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False consensus in situational judgment tests: What would others do?
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A B S T R A C T
We introduce an alternative response instruction to reduce the fakability of situational judgment tests. This novel instruction is based on the false consensus effect, a robust social psychological bias whereby people infer that the majority of other people’s thoughts, attitudes, and behaviors are aligned with their own. In four studies, including both field and laboratory data (total N = 882), we demonstrate that participants show a false consensus bias when asked what others would do in situational judgment tests. Furthermore, the situational judgment test based on the false consensus effect turned out to relatively difficult to be fake, and produced scores that were meaningfully correlated with conceptually related traits, as well as both self-reported and behavioral outcomes.

© 2017 Elsevier Inc. All rights reserved.

1. Introduction

Situational judgment tests (SJTs) have been used for employee selection for about 90 years (e.g., McDaniel, Morgeson, Finnegan, Campion, & Braverman, 2001; Moss, 1926) and have become increasingly popular in research and practice over the past decades (Weekley & Ployhart, 2005). A SJT is a measurement method typically composed of a series of job dilemmas, followed by a list of plausible response options. Candidates are asked to evaluate each response option for either the likelihood that they would respond in that particular manner, or the effectiveness of the response, and are often instructed to either rate each of the response options or to pick the most and/or least adequate option (e.g., O’Connell et al., 2007; Oostrom, De Soete, & Lievens, 2015). HR professionals then assess the degree to which the candidate’s responses map onto the kinds of knowledge, skills, abilities, or traits they are interested in. In general, the literature has supported the criterion-related validity of SJTs (e.g., Christian, Edwards, & Bradley, 2010). For instance, in a meta-analysis, McDaniel, Hartman, Whetzel, and Grubb (2007) found SJTs to have an average observed validity of 0.20 for predicting job performance. Furthermore, research has demonstrated that SJTs show smaller score differences than cognitive measures (e.g., Chan & Schmitt, 1997; Whetzel & McDaniel, 2009) and have high face and content validity (Lievens, Peeters, & Schollaert, 2008), making SJTs an attractive selection tool.

Despite their popularity and criterion-related validity, SJTs have a clear limitation: they are easy to fake by candidates in high-stakes selection settings. For instance, Peeters and Lievens (2005) conducted a between-subjects study on the fakability of SJTs and found that candidates in the faking condition scored 0.89 SD higher than candidates in the honest condition. Faking on a selection test can be defined as a candidate’s conscious distortion of their answers to score more favorably (e.g., McFarland & Ryan, 2000). Although there is an ongoing debate whether faking influences a selection test’s criterion-related validity (e.g., Hough, 1998; Ones & Viswesvaran, 1998), researchers do agree that faking can have a significant effect on the selection decisions that are based on individual test scores. Indeed, Peeters and Lievens showed in their SJT study that, with a selection ratio of 0.25, an organization would largely hire fakers (i.e., 76%) – a potentially costly decision, given the negative consequences of work-place dishonesty (Ariely, 2012).

A seemingly easy way to prevent faking on SJTs is to change the response instruction. There are two common types of response instructions: should-do (i.e., knowledge-based) and would-do (i.e., behavioral tendency) instructions (McDaniel & Nguyen, 2001). Should-do response instructions ask the candidate to identify the best or correct course of action. Would-do response
instructions ask the candidate to indicate how he or she would likely behave (McDaniel et al., 2007). Nguyen, Biderman, and McDaniel (2005) found that candidates can easily distort their answers on a would-do SJT. However, the results for the should-do SJT were inconsistent, due to the difficulty to fake knowledge. Faking even led to lower scores when candidates first answered honestly because they had already responded to the best of their ability the first time they were presented with the job dilemmas.

However, changing the response instruction to a should-do SJT is not possible without changing the constructs that are being measured with the SJT. Indeed, Ployhart and Ehrhart (2003) showed that construct validity is “dramatically affected by the type of instructions” (p. 11). In general, should-do SJTs tap more into ability and knowledge related constructs and would-do SJTs tap more into attitudes and personality related constructs (McDaniel et al., 2007). The question then is: How can we measure personality related constructs in a manner that is resistant to faking? In the present study, we offer a potential answer to this question by introducing an alternative response instruction based on a well-known social psychological phenomenon – the false consensus effect (Ross, Greene, & House, 1977). The false consensus approach would offer an alternative personality assessment, which seems to be particularly useful in situations when candidates have a strong tendency to present themselves in socially desirable ways (Alliger & Dwight, 2000; Becker, 1998).

Although we position this research within the context of employee selection, any assessment of personality and attitudes, be it in the service of theory testing or in the pursuit of applied employee selection, any assessment of personality and attitudes, interested in investigating personality, attitudes, and beliefs, in 2012) and as such should appeal to researchers and practitioners that is not intentionally given as self-informant (Uhlmann et al., 2012). Implicit measures are especially useful in response to self-presentation concerns, rather than from the perspective; many of the false consensus findings are open to multiple interpretations and the proposed mechanisms often overlap or operate simultaneously or in concert.

Even though the exact underlying mechanisms remain unclear, what is clear is that people have a strong tendency to base their estimates of others' characteristics on their own characteristics (Marks & Miller, 1987; Mullen et al., 1985). This tendency is very robust; persisting even when people are educated about the bias, or about actual consensus rates surrounding the issue in question (Alicke & Largo, 1995; Krueger & Clement, 1994). For example, Krueger and Clement (1994) informed participants just before making their prevalence estimates that such estimates are often biased by respondents' own characteristics, and still found no reduction in false consensus. Thus, when people are asked about others' characteristics, they seem unable to avoid revealing information about themselves, even when aware of the phenomenon they then exhibit.

1.2. SJTs as measures of individual differences through false consensus

In most social psychology experiments, the false consensus effect is measured at the group level: the standard test of the false consensus effect is whether the mean consensus estimate provided by people who endorse an item is greater than the mean estimate provided by those who do not endorse the item (e.g., Ross et al., 1977). However, with a SJT based test of the false consensus effect – one that instructs candidates to choose the response option that reflects what other people would do, instead of what they themselves would do (from hereon called ‘FC SJT’) – we move from group level to individual level measurement, with the potential for inferring traits and predicting behavior.

There have been a few earlier attempts at operationalizing false consensus at the individual level (see De la Haye, 2000; Krueger & Clement, 1994). So far, individual level measures of the false consensus effect have been used to confirm the existence of the effect, and to explore the boundary conditions surrounding it. To our knowledge, using the paradigm to directly assess individual level personality with the intention to predict future (job) behavior, has been limited to integrity tests such as the Reid Report (Ash, 1971; Cunningham, Wong, & Barbee, 1994).

We reasoned that the FC SJT is an implicit measure of personality: a measure that minimizes candidate's awareness of what is being measured and/or their ability to control their responses (Uhlmann et al., 2012). Implicit measures are especially useful in evaluative situations in which participants are unwilling to admit their attitudes to others (Sackett & Lievens, 2008; Uhlmann et al., 2012). In the personality domain, several promising implicit measures have been introduced to address the faking concerns of self-report measures (McDaniel, Beier, Perkins, Goggin, & Frankel, 2009).

Our idea of using FC response instructions to measure personality builds on the work by Motowidlo, Hooper, and Jackson (2006),
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