



## Results

### 1. Reliability and correlations (Form A)

	1	2	3	4	5
1. Org & Plan	(.71)	⇐ interjudge			
2. Leadership	.68	(.88)			
3. Perceptive	.29	.45	(.80)		
4. Decisions	.51	.68	.52	(.82)	
5. Delegation	.26	.15	.07	.23	(.83)
$\bar{X}$	3.2	2.2	1.5	2.6	2.5
S.D.	2.21	2.63	3.59	3.25	2.44
$\alpha$ (reliability)	.38	.44	.46	.49	.72

- Interjudge reliability is high
- Alpha is low
- Correlations among scales are moderate to high except delegation

### 2. Correlations between baskets

	1	2	3	4	5
1. Org & Plan	(.38)	⇐ same dimensions			
2. Leadership	.38	(.21)			
3. Perceptive	.43	.24	(.43)		
4. Decisions	.54	.11	.42	(.30)	
5. Delegation	.08	-.19	.04	-.12	(.26)

- Correlations of same dimension across baskets is low.

### 3. ANOVA for training outcomes

Standardized posttest with pretest M, SD.

Demension	MS	F	Posttest Means	
1. Org & plan	3.98	3.19	.78	.24
2. Leadership	1.58	1.59	.91	.58
3. Perceptiveness	7.14	8.60*	.83	.11
4. Decision making	2.01	3.89	.42	.04
5. Delegation	6.33	4.46*	.78	.11

Note. N=58; df = 1, 56.

\*p < .05

## Discussion

1. Problems with reliability of measures. Although judges agree, there is low alpha (internal consistency) and low alternate forms reliability. This means that there is problem in using the scores on in-baskets for making decisions about people.
2. Workbook affected scores on the in-basket. Shows that brief training can affect how well people do on the in-basket. Part of the score doesn't reflect enduring individual differences in traits of interest.

Brannick, M. T., Michaels, C. E., & Baker, D. P. (1989). Construct validity of in-basket scores. Journal of Applied Psychology, 74, 957-963.