

## **Q & A: Validity and Legality of the Harrison InnerView** **with Anne Sandberg, Managing Director of Predict Success\***

***In your professional judgment, Is the Harrison InnerView profiling tool legally “valid”?***

The “Uniform Guidelines on Employee Selection” remain the definitive source for the courts in interpreting test validity. The Guidelines specify three types of validity: construct, criterion, and content. A test is considered to be “valid” if it meets the definition of at least one of these types of validity. The Harrison InnerView meets both the criterion-referenced type, as well as the content type, if the job-person graph from the report set is used.

Criterion-referenced validity establishes a significant, positive correlation between how people perform on the test (test score) and how they perform on the job (job performance). Thus, someone who achieves a high score on the InnerView test (say, 70% or more on the job-person graph) would be expected to receive a high performance rating (say, 70% or more on a standard 0 – 100% scale of job performance) 90 days, six months or a year later if the test is working well (i.e. is “valid”). We can think about this kind of validity as statistical in nature: test scores accurately predicting job performance. In this way, we would expect that someone who tested poorly, that is, achieved a low score on the test, to turn out to be a poor performer, if actually hired. Conversely, if someone scored high on the test, we would expect that person to become a superior worker once on the job.

Many tests that examine traits, as InnerView does, cannot support criterion-referenced validity. Personality tests, for example, have historically shown little statistical predictiveness. The 25+ studies on InnerView we have reviewed show a reliable, positive correlation between test performance and job performance (averages about .87). InnerView meets the criterion type of validity well, which the courts would look favorably upon.

***What about “content” validity?***

This is the third type of validity that is described in the Guidelines. Content validity relies upon the content of the test being sufficiently similar to the content of the job. For example, a typing test could be said to be content valid for a position as a secretary if fast and accurate typing is required on the job. With InnerView, the job-person graph is constructed based upon a “job analysis”. The job analysis itself is built-into the InnerView process and is based entirely on understanding the essential functions of the job. In this way, the job-person graph demonstrates that the content of the test is sufficiently similar to the content of the job.

***It sounds like InnerView satisfies two types of validity . . .does that matter?***

Yes, the greater the validity evidence, the stronger one's position in the case of legal challenge.

***Has InnerView been taken to court yet?***

No, it hasn't, but that doesn't mean that it never will be; validity is an important issue.

***How often does the company refresh, or add to, its validation effort?***

The company is constantly sponsoring and publishing additional validation studies, which continues to strengthen the position of this test in the event of legal challenge. The product itself is continually being upgraded, as well.

-----

\* **PREDICT SUCCESS®** is a full-service, human resources consulting firm headquartered in Los Angeles, with clients all over the U.S. and S.E. Asia. Managing Directors, Anne Sandberg and Susan Lane, both have advanced degrees in the field, and combined, over 35 years of human resources experience. Sandberg's core training is in test construction and design, with over 20 years experience both designing and constructing tests, and managing testing programs for Fortune 500 companies. She has been used as a "selection expert" in evaluating various selection devices from the perspectives of validity, efficiency, reliability and legal "soundness".