

An Evaluation of the Construct Validity of Situational Judgment Tests

D. Matthew Trippe

Thesis submitted to the faculty of the Virginia

Polytechnic Institute and State University

in partial fulfillment of the requirement for the degree of

MASTER OF SCIENCE

IN

PSYCHOLOGY

Roseanne J. Foti, Chair

John J. Donovan

Robert J. Harvey

November 8, 2002

Blacksburg, VA 24060

Keywords: situational judgment test, construct validity, MTMMM.

AN EVALUATION OF THE CONSTRUCT VALIDITY
OF SITUATIONAL JUDGMENT TESTS

by

D. Matthew Trippe

Roseanne J. Foti, Chairperson

Psychology

(ABSTRACT)

Situational judgment tests are analogous to earlier forms of “high fidelity” simulations such that an ostensible paradox emerges in the consistent finding of criterion-referenced validity but almost complete lack of construct validity evidence. The present study evaluates the extent to which SJT’s can demonstrate convergent and discriminant validity by analyzing a SJT from a multitrait-multimethod perspective. A series of hierarchically nested confirmatory factor models were tested. Results indicate that the SJT demonstrates convergent and discriminant validity but also contains non-trivial amounts of construct-irrelevant method variance. Wide variability in the content and validation methods of SJT’s are discussed as the reason previous attempts to find construct validity have failed.

Table of Contents

Abstract.....ii

Acknowledgmentsiv

Introduction.....1

 Simulations.....6

 Adverse Impact.....9

 Development of SJT's.....10

 Criterion Referenced Validity.....11

 Construct Validity.....13

 Multi-Trait Multi-Method Matrices.....18

 Present Study.....20

Methods.....23

 Participants.....23

 Measures.....23

 Procedure.....25

 Factor Models Tested.....25

 Analyses.....26

Results.....27

Discussion.....29

 Limitations.....32

 Conclusion.....34

References.....37

Tables.....45

Figures.....53

Appendices

 International Personality Item Pool Scales61

 Situational Judgment Test.....63

Vita.....69

Acknowledgments

In memory of Antoinette Marcello

I would like to thank Roseanne J. Foti for her enduring wisdom and patience, Robert J. Harvey for not keeping his word to charge me by the question and John J. Donovan for keeping me on my toes. I would also like to thank my mother, father and grandparents for allowing me to find my own way. This process was made infinitely more enjoyable as a result of the moral and intellectual support of my classmates and comrades, Leifur, Yvette and Victoria. Thank you to my friends, Claire, Ryan and Scott and to my sister Elizabeth for helping me keep everything in perspective over the last two years.

List of Tables

Table 1: Correlations among manifest variables.....	45
Table 2: Descriptive statistics for items and standardized factor loading estimates for model 6.....	46
Table 3: Selected fit statistics and χ^2 values for hierarchically nested factor models.....	47
Table 4: χ^2 Difference tests between hierarchically nested confirmatory factor models.....	48
Table 5: Estimated correlations among latent variables in model 6.....	49
Table 6: Estimated correlations among latent trait variables.....	50

List of Figures

Figure 1: Null model. Note that only two observed variables per trait for each method are shown for the purpose of simplicity. In actuality each trait was measured with 8 manifest variables (4 SJT and 4 IPIP).....	51
Figure 2.: Trait model. Note that only two observed variables per trait for each method are shown for the purpose of simplicity. In actuality each trait was measured with 8 manifest variables (4 SJT and 4 IPIP).....	52
Figure 3: Method model. Note that only two observed variables per trait for each method are shown for the purpose of simplicity. In actuality each trait was measured with 8 manifest variables (4 SJT and 4 IPIP).....	53
Figure 4: General trait model with method factors. Note that only two observed variables per trait for each method are shown for the purpose of simplicity. In actuality each trait was measured with 8 manifest variables (4 SJT and 4 IPIP).....	54
Figure 5: Trait-method model with orthogonal methods. Note that only two observed variables per trait for each method are shown for the purpose of simplicity. In actuality each trait was measured with 8 manifest variables (4 SJT and 4 IPIP).....	55
Figure 6: “Full” trait-method model with oblique methods. Note that only two observed variables per trait for each method are shown for the purpose of simplicity. In actuality each trait was measured with 8 manifest variables (4 SJT and 4 IPIP).....	56

List of Figures (cont.)

Figure 7: SJT method only model. Note that only two observed variables per trait for each method are shown for the purpose of simplicity. In actuality each trait was measured with 8 manifest variables (4 SJT and 4 IPIP).....57

Figure 8: SJT general trait model with method factors. Note that only two observed variables per trait for each method are shown for the purpose of simplicity. In actuality each trait was measured with 8 manifest variables (4 SJT and 4 IPIP).....58