

Finally, and in relation to the above points, the personnel selection situation is very particular in terms of rarity, pressure, and self-presentational concerns. Thus, while there is much to gain from studying selection situations, I would suggest moving beyond them and into the workplaces themselves. For instance, longitudinal research following employees from the personnel selection situation into their workplaces could measure employees' workplace behaviours as well as their occupational and social competence in different situations and obtain ratings of behaviour, skills, or personality from several sources (e.g. bosses, peers, and clients). Such research would be highly valuable for both

personality and personnel researchers (and employers!). In addition, personality ratings could, in such research, be collected also after the selection situation, circumventing the problem of socially desirable responding.

In conclusion, as Lievens compellingly argues, personnel selection settings offer valuable contexts for studying situation-behaviour contingencies, but conducting basic personality research in these settings may not be the best course of action. Furthermore, for the mutual benefit of personality and personnel psychology, it would be desirable to extend behavioural and personality research from selection contexts to the workplace.

Applying Personnel Selection Techniques to the Psychological Study of Accurate Personality Judgment

TERA D. LETZRING and DOUGLAS E. COLMAN

Idaho State University, Pocatello, ID, USA
letztera@isu.edu

Abstract: We agree with Lievens's proposal to assimilate methods from personnel selection into the study of personality psychology and in particular into research on person perception accuracy. Researchers can apply Situational Judgment Tests to study judgment accuracy by using them as the criteria and judgment measures. Assessment Centre exercises could also be fruitfully applied to increase the fidelity/external validity of the accuracy criterion. Lastly, we touch on some key advantages and disadvantages of transferring personnel selection techniques to research on accurate personality judgment. Copyright © 2017 European Association of Personality Psychology

Lievens encouraged cross-pollination of methodological techniques between distinct, yet relatable, research literatures. He suggested that two approaches to personnel selection—Situational Judgment Tests (SJTs) and Assessment Centre exercises (ACs)—are ripe for transfer. We agree with this assessment and explicate ways that personality psychologists could use SJTs and ACs, specifically in research on accuracy of personality judgments.

Personality psychologists assess judgment accuracy as the agreement between a target person's actual standing on some personality characteristic(s) and a judge's assessment of the same characteristic(s). Targets' actual standing on a characteristic is usually assessed with self-report or a composite of self-reports and ratings from targets' acquaintances. Typically, assessments of personality judgment accuracy have focused on broad characteristics, without explicit consideration of how situations could influence these judgments. Therefore, we outline ways to apply SJTs and ACs to study personality judgment accuracy.

APPLYING SJT AND AC APPROACHES

Situation-specific SJT items could be used to assess accuracy. Targets would choose the behaviours from a list that they think they would perform in a set of situations, and responses would be the accuracy criteria. Ratings could also be gathered from acquaintances regarding what they think the targets would do, and items with convergence between self- and acquaintance-ratings could be used in the judgment

task. After some exposure to the targets, judges would report what they think the target would do in the same situations. A judgment would be deemed accurate if the judges selected the same behavioural response as the targets and the acquaintances. This approach could be problematic because the accuracy criteria would consist of what people *think* they would do, and people are not always able to predict their behaviour accurately, particularly in novel situations. Therefore, it must be expected that the link between intention and behaviour would be relatively weak because assessment of accuracy would be based on how others *think* they would behave instead of how they actually behave.

External validity/fidelity of the accuracy criterion could be increased by using ACs to capture actual behaviours, and these behaviours would be the accuracy criteria for SJT items. The judges' task would remain the same as in the purely-SJT approach. The difference would be that response accuracy would be based on targets' actual behaviours.

In both approaches, judges select a single behaviour they think would be performed in a specific situation by a given target. As such, each item would be scored as correct or incorrect. A benefit of this assessment scheme is a straightforward computation and interpretation of accuracy—the number of correctly identified behaviours. This method may result in less variable accuracy scores than traditional measurement methods that assess accuracy as the similarity in ratings on Likert-type scales with correlation or regression approaches. This is important and potentially problematic because detection of true variation is essential to examining how accuracy relates to other constructs.

ADVANTAGES AND DISADVANTAGES

There are several advantages to applying the methods from personnel selection to research on accurate personality judgment. First, there would be greater methodological variance in accuracy research, which is beneficial for examining the generalizability of findings. Second, there would be a greater focus on the contexts in which judgments are made. Personnel selection focuses on job-related characteristics within employment situations, so situations are designed to elicit certain characteristics.

Person perception research could operationalize a similar intention by carefully thinking about the characteristics being assessed, whether behaviour is expected to vary across situations and which situations would best elicit relevant cues. For example, for judgments of extraversion, situations should allow for variability in amounts of talkativeness and assertiveness. Even for traits traditionally associated with lower accuracy, it is possible to create situations that elicit variability in relevant behaviours (i.e. anxiety-provoking situations and neuroticism; Hirschmüller, Egloff, Schmukle, Nestler, & Back, 2015).

Our discussion above speaks to the importance of considering more than one moderator of accuracy at a time (e.g. judge and information), which according to Lievens is consistent with recent assessment centre research. Researchers should also attend to the relation between good judges and good targets. To capture true accuracy variability among judges, good targets are needed because they make many relevant cues available and this is necessary for assessing

differences in judgment ability (Rogers, 2015; Rogers & Biesanz, 2016). An AC approach could increase the likelihood that targets would be 'good' by engaging in personality-relevant behaviours, thereby making it possible to detect differences in judgmental ability.

A third advantage comes from having an explicit purpose for the judgments. Judges in person perception accuracy research are typically not given a reason or motivation for being accurate, whereas in real-world situations, there is often a known reason for making judgments and motivation to be accurate. Providing research participants with rationale and motivation to be accurate may change the way they approach the task and therefore affect accuracy and how it relates to other variables of interest.

There are also disadvantages that should be considered. First, using ACs to create accuracy criteria would require much time and resources, as each target would be put in multiple situations on which to base judgements. This would require a large investment of time, and situations would have to be realistically created by using additional participants or research confederates. A possible solution to this disadvantage would be to create a standardized AC test. Creating such a test would require a large investment of time and resources, but this would yield a test with high external validity that could be used by multiple researchers.

In conclusion, we see merit in Lievens's proposal that personnel selection techniques could be fruitfully applied to personality research and specifically to research on personality judgment accuracy.

A Call for Cross-Fertilization between Personality and Personnel Selection Researchers

DANIEL V. LEZOTTE¹, DAVID M. CONDON² and DANIEL K. MROCZEK³

¹*Mercer U.S., USA*

²*Northwestern University, Evanston, IL, USA*
daniel.mroczek@northwestern.edu

Abstract: Lievens made a case for using SJTs in personnel selection, a recommendation with which we agree. In particular, we like the emphasis on branching out from current methodologies and using new techniques such as SJTs not only in I/O or personnel selection research but also in basic personality research. Despite our enthusiasm, we point out several problems, most notably absence of time dimension in SJTs. Copyright © 2017 European Association of Personality Psychology

Lievens made an important contribution by laying out the case for more cross-disciplinary research collaboration between personality and personnel selection researchers. For any research discipline to make significant strides, it must branch out from methodologies and findings within its own discipline to learn from and share with other disciplines. This also applies to sub-disciplines of personality psychology and industrial/organizational psychology, both of which can learn from each other through cross-fertilization of ideas and methods. Lievens made a compelling case that this will likely extend utility of findings in both areas.

Selection researchers and practitioners rely heavily on personality trait theories and established methods for assessing these traits. However, as Lievens pointed out, in personnel selection, cognitive ability tests have consistently shown higher levels of validity (prediction of job performance) than personality tests. Meta-analyses on Situational Judgment Test (SJT) validity have shown them to predict less well in selection contexts than cognitive ability tests but better than personality tests (Schmidt, et al., 2016). Assessment centre exercises (ACs) are similarly situated between cognitive ability and personality tests, although their validity is generally higher