



Validation Analysis of the Hartman Value Profile
(Standard Version – Byrum Method)

Submitted to:



BlueCross BlueShield of Tennessee



Submitted by:

Bart L. Weathington, Ph.D.
University of Tennessee at Chattanooga

David Paul Roberts, M.S.
University of Tennessee at Chattanooga

May 6, 2005

Executive Summary

The criterion-related validity evidence presented in this report supports the use and relevance of the Extrinsic and Systemic facets of the Hartman Value Profile (Standard Version – Byrum Method) as components of the BlueCross BlueShield of Tennessee selection system for nurses, information systems, and customer service personnel. This study demonstrated that these facets are effective in identifying individuals who perform well on the job.

It is recommended that implementation of the Hartman Value Profile be monitored carefully by BlueCross BlueShield of Tennessee. Continued vigilance over the selection process is very important. Additionally, the Extrinsic and Systemic facets should not be used as the sole basis for making selection decisions but instead be incorporated into a more comprehensive selection system.

Introduction

In September of 2004, BlueCross BlueShield of Tennessee contracted with Dr. Bart Weathington to evaluate the use of the Hartman Value Profile (Standard Version – Byrum Method) for selecting employees in nursing, information systems, and customer service. This report details the results of a predictive criterion-related validation study conducted from December 2004 to February 2005.

Predictive Criterion Validation of the Hartman Value Profile

This section of the report evaluates the usefulness of the Hartman Value Profile (Standard Version – Byrum Method) by empirically investigating relationships between employee scores on facets of the Hartman Value Profile and job performance ratings. This strategy, also termed a criterion-related validation study, is consistent with professional standards for the design of testing programs (AERA, APA, & NCME, 1999; SIOP, 1987). Evidence from such a study will establish an empirical link between performance on the predictors and effectiveness on the job.

Objectives

The objective of this validation study is to:

- Investigate the empirical relationships among the scores on the Hartman Value Profile and measures of employee performance.

Method

A predictive validation design was used to establish a link between predictor scores and job performance. This validation method utilized incumbents and their current supervisors and involved three stages. First, a set of incumbents who had already completed the Hartman Value Profile was randomly selected. Second, supervisors were identified who had detailed knowledge of and familiarity with the performance of the incumbents identified in stage one. Third, these supervisors were asked to complete a performance rating questionnaire for between three and eleven supervised incumbents.

Sample

Only evaluations made by supervisors who had supervised selected incumbents for at least one year were included in the analyses. In total, usable data was collected on 150 current employees. Twenty-eight employees (18.7%) were male and 128 were White (85.3%). Eighty-four employees (56.0%) were over the age of 40. Sixty-four employees (42.7%) were working in nursing, 48 (32.0%) were working in information systems, and 38 (25.3%) were working in customer service and claims.

Description of the Measures

Predictor

Hartman Value Profile (Standard Version – Byrum Method): The Hartman Value Profile is a paper-and-pencil instrument that requires participants to rank order eighteen different statements in two different lists. Three types of evaluative judgment are identified based on results. Descriptions for these are presented below:

<i>Intrinsic Value Judgment</i>	The capacity for excellence in relational judgment.
<i>Extrinsic Value Judgment</i>	The capacity for excellence in tasks, projects, and processes.
<i>Systemic Value Judgment</i>	The capacity for excellence in long range planning, strategic visioning, structural integrations, implications, and consequences.

Performance Criteria

Job Performance: A paper-and-pencil instrument was developed to collect ratings of job performance from incumbents' current supervisors. Based on a review of the Hartman Value Profile, four skill areas were identified as being important for job performance. These skill areas and their descriptions are presented below:

<i>Decision Making</i>	Identifying and understanding issues, problems, and opportunities; using effective approaches for choosing a course of action or developing appropriate solutions; taking action that is consistent with available facts, constraints, probable consequences; maintain social, ethical, and organizational norms or codes of conduct.
<i>Strategic Decision Making</i>	Obtaining information and identifying key issues and relationships relevant to achieving a long-range goal or vision; committing to a course of action to accomplish a long-range goal or vision after developing alternatives based on logical assumptions, facts, available resources, constraints, and organizational values.
<i>Ability to Work Well with Others</i>	Developing and using collaborative relationships to facilitate the accomplishment of work goals.
<i>Overall Performance</i>	Overall ability to perform the job. A general rating of ability to perform his or her job effectively.

Analyses

A valid predictor-criterion relationship is established if predictor scores show a significant relationship with supervisory ratings of job performance across a group of individuals. In other words, effective job performance should accompany high predictor scores, while ineffective job performance should accompany low predictor scores. In the specific case of the Hartman Value Profile, due to the manner in which the instrument is scored, lower scores are considered more desirable. Therefore, in order for validity to be present, a significant negative relationship should exist between scores on the Hartman Value Profile and the evaluated performance criteria. Table 1 presents the zero-order correlations between the facets of the Hartman Value Profile and the measured performance criteria.

Table 1

Validity Coefficients - Hartman Value Profile Validation Study

	Hartman Value Profile Facet Scores		
	Intrinsic	Extrinsic	Systemic
Decision Making	-0.03	-0.16 *	-0.11
Strategic Decision Making	-0.05	-0.14	-0.22 **
Ability to Work Well with Others	-0.02	-0.20 *	-0.24 **
Overall Performance	-0.03	-0.19 *	-0.16 *

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$

Interpretation of Results

Analyses did not find a significant relationship between the 'Intrinsic' facet of the Hartman Value Profile and any of the measured performance dimensions. This suggests that while this facet may be useful for employee development it should not be used for selection purposes.

The 'Extrinsic' facet significantly related to employee ratings of Decision Making, Ability to Work Well with Others, and Overall Performance. The 'Systemic' facet significantly related to Strategic Decision Making, Ability to Work Well with Others, and Overall Performance.

Results provide evidence for the relationship between scores on the Extrinsic and Systemic facets and future employee job performance.

Adverse Impact

Group differences on predictor measures can lead to adverse impact against protected groups (e.g., gender, race, and age groups). As defined by the Uniform Guidelines on Employee Selection Procedures (EEOC, CSC, DOL, and DOJ, 1978), adverse impact exists when the ratio of hiring rates for minorities is less than 80 percent of that of the majority. One way of determining whether adverse impact is likely to occur is to review the size of the group differences for each of the predictors. The larger the group difference, the higher the probability that adverse impact will occur.

Due to data constraints, analyses could not be conducted on this sample to evaluate group differences on the Hartman Value Profile.

With respect to the potential for adverse impact, it is strongly recommended that BlueCross BlueShield of Tennessee obtain data on the gender, race/ethnicity, and age of candidates and track passing rates among the various racial subgroups. It is essential that these data are: (a) collected early on in the selection process, (b) kept separate from any scores or information that will be used to make personnel decisions, and (c) never used as the basis for hiring decisions. Following these guidelines will aid BlueCross BlueShield of Tennessee in ensuring compliance with prevailing legal guidelines for the use of employee selection procedures.

Conclusions

The criterion-related validity evidence presented above supports the use and relevance of the Extrinsic and Systemic facets of the Hartman Value Profile (Standard Version – Byrum Method) as components of the BlueCross BlueShield of Tennessee selection system for nurses, information systems, and customer service personnel. This study demonstrated that these facets are effective in identifying individuals who perform well on the job. The correlations presented in Table 1 provide empirical evidence that the predictors show a substantial relationship with the criterion dimensions identified evaluated. Incumbents with more desirable scores on the predictors tend to be ranked high on the performance criteria while incumbents with poorer scores tend to be ranked low on the performance criteria.

It is recommended that implementation of the Hartman Value Profile be monitored carefully by BlueCross BlueShield of Tennessee. Continued vigilance over the selection process is very important. For example, it will allow continued monitoring of the potential for adverse impact resulting from these predictors.

As a final point, although this report supports the use of the Extrinsic and Systemic facets in selection, these predictors should not be the sole basis for making selection decisions. Rather, they will function most effectively when combined with complementary predictors such as structured interviews and/or simulations. The addition of such behaviorally-based measures will maximize both the validity and fairness of the overall selection system.

References

- American Educational Research Association, American Psychological Association, and National Council for Measurement in Education (1999). *Standards for educational and psychological testing*. Washington, DC: American Educational Research Association.
- Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, Civil Service Commission, Department of Labor, and Department of Justice. (1978). Uniform guidelines on employee selection procedures. *Federal Register*, 43(166), 38295-38309.
- Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology (2003). *Principles for the Validation and Use of Personnel Selection Procedures* (4th ed.). Bowling Green, OH: Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology.