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ABSTRACT

Situational judgment tests (SJT) have been shown to be effective and useful organizational selection tools. However, researchers question what they measure. The position of the current study (and others) is that SJTs are both measures and constructs; SJTs have the ability to measure various constructs (depending on how they are constructed) but inherently assess unique construct(s) that some have suggested is judgment. Using the multi-trait multi-method design, the current study hypothesized that after all variance components of SJT were isolated, evidence for a situational judgment construct would be found. Results did not support the hypothesis. Instead, the MTMM displayed method (rather than construct) factors as well as expected correlations between SJT and other related variables. Implications for SJT is discussed.
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INTRODUCTION

A Multitrait-Multimethod Approach to

Isolating Situational Judgment from Situational Judgment Tests

A situational judgment test (SJT) is a personnel assessment tool often used in selection and development settings. Each item in the SJT poses a dilemma and provides possible responses to that dilemma. The responses may elicit respondents’ behavioral intentions (i.e. “what would you do in this situation?”) or their beliefs regarding the effectiveness of the responses (i.e. “what should you do in this situation?”). Because the scenario is often job-related, SJTs can be considered low-fidelity versions of traditional job simulations (Motowidlo, Dunnette, & Carter, 1990). Like job simulations such as those used in assessment centers, SJTs present situations that require respondents to simulate how they would react on the job. However SJTs are not as similar to the workplace as job simulations because they are limited to hypothetical paper or video scenarios often entailing little to none of the interactivity typically required of actual job settings.

Many consider SJTs measurement methods that can be used to assess multiple constructs (McDaniel, Morgeson, Finnegan, Campion, & Braverman, 2001; Ployhart, 2006; Weekley & Jones, 1999). For instance, one SJT could be designed to measure cognitive ability, customer-service orientation, and conscientiousness. Another could be designed to measure problem solving and job knowledge. There is a large array of constructs test constructors have targeted to measure using SJTs (Christian, Edwards, & Bradley, 2007). Some have further suggested that SJTs can be designed to measure whatever variables the researcher targets (Ployhart & Ryan, 2000; McDaniel & Nguyen, 2001). This logic likens SJTs to interviews or assessment centers;
instead of a common construct assessed, interviews and assessment centers measure whatever constructs are targeted by the test developers.

However, some have questioned what exactly it is that SJTs measure. Some have suggested that “although SJTs can be construed as a method that can be used to assess different constructs . . . the dominant constructs are probably conceptually distinct from established constructs” (Schmitt & Chan, 2006, 148). In other words, it has been suggested that, in addition to any constructs that may be targeted by a specific SJT, there is one common construct (i.e., situational judgment) inherently measured by all SJTs (e.g., Brooks & Highhouse, 2006; Stemler & Sternberg, 2006). As will be discussed, some evidence suggests there may be a situational judgment construct measured by SJTs, though few empirical studies have explicitly examined this topic.

The current study tested for evidence of a situational judgment construct in SJTs. The multitrait-multimethod (MTMM) research design was used to isolate all variance components of the SJT score and examine if any of them was due to a situational judgment construct. This design required multiple measures of the construct in question (i.e., situational judgment); the current study did so using two SJTs and an assessment center in-basket activity. This design also required multiple theoretically unrelated constructs to be measured, so in addition to situational judgment the current study measured personality and cognitive ability (as they are commonly associated with situational judgment). It was hypothesized that the MTMM design would suggest there is a situational judgment variance contribution (among all other variance contributions).
SJT as Predictors of Job Performance

An important strength of SJTs is their predictive power. Meta-analyses have found average validity coefficients predicting job performance of $\rho = .34$ (McDaniel et al., 2001) and $\rho = .29$ (Christian et al., 2007). These coefficients are comparable to coefficients of other common selection predictors such as conscientiousness and unstructured interviews (see Schmidt & Hunter, 1998). SJTs are significant predictors of performance in a variety of settings, such as customer service personnel and engineers (Clevenger, Pereira, Wiechmann, Schmitt, & Harvey, 2001) as well as academic environments (Oswald, Schmitt, Kim, Ramsay, & Gillespie, 2004). SJTs are also predictive of other important organizational outcomes, such as contextual performance, turnover, absenteeism, and satisfaction (Dalessio, 1994; McDaniel et al., 2001; Schmitt, Oswald, Kim, Imus, Merritt, Friede, & Shivpuri, 2007).

In addition to being a strong predictor of performance, it is important for a predictor to explain unique variance in performance above and beyond other typical predictors. This is often found with SJTs. For instance, SJTs significantly predict incremental validity beyond cognitive ability alone (Lievens & Coetsier, 2002) and beyond cognitive ability and experience together (Weekley & Jones, 1997; 1999). A number of studies tested SJTs as predictors of incremental validity beyond three predictors (cognitive ability, experience, and personality), but found mixed results. Two samples reported SJTs to predict significant incremental validity beyond these three variables (Chan & Schmitt, 2002; Clevenger et al., 2001, sample 1). However, the incremental validity reported in three samples was nonsignificant (Clevenger et al., 2001, samples 2 and 3; Weekley & Ployhart, 2005).
Regardless of which predictors SJTs were entered into the regression equation, the increments to variance accounted for were small. A recent meta-analysis reported average increments over cognitive ability and personality ranging from .01 to .02, depending on response instruction format (McDaniel, Hartman, Whetzel, & Grubb, 2007). Validity increments of the previously discussed studies ranged from .01 to .08. Some may argue that although these incremental validities were statistically significant, they may be so small as to be considered insignificant in application. However, McDaniel et al. noted few variables can explain any incremental variance beyond common predictors such as cognitive ability or personality. Using SJTs in selection settings may enable incremental prediction that although is small, cannot be produced by many other variables.

The ability of SJTs to predict incremental validity in job performance beyond other common selection variables has implications for SJT construct validity. Many have noted that because SJTs predict incremental variance in measures of performance they may be assessing more than these other variables (Clevenger et al., 2001; Schmitt & Chan, 2006; Weekley & Ployhart, 2005). Because they explain variance in measures of performance not explained by other predictors, there may be another construct besides cognitive ability, personality, or experience that is explaining the unique variance in performance. The current paper, as well as previous literature, suggests this other construct is situational judgment. It is difficult to disentangle the effects of situational judgment from these other predictors because it is likely that situational judgment may contain elements of these constructs; in other words, ability, personality, or experience may be part of situational judgment. In recognition of this, it is useful to discuss what situational judgment is.
What is Situational Judgment?

Despite the use of SJTs since the 1920s (see McDaniel et al., 2001, for a history of SJTs), the nature of the situational judgment construct is somewhat elusive. Because SJTs have been used for many purposes, many different conceptualizations of situational judgment have been offered. Although there are some theories of the construct, SJT research has focused more on analyzing the test’s predictive ability than on explicating the construct. However, within the theories and definitions that do exist, there are commonalities in how the construct is discussed.

One of the first uses of SJTs was as a measure of social intelligence. As one of Thorndike’s (1920) three types of intelligence, it was defined as the ability to understand and manage people; in general, it meant to interact well with others. For example, social intelligence would be necessary for understanding, adapting to, and responding to the emotions of others (similar to later work on emotional intelligence, see Goleman, 1995). Early SJTs posed interpersonal scenarios, and social intelligence was measured in how they were responded to (see Thorndike and Stein, 1937, for a review of the George Washington Social Intelligence Test). SJTs were used in the 1940s and 1950s to measure social intelligence specifically in management settings (i.e., supervisory quality). For instance, the How Supervise? (File, 1945) was a measure of the ability to effectively respond to and supervise others in work environments.

Despite general agreement that SJTs at this time measured social (or supervisory social) intelligence, a precise and detailed definition of this construct was not developed because these early studies focused more on psychometric properties than on theoretical construct development. However, these early incarnations of SJTs were all similar in that they viewed SJTs as measures of the general ability to effectively navigate and respond to situations that require interaction with and management of others. Decision-making was a key component;
social intelligence requires a person to decide how to navigate, respond to, and interact with others. These early discussions of social intelligence alternately discussed this construct as the ability to navigate interpersonal situations as well as the knowledge of how to do so.

Modern interpretations of situational judgment depart slightly from the previously discussed early interpretations. Instead of viewing SJTs as measures of the specific ability to interact with and decide how to respond to others, SJTs are now discussed as measures of the general ability to make decisions about how to respond to situations of all kinds (not just social). For example, though situational judgment may be used in navigating a social situation at an office party, it may also be used in solving a complex technical problem at work. The common element connecting early and modern SJTs is that they all measure the ability to decide how to effectively navigate, adapt, and respond to situations.

Brooks and Highhouse (2006) used Hammond’s (1996) cognitive continuum theory to explain situational judgment. Hammond suggested that instead of categorizing thought processes as either analytic or intuitive, these processes should be considered “quasirational” (i.e., having both analytic and intuitive aspects). Brooks and Highhouse suggested that situational judgment can be thought of as quasirationality; situational judgment is the general “common sense” use of both analysis and intuition in deciding how to respond to a situation. This ability requires understanding when to rely on analysis and when to rely on intuition; quasirationality balances these two functions to achieve effective outcomes. For instance, one study found that although analytically evaluating financial bonds resulted in more accurate ratings of them than intuitively evaluating them, a combination of the processes resulted in the most accurate ratings (Whitecotton, Sanders, & Norris, 1998). In this study, participants balanced the use of analysis and intuition to achieve the most effective outcome.
As previously mentioned, making judgments is often discussed in tandem with the knowledge of how to do so. In this vein, some have discussed situational judgment in terms of procedural knowledge. Anderson (1985) defined procedural knowledge as “knowledge about how to perform various cognitive activities” (p. 199). Some have argued that situational judgment is procedural knowledge of how to react specifically to everyday activities (as opposed to “academic” tasks; Schmitt & Chan, 2006; Stemler & Sternberg, 2006). Knowledge about everyday activities is not domain specific so it can be applied to various practical situations. Motowidlo, Hooper, and Jackson (2006) suggested situational judgment is not confined to the general category of “everyday activities.” They proposed situational judgment can be operationalized as a more specific type of procedural knowledge, such as knowledge of how to respond to interpersonal or problem-solving situations.

Although many focus on the role of procedural knowledge in situational judgment, others have argued that declarative knowledge is involved as well. For instance, Schmidt and Hunter (1993) argued that tacit knowledge (which Stemler and Sternberg, 2006, suggested SJTs assess) is nothing more than job knowledge. In the field of aviation judgment, SJTs pose complex aeronautical situations requiring basic knowledge about aviation (e.g., Hunter, 2003). People without a background in this area (i.e., without domain specific declarative knowledge) would not be able to successfully complete these SJTs. Although this example is job-oriented, non-job-specific SJTs also require declarative knowledge about the situation presented; however this declarative knowledge is provided in the scenario. Therefore these SJTs may not require background declarative knowledge.

In weak support of the suggestion that situational judgment can be discussed in terms of knowledge, meta-analysis has found SJT scores to be slightly related to experience ($\rho = .07,$
McDaniel et al., 2001). In other words, more experience is slightly associated with better performance on SJTs because knowledge gains are expected to accompany experience. It should be noted, though, that these correlations are considered low by conventional standards (Cohen, 1988).

A number of constructs are often discussed simultaneously with situational judgment because they are closely related to the construct and/or the test. Referencing these related constructs may help explicate the situational judgment construct. For instance, meta-analysis has found an average correlation between SJT scores and cognitive ability scores of $\rho = .46$, as well as the previously discussed slight correlation with experience (McDaniel et al., 2001). The magnitude of the relationship between SJTs and personality varies depending on the dimension of personality measured; correlations have ranged from $r = .06$ to $.31$ (Chan & Schmitt, 2002; McDaniel & Nguyen, 2001; Weekley & Ployhart, 2005). To date, theory has not explicitly referenced situational judgment’s relationship with these constructs, but the high correlations with SJTs suggest the construct may be related to them. Also, Schmitt and Chan (2006) proposed adaptability to be another construct related to situational judgment. Though no explicit links to situational judgment have been discussed in the context of adaptability, there are clear parallels between the constructs. For instance, adaptability is typically discussed as a behavior (e.g., solving problems creatively or dealing with unpredictable situations; Pulakos, Arad, Donovan, & Plamondon, 2000). Perhaps situational judgment is the basic ability that people utilize when performing adaptive behaviors.

SJT literature is not the only area where judgment is defined. For instance, assessment centers often measure judgment in some form (see Table 1 for a list of “judgment” and “decision making” dimension definitions measured by assessment centers). An assessment center is a
group of activities (such as in-baskets, leaderless group discussions, and oral presentations) often conducted over more than one day through which a number of constructs are measured (Thornton & Byham, 1982). The roots of the modern assessment center may be traced back to the individual assessment movement that was especially prominent starting in World War II (see Highhouse, 2002, for a history of individual assessment). Through a mix of objective and projective tests, different constructs were assessed, including judgment. For instance, the German military assessed practical ability by analyzing open-ended responses to a leadership-based scenario (described by Ansbacher, 1941; Fitts, 1946). Also, the US military measured judgment by asking assesses to compose “character sketches” of peers. How well they were able to assimilate information and come to an overall understanding of the person was assessed as judgment (described by OSS, 1948). Today, assessment centers typically strive to be more objective than these early examples when measuring judgment (and many other constructs in general), but the essence remains the same.

Although judgment is often measured in assessment centers, a number of factors make it difficult to fully study the construct in this context. For instance, the term “judgment” is not always used; often a different term is used. In their categorization of constructs measured by assessment centers, Arthur, Day, McNelly, and Edens’s (2003) “problem solving” dimension encompassed judgment. Constructs within this dimension included decision making, interpreting information, and perception, as well as “judgment.” Because of the fact that judgment (in assessment center literature) is a collection of various terms measured by various exercises, there are many definitions of the construct offered, but no common definition. Similar to SJT literature, though, decision making is a common element in many definitions of judgment in assessment centers. For instance, assessment centers that explicitly measure “judgment” (instead
of a related construct) have included the term “decision making” in their definition of the construct (e.g., Russell & Domm, 1995; Schmitt, Noe, Meritt, & Fitzgerald, 1984).

Another issue that makes it difficult to study judgment in the context of assessment centers is the lack of operational consistency. Because one behavior or activity is often used to measure many constructs in assessment centers (Brannick, Michaels, & Baker, 1989), there is no single method used for measuring judgment (and therefore no single definition). For instance, ratings of judgment may be made from assessees’ performance on an in-basket or a conflict resolution simulation. Regardless of the method, effective judgment is typically operationalized, though, as agreement with experts in the field, as suggested by Funder (1987). For example, Brannick et al. (1989) developed objective scoring criteria for measuring decision making using in-baskets (similar to how SJTs are scored). In their study, subject matter experts responded to each item in the in-basket, and each response was rated as positive, neutral, or negative. The degree to which assessees’ responses corresponded with experts’ responses determined their judgment score.

Although the study of judgment in the assessment center literature is not straight-forward, a number of conclusions can be drawn. Similar to SJTs, judgment is often thought of as the ability to effectively navigate, adapt, and respond to situations. Sometimes these situations are in-basket activities, though they could be any exercise included in the assessment center. Also similar to SJTs, decision-making is often a key component. In general, judgment as a construct is fairly similar across assessment centers and SJTs. The two seem to represent alterative methods of measuring the situational judgment construct.

Thus far, discussing the nature of situational judgment is predicated on the implicit assumption that there is a situational judgment construct. However, there is not complete
agreement with this assumption; criticisms can be traced back to early studies that questioned whether SJTs were simply measures of intelligence because of strong correlations between SJTs and cognitive ability (e.g., Carrington, 1949; Millard, 1952). Strong correlations are still found with variables such as cognitive ability and conscientiousness, so researchers today are still questioning if situational judgment is a unique from these other constructs (Weekly & Ployhart, 1999; 2005).

Another implicit assumption of the present discussion of situational judgment is that there is a unique “judgment” construct instead of a collection of constructs that together entail situational judgment. However there is disagreement with this assumption as well. This argument was first leveled against historical SJTs (e.g., Rosen, 1961; Thorndike & Stein, 1937), but is still discussed today. Specifically, McDaniel and Nguyen (2001) defined SJTs as “any paper-and-pencil test designed to measure judgment in work settings” (p. 730). However, they later said that “these tests reflect a measurement method that can be used to assess a variety of constructs” (p. 732). In other words, they suggested that judgment is measured by SJTs (as is argued by others discussed), but defined judgment as a meta-construct that is comprised of several sub-constructs instead of its own unique construct (as other definitions discussed have suggested). While suggesting SJTs assess multiple constructs, this argument calls these multiple constructs collectively “judgment.”

In light of the fact that not everyone agrees there is a situational judgment construct, it is difficult to come to agreement as to how to define it. Also, though situational judgment has been defined by many, it has been agreed upon by few (see Table 2 for an overview of discussions of situational judgment in the SJT literature). However, Schmitt and Chan (2006) suggested all definitions have essential commonalities. In the context of SJTs, situational judgment usually
refers to the ability to make decisions about how to respond to situations. As suggested by Brooks and Highhouse (2006), prediction is an inherent aspect of deciding how to respond to a situation: predicting what is the most effective method of response. This implies that a respondent possesses knowledge about how to attain effective outcomes (Schmitt & Chan, 2006; Stemler & Sternberg, 2006). These aspects of situational judgment, while not constituting a formal definition, are common threads that run through many conceptualizations of the construct.

**Do SJTs Measure Situational Judgment?**

To determine if situational judgment is measured by SJTs, a discussion of validity is necessary. Following the publication of Cronbach and Meehl (1955), there were thought to be three different “types” of validity (i.e., criterion-related, construct, and content validity). The act of “validating” a scale consisted of three “validity tests:” one for each type of validity. Once each type of validity was supported, the scale was labeled “valid.” More recently, some have argued against this interpretation of validity, which has been deemed the “trinitarian view” of validity (Guion, 1980). Instead, some have argued for a unitarian interpretation of validity (Guion, 1998; Landy, 1986; Messick, 1995). This view does not consider different “types” of validity; instead it considers validity to refer to the truth of an inference about a test or construct. Validation is a process through which the truth of the inference is examined. Therefore as much evidence should be gathered as possible to support or refute the inference.

Many inferences about SJTs and situational judgment can be made. One might infer that a high score on an SJT implies the person makes good judgments. Or one might infer that low situational judgment implies that a person would perform poorly at a particular job. The goal of the current study was to test for evidence of situational judgment in SJT scores. The inference that addresses this goal is that SJTs are measures of (among other constructs) the higher-order
construct “situational judgment.” Is this inference true? What evidence can help determine if this inference is true? As suggested by the unitarian view of validity, the current paper will attempt to gather many pieces of evidence to support or refute this inference.

Cronbach and Meehl (1955) suggested five methods to use for examining what construct(s) a test measures (which they called “construct validity”): item intercorrelations, dimensionality, subgroup differences, test-retest reliability, and process issues. Schmitt and Chan (2006) offered a review similar to the present discussion, although their explicit goal was to determine if SJTs are solely methods or solely constructs. The goal of the present discussion has a slightly different focus; the present discussion seeks to determine if situational judgment is one of the constructs SJTs measure.

Cronbach and Meehl (1955) suggested analyzing item intercorrelations to help determine what construct(s) a test measures. If a construct is unidimensional, the items are expected to be intercorrelated. So if a construct is unidimensional, a test with high item intercorrelations may measure this construct. This does not entirely apply to SJTs; as previously discussed, SJTs are not considered unidimensional so SJT items would not be expected to be intercorrelated. However, low SJT item intercorrelations would not necessarily imply the SJT is multidimensional; instead, the SJT may simply be unreliable. On the other hand, an argument could be made that SJT items should be intercorrelated if the dimensions are correlated (Cortina, 1993). However, there is no consensus as to whether or not dimensions measured by SJTs should be correlated. Also, item content differs across SJTs, so it is difficult to compare intercorrelation coefficients of SJTs with different item content. For these reasons there is no expected level of item intercorrelation, and it would be difficult to draw conclusions about what SJTs measure from intercorrelation coefficients.
Cronbach and Meehl (1955) also suggested examining dimensionality of the test as a method of studying what construct(s) a test measures. If a construct has the same number of dimensions as a test (either unidimensional or multidimensional), this could suggest the test is a measure of the construct. It is theoretically unclear how many dimensions comprise the situational judgment construct. However SJTs are considered to be tests that measure more than one construct (McDaniel et al., 2001; Ployhart, 2006; Weekley & Jones, 1999). Since SJTs may measure many constructs (including situational judgment), it is expected that SJTs as tests are not homogenous.

Factor analysis aims to determine how many dimensions comprise a test (Bobko, 1993). One study (Gillespie, Oswald, Schmitt, Manheim, & Kim, 2002) constructed twelve SJTs, each designed to measure a different college student performance criterion. They conducted a confirmatory factor analysis to test whether the twelve individual SJTs would emerge. They found mixed support for this model, but an exploratory factor analysis yielded one large factor (12.39%; the next largest factor only accounted for 4.79% of the test variance). This was also found by Chan and Schmitt (2002), who conducted exploratory factor analyses on two parallel forms of an SJT. These analyses suggested one large factor best fit the data (accounting for 16% of the test variance on the first form and 18% on the second). Neither study reported the items for the emergent factors so it is difficult to determine the nature of the factors.

These findings did not yield multidimensional tests as would be expected. Also, these studies did not report the items composing the central construct so it cannot be determined whether it is situational judgment or another dominant construct (such as conscientiousness). However, Schmitt and Chan (2006) interpreted these findings as evidence that the construct is
indeed situational judgment; they suggested that SJTs assess one dominant construct (i.e., situational judgment) that explains more variance than other constructs measured by the test.

Cronbach and Meehl (2006) suggested studying subgroup differences as the third method of analyzing what construct(s) a test measures. If a construct should theoretically yield subgroup differences and a test displays them, the test may be a measure of the construct. In the case of situational judgment, as discussed earlier this construct may be related to knowledge (either declarative or procedural). One would therefore expect subgroup differences displayed by SJTs; respondents with low knowledge should score lower on a measure of situational judgment than those with high knowledge. As noted earlier, McDaniel et al. (2001) reported an average correlation of $\rho = .07$ between SJT scores and experience. This weak relationship does not give evidence supporting the inference that situational judgment may be measured by SJTs.

Test-retest reliability was the fourth method Cronbach and Meehl (1955) suggested for examining what construct(s) a test measures. If theory dictates that a construct should be stable over time and a test exhibits high test-retest reliability, the test may measure the construct. On the other hand, if theory suggests a construct should change over time and a test shows change over time in the hypothesized direction, the test may measure the construct. There is no theory of situational judgment, but descriptions offered can be a starting point for making hypotheses.

As discussed, situational judgment may be related to knowledge. If this is the case, SJT scores should not stay the same over long periods of time because gains in knowledge that (presumably) come with time should increase the score on the SJT. Therefore high test-reliability would not be expected; instead it would be expected that SJT scores would increase over time. Firm conclusions regarding this cannot be made because no long-term study of SJTs has been conducted. In a typical short-term study of SJT reliability (i.e., two months or less), it
is unlikely respondents gained enough experience to significantly alter their situational judgment score. Future longitudinal studies of SJT test-retest reliability may help to answer this question.

It should be noted that high test-retest reliability has been shown over short periods of time. For instance, Ployhart, Porr, and Ryan (2004) reported a test-retest reliability estimate of .84 over a one month interval, and Becker (2004) reported an estimate of .71 over a two month interval. Ployhart and Ehrhart (2003) reported estimates ranging from .20 to .92 over a few weeks (across six different response formats), though some estimates had wide confidence intervals. It is encouraging to see these results because it suggests that the construct(s) assessed by SJTs are reliably measured. These test-retest reliability coefficients may be evidence of a stable individual difference component to the construct, though it is difficult to speculate without a formal theory.

Finally, Cronbach and Meehl (1955) suggested investigating process issues as the fifth method for studying what construct(s) a test measures. By this they referred to studying the process respondents go through as they complete the test. In the case of SJTs, this refers to the psychological process respondents go through to decide which response to the situation they will choose (i.e., “how” respondents choose a response). True process studies of this nature have not been conducted. However, some have offered useful suggestions on how to do so.

Ployhart’s (2006) Predictor Response Process (PRPR) Model offers a framework for understanding these processes. Drawing from Tourangeau, Rips, and Rasinski’s (2000) survey response process model, the PRPR model suggested there are five steps in the process of choosing a response to a predictor item: comprehension, retrieval, judgment, cognitive response selection, and behavioral response selection. He suggested future studies can formulate research questions using this model, such as conducting a cognitive task analysis of completing an SJT.
Research such as this could help determine what strategies respondents use for each step in the process; perhaps procedural knowledge could be linked to the retrieval step, or heuristics and biases could be linked to the judgment step. Understanding the process of completing an SJT would help determine what is measured by the SJT.

Similarly, Brooks and Highhouse (2006) discussed the use of judgment and decision making literature in studying situational judgment, and their suggestions could also help examine the process of completing an SJT. For instance, they suggested reaction time studies: measuring the amount of time necessary to complete an SJT item and comparing it to the amount of time necessary to complete a cognitive ability item. Completing an cognitive ability test should require complete analysis and no intuition, but (as discussed earlier) completing an SJT may require both intuition and analysis. Because intuition is a quicker process than analysis, comparing times across different items could be informative of the relative contributions of intuition and analysis to the process of completing SJT items. Differences between the amount of time taken to complete SJTs and cognitive ability tests may be attributed (in part) to differences in the contributions of analysis and intuition required of each test. Studies such as these would help examine the role the analysis-intuition continuum plays in situational judgment.

In the absence of explicit SJT process studies, Schmitt and Chan (2006) suggested studying the correlations between SJTs and other common predictor variables as a surrogate method of looking at the process of completing SJTs. Much research reports on this issue. As previously discussed, meta-analysis has found correlations (of varying magnitudes) between SJT scores and cognitive ability, experience, and personality (Chan & Schmitt, 2002; McDaniel et al., 2001; McDaniel & Nguyen, 2001; Weekley & Ployhart, 2005). Overall, SJTs are consistently correlated with other common predictors. However, Schmitt and Chan suggested that because
these correlations are somewhat modest, SJTs must be more than proxy measures of these correlates. In other words, they argued that SJTs likely also measure an additional construct in addition to these other constructs.

The present discussion regarding SJT construct validity started with the inference that SJTs measure situational judgment and discussed different pieces of evidence that were informative about this inference. What has the discussion yielded about this inference? Factor analytic results and correlations with other predictors suggest some dominant construct may be measured by SJTs which Schmitt and Chan (2006) interpreted to be situational judgment. If SJTs are thought to be related to knowledge, subgroup differences suggest situational judgment may be this dominant construct. Overall, Schmitt and Chan interpreted all these results to suggest “although SJTs can be construed as a method that can be used to assess different constructs . . . the dominant constructs are probably conceptually distinct from established constructs” (p. 148). Although SJTs may measure many constructs, according to Schmitt and Chan the dominant construct measured (situational judgment) is conceptually different from traditional correlates. Situational judgment is present regardless of how the SJT is constructed; it is an inherent part of the SJT.

*Isolating Method and Construct Variance to Test for Situational Judgment*

As stated, the goal of the current study was to test for evidence of situational judgment in SJTs. The presence of this evidence would support the inference that SJTs measure situational judgment. The previous discussion examined findings from the SJT literature to draw indirect conclusions about this inference. The current study suggested that a direct method for examining if SJTs measure situational judgment is to isolate method and construct variance contributions in
the SJT observed score. By isolating the construct contribution, its nature and magnitude can be studied.

There are many factors that contribute to a test’s observed score, such as error variance, method variance, and the true score of the targeted construct (in this case, situational judgment). Isolating the relative contributions of method, construct, and error variance to a test’s observed score can answer a number of questions regarding the inference that SJTs measure situational judgment. First of all, it can help determine if SJTs measure any construct, or if the observed score only reflects method variance. If all variance contributions are isolated and there is no construct contribution, this would suggest SJTs do not measure situational judgment (because no construct is being measured). If there is a construct contribution, once it is isolated from method and error contributions it can be individually studied to determine its nature (and specifically to see if it is situational judgment or some other construct). The multitrait-multimethod (MTMM) matrix design is a useful method of separating variance contributions in observed scores.

Campbell and Fiske (1959) introduced the idea of the MTMM matrix as a method of isolating the contributions of construct and method to the observed score. This design measures at least two different constructs (which should theoretically be unrelated) and uses at least two separate methods. If multiple constructs are measured using multiple methods, there are three types of relationships (i.e., correlations) to consider. The first, monotrait-heteromethod correlation, are correlations between scores for the same construct measured across different methods. In the MTMM design, the researcher desires these correlations to be high. The second type of correlation to consider in this design is heterotrait-monomethod, or correlations between different constructs measured using the same method. Ideally these correlations should be low; if these correlations are high, it implies there is high method variance contributing to the
observed scores. Finally, heterotrait-heteromethod correlations are analyzed. These correlations should also be low. Ideally, the strongest relationship should be between the same construct measured by different methods. This would support high construct contributions to variance. But if the strongest relationship is between different constructs measured by the same methods, this may suggest high method contributions.

To date, only one study has applied the MTMM design to the study of SJTs (Westring, Oswald, Schmitt, Drzakowski, Imus, Kim, & Shivpuri, 2009). The goal of their study was to isolate construct and situation variance components from SJT scores. Their approach was similar to the current study; they also created an MTMM design in which SJTs measured multiple constructs (which they referred to as “traits”). The multiple constructs their SJTs measured were three dimensions of goal orientation (mastery, performance-approach, and performance-avoid). However, instead of measuring the constructs using different methods (as the current study did), they considered each item to be a different situation. Therefore their study measured different constructs using different situations/items (rather than different methods); in other words, item variance was a surrogate for situational variance in their study. Situational variance in their study can be seen as similar (though not identical) to method variance in the current study.

Westring et al. (2009) found SJT scores to have both construct and situation (i.e., item) variance contributions. If the current study’s findings were similar to Westring et al.’s study, the current study would also find both construct and method variance components. This is expected; previous researchers have hypothesized that SJTs are a function of both the method used and all constructs assessed. Westring et al. further found that the situation variance contribution was larger than the construct contribution, which may also suggest that the current study would find a
larger method variance contribution than the construct variance contribution. However, their study does not directly address the goal of the current study, which was to find evidence of a judgment construct. Therefore the current study, while similar to Westring et al., extends their findings to address a different research question.

Although the MTMM design has not been extensively employed to study SJTs, it has been very prominent in assessment center literature (Lance, Lambert, Gewin, Lievens, & Conway, 2004; Lievens & Conway, 2001). In this line of research, different assessment center exercises (i.e. multiple methods) measure many of the same constructs (i.e. multiple constructs). The MTMM research design analyzes the correlation matrix to see what the highest correlations are: monotrait-heteromethod or heterotrait-monomethod. Using the MTMM design, a recent meta-analysis (Bowler & Woehr, 2006) concluded that exercise factors (i.e., methods) were more highly correlated than dimension factors (i.e., constructs). In other words, heterotrait-monomethod correlations were higher than monotrait-heteromethod correlations, thus suggesting method variance may be greater than construct variance in assessment centers. In this manner, the MTMM design can help determine which has a stronger presence in assessment center exercises: method or construct variance.

The MTMM design can be used in the study of SJTs to examine situational judgment. By administering multiple measures of situational judgment as well as multiple constructs, an analysis could be performed that is similar to that of assessment centers. Specifically, once method and construct contributions to variance are isolated, it can be determined if there is a significant construct contribution or if only a method contribution is present in SJTs.
The Current Study

The current study used the MTMM design to isolate the situational judgment variance contribution from an SJT observed score. I measured judgment using different methods (i.e., two SJTs and an in-basket exercise). I also measured other constructs that should be less related to judgment (personality and cognitive ability). I hypothesized that SJTs will measure situational judgment, in addition to conscientiousness and cognitive ability. Specifically, I hypothesized that there will be a situational judgment variance contribution to the overall observed SJT variance, once the method and other construct contributions are isolated.
METHOD

Participants

215 undergraduate students participated in this study for classroom extra credit. Eight cases were removed because they did not correctly answer a comprehension screening question. Two cases were removed for having no job experience. Because one of the SJTs used workplace examples (see Materials section for a fuller description of this measure) these two cases may not have had the knowledge or experience necessary to respond to these situations. Finally, one case was removed for not completing the in-basket activity. This resulted in a final sample of 204 useable cases. The final sample was 65% female and 74% Caucasian.

Materials

In-Basket Exercise: The in-basket was adapted from an activity used by a university freshmen-orientation class. It asked participants to imagine they were in their senior year. Having them imagine they were in their senior year was part of the study’s recruiting strategy; participants were told that being in the study may give them insight into what it is like being an undergraduate senior. A simulation email inbox with six interrelated emails was created for this study; participants turned on the computer to see the inbox open in front of them containing the six emails. Appendix C shows the in-basket exercise emails and Appendix D shows the in-basket exercise packet.

Although the content, format, and design of in-baskets can be diverse, there are aspects that are common to all of them (Schippmann, Prien, & Katz, 1990). For instance, they typically include multiple items that are representative of what the person would encounter in the specified situation. The items typically vary in importance and are often interrelated. The present in-basket was typical in these respects. There were many interrelated items in the in-basket, and
some were described as necessitating more urgency than others (see Appendix C to see each item). For instance, there were two items (emails #3 and #5) deemed “critical” by the coding team; these items represented urgent matters that would represent a serious lack of judgment and/or conscientiousness if not attended to. There were two items (emails #4 and #6) that were deemed to be of moderate importance. One item (email #2) provided details necessary for the other items. Finally, there was one item (email #1) that was deemed to be of little importance.

There are no common dimensions measured by all in-baskets; rather, job analyses are typically conducted to determine what dimensions the organization needs to have measured (Thornton & Mueller-Hanson, 2004; Thornton & Rupp, 2006). Because the focus of this study was an MTMM research design, judgment and conscientiousness must be assessed by the in-basket. Therefore these two dimensions were measured (see “In-Basket Pilot Study and Scoring Key Creation” for how these dimensions were assessed using the in-basket).

There is a precedent for measuring these constructs using assessment centers. In their meta-analysis, Arthur et al. (2003) identified judgment/decision-making as one of five dimensions commonly assessed by assessment centers. Eight studies explicitly measured judgment and 27 studies measured decision making/decisive/decisiveness. On the other hand, conscientiousness is not as commonly measured by assessment centers. They reported only one study that measured conscientiousness in this context. However, they listed organizing and planning (which is one facet of conscientiousness) as another dimension that is commonly assessed by assessment centers. Therefore there is some precedent for measuring judgment and conscientiousness in these contexts.

A common method of scoring in-baskets is to create an objective scoring key beforehand. This method of scoring is helpful because it reduces subjectivity in the scoring process. Some
have also argued that this method should increase interrater reliability (Hakstian & Scratchley, 1997) and possibly increase predictive validity (Kesselman, Lopez, & Lopez, 1982). Therefore a pilot study was conducted to create a scoring key. This process followed the same guidelines suggested and used by others (Brannick et al., 1989; Hakstian, Woolsey, & Schroeder, 1986; Kesselman et al., 1982).

First, a pilot study was conducted to have subject matter experts complete the in-basket. Eight students from an advanced undergraduate psychology class served as subject matter experts for this portion of the pilot study. Using their materials, a list of all possible responses to each in-basket item was compiled (with additions from the author and a team of coders, as is typically done).

Prior to scoring, the coders received training on how to score the in-basket response items; Appendices E and F show training material provided for judgment and conscientiousness, respectively. These training materials were created based on background literature of the constructs. They included definitions of the constructs as well as how they specifically applied to the present study. This was followed by an extensive discussion regarding the constructs to be measured and practice responses to score.

Next, the coding team scored each response item as either “neutral,” “positive,” or “negative” on each of the two dimensions (judgment and conscientiousness). To aid in distinguishing between the two dimensions, separate coders were used for each dimension; two coders rated response items on judgment, two separate coders rated response items on conscientiousness. The judgment coders were not aware that conscientiousness was also being scored, and vice versa. Consensus on each item was determined. This process resulted in all pre-determined responses to have an assigned score. Appendix G shows the section of the
scoring key referring to email #2 (regarding a reimbursement request). Although there was some overlap between what was considered positive and negative across the two constructs, Appendix G shows that there were also differences across the two groups.

Two scores for each in-basket dimension were determined for the in-basket exercise; therefore judgment and conscientiousness each had two scores from the in-basket. As stated, the first score was determined using the key devised in the pilot study. Every action performed by a participant in the in-basket was given a score of either “1,” “0,” or “-1” according to the scoring key. Points were totaled for the score. This was repeated for each dimension. These scores are represented as the “Judgment Score” and “Conscientiousness Score” variables.

A second score for each dimension was also calculated. After scoring each in-basket using the scoring key, an overall score on a five-point Likert scale was given. These scores are represented as the “Judgment Rating” and “Conscientiousness Rating” variables. Thus, four variables were derived from the in-basket.

A random 10% sample of in-baskets was scored by two coders. Table 3 shows the inter-rater reliabilities for each of the four in-basket variables. Because acceptable inter-rater reliability was demonstrated, the remainder of the in-baskets was scored by one coder.

**Situational Judgment:** Situational judgment was measured by two measures containing situational dilemmas. Each represented a different content domain: academic and workplace. Because so little work has focused on SJTs across different settings, it is important to see if judgment operates differently across various situations or if it truly is “independent of the nature of the situation” (Schmitt & Chan, 2006, 147). For that reason, two SJTs from different areas were used.
Like in-baskets, the content, format, and design of SJTs are diverse. However, Weekley and Ployhart (2006) offered some aspects common to all SJTs. SJTs provide situations the participant will likely encounter in the specified domain as well as multiple responses to the situation. Participants make some sort of judgment about the responses. Whether participants are asked to judge if they would perform a response or judge if the response is an effective alternative differs across SJTS (see next paragraph for a discussion of response format). Because the SJTs that were used in the current study followed the general guidelines suggested by Weekley and Ployhart, they can be seen as representative of typical SJTs.

When designing SJTs, there are two commonly used response formats: knowledge (“what should you do”) versus behavioral-tendency (“what would you do”) as previously discussed. Although there is no clear consensus among the literature as to which is the better format, I believe the behavioral-tendency format is better for the current study because behavioral-tendency SJTs are less cognitively loaded than knowledge SJTs (Nguyen, Biderman, & McDaniel, 2005). Therefore the current study used the behavioral tendency format.

**Academic-Oriented SJT:** The first SJT was a 24 item measure that focused on academic situations. This measure was adapted from an SJT developed by Bess (2001). See Appendix H for the full scale. An example item is:

An exam is approaching in one of your classes. The class has been difficult but interesting for you so far. In studying for your exam, you should:

A. carry books with you to various places and try to study in-between other obligations

B. find that often times there are too many interruptions to study consistently before an exam
C. want to start studying early but find that other things end up getting done instead

D. schedule blocks of time to study in one location a week or two before the exam

Workplace-Oriented SJT: Situational judgment was also measured by the Work Judgment Survey, a 31 item work-oriented measure (Smith & McDaniel, 1998). Minor modifications to the response instructions were made to match the response instructions of the academic-oriented SJT, though no modifications to the item content was made. Even though the scenarios were not academic-oriented, they were still appropriate for undergraduate students because they were general enough to apply to any work environment such as part-time low-responsibility jobs undergraduate students may have (McDaniel, personal communication, October 31, 2007). See Appendix I for the full scale. An example item is:

You are overqualified for your job and this makes you bored and unhappy. In the near future you intend to look for another job but that does not help you right now.

A. Keep quiet and do your work

B. Ask your boss for more challenging work

C. Begin looking around for other jobs for the next year

D. Involve yourself in enjoyable activities outside work

E. Just give up and quit.

A pilot study was also conducted to create scoring keys for the SJTs. Answer keys for the two SJTs do exist, but it was recommended to create a scoring key unique to this study’s population because norms differ across universities (M. Mullins, personal communication, October 31, 2007). Analyses were run using both scoring keys (the original scoring keys and the
scoring keys created for the current study). Correlations between the major study variables and the SJTs were not markedly different across the two scoring keys. However, the SJTs performed slightly less well than would be expected using the original scoring keys (e.g., the work-oriented SJT did not correlate with conscientiousness using the original scoring key as would be expected by theory, but these two scales were correlated using the scoring key created for this study). Therefore it was decided to use the scoring keys created for the current study rather than the original scoring keys.

Creating the SJT scoring keys followed a procedure similar to that used by Bergman, Drasgow, Donovan, Henning, and Juraska (2006). This pilot study used twenty graduate and upper-level undergraduate students as subject matter experts. They completed the SJTs in the same manner participants did by indicating which option they would most likely and least likely perform in the situation. To score each question, an option was considered a correct response if at least one-third of the subject matter experts selected it as their “most likely” option and was considered an incorrect response if at least one-third of the subject matter experts selected it as the their “least likely” option. All other options were considered neutral. This allowed for multiple correct and incorrect answers for each item (twelve questions on the academic-oriented SJT and 22 questions on the work-oriented SJT had multiple correct or incorrect answers). Also, this scoring method resulted in some items having no correct or incorrect answers (each SJT had one item with no correct or incorrect answer). This process resulted in all responses to have an assigned score.

Although each SJT question had two parts (“what would you most likely do” and “what would you least likely do?”), only the “most likely” option was used to create each participant’s SJT score. For the “most likely” score, participants received a “1” if they selected a correct
option (see above) or a “0” if they selected any other option. Scoring was similar to the in-basket; all points were totaled for a final score. This was repeated for each SJT.

**Conscientiousness:** Conscientiousness was measured using twenty-nine adjectives factor analytically derived by Hofstee, de Raad, and Goldberg (1992). This measure of conscientiousness assessed two sub-dimensions of the construct: organization and responsibility. An example adjective measuring organization is “orderly;” an example adjective measuring responsibility is “dependable.” See Appendix J for the full scale.

**Cognitive Ability:** Cognitive ability was measured with the Personnel Tests for Industry – Verbal Test Form A (Wesman, Doppelt, & Langmuir, 1969). This is a five-minute fifty-item measure of cognitive ability. See Appendix K for the full measure. A sample item is:

Which means furious?

a. hairy
b. angry
c. distant
d. rarely

**Demographics:** Information regarding gender, race/ethnicity, year of study, major, age, SAT score, ACT score, and job experience was collected. See Appendix L for the full measure.

**Comprehension:** A one-item comprehension screening question was asked to assess if the participant put effort into the in-basket exercise. The question was “You were just elected as an officer in an organization. What is your position?”

**Procedure**

For recruitment purposes, potential participants were told the purpose of this study was to analyze academic and workplace success. They were told that they would complete an exercise
(similar to ones used by businesses) asking them to imagine they are in their senior year. In addition to classroom extra credit, they were told they would gain insight into their academic and workplace behaviors, prepare for their senior year, and complete activities similar to those used in organizations.

When participants entered the lab, the experimenter first distributed both SJTs, the measure of conscientiousness, and the demographic survey (counterbalanced to minimize order effects). Next, the experimenter distributed the in-basket exercise packet and read the instructions printed on the first page. The participants then had fifteen minutes to complete the activity. After this, the experimenter collected the materials from the participants and distributed the comprehension test for participants to complete. Next the experimenter had participants complete the cognitive ability measure (allowing only five minutes to complete it). Finally, participants could finish any materials not yet completed, including the SJTs, conscientiousness measure, demographics survey, or the comprehension test. After this they were thanked and free to leave.
RESULTS

Descriptive Statistics

Internal consistency was acceptable for the conscientiousness measure (alpha = .90). As discussed, the academic-oriented SJT had 24 questions (though one question was removed because the scoring key yielded no correct answer, resulting in 23 items originally). Initial alpha was .31; after removing nine negatively intercorrelated items the final alpha was .65. The work-oriented SJT had 31 questions (though one question was also removed because of no correct answer, yielding 30 questions to start). The original alpha was .53; after removing nine negatively intercorrelated items the final alpha was .67.

Internal consistency was also analyzed for the in-basket. The scoring key yielded a score for each construct for each of the six emails. Therefore alpha was computed for each construct treating each email as an item on a scale. Standardized alpha was used because each item had a different total possible score. The “judgment” in-basket construct displayed poor internal consistency (alpha = .22), but no item displayed a negative inter-item correlation. The conscientiousness in-basket construct also displayed poor internal consistency (alpha = .13). One item (email #6) displayed a negative item-total correlation; removing this item raised alpha to .21. Because this alpha is still low (and because removing this item did not significantly alter subsequent analyses), all results reported include the full six items for the conscientiousness in-basket score.

See Table 4 for minimum, maximum, mean, and standard deviation values of the study variables. Table 5 shows intercorrelations of the study variables. The correlation matrix yields a number of notable results. First, it should be noted that cognitive ability did not significantly
correlate with the academic SJT. This was unexpected; SJTs have consistently correlated with cognitive ability in previous literature (McDaniel et al., 2001).

As a demographic variable, participants reported their ACT score. Self-reported ACT score was significantly correlated with cognitive ability \((r = .65, p < .01)\). Also, self-reported ACT score significantly correlated with the work-oriented SJT \((r = .35, p < .01)\) as would be expected by theory if it was measuring cognitive ability. Therefore self-reported ACT score was included in analyses as a supplemental measure of cognitive ability.

In general, there were not large differences between correlations of the study variables with in-basket “Judgment” scores and correlations of the study variables with in-basket conscientiousness scores. In other words, the in-baskets variables were similarly correlated with most variables. This suggests they may have been measuring the same construct. In further support of this, the correlation between the in-basket “Judgment” score and the conscientiousness score was \(.86, p < .01\), and the correlation between the in-basket “Judgment” rating and the conscientiousness rating was \(.65, p < .01\).

Another important finding from the correlation matrix is that neither SJT was significantly correlated with either in-basket “Judgment” score (with the exception of the work SJT and the “Judgment” score, \(r = .14, p < .05\)). I hypothesized that SJTs would measure (among other constructs) judgment; the lack of correlation indicates that the SJT did not measure judgment as assessed by the in-basket. Therefore the hypothesis was not supported.

*Model Testing*

Although the correlation matrix indicated the hypothesis was not supported, structural equation modeling was still conducted to try to explain the data. This process was empirically-
rather than theory-driven. Although this method does not inform theory or future research, it can help understand the current study’s data.

First, it should be noted that no model that included the cognitive ability measure would successfully run. It was therefore removed from all analyses (as an observed variable; it was retained as a latent variable). Instead, self-reported ACT score was used in its place. Because self-reported ACT is not assessed via the same method as the other paper-and-pencil measures so it was not set to load on any method factor.

Because the SJTs did not correlate with the in-basket judgment measures, the latent variable “Judgment” was removed from the model. Models that included both “Conscientiousness” and “Cognitive Ability” as latent variables would not run so models with each latent variable separate were run. Appendix M shows the best-fitting model for the cognitive ability-only model (Model A). Standardized regression weights are listed on each path. Table 6 lists goodness-of-fit indices which show that there was little support for fit; only two out of nine tests indicated model fit. Also, Table 7 shows the full listing of regression weight parameters. The parameter estimates suggest strong method factors. However, the construct factor (cognitive ability) loadings were smaller.

Unexpectedly, the model would not run unless the cognitive ability latent variable loaded on the four in-basket scores. Neither loading was strong, but theoretically there should be no loading (since cognitive ability as a constructs should theoretically not be related to conscientiousness and possibly not judgment). This may be partially explained by rater halo; if the rater of the in-baskets perceived participants to be high in cognitive ability, the rater may have also rated them higher on the in-basket.
Finally, Appendix N shows the best-fitting model for the conscientiousness-only model (Model B). Standardized regression weights are listed on each path. Table 6 lists goodness-of-fit indices which show little support for fit; only three out of nine tests indicated model fit.

Table 8 shows the full listing of regression weight parameters. The parameter estimates show moderate loadings of conscientiousness on the conscientiousness variables. However, it loaded higher on the in-basket conscientiousness scores than on the paper-and-pencil conscientiousness score, which is unexpected. Also, its loadings on the SJTs are weaker than in Model A.

In general, neither of the empirically-derived models showed strong overall model fit. It is clear that there are strong method factors, and it is clear that the construct factors are not as strong. Besides this, it is not possible to make strong statements about the models due to the poor model fit.
DISCUSSION

The goal of this study was to examine what is measured by SJTs. As expected, both SJTs were correlated with conscientiousness and the work-oriented SJT was correlated with cognitive ability. Strong evidence was also found supporting method factors in the MTMM design (as compared to construct factors). The main finding, though, was that the SJTs did not correlate with the in-basket judgment measures (with the exception of the work-oriented SJT and the “Judgment” score). Provided that the in-basket was a good measure of judgment, this may suggest that the SJTs did not measure judgment.

How do the findings of this study compare to previous literature? This study started with the inference that SJTs measure judgment. A common argument in the SJT literature supporting this inference is that because SJTs predict incremental variance in performance beyond cognitive ability and conscientiousness, they must measure a unique construct (Clevenger et al., 2001; Schmitt & Chan, 2006; Weekley & Ployhart, 2005). Although the present study did not measure performance, it should be noted that together cognitive ability and conscientiousness predicted little variance in the SJTs ($R^2 = .10$ for the work-oriented SJT and $R^2 = .05$ for the academic-oriented SJT). Given that these two variables did not predict much variability in the SJTs, it is likely the SJTs measure more than just these two constructs.

Earlier I also discussed different methods for analyzing the validity of the inference that SJTs measure situational judgment (Cronbach & Meehl, 1955). Though it is difficult to say with certainty without a theory of situational judgment, prior literature suggests that judgment measured by SJTs should display internal consistency and moderately correlate with cognitive ability and conscientiousness (Schmitt & Chan, 2006). The present study found this. As discussed, both SJTs displayed acceptable internal consistency (however it should be noted that a
large number of items had to be removed in order to achieve this internal consistency for both SJTs. Also, both SJTs were correlated with conscientiousness, and the work-oriented SJT was correlated with cognitive ability (the correlation between the academic-oriented SJT and cognitive ability was nonsignificant). Therefore the current SJTs primarily supported validity inferences as expected by previous literature.

The present study’s findings were similar to those of Westring et al. (2009) who also employed a MTMM design to examine SJTs. The goal of their study, though, was to compare construct to situational variance of SJTs, rather than comparing construct to method variance which was the goal of the current study. Instead of using multiple measures (to study method variance), they considered each item of the SJT to be a different situation (thus measuring situational variance). Each response option for the items represented a different construct (specifically: mastery, performance-approach, or performance-prove goal orientation).

Although Westring et al. (2009) found that situational variance was greater than construct variance, they did find evidence suggesting that their SJT assessed some constructs better than others (specifically: performance-avoid goal orientation was better assessed with the SJT than the other two constructs). These findings were similar to the current study’s findings which also found some evidence to suggest construct factors. However, it is unclear what constructs were measured by the SJTs in either study.

Therefore, the findings of this study regarding the SJTs are in agreement with previous literature. In general, this study’s SJTs operated as expected and were representative of typical SJTs. According to previous literature, the current SJTs would suggest that they measure a unique construct beyond conscientiousness and cognitive ability that may be judgment.
Unfortunately, the main hypothesis of this study (that the SJTs would correlate with the in-basket judgment scores) was not supported.

Therefore the question of what SJTs measure is still not answered. The results from the present study may suggest that SJTs measure conscientiousness and/or cognitive ability, but it may also be that SJTs measure a separate construct that is correlated with conscientiousness and/or cognitive ability. The results from this study may also suggest that SJTs do not measure judgment, but this assumes judgment operates the same for SJTs and in-baskets. The difficulty with interpreting this study’s findings is a result of a lack of a theory and definition of situational judgment. Such a theory could address many of these questions. In general, the absence of a theory of situational judgment makes it difficult to examine what it is SJTs measure. As discussed, Cronbach and Meehl (1955) discussed five methods of determining construct validity. However, all five of their methods require a theory of the construct in some form.

What would such a theory look like? There are many aspects of situational judgment that should be addressed in order to develop a theory of the construct. First (and perhaps most relevant to the SJT literature), it should be decided if related constructs such as conscientiousness and cognitive ability are part of judgment, or if they are separate constructs that should be correlated with judgment. Currently it cannot be said if this study’s findings were due to judgment being related to these constructs or if the SJT directly measured these constructs. Examining this issue would address these questions.

Another avenue that should be explored when discussing the development of a theory of situational judgment is how the outcome of judgment is defined. Currently, the lack of a definition of judgment resulted in the current study defining the outcome of judgment as “making a good decision.” In organizational literature, a “good decision” is inherently thought
of as a decision that leads to a productive outcome. But in some situations, it may be less important to be task-oriented and more important to be interpersonally-oriented. In other words, good judgment may dictate what kind of outcome one should attain. Therefore there may be different outcome foci of judgment.

An example of differing foci of judgment can be seen in the moral judgment literature. Kohlberg (1986) discussed moral judgment in terms of universal human rights. According to him, the highest level of moral judgment development is signified by a focus on issues of justice. On the other hand, Gilligan (1982) suggested a common theme of moral judgment is to not hurt others. This view suggests the highest level of moral development is signified by interpersonal sensitivity. Neither view of moral judgment is better or worse than the other, nor do the two views necessarily conflict with each other. This is the same for different outcomes of judgment. Good judgment does not necessitate being interpersonally-focused or task-focused. At different times one outcome focus may be more appropriate than another.

Addressing this aspect of the theory of situational judgment would also address a limitation to the current study. Because participants were not told what outcome they should focus on when exhibiting judgment (e.g., whether they should be task-focused or interpersonally-focused), some participants may have been task-focused when completing the SJT or in-basket while others may have been interpersonally-focused.

For example, a theory of situational judgment may treat task-focused judgment and interpersonally-focused judgment as separate constructs. This specifically has implications for future studies that compare SJTs to in-baskets. If SJTs and in-baskets are considered to be methods that measure the same construct, comparisons between them should only be made if the only factor that differs between them is the method (Arthur & Villado, 2008). A future study
comparing SJTs to in-baskets should construct them both so that they measure the same aspect of judgment.

Another issue regarding a theory of situational judgment pertains to whether or not situational judgment operates the same across different methods. In-baskets may be better able to assess one’s judgment. In-basket scenarios typically involve multiple items that are inter-related. The respondent is forced not just to consider each item individually, but in the larger context of how it affects and how it affected all other items. SJTs, by contrast, typically do not require respondents to consider items in a larger context. Each SJT question is typically unrelated to the other questions so respondents are not forced to make global decisions. In-baskets may require a different level of judgment (such as thinking globally instead of locally about one isolated situation) so may better assess the construct.

With this in mind, it may be possible to construct SJTs that better assess judgment by creating them to be more like in-baskets. Specifically, SJTs could be written such that each question is related to one central situation. Responses to one question may affect the response to another question. Electronic SJTs may incorporate branching, where how a participant responds to one question determines what his or her next question is.

In addition to the limitations previously discussed, one final concern with the current study was the high correlation between judgment and conscientiousness as measured by the in-basket. As discussed, these variables were strongly correlated. The correlations were so high as to suggest that they may not have measured different constructs. Therefore this study’s in-basket may have instead measured one ambiguous construct. This limitation results in difficulty in interpreting statements using these variables.
Future research should address these concerns. Specifically, in-baskets can be constructed as to better distinguish between situations requiring good judgment and situations requiring good conscientiousness. As discussed, there were some instances in this study’s in-basket that reflected either good judgment or good conscientiousness (but not both), but there were not many. Future studies could design in-baskets that incorporated more scenarios that separate the two constructs. Doing this will help better measure the constructs (by measuring them separately instead of one ambiguous construct) and thus allow stronger statements about the relationships they display to be made.

Conclusions

In conclusion, it is still unclear what SJTs measure. Because this study did not find a relationship between the SJTs and the in-basket judgment measures, the findings may suggest SJTs do not measure judgment. Though this may be true, further studies should be conducted before it can be determined. One important step toward determining this, though, is to develop a theory of situational judgment. As discussed, there are many avenues that can be explored that will help determine what situational judgment is. Once a theory is established, we can then develop SJTs based on this theory of the construct.

To further the current state of SJT literature, it is crucial to establish whether a SJT is a method, a construct, or a method that measures multiple constructs. Because researchers disagree as to whether or not an SJT is a method or a construct, one study may examine an SJT as a method and another may examine it as a construct. As discussed by Arthur and Villado (2008), it is inappropriate to make comparisons of findings between methods and constructs as if they were the same, and this is unfortunately common in the SJT literature. Statements made
comparing these two studies do not logically make sense. In order to further understand and use SJTs, efforts must be made to determine what it is they measure.
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APPENDIX A: HYPOTHESES MODEL 1

[Diagram showing relationships between variables such as Conscientiousness, Cognitive Ability, Academic SJT, Work SJT, Judgment Score, Judgment Rating, and Conscientiousness Score.]
APPENDIX B: HYPOTHESESIZED MODEL 2
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Email #1

From: "Bernard Weisser, Department of General Studies" <bweisser@bgsu.edu>
To: "Chris Cebular" <ccbula@bgnet.bgsu.edu>
Subject: Spread the Word!

Our department has made it a practice for several years to ask senior majors to help spread the word about our program. There are two ways we invite you to do this.

First, we will be holding a series of open meetings for current students who might be interested in becoming majors to come talk with faculty and current majors. We invite you to join us at the Ohio Suite on the 3rd floor of the Union. Refreshments will be served.

The meeting will start at 3:30 on Wednesday, November 7, 2007.

Second, new this year, we are inviting our top five students to serve as Ambassadors. The Ambassadors will visit area high schools and talk about their experiences in our department and at BGSU. Current students can do more to spread the word about the good things happening in this department and on this campus than any marketing campaign ever devised. Your job would be to give a brief talk about your experiences at BGSU, and hand out recruiting information for the university and our department. We will set up and coordinate the visits, provide transportation, etc. Please let me know as soon as possible if this opportunity interests you, and I will set up a meeting with you and the other four seniors I am contacting to work out the details.

I hope to hear from you soon.

Sincerely,

Bud

Bernard Weisser, Ph.D.
Professor and Chair
Email #2

From: "Pat Silverwood" <psilverwood@bgsu.edu>
To: "Chris P. Cebular" <cebula@bgnet.bgsu.edu>
Subject: Fwd: Reimbursement?

Congratulations on being elected Treasurer! I am so glad that you got the most votes! Ziggie could have done the job, but you are so much better organized than any of us.

And Adam Trombley’s election as President! I know you are friends. Phi Omega Omega will be in great hands with the two of you.

The fun part of being Treasurer is that the club cannot function without you, and I know you will do a great job. It is not difficult – it just takes a few minutes each month, but you DO have to pay attention to details. And you can’t afford to get behind (like I did from time to time).

As a way of closing up my duties, I wanted to let you know how much money has been carried over from last year. At the beginning of September, we had $200.00.

I know you were elected at the start of September, and I am really sorry that I couldn’t get the attached report and other stuff over to you right away. I know you can handle it, though, because you’re so well organized all the time. I have attached a run-down of our plan for the year in case you need it. I think it’s all correct, but check it, just to be sure.

And also I am forwarding you an email from Adam (see below). I misplaced it, and just found it when collecting this stuff for you. I sent the check requisition to Student Activities just before the end of the month.

Pat

> Date: September 25, 2007
> From: Adam Trombley
> To: Pat Silverwood
> Subject: Reimbursement?
> 
> Pat:
> 
> I still haven’t gotten my reimbursement check from Student Activities for the expenses I turned in to you last month. They are usually pretty quick. Could you check with them to see what gives? Did you get the paperwork in? $130.25 is a lot of money, and I can’t afford to float the club any longer. Let me know what you find out as soon as possible.
> 
> Thanks,
> 
> Adam
Email #2 Attachment

Phi Omega Omega Honor Society
Revenue and Expense Estimates for Current School Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expected Revenue</th>
<th>Expected Expenses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carry forward</td>
<td>Speakers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$200.00</td>
<td>$250.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member Dues</td>
<td>End of Semester Party</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>210.00</td>
<td>200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Univ. allotment</td>
<td>Awards Dinner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>152.00</td>
<td>125.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributions</td>
<td>Advertising on campus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>287.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>$552.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>$862.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Email #3

From: "Adam Trombley" <atrombley@bgsu.edu>
To: "Chris P. Cebular" <cebula@bgnet.bgsu.edu>
Subject: Fwd: December Speaker Special Event

Help!

I tried to call you but you were already gone for the weekend. Here is a BIG problem.

I just found out that we have to start over on planning the speaker for December. The Special Event Planning Committee has completely fallen apart, and J. T. seems to have disappeared. I would like you to take this over for a few days and get the project started while I find someone who can take over from you. I know your hands are full already, but this project really needs leadership right now, so just get it started.

We usually schedule the speaker during the last week of classes before finals. The only problem is to not schedule the speaker during the end of the semester party, but the two events could be done together or on the same day. Anyway, I am forwarding you my email (see below) to the planning committee, and information about two potential speakers is attached to this email. Read through it and select the one you think would be best.

Both Frohberger and Jones were members of Phi Omega Omega when they were students here, so they are BG alums too. Let me know who you pick, and send the one you want an invitation letter right away.

Or maybe you should call the one you want. Either could have already booked something else for our date. Get us a speaker.

Once you get the speaker to agree to a date, start on the local arrangements, like reserving the room at the Union, get a motel reservation, order refreshments, notify the BG News and the Office of Student Activities, etc. I’ll get someone else to take this over, but the faster we get it started, the better our chance of success. I think we should use $250.00 for this event, and part of it could come from our publicity budget, since the speaker helps so much with member recruitment next semester.

Let me know who you pick. Thanks very much!!!

> Date: September 12, 2007
> From: Adam Trombley
> To: Special Event Planning Committee
> Subject: December Speaker Special Event
> 
> Thanks for agreeing to plan our special events for this year. We always have a good turnout, and these events are especially important because the publicity for them helps us to recruit new members.
The first event to plan is the December speaker. The following speakers have forwarded biographies for you to read. Both of them are former members, and would be proud to visit their “alma mater” to speak.

You all know the routine for selecting and scheduling, so I leave this task in your good hands. Let me know how I can help or answer any questions.

Thanks again!

Adam

Mitchell Frobinger1.doc

Ronald Jones1.doc
Dr. Mitchell Frohinger
Department of General Studies
The Pennsylvania State University
State College, PA 16802
(814) 555 – 1212
frob@psu.edu
Visit my web site at http://www.psu.edu/think/clearly

Biography:
Assistant Professor of General Studies at Penn State University since 2002.

After graduating from Bowling Green State University in Ohio in 1991, Frohinger worked first for the Cuyahoga County Consortium, a public-private partnership that assists students who are making the transition from school to work. This was followed by a year in Denver and then a year in Atlanta as an assistant administrator for programs delivered by a national service organization. In 1996 Frohinger moved to Minneapolis for graduate studies at the University of Minnesota, completing the Ph.D. degree in 2006.

Frohinger has developed quite a special skill in finding ways to help people to make the best of their circumstances, to get out of ruts, and to bring creativity and energy to bear on their problems. Frohinger’s multimedia presentation is titled “Leading from the Sidelines: How Gophers Can Become Top Dogs!”

Availability: (As of 08/27/2007)
November 19, 2007
December 17, 2007

Cost:
Travel expenses + $100.00 (travel is estimated at $250.00)
Biography:
Program Director and Senior Fellow at the Center for Creative Leadership, Greensboro, N.C., since 2002.

Jones credits part of his success to being Treasurer of Phi Omega Omega during his years as an undergrad at Bowling Green (Jones graduated from BGSU in 1989). “I learned how small groups really work, and how to get others to be excited and eager to try new things.”

This lead to an interest in how to apply new knowledge to tangible problems in the real world. Attending graduate school was a natural extension. After graduate study at Yale University and completion of the Ph.D. degree there in 1993, Jones’s interest in groups and applications produced a string of jobs in government, private corporations, and non-profit associations. It led, too, to foreign travel and additional studies in law, business, and education.

Jones is a highly sought consultant and speaker, due especially to having such diversity of work experiences. The title of Jones’s presentation is “If You’ve Got a Dream, Just Do It!”

Availability: (As of 08/31/2007)
December 10, 2007
December 17, 2007

Cost:
Travel expenses + $120.00 (travel is estimated at $350.00)
Email #4

From: "Adam Trombley" <atrombley@bgsu.edu>
To: "Chris P. Cebular" <cebula@bgnet.bgsu.edu>
Subject: End of the Semester Party

Chris

It’s time to start planning our end of the semester party. The planning committee was supposed to get started last month, but they haven’t made any progress so far. So here is the information I gave them about the last party. Pick two or three people to help you, and start making arrangements right away because there is not much time left – the rooms will be fully booked pretty soon, so we might have to hold the party somewhere else. Come to think of it, that might not be so bad after all – there has to be someplace better than the back room at Sam B’s. Maybe we can save some bucks, too. Maybe Pat can give you a hand, since being the Treasurer is no longer and excuse.

End of Semester Party
Cost of food and refreshments $210.00
Rent for Back Room at Sam B’s $35.00

We have budgeted $200, and I don’t know whether that’s very realistic given our revenue and other plans. So when you look at the overall budget, let me know how thing’s look.

In the meantime, pick a date, get us a reservation somewhere, and let’s have a blast!

Adam
Email #5

From: "Accounts Section - Office of Student Activities" <osaaccounts@bgsu.edu>
To: "Chris P. Cebular" <cebula@bgnet.bgsu.edu>
Subject: Reminder: Charter Status

Dear Treasurer:

The Office of Student Activities requires that a current budget be filed and approved before any check requisitions will be processed. Since we have not yet received your budget for this school year, your charter has been placed on “suspended” status. The suspension will be removed once your budget is filed in our office, and the processing of financial transactions will resume.

Please contact our office at your earliest convenience when your budget is ready. A copy of the standard budget format is attached with this email, for your convenience. If you have any questions, please contact us at 372-7734.

Sincerely,

Dexter F. Flatnoy, Supervisor
Accounts Section

[Annual Budget Plan1.doc]
Office of Student Activities

Annual Budget Plan

Use this form to furnish budget information for your club or organization. Return it to the Accounts Section before the start of the semester to assure uninterrupted access to club funds.

Name of club or organization: __________________________________________
Treasurer’s Name (Print): __________________________________________
Treasurer’s campus address: __________________________________________
Treasurer’s signature: __________________________________________
Date of submission: __________________________________________

Starting Balance (1): __________________

Estimated Revenue (list source and amount):
   University fee allocation __________________
   Member dues and fees __________________
   Contributions __________________
   Fund raising activities __________________
   Other __________________
   TOTAL Estimated Revenue (2): __________________

Estimated Expenses (list categories and amounts):

   __________________
   __________________
   __________________
   __________________
   __________________
   TOTAL Estimated Expenses (3): __________________

Estimated Ending Balance (add line 1 and line 2, subtract line 3, the result must be positive or the budget will be rejected). __________________
Email #6

From: "Office of Registration and Records" <orr@bgsu.edu>
To: "Chris P. Cebular" <ccebula@bgnet.bgsu.edu>
Subject: Application for Graduation

Dear Graduating Senior:

Just a reminder. You must apply for graduation this month in order to graduate in the spring commencement. Please apply for graduation at this office.

You must also order your cap and gown. Please contact the office for the appropriate forms. In order to graduate, you must have fulfilled all course requirements, and have paid your Bursar account balance in full. If you have any questions, please contact our office at 372-0000.

Sincerely,

Helen Waite
Office of Registration and Records
Today is a Day in Your SENIOR YEAR!

For this activity, pretend you are Chris Cebular, a senior at BGSU. **It is 3:45PM on Monday, October 15, 2007.** Your senior year started seven weeks ago. It’s Monday afternoon, and there are several emails in your inbox. You need to find out what’s here and handle it as well as possible in the next 15 minutes, before leaving to attend a senior seminar in your major. Your senior seminar, which starts at 4:00, will be done at 6:00, so offices may be closed after class.

*Not every email is so urgent that it should be handled immediately. Therefore, you don’t need to handle every email completely and in detail – some you may decide to ignore all together.* You need to determine what is important and needs to be handled now and what can wait until later. You’ll notice that the first email you see is the oldest; however, you can handle each email in whatever order you wish; you can read each in order, or you can skip the unimportant ones and only read the important ones. You may do whatever you think is the best strategy to respond to every important email within the 15 minute time limit.

**Remember: everything about this simulation (including dates, times, and deadlines) is real so you should handle each email how you actually would in real life.** You can handle each email however you wish. For instance, you can:
- Respond using email, such as replying to, forwarding, or composing a new email.
- Write yourself a note to take care of it later.
- Make a phone call.
- Set the email aside and handle it later.
- Or any other method you think is appropriate.

In addition to creating any necessary emails, you should also jot notes down on the following pages. Please rate each email on how important and how urgent it is even if you choose not to handle it right now. Also, please make note of any other actions you may wish to perform besides sending an email. *Please be as detailed as possible when explaining what you would do during the allotted 15 minutes.*

*Please pay attention to all dates and times on the emails.* They are all accurate. Remember, it is currently **3:45PM on Monday, October 15, 2007.**

**The key point to remember is:**
- *Not every email is so urgent that it should be handled immediately. Therefore, you don’t need to handle every email completely and in detail – some you may decide to ignore all together.*

You will only have 15 minutes to complete as much of this task as you can, so please budget your time accordingly so you can handle all the important items. Pay careful attention because you will be asked questions about the content of the simulation after. Your experimenter will tell you when your time is up.
Email (Subject: Spread the Word!)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Importance:</th>
<th></th>
<th>Urgency:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High _____</td>
<td>Handle NOW _____</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium ____</td>
<td>Handle today ____</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low ____</td>
<td>Handle this week ____</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None ____</td>
<td>Handle in 2-3 weeks ____</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Handle within 4 weeks ____</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Handle eventually ____</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No handling needed ____</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How will you handle this email? Please as many boxes as apply.

☐ Respond using email (there is no need to write the content of your email here).

☐ I will set this email aside and handle it later.

☐ Other (please describe what other action you will take to handle this email now).

__________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________

Email (Subject: Fwd: Reimbursement)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Importance:</th>
<th></th>
<th>Urgency:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High _____</td>
<td>Handle NOW _____</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium ____</td>
<td>Handle today ____</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low ____</td>
<td>Handle this week ____</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None ____</td>
<td>Handle in 2-3 weeks ____</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Handle within 4 weeks ____</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Handle eventually ____</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No handling needed ____</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How will you handle this email? Please as many boxes as apply.

☐ Respond using email (there is no need to write the content of your email here).

☐ I will set this email aside and handle it later.

☐ Other (please describe what other action you will take to handle this email now).

__________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________
### Email (Subject: Fwd: December Speaker Special Event)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Importance:</th>
<th>High _____</th>
<th>Medium _____</th>
<th>Low _____</th>
<th>None _____</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urgency:</td>
<td>Handle NOW _____</td>
<td>Handle today _____</td>
<td>Handle this week _____</td>
<td>Handle in 2-3 weeks _____</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How will you handle this email? Please as many boxes as apply.

- [ ] Respond using email (there is no need to write the content of your email here).
- [ ] I will set this email aside and handle it later.
- [ ] Other (please describe what other action you will take to handle this email now).

__________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________

### Email (Subject: End of the Semester Party)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Importance:</th>
<th>High _____</th>
<th>Medium _____</th>
<th>Low _____</th>
<th>None _____</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urgency:</td>
<td>Handle NOW _____</td>
<td>Handle today _____</td>
<td>Handle this week _____</td>
<td>Handle in 2-3 weeks _____</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How will you handle this email? Please as many boxes as apply.

- [ ] Respond using email (there is no need to write the content of your email here).
- [ ] I will set this email aside and handle it later.
- [ ] Other (please describe what other action you will take to handle this email now).

__________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________
Email (Subject: Reminder: Charter Status)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Importance:</th>
<th>High _____</th>
<th>Medium _____</th>
<th>Low _____</th>
<th>None _____</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| Urgency:    | Handle NOW _____ | Handle today _____ | Handle this week _____ | Handle in 2-3 weeks _____ | Handle within 4 weeks _____ | Handle eventually _____ | No handling needed _____ |

How will you handle this email? Please as many boxes as apply.

☐ Respond using email (there is no need to write the content of your email here).

☐ I will set this email aside and handle it later.

☐ Other (please describe what other action you will take to handle this email now).

__________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________

Email (Subject: Application for Graduation)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Importance:</th>
<th>High _____</th>
<th>Medium _____</th>
<th>Low _____</th>
<th>None _____</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| Urgency:    | Handle NOW _____ | Handle today _____ | Handle this week _____ | Handle in 2-3 weeks _____ | Handle within 4 weeks _____ | Handle eventually _____ | No handling needed _____ |

How will you handle this email? Please as many boxes as apply.

☐ Respond using email (there is no need to write the content of your email here).

☐ I will set this email aside and handle it later.

☐ Other (please describe what other action you will take to handle this email now).

__________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________
What is Judgment?

- Judgment usually refers to the ability to make decisions about how to respond to situations.
- Prediction is an inherent aspect of deciding how to respond to a situation: predicting what is the most effective method of response.
- This implies that a respondent possesses knowledge about how to attain effective outcomes.
- It includes:
  - the ability to navigate interpersonal situations
  - the knowledge of how to do so
    - procedural knowledge
    - declarative knowledge
- Judgment is sometimes thought of as the general "common sense" use of both analysis and intuition in deciding how to respond to a situation. This ability requires understanding when to rely on analysis and when to rely on intuition.
- A number of constructs are often discussed simultaneously with judgment because they are closely related to the construct and/or the test.
  - cognitive ability
  - experience
  - personality
  - adaptability (solving problems creatively or dealing with unpredictable situations)
- There are many ways it is assessed:
  - German military assessed practical ability by analyzing open-ended responses to a leadership-based scenario
  - US military measured judgment by asking assesses to compose "character sketches" of peers
- Effective judgment is typically operationalized as agreement with experts in the field
APPENDIX F: CONSCIENTIOUSNESS TRAINING MATERIAL

What is Conscientiousness?

Conscientiousness is the trait of being painstaking and careful, or the quality of acting according to the dictates of one’s conscience. It includes such elements as self-discipline, carefulness, thoroughness, organization, deliberation (the tendency to think carefully before acting), and need for achievement. It is an aspect of what was traditionally called character.

Conscientious individuals are generally hard working and reliable. When taken to an extreme, they may also be workaholics, perfectionists, and compulsive in their behavior. People who are low on conscientiousness are not necessarily lazy or immoral, but they tend to be more laid back, less goal oriented, and less driven by success.

My study measures two sub-dimensions of conscientiousness:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>organized</td>
<td>responsible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>neat</td>
<td>dependable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>orderly</td>
<td>reliable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>systematic</td>
<td>mannerly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>efficient</td>
<td>conscientious</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>precise</td>
<td>mature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>practical</td>
<td>unreliable (-)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prompt</td>
<td>negligent (-)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>exacting</td>
<td>undependable (-)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>meticulous</td>
<td>rash (-)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fastidious</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>disorganized (-)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>disorderly (-)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>careless (-)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unsystematic (-)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sloppy (-)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>impractical (-)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>absent-minded (-)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wasteful (-)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX G: SAMPLE IN-BASKET SCORING KEY

Fwd: Reimbursement (Judgment)

The following responses are positive. Please check the box if the participant did the response.
  o Discuss this year's plans with Pat – are they OK?
  o Ask Student Activities why the check hasn't gone through
  o Say you'll figure out what happened to the check
  o Get a check written for Adam
  o "Check over" the attached document
  o Say you'll respond to it within a week
  o Other (please specify) ______________________________________

Total _________

The following responses are negative. Please check the box if the participant did the response.
  o Yell at Pat for dropping this work on you
  o Tell Adam the budget doesn't allow it
  o Tell Adam you can't reimburse (no further explanation)
  o Contact Student Activities unprofessionally
  o "I will set this email aside and handle it later"
  o Say you'll respond to it after a week
  o Other (please specify) ______________________________________

Total _________

Fwd: Reimbursement (Conscientiousness)

The following responses are positive. Please check the box if the participant did the response.
  o Ask Pat if there is anything else to do
  o Ask Pat if you need to know anything else
  o Say you'll figure out what happened to the check
  o Let Adam know why the check hasn't gone through yet
  o "Check over" the attached document
  o Notice the numbers in the budget do not add up
  o Say you'll respond to it within a week
  o Other (please specify) ______________________________________

Total _________

The following responses are negative. Please check the box if the participant did the response.
  o Tell Adam the budget doesn't allow it
  o Tell Adam you can't reimburse (no further explanation)
  o Ask Pat for the reports (the one attached)
  o Ask Pat why Adam doesn't have his check
  o Contact Student Activities unprofessionally
  o Ask Student Activities why the check hasn't gone through
  o Get a check written for Adam
  o "Explicitly* doesn't understand why check isn't written
  o "I will set this email aside and handle it later"
  o Approve the budget (i.e., say it's OK, even though it's messed up)
  o Say you'll respond to it after a week
  o Other (please specify) ______________________________________

Total _________
Each of the following sections presents hypothetical problem situations and asks you how you would respond. Problems in Section I are hypothetical academic situations, and problems in Section II are hypothetical job situations. Each problem has four to five alternative actions that might be taken to deal with the problem. You are to rate which option you would most likely perform as well as which option you would least likely perform. Please indicate one most likely and one least likely option for each situation.

Section I

1. An exam is approaching in one of your classes. The class has been difficult but interesting for you so far. In studying for your exam, you would:
   A. carry books with you to various places and try to study in-between other obligations
   B. find that often times there are too many interruptions to study consistently before an exam
   C. want to start studying early but find that other things end up getting done instead
   D. schedule blocks of time to study in one location a week or two before the exam

   Which option would you MOST LIKELY perform?  
   Which option would you LEAST LIKELY perform?  

2. When studying for an exam, you would:
   A. you start planning and setting aside time in advance
   B. work in a clean environment, even if it means taking time away from studying
   C. wait for inspirations before becoming involved in most important study tasks
   D. wait until the last day or so to study, knowing that you HAVE to get it done now

   Which option would you MOST LIKELY perform?  
   Which option would you LEAST LIKELY perform?  

3. Your professor announces in class that undergraduate students are needed to help run subjects for his upcoming study. While you would not receive any formal sort of extra credit, the professor would appreciate any volunteers. Given the following choices, which option would you choose?
   A. Examine your schedule and offer to volunteer a couple hours a week when it is personally convenient.
   B. Examine your schedule and offer to volunteer as many hours as you can.
   C. Realize that you would have to give up some of your free time and choose not to volunteer.
   D. Offer to run subjects only if you are paid.

   Which option would you MOST LIKELY perform?  
   Which option would you LEAST LIKELY perform?  

4. When studying for an exam that will cover both lecture notes and the assigned readings from a textbook, you would:
   A. break studying into sections and test yourself as you go through the material
   B. review all the material then test yourself
   C. review your lecture notes and then review your notes taken from the textbook
   D. read the chapters throughout the semester but focus on the lecture notes for the exams

   Which option would you MOST LIKELY perform?  _____________
   Which option would you LEAST LIKELY perform?  _____________

5. You are a member of a team that has completed a class project. The professor hands back the grade and feedback on the project. In professor’s comments was a pointed attack on the group for plagiarizing and half a letter grade was deducted from the project’s final grade. You know that the student honor code requires you to report whomever has plagiarized. However, the plagiarizing was not related to the portion of the project that you were personally responsible for. What would you do?
   A. Discuss the situation with the group and come up with a decision what to do, or not to do, together.
   B. Tell the person responsible for the error that he should contact the team leader.
   C. Tell the professor who was responsible for the plagiarism.
   D. Accept the grade, learning from the experience and vowing never to let it happen again.

   Which option would you MOST LIKELY perform?  _____________
   Which option would you LEAST LIKELY perform?  _____________

6. You have so many assignments to complete and so much studying to accomplish, you feel you will never get caught up or accomplish anything. You are truly overwhelmed. What would you do?
   A. Prioritize your activities, enumerate the steps to be accomplished for each activity, and systematically go through your work.
   B. Decide what you can accomplish reasonably and focus on getting that work done, and let the rest of the work go unfinished.
   C. Talk to your professors, explaining your situation, and ask for extensions on the due dates.
   D. Take a break for a day and go out with your friends, then go back to working hard again.

   Which option would you MOST LIKELY perform?  _____________
   Which option would you LEAST LIKELY perform?  _____________
7. When studying for an exam that will cover both the readings you have been assigned as well as lecture notes, would you:
   A. read the text book at least once and read through the lecture notes
   B. attend class and read the book, then the night before the exam spend time reviewing the material
   C. take notes during lecture and from the text book and review just the notes before the exam
   D. integrate the notes you have taken in class and from the text book into a study guide to study from

   Which option would you MOST LIKELY perform?  _____________
   Which option would you LEAST LIKELY perform? _____________

8. When taking a multiple-choice exam, would you:
   A. start working on the easy questions first then come back to the more difficult questions
   B. start working on the first question and continue working on the questions in order
   C. randomly work on questions until all are answered
   D. start working on the most difficult questions first, then come back and fill in the answers to the easy ones

   Which option would you MOST LIKELY perform?  _____________
   Which option would you LEAST LIKELY perform? _____________

9. You are working on a class project, and realize that the project requires more time than you have budgeted for. You have requested and your professor has refused an extension on the project. Recognizing that this class project determines a large portion of your grade, what would you do?
   A. Determine alternative methods of doing the project that require less time, even though is means sacrificing some of the quality of the project.
   B. Seek input from others who have experienced similar problems on how to best handle matters.
   C. Discuss with your professor the importance of and progress made on the project, exactly why you need more time, and how the lack of time will impact your work. Try to persuade the professor to give you what you need.
   D. Put in the additional hours needed so the project is completed, even if it means sacrificing sleep or free time.

   Which option would you MOST LIKELY perform?  _____________
   Which option would you LEAST LIKELY perform? _____________
10. When taking an essay exam, would you:
   A. write a rough draft and then a final draft for each essay
   B. create a written outline for each essay before writing it out
   C. write out thesis first, then start writing the rest of the essay
   D. start writing an essay knowing that you can go back and reorganize it if needed

   Which option would you MOST LIKELY perform?  _____________
   Which option would you LEAST LIKELY perform?  _____________

11. You are a student in a class. Another student comes to you and asks to borrow your class notes as he was not able to come to class. You give the notes to him. Later that month, the same thing happens, and again you give your notes to the student. This situation continues and you finally get upset since your classmate should be doing his own work and coming to class, not relying on you taking notes for him. How would you proceed?
   A. Explain to the student that you do not understand what the problem is with coming to class, but you have helped as much as you can.
   B. Continue to lend your class notes to him.
   C. Inform the student that you will give him your notes one more time, but warn him that it will be the last time.
   D. Sit down with the student and find out why he is not coming to class so that you can figure out the best way to deal with the situation from here on.

   Which option would you MOST LIKELY perform?  _____________
   Which option would you LEAST LIKELY perform?  _____________

12. When you receive your exam back, would you:
   A. look at the grade you received then put the test away
   B. look through the exam briefly to see which questions you answered incorrectly
   C. look through the exam and examine why you answered the question incorrectly
   D. do not look at the exam at all

   Which option would you MOST LIKELY perform?  _____________
   Which option would you LEAST LIKELY perform?  _____________
13. You are working with a very good student who has recently experienced some personal difficulties on a group project. He has confided these problems only to you. You have experienced an increased workload because of his problems. You have talked to him about you concerns, and empathetically requested that he resume full duties as soon as possible. A month passes and you are still doing too much of his work. Realizing that his work is taking up most of your free time, what would you do?
   A. Inform your teammate that you understand his problems, but are no longer able to perform his work for him.
   B. Ask your teammate if he would rather you look for another partner.
   C. Continue to inform your teammate of your concerns until he resumes his full duties.
   D. Talk to your professor about the situation.

Which option would you MOST LIKELY perform? _____________
Which option would you LEAST LIKELY perform? _____________

14. You are given an assignment that is due the same day as a really difficult exam in another class. Would you:
   A. consult with the professor that gave the assignment and ask for an extension
   B. accept the penalty and turn in the assignment late
   C. complete the assignment the night before, sacrificing some of the quality but nonetheless getting it in on time
   D. complete the assignment ahead of time so that you can spend the time the night before study for your exam

Which option would you MOST LIKELY perform? _____________
Which option would you LEAST LIKELY perform? _____________

15. You are having problems in one of your classes. The second exam is quickly approaching, and you want to do well on it, especially considering the poor grade you received on the first exam. You have worked hard so far in college to maintain a good GPA and don’t want to sacrifice it. What would you do?
   A. Continue to study and not give up even when you encounter difficult concepts.
   B. Make an appointment and consult the professor for advice on studying and how to approach the material.
   C. Set aside more time to study than you did studying for the previous exam.
   D. Accept that you cannot always get great grades and focus your time and energy on other classes that you are doing well in.

Which option would you MOST LIKELY perform? _____________
Which option would you LEAST LIKELY perform? _____________
16. On the first day of class, your professor indicates that the class will meet three times a week. The format of the class will consist of a lecture for the first half followed by a discussion/answering questions on the topics. For each lecture there is also a corresponding chapter assigned in your textbook. Would you:
   A. attend lecture and then before the exams read the chapters assigned from the text book
   B. read the assigned chapter before each class
   C. read the assigned chapter after each lecture
   D. don’t bother reading the text book at all

   Which option would you MOST LIKELY perform? _____________
   Which option would you LEAST LIKELY perform? _____________

17. You are taking five classes this semester, which is a normal course load for you. All classes have some exams, homework assignments, and an essay or two. Throughout the semester, would you:
   A. wait until the day before something is due and then work on it until completion
   B. spend some time studying everyday so the work doesn't build up
   C. a couple days before an assignment is due then begin to work on it a bit each day
   D. don’t worry about it and take things one day at a time

   Which option would you MOST LIKELY perform? _____________
   Which option would you LEAST LIKELY perform? _____________

18. You are working on a project that involves doing some research and a lot of reading with another student. You take a break and come back to find that your desk is filled with more research articles. The student you are working with re-arranged everything on your desk and now you can’t tell what you have already read and what you still need to read. You are angry. What would you do?
   A. Take a few minutes to cool down and then ask the student to tell you how she rearranged your desk.
   B. Realize it is your fault for leaving the files unattended on your desk.
   C. Inform the student that you are angry for what she has done and tell her that in the future you do not want her to touch your desk.
   D. Assume that the student had no bad intentions, and try to re-sort the piles.
   E. Ask the student if she knew where you had left off since the papers are all shifted now.

   Which option would you MOST LIKELY perform? _____________
   Which option would you LEAST LIKELY perform? _____________
19. Your roommate is having problems studying for an exam in a class that happens to be your major. You have finished your assignments for the night and were planning on going out to dinner with a couple of friends. However, you recognize that your roommate has helped you previously on some of your assignments. Your roommate asks you for help in studying for exam. What would you do?

A. Explain that you already made plans, but that when you get home from dinner you can review some material with her.
B. Call your friends and cancel dinner, staying home to help your roommate and have dinner with her instead.
C. Delay your dinner plans for an hour, spending the time helping your roommate, then go out to dinner.
D. Explain that you would have liked to help her, but you already have plans that cannot be broken.

Which option would you MOST LIKELY perform? _____________
Which option would you LEAST LIKELY perform? _____________

20. You are assigned a final paper due at the end of the semester. Your professor gives you a suggested timeline to follow throughout the semester, with periodic submissions of different sections of the paper for review by the professor. However, the final draft is the only part of the project you will be graded on. Would you:

A. wait until the end of the semester to write the paper
B. stick to the professor’s suggested timeline
C. work on the paper periodically throughout the semester, but do not necessarily follow the professor’s timeline
D. write the paper in the first month of classes to get it out of the way

Which option would you MOST LIKELY perform? _____________
Which option would you LEAST LIKELY perform? _____________

21. You are assigned to write a research report for a project that was conducted in class. You don’t know how to prepare parts of the report. As the first step in figuring out how to prepare the report, what would you do?

A. Ask your professor.
B. Just write out it out to the best of your ability.
C. Review relevant documentation and previous example reports to determine how to write yours.
D. Find out if students that have had this class before had to write a report and ask them what to do.

Which option would you MOST LIKELY perform? _____________
Which option would you LEAST LIKELY perform? _____________
22. The first day of class your professor goes over the syllabus with the class and notes that there will be four exams in the class. Your professor discusses in class what the exam will cover, and notes that almost all of the exams will be taken primarily from the lecture notes. Would you:

A. skim each chapter throughout the semester, but study exclusively from the lecture notes
B. read and review each chapter as well as study from lecture notes for the exam
C. use only the lecture notes in studying for the exam
D. focus on the chapters, trusting that the professor is using the book material as the basis for the lectures

Which option would you MOST LIKELY perform? _____________
Which option would you LEAST LIKELY perform? _____________

23. You are assigned to work on a group project with three other people. It is the night before the project is due, and the four of you are still working on tying up the loose ends. People are getting grumpy and tired, yet there is a full hour of work before you are done. Moreover, you realize that this grade may make the difference between an A- and a B+ for you in the class. What would you do?

A. Point out to the group that everybody is tired so let’s just try to get the job done as quickly as possible.
B. Stay quiet and focus on your tasks at hand, letting the others to quarrel if they so desire.
C. Offer to take over the last of the duties so that the others can go home.
D. Decide that the grade isn’t that important and decide to go home.

Which option would you MOST LIKELY perform? _____________
Which option would you LEAST LIKELY perform? _____________

24. At the beginning of the semester, your professor asks for a volunteer to type out the lecture notes after each lecture for a hearing-impaired student. The task would require you to type out the lecture notes and e-mail them to the student before the following class. The position is not paid. What would you do?

A. Volunteer to type the notes.
B. Volunteer at the beginning of the semester, but half-way through the semester realize you don’t want to do it anymore and quit.
C. Realize that it will take up too much time so you don’t volunteer.
D. Volunteer to type half the notes if the professor can find someone to share the duty with you, but if the professor can’t find anyone else you wouldn’t be able to do it.

Which option would you MOST LIKELY perform? _____________
Which option would you LEAST LIKELY perform? _____________
APPENDIX I: WORK-ORIENTED JUDGMENT TEST

Section II

1. You are overqualified for your job and this makes you bored and unhappy. In the near future you intend to look for another job but that does not help you right now. What would you do?
   A. Keep quiet and do your work
   B. Ask your boss for more challenging work
   C. Begin looking around for other jobs for the next year
   D. Involve yourself in enjoyable activities outside work
   E. Just give up and quit.

   Which option would you MOST LIKELY perform? _____________
   Which option would you LEAST LIKELY perform? _____________

2. You are in the middle of a difficult job and you ask your boss for help. Your boss won’t help. What would you do?
   A. Get help from someone else
   B. Tell the boss you don’t like the boss’ attitude
   C. Go to the boss’ supervisor and complain
   D. Refuse to do the work
   E. Ask for a meeting with your boss’ supervisor

   Which option would you MOST LIKELY perform? _____________
   Which option would you LEAST LIKELY perform? _____________

3. You need new equipment and supplies to get the job done right, but your boss does not want to spend the money. The work and morale of your work group are suffering. What would you do?
   A. Explain the situation to your boss’ supervisor
   B. Do your job and mind your own business
   C. Get together with your co-workers and meet with the boss to demand changes
   D. Show the boss how spending money will actually help save money by buying faster equipment, etc.
   E. Spend some of your own money to buy supplies

   Which option would you MOST LIKELY perform? _____________
   Which option would you LEAST LIKELY perform? _____________
4. Your boss has demanded you make many changes at once. These changes do not improve performance and everyone is unhappy. What would you do?
   A. Wait to see what happens.
   B. Get together with some other unhappy employees and complain to the boss
   C. Write up a different plan and present it to the boss
   D. Give the changes time to work and keep a good attitude
   E. Keep doing things the old way

   Which option would you MOST LIKELY perform? _____________
   Which option would you LEAST LIKELY perform? _____________

5. Your company has laid off workers. Now you have more work to do. What would you do?
   A. Work the longer hours it takes to get the job done.
   B. Do the same amount of work you did before
   C. Organize company picnics and social events to improve morale
   D. Look for another job
   E. Try to work harder and smarter by finding faster and simpler ways to get your job done

   Which option would you MOST LIKELY perform? _____________
   Which option would you LEAST LIKELY perform? _____________

6. Your boss is not happy about the amount of work you are doing. The boss wants you to work faster. What would you do?
   A. Accept the challenge and work as fast as you can
   B. Explain that quantity does not replace quality and keep working at the same speed
   C. Make a list of your work and do the most important work first
   D. Ask your boss to tell you how to do it faster
   E. Try to give some of your work to your co-workers

   Which option would you MOST LIKELY perform? _____________
   Which option would you LEAST LIKELY perform? _____________

7. Your boss is impossible to please. Your boss constantly picks on you and you have a personality clash. You just cannot get along. What would you do?
   A. Be patient and try to do better
   B. Tell your boss this hurts your work and you would do better if you were left alone
   C. Talk to your co-workers to see if anyone else is having the same problem; as a group confront the boss
   D. Go to the Human Resource department and ask for help
   E. Ask to be reassigned to a different department and a different boss

   Which option would you MOST LIKELY perform? _____________
   Which option would you LEAST LIKELY perform? _____________

8. You have to work with a co-worker with whom you have a personality clash. You just cannot get along. What would you do?
A. Avoid and ignore this co-worker
B. Talk to your boss about the problem and try to find a solution
C. Talk to the co-worker and try to solve the problem
D. Be nice at work but have no other contact with this co-worker
E. Wait, it will get better

Which option would you MOST LIKELY perform?  
Which option would you LEAST LIKELY perform?  

9. Your work is shared with a co-worker. You work every afternoon and the co-worker works every morning. The co-worker is not doing a fair share of the work and as a result you have too much to do in the afternoon. What would you do?
A. Ask the boss to handle it
B. Talk with the co-worker and demand that the co-worker do more work
C. Decrease the amount of work you do
D. Try to have a friendly, non-threatening meeting with the co-worker to divide the tasks
E. Ask the boss to assign a different co-worker to you

Which option would youMOST likely perform?  
Which option would you LEAST LIKELY perform?  

10. One of your co-workers is always late, misses meetings and does not work toward group goals. What would you do?
A. Ask the co-worker to leave the group
B. As a group speak to the co-worker about the problem
C. Speak to the co-worker privately about the problems
D. Ask the boss to handle it
E. Ignore the co-worker and do the work

Which option would you MOST LIKELY perform?  
Which option would you LEAST LIKELY perform?  
11. Your co-worker handles the initial stages of a work task and then you finish the job. Unfortunately, your co-worker is lazy and only works when the boss is watching. This makes it difficult for you to do your work. What would you do?
   A. Ask your other co-workers to help motivate this slow worker
   B. Bring the situation to the boss’ attention.
   C. Go directly to the co-worker and complain
   D. Help the co-worker with the work
   E. Ask the boss if you can switch jobs with the co-worker so you do not have to depend on the co-worker

   Which option would you MOST LIKELY perform?  _____________
   Which option would you LEAST LIKELY perform?  _____________

12. Your boss was laid off and no one was hired to replace the boss. It is the busiest time of the year. What would you do?
   A. Work as hard as you can. You might get a promotion
   B. Try to get everyone to work hard as a team
   C. Pressure someone higher up to hire a new boss
   D. Take charge and manage everyone yourself
   E. Do your own work at your own pace

   Which option would you MOST LIKELY perform?  _____________
   Which option would you LEAST LIKELY perform?  _____________

13. A co-worker refuses to stay late to finish critical work. Other employees must work late to get it done. What would you do?
   A. Ask your boss to handle it
   B. Speak with this co-worker and ask the co-worker to stay and help
   C. Refuse to do the work
   D. Do the work without complaining
   E. Bring the subject up during an employee meeting

   Which option would you MOST LIKELY perform?  _____________
   Which option would you LEAST LIKELY perform?  _____________

14. Many of your co-workers gossip about other employees. What would you do?
   A. Ignore them because this is a common problem
   B. Don’t join in the gossip
   C. Ask them to stop because it hurts everyone
   D. Ask your boss to tell them to stop
   E. Get everyone together to discuss the problem

   Which option would you MOST LIKELY perform?  _____________
   Which option would you LEAST LIKELY perform?  _____________
15. Your boss assigns you work to do that is not part of your usual job. What would you do?
   A. Do the new work one time and then refuse to do it again
   B. Ask the boss for an explanation
   C. Do the work to the best of your ability
   D. Have a discussion with your boss about what the boss wants and expects you to do
   E. Ask the boss to take away some of your other assignments

   Which option would you MOST LIKELY perform? _____________
   Which option would you LEAST LIKELY perform? _____________

16. One of the co-owners of your company is very rude and yells all the time. Many employees are afraid of this person. What would you do?
   A. Don’t talk about the problem and avoid this person
   B. Gather other employees together to tell the other co-owner about this person’s behavior
   C. Quit
   D. Threaten to file a law suit
   E. In a non-threatening way talk to the co-owner

   Which option would you MOST LIKELY perform? _____________
   Which option would you LEAST LIKELY perform? _____________

17. Your boss treats you and your co-workers with little respect. The boss always criticizes your work. What would you do?
   A. Get all the co-workers together to confront the boss
   B. Search for a new job
   C. Approach the boss and state your concerns
   D. Complain to the boss’ supervisor
   E. Try to get along and improve your work

   Which option would you MOST LIKELY perform? _____________
   Which option would you LEAST LIKELY perform? _____________

18. You are working overtime and your work performance is suffering. What would you do?
   A. Continue working but refuse the overtime
   B. Explain the situation to your boss and ask that your overtime be cut
   C. Take some vacation time or a few sick days
   D. Ask the boss to assign extra help in your area
   E. Take more frequent breaks

   Which option would you MOST LIKELY perform? _____________
   Which option would you LEAST LIKELY perform? _____________

19. You have been given new work to do and you are bored. What would you do?
   A. Ask to be given different work
   B. Finish the new work but tell your boss how you feel
   C. Try to be moved back to your old job
D. Work very hard to look good
E. Just relax and take it easy on the new work

Which option would you MOST LIKELY perform?  
Which option would you LEAST LIKELY perform?  

20. Your group leader does not give direction to your group. There is not a plan to get the work done. What would you do?
A. Talk with the group and vote in a new leader
B. Volunteer to help lead the group
C. Ask the boss to pick a new leader
D. Take charge and begin to lead the group
E. As a group, without the leader, make a plan to get the work done

Which option would you MOST LIKELY perform?  
Which option would you LEAST LIKELY perform?  

21. Your boss expects you to do different work than you usually do on your job. The boss lends you to other departments without consulting you. This interrupts the work you are already doing. What would you do?
A. Demand a raise
B. Look at it as a chance to learn new things
C. Work hard and hope to be noticed
D. Talk to your boss and try to agree on what you are to do
E. Quit

Which option would you MOST LIKELY perform?  
Which option would you LEAST LIKELY perform?  

22. You have been working at the same job for over a year and feel ready for more responsibility. What would you do?
A. Ask for a promotion
B. Apply for a different position within the company
C. Discuss your feelings with your boss and ask your boss to evaluate your work
D. Start looking for a new job with a different company
E. Wait, work hard, and see what happens

Which option would you MOST LIKELY perform?  
Which option would you LEAST LIKELY perform?  
23. Co-workers gossip and take sides against other co-workers. Work is not getting done because the employees are distracted. What would you do?
   A. Get everyone together to handle the problem
   B. Don’t take sides
   C. Tell the boss about the problems
   D. Ask the boss to make them quit gossiping
   E. Choose to join the most powerful side

   Which option would you MOST LIKELY perform? _____________
   Which option would you LEAST LIKELY perform? _____________

24. A co-worker asked you to lie to cover up the co-worker’s absence. What would you do?
   A. Agree to do it once but never again
   B. Refuse to lie
   C. Do it; it’s no big deal
   D. Refuse and tell the co-worker that lying could cause trouble
   E. Tell the boss about the co-worker’s request

   Which option would you MOST LIKELY perform? _____________
   Which option would you LEAST LIKELY perform? _____________

25. Your boss is showing favoritism to some co-workers. They get easier work and better hours. What would you do?
   A. Ignore it
   B. Discuss your feelings with your boss
   C. Ask your boss to treat everyone fairly
   D. Tell your boss’ supervisor of this unfair treatment
   E. Talk to your co-workers and tell them how you feel

   Which option would you MOST LIKELY perform? _____________
   Which option would you LEAST LIKELY perform? _____________

26. Your boss gave you a new project. As you look over the details, you see that the only way to meet the deadline would be to skip your lunches and breaks for the next two weeks. What would you do?
   A. Work very hard even if it means you skip your lunches and breaks
   B. Make sure your boss realizes the difficult situation and assigns someone to help you
   C. Tell your boss the project is impossible to complete in two weeks and refuse to do it
   D. Ask your boss to give you a more reasonable deadline
   E. Complain to the boss’ supervisor about the way the boss assigns work

   Which option would you MOST LIKELY perform? _____________
   Which option would you LEAST LIKELY perform? _____________

27. Your boss reassigned you to a new job. Your old job gave you freedom and responsibility. Your new job does not make use of your skills. What would you do?
   A. Be content and do your best
B. Ask your boss for the reasoning behind the move
C. Ask to be moved back to your old job
D. Take it easy at work
E. Start looking for another job

Which option would you MOST LIKELY perform? _____________
Which option would you LEAST LIKELY perform? _____________

28. You have suggested a great idea to your company but due to political reasons your idea was not used. What would you do?
   A. There’s nothing you can do so forget it
   B. Wait six months and offer the idea again
   C. Suggest your idea to a more friendly boss
   D. Try to build support from nay areas before you suggest the idea again
   E. Wait three months and then suggest the idea again.

Which option would you MOST LIKELY perform? _____________
Which option would you LEAST LIKELY perform? _____________

29. You were promised a raise if you developed a plan to improve productivity. You have worked many hours on this project. Your plan works, but you have not received your raise. What would you do?
   A. Be patient and continue to wait
   B. Meet with your boss and demand the raise
   C. Go to your boss’ supervisor and complain
   D. Document the improvements and discuss it with the boss
   E. Look for another job

Which option would you MOST LIKELY perform? _____________
Which option would you LEAST LIKELY perform? _____________

30. Yesterday you heard your boss yell at your friend for taking some time off when your friend was supposed to be working. Today you noticed the boss left work to go to the mall on a personal errand. What would you do?
   A. Let it go because supervisors get privileges
   B. Tell your co-workers about it
   C. Complain to your boss’ supervisor
   D. Confront the boss and ask the boss to do the same thing expected from other workers
   E. Take some time off yourself

Which option would you MOST LIKELY perform? _____________
Which option would you LEAST LIKELY perform? _____________

31. Your place of work is being updated but you have not received the same new equipment as your co-workers. What would you do?
   A. Refuse to do your work until you get new equipment
   B. Do the best with what you have
C. Assume this was a mistake and ask the boss about it
D. Take another worker’s new equipment when the worker is absent
E. Meet with the boss and demand new equipment.

Which option would you MOST LIKELY perform? _____________
Which option would you LEAST LIKELY perform? _____________
APPENDIX J: CONSCIENTIOUSNESS MEASURE

Instructions:

On this page, there are adjectives describing people's behaviors. Please use the rating scale below to describe how accurately each adjective describes you. Describe yourself as you generally are now, not as you wish to be in the future. Describe yourself as you honestly see yourself, in relation to other people you know of the same sex as you are, and roughly your same age. Please read each statement carefully, and then circle the number that corresponds to how you rate yourself the scale.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Inaccurate</th>
<th>Moderately Inaccurate</th>
<th>Neither Inaccurate nor Accurate</th>
<th>Moderately Accurate</th>
<th>Very Accurate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* How accurately does each word describe you?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>organized</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>neat</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>orderly</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>systematic</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>efficient</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>precise</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>practical</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prompt</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>exacting</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>meticulous</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fastidious</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>disorganized</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>disorderly</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>careless</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unsystematic</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sloppy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>impractical</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>absent-minded</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wasteful</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*responsible</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*dependable</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*reliable</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*mannerly</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*conscientious</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*mature</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*unreliable</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*negligent</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*undependable</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*rash</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* indicates the item measures the responsibility sub-dimension; all other items measure the organization sub-dimension.
APPENDIX K: COGNITIVE ABILITY MEASURE

Please read each question and circle the letter of the choice which best answers the question.

1. Which means furious?
   a. hairy
   b. angry
   c. distant
   d. rarely

2. Which does not belong?
   a. cheat
   b. chisel
   c. plane
   d. hammer

3. Which does not belong?
   a. pint
   b. gallon
   c. pound
   d. quart

4. Which are shears?
   a. sickles
   b. cliffs
   c. stockings
   d. scissors

5. Which is a seaport?
   a. New Orleans
   b. Reno
   c. Des Moines
   d. Omaha

6. What is a scaffold?
   a. clothing
   b. platform
   c. building
   d. noose

7. Which is a lubricant?
   a. glue
   b. eraser
   c. grease
   d. comedian

8. Which means annual?
   a. celebration
   b. always
   c. flower
   d. yearly
9. Which does not belong?
   a. diamond
   b. ruby
   c. gold
   d. emerald
10. Which does not belong?
    a. map
    b. cartoon
    c. chart
    d. graph
11. Which does not belong?
    a. brush
    b. towel
    c. broom
    d. mop
12. Which does not belong?
    a. rabbi
    b. minister
    c. priest
    d. doctor
13. Which does not belong?
    a. ash
    b. birch
    c. vine
    d. oak
14. Which is a filter?
    a. sieve
    b. smoke
    c. plane
    d. tailor
15. Which means to detach?
    a. draw
    b. fight
    c. join
    d. separate
16. Which is a marsh?
    a. forest
    b. candy
    c. parade
    d. bog
17. Which does not belong?
    a. hearts
    b. aces
    c. diamonds
    d. spades
18. A team always has
   a. equipment
   b. uniforms
   c. schedules
   d. members
19. Which is corrosion?
   a. gulley
   b. sewage
   c. rust
   d. depravity
20. Which does not belong?
   a. shoes
   b. socks
   c. stockings
   d. hose
21. Which means precision?
   a. surgery
   b. accuracy
   c. value
   d. seeing
22. Which is an emblem?
   a. charcoal
   b. flag
   c. scar
   d. honor
23. Which does not belong?
   a. silo
   b. barn
   c. granary
   d. cattle
24. Which does not belong?
   a. hotel
   b. inn
   c. motel
   d. house
25. Which does not belong?
   a. barometer
   b. clock
   c. speedometer
   d. generator
26. Which is brittle?
   a. cotton
   b. water
   c. glass
   d. sand
27. Which is a disease?
   a. antitoxin
   b. influenza
   c. bacteria
   d. fracture
28. Which is a windlass?
   a. winch
   b. woman
   c. shelter
   d. boaster
29. Which is an architect?
   a. builder
   b. planner
   c. inventor
   d. supervisor
30. Which does not belong?
   a. key
   b. latch
   c. lock
   d. bolt
31. Which means banish?
   a. exile
   b. forbidden
   c. angry
   d. horrid
32. Which are forceps?
   a. decrees
   b. armies
   c. predictions
   d. tongs
33. Which is acceleration?
   a. stressing
   b. agreeing
   c. quickening
   d. nearing
34. Which is zeal?
   a. enthusiasm
   b. fur
   c. reluctance
   d. closing
35. Which is prestige?
   a. agility
   b. leveling
   c. equality
   d. distinction
36. Which means wary?
   a. cautious
   b. hardy
   c. hostile
   d. bent
37. Which is disorder?
   a. command
   b. cancellation
   c. refusal
   d. confusion
38. Which does not belong?
   a. nail
   b. brad
   c. spike
   d. screw
39. A horse always has
   a. withers
   b. reins
   c. bridle
   d. rider
40. Which does not belong?
   a. infantry
   b. artillery
   c. military
   d. cavalry
41. Which does not belong?
   a. Texas
   b. Denver
   c. Arkansas
   d. Maine
42. Which is a dory?
   a. window
   b. boat
   c. gateway
   d. column
43. Which means intricate?
   a. involved
   b. brave
   c. decorate
   d. accuse
44. Which does not belong?
   a. nozzle
   b. spigot
   c. hose
   d. spout
45. What does @ mean?
   a. at
   b. about
   c. always
   d. articles

46. A guarantee always has a
   a. penalty
   b. guard
   c. pledge
   d. signature

47. Which does not belong?
   a. cup
   b. dish
   c. saucer
   d. plate

48. Which does not belong?
   a. tax
   b. assessment
   c. income
   d. fine

49. Which does not belong?
   a. pound
   b. acre
   c. weight
   d. yard

50. Which means grovel?
   a. stone
   b. dismal
   c. crawl
   d. snarl
APPENDIX L: DEMOGRAPHICS MEASURE

1. What is your gender?
   o Male
   o Female
   o Other/Prefer not to answer

2. What is your racial/ethnic background?
   o Caucasian
   o Hispanic
   o African/African American
   o Asian
   o Other/Prefer not to answer

3. What year student are you?
   o Freshman / 1st Year
   o Sophomore / 2nd Year
   o Junior / 3rd Year
   o Senior / 4th Year
   o 5th Year or Higher

4. What is your major? ________________

5. What is your age?
   o 18
   o 19
   o 20
   o 21
   o 22
   o 23 or older

6. What was your SAT score (if you took it)? ____________

7. What was your ACT score (if you took it)? ____________

8. You can think of a job as something you were paid for and you interacted with others (such as supervisors or coworkers). How much job experience have you had?
   o Never
   o Less than 6 months
   o 6 months – 1 year
   o 1 year – 2 years
   o 2 years – 3 years
   o 3 years – 4 years
   o Over 4 years
APPENDIX M: MODEL A COGNITIVE ABILITY-ONLY MODEL RESULTS

![Path diagram of model A cognitive ability-only model results]

- Conscientiousness influenced by Paper-and-Pencil (.33), Academic SJT (.63), Work SJT (.56), Self Reported ACT (.60), Judgment Score (.87), and In-Basket (.92).
- Judgment Rating influenced by Judgment Score (.24) and In-Basket (.23).
- Conscientiousness Score influenced by Conscientiousness Rating (.78) and In-Basket (.92).
- Cognitive Ability influenced by Conscientiousness (.33), Academic SJT (.63), Work SJT (.56), Self Reported ACT (.60), Judgment Score (.87), Judgment Rating (.71), Conscientiousness Score (.78), and Conscientiousness Rating (.87).
APPENDIX N: MODEL B CONSCIENTIOUSNESS-ONLY MODEL RESULTS
Table 1

Assessment Center Construct Definitions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>Author(s)</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Decisiveness</td>
<td>Garavan &amp; Morley (1998)</td>
<td>Degree to which decisions are made as required on the job.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decisiveness</td>
<td>Russell &amp; Domm (1995)</td>
<td>Degree to which decisions are made as required on the job.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decisiveness</td>
<td>Schmitt, Noe, Meritt, &amp; Fitzgerald (1984)</td>
<td>Ability to recognize when a decision is required and to act quickly (without an assessment of the quality of the decision).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision Making</td>
<td>Bray (1982)</td>
<td>How ready is this person to make decisions, and how good are the decisions made?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision Making</td>
<td>Bray, Campbell, &amp; Grant (1974)</td>
<td>How ready is this man to make decisions, and how good are the decisions he makes?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision Making</td>
<td>Campbell &amp; Bray (1967)</td>
<td>To what extent can this individual make decisions of high quality, and how likely is he or she to make decisions when required?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision Making</td>
<td>McConell (1969)</td>
<td>The ability to arrive at a decision relatively quickly after obtaining the necessary information and to live with the decision after it has been made.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision Making</td>
<td>McConnell &amp; Parker (1972)</td>
<td>Consciously weighing and selecting one of two or more alternatives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision Making</td>
<td>Worbois (1975)</td>
<td>Consciously weighing and selecting one of two or more alternatives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judgment</td>
<td>Russell &amp; Domm (1995)</td>
<td>Degree to which decisions of high quality are made as required on the job.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judgment</td>
<td>Schmitt, Noe, Meritt, &amp; Fitzgerald (1984)</td>
<td>Skill in identifying educational needs and setting priorities, ability to reach logical conclusions and make high-quality decisions based on available information, ability to critically evaluate written communications.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2

Selected Situational Judgment Constructs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author(s)</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brooks &amp; Highhouse (2006)</td>
<td>“We believe that SJTs may be methods of assessing Hammond’s quasirationality, or the ability to effectively use intuition and analysis in making good judgments” (p. 41).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chan &amp; Schmitt (2005)</td>
<td>“SJT performance is a manifestation of these knowledge and ability dimensions which collectively constitute what Sternberg and his colleagues have called <em>practical intelligence</em>” (p. 225).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>File (1945)</td>
<td>“[Supervisory quality is the] ability to supervise workers . . . ability to deal with <em>human relations</em> . . . knowledge of how to handle the supervisory function” (p. 325).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McDaniel, et al. (2001)</td>
<td>“Situational judgment tests [are] any paper-and-pencil test designed to measure judgment in work settings” (p. 730), though “these tests reflect a measurement method that can be used to assess a variety of constructs” (p. 732).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motowidlo et al. (2006)</td>
<td>“Common methods for scoring situational judgment tests (SJT) produce measures of procedural knowledge” (p. 57).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ployhart (2006)</td>
<td>“We then might say a situational judgment test (SJT) measures cognitive ability, personality, experience, and so on, and hence it is a predictor method” (p. 84).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schmidt &amp; Hunter (1993)</td>
<td>“Tacit knowledge is just knowledge, and in the job context, it is simply job knowledge” (p. 8).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stemler &amp; Sternberg (2006)</td>
<td>“[SJT] measure part of a particular aspect of intelligence that Sternberg (1997, 1999) has called <em>practical intelligence</em> – the ability to adapt to, shape, and select real-world environments” (p. 109).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thorndike (1920)</td>
<td>“By social intelligence is meant the ability to understand and manage men and women, boys and girls – to act wisely in human relations” (p. 228).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3
In-Basket Inter-Rater Reliabilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rater 1</th>
<th>Rater 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Judgment Score</td>
<td>Judgment Rating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.65</td>
<td>.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judgment Rating</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conscientiousness Score</td>
<td>Conscientiousness Rating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* All values are bivariate correlations; *p* < .01
### Table 4

**Descriptive Statistics**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic SJT</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>14.00</td>
<td>8.89</td>
<td>2.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work SJT</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>12.63</td>
<td>3.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conscientiousness</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive Ability</td>
<td>16.00</td>
<td>46.00</td>
<td>34.15</td>
<td>6.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Report ACT Score</td>
<td>14.00</td>
<td>32.00</td>
<td>23.32</td>
<td>3.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judgment Score</td>
<td>-5.00</td>
<td>14.00</td>
<td>5.74</td>
<td>2.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judgment Rating</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>1.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conscientiousness Score</td>
<td>-5.00</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>4.94</td>
<td>2.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conscientiousness Rating</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>1.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) Academic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SJT (.65)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Work SJT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.44** (.67)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Conscientiousness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.21** (90)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) Cognitive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability -.03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.24** -.04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) Self-Report</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACT Score .07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.35** -.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.65** ( - )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6) Judgment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score .12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.14* .12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.10 .16* ( - )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7) Judgment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rating .10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.13 .13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.04 .12 .70**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( - )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(8) Conscientiousness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score .12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.18* .18* .13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.16* .86** .66**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( - )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(9) Conscientiousness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rating .12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.17* .20** .10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.17* .68** .66**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.79** ( - )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* *p < .05, **p < .01; Reliability in parentheses (where appropriate)
Table 6
Goodness of Fit Indices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Index</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>Acceptable?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive Ability-Only Model</td>
<td>$\chi^2$</td>
<td>46.51, p &lt; .001</td>
<td>p &gt; .05</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NFI</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>NFI &gt; .95</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RFI</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>RFI &gt; .95</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IFI</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>IFI &gt; .95</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TLI</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>TLI &gt; .95</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CFI</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>CFI &gt; .95</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PNFI</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>PNFI &gt; .50</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PCFI</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>PCFI &gt; .50</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RMSEA</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>RMSEA &lt; .08</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conscientiousness-Only Model</td>
<td>$\chi^2$</td>
<td>30.57, p &lt; .01</td>
<td>p &gt; .05</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NFI</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>NFI &gt; .95</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RFI</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>RFI &gt; .95</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IFI</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>IFI &gt; .95</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TLI</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>TLI &gt; .95</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CFI</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>CFI &gt; .95</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PNFI</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>PNFI &gt; .50</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PCFI</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>PCFI &gt; .50</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RMSEA</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>RMSEA &lt; .08</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Model fit standards taken from Byrne, 2001
Table 7

Model A: Cognitive Ability-Only Model Parameter Estimates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Latent Variable</th>
<th>Observed Variable</th>
<th>Regression Weight Estimate</th>
<th>Standardized Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Paper-and-Pencil</td>
<td>Work SJT</td>
<td>1.12, p &lt; .01</td>
<td>.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Academic SJT</td>
<td>1.00*</td>
<td>.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conscientiousness</td>
<td>.09, p &lt; .05</td>
<td>.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-Basket</td>
<td>Judgment Score</td>
<td>1.00*</td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Judgment Rating</td>
<td>.30, p &lt; .01</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conscientiousness Score</td>
<td>.95, p &lt; .01</td>
<td>.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conscientiousness Rating</td>
<td>.35, p &lt; .01</td>
<td>.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive Ability</td>
<td>ACT Score</td>
<td>1.00*</td>
<td>.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Work SJT</td>
<td>.88, n.s.</td>
<td>.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Academic SJT</td>
<td>.17, n.s.</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conscientiousness Score</td>
<td>.27, p &lt; .05</td>
<td>.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conscientiousness Rating</td>
<td>.12, n.s.</td>
<td>.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Judgment Score</td>
<td>.08, n.s.</td>
<td>.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Judgment Rating</td>
<td>.26, n.s.</td>
<td>.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* SEM requires one loading to be set to 1. These values were selected to be set to 1.
Table 8

Model B: Conscientiousness-Only Model Parameter Estimates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Latent Variable</th>
<th>Observed Variable</th>
<th>Regression Weight</th>
<th>Standardized Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Paper-and-Pencil</td>
<td>Work SJT</td>
<td>1.10, p &lt; .05</td>
<td>.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Academic SJT</td>
<td>1.00*</td>
<td>.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conscientiousness</td>
<td>.06, p &lt; .05</td>
<td>.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-Basket</td>
<td>Judgment Score</td>
<td>1.00*</td>
<td>.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Judgment Rating</td>
<td>.28, p &lt; .01</td>
<td>.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conscientiousness Score</td>
<td>.83, p &lt; .01</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conscientiousness Rating</td>
<td>.28, p &lt; .01</td>
<td>.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conscientiousness</td>
<td>Conscientiousness</td>
<td>1.00*</td>
<td>.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Work SJT</td>
<td>5.61, n.s.</td>
<td>.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Academic SJT</td>
<td>1.51, n.s.</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conscientiousness Score</td>
<td>7.94, p &lt; .05</td>
<td>.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conscientiousness Rating</td>
<td>4.93, p &lt; .05</td>
<td>.44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* SEM requires one loading to be set to 1. These values were selected to be set to 1.