasons, based on a survey of past SIOP presidents. The reasons were fourfold: (1) the name is too long, (2) the term "industrial" is archaic, (3) it doesn't match the names favored by our international colleagues, and (4) it doesn't help us brand ourselves for the future. At the crux of these concerns is the challenge of maintaining relevance and enhancing visibility over time while staying true to what defined the society in the first place.

With these and other reasons in mind, the SIOP Executive Board began the process of voting on a possible name change. They determined that the most fair and accurate way to go about this process would be to gather input from members about possible alternatives followed by a "primary" vote to select one alternative name that then would go "head-to-head" with "SIOP" in a final and deciding vote. The Executive Board went through great efforts to afford opportunities for public dialogue on the name change, including interactive discussions via the SIOP Exchange, developing a Frequently Asked Questions document, and publishing several TIP articles on the issue before and during the voting. During this process those members against a name change pointed out both theoretical and practical concerns, including (1) potential mass confusion and identity loss that a change would bring, (2) immediate financial consequences, (3) potential costs associated with re-branding efforts, and (4) the notion that a name change wouldn't help because member interests change over time and members would continue to use other

----- **CONTINUED ON PAGE 12**

PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE, FROM PAGE 11-----

terms to describe what they do (e.g., work psychologist, business psychologist, organizational researcher, etc.).

In the November 2009 primary vote, "The Society of Organizational Psychology (TSOP)" beat out the "Society for Work Psychology (SWP)" and "Society for Work and Organizational Psychology (SWOP)" to win the opportunity to go head-to-head with "SIOP" in a final vote. In the final vote, held from December 4, 2009, to January 4, 2010, "SIOP" beat out "TSOP" by a margin of only fifteen votes (515 to 500 ballots, respectively). You read that correctly; "SIOP" won 50.7% to 49.3%.

According to SIOP president Kurt Kraiger, about 33 percent of all SIOP members participated in the vote, which was about double the 2004 turnout. Despite the increased publicity and voter turnout, SIOP members literally remained split on what to be called. As noted by Kraiger,³ the decision about what to be called is an emotional one for many SIOP members. What we call ourselves says something about our history, our training, and who we are, and what we do. This shouldn't be a surprise given the diverse set of careers that training in I/O Psychology or HRM may lead to. The challenge is to characterize the society in a way that maintains relevance and enhances visibility while staying true to what defined the community in the first place.

What Can PTC/MW Learn?

The SIOP name change offers several insights for all local I/O-HRM groups. Arguably, the most important of these insights is that history matters, as illustrated by the results of the SIOP vote. History plays a key role in identity and members value of the history of SIOP (and perhaps of the 'industrial' component, as 'archaic' as it may be). Like SIOP, PTC/MW has a rich history grounded in social scientific research, with a specific emphasis in testing. PTC/MW was founded in the late 1970s by Steven Bemis, then the chief psychologist at OFCCP, and colleagues.⁴ It was founded around the time the *Uniform Guidelines on Employee Selection Procedures* were being developed. Accordingly, employment testing and legal-EEO matters were high profile issues (and they continue to be). Those issues, and their implications for the organizations that members served, are what brought the community together. Like SIOP, many PTC/MW members may have a strong emotional attachment to the organization's history and understandably so.

Although we should always remain true to our history, that doesn't change the fact that membership and topics that interest members are constantly changing over time. Like SIOP, PTC/MW is challenged with satisfying a

diverse member base. Over the years, the interests of our membership have grown much broader than the content areas of testing and selection. This trend was most recently supported by our 2009 Membership Survey results. Those results showed that the PTC/MW member base represent different kinds of occupations, organizations, and is interested in a diverse range of topics.

As with all professional societies, a name can only tell part of the story. Accurately capturing what an entire membership base does by a single name is challenging and essentially impossible when you consider that areas of member expertise and interest are dynamic and constantly changing over time. PTC/MW's 2009 call for the *Outstanding Student Research Award* illustrates this. The call stated:

The topic areas that PTC/MW members are generally interested in include but are not limited to the following:

- *Employee recruitment and selection*
- *Employment testing legal issues*
- *Performance appraisal and performance management*
- *Compensation*
- *Uses of statistical techniques to solve business problems*
- *Job analysis*
- *Testing feedback programs*
- *Test preparation programs*
- *Leadership*
- *Organizational Culture*
- *Teamwork/Group Dynamics*
- *Organizational development topics (e.g., impact of work-life programs, diversity-oriented research, etc.)*

Several of these same topics were at the top of the list 30 years ago, whereas others have taken on greater importance recently. Still other topics didn't make the list, although they are of interest given the '*generally interested in include but are not limited to the following.*' language used. Lists like these illustrate how PTC/MW continues to adapt to the needs and interests of its membership, and how each new PTC/MW Board brings a new perspective to these issues.

So how can PTC/MW satisfy a diverse member base, maintain relevance and enhance visibility while staying true to what defined the community in the first place? The PTC/MW name is rich in history, and no name will exhaustively capture what members have expertise or are interested in. The same selection-focused topics that were largely responsible for PTC/MW's origins in the late 1970s are still prominent today. However, the roles and

³ http://siop.org/article_view.aspx?article=680

⁴ For more information please refer to:
<http://ptcmw.typepad.com/ptcmw/history.html>

interests of our members or prospective members have expanded. Like SIOP, PTC/MW is continually working to figure out how best to serve our existing member base and enhance our visibility to broader audiences (e.g., HR, policy driven agencies, etc.). The fruits of these efforts can be seen in our members, what topics our events focus on, and how we interact with other professional communities.

PTC/MW will continue to schedule a diverse set of presentations that target various content areas. All are intended to provide value to our members. We have developed a cutting edge new website that should enhance information sharing and communication within the PTC/MW community. We have expanded our membership committee to ensure that we are maximizing the effectiveness of our communications and the events we organize. We also plan to communicate with other I/O communities in the area and with the schools that will produce the next generation of PTC/MW members. It is important to note that you can help. You probably have colleagues, coworkers, students or fellow alumni who would be interested in PTC/MW in general or in specific events and services we provide. You can help us get the word out, by forwarding a PTC/MW event invitation or sharing the link to our new website with them, to name a few.

We plan to communicate with other professional groups outside the DC area, primarily because our webcast technology ensures that one doesn't have to be in DC to see or hear PTC/MW presentations. We will be co-hosting a SIOP reception along with some other personnel testing councils from around the country. PTC/MW is also in the early stages of planning a full day fall workshop event that should be of interest to many professional communities. As a valued member of PTC/MW, we hope that these efforts meet your needs and those of your colleagues, while staying true to what defined PTC/MW in the first place.

References

Highhouse, S. (2007). Where did this name come from anyway? A brief history of the I-O label. *The Industrial-Organizational Psychologist*, 45, 53–56.

Landy, F. J. (2008). What shall we call ourselves? Food for thought. *The Industrial-Organizational Psychologist*, 45, 11–12.

----- PTC

Join PTC/MW's LinkedIn Group!

Thanks to PTC/MW'er **Martha Hennen**, PTC/MW now has a LinkedIn Group. To join or to obtain more information about the group, point your browsers to:

www.linkedin.com/e/gis/1148887

Current Trends in Managerial Assessment: Assessment Centers and Situational Judgment Tests *

Dennis A. Joiner

Dennis A. Joiner and Associates

Two very well respected types of tests for selecting leaders for supervisory and management jobs are assessment Centers (ACs) and Situational Judgment Tests (SJT). This article takes a brief look at each of these types of tests with an emphasis on current trends.

Assessment Centers (ACs)

The most significant recent development with ACs was the publication of new AC guidelines, officially titled "The Guidelines and Ethical Considerations for Assessment Center Operations" (International Task Force on Assessment Centers, 2009). This fifth edition of the AC guidelines continues to define what an AC is and what is not an AC in order to preserve the essential elements of the AC process which are believed to enhance and ensure the predictive accuracy of the process.

According to the AC guidelines, "an assessment center consists of a standardized evaluation of behavior based on multiple inputs. Several trained observers and techniques are used. Judgments about behavior are made, in major part, from specifically developed assessment simulations." The use of simulations that allow candidates to construct and demonstrate their response to job relevant situations is probably the most important core concept and what sets ACs apart from other types of testing processes.

In addition to minor updates and revisions to most sections of the guidelines, the new AC guidelines include major changes in the section on Assessor Training (training content and length of training) and new sections on "Assessment centers for different purposes" and "Conducting assessment centers across cultural contexts."⁵

Most of the actual changes to ACs in recent years have been increases in the use of technology within the process (e.g., use of computers, use of the internet and

----- **CONTINUED ON PAGE 14**

* This article was adapted from a presentation, "Assessment Centers and Management and Supervisory Tests," made at the jointly sponsored IPAC/IPMA-HR International Training Conference (Nashville, TN; September 12-16, 2009). Please send correspondence to Dennis Joiner, Email: joinerda@pacbell.net.

⁵ A complete copy of the new AC Guidelines can be obtained by e-mailing the author.

ASSESSMENT TRENDS, FROM PAGE 13-----

use of video). A recent article in *Public Personnel Management* (Gowing, Morris, Adler, & Gold, 2008) provides examples of a telephone-based assessment program with multiple recorded phone based role plays, a web-based “day in the life” assessment program with phone calls, e-mails, IMs, VM and in-person talks and a video-based AC including three job simulations administered in a short time frame and scored later.

Video-based ACs are the most common variation to the traditional live AC. Video technology introduces a number of advantages to the assessment process. Video can be used to provide standardized content for candidates to respond to including video shot in the field that provides material that would otherwise be difficult to recreate for each candidate during the assessment process (e.g. major emergency incidents). Also, video is often used to capture the candidate’s responses for later scoring and to create a record of candidate performance that can be used to enhance candidate feedback and career development.

Some video-based programs use video for both the stimulus material and for recording the candidates’ responses for later scoring. In these “100 percent video AC programs,” candidates view material (e.g. actors playing roles and asking questions) and then respond to the image on the video monitor during timed response periods. The candidate’s responses are captured by cameras positioned on or near the video monitor.

Table 1. Advantages and Disadvantages of Video AC

Advantages	Disadvantages
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Great for standardizing the exam process – Fairness • Great for preventing cheating – Exam Security • Lots of questions and answers and “presentation skills” observable 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No interpersonal interaction or human connection between candidates and actors on the video or the assessors • Lower scores achieved by candidates across all exercises • Possible equipment problems – Must build in redundancy

Video assessment programs such as this result in substantial improvements in the standardization of the assessment process as compared to live programs. Another advantage is that the testing process can be completed much faster as long as the organization has multiple video testing rooms, equipment and qualified staff to run the exercises and equipment. The main disadvantages of the video assessment approach are: 1) the loss of true interpersonal interaction in the exercises which this author has found to consistently result in loss of information and lower assessment scores; and 2) an increased probability of equipment problems the more electronic equipment you add to the process. The lesson

here is to build in lots of redundancy in the form of back-up cameras, extra stimulus DVDs, video monitors, camera operators, etc.

Situational Judgment Tests (SJTs)

In part due to the economic downturn effecting many organizations, due in part to the higher cost of conducting ACs and due to their many attributes as tests, there has been an increase in the use of situational judgment tests. SJTs can be designed to measure many of the same leadership qualities ACs are used to evaluate. SJTs are sometimes referred to as written simulation tests or low-fidelity simulations. In this type of test candidates are given a series of situations. The situations are usually in written form consisting of one short paragraph. An alternate approach is to provide the situations/scenarios via video. Following each situation there are a number of possible courses of action (usually four choices). Candidates are asked to choose the best course of action and often also the worst course of action from the list of choices. Commonly the SJT instructions ask the candidates to put themselves into the situation and choose the action they would most likely take and the action they would least likely take in response to the scenario.

Scoring of these SJTs can be accomplished by providing one point for each correct response or the various choices for each scenario item can be weighted. For example, the weighted response scoring approach can provide more points for choosing the responses keyed as the best choices and less points (or a reduction of points) for choosing the worst choice as the action the candidate would “most likely take” and/or for choosing the (pre-identified) best choice as the action the candidate would “least likely take.” Another variation of the SJT, often referred to as a “multiple-choice in-basket,” consists of providing the candidate with the situations, scenarios or issues via separate written items and then having the candidate respond to the same types of multiple choice questions as described above.

The research on SJTs tends to be quite positive. In a *Journal of Applied Psychology* article authored by Michael McDaniels and colleagues (2001), a meta-analysis based on 102 coefficients and 10,640 people resulted in an estimated population validity coefficient of .34. This research indicates that SJTs are good predictors of job performance and compares favorably with the validity coefficients cited for ACs.

Sometimes SJTs are used as part of an AC and sometimes as a cost-efficient way to reduce the size of the candidate group moving on to the AC. In my research over the last few years I have found the correlation between supervisory and management SJT total scores and the AC total scores to range from .21 to

----- **CONTINUED ON NEXT PAGE**

.47 with small candidate groups of 13 to 20 (no correction for sample size or restriction of range). I have also found SJT scores correlate very well with supervisory and management AC exercises (above .30) and not at all or even negatively with police and fire emergency exercises. So, it appears that the SJTs are measuring what they are intended to measure - supervisory and management leadership skills. The consistently positive correlation between SJTs and ACs appears to support using SJTs to reduce the size of the candidate group that moves on to the AC.

Table 2. Why SJTs are Used

- Low-cost, efficient approach to assessing leadership, human relations, supervisory and managerial competencies
- Easily administered to any size candidate group
- No reading list or candidate study time required
- Require no subjective scoring or ratings (save time and costs associated with using interview or assessment panels)
- Positive candidate feedback and high candidate acceptance
- Custom keyed to the culture and needs of the organization
- Good validity with low or no adverse impact as compared to many other types of written tests

The SJT correlation with job performance lends some support for replacing ACs with SJTs. My first caution here would be to consider the primary differences between the two types of test processes. ACs allow candidates to provide a much more comprehensive response to scenarios or exercises within which the candidate must develop and implement his or her response. SJTs can cover a lot more content (e.g., as many as 50 or more job relevant scenarios). However, the candidate only needs to recognize and choose the best (and worst) response from the choices provided. A second caution would be to consider the content coverage carefully. As I have found with the lack of correlation with the SJTs and emergency exercises, you need to consider whether the SJT is covering all of the important content and contexts you want to evaluate in your testing process. If not, you may be able to add some of that content to your SJT or you may decide to supplement the SJT with one or more additional test components.

Summary

ACs and SJTs can both be very valuable testing components for assessing supervisory and management leadership skills. They can be used together or used alone depending on the content you need to cover, the skills you need to assess and the many practical constraints you operate within.

References

Gowing, M.K., Morris, D.M., Adler, S. & Gold, M. (2008). The next generation of leadership assessments: Some case studies. *Public Personnel Management*, 37(4), 435-455.

International Task Force on Assessment Center Guidelines (2009). Guidelines and ethical considerations for assessment center operations. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 17, 243-253.

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

McDaniel, M.A. & Nguyen, N.T. (2001). Situational judgment tests: A review of practice and constructs assessed. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 9, 103-113.

PTC

LEGAL COMMENTARY

Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) Rules against Bank of America *

Art Gutman

Florida Institute of Technology

On January 21, 2010 Linda S. Chapman, a Labor Department Administrative Law Judge (ALJ), ruled that Bank of America (BOA) was guilty of a pattern or practice of discrimination against black applicants for four entry-level jobs in administrative/clerical job categories in 1993, and again from 2002 to 2005. BOA was given 14 days to appeal the ruling to the Secretary of Labor. Chapman ruled that the OFCCP established a prima facie case of a pattern or practice of discrimination, which BOA could not successfully rebut. The complete ruling is available at <http://op.bna.com/dlrcases.nsf/r?Open=kmgmgn-82dlq7>.

The case originated against NationsBank, which was later acquired by BOA. After a 5-day onsite compliance review at a North Carolina branch, the OFCCP requested additional statistical information from that branch, as well as from branches in Tampa and South Carolina, which had not been a part of the initial audit. NationsBank objected based on the 4th Amendment to discovery at the Tampa and South Carolina branches, and later, to

CONTINUED ON PAGE 18

* *Editor's Note.* This article was originally published on DCI Consulting Group's blog, www.ofccp.blogspot.com. It has been re-printed with the permission of the Dr. Gutman and DCI.

Refer a Friend to PTC/MW



You will receive *one FREE pass to an upcoming Luncheon* when you refer a *NEW* member to PTC/MW. To participate, ask the new

member to list your name (under "Referred by") when submitting the online Membership Form. This program is open to *all* PTC/MW members, including students. To submit the form online, visit the web site at www.PTCMW.org.

As you know, PTC/MW is a great venue for professional development and networking. The value of your membership will only increase with more people becoming involved. Join us as we continue to make PTC/MW a leader in the personnel testing community!

Presenting the 2010 PTC/MW Budget

Lia M. Reed

United States Postal Service (USPS)

Presented here is the PTC/MW 2010 budget. Note that this year we are expecting a roughly balanced budget, with only a modest increase in membership and with no paper newsletter.

Income. We did not meet our aggressive goals for increasing membership in 2009, although we did exceed our goal for increasing student membership, ending the year with 26 student members versus 15 student members in 2008. Therefore, we have set a less aggressive goal for increasing membership in 2010. Eric Dunleavy has assembled a Membership Committee under the able leadership of Alex Alonso. They have already begun taking steps to increase membership, so I am hopeful that we will exceed our goal this year.

We have also set moderate goals for event attendance. In 2008, we had excellent workshop attendance rates and had hoped to match that in 2009, but did not. In 2009 we began broadcasting the luncheons over the Internet, and I created a separate line to report webcast income.

Expenses. We plan to continue to hold luncheons at GMU, so have budgeted for that venue. The member survey responses suggest that the GMU facility is satisfactory and is generally convenient to our members.

Of those who responded to the survey, 70% of members who had attended a luncheon/workshop at GMU were satisfied with the facility. Also, 40.4% of survey

respondents said they prefer luncheon meetings in Arlington/Clarendon, versus 36% in DC and 7.9% in Maryland. We have seen a fairly steady attendance rate for the webcasts (with a marked increase for Dr. Outtz' August presentation), and 64% of respondents on the member survey said they would be interested in attending monthly meetings remotely via web conferencing. Therefore, we plan to continue the webcasts in 2010 with hopes of seeing more people take advantage of that convenience. We have kept the speaker travel budget respectable, so that we can continue to bring you great speakers regardless of where they reside.

On the member survey, 46.1% said they would prefer to receive the newsletter electronically via e-mail, and 36% said they would prefer to receive it both by mail and electronically. Only 6.7% said they would like to continue to receive the newsletter by mail (current delivery format). Given these responses, and seeing that the printing and mailing of the paper newsletter is our second-largest expense (the largest being the luncheons), the Board voted unanimously to deliver the newsletter only electronically this year.

Officer elections have been handled electronically for the past few years, incurring no expense, so we did not budget any money for them in 2010. PayPal fees have been calculated to be proportionate to our income, since we now receive most payments through PayPal. Our plan for the Bemis contribution remains the same. The professional outreach budget includes \$1,000 to sponsor a SIOP reception. And the student outreach includes funds to sponsor IOOB and to again award a student for outstanding research.

In previous years, each PTC/MW Treasurer setup a new PayPal account and then closed it at the end of the year, so there was no need to report a PayPal account balance. However, this year I setup the PayPal account so that it can remain in place and be passed along to each incoming Treasurer. It is convenient to keep at least a humble balance in that account in order to issue refunds, and possibly to pay other organizational expenses (though we have not yet used it for that). For these reasons, I have added a line in the annual budget to also report the current PayPal account balance.

2008 Actual Expenses. The 2008 actual expenses are presented here as a correction to what was printed last year. I neglected to include the December newsletter last year, so the expenses previously showed the cost for only three newsletters. Also, early in 2009 we learned about overdue expenses for 2008 GMU events, so those are shown here as 2008 expenses.

Feel free to e-mail me with questions or comments about the budget at Lia.L.Meyer@USPS.gov.

PTC/MW Budget 2010

	2008 Actual	2009 Budget	2009 Actual	2010 Budget
Income				
<i>Membership Dues</i>				
Regular (185 Members @ \$30)	4,990.00	6,600.00	5,190.00	5,550.00
Student (35 Students @ \$15)	225.00	315.00	390.00	525.00
<i>Monthly Events</i>				
Luncheon Attendees (30 @ \$20; 9 luncheons)	5,980.00	5,400.00	5,510.00	5,400.00
Webcast Attendees (5 @ \$5; 9 luncheons)	NA	NA	360.00	225.00
Workshop Attendees (25 @ \$40; 3 wkshps)	4,305.00	5,550.00	2,575.00	3,000.00
Workshop/Luncheon Sponsors (6 @ \$450)	2,000.00	2,700.00	2,700.00	2,700.00
<i>Interest/Dividends</i>				
Money Market Account/CD	112.44	100.00	9.28	0.00
Total Income	17,612.44	20,665.00	16,734.28	17,400.00
Expenditures				
<i>Monthly Events</i>				
Luncheons (9 luncheons at \$750)	5,118.23	5,850.00	5,850.00	6,750.00
Workshops (3 workshops at \$800)	1,680.98	1,950.00	1,775.00	2,400.00
Webcast Subscription (\$72.25/month)	NA	NA	505.75	867.00
Speaker Travel	1,600.22	4,000.00	1,058.15	2,000.00
Speaker Gifts	199.53	0.00	0.00	0.00
<i>Organization Publications</i>				
Quarterly Newsletter	4,435.97	4,000.00	4,805.86	0.00
Internet Server	420.00	420.00	420.00	500.00
Web Page Maintenance	490.00	400.00	750.00	1,000.00
<i>Administrative Costs</i>				
Nominations/Elections	0.00	90.00	0.00	0.00
Technology Enhancements	720.00	800.00	62.99	0.00
PayPal Fees	462.48	515.00	497.63	500.00
Miscellaneous	263.74	600.00	756.31	700.00
<i>Outreach</i>				
Bemis Award Contribution	0.00	150.00	150.00	150.00
Professional Outreach	0.00	1,000.00	0.00	1,500.00
Graduate Outreach	0.00	750.00	500.00	500.00
Total Expenditures	15,391.15	20,525.00	17,131.69	16,867.00
Income Less Expenditures	2,221.29	140.00	-397.41	533.00
Investments				
Checking Account (Wachovia)	11,929.37	NA	9,042.94	NA
Online Merchant Account (PayPal)	NA	NA	1,631.20	NA
Money Market Account (Merrill Lynch)	4,033.10	NA	4,065.61	NA
Certificate of Deposit (Merrill Lynch)	8,014.19	NA	7,949.19	NA

PTC

**Call for Nominations:
2010 Stephen E. Bemis Award
Nomination Deadline: March 12, 2010**

Each year, the PTC/MW board nominates an individual for the **Stephen E. Bemis** Memorial Award. This award is intended to reflect on both the tangible contributions that Steve Bemis provided to our profession AND on the open, caring attitude that characterized his personality. It was designed to serve as a perpetual reminder of the qualities that caused his colleagues to admire him. **We need you to participate in the nomination process by suggesting a PTC/MW member whom the Board could then nominate.**

Individuals nominated for this award should be current or retired professionals who most nearly mirror the three primary qualities for which Steve Bemis is remembered:

- Accomplished personnel measurement practitioners who are recognized for their on-going commitment to the principles of merit and fairness;
- Professionals who have made an impact in the field by their practical contribution(s) that have either resulted in an improved or new procedure; and
- Concerned individuals who are recognized for their commitment to assisting fellow practitioners, being available to them, and freely calling on them.

If you would like to nominate a professional for this prestigious award, please forward his/her name to **PTC/MW President-Elect, David Hamill, at David.Hamill@dhs.gov by Friday, March 12, 2010. Please keep in mind that if your nominee is selected, you may be asked to assist with the full nomination package.**

The Board will then select among the nominations, develop the application package, and forward PTC/MW's official nomination which must be received by the Bemis Award committee by April 30, 2010.

Many of our members and colleagues are deserving of such recognition. Please help us to identify such an individual.

LEGAL COMMENTARY, FROM PAGE 17-----

discovery at the North Carolina branch as well. Originally, 4th Amendment rulings were made favoring the bank, both within the Department of Labor and the federal courts. However, these rulings were overturned. The delay afforded the OFCCP the opportunity to add the charges for the later years. BOA argued that the OFCCP was afforded 15 years of discovery, which ALJ Chapman rejected on grounds that the delays were due to the 4th Amendment claim and subsequent appeals.

Two bank recruiters testified that the selection process involved two steps: (1) from application to interview and (2) from interview to job offer. Theresa Simmons, the recruiter for two of the jobs, testified that in the early 1990s, jobs were advertised twice weekly in the local newspaper, and were posted with the EEOC. Applicants then came in to complete applications. An administrative assistant tore off attachments with EEO information (i.e. race/ethnicity and sex), and decisions were made regarding which applicants to interview. According to Simmons, she did not know the race of any applicant until they came in for interviews. The recruiter for the other jobs (Donna Craddock) described a similar process, and both recruiters testified that the major difference in later years was the addition of Internet recruitment. Applicants were excluded at either step based on reference checks, credit history, job-hour compatibility, and after job offers based drug tests.

The prima facie case was based on statistical analyses by Dr. David L. Crawford and the testimony of three excluded applicants. Crawford testified that there were significant applicant flow disparities in both time periods for (1) applicants selected for job interviews and (2) interviewees selected for the jobs, arguing that there were shortfalls in both time periods for both steps of the selection process well in excess of two standard deviations. BOA's expert, Dr. Joan G. Haworth, cited several flaws in Crawford's analysis, most notably: (1) mistakes in the data that were not corrected; (2) aggregation of the clerical and administrative jobs; (3) inclusion in the analyses of applicants excluded based on credit checks (coded RC) and time incompatibilities (coded RH). When Haworth separated the two job classifications, there were no shortfalls for administrative jobs, and that the shortfalls for the clerical jobs were eliminated when the RC and RH applicants were excluded. Haworth also testified that the charges were fallacious because the allegations involved only 2 of 33 classifications, and there were no shortfalls in the other 31 classifications. Two other points are worth noting. First, there was some debate about whether exclusion decisions based on the RC and RH codes were implemented in a standardized fashion. Thus, in essence OFCCP alleged that discrimination could occur via the

----- **CONTINUED ON NEXT PAGE**

Get connected

**Visit PTC/MW online at:
www.PTCMW.org**

subjectivity involved in making those exclusionary decisions. Second, a multiple events Fisher's exact test was used to measure adverse impact by both sides. This methodology was accepted and not an issue of contention.

There were other criticisms back and forth between Crawford and Haworth. This was clearly a complicated case. Nevertheless, the main issues in the eyes of ALJ Chapman were that Crawford was justified in aggregating the two classifications and by including the applicants coded RC and RH. Based on her interpretations of major Supreme Court pattern or practice rulings in *International Teamsters v. United States* (1977) [431 US 324] and *Hazelwood School District v. United States* (1977) [43 US 299], ALJ Chapman ruled there were "gross" disparities sufficient for a prima case of a pattern or practice of discrimination that BOA could not rebut.

It is interesting to consider whether this case would have played out differently in a federal court; let's imagine this was a pattern or practice case brought to a district court.

As such, the plaintiffs would present their statistical evidence together with individual claims of disparate treatment. The defense could then rebut the prima case with its own statistical evidence and the court would decide if there is a prima facie case. For example, in *Hazelwood*, the Supreme Court accepted the defendant's statistical rebuttal and ruled there was no prima facie case. In contrast, in *Teamsters*, there was an "inexorable zero" number of minorities in an at-issue job classification, making the prima facie case irrefutable. In the BOA case, there were two refutable applicant flow disparities, and it is arguable that a federal district court judge would rule there is no prima facie case on two grounds. First, the applicant flow disparities were not statistically significant when proper controls were used, and second, two disparities out of 33 job classifications is insufficient evidence to make a prima facie case of "systemic" discrimination.

Returning to federal court, a successful prima facie claim in either a disparate treatment or pattern or practice case would then pass a relatively light burden to the defendant to articulate (i.e., to explain in words without have to factually prove) a legitimate nondiscriminatory reason for the statistical disparities. That explanation could take several different routes, the most obvious one being that the recruiters did not know the race of the applicants prior to interviews, and that they were unbiased in their decision making. It would now be up to the plaintiffs to prove that the explanation(s) offered are a pretext for discrimination. As the ALJ ruling stands, it appears that a burden was placed on BOA to prove that the various procedures used in the selection process were not discriminatory.

Note that some testimony suggests that the plaintiffs would not succeed in a pretext argument. First, the

OFCCP's auditor himself testified that exclusion based on credit checks is not suspect for bank jobs. Second, Crawford testified that he had no evidence to believe there was bias on the part of the recruiters. Nevertheless, ALJ Chapman ruled that BOA could not prove there was no bias by the recruiters. Is this consistent with the traditional burdens of proof by plaintiffs and defendants in disparate treatment and pattern or practice cases?

What this case illustrates is that the OFCCP may have, in effect, the power to transcend traditional federal court principles. In order to get to federal district court, BOA would have to appeal once again (this time to the Secretary of Labor), and lose again. This is an arduous (and expensive) process. That's why challenges to OFCCP rulings in federal court are rare. Yet, cases like this one belong in federal court. Traditionally, pattern or practice cases are built on "statistical disparities between composition of the workforce as compared to composition of the labor pool (as in *Hazelwood*) or composition of two or more jobs within the same company (as in *Teamsters*). Here, the claim of "systemic" discrimination was based on applicant flow disparities. If there is a legitimate claim here, it may be an adverse impact one, not pattern or practice. But that's another matter altogether.

PTC

Job Announcements

ICF International

www.ICFI.com

Summer Fellow, Workforce Research Center (Fairfax, VA)

ICF International is a global professional services firm that combines the entrepreneurship and dynamism of a new company with the solid consulting reputation that comes after 40 years of superior performance. Since 1969, ICF has been serving all levels of government, major corporations and multilateral institutions. More than 3,500 employees on four continents combine passion for our work with industry and technical expertise to protect and improve the quality of life.

About the Job

ICF International seeks a Summer Fellow to work within the Workforce Research Center (WoRC). The WoRC team assists Federal and commercial clients with research and consulting projects in the I/O Psychology arena. The Summer Fellow will contribute to the

----- **CONTINUED ON PAGE 20**

JOB ANNOUNCEMENTS, FROM PAGE 19-----

development of innovative, high quality solutions and services, typically working on multiple projects with all levels of staff. Responsibilities include assisting with data collection and analysis, reviewing literature, conducting interviews and surveys, solving quantitative and qualitative problems, and interacting with federal and commercial clients. Summer Fellows at ICF have an opportunity to apply their academic knowledge, gain exposure to major projects, interact with experts in the field, whilst building content knowledge and consulting skills.

Job Requirements

Current enrollment in a Ph.D. I/O Psychology or related program is required; having completed either 2 or 3 years in the program is preferred. Candidate should have experience with quantitative research, survey methodology, statistical analysis, excellent written and oral communications skills, and the ability to work under strict deadlines in a fast-paced environment.

Application Instructions

To apply, please submit your cover letter, résumé, and a writing sample to: <http://jobs.icfi.com>.

☞☞☞

Society for Human Resource Management (SHRM)

www.SHRM.org

Director, Research (Alexandria, VA)

Direct, oversee, and lead the association's research activities, which comprise four program areas each with its respective staff, and include three major organizational initiatives – SHRM Human Capital Benchmarking Service, the Leading Indicator of National Employment (LINETM), and SHRM's Survey Program.

Serve as a spokesperson for SHRM at press conferences and other media events as appropriate. Give speeches to a diverse group of audiences (e.g., HR professionals, CEOs, other business leaders, academics, etc.). Identify and create research that will inform SHRM about its market and governmental policy and organizational strategy.

The incumbent is a member of the senior management team at SHRM.

Education and Experience

- Requires master's degree though a doctoral degree in the field of Human Resource Management or a related field is preferred. SPHR and/or GPHR (or related HR credential) preferred. At least five to eight years experience working in an association/membership organization environment preferred.

- Minimum of 8 to 10 years of professional experience and leadership in research administration, preferably involving areas of corporate research.
- Prior supervisory experience.
- Experience managing departmental budgets.
- Proficiency of statistics and research methods.
- Excellent presentation skills with the ability to present to both academic and practitioner audiences.
- Ability to demonstrate entrepreneurship and negotiation strategies.
- Excellent verbal, written, and interpersonal communications skills are a must. Ability to present to small and large audiences.
- Knowledge of the HR field and a network of thought leaders in HR and management.

SHRM is an equal opportunity employer (M/F/D/V).

Relocation assistance is provided for this position.

Visit https://hostedjobs.openhire.com/epostings/submit.cfm?fuseaction=app.jobinfo&jobid=207950&company_id=16075&version=1&source=ONLINE&jobOwner=980064&aid=1 for additional information or to apply for the position online.

☞☞☞

State of Connecticut, Department of Administrative Services (DAS)

www.DAS.STATE.CT.us

Personnel Psychologist (Hartford, CT)

Within the DAS Management Division, Statewide Examination Unit, Personnel Psychologists are responsible for developing and validating the State's most complex and sensitive employment examinations; providing consultation and training to other staff on test development and validation projects; performing statistical analysis; and serving as an expert witness in legal challenges.

Candidates must have a Ph.D. in industrial/organizational psychology, statistics, tests and measurements, or other closely related field and two years of professional experience with significant involvement in job analysis, personnel selection, test development, and validation. For more information go to: http://www.das.state.ct.us/exam/bl_jobs_list.asp?F_Type_List=Jobs

Interested and qualified candidates who meet the above requirements should submit a cover letter, a resume,

----- **CONTINUED ON NEXT PAGE**

and an Application for Employment (PLD-1) to: Susan Turko, State of Connecticut, Department of Administrative Services, 165 Capitol Avenue, Hartford, CT 06106 or Fax (860) 713-7473.

----- PTC



Help Wanted





PTC/MW publishes job and internship announcements in its Quarterly Newsletter (March, June, September, and December) and on its website at no cost for positions related to I/O Psychology, Human Resource Management (HRM), and Testing.

To publish a job announcement in the newsletter and/or online, please send the announcement (250 words or less) to PTC/MW Newsletter Editor **Mike Ingerick** at MIIngerick@HumRRO.org or (703) 549-3611.

validation theory, performance appraisal, and the role of I/O psychology in employment discrimination litigation. He also wrote one of the most used 'Introduction to I/O Psychology' textbooks. For those interested in paying their respects to Frank, donations can be made to the Memorial Sloan Kettering Cancer Center (www.mskcc.org/) in his name.

Congratulations To...

Alex Alonso (American Institutes for Research, AIR) for receiving the American Psychological Association's (APA) most recent Innovative Practice Award. Alex was awarded for his research to develop team training and cultural competencies in healthcare. About 98,000 deaths occur annually because of breakdowns in communication, according to a 1999 report. Alex's research is helping to prevent communication errors before they can hurt patients. His research is an offshoot of TeamSTEPPS, a training curriculum developed by a team of researchers at AIR led by David Baker; Baker also received an APA Innovative Practice Award citation earlier this year for the work. Over the last three years, Alex, along with his team of close to sixty people, including coaches, designers and implementers of the training, and others have taught a staff of close to five hundred in a large Midwestern health system. The team helped the system design their communications intervention and is currently helping them evaluate it. PTC/MW Past President Rich Cober nominated Alex for the Innovative Practice award, which was featured in the November issue of the APA's Monitor on Psychology (<http://www.apa.org/monitor/2009/11/practitioner.html>).

John "Jack" Jones (Vangent, Inc.) on being elected to the Board of Directors of the Association of Test Publishers (ATP) (www.testpublishers.org). Jack, along with five other newly elected individuals, will serve a two-year term on the board of ATP starting in 2010. Established in 1992, ATP is a non-profit organization representing providers of tests and assessment tools and/or services related to assessment, selection, screening, certification, licensing, educational or clinical uses and dedicated to the highest level of professionalism and business ethics within the test publishing community.

☪☪☪

Have news to share with your fellow PTC/MW members? The Member News section is the perfect forum to announce job transitions or new appointments, awards and honors earned, and more.

*If you have news to share with your fellow PTC/MW members, please contact PTC/MW Newsletter Editor, **Mike Ingerick**, at MIIngerick@HumRRO.org or (703) 549-3611.*

Member News

Welcome New Members!

Shelly Butler, SRA International
Brian Edwards, Eagle Ray Inc.
Michael Heil, Aon Consulting
Hailey Herleman, American Institutes for Research
JT Kostman, C² Technologies
Arthur Paddock, National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases - National Institutes of Health
Kathy Stewart, Fields Consulting Group, Inc.
Melody Thomas, American Institutes for Research
Kathlea Vaughn, U.S. Customs and Border Protection

Condolences To...

The family, friends, and colleagues of **Frank Landy** (Landy Litigation Support Group). Frank passed away peacefully on January 12th, 2010. Frank was an exceptional I/O psychologist, who cared deeply about the field. Among his many accomplishments, Frank authored some of the most insightful and influential material on

----- PTC

PTC/MW QUARTERLY NEWSLETTER POLICY

Approved by the PTC/MW Executive Committee, 27 October 2006

Policy. PTC/MW shall have a written policy regarding the content, format, and style of its newsletter the PTC/MW Quarterly. The Executive Committee shall review the newsletter policy periodically and publish the current policy in the newsletter at least annually.

Schedule and Deadlines. The newsletter shall be published four times a year (March, June, September, December). The deadlines for submitting content to the Quarterly are as follows: March (February 1st); June (May 1st); September (August 1st); December (November 1st). All submissions should be sent electronically to the Newsletter Editor as a Microsoft Word document or as text file.

Content. Each Quarterly Newsletter shall include (a) the President's Message, (b) information on the upcoming Luncheon/Workshop (i.e., speaker, title, abstract), (c) announcements and/or updates on other PTC/MW business and activities, (d) job announcements, (e) Member News, (f) the Professional Calendar, (g) other professional announcements, and (h) articles and other submissions on topics that are relevant to PTC/MW or the field of personnel measurement and selection. The newsletter shall be open to the expression of informed professional opinions and to presenting opposing views on controversial issues in any form (e.g., as Letters to the Editor, as an article, etc.). In all cases, the newsletter will strive to provide facts and opinions in an accurate, complete, and fair manner. Publication of items in the newsletter shall not necessarily imply the endorsement of PTC/MW. PTC/MW reserves the right to decide whether content submitted for publication is of sufficient merit and interest to be printed in the newsletter.

Letters to the Editor. Individuals and organizations may submit Letters to the Editor expressing informed professional opinions, views on current issues and trends, and commentary on specific articles published in newsletter. When comments are received on specific articles, the newsletter shall provide the articles' author(s) an opportunity to submit a response for publication in newsletter. Each Letter should be submitted to the Newsletter Editor electronically, with a limit of 500 words.

Articles. Individuals and organizations may submit articles for publication in the newsletter. All articles must serve a useful educational purpose. Articles based on research and/or professional opinions presented in a referred journal or at a professional meeting are welcome. Each article should be submitted to the Newsletter Editor electronically, with a limit of 1,750-1,800 words.

Member News. Individuals and organizations may submit personal and professional news (transitions and appointments, retirements, awards and recognition, deaths, etc.) about or of interest to current and former PTC/MW members for publication in newsletter.

Advertisements. PTC/MW shall not solicit nor accept paid advertisements.

Job Announcements. Individuals and organizations may submit job announcements related to Industrial/Organizational (I/O) Psychology, Human Resource Management (HRM), and Testing for publication in the newsletter. There will be no restrictions on location; jobs can be located in the Metropolitan, DC area or elsewhere. There will be no charge for publishing job announcements. Announcements will be published in alphabetical order according to the name of the organization. Announcements should be submitted to the Newsletter Editor electronically and are limited to 250 words.

Other Professional Announcements. Individuals and organizations may submit non-job related announcements that are professional in nature for publication in the newsletter. Such announcements may include requests for information, calls for papers and presentations, and calls for nominations. Other professional associations who share PTC/MW's mission to promote personnel measurement and selection may submit calls (e.g., for papers and presentations) and announcements of professional meetings (i.e., conferences, conventions, training courses, and workshops) officially sponsored by the association that would be of interest to PTC/MW members. Announcements of meetings, conferences, conventions, training courses, and workshops not sponsored by a professional association shall be restricted to the "Professional Calendar" section of the newsletter. PTC/MW reserves the right to decide whether announcements submitted for publication meet these criteria and are of sufficient interest to be printed in the newsletter. There will be no charge for publishing announcements. Announcements should be submitted to the Newsletter Editor electronically with a limit of 100 words.

Authorship. The person(s) responsible for the content of each article or announcement shall be identified by authorship. Both the name and employer of the author(s) shall be listed with the article. Footnotes may be used to provide additional information, as needed (e.g., disclosure of relationships that could affect article content; author's contact information if not in the Membership Directory). Footnotes may not be used simply for advertising purposes.

Editing. PTC/MW reserves the right to edit submissions to comply with newsletter requirements for style, format, and length. PTC/MW will contact the senior author prior to publication if major editing is needed. All items submitted to the newsletter become the property of PTC/MW.

Copyright. PTC/MW shall put the copyright notice on each issue of the newsletter. This notice shall read, "The Personnel Testing Council of Metropolitan Washington encourages other groups to reprint articles from the PTC/MW Quarterly, provided that credit is given to the author and to the PTC/MW Quarterly."

Administration. The Newsletter Editor shall administer and interpret the newsletter policy, subject to review by the Executive Committee.

PROFESSIONAL CALENDAR

by Lance W. Seberhagen, Seberhagen & Associates, sebe@erols.com

- Mar 5-6** American Psychological Association. Conference. "Psychologically Healthy Workplace." Washington, DC. Contact: www.phwa.org/conference.
- MAR 10** *PTC/MW. BREAKFAST WORKSHPOP. Dr. Ken Lahti, PreVisor. "Hiring Reform and Internet Testing: Whether and How to Go Unproctored." Featured Exhibitor: PDRI, a PreVisor Company (www.PDRI.com). GMU, Arlington, VA. Contact: www.PTCMW.org.*
- Mar 10** Metropolitan New York Association of Applied Psychology. Dinner Meeting. Dr. William Schiemann, Metrus Group. Topic to be announced. New York, NY. Contact: www.metroapppsych.com.
- Mar 12** HR Leadership Forum. Breakfast Meeting. Mark Carrier, David Makarsky, & Camye Mackey, BF Saul. "Excellence in Corporate Branding: BF Saul's Big 3." Arlington, VA. Contact: www.hrleadershipforum.org. Reservations required.
- Mar 12-14** IO/OB Graduate Student Conference. Houston, TX. Contact: www.uh.edu/ioob.
- Mar 17-19** Society for Human Resource Management. Law and Legislative Conference. Washington, DC. Contact: www.shrm.org.
- Mar 19** George Mason University. Conference. "Positivity: The Leadership Tipping Point." Fairfax, VA. Contact: <http://cct.gmu.edu/positivity>.
- Apr 2** HR Leadership Forum. Breakfast Meeting. Neena Dosanj & Rebecca LaCroix, PA Consulting. "Creating Scalable Organization Designs for Growth in the New Marketplace." Arlington, VA. Contact: www.hrleadershipforum.org. Reservations required.
- Apr 7-10** Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology. Annual Conference & Workshops. Atlanta, GA. Contact: www.siop.org.
- Apr 9-13** American Society for Public Administration. Annual Meeting. San Jose, CA. Contact: www.aspanet.org.
- Apr 12-13** University of Maryland. Short Course. "Introduction to Multilevel Analysis Methods: Hierarchical Models." College Park, MD. Contact: www.education.umd.edu/EDMS/ShortCourses/HLMworkshoppage.html.
- APR 14** *PTC/MW. LUNCHEON MEETING. Dr. Paul Usala, U.S. Customs and Border Protection. "Procedural Steps in Conducting Common Item Equating." GMU, Arlington, VA. Contact: www.PTCMW.org.*
- Apr 26-28** Society for Human Resource Management. Conference. "Leading Diversity." Atlanta, GA. Contact: www.shrm.org. □
- Apr 28-29** University of Colorado. International Objective Measurement Workshop. Boulder, CO. Contact: www.iomw2010.net.
- Apr 29 – May 3** National Council on Measurement in Education. Annual Meeting. Denver, CO. Contact: www.ncme.org.
- Apr 30 – May 4** American Educational Research Association. Annual Meeting. Denver, CO. Contact: www.aera.net.
- May 11-13** Linkage Inc. Conference. "Best of Organization Development Summit." Chicago, IL. Contact: www.linkageinc.com/od.
- MAY 12** *PTC/MW. LUNCHEON MEETING. Dr. Kevin Kramer, Accenture. "I/O Psychology's Role in Strategic Human Resources Outsourcing." GMU, Arlington, VA. Contact: www.PTCMW.org.*

Future SIOP: Atlanta, April 8-10, 2010. Chicago, April 14-16, 2011. San Diego, CA. April 26-28, 2012.

Visit the PTC/MW web site (www.PTCMW.org) for the full calendar.

PERSONNEL TESTING COUNCIL OF METROPOLITAN WASHINGTON

www.PTCMW.org

PTC/MW Elected Officers, 2010				
Office	Name	Affiliation	Work Phone	E-Mail
<i>President</i>	Eric Dunleavy, Ph.D.	DCI Consulting	(202) 280-2175	EDunleavy@dciconsult.com
<i>Past President</i>	Rich Cober, Ph.D.	Marriott International	(301) 380-4811	Richard.Cober@marriott.com
<i>President-Elect</i>	David Hamill, M.S.	Transportation Security Administration (TSA)	(443) 320-3601	David.Hamill@dhs.gov
<i>Vice President</i>	Pat Curtin, Ph.D.	U.S. Customs and Border Protection	(202) 863-6292	Pat.Curtin@yahoo.com
<i>Secretary</i>	Courtney Morewitz, M.A.	Marriott International	(301) 380-7435	Courtney.Morewitz@marriott.com
<i>Treasurer</i>	Lia (Meyer) Reed, Ph.D.	U.S. Postal Service	(202) 268-8015	Lia.M.Reed@usps.gov
<i>Recorder</i>	Gonzalo Ferro, M.A.	PDRI	(703) 812-3055	Gonzalo.Ferro@pdri.com

PTC/MW Committee Chairs, 2010				
Committee	Name	Affiliation	Work Phone	E-Mail
<i>Nom/Elections</i>	Rich Cober, Ph.D.	Marriott International	(301) 380-4811	Richard.Cober@marriott.com
<i>Membership</i>	Alex Alonso, Ph.D.	American Institutes for Research (AIR)	(202) 403-5176	AAlonso@air.org
<i>Legal</i>	Richard Tonowski, Ph.D.	Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC)	(202) 663-4752	Richard.Tonowski@eeoc.gov
<i>Newsletter</i>	Mike Ingerick, M.A.	HumRRO	(703) 549-3611	MIngerick@humro.org
<i>Website</i>	Zack Horn, Ph.D.	Aptima, Inc.	(703) 966-8156	ZackHorn@gmail.com
<i>Training</i>	Rose Mueller-Hanson, Ph.D.	PDRI	(703) 812-3042	Rose.Hanson@pdri.com
<i>Calendar</i>	Lance Seberhagen, Ph.D.	Seberhagen & Associates	(703) 790-0796	Sebe@erols.com

Copyright © 2010 Personnel Testing Council of Metropolitan Washington. PTC/MW encourages other groups to reprint articles from the PTC/MW Quarterly, provided that credit is given to the author(s) and to the PTC/MW Quarterly. All statements expressed in this publication are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the official opinions or policies of the Personnel Testing Council of Metropolitan Washington. **Deadline for the June Quarterly is May 1, 2010.**