

Judgment at Work Survey

Overview

The Judgment at Work Survey is a tool to screen job applicants for a wide range of jobs. The survey contains several situational judgment items. Each item describes a scenario that one might encounter at work. Each situation is followed by several possible actions and the applicant is asked to evaluate the effectiveness of each action. Employers seeking to determine the usefulness of the survey for a specific job should review the item content to determine the appropriateness of the survey for the job.

Sample item

You have a deadline at work. It is very important to your supervisor that the work is completed by the deadline. You think the work cannot be completed by the deadline.	Extremely Ineffective	Ineffective	Average Effectiveness	Very Effective	Extremely Effective
Ask your supervisor to assign someone to help you.	<input type="radio"/>				
Talk to your supervisor about your concerns.	<input type="radio"/>				
Work extra hours to get the work done.	<input type="radio"/>				
Explain to your supervisor that the deadline is unreasonable.	<input type="radio"/>				
Look for a more efficient way of doing the work.	<input type="radio"/>				

Technical Information

This technical documentation is designed to meet various professional and legal guidelines. As such it contains language unfamiliar to many human resource and other professionals. We would be happy to answer any questions you have concerning this documentation. Questions on this report may be directed to Info@workskillsfirst.com or by calling Work Skills First, Inc.

Reliability

Situational judgment tests tend to measure multiple constructs because the determinants of behavior in a given situation are typically a function of multiple variables including general cognitive ability, personality, and job experience. Parallel forms reliability is an appropriate method for assessing the reliability for heterogeneous tests. The parallel forms reliability for the Judgment at Work Survey is .89.

Criterion-related validity

The average validity estimate for situational judgment tests for the prediction of job performance is estimated at .26 (McDaniel, Hartman, Whetzel, & Grubb, 2007). The validity of .26 is a likely an underestimate of the operational validity because (1) the validity estimate is not corrected for range restriction, and (2) most validity studies in the McDaniel et al., (2007) meta-analysis did not correct for elevation and scatter (McDaniel, Psozka, Legree, Yost, & Weekley, 2011). The elevation and scatter corrections are used in the Judgment at Work Survey and such corrections are shown to substantially increase the validity while reducing White-Black mean score differences (McDaniel, et al., 2011).

Faking resistance

Research has shown that situational judgment tests with knowledge instructions (such as the Judgment at Work Survey) are substantially resistant to applicant faking. In contrast, personality tests are easily faked (Nguyen, Biderman & McDaniel, 2005). Thus, employers who are concerned with applicant misrepresentation on personality-based customer service tests may find this test particularly attractive.

This test is scored in a manner that controls for elevation and scatter (McDaniel, et al., 2011). The scoring process destroys the effectiveness of one faking strategy.

Score reporting format

The Judgment at Work Survey reports two scores: A total raw score and a stanine (“standard nine”) score that has values from 1 to 9. Most employers find the stanine score the most useful to interpret.

This stanine score standardization places most applicant scores on a scale from 1 to 9. We offer the following hiring recommendations as reasonable:

- Applicants with scores of 7, 8, or 9 receive our highest recommendation for hire.
- Applicants with scores of 4, 5, or 6 receive our next best recommendation for hire.
- Applicants with scores of 3 and below are not recommended for hire.

Very low scores (e.g., a stanine score of 1) likely indicate that the applicant responded to the items without reading the questions, read the questions but lacked the reading comprehension skills to understand the questions, or was purposely trying to look bad.

Users of the survey may wish to make their own hire recommendations based on the availability of applicants in the local applicant pool, the performance records of employees who were previously tested, and the adverse impact of the survey on their applicants. Work Skills First, Inc. invites users of the survey to contact its staff with doctoral degrees in industrial/organizational psychology if the user has questions about the appropriate use of the survey.

Norm Table ($N = 103$)

Stanine Score	Total Raw Score	Cumulative Percentile
1	≤ 26	4.9
2	27	8.7
	28	14.6
3	29	18.5
4	30	25.2
	31	34.0
5	32	52.4
6	33	68.0
	34	76.7
7	35	86.4
8	36	93.2
	37	99.0
9	38 and greater	100.0

References and additional information

References cited in this technical documentation are listed below and can be obtained from Work Skills First, Inc.

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

McDaniel, M.A., Psozka, J., Legree, P.J., Yost, A.P., Weekley, J.A. (2011). Toward an understanding of situational judgment item validity and group differences. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 96, 327-336.

Nguyen, N. T., Biderman, M.D. & McDaniel, M.A. (2005). Effects of response instruction on faking a situational judgment test. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 13, 250-260.