



Assessment Center Dimensions Predict Performance-Based Bonus in Business Management Settings

PDF (Size:47KB) PP. 500-503 DOI: 10.4236/psych.2012.36071

Author(s)

Leehu Zysberg

ABSTRACT

This study sought to add to the literature on the validity of Assessment centers (ACs) by first examining the factorial structure emerging from observers' dimension ratings and then examining their predictive validity using a performance criterion often unavailable to researchers—performance-based bonus payment. A series of ACs specially designed for the selection of candidates for entry-mid tier management positions in a large financial corporate ($n = 180$) was used as the sampling frame. For candidates who were promoted to managerial position we gathered bonus information within 6 - 12 months of their promotion ($n = 75$). The dimension ratings and factorial structure of the AC were examined to reveal a 2-factor structure pertaining to cognitive and interpersonal aspects of performance. Both the original dimensions and the two factorial grades showed moderate predictive validity using performance-based bonus as the criterion: The 'organizational commitment' dimension best predicted bonus payment ($r = .38$; $p < .01$) and the interpersonal factorial grade best predicted bonus (standardized $b = .22$ $p < .01$), followed by the cognitive factor, after controlling for gender and tenure. The theoretical and practical implications of the findings are briefly discussed.

KEYWORDS

Assessment Centers; Construct Validity; Predictive Validity; Performance-Based Bonus

Cite this paper

Zysberg, L. (2012). Assessment Center Dimensions Predict Performance-Based Bonus in Business Management Settings. *Psychology*, 3, 500-503. doi: 10.4236/psych.2012.36071.

References

- [1] Arthur, W., Day, E. A., McNelly, T. L., & Edens, P. S. (2006). A meta-analysis of the criterion related validity of assessment center dimensions. *Personnel Psychology*, 56, 125-155. doi:10.1111/j.1744-6570.2003.tb00146.x
- [2] Bowler, M. C., & Woehr, D. J. (2006). A meta-analytic evaluation of the impact of dimension and exercise factors on assessment center ratings. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 91, 1114-1124. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.91.5.1114
- [3] Bowler, M. C., & Woehr, D. J. (2009). Assessment center construct related validity: Stepping beyond the MTMM Matrix. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 754, 173-182. doi:10.1016/j.jvb.2009.03.008
- [4] Bray, D. W., & Grant, D. L. (1966). The assessment center in the measurement of potential for business management. *Psychological Monographs: General and Applied*, 80, 1-27. doi:10.1037/h0093895
- [5] Cascio, W. F., & Aguinis, H. (2010). *Applied psychology in human resource management*. New York: Prentice-Hall.
- [6] Coolican, H. (2010). *Research methods and statistics in psychology*. London, UK: Hodder.
- [7] Gaugler, B. B., Rosenthal, D. B., Thornton III, G. C., & Bentson, C. (1987). Meta-analysis of assessment center validity. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 72, 493-511. doi:10.1037/0021-

• Open Special Issues

• Published Special Issues

• Special Issues Guideline

PSYCH Subscription

Most popular papers in PSYCH

About PSYCH News

Frequently Asked Questions

Recommend to Peers

Recommend to Library

Contact Us

Downloads: 247,327

Visits: 543,140

Sponsors >>

- [8] Hofman, B. J., Melchers, K. G., Blair, C. A., Klienmann, M., & Ladd, R. T. (2011). Exercises and dimensions are the currency of assessment centers. *Personnel Psychology*, 64, 351-395. doi:10.1111/j.1744-6570.2011.01213.x
- [9] Ittner, C. D., Larcker, D. F., & Rajan, M. V. (1997). The choice of performance measures in annual bonus contracts. *The Accounting Review*, 72, 231-255.
- [10] Jansen, A., Lievens, F., & Kleinmann, M. (2011). Do individual differences in perceiving situational demands moderate the relationship between personality and assessment center dimension ratings? *Human Performance*, 24, 231-250. doi:10.1080/08959285.2011.580805
- [11] Jansen, P. G. W., & Stoop, B. A. M. (2001). The dynamics of assessment center validity: Results of a 7-year study. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86, 741-753. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.86.4.741
- [12] Melchers, K. G., Kleinmann, M., & Prinz, M. (2010). Do assessors have too much on their plates? *International Journal of Selection & Assessment*, 18, 329-341. doi:10.1111/j.1468-2389.2010.00516.x
- [13] Meriac, J. P., Hoffman, B. J., Woehr, D. J., & Fleisher, M. S. (2008). Further evidence for the validity of assessment center dimensions: A meta-analysis of the incremental criterion related validity of dimension ratings. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 93, 1042-1052. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.93.5.1042
- [14] Sackett, P. R., & Yang, H. (2000). Correction for range restriction: An expanded typology. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 85, 112-118. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.85.1.112
- [15] Schmidt, F. L., & Hunter, J. E. (1998). the validity and utility of selection methods in personnel psychology. *Psychological Bulletin*, 124, 262-274. doi:10.1037/0033-2909.124.2.262
- [16] Thornton, G. C., & Gibbons, A. M. (2009). Validity of assessment centers for personnel selection. *Human Resources Management Review*, 19, 169-187. doi:10.1016/j.hrmr.2009.02.002
- [17] Viswesvaran, C., & Ones, D. S. (2000). Perspectives on models of job performance. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 8, 216-226. doi:10.1111/1468-2389.00151
- [18] Werner, R., & Dudley, R. A. (2009). Making the pay matter in pay for performance. *Health Affairs*, 28, 1498-1508. doi:10.1377/hlthaff.28.5.1498
- [19] Witt, L. A., Burke, L. A., Barrick, M. A., & Mount, M. K. (2002). The interactive effects of conscientiousness and agreeableness on job performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87, 164-169. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.87.1.164