Examination of Selection Tests for Improved Manpower Hiring in Organizations

By

Okere Loveday, Ph.D
Professor of Management (HRM)
Faculty of Administration and Management
Department of Management
Ignatius Ajuru University of Education, Rumuolumeni
Port Harcourt, Rivers State, Nigeria.
E-mail: okereloveday22@gmail.com
&
Nwachukwu Peace Ijeoma
Faculty of Administration and Management
Department of Management
Ignatius Ajuru University of Education, Rumuolumeni
Port Harcourt, Rivers State, Nigeria.
E-mail: ijeomapeacenwachukwu@gmail.com

Abstract

Manpower selection tests are used to provide valid and reliable evidence of levels of ability, intelligence, personality characteristics, aptitudes and attainments. They typically supplement the information obtained from an interview. This study reviewed the components of selection tests for improved manpower hiring in organizations. The study observed that personality tests are making a comeback and can have modest but consistent validity for some aspects of job success. The review study also recommend that all test takers should get the same instructions, have the same length of time to work, and take the test under similar conditions.

Key Words: Selection, Tests, Manpower, Organizations, Management.

Introduction

A test is a means of obtaining a standardized sample of behaviour (Okere, 2019). Tests are standardized in content, scoring, and administration. That is, every time the test is given, its questions are identical or, in the case of tests with more that

one form, equivalent. The scoring rules are constant. The administration is also the same; All test takers get the same instructions, have the same length of time to work and take the test under similar conditions. Because tests are standardized, they provide information about job candidates that is comparably for all applicants. Other aspects of competing candidates cannot be compared so readily. For instance, grade point averages could be compared, but if candidates went to different schools or took somewhat different causes, this measure would not mean exactly the same thing for all applicants. American Management Association (2000) found that in 2000, about 60% of companies surveyed used some form of testing for selection. However, selection tests can be divided into two broad categories: (1) measures of typical performance such as personality inventories that do not have right or wrong answers, and (2) measures of maximum performance that measure how well people can do things, how much they know and the level of their ability, and ask questions for which there are right or wrong or good or bad answers. The latter category can focus on what people are capable of knowing or doing (ability tests) or what they actually know or can do (aptitude or attainment tests).

Psychological Tests

According to Armstrong (2009) psychological tests use systematic and standardized procedures to measure differences in individual characteristics such are intelligence and personality. They enable selectors to gain a greater understanding of candidates to help in predicting the extent to which they will be successful in a job. Psychological tests are measuring instruments which is why they are often referred to as psychometric tests. Armstrong (2009), view psychometric literally as mental measurement. For selection purposes, the main types of tests are those used for measuring intelligence, and ability and those concerned with assessing personality characteristics.

Intelligence Test

Intelligence tests, sometimes called "mental ability tests" are designed to give an indication of overall mental capacity. A variety of questions are included in such tests, including vocabulary, analogies, similarities, opposites, arithmetic, number extension and general information. Ability to score highly on such tests correlates with the capacity to retain new knowledge, to pass examinations and to succeed

at work. Thus, intelligence tests measure a range of mental abilities which enable a person to succeed at a variety of intellectual tasks using the faculties of abstract thinking and reasoning. They are concerned with general intelligence, and are sometimes called general mental intelligence, and are sometimes called general mental ability tests. "Intelligence test measures abilities", while "cognitive tests measure individual's learning in a specific subject areas". The meta-analysis conducted by Schmidt and Hunter (1998), showed that intelligence tests had high predictive validity in fact, when combined with a structured interview, they had the highest predictive value of all the methods of selection they studied. Intelligence tests contains questions, problems and tasks. The outcome of a test can be expressed as a score that can be compared with the scores of members of the population as a whole or the population of the whole or part of the organization using the test (norm). The outcome of an intelligence test may sometimes be recorded as an intelligence quotient (IQ) which is the ratio of an individual's mental age to the individual's actual age as measured by an intelligence test. When the mental and actual age correspond, the IQ is 100. Scores above 100 indicate that the individual's level of average is above the norm for his or her age, and vice versa (Armstrong, 2009). However, the intelligence test used would still need to be carefully validated in terms of the job for which the candidate was applying. Ceci and Williams (2000), noted that intelligence is to some extent determined by the context, so an individual's test score may not reflect capacity to act intelligently. Indeed, practical intelligence, associated with success in organizations, may be different from the nature of intelligence as measured by tests (William and Sternbery, 2001).

Ability Tests

Ability tests establish what people are capable of knowing or doing. Although the term can refer primarily to reasoning ability. According to the British Psychological Society (2007) ability test refers to measuring the capacity for:

1. Verbal reasoning, that is, the ability to comprehend, interpret, and draw conclusions from oral or written language.
2. Numerical reasoning, that is, the ability to comprehend, interpret and draw conclusions from numerical information.

3. Spatial reasoning, that is, the ability to understand and interpret spatial relations between objects.
4. Mechanical reasoning, that is, understanding of everyday physical laws such as force and leverage.

Personality Tests

Personality test attempt to assess the personality of candidates in order to make predictions about their likely behaviour in a role. Personality is an all-embracing and imprecise term that refers to the behaviour of individuals and the way it is organized and coordinated when they interact with the environment. According to American Management Association (2000) in 2000, about 15% of companies in an American Management Association survey reported using personality tests for selection. Personality test says researchers do not have correct answers. The intent of these tests is to elicit "self-descriptive" answers. Measuring of personality must be developed as carefully as measures of cognitive ability. In evaluating such measures one would expect to see a complete test manual detailing extensive development work, utilizing large samples, followed by evidence of validity against job-performance criteria. There are a number of personality tests on the market that amount to little more than quackery, so potential buyers must take care. Okere (2019), argued that personality inventories are sets of objectively scored questions or statements to which the test taker responds yes if the item is self-descriptive and no if it is not. However, there are a number of well-developed personality inventories available. Most give scores on several traits, such as dominance, tolerance, extroversion, aggression, self-esteem, authoritarism, neuroticism, and independence. Even though these inventories are scored objectively, their proper interpretation may require special training. Users should also be aware that tests that specifically diagnose mental illnesses rather than relative standing on normal personality traits may be illegal in pre-employment screening (Brown, 1996). Historically, says Murray and Michael (1991); Mount and Barrick (1995), predictive validities have been thought to be lower for personality measures than for other types of tests. Lower validities have been attributed to (1) the transparency of some personality inventories, which may invite efforts to "fake good" by applicants eager to be hired, (2) the "shotgun" approach of attempting to find relationships between many personality dimensions and job performance without giving much thought to the actual demands of the job, and (3) the fact that

very few jobs require one and only one type of personality for success. There may be several ways to do the same job well, perhaps by diligent or creative or persuasive. Thus, for many years industrial psychologists recommended that personality test not be used for employee selection (Okere, 2019). However, since 1990, a number of studies have shown that appropriately chosen personality measures often do help predict interpersonal, non-cognitive aspects of job success, although cognitive ability measures remain the best predictors of task performance (David and Stanley, 1989; John and Ellen, 1998; Robert et al, 1986; Leaetta et al, 1990; Fisher and Boyle, 1997). Because personality measures are usually uncorrelated with ability measures, adding an appropriate personality test to a selection battery test may well increase the overall validity of the selection system. According to Behling (1998) some employers rely heavily on assessing the personality of applicants, believing that it is better to hire motivated, reliable, honest, sober, respectful, conscientious employees and then train them to do a specific job than to seek only smart, skilled people who may or may not be responsible and trustworthy. The debate still rages as to the importance of personality for success in some jobs and organizations. The need for personality assessment may be high but there is even more resistance to tests of personality than to tests of aptitude, partly because of the reluctance to see personality as in any way measurable. There is much evidence to suggest that personality is also context dependent, and Iles and Salaman (1995) also argue that personality changes over time. Both of these factors further complicate the issue. Personality tests are mainly used for management, professional and graduate jobs, although there is evidence of their use when high-performance teams are developed.

Theories of human personality vary as much as theories of human intelligence. Researchers have proposed different sets of factors/traits which can be assessed to describe personality. Based on research, Robertson (2001) argued that is now possible to state that there are five basic building blocks of personality: Extroversion/Introversion; Emotional Stability; Agreeableness; Conscientiousness and Openness to new experiences. When past selection research is categorized into these five factors, there is evidence that some personality dimensions are consistently related to job success. For instance, conscientiousness is related to success in job training, to job performance, and to personnel data such as absenteeism and disciplinary actions in virtually all jobs. Openness to experience

predicts success in training, while extraversion is positively related to success in management and sales Mount and Barrick (1995); Ones and Viswesvaran (1996); Leaetta (1992); Schneider et al (1996); Judge et al (1999). There is also evidence that personality-type measures of customer service orientation can be useful in predicting the performance of service employees (McDaniel and Frei, 1994). The correlations between personality and desirable behaviour on the job tend to be small to moderate in size but are of use when combined with appropriate ability measures. Thus, it is dangerous to assume that there is a standard profile of the ideal employee or the ideal personality for a particular job, as the same objectives may be satisfactorily achieved in different ways by different people. Another problem with the use of personality tests is that they rely on an individual's willingness to be honest, as the socially acceptable answer or the one best in terms of the job are seemly easy to pick out, although "lie detector" questions are usually built in. However, research shows that "Ipsative" tests may seek to avoid the social desirability problem by using a different test structure, but another problems arise from this approach. Dalen et al (2001) did show that tests are manipulable but not sufficiently for the candidate to match on ideal profile, and that such manipulation would be exposed by detection measures within the test. There is further problem that some traits measured by the test will not be relevant in terms of performance on the job. However, in the opinion of McHenry (2002) there is at the time of writing an interest in emotional intelligence, test measure self-awareness, self-motivation, emotional control, empathy and the ability to understand and inspire others. Thus, personality tests can provide interesting supplementary information about candidates that is free from the biased reactions that frequently occur in face-to-face interviews, but they have to be used with great care. The test should have been developed by a reputable psychologist or test agency on the basis of extensive research and field testing and they must meet the specific needs of the user. Advice should be sought from a member of Psychological Society on what tests are likely to be appropriate.

Aptitude Test

Aptitude tests are job-specific tests designed to predict the potential an individual has to perform tasks within a job. They typically take the form of work sample tests, which replicate an important aspect of the actual work the candidate will have to do, such as using a keyboard or carrying out a skilled task such as repair

work. Work sample tests can be used only with applicants who are already familiar with the task through experience or training. However, people differ in their performance of tasks of aptitude, or ability measure an individual's potential to develop in either specific or general terms. This is in contrast to attainment tests, which measure the skills an individual has already acquired. When considering the results from aptitude tests it is important to remember that a simple relationship does not exist between a high level of aptitude and a high level of job performance, as other factors, such as motivation, also contribution to job performance. Aptitude tests can be grouped into two categories: those measuring general mental ability or general intelligence, and those measuring specific abilities or aptitudes. Aptitude tests should be properly validated. This will be the case if a test or a test battery has been obtained from a reputable test agency. Alternatively, a special test can be devised by or for the organization to determine the aptitudes required by means of job and skills analysis. The test is then given to employees already working on the job and the results compared with a criterion, usually managers' or team leaders' ratings. If the correlation between test and criterion is sufficiently high, the test is then given to applicants. To validate the test further, a follow-up study of the job performance of the applicants selected by the test is usually carried out.

Work Sample Test

Work-sample tests are used when the applicant is expected to possess one or more crucial job skills, that is, skills that the organization does not intend to teach to new hires. After conducting a thorough job analysis to verify the level and need for these kinds of skills, the human resource specialist can construct a carefully standardized work-sample test. For example, if 80% of the job of secretary requires typing manuscripts from handwritten copy, then the work-sample test should include typing from handwritten copy. The tester should give all candidates the same copy, equipment, instructions, and length of time to complete the test. Scoring standards that have been developed in advance should be applied consistently for all applicants.

Work-sampling of potential candidates for permanent jobs can take place by assessing candidates' work in temporary posts or on government training schemes in the same organization. For some jobs, such as photographers and artists, a

sample of work in the form of a portfolio is expected to be presented at the time of interview. Kanter (1989) suggest that managers and professionals should also be developing portfolios of their work experiences and achievements as one way of enhancing their employability.

Trainability Tests

Trainability tests are used to measure a potential employee's ability to be trained, usually for craft type work. The test consists of the applicants doing a practical task that they have not done before, after having been shown or trained how to do it. The test measures how well they respond to the training and how their performance on the task improves. Because it is performance at a task that is being measured, these tests are sometimes confused with attainment tests; however, they are more concerned with potential ability to do the task and response to training. Thus, trainability tests are used for semiskilled jobs in which the candidate is not expected to know the skill when applying for the job. They are intended to assess the ease with which a candidate can learn the type of skill required by the job.

Attainment Tests

Whereas aptitude test measure an individual's potential, attainment or achievement tests measure skills that have already been acquired. There is much less resistance to such tests of skills. Few candidates for a secretarial/administrative post would refuse to take or typing speed test, or a test on "Word" "PowerPoint" or "Excel" software before interview. The candidates are sufficiently confident of their skills to welcome the opportunity to display them and be approved. Furthermore, they know what they are doing and will know whether they have done well or badly. They are in control, while they feel that the tester is in control of intelligence and personality tests as the candidates do not understand the evaluation rationable. Attainment tests are often devised by the employer.

Integrity Test

Many employers today are interested in screening out job candidates who may be likely to steal from them. Greengard (1995); Niehoff and Paul (2000), confirmed that estimates of the cost of American business of employee theft, pilferage, or

unexplained inventory shrinkage range up to $200 billion per year. Employers who subscribe to the "bad apple" theory believe that rejecting potential thieves and hiring only honest employees will greatly reduce losses (Brown, 1995). This view is only partly correct, since research has shown that post-hire factors such as pay equity, job satisfaction, and opportunity to steal also play a role in determining actual theft (Richard and John, 1983). Traditionally, two types of integrity tests have been used to identify potentially dishonest employees: "polygraph examinations and paper-and-pencil tests". The polygraph, or lie detector, measures and graphs respiration, blood pressure and perspiration while the person being tested answers questions. Doubts about the validity of the polygraph and horror stories of honest individuals who were discharged or denied employment because of erroneous polygraph results have led to legal restrictions on the use of polygraphs (Niehoff and Paul, 2000). Since polygraph testing has been restricted, paper-and-pencil integrity tests have increased in popularity. There are two types of written integrity tests on the market: "overt integrity tests" that assess attitudes toward theft and ask about past dishonest behaviour, and personality-oriented integrity tests that focus on broader traits such as dependability, rule-following, impulse control, and conscientiousness (Paul et al (1989); Ones et al (1993); Bernardin and Cooke (1993); Murphy (1993); Cunningham et al (1994). Most available tests have satisfactory reliability and reasonable validity in identifying individuals who have been caught stealing in the past or who will be caught stealing in the future. Greengard (1995) asserted that personality-oriented tests predict not only theft but also composite measures of other types of counter-productive behaviour, such as abuse of sick leave, excessive grievance filing, drug use at work, and rule breaking. Joyce and Robert (1989), also posit that these behaviours are more common than outright theft and can cost organizations a great deal of money and aggravation.

Predicting Violence in the Workplace

Violence that is, threats, verbal abuse, harassment, physical attacks, homicide, is another problem that many organizations face. In fact homicide is the leading cause of death among female employees. Employers are increasingly interested in screening applicants for violent tendencies, both to reduce the incidence of violence and to reduce liability for negligent hiring. While pre-employment screening with personality tests and background checks may be a partial answer,

Dilorenzo and Carroll (1995) observed that a compete solution must include education, recognition of early warning signs, effective supervision, and appropriate preventive action. Statistically, it is very difficult to accurately predict rare events such as workplace homicide, but it is possible to measure personality traits that tend to be associated with generally noncompliant, hostile, and impulsive behaviour. Arvey (1994); Ones et al (1994) in a research specially constructed violence scales as well as personality-type integrity scales that have shown that these instruments do have validity for predicting violent and counterproductive behaviour at work. The study has also that these scales tap the Big Five Personality dimensions of (low) conscientiousness, (low) agreeableness, and neuroticism.

Critical Features of Test Use

Validity: Different types of validity are:-

1. Predictive Validity: This is the extent to which the test correctly predicts future behaviour. To establish predictive validity it is necessary to conduct extensive research over a period of time. It is also necessary to have accurate measures of performance so that the prediction can be compared with actual behaviour.
2. Concurrent Validity: The is the extent to which a test score differentiates individuals in relation to a criterion or standard of performance external to the test. This means comparing the test scores of high and low performances as indicated by the criteria and establishing the degree to which the test indicates who should fit into the high or low performance groups.
3. Content Validity: This is the extent to which the test is clearly related to the characteristics of the job or role for which it is being used as a measuring instrument.
4. Face Validity: This is the extent to which the test looks or feels right in the sense that it is measuring what it is supposed to measure.
5. Construct Validity: This is the extent to which the test measures a particular construct or characteristic. Construct validity is in effect concerned with looking at the test itself.

Thus, different types of validity can be applied to psychological tests. Human resource managers are most concerned with predictive validity, which is the extent to which the test can predict subsequent job performance. Predictive validity is measured by relating the test scores to measures of future performance, such as error rate, production rate, appraisal scores, absence rate or whatever criteria that are important to the organization. Sometimes performance is defined as the level of the organization to which the individual has been promoted, so the criteria here are organizational rather than job specific. If test scores relate highly to future performance, however defined, then the test is a good predictor.

Reliability: The reliability of a test is the degree to which the test measures consistently whatever, it does measure. If a test is highly reliable, then it is possible to put greater weight on the scores that individuals receive on the test. However, a highly reliable test is of no value in the employment situation unless it also has high validity.

Choosing Tests

It is essential to choose tests that meet the four criteria of sensitivity, standardization, reliability and validity. It is very difficult to achieve the standards required if an organization tries to develop its own test batteries, unless it employs a qualified psychologist or obtains professional advice from a member of Psychological Society. This organization, with the support of the reputable test suppliers, exercises rigorous control over who can use what tests and the standard of training required and given. Particular care should be taken when selecting personality tests, because there are a lot of charlatans about it. Thus, the selection of potential predictors is a critical step. Because so many published tests are available, a firm must collect information and consider it carefully before selecting several tests for a validation effort. Plake and Impara (2001) posit that the choice process should involve reading test reviews written by knowledgeable people and carefully reading the test manual, which details test content, purpose, administration, scoring, and developmental procedures. Also Paul (2002) conclude that among the several characteristics to look for in a published test include (1) specificability assessed, (2) reliability, (3) proper test development procedures, (4)administrative case, and (5) past scores.

Use of Test in a Selection Procedure

While validated intelligence and personality tests can produce useful data, they should not be relied on entirely. It is best to combine them says Armstrong (2009) in a selection procedure with structured interviews.

However, the following should be noted:

1. Tests are often used as part of a selection procedure for occupations where a large number of recruits are required, and where it is not possible to rely entirely on examination results or information about previous experience as the basis for predicting future performance.
2. Intelligence tests are particularly helpful in situations where intelligence is a key factor, but there is no other reliable method of measuring it.
3. Aptitude tests are most useful for jobs where specific and measurable skills are required, such as word-processing and skilled repair work.
4. Tests should be administered only by people who have been trained in what the tests are measuring, how they should be used, and how they should be interpreted.
5. It is essential to evaluate all test by comparing the results at the interview stage with later achievements. To be statistically significant, these evaluations should be carried out over a reasonable period of time and cover as large a number of candidates as possible.
6. In some situations a battery of tests may be used, including various types of intelligence, personality and aptitude tests. These may be a standard battery supplied by a test agency, or a custom-built battery may be developed.

Good Practice in Psychological Testing

Armstrong (2009) says the British Psychological Society and the International Test Commission have respectively produced guidelines on the general use of psychological tests and on the use of one line testing.

General Use of Tests

People who use psychological tests are expected by the British Psychological Society (2007) to:

1. Take steps to ensure that they are able to meet all the standards of competence.
2. Monitor the limits of their competence in psychometric testing and not to offer services that lie outside their competence nor encourage or cause others to do so.
3. Use tests only in conjunction with other assessment methods and only when their use can be supported by the available technical information.
4. Administer, score and interpret tests in accordance with the instructions provided by the test distributor and to the standards defined by the Psychological Society.
5. Store test materials securely and to ensure that no unqualified person has access to them.
6. Ensure test results are stored securely, are not accessible to unauthorized or unqualified persons and are not use for any purposes other than those agreed with the test taker.
7. Obtain the informed consent of potential test takers, making sure that they understand why the tests will be used, what will be done with their results and who will be provided with access to them.
8. Ensure that all test takers are well informed and well prepared for the test session, and that all have had access to practice or familiarization materials where appropriate.
9. Give due consideration to factors such as gender, ethnicity, age, disability and special needs, educational background and level of ability in using and interpreting the results of tests.
10. Provide the test taker and other authorized persons with feedback about the results in a form that makes clear the implications of the results, it clear and in a style appropriate to the level of understanding.

Guidelines on the Use of Online Tests

The key points made in the guidelines on the use of online tests produced by the Interactional Test Commission (2005) are:

1. Only use websites supplied by test publishers who offer validated psychometric tests.
2. Test alone may not provide a complete assessment of an individual as other confirmatory or ancillary information is not included.

3. Provide test-takers with clear instructions on how to take the test.
4. Provide relevant feedback to test takers.
5. When individuals take an unsupervised test, procedures should be used in the form of a confirmatory test to check whether the test-taker's original responses are consistent with the responses to the confirmatory test.

Problems with Using Tests

Okere (2019) reported that a number of problems can be incurred when using tests.

1. Tests are not outstanding predictors of future performance.
2. Validation procedures are essential to the effective use of tests. There are concerns that with the growth of web testing, new types of tests, such as emotional intelligence tests, are being developed without sufficient validation (Tulip, 2002).
3. The criteria that are used to define good job performance in developing the test are often inadequate. They are subjective and may account to some extent for the mediocre correlation between test results and job performance.
4. Tests are often job-specific. If the job for which the test is used changes, then the test can no longer be assumed to relate to job performance in the same way. Also, personality tests only measure how individuals see themselves at a certain time and cannot therefore be reliably reused at a later time.
5. Tests may not be fair as there may be a social, sexual, or trial bias in the questions and scoring system. People from some cultures may, for example, be used to working against the clock.
6. Increasingly, organizations are using competencies as a tool to identify and develop the characteristics of high performance. However, as Fletcher (1996) has reported, it is difficult to relate these readily to psychological tests. Rogers (1999) reports research which suggest the two approaches are compatible – but there is little evidence to support this so far.

Interpreting Test Results

Armstrong (2009) suggest that test results can be interpreted by the use of norms or through criterion scores.

Norms: An individual's score in a test is not meaningful on its own. It needs to be compared with the scores achieved by the population on whom the test was standardized, that is, the norm or reference group. In the opinion of Okere (2019) a normative score is read from a norm's table and might, for example, indicate that some one has performed the test at a level equivalent to the top 30% of the relevant population.

Criterion Scores: Armstrong (2009) says norms simply tell us how someone has performed a test relative to other people. A more powerful approach is to use the relationship between test scores and an indication of what the test is designed to measure, such as job success. This is described as a criterion measure. For example, when the test is validated it may be established that for scores of less than 10 on a test, 50% of people would fail in the job, while the failure rate may be 35% for those who score between 10 and 15 and 20% for those scoring more than 15. Ceci and Williams (2000); McHenry (2002) conclude that the score achieved by the individual would therefore enable a prediction to be made of the likelihood of success. It is important to choose tests that meet the four criteria of sensitivity, standardization, reliability and validity.

Conclusions

A wide variety of selection devices may be used to assess job applicants. One of the most common is test. A test is a means of obtaining a standardized sample of behaviour. Properly chosen tests of cognitive ability are also excellent predictors, as are work-sample and trainability tests. Psychological tests also use systematic and standardized procedures to measure differences in individual characteristics such is intelligence and personality tests. Intelligence tests sometimes called mental ability tests are designed to give an indication of mental capacity. While personality test attempt to assess the personality of candidates in order to make predictions about their likely behaviour in a role. Personality tests are making a comeback and can have modest but consistent validity for some aspects of job success. Also, aptitude tests are job-specific tests designed to predict the potential an individual has to perform tasks within a job. Whereas aptitude test measure an individual's potential, attainment tests measure skills that have already been acquired. Research has also shown that many employers today are interested in screening out job candidates who may be likely to steal from them. Therefore,

employers who subscribe to the bad apple theory believes that rejecting potential thieves and hiring only honest employees will greatly reduce losses. The features tests uses include validity and reliability. Different types of validity are predictive, concurrent, content, and construct validities. At the same time, reliability is the degree to which the test measures consistently whatever it does measures.

Recommendations

The study recommend the following for improved manpower hiring in organizations:-

1. All test takers should get the same instructions, have the same length of time to work, and take the test under similar conditions.
2. Test should be standardized on a representative and sizeable sample of the population for which it is intended.
3. It should be reliable in the sense that it will always measure the same thing.
4. Test should be valid in the sense that it will measure the characteristic the test is intended to measure.
5. The results of test should be interpreted by the use of norms and criterion scores.
6. It is essential to choose tests that meet the four criteria of sensitivity, standardization, reliability, and validity.
7. While validated intelligence and personality tests can produce useful data they should not be relied upon entirely. It is best to combine them in a selection procedure with structured interviews.
8. A number of criteria might also be considered in choosing a selection device. Among these are validity, utility, legality, acceptability to management, applicant reactions, effect on society, and incremental validity beyond devices already in use.
9. Homicide is the leading cause of death among female employees. Therefore, employers should increase interest in screening out applicants who have violent tendencies, both to reduce the incidence of violence and to reduce liability for negligent hiring.
10. The two types of integrity tests, that is, polygraph examinations and paper-and-pencil tests should be used to identify potentially dishonest employees.

References

American Management Association (2000): AMA survey on workforce testing: Basic skills, job skills, and psychological measurement.

Armstrong, M. (2009): Human resource management practices. London.

Arvey, R. D. (1994): Violence in the workplace. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the academy of management, Dallas.

Behling, O. (1998): Employee selection: Will intelligence and conscientiousness do the Job? Academy of management executive, 77 – 86.

Bernardin, H. J. and Cooke, D. K. (1993): Validity of an honesty test in predicting theft among convenience store employees. Academy of Management Journal, 36, 1097 – 1108.

British Psychological Society (2007): Psychological testing: A user's guide. Psychological testing centre, Leicester.

Brown, D. C. (1995): Test misuse in the United Kingdom. The industrial and organizational psychologist, 65 – 66.

Brown, D. C. (1996): EEOC issues revised policy on medical examinations under the ADA. The industrial and organizational psychologist, 107 – 108.

Ceci, S. and Williams, W. (2000): Smart bomb. People management, 24, 32 – 36.

Cunningham, M. R., Wong, D. T. and Barbee, A. P. (1994): Self presentation dynamics on overt integrity tests: Experiment studies of the Reid Report. Journal of applied psychology, 79, 5, 643 – 658.

Dalen, L., Stanton, N. and Roberts, A. (2001): Faking personality questionnaires in selection. Journal of management development, 20, 8, 729 -741.

David, V. D. and Stanley, B. S. (1989): Personality and job performance: Evidence of incremental validity. Personnel psychology, 25 – 36.

Dilorenzo, L. P. and Carrol, D. J. (1995): Screening applicants for a safer workplace. HR Magazine, 55 – 58.

Fisher, C. D. and Boyle, G. J. (1997): Personality and employee selection: Credibility regained. Asia Pacific Journal of Human Resources, 35, 2, 1997.

Fletcher, C. (1996): Mix and Match fails to work on competencies. People management.

Greengard, S. (1995): Are you well armed to screen applicants. Personnel Journal, 84 – 95.

International Test Commission (2005): International guidelines on computer-based and Internet delivered testing. British Psychological Society, Leicester.

John, R. H. and Ellen, M. W. (1988): Reclaiming personality traits for personnel selection: Self-esteem as an illustrative case. Journal of management, 14, 81 – 91.

Joyce, H. and Robert, H. (1989): How to measure employee reliability. Journal of applied psychology, 273 – 279.

Judge, T. A.; Higgings, C. A.; Thoresen, C. J. and Barrick, M. R. (1999): The big five personality traits, general mental ability, and career success across the life span. Personnel Psychology, 52, 621 -652.

Kanter, R. M. (1989): When giants learn to dance. New York: Simon and Schuster.

Leaetta, M. H. (1992): The big five personality variables-construct confusion: Description versus prediction, Human performance, 5, 139 – 155.

Leaetta, M. H., Newell, K. E., Marvin, D. D., John, D. K. and Bodney, A. M. (1990): Criterion – related validities of personality constructs and the effect of response distortion on those validities. Journal of applied psychology, 581 – 595.

MacDaniel, M. A. and Frei, R. L. (1994): Validity of customer service measures in personnel selection: A meta-analysis, paper presented at the ninth annual conference of the society for industrial and organizational psychology, Nashville.

McHenry, R. (2002): The Myers-Briggs response. People management, 8 24, 34.

Mount, M. K. and Barrick, M. R. (1995): The big five personality dimensions: Implications for research and practice in human resource management. Research in personnel and human resource management, 13, 153 – 200.

Murphy, K. R. (1993): Honesty in the workplace. Pacific grove, Calif.: Brooks/Cole.

Murray, R. B. and Michael, K. M. (1991): The big five personality dimensions and job performance: A meta-analysis. Personnel Psychology, 1-26.

Niehoff, B. P. and Paul, R. J. (2000): Causes of employee theft and strategies the human resource managers can use for prevention. Human resource management, 51 – 64.

Okere, L. (2019): Human resource management. Port Harcourt, Sambiz publications.

Ones, D. S. and Viswesvaran (1996): Bandwidth fidelity dilemma in personality measurement for selection. Journal of organizational behaviour, 17, 609 – 626.

Ones, D. S., Viswesvaran C. and Schmidt, F. L. (1993): Comprehensive meta-analysis of integrity test validities: Findings and implications for personnel selection and theories of job performance. Journal of applied psychology, 78, 679 – 703.

Ones, D. S.; Viswesvaran, C., Schmidt, F. L. and Reiss, A. D. (1994): The validity of honesty and violence scales of integrity tests in predicting violence at work. University of Houston CBA working paper series, 278.

Paul, C. S. (2002): How to read a test manual in Hogan and Hogan eds. Business and industry testing, 36 – 47.

Paul, R. S.; Laura, R. B. and Christine, C. (1989): Integrity testing for personnel selection: An update. Personnel Psychology, 491 – 529.

Plake, B. S. and Impara, J. C. (2001): The fourteenth metal measurements yearbook. Lincoln, Nebraska: University of Nebraska Press.

Richard, C. H. and John, P. C. (1983): Theft by employees. Lexington, Mass: Lexington books.

Robert, L. H.; Linda, L. S. and Alan, L. C. (1986): The honeymoon effect in job performance: Temporal increases in the predictive power of achievement motivation. Journal of applied psychology, 17, 185 – 188.

Robertson, I. (2001): Undue diligence. People management, 7, 23, 42 – 43.

Schmidt, F. L. and Hunter, J. E. (1998): The validity and utility of selection methods in personnel psychology: practical and theoretical implications of 85 years of research findings. Psychological bulletin, 124, 2, 262 – 274.

Schneider, R. J.; Hough, L. M. and Dunnette, M. D. (1996): Broadsided by broad traits: How to sink science in five dimensions or less. Journal of organizational behaviour, 17, 639 – 655.

Tulip, S. (2002): Personality trait secrets. People management, 8, 17, 14 – 18.

Williams, W. and Sternbery, R. (2001): Success for managers. London: Lawrence Eribaum associates.