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Abstract

The purpose of this study was to investigate whether prior performance variations within and among job candidates affect evaluations of present performance and whether these variations result in ratings that are exaggerated or erroneous. There were three conditions: a consistent performance condition (CP), a within candidate performance variation condition (WCV), and a between candidate performance variation condition (BCV). Contrast effects were found in both the BCV and WCV conditions. In addition, ratings obtained when there were performance variations within and among candidates were significantly more accurate than those obtained when there were no performance variations. Practical implications and future research suggestions are discussed.
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CHAPTER I

Overview

The influence of information regarding a ratee's prior performance and the performance of surrounding ratees on evaluations of present performance has been well established (Balzer, 1986; Butler & Gaugler, 1990; Carlson, 1968; Feldman, 1981; Grey & Kipnis, 1976; Hemsley & Marmurek, 1982; Ivancevich, 1983; Murphy, Balzer, Lockhart & Eisenman, 1985; Smither, Reilly, & Buda, 1988). When a rater has this performance information, two outcomes are possible: an assimilation effect or a contrast effect. An assimilation effect results when ratings of present performance are biased toward the level of previous performance or the performance of others. A contrast effect results when ratings of present performance are biased away from the level of previous performance or the performance of others (Murphy, et al., 1985).

Ample evidence of both contrast and assimilation effects has been found in selection interviews (Carlson, 1968; Schuh, 1978) and performance appraisals (Balzer, 1986; Grey & Kipnis, 1976; Hemsley & Marmurek, 1982; Ivancevich, 1983; Kipnis & Vandeveer, 1971; Murphy, et al., 1985; Smither, et al., 1988). With the exception of a single study (Butler & Gaugler, 1990), however, the influence of performance variation in the assessment center has not been investigated. Given the widespread use of the assessment center method for both development and selection, a thorough examination
seems warranted. In addition, assessment centers are rating situations in which several people perform in several job-related situations. Potentially, variations in performance within and among ratees could be present at the same time. The relative strengths of within and between-ratee variation and the influence on ratings have not been investigated. Finally, Smither, et al. (1988) note that contrast and assimilation result in what they term "...error, or bias..." (p. 72) away from or toward prior performance levels or the performance of others. This implies that performance variation leads to inferior or inaccurate ratings, but the assumption has not been tested. The accuracy of ratings obtained when performance varies within and among ratees must be compared to those obtained when performance is consistent before it can be established that variation results in error or bias.

The purpose of this study was to expand the contrast and assimilation effect literature in four ways. First, the effect of performance variations within and among ratees was examined in the assessment center method. Second, the influence of performance variations in a multiple ratee, multiple situation setting was examined. Third, ratings obtained when performance varied were compared to those obtained when performance was consistent. Finally, the relationship between performance variation and accuracy was investigated. Following a review of the literature, each of these points is discussed below.
Review of the Literature

Predicting the effects of surrounding performers and prior knowledge, opinions, and impressions of performers on the rating of present performance is of great interest in psychology. An abundance of research in many areas suggests that performance expectations bias ratings of present performance (Balzer, 1986; Feldman, 1981; Hemsley & Marmurek, 1982; Murphy, et al., 1985; Smither, et al., 1988), and that the context in which performance is evaluated (i.e., the behavior of surrounding performers) will bias evaluations of individual performers (Carlson, 1968; Grey & Kipnis, 1976; Ivancevich, 1983; Butler & Gaugler, 1990).

Assimilation and contrast effects have been studied from the perspectives of variations among persons and variations within persons. An assimilation hypothesis for within-subject comparisons predicts that when evaluating present performance, ratings will be biased in the direction of performance expectations. For example, when the past performance of a ratee has been at a below average level, raters expect that the ratee’s present performance will be below average, as well. When raters observe present performance that is better than they expected (i.e., average or above average performance), raters will tend to evaluate the ratee’s performance lower than it actually was. A contrast hypothesis for within-subject variations, on the other hand, posits that present evaluations will be biased away from the level of performance expectations. Given the same example, a contrast
hypothesis predicts that when raters observe present performance that is better than they expected (i.e., average or above average performance), they will tend to rate the ratee's performance higher than it actually was.

The predictions of assimilation and contrast effects for between-subject comparisons are similar. Assimilation occurs when ratings of an individual are biased in the direction of the performance of others in the perceptual field, whereas contrast effects occur when evaluation of an individual is biased away from the level of surrounding performers (Murphy, et al., 1985). For example, when a low performing person is rated together with superior people, the poor performer may be rated as better than he or she actually performed, illustrating an assimilation effect. Conversely, the same performer evaluated in the identical context may be rated lower than he or she actually performed, illustrating a contrast effect.

Comparisons Within Persons. Both contrast and assimilation effects have been found in studies comparing performance within an individual ratee. Several variables have been identified which influence whether ratings are biased toward or away from the level of prior performance. The time lapse between the formation of an impression and the performance evaluation (Murphy, et al., 1985; Smither, et al., 1988), the mode of presentation (Balzer, 1986; Smither, et al., 1988), and the degree of similarity between present and past performance (Feldman, 1981; Johnson & Judd, 1983; Murphy,
et al., 1985; Pardaffy, 1989) have been shown to affect whether contrast or assimilation effects occur.

The amount of time elapsing between a manager's initial contact with an employee and the point at which he/she is required to complete a performance evaluation may depend on any number of variables. The length of time the employee has been working for the supervisor, the amount of contact the supervisor has with his/her employees, and the frequency of performance evaluations are several such factors. Murphy et al. (1985) investigated the possibility that this time lapse may affect whether contrast or assimilation effects occur. They manipulated the length of time between the formation of an impression and the performance evaluation, and found evidence of a significant contrast effect when the time lapse was one hour. No contrast effects were observed when the time lapse was increased to three weeks. This finding was replicated by Smither, et al., in 1988.

Managers presumably have access to past performance information in a variety of forms: previous performance ratings, written vignettes of critical incidents or performance reviews, and memory of actual performance behavior. The mode of this information has been found to affect whether contrast or assimilation effects occur. Studies finding assimilation effects tend to use trait information lists to create an initial impression, whereas studies finding contrast effects tend to create an initial impression through the actual exposure to ratee performance via
videotape (Balzer, 1986; Smither, et al., 1988). When knowledge of prior performance (impression formation) is obtained through direct observation of candidate performance, contrast effects result. Conversely, assimilation effects tend to occur when knowledge of prior performance is obtained through trait descriptions, written performance ratings, or vignettes (Balzer, 1986; Smither, et al., 1988).

The degree of similarity between past and present performance seems to be an important factor, as well. Assimilation effects are more likely to occur when the difference between past and present performance is relatively small, whereas contrast effects seem to occur when the difference is relatively large (Feldman, 1981; Johnson & Judd, 1983; Pardaffy, 1989; Murphy, et al., 1985).

**Comparisons Among Persons.** The influence of performance variations among ratees on selection interviews (Carlison, 1968; Schuh, 1978), performance appraisals (Grey & Kipnis, 1976; Ivancevich, 1983; Kipnis & Vanderveer, 1971), and the assessment center method (Butler & Gaugler, 1990) have resulted in both contrast and assimilation effects. Carlson (1968) found that ratings of applicants were dependent upon the context in which the applicants were presented. Specifically, unfavorable applicants were rated lower when presented in a group rather than individually, whereas favorable applicants were rated higher when presented in a group rather than individually. Additionally, it was found that when no context information was present, raters had difficulty evaluating
applicants. As when comparisons are made within an individual candidate's performances, comparisons made among individuals tend to result in contrast effects when the mode of initial presentation is actual behavior observation, whereas assimilation effects result when the initial impression is formed by the presentation of a trait adjective list, previous performance ratings, or written vignette (Balzer, 1986).

It has also been found that variations among the performances of several candidates also produce predictable effects on evaluations of performance and subsequent allocation of rewards. Research has found that the presence of a "poor" performer (most often defined as a hostile, non-compliant worker) leads to higher performance evaluations of good performers (compliant workers) than when the context in which the good performer is judged does not include a poor performer (Kipnis & Vanderveer, 1971). A similar finding has been discovered with regard to allocation of rewards: the number of poor performers in a work group was directly proportional to performance ratings and rewards given to good performers (Grey & Kipnis, 1976; Ivancevich, 1983).

A single study has examined the effects of performance variations among candidates in the assessment center (Butler & Gaugler, 1990). This study is also unique in that subjects observed the performances of several candidates performing simultaneously, rather than serially, in a group interaction situation. Specifically, it was found that a standard candidate was perceived as performing
at a higher level when she was observed in a group discussion with below standard candidates than with above standard candidates or a combination of above and below standard candidates.

Implications

The preceding review of literature has revealed four important issues. First, with the exception of a single study (Butler & Gaugler, 1990), the effect of performance variation in the assessment center method remains essentially unexamined. Although there have been a multitude of studies examining the effects of performance variations within and among ratees on ratings, only one study has been conducted in the assessment center setting. An assessment center is a structured process used in the individual evaluation of managerial employees for selection, placement, promotion, training, and development. Ratees, or candidates, participate in a number of job-related simulations, or exercises. The exercises provide trained raters (assessors) with the opportunity to observe and record behaviors reflecting the critical skills and abilities necessary to perform the target job. Assessors then sort the recorded behaviors into the appropriate dimensions of performance. A candidate's performance on each dimension is evaluated, and assessors make an overall assessment rating (OAR) based on the candidate's performance on all dimensions in all exercises.

The assessment center method has become a widely accepted and frequently applied tool for developmental and/or selection purposes
in personnel. Research has encouraged this acceptance by providing strong evidence of the predictive validity of the assessment center, revealing that assessment center ratings predict subsequent performance, salary increases, and promotion (Russell, 1985). Meta-analyses of assessment center research results reported by Hunter and Hunter (1984) and Gaugler, Rosenthal, Thornton, and Bentson (1987) reported validities ranging from .37 to .43, establishing that assessment centers are consistently useful tools for predicting the future success of managerial candidates.

The effectiveness of assessment centers can be attributed to many of the characteristics unique to the assessment center process (Thornton & Byham, 1982). Assessment centers provide assessors with the opportunity to make predictions from behavior gathered from multiple sources of data. In that each exercise is designed to elicit behaviors representative of performance dimensions determined to be relevant to success, assessors are given several opportunities to observe and record assessee behavior across several situations. Furthermore, assessors are motivated to provide high quality observations because assessors must rely on each other for accurate information. Finally, performance reports made by the assessors are supposed to be based on observed, concrete behaviors rather than general, vague and abstract impressions. Assessors must describe performance in terms of behavioral observations and the judgment of behavior is delayed, presumably decreasing the risk of interpretive bias (Holmes, 1977).
There is reason to believe that although the assessment center is a relatively objective rating situation, the performance characteristics of candidates may affect assessors' ratings. First, in addition to the results reported by Butler and Gaugler (1990), the review of assimilation and contrast effects suggested that prior performance differences among and within candidates in selection interviews and performance appraisals affect evaluations of present performance. Second, at least two of the factors that have been associated with contrast effects are present in the assessment center: short time lapse between formation of an impression and the performance evaluation, and actual exposure to ratee performances. It is clear, however, that the assessment center process is different from the interview and performance appraisal in several ways. Additional research is necessary before the findings of prior research can be confidently applied to a process such as the assessment center method.

Second, the effects of within and between-ratee performance variations on performance evaluations have yet to be examined in a multiple ratee, multiple situation setting. In prior research, raters are typically presented with information regarding the performance of one person in several situations or several people in the same situation. To the extent that managers and interviewers in organizations probably observe variations in performance within a single person or across several people, these paradigms are realistic. However, it is unlikely that an interviewer evaluates the
performance of only one worker in several situations. Similarly, it is unlikely that a manager evaluates the performance of several workers in only one situation. Presumably, people evaluating the performance of workers observe several persons across several job-related situations. The effects of performance variation on ratings may be influenced by the availability of information regarding different people in different situations.

Third, in any rating situation, the performance of ratees is likely to vary. Under some circumstances within and between-ratee performance may vary greatly, while under other circumstances performance may be quite similar. Previous research has focused on the occurrence of contrast and assimilation effects when there are performance variations within and among ratees and ratee groups. Ratings obtained when subjects see two high performances followed by the target, standard performance are compared to those obtained when subjects see two low performances followed by the target, standard performance. Performance variation is certainly common, but an equally common situation is one in which performance within and among ratees is consistent. For example, when range restriction is evident, the performance within and among ratees may be very consistent. This rating situation differs from one in which performance varies because raters must differentiate among very similar performances. Although contrast or assimilation effects may occur when performance within and among ratees is consistent, this issue hasn't been addressed.
Finally, a common perception is that contrast and assimilation effects produce biased and erroneous results (Balzer, 1986; Carlson, 1968; Feldman, 1981; Grey & Kipnis, 1976; Hemsley & Marmurek, 1982; Ivancevich, 1983; Murphy, et al., 1985; Smither, et al., 1988). Regardless of whether performance differences are among or within persons and assimilation or contrast effects result, the ratings produced under such conditions are thought to be inaccurate, "artificially" high or low. Previous research, while establishing the occurrence of contrast and assimilation effects, has not directly examined the accuracy of the resulting judgments. Although it has been assumed that ratings influenced by performance variations within and among ratees are biased or erroneous, it has yet to be established whether these ratings are "inferior" (i.e., less accurate) to ratings made when there are no performance variations among and within ratees. In order to establish the relative accuracy of ratings influenced by different performance variations, ratings obtained under these conditions must be compared to target ratings of experienced raters.

The Present Study

These four points illustrate the need to extend the contrast and assimilation effect literature beyond its present development. The present study investigated whether prior performance variations within and among candidates affect evaluations of present performance and whether these variations result in ratings that are exaggerated or erroneous. Three performance conditions were
manipulated: a consistent performance condition (CP), a within-
candidate performance variation condition (WCV) and a between-
candidate performance variation condition (BCV). The CP condition
consisted of three candidates performing poorly in three exercises.
The WCV condition consisted of three candidates performing well in
two successive exercises, and poorly in a third exercise. The BCV
condition consisted of two candidates performing well in three
exercises and a third candidate performing poorly in three exercises.
Assessors observed and evaluated candidates’ videotaped
performances in an assessment center simulation.

Hypotheses

The following hypotheses were investigated:

1. Contrast effects are expected to occur in the BCV condition.
Specifically, ratings of the third candidate evaluated will be
significantly lower in the BCV condition than in the CP condition.

2. Contrast effects are expected to occur in the WCV condition.
Specifically, candidate ratings in the third exercise will be
significantly lower in the WCV condition than in the CP condition.
The relationship between performance variations within and among
candidates and rating accuracy will be explored as well.
CHAPTER II

Method

Subjects

Seventy-two undergraduates served as assessors for the position of residence hall student assistant (SA). All subjects were enrolled in psychology courses and received course credit for their participation.

Research Design

Subjects were randomly assigned to one of three conditions (CP, BCV, and WCV conditions). Subjects in the CP (consistent performance) condition were exposed to all candidates performing poorly in all exercises. Subjects in the BCV (between-candidate variation) condition were exposed to tapes in which two candidates performed well in all exercises and a third candidate performed poorly in all exercises. Subjects in the WCV (within-candidate variation) condition were exposed to tapes in which all candidates performed well in the first and second exercise, and poorly in the third exercise. The research design is shown in Appendix A.

Selection of Target Job, Exercises, and Dimensions

Target Job. Subjects evaluated candidates for the job of student assistant (SA) in a university residence hall. The target job was chosen because it is a managerial position as well as one with which
most students would be familiar. Prior research has used university students as assessors for this position successfully (Butler & Gaugler, 1990; Hayes & Gaugler, 1990; Gaugler & Thornton, 1989).

**Exercises.** Three exercises were used: a conflict mediation involving two roommates, a counseling session involving a student who was having personal problems, and a group meeting regarding a campus policy on alcohol. These exercises were chosen because a thorough job analysis showed that they reflect the position of SA adequately (Gaugler & Thornton, 1989). Additionally, in that serial rather than simultaneous presentation of candidates was necessary to test the hypotheses of this study, none of these exercises required interaction among the job candidates.

**Dimensions.** Planning and organizing, oral communication, analysis and judgment, and sensitivity were the four dimensions used. These dimensions were chosen because experts judged them to be adequately distinguishable from one another and they reflect the content of the SA position. All dimensions were observable in all exercises. The dimensions and their definitions are included in Appendix B.

**Experimental Procedure**

All subjects participated in an assessor training session and an assessment center simulation session. Subjects participated in three person teams and one to five teams participated in any given session. Additional subjects were scheduled to ensure full sessions.
Excess subjects served as observers in the integration session and evaluated the presentation skills of the assessor team members.

Assessor Training. All subjects participated in a one-hour training session conducted by the experimenter before participating in the simulation session. Training for assessors included becoming familiar with the assessment center process and procedure as well as the SA job and dimensions. Assessors gained experience in making behavioral observations by watching a videotape from an unrelated assessment center. Assessors also became familiar with the absolute scale of measurement and the minimal standards of performance used to provide a common standard for evaluating candidates. They received feedback about their performance in this session before participating in the simulation session. Training materials and the assessor training guide are included in Appendix C.

Simulation. Each member of a team viewed three different candidates in three different exercises, made behavioral observations, and classified behaviors into dimensions. The integration session proceeded in the following order.

1. The assessor who observed the first candidate in the first exercise described his/her observations of that candidate for the first dimension, oral communication, while the other assessors listened and took notes. Assessors were permitted to ask questions for clarification, but discussion was limited.

2. Assessors independently rated the first candidate on the first dimension in the first exercise
3. Steps 1-2 were repeated for each dimension.
4. Steps 1-3 were repeated for each exercise.
5. Assessors independently rated the performance of the first candidate on each dimension across all exercises.

The entire procedure was repeated for each candidate. The order in which candidates were discussed was held constant (Candidate 1, Candidate 2, and Candidate 3). The order in which exercises were discussed was held constant as well (conflict mediation, group meeting, and counseling session).

**Development of Stimulus Materials**

**Videotapes.** Scripts were developed to reflect the performance levels necessary for the manipulation. The minimal standards were used to determine the behaviors to be included in each videotape. The minimal standard for each dimension of an exercise is a description of those behaviors which a candidate must show (or must not show) in order to be rated as acceptable (a rating of "3" on the 1 to 5 scale). The minimal standards of performance for each of the three exercises are included in Appendix D. Transcripts for all videotapes are included in Appendix E.

High and low performance levels were used to ensure that performance varied within and among candidates. An effort was made to vary the performance level for a given candidate in a given exercise on each dimension. For example, an overall "low" performance in an exercise might have consisted of a "3" in planning and organizing, a "2" in sensitivity, a "1" in analysis and judgment,
and a "1" in oral communication rather than a "2" in all dimensions.

**Expert Ratings.** Four expert raters were used to determine the levels of performance for the stimulus materials. The experts were persons who had experience in assessment center development and had served as assessors. The expert raters made behavioral observations, classified behaviors into dimensions, and made within-exercise dimension ratings. In an attempt to minimize the problem of contrast effects among expert raters, the following steps were taken.

1. Two experts evaluated all low performance tapes and two experts evaluated all high performance tapes so that each expert rated only one level of performance.

2. Experts were given transcripts of the tapes and were allowed to observe the tapes as many times as they desired. Because the experts could verify their observations with a written transcript, the chance that their observations, classifications, and ratings would be influenced by the performance levels of other candidates was diminished.

The expert raters verified the target performance levels for all tapes. Expert raters were not asked to make across-exercise dimension ratings or overall ratings of performance; therefore, the across-exercise dimension ratings for a candidate were computed as the average of the independent within-exercise dimension ratings of the experts. The mean performance rating of each candidate on each
dimension across exercises for high and low performance levels is presented in Appendix F.

**Administrator Training**

Undergraduates served as administrators for all experimental sessions. In addition to receiving the assessor training, administrators were trained to run the experimental sessions by serving as administrators in pilot sessions. They received individual feedback from experienced administrators as well. The guide for administrators is presented in Appendix G.
CHAPTER III

Results

Manipulation Check

As a manipulation check, a multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was conducted on ratings of each candidate to determine whether each candidate's high performances were perceived by subjects as significantly higher than each candidate's low performances. Results showed that each of the three candidates was rated significantly higher in the high performance tape of each exercise than in the low performance tape of each exercise. The multivariate results are presented in Table 1. The univariate results are presented in Appendix H.

Contrast Effects Among and Within Candidates

The correlations of individual dimension ratings within exercises were computed to examine the degree to which dimensions represented different constructs. These are presented in Table 2. Given the nature of the stimulus materials and the condition manipulation itself, it was necessary to calculate the correlations in the following way:

1. A within-exercise dimension correlation matrix was calculated for each candidate for each exercise at each performance level resulting in eighteen separate matrices.
Table 1.
Manipulation Check: Multivariate Analyses of Variance of Ratings for Candidates One, Two, and Three

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Candidate</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>significance of E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Candidate One</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>155.34</td>
<td>.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidate Two</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>269.33</td>
<td>.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidate Three</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>217.41</td>
<td>.0001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2.

Correlations of Dimension Ratings Within Exercises, Averaged Across Candidates and Performance Levels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>OC</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>PO</th>
<th>A J</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OC</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PO</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A J</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>OC</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>PO</th>
<th>A J</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OC</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PO</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A J</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>OC</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>PO</th>
<th>A J</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OC</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PO</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A J</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. O C=oral communication; S=sensitivity; P O=planning and organizing; A J=analysis and judgment.
2. The within-exercise correlations were averaged across performance levels for each exercise and each candidate resulting in nine matrices.

3. The within-exercise correlations were averaged across candidates for each exercise resulting in three dimension correlation matrices, one for each exercise. The magnitude of the correlations ranged from $r=0.27$ for oral communication and planning and organizing in exercise 1 to $r=0.61$ for sensitivity and analysis and judgment in exercise 3. The average $r$ of dimensions was $r=0.41$. Given these moderate to low correlations among dimensions, dimension ratings were not combined to form a single performance index.

**Performance Variations Among Candidates.** To examine the effects of between-candidate variation on assessors' judgments, the dimension ratings given to the third candidate in the BCV condition were compared to the ratings given to the same candidate in the CP condition. The third candidate was the target candidate for this comparison.

A multivariate analysis of variance was conducted for each exercise using dimension ratings as dependent variables and performance condition (CP vs. BCV) as the independent variable. Performance variations among candidates significantly influenced ratings of the third candidate in exercises 2 ($F(4,43)=6.97$, $p<.0005$) and 3 ($F(4,43)=2.62$, $p<.05$). These results are presented in Table 3. Univariate analyses of ratings of exercise 2 showed significant $F$.
values for three of four dimensions: oral communication, sensitivity, and planning and organizing. Univariate analyses of ratings of exercise 3 showed significant F values for two of four dimensions: planning and organizing, and analysis and judgment. The univariate results for exercises 2 and 3 are presented in Tables 4 and 5, respectively.

In partial support of hypothesis 1, contrast effects occurred in the BCV condition for two of three exercises: the dimension ratings of the performances of the third candidate in the BCV condition were significantly lower than those given to the third candidate in the CP condition for most dimensions. Therefore, ratings of the third candidate were biased away from the level of performance of other candidates.

Performance Variations Within Candidates. To examine the effects of within-candidate performance variation on assessors' judgments, the dimension ratings given to each candidate for the third exercise in the WCV condition were compared to the ratings given to each candidate for the same exercise in the CP condition. Each candidate's performance in the third exercise was the target rating for this comparison.
Table 3.

**Multivariate Analyses of Variance of Ratings for the Third Candidate in Exercises One, Two, and Three**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exercise</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>$E$</th>
<th>Significance of $E$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exercise One</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>.183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exercise Two</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>6.97</td>
<td>.0005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exercise Three</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>.048</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.

Univariate F Values for the Effect of Performance Variations Among Candidates on Dimension Ratings - Exercise Two

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>CP</th>
<th>BCV</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Eta</th>
<th>Direction of Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oral Communication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>10.36***</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>CP&gt;BCV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sensitivity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>7.46**</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>CP&gt;BCV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning and Organizing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>13.89***</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>CP&gt;BCV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis and Judgment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CP&gt;BCV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

***p < .001; **p < .01
Table 5.

Univariate F Values for the Effect of Performance Variations Among Candidates on Dimension Ratings - Exercise Three

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>CP</th>
<th>BCV</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Eta</th>
<th>Direction of Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oral Communication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td></td>
<td>CP &gt; BCV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sensitivity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td></td>
<td>CP &gt; BCV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning and Organizing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>8.18**</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>CP &gt; BCV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis and Judgment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>7.19**</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>CP &gt; BCV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**p < .01
A multivariate analysis of variance was conducted for each candidate using dimension ratings as dependent variables and performance condition (CP vs. WCV) as the independent variable. Performance variations within candidates significantly affected ratings of the second candidate (F(4,43)=6.80, p<.0005). Performance variations within candidates 1 and 3 did not significantly influence assessors' evaluations of performance in the third exercise. The multivariate results are presented in Table 6. Univariate analyses of ratings of candidate 2 were statistically significant for two of four dimensions: oral communication, and analysis and judgment. The univariate results for candidate 2 are presented in Table 7.

In partial support of hypothesis 2, contrast effects occurred in the WCV condition for one of three candidates: the dimension ratings of the performance of one candidate in the third exercise in the WCV condition were significantly lower than those in the CP condition. Therefore, ratings were biased away from the level of prior performance.

Influence of Performance Variation on Rating Accuracy

Rating Accuracy Calculation. Rating accuracy scores were computed for each subject for each within-exercise dimension rating. Rating accuracy was calculated by squaring the difference between the experts' and subjects' ratings.
Performance Variation Among Candidates. The influence of performance variations among candidates on the accuracy of assessors' ratings was examined by comparing the accuracy of ratings given to the third candidate for each exercise in the BCV condition and the accuracy of ratings given to the third candidate for the same exercises in the CP condition. A multivariate analysis of variance was conducted on the accuracy of ratings of the third candidate in each exercise using dimension accuracy scores as dependent variables and condition (CP vs. BCV) as the independent variable.

Performance variations among candidates significantly influenced the accuracy of ratings of the performance of the third candidate in exercises 2 ($F(4,43)=2.90$, $p<.03$) and 3 ($F(4,43)=4.10$, $p<.03$).
Table 6.

Multivariate Analyses of Variance of Ratings in the Third Exercise for Candidates One, Two, and Three

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Candidate</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>$E$</th>
<th>significance of $E$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Candidate One</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidate Two</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>6.80</td>
<td>.0005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidate Three</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td>.098</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7.
Univariate F Values for the Effect of Performance Variations Within a Candidate on Dimension Ratings - Candidate Two

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>CP</th>
<th>WCV</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Eta</th>
<th>Direction of Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oral Communication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>22.67***</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td></td>
<td>CP &gt; WCV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sensitivity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CP &gt; WCV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning and Organizing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CP &gt; WCV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis and Judgment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>4.14*</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td></td>
<td>CP &gt; WCV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

***p < .001; *p < .05
Performance variations among candidates did not significantly influence the accuracy of evaluations of the third candidate in exercise 1. The multivariate results are presented in Table 8. Univariate analyses of accuracy ratings for candidate 3 in exercise 2 showed that performance variations significantly affected the accuracy of only one of the four dimensions: sensitivity. Univariate analyses of accuracy scores for candidate 3 in exercise 3 showed significant F values for two of four dimensions: planning and organizing, and analysis and judgment. Examination of cell means showed that subjects in the between-candidate variation condition made more accurate ratings than subjects in the consistent performance condition. The univariate results for exercises 2 and 3 are presented in Tables 9 and 10.

Performance Variation Within Candidates. The influence of performance variations within candidates on the accuracy of assessors' ratings was examined by comparing the accuracy of ratings given to each candidate's performance in the third exercise in the WCV condition and the accuracy of ratings given to each candidate's performance in the same exercise in the CP condition. A multivariate analysis of variance was conducted on the accuracy or performance ratings of each candidate using dimension accuracy scores as dependent variables and performance condition (CP vs. WCV) as the independent variable.
Table 8.
Multivariate Analyses of Variance of Accuracy Ratings for the Third Candidate in Exercises One, Two, and Three

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exercise</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>$E$</th>
<th>significance of $E$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exercise One</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>.090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exercise Two</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>.033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exercise Three</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>.007</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 9.

Univariate F Values for the Effect of Performance Variations Among Candidates on Accuracy of Dimension Ratings - Exercise Two

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>CP</th>
<th>BCV</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Eta</th>
<th>Direction of Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oral Communication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CP = BCV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sensitivity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>7.46**</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>CP &gt; BCV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning and Organizing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CP &gt; BCV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis and Judgment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CP &lt; BCV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**p < .01
Table 10.

**Univariate F Values for the Effect of Performance Variations Among Candidates on Accuracy of Dimension Ratings - Exercise Three**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>CP</th>
<th>BCV</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Eta</th>
<th>Direction of Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oral Communication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CP &lt; BCV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sensitivity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CP &gt; BCV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning and Organizing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>8.66**</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td></td>
<td>CP &gt; BCV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis and Judgment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>5.25*</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td></td>
<td>CP &gt; BCV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**p < .01; *p < .05**
Performance variations within candidates significantly affected the accuracy of ratings of the third exercise of candidate 3 ($E(4,43)=3.21$, $p<.02$). The multivariate $E$ values were not significant for candidates 1 and 2. The multivariate results are presented in Table 11. Although univariate analyses of accuracy scores for candidate 3 did not show any significant $E$ values, examination of cell means showed that subjects in the within-candidate variation condition made more accurate ratings than those in the consistent performance condition for this candidate. The univariate results are presented in Table 12.
### Table 11.

**Multivariate Analyses of Variance of Accuracy Ratings in the Third Exercise for Candidates One, Two, and Three**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Candidate</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>( E )</th>
<th>Significance of ( E )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Candidate One</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>.155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidate Two</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>.122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidate Three</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>.022</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 12.

Univariate F Values for the Effect of Performance Variations Within a Candidate on Accuracy of Dimension Ratings - Candidate Three

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Condition</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CP</td>
<td>WCV</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Eta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral Communication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sensitivity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning and Organizing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis and Judgment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER IV
Discussion

Contrast effects influenced ratings of the target candidate when there were variations in performance among candidates. There was also some evidence of contrast effects for ratings of candidates in the third exercise when there were variations in performance within candidates. The accuracy of assessors' ratings was influenced by between-candidate performance variations, and influenced to a lesser extent by variability in performance within candidates. The implications of these findings are discussed below.

Influence of Between-Candidate Performance Variation on Assessors' Judgments

Contrast effects occurred for ratings of the target candidate when there were variations in performance between candidates. For two of three exercises, the low performing target candidate was rated significantly lower on most dimensions when he was evaluated in a candidate group consisting of two dissimilar, high performers than when he was evaluated in a candidate group consisting of two similar, low performers. These findings are consistent with prior research in areas other than the assessment center which showed that serial presentation of performers may lead to contrast effects (Carlson, 1968; Grey & Kipnis, 1976; Ivancevich, 1983; Kipnis & Vandeveer, 1971; Schuh, 1978). In addition, the results of this
study are consistent with the only other examination of contrast effects within the assessment center process which showed that the simultaneous presentation of performers may lead to contrast effects as well (Butler & Gaugler, 1990). Thus, it seems that previous research findings can be extended to a multiple ratee, multiple situation setting such as the assessment center process.

Although performance variations among candidates significantly influenced ratings of the target candidate in only the second and third exercises, prior research has shown that contrast effects can occur when there is between-person performance variation in a single exercise. The finding reported here may be a result of the unique rating situation of the assessment center process. Specifically, unlike the typical paradigm used in previous interview and performance appraisal research, this simulation consisted of three exercises. In a situation such as this, it may be that contrast effects strengthen as subjects gather more information about the candidates. As subjects discover that the performance differences among candidates are consistent across exercises, these differences may become more salient to them, resulting in contrast effects. This is particularly realistic in terms of a rating situation such as the performance appraisal where raters may evaluate the performance of incumbents in many situations over a period of time.

Perhaps more important is the fact that subjects are aware that they will have an opportunity to learn about the across-exercise performance of any given candidate during the integration session.
This is an element of the assessment center which differs from previous research designs. Assessors may hesitate to compare the performance of the target candidate to the other candidates until it has been established that performance differences among candidates are consistent. Therefore, performance in the first exercise may not have provided subjects with the amount or degree of discrepant information needed to produce contrast effects when information regarding several exercises will be available.

Influence of Within-Candidate Performance Variation on Assessors' Judgments

There was limited evidence of contrast effects for ratings of candidates in the third exercise when there was variation in performance within candidates. For only one of three candidates, the low target performance was rated lower on most dimensions when the candidate's prior performance had been dissimilar (high) than when the candidate's prior performance had been similar (low). This finding is consistent with prior research in other areas of personnel decision-making which have showed contrast effects resulting from differences in performance within performers (Balzer, 1986; Feldman, 1981; Johnson & Judd, 1983; Murphy, et al., 1985; Pardaffy, 1989; Smither, et al.,1988). The present study extends prior research in that these results indicate that contrast effects may result from variations in performance within
candidates in situations in which several performers are evaluated within a single rating session.

Although there was evidence that performance variations within candidates influenced ratings, this finding was significant for only one of the three candidates evaluated. As previously mentioned, within-person contrast effects have been a fairly robust finding in other areas. In that this simulation incorporated several of the elements which have been found to attenuate the occurrence of contrast effects within persons (e.g., short time lapse between observation and judgment, realistic performance presentation, and highly dissimilar past and present performance levels), it is surprising that within-candidate contrast effects were not stronger. Unlike prior research in this area, subjects in this study evaluated several candidates, rather than a single person, performing in several exercises. Thus, the assessment center rating situation was quite different from that which is typically used in interview or performance appraisal research. Assessors had information regarding the performance of other candidates as well as the performance of an individual candidate. Performance differences within candidates may have been relatively less salient than differences among candidates.

Also, it is important to note that assessors saw each candidate perform in a different exercise before they had complete information regarding the performance of a single candidate in all exercises. Therefore, they observed variations in performance
among candidates in all exercises and then heard assessor reports of performance variations within candidates during the integration phase. This suggests at least three explanations for the relatively weak within-candidate contrast effects. First, it is unclear at what stage in information processing contrast effects occur, but some evidence indicates that contrast effects occur at the observation phase (Balzer, 1986). If contrast effects can occur as early in the rating process as observation, the observation of between-candidate performance variation prior to within-candidate performance variation might weaken the effect of contrasts within candidates.

Second, as previously mentioned, assessors actually observed variations in performance among candidates in all exercises, but merely heard about variations within candidates. The results of this study may reflect the finding that mode of presentation influences the occurrence of contrast effects (Balzer, 1986; Smither, et al., 1988). The information gathered at the integration phase of the assessment center may be analogous to the written vignettes used in past research. Even though the assessors' reports are behaviorally based, it may be that because performance variations within candidates were not directly observed, contrast effects weaken.

Related to this is a third possibility, that assessors weight the information they have gathered more heavily than that which they have heard from members of their assessor team. Because assessors only hear about performance variations within candidates,
they may be hesitant to the extreme ratings characteristic of
contrast effects in this study. The exercise in which the candidates' performances were discrepant was held constant, but the availability of information regarding the performance of other candidates and the way in which performance information is presented may lessen the effects of within-candidate performance variation on ratings.

**Influence of Performance Variation on Rating Accuracy**

The accuracy of ratings obtained when there were performance variations among candidates differed from when there was consistent performance among candidates. Specifically, for two of three exercises, dimension ratings of the low performing target candidate were significantly more accurate when he was evaluated in a group of dissimilar, high performers than when he was evaluated in a group of similar, low performers. Moreover, there was limited evidence that rating accuracy was greater when there were performance variations within candidates than when candidates performed consistently across exercises. For one of three candidates, dimension ratings of the low target performance were more accurate when the candidate's prior performance had been dissimilar (high) than when the candidate's prior performance had been similar (low).

A common perception is that a contrast effect is a form of error which results in ratings that are biased, inaccurate, and
"artificially" high or low. Thus, the occurrence of contrast effects in rating situations has been of concern for many years, and attempts have been made to identify situations in which contrast effects occur and to train raters to avoid comparing performers (Wexley, Sanders, & Yukl, 1973). Although many assessment centers incorporate strategies which should lessen the occurrence of contrast effects (e.g., providing assessor training, use of an absolute rating scale, providing minimal standards of performance), the results of this and another study suggest that the assessment center is not immune to effects of within and between-candidate performance variations (Butler & Gaugler, 1990).

If contrast effects are a form of rater error, then ratings obtained under conditions of between and/or within-candidate variation should be less accurate than when there are no such performance variations. This research, however, suggests that contrast effects may not negatively influence the quality of ratings. In fact, these results suggest that variations in performance within and among candidates may actually enhance the accuracy of ratings. In light of one theory of judgment (Marsh & Parducci, 1978), range frequency theory, these findings may not be surprising. The first principle of this theory, the frequency principle, relies on the significance of the median. According to this principle, raters will try to assign an equal number of stimuli to each part of the rating scale, regardless of the "true" range of the stimuli values. The second principle of this theory, the range principle, relies on the
significance of the mean or midpoint of stimuli. According to this principle, raters will divide a set of stimuli into sub-ranges with equal numerical spread. Raters are seen as torn between these two tactics which can result in very different judgments (Marsh & Parducci, 1978). Regardless of the tactic raters tend to choose, the central point is that the absence of performance variability may lead raters to impose variation where none exists, resulting in less accurate ratings. This may be particularly true in selection and promotion situations where differentiation among performers is central to the rater's job.

Practical Implications

The results of this study suggest several practical implications for conducting assessment centers. Although the performance levels used in this study were highly discrepant, such differences are probably seen in the field. For example, the amount of variability expected within and among candidates in any assessment center may be influenced by the severity of range restriction in the candidate pool. The likelihood of range restriction may be influenced by several factors, including the method by which people are chosen for the assessment center, the use of pre-screening measures, the purpose of the assessment center, and the selection ratio.

The effects of these four factors on the likelihood of variations within and among candidates demonstrate the potential strength of contrast effects in assessment centers. Additionally, the results of
this study indicated that contrast effects can occur within and among candidates. This suggests several practical implications, the first of which is the need for increased awareness and training regarding contrast effects. Both assessors and administrators must be aware of the effects that performance variations within and among candidates can have on ratings. Although subjects in this experiment were told to use the absolute scale for evaluation and were warned against comparing candidates to one another, they were not explicitly told of the effects of comparisons on judgments. Furthermore, examples of several levels of performance should be incorporated in the assessor training program. Although subjects were provided with minimal standards for each exercise and verbal examples of different performance levels, a single, high performance, videotape was used for practicing observation and classification skills. Exposing assessors to several realistic examples of performance levels during training might provide assessors with the range of possible performance levels, thereby minimizing contrast effects. Also, assessors should be provided with the opportunity to rate several levels of candidates in group interaction as well as individual exercises before acting as assessors. Experience and feedback in rating candidate groups in which performance is varied within and among candidates might minimize contrast effects.

A second implication concerns the actual selection of candidates for a candidate group. Accuracy findings suggest that although
contrast effects occur, ratings are more accurate when there are differences in performance among and within candidates than when performance is consistent. This might suggest that, if possible, an effort should be made to place candidates of different performance levels in the same candidate group by screening candidates on a single exercise, for example. This might serve to lessen the effects predicted by range frequency theory of stimulus judgment discussed earlier.

**Suggestions for Future Research**

The findings of this study suggest several areas of future research on contrast effects in the assessment center. First, the magnitude of contrast effects and their influence on rating accuracy should be examined in the field. Although attempts were made to make this assessment center simulation as realistic as possible, inexperienced students served as assessors. For many of the assessors, this was the first time they had evaluated performance in any formal manner. Even though students have been successfully used in past research, their lack of experience and short training may be critical to their notion of the range of performance in assessment centers exercise and influence the magnitude of contrast effects. Although amount of training has not been found to influence the quality of assessors' judgments (Gaugler, et al., 1987), experienced assessors may not be as susceptible to the performance level manipulation used here. Additionally, the degree of accountability and responsibility felt by subjects in the lab setting
is probably much different from that which is felt in the field. Although subjects were told that their participation was important to the development of a selection tool, they were not asked to make a final decision to hire a single candidate. When assessors are asked to make real world selection and promotion decisions for which they will be held accountable, the magnitude of contrast effects might be lessened. Finally, the consensus process used to arrive at a final judgment in most assessment centers was not incorporated into this simulation. Because assessors must support their ratings with behavioral observations, the process of reaching consensus may minimize contrast effects.

Second, future research should examine the occurrence of contrast effects as a function of the purpose of the assessment center. The purpose of the assessment center may influence the strength of within and between-candidate contrast effects in several ways. When the assessment center is used for selection and promotion purposes, the goal of the evaluation process is to choose a few of the "best" candidates and make a hiring or promotion decision. When the assessment center is used for developmental purposes, however, the goal of the evaluation process is to assess each individual's strengths and weaknesses. When assessors are faced with the task of selecting a single person for hiring or promotion, there may be a tendency to compare candidates so that the "best" of the candidate group can be chosen. Therefore, contrast effects among candidates may be more likely in selection and
promotion situations. Conversely, when the assessor's task is to evaluate each candidate's strengths and weaknesses, the emphasis is naturally placed on performance differences within a single candidate. In that the goal is to evaluate the consistency of a candidate's performance across situations, differences within candidates may be more salient. Furthermore, promotion assessment centers may consist of exercises similar to current job situations as well as exercises similar to the job for which the candidate is applying. These new situations may or may not have been encountered prior to the assessment center. It seems likely that not all candidates will be able to perform as well in the new situations as in the more familiar ones. Therefore, within-candidate variation may be more likely in promotion assessment centers because of nature of the exercises themselves. The findings of this study are applicable to selection assessment centers, but may not be extended to developmental or promotion assessment centers.

Third, the effect of within-candidate variation on judgments may have been affected by the presence of between-candidate performance information. The interaction of within and between-candidate performance variation on ratings and rating accuracy could not be examined because this was not a full-factorial design. It is probable that a single candidate group might contain variations within as well as among candidates; therefore, the relative effects
of the two and the interaction between them should be addressed in future research.

Fourth, the magnitude of within-exercise dimension correlations suggested that assessors can discriminate among dimensions. Given that assessors are able to discriminate among dimensions, it may be that contrast effects could occur at the dimension level. The findings of this study suggest that when performance variations within and among candidates are absent, ratings are less accurate. Can this be extended to the dimension level? When there are no variations on dimensions within an exercise, do raters impose variability as range frequency theory would suggest? Whether or not performance variation among dimensions influences contrast effects and rating accuracy should be examined.
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Appendix A
### Consistent Performance (CP)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Exercise 1</th>
<th>Exercise 2</th>
<th>Exercise 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Candidate A</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidate B</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidate C</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>low</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Between Candidate Variation (BCV)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Exercise 1</th>
<th>Exercise 2</th>
<th>Exercise 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Candidate A</td>
<td>high</td>
<td>high</td>
<td>high</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidate B</td>
<td>high</td>
<td>high</td>
<td>high</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidate C</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>low</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Within Candidate Variation (WCV)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Exercise 1</th>
<th>Exercise 2</th>
<th>Exercise 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Candidate A</td>
<td>high</td>
<td>high</td>
<td>low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidate B</td>
<td>high</td>
<td>high</td>
<td>low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidate C</td>
<td>high</td>
<td>high</td>
<td>low</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B
LIST OF DIMENSIONS AND DIMENSION DEFINITIONS

**Oral Communication:**

The ability to express oneself effectively in individual or group situations; includes gestures and other non-verbal behaviors; conveys thoughts clearly and concisely without straying from the topic at hand.

**Sensitivity:**

The ability to accurately appraise the needs, feelings, skills and competencies of others in interpersonal situations and act accordingly.

**Planning and Organizing:**

The ability to establish a course of action for oneself and/or others to accomplish a specific goal; makes proper assignments of personnel and allocates resources properly.

**Analysis and Judgment:**

The ability to identify problems and possible causes; gathers relevant information and relates data from different sources to solve problems.
Appendix C
TRAINING PROGRAM FOR ASSESSORS

OVERVIEW

PUT UP DO NOT DISTURB SIGN
INTRODUCE YOURSELF AND GIVE EACH STUDENT A PACKET
HAVE SUBJECTS SIGN CONSENT FORMS

The purpose of this project is to evaluate a new technique for hiring resident hall assistants. This technique is called an assessment center.

SHOW OVERHEAD 1

An assessment center is not a place. It is a method used to make employment decisions, such as the hiring of a job applicant, the promotion of an employee, or training and development of an employee. In an assessment center, the candidates, who are usually called ‘assesseees’ are observed by trained people, called ‘assessors’, under controlled conditions for a specific amount of time.

Today you will be trained as assessors so that you can evaluate student assistant candidates. I appreciate your help as an assessor in this research project and your willingness to help this research
project succeed so that universities will have the best system possible for hiring residence hall student assistants.

Now I will describe the job of student assistant.

SHOW OVERHEAD 2

A student assistant, known as an SA, is an upper level undergraduate who is assigned to a floor section of a residence hall or college. SAs are responsible for working closely with other SAs to develop and maintain an atmosphere which promotes academic, personal, and social growth in the residence hall.

An SA’s duties entail helping develop university and residence hall policies, communicating and enforcing residence hall policies and procedures, promoting consideration of individual needs in a group living environment, coordinating educational and social/recreational programs for students, ensuring that students develop an appropriate atmosphere on the floor, counseling students, and promoting security awareness. Now I will discuss the assessment center in which you will be participating as an assessor.

Assessment Center Process
SHOW OVERHEAD 3

The three phases of the assessment center in which you will participate are:

a) Observe three candidates for student assistant positions who will perform in three exercises—a counseling session with a troubled student, mediating a conflict between two roommates, and a discussion of alcohol problems on campus with two floor representatives. You will take detailed notes on what the candidates say and do. You won't observe each candidate in every exercise, but you will observe each candidate in one exercise. Later, you will break into groups and share your observations with other assessors.

b) Classify the behaviors you observed and recorded into dimensions of performance, such as oral communication and sensitivity.

c) Break into groups of assessors and observers. You will become part of a three person assessor team and will share information on candidates, one candidate at a time. For each candidate, you will rate each dimension, taking into account the candidate's performance in each exercise. Finally, you will rate candidates on each dimension across all exercises, taking into account the candidate's overall performance on that dimension.
I. Observation

In the observation stage, you will observe three candidates for a student assistant position who will be performing in one of three exercises (conflict mediation, counseling session, and group meeting). You will take notes on everything the candidates say and do. This will include both verbal and non-verbal behavior.

Now we will focus on how to accurately observe and record behaviors.

It is very important to make good behavioral observations of others. Good behavioral observations enable you to make accurate evaluations of others and allow you to successfully communicate to the other assessors what the student assistant candidate actually said and did.

Take out the sheet labelled "Tips for observing and recording behaviors"

SHOW OVERHEAD 4

(a) Good observations:
State what a person says or does (e.g., “He said to the student, ‘I don’t have time to discuss your problem’)

Are specific rather than general (e.g., “She suggested a follow-up meeting in 10 days)

Are descriptive rather than evaluative (e.g., “The students kept talking when he was trying to start the discussion)

Are confirmable by others (e.g., “He took notes throughout the meeting”)

(b) Poor observations:

Make general classification statements (e.g., “She was sensitive”)

Interpret actions (e.g., “The student was getting on the SA’s nerves”)

Impart feelings (e.g., “He was angry”)

Describe underlying personality make-up (e.g., She is paranoid”)

Are there any questions?

A. Practice in identifying good behaviors

Now you are going to practice identifying good and poor behavioral observations. Take out the sheet labelled "Behavior Example Practice Exercise" and determine whether each of the 15 behaviors listed are
indicative of a good or a poor behavioral observation.

HOLD UP THE CORRECT FORM. GIVE THEM 3 MINUTES TO FILL OUT THIS FORM. AFTER TWO MINUTES IS UP, SHOW OVERHEAD 5. DISCUSS EACH OF THE 15 EXAMPLES AND HAVE THEM INDICATE WHETHER EACH IS A GOOD OR A POOR BEHAVIORAL OBSERVATION. REITERATE WHY EACH BEHAVIOR IS A GOOD OR POOR BEHAVIORAL OBSERVATION.

Are there any questions?

B. Practice in recording behavioral observations

Now, you will practice recording behavioral observations by watching a tape of a group of people in a leaderless group discussion exercise. You are to observe and write down both non verbal and verbal behaviors of CHUCK, in the middle. You will be critiqued and will get feedback on your performance. Please remember that making good behavioral observations is one of the most important things that you will do. Keep in mind that you will have to write very quickly to record the gist of what the person says and does. You need to write down details; write down verbatim quotes if possible, and note the context of things to help interpret what the person says. I will now model GREG to give you an example of how this is done.
MODEL GREG FOR 30 SECONDS

Now, please take out your sheet labelled "Behavioral Observation Form (practice)". It looks like this.

SHOW THEM A SAMPLE FORM

You will observe CHUCK, the man in the middle, for two minutes. Please remember to write down everything on this form in as much detail as possible. Start now.

PLAY TAPE FOR TWO MINUTES.

II. Classification of behavior

Now, I would like to discuss the performance dimensions you will be using in this assessment center when you rate candidates. Please take out your sheets labelled "List of Dimensions and Dimension Definitions" and "Behavioral Classification Form (practice)"

HOLD THEM UP.

SHOW OVERHEAD 6

READ THE DEFINITIONS OF THE DIMENSIONS AND ELABORATE ON THEM
Oral communication is defined as the ability to express oneself effectively in individual or group situations. This includes gestures and other non-verbal behaviors and conveying thoughts clearly and accurately. Please note that both verbal and non-verbal behavior is included in this dimension.

Sensitivity is defined as the ability to accurately appraise the needs, feelings and competencies of others and act accordingly. It would involve such things as listening attentively, not interrupting, and incorporating others ideas into a discussion.

Planning and Organizing is defined as the ability to establish a course of action for oneself and/or others to accomplish a specific goal. Also, making proper assignments of personnel and allocating resources appropriately. Planning and organizing deals with activities related to planning and handling matters in an orderly fashion. This might involve organizing the group's time and making a statement of purpose.

Analysis and Judgment is defined as the ability to identify problems and possible causes, gathering relevant information, and relating that information in order to solve problems. Behaviors related to analysis and judgment might involve encouraging everyone to participate and questioning the strengths/weaknesses of possible solutions.
Now please refer to your behavior classification form. It looks like this.

SHOW OVERHEAD 7

A. Classifying behavior into dimensions
As I mentioned earlier, the second phase of the assessment center process involves classification of behavior into the performance dimensions. Now, I will give you examples of how to do this.

GIVE EXAMPLES OF BEHAVIORS THEY SHOULD HAVE RECORDED IN THE PRACTICE SESSION. POINT TO THE DIMENSIONS ON OVERHEAD 7 AS YOU ARE DOING THIS. TRY TO GET SUBJECTS TO PARTICIPATE IN THIS PHASE

When you observed Chuck several minutes ago, you probably noticed that he said "okay" several times. He also maintained eye contact and used his hands throughout the discussion. These behaviors are indicative of oral communication. When classifying behaviors, you would write down these behaviors under the oral communication category.
Chuck also showed sensitivity by stating that ____________
__________________________
A behavior that could be classified under planning and organizing is that Chuck went through the discussion in a methodological manner and did not go off on tangents. Chuck started out the discussion

A behavior related to the analysis and judgment dimension is that Chuck

Are there any questions on how to classify behaviors into dimensions?

III. Integration session

Now we will go over the third stage in the assessment center process - the integration session.

A. Steps in the integration session

SHOW OVERHEAD 8

B. Use absolute scale when rating candidates

When you are discussing a candidate’s performance during the integration session you should never compare his/her performance with that of other candidates. You should use the following rating scale.

SHOW OVERHEAD 9
On this scale an acceptable rating (a rating of 3) does not mean average. It means that the candidate has met what are called the minimal requirements for acceptance for the job.

C. Use minimal standards as a guide

You should use the minimal standards for performance when rating a candidate. You will be given a copy of the minimal standards later.

D. Dimension Ratings

SHOW OVERHEAD 7 AGAIN

Indicate on the form where dimension ratings will be written

E. Across Exercise Dimension Ratings

You will then make what are called across-exercise dimension ratings for each candidate.

SHOW OVERHEAD 10

This is the form on which overall dimension ratings will be made.

Are there any questions at this point?

IDQ

That concludes the training session of this experiment. Before you take a 10 minute break, who has lived for at least one semester in a
residence hall, either here or somewhere else? I would like you to fill out this questionnaire for another project that we are doing here at Rice. Please read the instructions and take a few minutes to fill it out. If you have any questions, please ask me.

**Conclusion**

Now you will have a ten minute break. Please go to room number ____ after your break. Please arrive at your assigned room by ____.

**GIVE SUBJECTS THEIR ASSIGNED ROOMS AND THE TIME THAT THEY SHOULD ARRIVE.**

**COLLECT ALL MATERIALS.**
CONSENT FORM

Experiment #108
Experimenter: Amy Rudolph Ph: x3772
Chair of the Rice Psych Department: Ken Laughery Ph: x4862
Place: Sewall Hall, 201, Rice University

Brief Description: In this experiment, you will be trained in making accurate behavioral observations of candidates for the job of Student Assistant. You will be asked to watch three videotapes of three candidates and rate each candidate's performance as a Student Assistant.

Risks: There are no risks involved in this experiment.

Benefits: You have the opportunity to be trained in making accurate behavioral observations of others and you will become familiar with the assessment process.

Consent Agreement: I have read the above, and agree to participate in this study. I understand that I am free to discontinue my participation at any time. I further understand that any complaints or grievances I may have concerning my participation may be directed to the chairman of the Psychology Department Human Subjects Committee, or to the chairman of the Psychology Department at Rice (x4862).

Print Name:

Signature:

Date: ______________________________________________________
Course for which you would like to receive credit:

________________________________________
Assessment Center

- used to make employment decisions (hiring, promotion, etc.)

- candidates participate in job-related simulations

Those who observe and rate behavior are called ‘assessors’
WHAT IS A STUDENT ASSISTANT (SA)?

* An upper level undergraduate who is assigned to a floor section of a residence hall or college

* Is responsible for developing and maintaining an atmosphere which promotes academic, personal, and social growth in the residence hall

* Duties entail:

- Aiding in development of policies
- Communicating and enforcing policies and procedures
- Promoting consideration of individual needs in a group living environment
- Coordinating educational and social/recreational programs for students
- Developing an appropriate academic atmosphere on the floor
- Counseling students
- Promoting security awareness
PHASES OF THE ASSESSMENT CENTER

1. Observation of behavior
   - Observe one candidate in a group discussion
   - Take detailed notes on what the candidate says and does

2. Classification of behavior
   - Classify behaviors into performance dimension categories

3. Integration session
   - Follow steps in the integration session
   - Rate candidates on an absolute scale; do not compare performance across candidates
   - Use minimal standards as a guide
   - Make within-exercise dimension ratings
   - After one candidate's performance in all exercises is described, make across-exercise dimension ratings
GOOD OBSERVATIONS:

- State what a person says or does
- Are specific rather than general
- Are descriptive rather than evaluative
- Are confirmable by others

POOR OBSERVATIONS

- Make general classification statements
- Interpret actions
- Impart feelings
- Describe underlying personality make-up
**BEHAVIOR EXAMPLE PRACTICE EXERCISE**

Read each statement below and decide whether it is a behavioral statement or it is too general, vague, subjective, etc. The statement may be an example of something "effective" or "ineffective". Imagine that you were listening to someone report observations from an exercise. If the observer actually made that statement, would you know what the student assistant actually said or did? If you think it is a behavioral statement, put an "X" in the "good example" column. If you consider it too vague or general put an "X" in the "poor example" column.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GOOD EXAMPLE</th>
<th>POOR EXAMPLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Looked at his watch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Seemed nervous</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Was the leader of the group</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Asked the student how he was feeling</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Told the student that she looked terrible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Assertively stated her opinion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Suggested studying schedules for the roommates</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Had good listening skills</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Adequately summarized the discussion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Leaned back in chair</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Made a statement of purpose at the beginning of the discussion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Was considerate of others' feelings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Came up with creative solutions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Looked at others' while they spoke</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Giggled several times</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
LIST OF DIMENSIONS AND DIMENSION DEFINITIONS

Oral Communication:

The ability to effectively express oneself effectively in individual or group situations; includes gestures and other non-verbal behaviors; conveys thoughts clearly and concisely without straying from the topic at hand.

Sensitivity:

The ability to accurately appraise the needs, feelings, skills and competencies of others in interpersonal situations and act accordingly.

Planning and Organizing:

The ability to establish a course of action for oneself and/or others to accomplish a specific goal; makes proper assignments of personnel and allocates resources properly.

Analysis and Judgment:

The ability to identify problems and possible causes; gathers relevant information and relates data from different sources to solve problems.
Overhead 7

BEHAVIOR CLASSIFICATION FORM (practice)

Assessor: ____________
Date: ________________
Candidate: CHUCK

Oral Communication: (   )

Sensitivity: (   )

Planning and Organizing: (   )

Analysis and Judgment: (   )
Overhead 8

**STEPS IN THE INTEGRATION SESSION**

1. The assessor who observed a candidate shares his/her behavioral observations of that candidates on oral communication while the other assessors listen and take notes.

2. Assessors may then ask questions for clarification but discussion is limited.

3. Assessors independently rate the candidate on the dimension.

4. Steps 1-3 are repeated for each dimension

5. Steps 1-4 are repeated for each exercise

6. Assessors independently rate the candidate’s overall performance on each dimension across all exercises

7. Steps 1-7 are repeated for the other two candidates
Overhead 9

Rating Scale

“5” — high performance on the dimension
“4” — fairly high performance on the dimension
“3” — acceptable performance on the dimension, not low, not high
“2” — fairly low performance on the dimension
“1” — low performance on the dimension
DEBRIEFING FORM FOR EXPERIMENT #108 (ASSESSMENT OF JOB CANDIDATES)

Thanks again for participating in my study! Now that the study has ended for the semester, I can give you more information about what I was studying and the purposes of the experiment. The experiment was designed to examine two topics within the context of the assessment center: attribution and contrast effects. I was interested in examining the influence of assessee's (the videotaped candidates you observed) performance variations on assessors' (you, the subject) attributions and judgments.

The term attribution refers to the process(es) people use to understand the behavior of other people by attributing characteristics and intentions to them. Generally, a distinction is made between attributions made to internal causes (characteristics of the person) and attributions made to external causes (characteristics of the situation). In the employment setting, it is desirable to choose people according to their internal characteristics because they are more stable than external causes. It is assumed that the standardized conditions of the assessment center eliminate the potential attribution of behavior to external causes, or the "circumstances", thereby allowing assessors to make observations about stable, internal characteristics necessary for job success. If assessors cannot attribute behavior to internal and stable characteristics, their evaluations may be poor predictors of future job success. People tend to base their attributions on several types of information, two of which are distinctiveness and consensus. Distinctiveness refers to how present behavior differs from past behavior. That is, if a person's behavior in one exercise is very different from his/her behavior in the previous two exercises, his/her performance is highly distinctive. There is high consensus if a persons performance in a single exercise is similar to the performance of others in the same exercise; however, if it is different, consensus is low. Research has shown that when distinctiveness is low (the candidate performed at the same level in all exercises), people tend to attribute performance to internal characteristics. Attributions are made to internal characteristics when there is low distinctiveness and low consensus (each candidate performs consistently in all exercises, but candidates perform at different levels).

Contrast effects occur when judgments of one candidate are biased in the opposite direction of other candidates or biased in the opposite direction of the candidate's previous performance. That is: (1) the average candidate rated in a group with below average candidates may be rated as above average, or (2) the presently average performance of a candidate who has performed at an above average level in other exercises may be rated as lower than average. It is assumed that contrast effects do not occur in the assessment center for a variety of reasons. Some of you saw all "high" performances or all "low performances - these were the control conditions of the contrast effects study. Others of you saw combinations of high and low performance - these were the experimental conditions of the study.

Although I have finished running subjects for the semester, I will be running again in the Spring, so please do not discuss the purposes of the experiment. It is crucial that subjects be unaware of the purposes of the experiment. If you have any additional questions or comments regarding the study, feel free to contact me at 527-8101 x3772 or 667-6436. Also, if you might be interested in participating in experiments as a Research Assistant (for credit) next Spring, please contact me. Thank you again.

Sincerely,

Amy Rudolph
Appendix D
CONFLICT MEDIATION

Minimal Standards of Performance*

* the behaviors listed describe what a candidate must do (or not do) to be rated as "acceptable" (a rating of "3") in the conflict mediation

**Oral Communication:** The ability to express oneself effectively in individual or group situations; includes gestures and other nonverbal behaviors; conveys thoughts clearly and concisely without straying from the topic at hand.
- Spoke clearly, concisely, and fluently
- Did not have to repeat self to be understood
- Used acceptable grammar
- Spoke in a conversational tone and volume (i.e., voice didn't crack; no high-pitched or high-paced voice; no giggling or stuttering)
- Maintained train of thought (i.e., not easily diverted more than once by other topics or intruding thoughts)

**Sensitivity:** The ability to appraise accurately the needs, feelings, skills, and competencies of others in interpersonal situations and act accordingly.
- Listened attentively (i.e., often made eye contact with speaker)
- Did not interrupt the roommates
- Expressed an understanding of each roommate's feelings and needs
- Made at least one positive and reinforcing statement about each roommate
- Was persuasive, but not coercive (i.e., did not "give orders" to the roommates, but got them to improve their relationship)
CONFLICT MEDIATION

Minimal Standards of Performance (cont'd)

Planning and Organizing: The ability to establish a course of
action for oneself and/or others to accomplish a specific goal;
makes proper assignments of personnel and allocates resources
appropriately.
• Made an initial statement of purpose at the start of the interview
  • Ensured that the discussion moved along (i.e., did not get bogged
down in one area of concern, but devoted a few minutes to each area)
  • Devised a plan for the roommates to follow to improve their
relationship and asked for commitment from them to follow their
plan
  • Set up a follow-up meeting, specifying its time and date, to
review the roommates' progress with their problems

Analysis and Judgment: The ability to identify problems and
possible causes; gathers relevant information and relates data from
different sources to solve problems.
• Used information provided by both students to identify the
problem
  • Followed up on clues provided by the roommates, and did not
merely follow the interview plan
  • Encouraged both John and Steve to express their ideas regarding
the source of their conflict
  • Gathered information about possible causes of their conflict
before coming up with a plan for the roommates to get along better
(e.g., how come you are not getting along? when do each of you like
to study?)
  • Sought common ground in each roommate's position as a start
  toward resolving the conflict
GROUP MEETING

Minimal Standards of Performance*

* the behaviors listed describe what a candidate must do (or not do) to be rated as "acceptable" (a rating of "3") in the group meeting exercise

**Oral Communication:** The ability to express oneself effectively in individual or group situations; includes gestures and other nonverbal behaviors; conveys thoughts clearly and concisely without straying from the topic at hand.
* Spoke clearly, concisely, and fluently
* Did not have to repeat self to be understood
* Used acceptable grammar
* Spoke in a conversational tone and volume (i.e., voice didn’t crack; no high-pitched or high-paced voice; no giggling or stuttering)

* Maintained train of thought (i.e., not easily diverted by other topics or intruding thoughts)

**Sensitivity:** The ability to appraise accurately the needs, feelings, skills, and competencies of others in interpersonal situations and act accordingly.
* Listened attentively (i.e., often made eye contact with speakers)
* Did not interrupt the other group members
* Expressed an understanding of both Ken’s and Mike’s concerns
* Questioned the ideas of the representatives in a supportive manner (e.g., did not insult them or their ideas/concerns)
* Showed evidence of awareness of the possible reactions of other students and the administration to suggestions and concerns about the alcohol policy
GROUP MEETING

Minimal Standards of Performance (cont'd)

Planning and Organizing: The ability to establish a course of action for oneself and/or others to accomplish a specific goal; makes proper assignments of personnel and allocates resources appropriately.
• Made an initial statement of purpose at the start of the meeting
• Ensured that the discussion moved along (i.e., did not get bogged down in one area of concern, but devoted a few minutes to each area; paid attention to how much time was left for the meeting)
• Made a statement about what should be done with the suggestions the group came up with (e.g., print them in the school newspaper)
• Showed evidence of handling the meeting in a methodical, organized way (e.g., took notes during the discussion; organized the group's ideas into a clear, concise statement)

Analysis and Judgment: The ability to identify problems and possible causes; gathers relevant information and relates data from different sources to solve problems.
• Encouraged both representatives to express their ideas
• Gathered information about students' reactions to the alcohol problem before coming up with a plan to solve the problem
• Examined the strengths and weaknesses of proposed solutions
• Incorporated the ideas of both Ken and Mike when suggesting solutions to the problem
COUNSELING SESSION

Minimal Standards of Performance*

* the behaviors listed describe what a candidate must do (or not do) to be rated as "acceptable" (a rating of "3") in the counseling session

**Oral Communication:** The ability to express oneself effectively in individual or group situations; includes gestures and other nonverbal behaviors; conveys thoughts clearly and concisely without straying from the topic at hand.
• Spoke clearly, concisely, and fluently
• Did not have to repeat self to be understood
• Used acceptable grammar
• Spoke in a conversational tone and volume (i.e., voice didn't crack; no high-pitched or high-paced voice; no giggling or stuttering)
• Maintained train of thought (i.e., not easily diverted by other topics or intruding thoughts)

**Sensitivity:** The ability to appraise accurately the needs, feelings, skills, and competencies of others in interpersonal situations and act accordingly.
• Listened attentively (i.e., often made eye contact with speaker)
• Did not interrupt Bob
• Expressed an understanding of Bob's feelings and needs
• Made at least one positive and reinforcing statement about Bob
• Was persuasive, but not coercive (i.e., did not "give orders" to Bob, but got him to improve his hygiene and to get help from others to deal with his family problems)
COUNSELING SESSION

Minimal Standards of Performance (cont'd)

Planning and Organizing: The ability to establish a course of action for oneself and/or others to accomplish a specific goal; makes proper assignments of personnel and allocates resources appropriately.

- Made an initial statement of purpose at the start of the interview
- Ensured that the discussion moved along (i.e., did not get bogged down in one area of concern, but devoted a few minutes to each area)

- Devised a plan for Bob to follow to help him deal with his parents' separation and asked for commitment from Bob to follow their plan

- Set up a follow-up meeting, specifying its time and date, to review Bob's progress with his problems

Analysis and Judgment: The ability to identify problems and possible causes; gathers relevant information and relates data from different sources to solve problems.

- Followed up on clues provided by Bob, and did not merely follow the interview plan
- Encouraged Bob to express his ideas regarding the source of his depression
- Asked questions about Bob's current hygiene practices (e.g., how often he wears the same clothes; how often he showers)
- Asked questions about Bob's parents' separation (e.g., how do you feel about it?; was it a surprise to you?)
- Gathered information about possible causes of Bob's problems before coming up with a plan for Bob
Appendix E
CONFLICT MEDIATION - CANDIDATE TWO - HIGH PERFORMANCE

John: It's just that you have a weird schedule. I mean, if you just... Come on in.
Dave: Hi guys! My name is Dave. I'm the new student assistant on this floor. I don't think I've met either of you before.
Steve: I'm Steve.
D: Nice to meet you.
J: John
D: John, nice to meet you, too. I understand you two aren't getting along very well.
S: Yeah, that's the truth!
J: That's an understatement. This isn't working out well at all.
D: Well, today we are going to try ans do two things. All right, first of all we need to try and find out why it is that you're not getting along very well and then once we've covered that we'll try and work out some kind of solution so you both can live here and be happy with the situation. I've talked to the housing manager and there aren't going to be any other rooms available for the rest of the semester. So you're going to have to share a room at least for that long. All right? But we are going to work on a plan so you'll both be happy. Why don't we first try and figure out why you guys aren't getting along. Who wants to go first?
J: I'll tell you why we're not getting along. It's him and his girlfriend coming up here all during the weekend or every weekend and spending the whole weekend in the room. And just not giving me any time to study there at all. We just have completely different lifestyles. He studies all the time during the week. I like to party a little bit and take it easy during the week and get my work done on the weekends. They ask me to go to the library all the time and I can't study there. There's no...I have a stereo here and all my books and all my stuff that I need when I'm working. And I don't want to carry all the junk over there...And...he...it's just not workin'. I need to study here. And, and I can't do that when they're here.
D: So you don't really like to study any other place than besides your room? And it sounds like you're a little mad that on the weekend you feel like it's a triple? And, you know, it's your room, too.
J: Yeah
D: Well, I know you would probably like your own room. But like I said the housing manager can't find any other rooms. So we're going
to need to work out some kind of compromise solution. But, before
we do that. let's go ahead and steve, why don't you tell us what you
think the problem is.
S: Well, I agree with john on one thing - we have completely
different lifestyles as he said. I study every weekday 3 to 4 hours a
day. I have a really heard course load. So I have to work really hard.
Um, when the weekend comes I just want to relax and have a good
time. And that's the only time that I can see my girlfriend who goes
to school out of town. She drives here on the weekends. But he's
there every minute of the day on the weekends studying or whatever.
But...Uh...I just...it's the only time that I can take off and relax. I
mean that I can take time off and relax with my girlfriend.
D: Ok. So your lifestyle is that you have to work during the week
because your girlfriend is only here on the weekends. Ok. Well, that
must be really tough. Well... We'll work some kind of compromise
solution out.
S: Well, I work really hard and] he doesn't seem to work that hard at
it. It's just...
J: Wait a minute! I work hard. too. It's just that I do my work on the
weekends. When I go to classes all during the day, I don't feel like
going and studying all night long, too. You know I just do my work on
the weekends and get it done. And I do fine!
D: Well, I've heard you're both very good students. In fact, I know
you both made good grades last semester. And that must be
difficult. You're girlfriend is away and you have a hard class load.
Uh, so you're both good students. The problem is, you know, your just
on different schedules. you just have different lifestyles. Ah, we
can work that out. Oh, let's try and work out some kind of
compromise, okay, so you guys can get along. Does either of you have
any suggestions?
S: Well, I mean, I'll agree to study somewhere else during the week
if John will leave the room to Cathy and me on the weekends so we
can just be alone.
J: No. No way! If you leave me the room on the weekends, I'll go
someplace else during the week and let you study.
S: No, I can't do that. It's the only time I can see Cathy.
D: Ok, wait a minute., I've got a suggestion here - what time during
the week do you guys like to go to sleep? What time?
S: Well, I usually like to go to sleep around midnight.
J: Yeah, probably midnight
S: Every day of the week
D: Ok, all right. You both go to sleep about midnight. How's this for a schedule for the weekdays? How about, oh, from 9-12 let's say the room is reserved just for socializing and visiting with friends. And then from 5-9 the room is reserved just for studying. Ok. So if you want to study later you have to go someplace else, like the library. If you want to visit with] friends before 9, you have to go to their rooms. OK? And then Steve, why don't you try and find a way you can visit Cathy every other weekend so you rotate the schedule.

J: I don't think that's gonna work. This guy studies all the time. Like, it's just not from 5-9. He studies until he goes to bed every night during the week. And I can't party in the room or have friends over when he's working like that. It just puts a damper on everything and on anything anybody wants to do. And I don't believe he's gonna go off on the weekends. And I told you, I don't like studying in the library. It's just, it's just too quiet in there and I can't study.

S: I don't think it's gonna work either because...cause I don't have a car. I have to, we have to stay here because she has the car. She comes to visit me and I don't have a car and I can't leave town. The weekends are the only times I can see her when she drives here.

D: Okay. How about.. All right. You like your music with you when you study. How about if you take your walkman with you to the library. That way you'll have music - background noise to study with, all right? And, you know, you don't have a car, but you still can get to her campus. Why don't you put up notices around campus? You know, advertising for a ride or put an ad in the student paper for rides to her campus.

S: Well, uh, I'll try it out if he'll try it out...try it out

J: If he'll leave almost every other weekend, yeah.

D: Okay. good. Is there anything you guys have in common? That you both like?

J: No man. We don't have anything in common. Well...He studies all the time during the week. Except for the weekends when Cathy's here. And that's true all the time except for last weekend when they were away and left me alone to study.

S: Yeah, yeah, that's right. We went to an Oilers game last weekend. We left and went to that.

J: You went to that game? I heard it was good.

S: yeah, it was a pretty good game. Yeah.

D: All right! So you like the Oilers?

J: Yeah.
D: Great! Do you watch Monday night football?
J: Every week.
D: How 'bout you? Do you watch Monday Night Football, too?
S: Sure, yah.
D: Perfect. OK, so 'bout...listen to this. You guys get together on Monday nights and watch the game together. And that would be a perfect time to talk about any potential problems that might come up that week. Oh, let's say somebody has an important exam and you have a change in the schedule. And you could talk during commercials or before the game. that y all kinds of problems could stop before it happens. And that way you get to watch some football, too. And something you both like, OK? Are you guys willing to try that?
J: Yeah
S: Sounds OK to me.
D: OK great. Well, why don't we meet again 1 week from tonight, same time here in this room and we'll see how the schedule is working out. OK?
J: OK
S: OK
D: so, we're gonna try out this schedule: 9-12 socializing 5-9 just studying in the room, and Monday nights football night. Talk about any problems and watch football games, toss a football, have a good time and I'll meet with you guys a week from tonight to see how it's going. OK?
J: OK
D: OK
S: OK
D: Great!
COUNSELING SESSION - CANDIDATE TWO - HIGH PERFORMANCE

Bob: Come in
Dave: Hi Bob. I don't think we've met before. My name is Dave. I'm the new Student Assistant on this floor and I thought you might want to talk to somebody. I've heard that you've been having some personal problems and I was wondering if you wanted to talk about how you were feeling.
B: Well, ever since I found out that my parents were getting a divorce about a week ago, I just feel like my world is falling apart.
D: Boy, that's tough to find out something like that about your parents when you're far away at school. I can understand it must be really difficult to go to classes and take care of yourself when you feel like your world is falling apart. How have you been feeling since you found this out?
B: Well, ever since I found out about that my parents were getting a divorce about a week ago, I just feel like my world is falling apart.
D: Boy, that's tough to find out something like that about your parents when you're away at school. I can understand it must be really difficult to go to classes and take care of yourself when you feel like your world is falling apart. How have you been since you've found this out?
B: Well, I guess I feel really helpless since I'm so far away at school. I feel like there's really nothing I can do without actually being there. I'm not really gonna have a chance to get home until summer. I'm not sure I understand what's going on between them. It seems like whenever I was home at Christmas things seemed to be going all right. Since I've found out I just can't really seem to get motivated to go to class or do my reading.
D: Well as far as classes are concerned, I know that you are a very good student, and I know that you made all A's last semester. In fact, you help other students sometimes with their assignments if they need help.
B: I just, I just haven't been able to get motivated this semester.
D: Well I can understand news like that makes it difficult to study and take care of yourself; you feel like things are out of your control. But I've also heard that you haven't been taking very good care of yourself - you know, showering, changing and really I'm just concerned about you.
B: What are you trying to say? You trying to say that I smell that I stink.
D: No, what I'm trying to say is that several of your buddies have noticed that there's a problem and really everyone is just concerned about you.
B: I guess I hadn't realized that it had gotten that bad.
D: Well, let's see... How often have you been taking a shower and changing your clothes?
B: Um maybe I guess I've been wearing these for a few days, maybe three days.
D: Well what do you think you could do first to improve your situation hygiene-wise?
B: I could do some laundry, I haven't really done laundry in a while.
D: O.K. You know if you took a shower every day and changed clothes you might really feel better. Uh, since you mentioned laundry, how about this: would you agree like after we finished meeting here to go and do some laundry and then, let's say, how about if you, if you took a shower every day, every morning, and changed clothes?
B: I guess I could take a shower and do some laundry.
D: O.K. Great. Let's see, I'd like to talk a bit more about your family problems. Is there anything you think you could do that would help you cope better with the situation? For instance, is there somebody that you could talk to about it?
B: I have a brother, he's also in school, he's older than me. His name is Frank. I guess I could talk to him.
D: That would be great. I think, I think you should call Frank. Um, you said he's older than you are?
B: Yeah.
D: And he's in college. Is he near here or far away?
B: It's not very far. It's a couple of hours.
D: Well, I think that would be a great idea to talk to Frank. He's probably feeling the same way you are. As a matter of fact, there are other people on the floor you know who have gone through the same type of thing and who would be probably be able to help you. Also I know there is a group of students that meet here on campus who are going through the same type of thing. And if you'd like, I can get you some information on that group.
B: I don't feel like anybody understands, that I could talk to a group of strangers.
D: I know it's difficult especially to talk to strangers about a divorce and every situation is different, but I think people basically
feel the same about a divorce. I'll tell you what, how 'bout I get you some information on the group and that way if you decide you want to look into it, you can.

B: O.K. That sounds good.

D: O.K. How 'bout if we meet 2 days from now to see how things are going. And if you want to talk to me in the mean time just stop by my room. And we agreed that you would do some laundry after the meeting and that you would shower and change daily. And you are going to call your brother Frank and then we'll meet again 2 days from now to see how things are going. O.K.?

B: O.K.
COUNSELING SESSION - CANDIDATE ONE - HIGH PERFORMANCE

Bob: Come in.
Mark: Hello, Bob, I'm Mark, your floor's new SA and I understand you've been having some problems and I was wondering if there was anything you'd like to talk about.
B: Well, about a week ago I found out that my parents were getting divorced and uh ever since then my world's been falling apart.
M: Well I can understand that it must be quite a shock you know it must be very hard for you to concentrate on your school work, you know, taking care of yourself. You know, how did you feel when you first found out about this?
B: I felt real, real helpless, you know, being at school I won't really get a chance to go home until Spring Break or the summer. It's very frustrating talking to my parents on the phone. I don't know what to say - there's really not much to tell, um, I don't understand what happened. I was home for Christmas and things were going really well. I guess things have broken down since then, since I've been back to school this semester. It's like really hard to concentrate on my school work - I'm just not motivated to go to class.
M: Uh, I understand you made all A's last semester and you really helped a lot of people with their assignments. You know, I can understand your sense of feelings when things are out of your control, you know, but um you know other people have mentioned you haven't been showering regularly or changing your clothes, and you know, they are concerned.
B: Uh, what are you trying to say. I mean, are you trying to say that I smell or something - that I stink?
M: Well, um, you know, it's just other people have been noticing that, you know, I mean they notice that you haven't been coming to meals and eating right lately.
B: I guess I didn't realize that. Sometimes I think about my parents - I haven't been able to concentrate and I really haven't been taking care of myself or anything like that.
M: Well, uh, you know why don't you try like eating meals you know. Do you think your hygiene started going down when you found out about your parents. You know, how long has it been since you took a shower?
B: Well, I guess it's been about 4 or 5 days since I have taken a shower or changed my clothes.
M: Well, um, you know, do you have any ideas on how you can improve your hygiene?
B: I guess I could do some laundry. I really haven't done any laundry in a while and I don't have any clean clothes.
M: Well, well, you know, why don't you try showering and doing some laundry or you can try you know taking a shower everyday and after this meeting maybe you can do some laundry immediately following. Then you know, that way you'll have some clean clothes to change into.
B: I guess I could do that
M: Well, uh, you know, is there anyone you can talk to about your family. You know, they'll help you - somebody that can make you feel better?
B: I have a brother, his name is Frank
M: You know I think that'd be a good idea. Is he older than you?
B: Yeah, he's 26.
M: Where's he live?
B: He goes to school about 2 hours from here
M: You know, you know, can you talk to him about it. I mean maybe he feels the same way you do about this
B: Yeah, I really haven't talked to him. I don't know how to
M: You know, I think that'd be a good thing to do and why don't we why don't we try meeting back here, uh, 2 days from now. If you have any problems between now and then, you can feel free to stop by and you know, talk about it. Stop by my room, you know. Otherwise, let's work on doing laundry every day and keeping your clothes clean and taking a shower and eating regularly and let's plan on meeting here at 8 o'clock two days from now.
B: OK sounds good.
CONFLICT MEDIATION - CANDIDATE THREE - HIGH PERFORMANCE

John: So, is Cathy coming up again this weekend?
Steve: Yeah, she is. What about it?
J: We go through this every weekend. Can't you guys make some
other arrangements or something?
S: Why should we make other arrangements? I mean, it's you weird
schedule. It's impossible.
J: What's weird about my schedule? Come on in
Jim: Hi guys, my name is Jim. I'm your resident hall student
assistant
S: I'm Steve
Jim: Steve, nice to meet you, Steve
J: My name's John
Jim: John, nice to meet you. Heard you two guys aren't getting along
very well
S: No kidding!
J: Yeah
Jim: Well, I've talked to the resident hall manager and he says we're
not going to be able to get another room at least the remainder of
the semester. So, we're gonna have to work out some kind of
compromise between you so you can get along a little bit better.
What seems to be the problem?
J: I'll tell you what the problem is. It's him and his girlfriend
locked up in the room every weekend when I'm trying to study. I
mean... they tell me I need to go to the library or something and that
just doesn't work. I just can't study there. It's just too quiet. I
need a stereo or something around to to help me concentrate. The
lights there are fluorescent lights or something, it bothers my eyes.
I can't read for more than an hour without getting a headache or
something. It's supposed to be a double, not a triple. It's ridiculous
Jim: I understand. Sometimes the lights can be very difficult when
reading in the library. I need to hear both sides of the story. So
what do you think seems to be the problem, Steve?
S: Well, I agree with John on one thing. I mean, we really have
different schedules and lifestyles. I work really hard during the
week. I study 3 or 4 hours a nights and ah he wants to be partying
with his friends. And on the weekends, I just want to kick back and
relax. It's the only time I can see my girlfriend, Cathy, who lives out
of town. So I can't see her any other time. He's there every minute of the day studying or whatever. We have no time alone together.

Jim: Well, it can be tough when she's out of town like that. You don't get much time alone together.

S: Yeah, I work really hard and this guy, he hardly seems to work at all. I mean...

J: that's not true! I just don't like working during the week after I've had classes all day long. I work hard on the weekends and get all my stuff done then. I do fine

Jim: Well, I've heard both you guys are pretty good students. It must be really tough trying to do this with conflicting schedules. I hope we can work out some kind of a compromise so we can work this thing out. Anybody have an idea?

S: Well, I'll agree to give up the room on weeknights, so he can party with his friends. I'll go study somewhere else if I can have the room on weekends to be with Cathy.

J: No way. I won't go along with that. I told you, I don't like th studying in the library part. I don't like studying... I can't study in the library. I'll give up the room during the week and go someplace else to party if you'll let me have the room on the weekend.

S: No, I can't do that! I mean, it's the only time I get to see Cathy. And I don't want to go somewhere else on the weekends.

Jim: Well, um, How late do you guys stay up during the week?

S: About midnight, usually

J: Midnight

Jim: About midnight? Well, why don't we come up with some kind of schedule around that? Maybe we could use the room from 5-9 for studying. And use it from 9 to 12 for socializing. That way if either of you needed to study before 5 or something, you could just go somewhere else, like take a break to a friend's house. And if you need to socialize before 9, you could to somewhere else to do that. You know, maybe you could go visit Cathy over the weekend or something

J: No, um, I don't think that's gonna work. This guy just doesn't study from 5-9 every night. He studies all night long. And I don't see that changing him. You can't have a good time with somebody working like that and stuff. And I don't like working in the library. I told you, it's just too quiet in there to study.

S: Well, I don't think this is going to work either. I don't have a car, and there's no way for me to go visit Cathy and so she has to come here every weekend. And there's just no other way to do it.
Jim: Well, you know, maybe you could take a walkman or something like that to the library. You know, that would give you some music to listen to or something. Maybe you could advertise in the school paper, put signs up or something like that to get a ride to see Cathy up at her school. Do you think that will work out?
S: well, OK
J: OK
Jim: You two guys have anything in common?
J: No, man, this guy he just studies all the time. Except for the weekends, when Cathy comes up. And that's every weekend. Except for last weekend.
S: Yeah, last weekend we went out of town to see an Oilers game, the football game
J: Oh, that game? I heard it was a pretty good game
S: yeah, it was a really good game
Jim: Do you like the Oilers?
J: Yeah, I like to watch football
Jim: Do you ever watch Monday Night Football or anything?
S: Almost every Monday night
J: Yeah, crack a few beers
Jim: Well, yeah, maybe that's a good idea. Maybe we can work out something with that. Maybe on Monday nights, you two could get together and watch the game together and ah if you had any kind of changes you needed to make to that schedule, you could talk about it then. If you had a change or something like that, or you could work on a little variation of the schedule. Either before or after the game or something like that. You can talk about it then. What do you think about that?
S: It's pretty good
J: Yeah
Jim: OK, great. Great
J: I like that
Jim: Why don't we set up a time one week from today, uh, same time, same place, right here. We'll meet and talk about how it all worked out. Sound good?
S: OK
Jim: Can you make it back here?
J: Sure
S: Yeah
Jim: Well, let's try and work on that schedule. Five to nine for studying, 9 to 12 we can use for socializing and you can spend
Monday nights trying to work out your differences. And, ah, we'll meet here again one week from today, same time. We'll see how it's all working out
S: OK. Sounds good
J: OK
CONFLICT MEDIATION - CANDIDATE ONE - HIGH PERFORMANCE

John: We go thru this every weekend. Can't you guys make some other arrangements or something?

Steve: No, I mean why should we have to make other arrangements. I mean, it's your weird schedule...

J: Come in

Mark: Hi there! I'm Mark, you're SA. And your Steve, and you must be John. Well, good to meet y'all. I called y'all together today because I understand y'all are having a little problem getting along.

J: Heh, that's true

M: Well, ah, there's no other rooms available this semester. So, we're going to have to try and work out some type of compromise, to help y'all make it thru this semester. And maybe y'all can tell me what the problem is

J: Yeah, I'll tell you what the problem is. It's him and his girlfriend monopolizing the room every weekend when I'm trying to get some work done. I, uh, during the week I like to hang out and he's in there studying all night long and stuff. You can't really invite your friends over to socialize at all. And after you've had a hard day of classes. Weekends when I need to do my work, he invites his girlfriend up and they want to spend all the time together all alone in the room. And, uh, they tell me I need to go to the library or something and I just don't like studying there. It's just too quiet. I need my stereo or some music and all of my books and stuff are here anyway. The light there just bothers my eyes. I mean, but anyway, I thought it was a single this semester, not a double, and now it's a triple. Every weekend it turns into a triple. It's just not fair.

M: Well, I can understand that. You know it is your room and on the weekends, as well. And you know, you should be able to study there. The lighting at the library is a little different. But you know there is no more rooms available. So, we do need to work something out.
Some kind of compromise. So I need to hear both sides. So Steve, do you want to tell me what's the problem?

S: Well, I don't agree with John on one thing, our schedules and lifestyles are really different. I have to study every night of the week, 3 to 4 hours a week, because I really have a course load and he's there partying every night with his friends. And on the weekends I just want to kick back and relax. It's the only time I can see my girlfriend, Cathy, who lives out of town. It's the time we can have any time together. And he's there every minute of the day. So we have no privacy at all, ever.

M: Well, you know, I can understand that too. She's a long ways away at a different college and that could bring some problems.

S: Yeah, and I work really hard. This guy hardly seems to work at all.

J: That's not true! I just don't work during the week. I can't study at night after being in classes all day. I like to do my work on the weekends when I have more time and stuff. But I still do real well in school.

M: Well, uuhh, Steve I know you're a good student and make good grades and you carry a difficult class load. And that's good, you know, Cathy's a long ways away. And John, I know last semester you did really well ins school and you completed some difficult classes, as well. Both of y'all are good students and we need to get some study times down. What we need to do is make a compromise. There are no other rooms available, so do y'all have nay suggestions?

S: Well, I'd be willing to give up the room during the weekdays and study somewhere else so he can party with his friends, if he'll leave the room to Cathy and me on the weekends so we can be alone together.

J: I can't do that. I told you, I can't study in the library. But I'll give up the room during the weekdays and let you study there and I'll go someplace else to hang out. If you'll let me use the room on the weekends to study.
S: No way! The weekends are the only time I can see Cathy so I can't
give it up during the weekends

M: Well, uh, how late do y'all you guys stay up?

S: Usually stay up til about midnight

J: Yeah

M: Well, um, maybe we could try a time from like 9 to 12 as a social
time in the room and a say 5 to 9 study time and if you want to study
before then maybe you could go to the library or somewhere else.
And ah during that time if you want to hang out or have somebody
over for a party maybe y'all could maybe go to a room down the hall
or go somewhere else. And, ah, Steve, maybe you could try seeing
Cathy every other weekend instead of her coming down here

J: Well, I don't think that's gonna work. this guy just doesn't study
from 5 to 9. He studies all night long til midnight. And when he's in
the room, nobody feels like coming in and socializing and stuff. And
I told you, I don't' like going to the library, it's just too quiet there.
I need some music or something. I'm used to my stereo around or
something

S: Well, I don't think it's gonna work either. I don't have a car, so
how am I supposed to see Cathy every other weekend?

M: Well, uh, John maybe you could use some headphones in the
library or possibly go to a roommates room, or in the lounge or
something where the lights are a little bit better. And try that.
Steve, maybe you could put an ad in the school paper or maybe put
signs up for people going towards over to Cathy's campus and maybe
a bus station. they really have some good fares if you are traveling,
you know, pretty often. You could get over there like that. How
dopes this plan sound?

S: Well, I'll try if he will

J: Yeah

M: All right. Is there anything y'all have in common?
J: No, man, this guy all he does is study during the week and studies all night long. And on the weekends, Cathy comes up. And they're together all the time. Except for last weekend. They weren't here.

S: Yeah, last weekend we went to see an Oilers game

J: Oh yeah? I heard that game was good

S: Yeah, it was a really good game

M: Y'all like football?

J: Yeah. I watch Monday Night Football

M: Do you ever watch Monday Night Football?

S: Almost every Monday night

M: Really? Well, um, maybe y'all could get together and watch Monday Night Football and maybe before the game starts or during commercials, y'all could discuss y'all's schedule. And maybe make different plans or arrangements if one of y'all have a big test coming up and change it a little bit. Other than that, maybe y'all could kick back and relax and enjoy some football. OK?

S: Sounds pretty good

J: Sounds good

M: OK, well, um, OK, why don't we try that. We'll meet back here next, same time next week and see if we can't see how things are going. And let's remember, let's watch Monday Night Football and discuss the problem and discuss the schedule and meet back here. Does that sound good?

S: Yeah

J: Sounds good
COUNSELING SESSION - CANDIDATE THREE - HIGH PERFORMANCE

Bob: Come in
Jim: Hi Bob. I'm Jim the SA on the floor. Uh, how are ya doin'? I've heard you've been having some personal problems and might want to talk to somebody. Well, would you like to talk to me?
B: About a week ago, I found out that my parents are getting divorced and and ever since then I just feel like my world's falling apart.
J: I understand how tough that can be you know going through school having your parents get separated like that. It must be hard to concentrate on your school work and take care of yourself. Um, how do you feel about the separation?
B: I feel really helpless, you know, being up here at school, there's really not much I can you know do about it. Not being able to get home until Christmas. Well, maybe during Christmas things will change. It's just that right now, it's real hard to be motivated towards school or anything like that.
J: I know. I know you do real well in school - you made good grades this semester. Um, it must be hard going through this right now. Um, you know Gerry lives right down the hall and you might get some notes from him. I know he's in your classes and I'm sure he'd be happy to give them. Another thing I've heard that you really haven't been taking care of yourself, taking showers, changing clothes and stuff and I'm just real concerned about you.
B: Are you trying to say that I smell or something??
J: No, no, just that several other students have noticed and we're all just a little bit worried about you.
B: I guess I didn't realize it had, you know, gotten that bad - that I was bothering other people or anything like that. I don't know.
J: Um, well, how often have you been showering and changing clothes?
B: Oh, it's probably 4 or 5 days. I just haven't really been really able to get motivated to do anything - study or read or go to class or nothing.
J: I understand it can be really tough on you right now. What do you think you can do first right now to start to help yourself?
B: I guess I could do some laundry. I haven't done laundry in a while.
J: Well, you know, taking a shower and putting on some clean clothes might make you fell a little better. Um, do you think you
know you could take a shower and do some laundry right after this meeting?
B: Yeah, I could do that
J: OK, great. Also, I've been thing about your parents and everything - is there anything that...Is there anyone you could talk to, family or a brother or sisters or somebody like that who might be going through this, too?
B: Well, I have an older brother, Frank.
J: Well, that's a good idea. Does he does he live here in town?
B: No, he goes to school a couple hours away.
J: Have you had a chance to talk to him yet about this?
B: No, I haven't talked to him in a while
J: Well, I think it's a really good idea if you' could talk to Frank about it. I'm sure he's having the same feelings that you are. And there's a couple students on the floor who have had their parents separate and I'm sure they had close to the same feelings you are. There's also a group on campus - it's like a support group for students of divorced parents. You might want to contact them
B: I feel like my situation's different. No one - that they wouldn't really even understand
J: Well, every situation is different, but they may be going through the same feelings that you have right now. Well, let me get you some information on that and maybe if you want to, you can call them and find out where they meet and that would help you out if you want. I think it would also be a good idea to call your brother Frank. I'm sure he has pretty much the same thoughts and feelings you have about the separation. Also, you know, I'm sure Gerry down the hall would be happy to give you those notes for the classes that you missed. And, uh, why don't we meet again here in 2 days just to make sure you're changing, showering, and taking care of yourself. If you want, drop by my room before then. I'm there quite a bit, I could help you out - talk. OK?
B: Uh huh
J: So, we'll meet here again in 2 days and I'll get you that information on that support group and you can talk to your brother before then and do some laundry and things and that'll be great. Alright?
B: OK, yeah.
GROUP MEETING - CANDIDATE TWO - HIGH PERFORMANCE

Dave: Hi, my name's Dave. I don't think we've met before
Ken: I'm Ken
D: Ken, nice to meet you
Mike: And I'm Mike
D: Hi Mike. Nice to meet you. I'm the new Student Assistant in this
dorm and the reason I wanted to meet with you two floor
representatives is, as you probably know, there's been an increase in
alcohol related problems on campus. We need to talk about ideas for
solving this problem. There are 2 points I wanted us to concentrate
on. First, is how the policy could be better enforced and number 2 is
who's going to be enforcing it.
K: That sounds good
D: Does that sound okay?
M: OK
D: alright, well, before we come up with solutions or suggestions,
ah, I want to hear how each of your floors fell about the alcohol
problems. I think it's important that um we consider how students
feel about the problem and the policy before we come up with any
kind of solution. Ah, Ken, why don't you tell me how the second floor
people feel about it
K: OK, well, I ah talked with several of the people on my floor and
I've also read about this supposed increase in the number of alcohol
related incidents, fights and these types of things, ya know, we've
been having here on campus. The general consensus on my floor is
"hey what's the problem". Let's face it, people are going to party and
drink regardless of what some alcohol policy has to say, ah, but I
don't know. I think that if anything works it's gotta be a punishment,
some type of punishment system built into the policies so that we
can nail the underage drinkers
D: Well, I can understand that you you fell frustrated working on a
policy that you fell like no one's going to pay attention to, it's gonna
be ignored. you brought up several points and we'll consider them all
when we come up with solutions. But first of all Mike, I want to
hear what what your floor thinks about the problem
M: Well, i,too, have talked to a few people and it seems that most
people are very confused about what the policy is and what the
consequences pf breaking the rules are. Um, a few people even think
that it's okay for an underage person to drink in their room and even
those who know it's illegal still do anyway. Most people seem to agree that you know the students have to know what the policy is, what the consequences are, but we seem to fell that it's going to be too hard to enforce anyway
D: Well, you brought up some good points and I agree that enforcing the policy is going to be difficult, but I think between the 3 of us we can come up with some workable solution. I want it to be a solution that uses the ideas of all the students. I think that's very important. That way it will be easy for people to accept the policy and also it will make enforcement easier. Now, I'd like to know if you guys have any ideas about how we can make sure students know what the policy is
M: I personally think that probably one of the easiest ways would be to call floor meetings and get everyone together and explain it
K: Yeah, I agree
D: Okay. Well, I agree with you guys that would be the easiest and quickest way to deal with the problem, but unfortunately as you probably know, just because people know what the policy is doesn't mean that they're necessarily going to comply with it. So I think we should talk next about how we're going to enforce the policy.
K: I'll tell you how to enforce it. The problem with the current policy is that there just aren't enough penalties for people who get caught drinking. I mean you've got these underage drinkers running around causing all the problems and they're just getting warnings warnings and nothing ever comes of it. I think what we need to have in this new policy, if it's going to work, is some type of punishment penalty system that really sticks it to these underage drinkers who are causing all the problems. I mean Mike, you said one of the guys that got caught drinking was under 21, right?
M: Yeah sure, but I mean the problem isn't just with people who aren't of legal age. There have been several incidents that I personally know of where people who were over 21 had accidents and were getting into fights because they had had too much to drink
D: Well, the problem is throughout campus, it's not just the people under 21 who aren't allowed to drink. It's the people who are over 21 who don't know when to stop, don't know what to do when they've had too much to drink. The good thing is that as floor representatives, you can bring both viewpoints to the problem and um that way the solution will apply to everyone. Um, right now why don't we go ahead and think of some ways to enforce the policy
K: OK How 'bout we have one warning before coming up with before levying some sort of severe punishment. One warning and how 'bout a $50 fine to give it some teeth. The way it's set up now, people just get warned and warned and warned. Let's let's let's give 'em a $50 fine. That'll get them
D: I agree with the warning, but unfortunately I think a $50 fine might be a little bit high, especially for students on a tight budget. How 'bout if the fine was $20.
M: I personally still don't think this is going to work. It's not addressing the problem. I think we have people who have alcohol abuse problems and we need a treatment program for that
D: What exactly do you mean Mike?
M: I don't know. Something like an AA program where people who have a problem get help. Right now all the social activities and parties on campus really promote a drinking atmosphere. You can't go anywhere without being exposed to it an people who don't want to drink or can't drink don't have anyplace to go and people with problems and need help have no program to go to. I really think a program would solve the whole problem
D: Well ya know Mike I think it's a good idea. I can understand why you would be concerned about students who have drinking problems and I agree that there's got to be other things for people to do at parties besides drink. We'll try to work that idea into an education or awareness program. But right now I really want to come up with some type of enforcement scheme, a punishment system for example. How 'bout, why don't we suggest this. For the second warning it needs to be more severe. Why don't we bar people from activities
K: No No No wait a minute. that's gonna be very difficult to enforce and what are you going to do, prevent them from going to the football game on Saturday? There's just too many people. I'd like to suggest something official, like disciplinary probation
D: That's a good idea because that way the University would handle the problem. They would put the person on probation. I'll put that down. I also think by the second offense, the administration would like to have some say in what happens to the student
M: I agree that sounds like a good idea, but I think we should have some sort of fine, maybe $40, because there are going to be some people who have no problem keeping their grades up so you now disciplinary probation isn't gonna apply to them
D: Uh Ha. Well how 'bout if we have a limit to the number of offenses. For example, you cannot have more than 3. That would be the limit
K: Yeah, I agree. I think they oughta be suspended on the third offense. That'd really fix those little weasel freshman who are getting caught all the time
D: Well now Ken, the punishments need to apply to everyone. Like I said before, it's not just the, excuse me, under 21 people who are causing the problems. Um, regardless of people's age, the policy has to apply to them. Now, don't forget that none of us has the power to suspend anybody and I don't think that administration would is gonna go for that because for one thing it's going to cause problems with parents and the student backlash would be more that the administration would want to deal with. It's gonna create more problems for them, basically, than it might solve. I'd like to suggest that instead of that, we ask them to move off campus
M: Yeah, that sounds like a better idea - that would also get them out of the drinking environment, too
K: How 'bout if we put a $100 fine on the third violation
D: Well, you know I think that actually making somebody move off campus is a pretty big financial burden in and of itself. So do you guys agree so far on the 3 levels of punishments we talked about?
K/M: Yeah
D: OK. Well, let me quickly summarize. For the 1st violation, we're gonna give them a warning and a fine of $20, for the 2nd violation we're gonna give them disciplinary probation and a fine of $40 and the third violation, we make 'em move off campus. Okay, now let's talk about enforcement of the policy. Now I feel very strongly that the policy should be student enforced
K: No I don't think' that's going to work, man, because no one wants to be a NARC. I suggest that we have police officers posted at the entrances and exits of the parties and just have them check people as they come and go
D: You know, that might be a good idea, but I think that having police at parties would be kind of intimidating. People might stay away. What I was thinking was that students could enforce the policy and I'll tell you how. A person wouldn't be a NARC if they anonymously reported the violation to the SA and that way I could follow up on the violation. OK, now, what do you guys think about that idea?
K: Yeah, sounds good
M: I agree
D: OK great. After I take all our ideas and present them to the Resident Director, how 'bout if we first of all print them in the school newspaper, also include them in the new handbook. OK. And I'd like you guys to discuss these suggestions at a follow-up meeting with people on your floor. And also I think that I think that the policy should be printed at the bottom of party announcements or posters around campus.

M: I don't understand how you're going to do that.

D: Well, you could have something at the bottom that says ah let's see I had it down here. "Alcohol will be served only to those with proper ID" OK, that way people know what the policy is before they get to the party. OK, do you guys have any other suggestions for letting people know what the policy is?

K: No.

M: No, sounds good.

D: OK, well, like we said before, there will be 3 punishments. Level one is a warning and a $20 fine, the second is disciplinary disciplinary probation and a $40 fine, and finally, for the third violation we make them move off campus. And okay what else. The results of this meeting will be printed in the newspaper, and discussed at floor meetings by you guys. Also, they're gonna be included in the new student handbook. And we're gonna put something on party announcements so people will know. Finally, we gotta think of eventually providing some alternatives for people to drinking. We also need to think about providing counseling or help for people who really do have alcohol problems. Is that okay?

K: Sounds good.

M: Yeah, I think it will work.
GROUP MEETING - CANDIDATE THREE - HIGH PERFORMANCE

Jim: Hello, guys, my name is Jim.
Ken: I'm Ken
J: Nice to meet ya.
Mike: Mike
J: Mike, nice to meet ya. As you probably know, the reason that we're meeting today is to discuss the problems that we're having due to alcohol on campus. What I wanted to go over today is trying to get some ideas about what we can do about this for a new enforcement policy. We need to cover 4 points that I've gone over: 1) we need to inform the students of the alcohol policy, which is, as you know, no one under 21 can drink anywhere on campus and students over 21 can drink in the rooms or certain designated areas. Second, we need to know how we're going to enforce this policy. Third, we need to know whose gonna enforce it. Finally, we need somehow of informing the students of what we've gone over in this meeting. How does that sound to you?
K: Sounds good.
M: Yeah, fine.
J: OK, great. Before we go on with these issues, though, I'd like to hear what the students think of the policy on campus. Ken, why don't you tell us what your students are saying about it.
K: Well, um, I've had a chance to talk with several people on my floor and I've also read about the supposed increase in the number of alcohol-related incidents, fights, what-not. However, the general consensus on my floor seems to be that there really isn't a problem; "what's the problem". People are going to drink, let's face it, they're gonna party, they're gonna have fun. I think if anything is necessary it's a punishment system for the underage kids who are getting in trouble. I think that's where we could do the most good.
M: You brought up some good points there. It is going to be frustrating trying to enforce this when nobody pays attention. Mike, why don't you tell us what students on your floor have to say
M: Well, I've also talked to some students. Basically, it seems like everyone is pretty much confused about what the alcohol policy is. No one seems to know what the rules are, what the consequences are for breaking the rules. They're really, the people are even drinking in their rooms thinking it's OK to do that when obviously it's not. Everyone seems to agree that it needs to be made clear what the
rules are, what the consequences are, but we still think it's going to be too hard to enforce
J: You brought up a lot of good points. It is going to be very difficult to find some way to enforce it, but I think that as a group we can come up with a policy that's gonna incorporate everybody. And I think that then we can get everything goin'. Let's start with the problem you brought up, that no one knows about the policy. Do y'all have any ideas about how we can inform the students about what the current alcohol policy is?
M: Well, I think probably the easiest way would be just to have floor meetings
J: OK
K: Yeah, that sounds like a good idea
M: OK
J: Next, if they know about it that doesn't necessarily mean they are going to enforce the policy
K: Well, I think the real problem is there just aren't enough penalties for getting caught drinking. What you have here are underage kids, kids under 21 causing all these problems and they're just getting warnings, many, many warnings, and nothing's coming of it. I think what we need is some good stiff penalties for the underage kids causing all the problems. And, ah, I mean Mike, you yourself said that guy last weekend who got caught, was busted, was underage, right?
M: Yeah, sure, but it's not the people who are under 21 who are getting in trouble. I know of several incidents where people over 21 got in accidents and fights because they have too much to drink
J: I think we need to get a policy that's gonna you know will incorporate all the students. Those who are under 21 and those who are over 21. But let's go into the enforcement area. Um, I think maybe we can start off with just some warnings and maybe from there we can move on to some more severe penalties
K: There needs to be just one warning. As I said earlier, the problem with the present policy is there are too too too many warnings. I think to put some teeth into it, we should stick'em with a 50 dollar fine
J: OK. Um, I think a 50 dollar fine might be a little high. I think a fine of 20 dollars might be enough to get their attention but wouldn't ruin them financially. I think especially for college students, 20 dollars would work well
M: I still don't think this will work. You're not dealing with the problem. The problem is alcohol abuse and I think you really need a treatment program for people.

J: OK. Well, what do you mean?

M: OK, I don't know, like an AA program on campus so people who have a problem can go and get help. There's so much emphasis on campus, social events and parties going on that people just can't get away from the whole drinking attitude and there's no place for people to go who don't want to drink or can't drink. So, in order to get help I think there should be someplace for them to go. I think a University AA office would be good.

J: OK. Well, let's stick to our present policy. I think that would be a very good topic to bring up in another meeting. We could discuss treatment programs. I think it was a good idea we could go on with the point of other things to do at parties. Do y'all have anything that maybe we could do?

M: Well, ah, I think a place where they could go listen to music and be able to dance. I think the parties should be required to have a non-alcoholic alternative for people who don't want to drink.

J: good idea. I think we could serve sodas at all the parties or something like that. Let's move on to the second form of punishment. I think if we barred them from activities

K: No, No that's not a good idea. you can't bar people from a football game, too many people there. We need something official, like disciplinary probation maybe

J: That's a good idea. that way, the University would handle that as well.

M: Yeah, sounds good but maybe we should have a 40 dollar fine or something because disciplinary probation wouldn't be a problem for everybody.

J: That's true. OK., well I think we should set as limit of 3 offenses. The maximum they should do.

K: Yeah, let's suspend them. That would really fix those freshmen who get caught.

J: Well, I think we need to make sure that our policies apply to everyone. I think, first of all, that none of us has the authority to suspend and I don't think the University would go for that. How 'bout if we just make 'em move off campus?

M: That would get them out of the drinking environment, too.

K: How 'bout if we stick'em with a $100 fine with the third violation?
J: Well, I think moving off campus would be strain enough. Um, ya know, so can we agree on these three forms of punishment?
K: yeah
M: Sure
J: OK. Great, um, so let's summarize. We have a warning ans a fine of 20 dollars. We also have disciplinary probation and a 40 dollar fine and finally, we'd have to move them off campus. OK, um, we've got a few more minutes so let's go on move on to the enforcement policy. Who's gonna do that. I think we should get students to enforce it
K: No. No one wants to be a NARC. I don't think that would really work. Why don't we have police officers at the entrances and exits and have them check people as they go. What about that?
J: I'm afraid, that's a good point but, I'm afraid that would be intimidating. I think they would be afraid to go with police. I think if the students reported it to the SAs anonymously, then you know then the SA would handle it from there. I think we could get it done. What do y'all think about that?
K: Yeah, sounds good
J: OK, great. Um, so let's move on to how we're gonna inform students of the result of this meeting. Some of the ideas that I had would be that after we get approval of all these ideas from the Resident Director, that we could put them in the newspaper, print that first, and the new student handbook, which is coming out soon. We would have follow-up meetings on each floor and finally, I think it's a good idea if we printed the policy on the bottom of all the announcements, party announcements around campus. that way it would be there right at the time. They could read it.
M: yeah, sounds good, but how will we do that?
J: Well, I think that if we just said that no one under 21 will be drinking, we will serve alcohol to no one under 21 at this party, I think that would get the point across. Uh, so do we have any other ideas about enforcing the policy?
K: No
M: No
J: OK, great. So, um, let's summarize. We'll have the, once we get approval, we'll have it in the school newspaper, we'll have it also in the handbook. We'll have follow-up meetings to discuss it all, and we'll print it on party announcements. OK, Um, great. I think the warning systems that we have will work. I think we had 1st, just a warning and 20 dollar fine, 2nd, disciplinary probation and a 40
dollar fine, and finally students would have to move off campus. Um, we also have alternatives for each of the parties. We'll serve good music, er, have good music and serve cokes, non-alcoholic beverages. You know, um, like you said earlier, I think it's a good point to get together and meet again some other time to discuss the alcohol treatment program. I think that's gonna be a key ingredient into all of this. Sound OK?
K: Great
M: I think it'll work
GROUP MEETING - CANDIDATE ONE - HIGH PERFORMANCE

Mark: Hi there. I'm Mark ah you're SA and you're...

Ken: I'm Ken.

M: Ken, good to meet you.

Mike: Mike

Mark: Mike, hi there. Well the reason we're having this meeting this afternoon is the recent problems with alcohol on campus and our alcohol policy. Um, let's talk about some ideas here. Before, we get started I'd like to find some, get some students' reactions from students that y'all have talked to on campus and see how the students feel before we start on on a policy revision. Ken, could we start with you?

K: Yeah, ok. Well, I've had the opportunity to talked with several people on my floor and uh I've also heard about the supposed increase of alcohol related incidents that's been happening on campus. Uh, the general consensus on my floor seems to be "hey, what's the problem"? I mean, let's face it, people are going to party and drink, they're in college, and uh they're going to do these things regardless of what the alcohol policy states. Although, I think if anything will work it's going to be some form of punishment system for the underage drinkers who are getting caught and causing these troubles.

Mark: Well, Ken, I can understand your frustration with people who aren't listening to the policy or who aren't followng it. You have several good points that we can discuss later in the meeting. Can we get some ideas from Mike?

M: Well, I've talked to a few people also and basically it seems that everyone is confused about what the policy actually is and what are the consequences of drinking when you're underage. But I think everyone really believes that it's just really gonna be hard to enforce any drinking policy at all but the consensus is that everyone has to know what the policy is and what the consequences will be if you break that policy.
Mark: Well, Mike, you have some good ideas too. Can I get y'all's reaction to the arrest that happened with the couple of people who got drink this weekend and wandered into town?

M: Well, I know the guy who was arrested and he lived on my floor. Everyone knew he had a drinking problem and it really wasn't surprising that he got drunk and got into trouble.

K: Yeah, well, I think that they were stupid for leaving campus in the first place. I mean, had they not left campus, they wouldn't have gotten caught. I don't know. The alcohol policy as it stands right now is too hard to enforce people and even if you do get caught, it's really easy to get out of trouble.

Mark: OK, so what we're looking at here is that enforcement is really hard. But I think we can come up with a workable solution. You know, we got ideas from different groups of students here and I think that we can come up with something that the students will be happy with and it'll be easier to enforce. Um, now Mike's problem, that no one knows the policy, I think is important. Can we get some ideas on how to make it known?

M: Well, I think the easiest way is to just call floor meetings and tell everyone.

K: Yea, I agree. That'd be good.

Mark: Well, you know we already talked about some of the students knowing the policy and just not paying any attention to it. I think we need to find some way to get the students to pay more attention to the policy.

K: Yeah, cuz the way the policy stands now there are no punishments, there's just warnings. I mean, um, what we here are all of these underage drinkers who are getting caught and causing all the problems. I mean, you Mike yourself said that one of the guys caught last weekend was under 21, right?

M: Yeah, but it's it's not just the people who are under 21 drinking like that. I know of quite a few incidents where people who were
legal have gotten drink and gotten into accidents and fights, so you can't just blame us.

Mark: That's right. Um, the policy does include everyone on campus. The problem is throughout campus and um the suggestions made today need to include people who are underage as well people who are over 21 and drink. I think we have an advantage here because we have people from every age category and maybe I can get some ideas on enforcement?

K: Why don't we have one warning and to put some teeth into it, one warning with a $50 fine.

Mark: I think the warning is good. $50 is probably a bit much for college students. $20 I don't think would bust anybody's bank account. I think $20 would be a good fine.

M: I really don't think it's gonna work at all. I really think there should be a treatment program for students who have drinking problems.

Mark: Can you explain this, Mike?

M: Well, I don't know, something like a University branch of AA. You know, they could go someplace where people who have drinking problems could go and get help. Right now, there's such an attitude or atmosphere of drinking on this campus that it's really hard to get away from it if you don't drink or don't want to drink. There's no place to go and if you have a problem there's no place to get help.

Mark: Uh, I think that's a good idea and I understand your concerns with students who have drinking problems. Now, we need to discuss the enforcement system that we're discussing here. I think we can bring this up at a meeting an alcohol awareness and discuss that. And I also liked the idea of having alternatives to drinking at parties. Do you have anything else about that?

M: Well, yeah. I think possibly we could have someplace where people could go and listen to some good music and dance and meet people and not have to be around alcohol. Someplace where they could have an alternative, like you know, soda or something.
Mark: Well, I agree. That sounds like a good idea. Um, let's get back to the punishment system. What about a second level punishment, maybe barring students from activities or something.

K: No, that's I think that's too difficult to enforce. I mean, what are you going to do, keep people out of football games on Saturday afternoons. There are just too many people there to enforce that. Um, I think what we need is something official sounding, like disciplinary probation.

Mark: Well, that sounds good. Disciplinary probation um that would bring the administration into it and I think the University would like to have something to say by the time someone has a second offense or alcohol policy violation.

M: Yeah, but I think that we should probably add a $40 fine or something on that because disciplinary probation isn't gonna be a problem for people who you know don't have trouble keeping their grades up.

Mark: OK, that sounds good. Um, I think we should limit the number of offenses. That was one of the problems with the old policy is people kept having offenses and offenses. Um, I think three should be the limit.

K: Yeah, that's good and I say on the 3rd one suspend 'em. That'd really fix the little freshmen who are causing all the trouble and getting caught and all.

Mark: Well, this...our policy will apply to everyone, freshman as well as the older people. Um, we don't have the power to suspend anyone and I don't think the University would suspend anyone for drinking. It's gonna cause a lot of problems with the parents and students and probably end up causing more problems than it solves. Um, maybe we should simply have them move off campus.

M: Yeah, I think that'll work because that'll get them out of the drinking environment, too.

K: How 'bout we give them a $100 fine on that 3rd offense?
Mark: Well, I think that moving off campus probably be a financial strain in itself. What do you think?

M: Yeah, I agree

K: Yeah, I think it would be

Mark: OK. Um, so we'll have three punishments and it's going to be student enforced, OK?

K: Oh, no way no way can you have it be student enforced. No one wants to be a NARC. Why don't we at these parties have police posted at the entrances and exits to check people as they come by.

Mark: Well, I think that I think that would work. But I think that posting police at parties would discourage attendance. Students coming to the parties and thinking the police are watching everything they do. Um, I think if we have students report it anonymously to the SAs and have the SAs take over from there. I think that would work.

K: Yeah, I see what you mean.

Mark: OK, well, after I present this to the resident director for approval we'll have it printed in the school newspaper and publish it in the new student handbook. Y'all can discuss it at follow up meetings on the floors and uh, do you have any idea about how we can get it out to the students?

K: No, that sounds good

Mark: Alrighty, well so what we've got here is three punishments that apply to all students. The first one being a warning and a fine of $20, then we'll have a $40 fine and disciplinary action and the last thing will be mandatory moving off campus. What we'll do is we'll have this printed in the student handbook and then we'll have it in the school newspaper and y'all will discuss it at some of the meetings. Finally, we'll have alternatives to drinking at the parties. Does that sound good?
K: Sounds good.

M: I think it will work.
CONFLICT MEDIATION - CANDIDATE TWO - LOW PERFORMANCE

Steve: Yeah, what about it?
John: Man, we go through this every single weekend. can't you guys make some other arrangements for a change?
S: Why should we? It's your weird schedule that's the problem
J: It's not my schedule that's the problem
S/J: Come in
Dave: Hi, um, I heard you guys aren't getting along. I heard from you know other people on the floor and um you're going to have to straighten things out and get along better
J: What concern is it of yours?
S: Yeah, why do you care?
D: I'm, uh, the new student association guy on this floor and um I talked to the housing director and there are no other rooms available until the end of the semester and so you guys are just going to have to work things out that's...
J: Great. I don't see how we're going to be able to do that. We just have completely different lifestyles and schedules. This guy studies all during the week and the I like to party during the week and unwind after a day of classes and um on the weekends when I like to study, he invites his girlfriend up and they spend every minute in the room and I can't get any work done. at all. They tell me to go to the library or something but I don't like it in the library. I don't have my stereo there and the lights, I don't know, the fluorescent lights give me a headache when I study there too long. So I like to be in my room where I have all my stuff and they won't let me do that. They spend so much time in there and anyway, I thought I was supposed to have a double not a triple...
D: Okay, um, you're just gonna have to start trying a little bit harder to get along. And you obviously don't like studying anyplace else other that the room. The library's not a good place, the the lights they make that noise and they flicker and I read somewhere that it's not good to work with those lights, but the lights aren't my problem and you're just going to have to get used to it.
S: well, I can understand what he's saying. I mean, I agree that we have very different lifestyles. I like to study during the week. I work really hard. I have a really heavy course load. I use the weekend for unwinding and relaxing. it's the only time I can see my girlfirend Cathy and he's there every minute. He's there all the time.
It's just that we have no privacy and we have not time to ourselves. We have no...
D: Yeah, but you heard what I told him right? You just gotta start getting along. It must be difficult - your girlfriend is far away and you don't have any time together, but um your just gonna have to clean up the act
S: Well, I work really hard for my grades and I need to study during the week and this guy hardly works at all.
J: That's not true. I work hard, too. It's just that I don't like to study after classes all day. I do my work on the weekends and I get it all done
D: yeah, but you're both good students and you both made good grades and it takes a lot of effort and um, but, uh grades are not, you're starting to make me look bad to the other people and you're just gonna have to um, even though its' hard to live with someone else who has a different lifestyle from your own, you're just gonna have to...
S: Well, I'll do this. I mean, if he agrees to leave the room to Cathy and me on the weekends, the I'll study somewhere else on the week days. I'll agree to do that
J: I'm not gonna do that. I will leave you the room to study if you guys'll go someplace else on the weekend and leave me to study in the room
S: No way. She has to come here on the weekends. She goes to school out of town. She has to come here.
D: yeah, yeah, well, whatever. Just, um, don't involve other people on the floor because everyone's got their own problems to worry about so...
J: Other people on the floor are involved I want to party with Ted and Tom and this guy is in there studying all night long and all during the week. those guys don't want to come in here then. He just puts a damper on things
S: Yeah, um, I I mean I can't go with anything that involves me leaving town to visit Cathy because I don't have a car so I can't leave town
D: Um, I can understand you don't have a car. The car thing is hard, ya know, my parents promised me that I would get a car and when they got a new one, they just went ahead and gave the old one to my brother and that wasn't good cuz I liked the car - it was a blue car...
J: What does that have to do with anything?
D: Um, yeah, you're ya know gonna have to try to get along with your roommate and work out the weekend thing. Would you try, just try, to get along better
S: Whatever. Whatever
J: Yeah
D: Okay, well, we'll see if you guys can get along better
CONFLICT MEDIATION - CANDIDATE THREE - LOW PERFORMANCE

John: So, is Cathy coming up again this weekend?
Steve: Yeah, she is. What about it?
J: Man, we go through this every weekend. Can't you guys make some other arrangements or something?
S: Why should we have to make other arrangements? I mean, it's your weird schedule that's the whole problem
J: It's not my schedule. Come in.
Jim: Hi guys. I'm ah, the new SA on the floor. I heard you guys aren't getting along very well and it's starting to make me look bad. It's kinda causing a disturbance around the floor so you gotta work out something to you two guys can get along a little better. I don't know that you wanna do, but we gotta work this out. You're stuck with each other so you gotta find a way to handle it.
J: Look, we just have completely different lifestyles. This guy studies all night long during the week when I'm trying to party and have a good time. Then, on the weekends my friends go home and that's the time I like to study. His girlfriend comes up and uh the two of them monopolize the rooms when I'm trying to get some work done. They try to send me off to the library or something but I don't like to work there, it's just too quiet. I need a stereo or something to get some music going or some background noise when I work and besides, all my books and stuff are here and I don't want to carry all that junk over to the library and the lights over there are ridiculous. They fliker and bother my eyes and stuff...
Jim: Well, we're not here to ya know worry about the lights or anything. We gotta work out some kind of arrangement where you two guys can get along a little better. Um, like I say, you're stuck with each other. You gotta find some way to deal with that and get along a little better to you're not causing any kind of disturbance.
S: The way I see it, I agree with John that we have different schedules and we gotta work that out. Um, I like to study on the week nights, 3 or 4 hours a day. I work really hard and on the weekends, I just want to kick back and relax and that's the only time I can see my girlfriend Cathy, who goes to school out of town. She comes here every weekend so we can spend some time together and he's in the room every minute of the day on the weekend. I mean, he never does anything. He's either studying, but he's always in the room. I have 18 hours this semester, a really heavy course load...
Jim: What's your major?
S: Biology, my major is Biology
Jim: Geez, I used to be a Biology major a long time ago. I had this teacher he was so bad. It was terrible. I had to get out of that. Now, I'm just completely turned off of science. I can't stand it. I just hate it.
S: Well, all I know is I work really hard for my grades. This guy doesn't hardly seem to work at all
J: That's not true, man. I work hard for my grades, too. I just don't work at night after taking a whole day of classes. I like to work on the weekends
Jim: Yeah, well, good students or not, you guys have to work out something. I don't know what to do about this, but you're going to have to work out something out so you can get along a little better. You're stuck with each other and you gotta work something out.
S: Well, I'll do this if he agrees to give up the room on the weekends and go study someplace else like the library, I'll go study someplace else on the week days and he can party all he wants in the room.
J: No way. that's not gonna work. I told you, I can't study in the library. I'll go someplace else and party during the week and you can have the room if you leave me the room on the weekend and I'll study here
S: Well, I can't do that cuz it's the only time I can see Cathy - on the weekends. you're there the whole time and I have to leave. How am I supposed to see Cathy?
Jim: There's nothing you two guys can work out? There's gotta be something you can do. You're stuck with each other. Come on. There's gotta be something you can work out.
J: This guy studies all night long during the week. I mean, there's just no way my friends ted and tom come over and we try to party and have a good time during the week. He's just studying away and it just puts a damper on everything. You can't...
Jim: I that the Ted who runs track? is that the one? We had a good track tea last year but when I was a freshman, they were really bas. I mean, they were terrible. I think it's cuz they got some kind of new track....
J: What is this?
Jim: Look, you guys are gonna have to work something out between you. I don't know what the deal is and I know you are not working on anything yet but we can get something where you can get along better. You're stuck with each other and that's how it's gotta be.
S: Well, I mean, I can't, there's nothing I can do about the weekends because I don't have a car so he's just gonna have to leave if Cathy and I are ever going to spend any time together.

Jim: Well, look, do you think there's any way you could get something worked out? Well, why don't we meet here a week from today, same place, same time, and we'll see and ya know, I'll see how you guys work it out, OK?

J/S: Whatever.
CONFLICT MEDIATION - CANDIDATE ONE - LOW PERFORMANCE

John: Is Cathy coming up again this weekend?
Steve: Ya, what about it?
J: We go through this every weekend. Can't you guys make some other arrangements or something?
S: Why should we have to make other arrangements? It's your weird schedule that's the whole problem
J: There's nothing weird about my schedule
S/J: Come in. Come on in
Mark: Hey, I'm Mark. I hear y'all were having some problems getting along. You know, you know people told me and stuff. I mean there's no other rooms available this semester, y'all are just going to have to work something out. You know, so, I mean, it probably can't even be that bad. What's the problem anyway?
J: I'll tell you what the problem is, him and his girlfriend are in the room every weekend when I'm trying to get some work done and I can't even study. Besides that we just have two different lifestyles. I mean he's studying all night long. After a hard day of classes I just like to hang out and socialize with my friends. I can't study all night like this guy does. But then he's in there working on it and nobody wants to come in and hang out with him in there. Then on the weekends my friends go home and I have to get my work done - he invites his girlfriend up and they wanna spend every minute together in the room and tell me to go to the library or something. I just can't work there. It's just too quiet and I need my stereo here and my books are here and I don't wanna drag all my junk over to the library and the lights there - you know. I can't stand them for more than an hour or so without getting a headache and stuff. Besides, when I came here, I was supposed to get a single not a double and every weekend Cathy comes up and practically moves in and we end up with a triple.
M: Uh, well I mean that's something y'all will have to work out whether you all guys got different lifestyles. I mean. What do you think is the problem?
S: Well, I agree with John that we really have different lifestyles and schedules of study habits. I mean during the weekdays, I really have a heavy course load and I have to study 3 or 4 hours a night to get by and he's partying with his friends. On the weekends I just
wanna kick back and relax and my girlfriend Cathy lives out of town and she goes to school out of town...

M: Cathy, is that short for Catherine?

S: No.

M: No? Well, we're kinda studying about Catherine the Great. It's really interesting, we're reading about her in this book and the Prof, well, the Prof, he's got this really bad habit. He kinda snorts after he talks all the time. Well anyway we're gonna have to work something out here and get some type of situation going to make it through the semester.

S: Well, I work very hard and this guy never seems to study at all.

J: That's not true. I work hard, too. I just don't work in the night after being in class all day long. I do my work on the weekends. I get it done, I'm doing fine in school.

M: Well, whether you all are good students or not, that's really not the point here, I mean we all have different lifestyles, but y'all are just gonna y'all are just gonna have to work something out. Y'all are gonna have to start getting along.

S: Well, I'll agree to this. I give up my weeknights and go study someplace else if Cathy and I can have the room to ourselves on the weekends with no interruptions and you go someplace else to study.

J: I told you I can't study in the library. Well, why don't you let me study in the room on weekends and you can, uh, and I'll go someplace else during the week so you can study then.

S: Now wait. I can't do that - that's the only time I can see Cathy.

M: Y'all are gonna have to work something out. You know, I mean can't you find somewhere else to study?

J: I don't see what we're gonna be able to do. This guy studies all night long. I can't hang out with my friends and stuff like that and besides the library's too quiet. I don't like studying there on the weekends and the lights and stuff...

M: Well you've seen these old movies are stuff about these "Quiet please" signs in the library. I've been at the library a couple of times and I never saw a sign like that, besides I mean, like th other day I was in the hospital and I saw one there. But i mean i've never seen one at a library. Well, I mean y'all are going to have to do something. Y'all don't bother anyone lese on the floor with this but you know y'all need to start getting along.

S: Well, I really don't know what you expect me to do about it. I don't have a car and there's no way I can leave on the weekends.
just don't know what to do on the weekends. I mean Cathy has to come here.

M: Well, I mean you can take a bus or something. The buses go up there, I'm sure, I mean we have a station here that goes everywhere you know and that seems like something you can do. That would help out. Well, is there anything you can do to work this out?

S: Whatever.

M: Like, y'all work something out.
COUNSELING SESSION - CANDIDATE THREE - LOW PERFORMANCE

Bob: Come in
Jim: Hi, um, I'm Jim. I'm the SA on this floor and I've heard you've been having some personal problems and haven't been taking care of yourself and things. You're just not taking showers or anything.
B: Well, about a week ago I found out that my parents are getting separated] and probably will be getting a divorce. So ever since then I felt like my world is falling apart
J: Well, yeah, I mean, divorces can be tough but it's no big deal. People go through those a lot. I don't think that a reason to stop taking showers and taking care of yourself, changing clothes, and things. I mean, now people are getting divorced 30 40 years into marriages. It's really no big deal. I think you'll get over it. I had a class one time - family and marriage class. It was at 8 in the morning. Man, I used to hate that class. I don't know why they schedule classes that early. Nobody ever showed up or anything
B: Um, I feel really helpless, um, being so far away from home. It's really frustrating not being there. You want to help your parents when they're going through something like this. I thought maybe if I was there, I could do something about it. I don't know. I'm not going to get home until summer or spring break or... It seemed like that whenever I was home for Christmas, everything was fine. The whole family was there and we would all sit around. It's just that, they would argue and everything just like normal parents but it just never seemed like a big deal. Nothing to get divorced over. When I found out it just really came as a big surprise
J: Well, ya, but like I said it's really not that big of a deal, a divorce. People get over it all the time. Right now you need to worry about taking a shower and changing clothes, taking care of yourself.
B: I guess ever since I found out about my parents, I haven't been able to concentrate on anything - taking care of my self, going to classes, showering or anything like that
J: Yeah, well, uh, ya know, maybe just taking a shower would help you out. I know that as lot of people are kinda starting to complain about it and they're coming to me and wanting me to do something about it. So that's why I wanted to come in dn talk to you because it's getting pretty bad.
B: Are you trying to say that I smell? Is that what you're trying to say? I smell?
J: Well, ya know, um there's just been a lot of people telling me and they didn't know that to do about it so I just wanted to see if maybe I could talk to you and get you to take a shower, change your clothes. B: I guess I hadn't realized that it had gotten this bad, ya know, that I was bothering people and people were noticing. I haven't been able to concentrate on anything else but my parents. I haven't been motivated to do anything.
J: Yeah, right now maybe it's a good idea t concentrate on the things you need to do right now. I think taking a shower is pretty important. It's causing a problem for the other students on the floor. That's another reason you need to take care of that.
B: I guess it's been 5 or 6 days since I've changes clothes or showered. I don't know, I just don't have the energy to keep up with myself, do laundry, go to class, study, or read, or anything.
J: Well, um, your grades are important and everything but you gotta take care of yourself first. taking a shower and changing clothes is pretty easy. You could probably do that and it might help you out.
B: I don't really feel like the situation is going to get better until I can talk it over with somebody. I guess I could call my older brother Frank. He's up at school. Maybe...
J: Well, yeah, yeah, yeah you can do what you feel you gotta do but I think you gotta take a shower. You can do some other things to maybe help you out with your parents deal but taking a shower has gotta be first.
B: I just feel like my situation is different than other people's here at school. I really feel like I need somebody to talk to. It's just hard knowing who the right people to talk to are, who could help me.
J: Well, first of all I think you need to concentrate on taking a shower. Maybe if we can get together two days from now. And if, ah, I'd like to know if you're able to take a shower, do some laundry and change your clothes by then. So why don't we ah try to meet here. I'll try to come by two days from now - just to check up to see how you're doing. Sound OK?
Bob: Come in
Mark: Hey, I'm Mark and uh and a lot of people have been saying that you know that you haven't been taking care of yourself and causing some problems on the floor and I think you need to start taking a shower and changing clothes
B: About a week ago, I found out that my parents were separating and probably going to get a divorce. Since then, my world's been falling apart.
M: Really. Well you know I don't think that should stop you from taking showers and you know wearing clean clothes. What you need to do you know lots of people get divorced now a days and you know, you just got to learn to accept it.
B: Well, it's a really helpless feeling being here at school so far away from home you know. I'm not really I'm not going to get a chance to get back home until Spring Break or summer and I really don't understand what's happening. It seems like when I was home for Christmas things were going pretty well. You know, the whole, family was there...
M: You know, I think if you just start cleaning yourself up and uh taking better care of yourself, you know, people are saying you're being offensive. You know, you're kinda bothering people.
B: I don't know. I just really can't get motivated to take care of myself or go to classes or study or anything
M: Yeah, well, uh, you know you need to just straighten yourself up and pull yourself together and you know your grades can wait and stuff. You know you really need to start showering. You're becoming offensive to people.
B: So, you're saying that I smell. Is that what you're saying?
M: Exactly, I mean you know others have been trying to say this and it's just that it's really gotten bad and they asked me to talk to you about it
B: I guess I didn't realize that I was bothering people. I didn't know it had gotten this bad. I really can't seem to concentrate or do anything
M: Well, you know after you found out about your parents, do you think, do you think that your hygiene started well, you know started going down or you know how long has it been since you've taken a shower?
B: It's probably been 4 or 5 days since I've changed clothes or showered. I just don't seem to have that much energy.
M: Well, uh, you know what you need to do is pull yourself together and get over this thing. I mean it's really not that big of a deal. You know lots of people go through this and I think you need to start taking a shower and cleaning yourself up. I mean, you're really causing problems on the floor and you know I'm the SA and you're causing problems for me.
B: I have a brother, Frank
M: Well, uh, is he an undergraduate here?
B: No, he goes to school someplace else
M: Well, you know I have a sister and she wanted to be an undergraduate here. I told my parents no way, you know, I did not want a little sister here at this school and it's mean, you know I'd have her running over here and running to my room every time she got in trouble and had a problem. You know, Mom Mom wanted her to go to some wimpy all girls school anyways so she went up someplace up north. She's not even going to school - she took a year off and she's hanging out with some band, I mean she probably won't even go back to school. Um, but, ah, I think you should call Frank. It's probably a good thing to do and uh, I mean, you know, is he older?
B: Yeah, yeah, he's older.
M: I mean, ya know, have you talked to him? You know, he might feel the same way you do.
B: I haven't I haven't talked to him> I just feel like uh his situation and my situation are different. I don't really feel like he would understand.
M: Well, I think you should talk to Frank - he probably feels the same way you do
B: I just don't feel like he would understand
M: Well, I mean I think you're gonna get over this. You just, I think you just have to pull yourself together and you know, calling your brother is definitely something to do. You know get your hygiene on the right track, you got to start taking showers, you know, try combing your hair, getting your haircut or something. You know, maybe changing your clothes, wearing clean clothes and just see if you can see if you can take a shower and change clothes, OK?
GROUP MEETING - CANDIDATE ONE - LOW PERFORMANCE

Mark: Hi, I'm Mark and uh you know the residence hall director told me that there is a, there's an alcohol problem. And, uh, well you know before we get started, I think we should get some ideas on what y'all's floors had to say about the alcohol problem. Uh, Ken, what's uh your floor's opinion?

Ken: Well, um, ok, well I talked to several people on my floor before coming down here and I also heard about the uh supposed increase as far as alcohol related incidents here on campus and um general consensus on my floor seems to be that there is no problem. Students party and drink, that's just part of college life. Uh, if there was a problem I would have to say it was the under aged kids who who's causing trouble. Um, the current system isn't set up right. They're just punishing these people, they hardly ever get caught and when they do get caught, they usually get off. We need more punishments. We need to punish these under 21 folks

Mark: Um, well, Mike, what's your floor think?

Mike: Well, I I talked to a few people and uh you know, basically the people on my floor seem to be really confused about what the policy is. They don't know what, you know, what the rules are and what the consequences are to breaking those rules. You know, um, some people even think it's ok if, you know, they drink in their rooms as long as they're not out walking around campus...

Mark: Well, look, I mean the problem is the students just aren't taking it seriously enough. Uh, they don't even respect the Campus Police and th power that they have and uh and they're not even afraid of the punishment if they violate the policy.

M: You know, well, I mean I think the best way to solve the problem is you know get everyone together and explain the rules, the consequences, you know, so people aren't as confused.

K: Yeah, yeah definitely.

Mark: Uh, I mean if the SAs had a meeting, the students probably would even show up. Uh, you know, I mean they just don't take this seriously enough. Uh, uh, I think if the campus police came in their uniforms and that, I mean the people would respect that. You know, you respect somebody in a uniform and if they showed up they could be you know really professional and you know give a big presentation. Students would like that, you know and I mean I was going to be a cop. You know, I was a criminal justice major here and
you know it was pretty exciting you know my mom was really upset about it. She was afraid I was gonna get shot or something. I don't know, so I changed majors.

K: Um, the way I see it, we have some problem. The problem is that there is just a lack of punishment built into the system. It's the under aged crowd that's causing all the problems. They're getting off with too many warnings. They are the problem. You even said yourself earlier that one of the kids arrested the other night, he was under 21.

M: Well yeah he was under 21 but I mean he lived on my floor and you know, everyone who lived there was aware that you know, he had a drinking problem and I myself know of several incidents where people who are over 21 were involved in accidents and getting in fights some of them even on your floor, you know, because they were drinking too much.

Mark: Uh, I mean, Ken maybe you feel this way because you know, you're over 21 and uh I think these suggestions need to uh they need to include everybody that's underage and over 21 who just had too much to drink.

K: OK, well how 'bout if we just have one warning uh one warning uh before having more severe punishments? There is really just too many warnings in the current system, people just get more and more and more. Uh, better yet, to to give this one warning some teeth, let's stick people with a fifty dollar fine how 'bout that?

Mark: First offense? Uh, 50 dollars, uh would work well? I mean I think a warning and 20 dollars will be good, you know, for college kids and you know, that's 20 dollars and that'll be enough to make them realize that it's a problem.

M: See, uh I don't I don't think that's going to work. I mean, you're not addressing the problem. I think we should have some type of treatment program for students with drinking problems.

Mark: Like, what do you mean, Mike?

M: Well, you know like an AA group for um college students. You know, someone could could deal with their problems and you know there's a lot of parties and things that go on on campus that center around drinking and heavy alcohol. And you know, it's hard for people who don't drink or you know can't drink you know deal with that and to go out and you know if you have a drinking problems there's no place that you can go for help so I, I uh really think that you know an AA program on campus...
Mark: Well, you know an alcohol treatment problem you know alcohol treatment just doesn't really have anything to do with the punishment policy and uh try to get students to take the policy seriously and I mean that's really what we're trying to do. And uh you know just trying to get them to take it seriously because uh I mean no one is going to pay attention to it if they don't have to.
M: Well, there should at least be some place where you know people can go and listen to some good music and you know hear a band and dance and be able to not you know have something other than alcohol to drink you know, people who have parties and stuff on campus should you know they should be made to have you know pop for people who don't wanna drink.
Mark: Well, I mean everybody is getting really upset about the alcohol problem on campus and uh I've heard the director uh say uh people might be barred from activities if they get caught breaking the policy.
K: No, uh that's too hard a punishment course. What will we do, bar people from football games on Saturday afternoon? There's just too many people. Um, how 'bout if we come up with something official, like disciplinary probation, how 'bout that?
M: Yeah, that sounds good. Then maybe we can you know put in like a 40 dollar fine because people who don't have to worry about their grades, it's not going to be that hard for them to ignore the the probation.
K: Uh huh, OK, um yeah, I'll go along with that. How 'bout let's say for the third offense we suspend them. We just kick'em kick'em right out, that'll fix the miserable little underage crowd that's causing all the trouble.
Mark: Well, I mean we can't suspend anybody. Well, uh, we probably could make them move off campus.
M: Well, yeah, that would take them out of the environment
K: OK, how 'bout there be like a 100 dollar fine with the third violation. How 'bout that?
Mark: Well, you know, I think if the students knew that they were being watched, that uh you know they'd probably take this seriously and we wouldn't have to worry about all this punishment stuff.
K: Yeah, but whenever you try to student enforce it, that ain't gonna work. That's difficult to enforce, no one wants to be a NARC. I mean uh uh how 'bout if we put police or some cops at the entrances and exits of the party so the cops could check people coming and going. How 'bout that?
M: Um, that doesn't sound like a good idea to me...
Mark: Well, I guess that's about it. I really don't know what to do with the suggestions this group has come up with and you know I don't know what will be next. You know, I really think that uh we should get the campus police to make a presentation. You know, in their uniforms and everything so that you know everybody knows the alcohol policy and you know, that that it's a serious business. You know that's what I think. I think that's what I think should be done. OK?
K/M: Yeah, whatever.
GROUP MEETING - CANDIDATE THREE - LOW PERFORMANCE

Jim: Hi guys, my name is Jim. As you probably know we're supposed to get together and talk about the supposed alcohol problem that we're having on campus. Um, you know we need to go over two major points that I think we need to discuss. How we're going to enforce you know our policy and who can do that. Um...

Ken: Sounds good

Mike: Yeah

J: OK great. Personally, I think it's you know just a you know couple of rowdy guys on the weekends, you know just gettin' a little too much to drink. I think if we can just get these guys to calm down, then that should solve our problem.

K: Well, uh, I've talked to several people on my floor and, uh, I too am aware of the supposed increase in the alcohol related incidents, the fights, and that kind of thing. Um, the general consensus on my floor, however, is "What's the problem". And in fact, ah ah I mean let's face it, I mean people are going to party regardless of what any alcohol policy has to say. But um if anything's gonna work it's a punishment punishment system that needs to be...

J: Yeah, well all I know is that we're supposed to come up with suggestions even if if nobody listens

M: Yeah, well I I mean I talked to some people and they seem to agree that most people don't know what the alcohol policy is. You know, they're not clear on what the rules are and what the consequences are for breaking that and...

J: I think everybody would know what you know the alcohol policy is. You know, it's printed in the student handbook, anyone can read it. I mean, I think what we need maybe to do is like get the police to give a big presentation or something. That way, maybe it would intimidate people, make 'em sit down and listen.

M: Well, I think the easiest way, the best way is just to have floor meetings or something

K: Yeah, I agree with that

J: OK, whatever. Um, well we're supposed to...now let's talk about punishments

K: OK, well the problem as I see it with the current system, the alcohol policy, is that there just aren't enough punishments. There are too many warnings. It's the underage drinkers who are causing all of these problems and they just get warning after warning after
warning. Um, what we need is a alcohol policy that has some stiff penalties and a good punishment system in it for these underage drinkers who are getting caught and causing problems. I mean you yourself Mike said that one of those guys who got caught last week drinking, one of them was under 21, right?
M: Oh, yeah, sure, but I mean it's not just a problem with people who are under 21. I mean I know of a whole bunch of incidents where people who were over 21 who were drinking and got into trouble and...
J: Yeah, I don't think it matters who's doing the drinking. I think that you know, the big the only problem as I see it is supposedly there's a problem. I mean the administration is in this huge uproar, but I mean I don't know what the big deal is, though.
K: OK, I think how 'bout we have just one warning before a more severe punishment. To put some teeth into it, let's how 'bout, I don't know, a 50 dollar fine with the warning
J: Oh, I think 50 dollars would be terrible. I mean I I remember when I started school. I mean 50 dollars was all I had to go for a whole month for like entertainment, extra food and junk like that. I Mean I know I remember havin' to call my parents for extra money. God, I mean it was just constantly, "what are you doing with all that money?". I mean, all that money, what is 50 bucks gonna buy you anyway, ya know.
M: Well, I don't think it's gonna work. I mean I really think the problem is with people who are abusing alcohol. There should be some kind of treatment program or something like you know an AA branch ah here on campus. There's just no place for people who don't want to drink or can't drink to go. I mean, there's such a drinking atmosphere on campus and everything and well...
J: OK, we're supposed to talk about you know the alcohol policy and not really treatment. I don't think treatment and counseling and everything is gonna be a way of enforcing a policy. Um, ya know I mean even at the you know parties, even though there's alcohol there, I mean there's nobody forcing underage people to drink, ya know?
M: I mean I think then there should be bands and music and some place for people to dance and maybe maybe we should make it so if you have a party, you have to have you know soda or something for people who don't drink.
J: Well, you know I mean even if you have sodas and stuff, people are going to still drink. What the resident director suggested was maybe barring from activities or something.
K: No, no that's difficult to enforce. I mean, what are you gonna do, bar'em from going to football games on Saturday afternoons? I mean there are just too many people. You can't enforce that.
M: Yeah and
K: What about maybe something official like disciplinary probation
M: Yeah, that sounds good, but don't you think there should be a fine or something, maybe like 40 dollars because, you know it it you people you just have to keep your grades up if you're on probation and you know some people that's not going to be a problem for
J: This is good, we're talking about offenses and everything. Good. Now we're getting something
K: Um, OK. What if we suspend them for the third offense. That'd really fix those freshman who are causing all these troubles.
J: Well, that sounds good. I mean we probably don't have the authority to do that, but it would work.
M: Oh, I don't know
K: Well, how 'bout we have a 100 dollar fine with the third violation, how 'bout that?
J: Well, who's gonna enforce this policy. I mean I think what we can do is have police at the parties and to get some guys some students to go and spy on everybody and they can go and tell the police.
K: Oh, I don't think that's gonna work. I mean, who wants to be a NARC, let's face it. I think maybe if we had police posted at the entrances and exits of parties and have them check people as they come and go.
J: Alright, well, you have anything else?
M: Well, I um, never mind.
J: OK, great. So so far, what I think we've got here is the new policy is going to be presented by the the Campus Police you know and they're gonna have a big formal meeting and that's where they'll do all that stuff. We're also gonna like put it in the school newspaper and in the handbook, OK?
M: Well, I really don't think it's a good idea to have the Campus Police give a presentation.
J: Well, Ok, even though no one thinks there's a problem, I think that you know what we're gonna have is the three ah punishments for violating and you know these are all gonna be pre ah presented by the
police and it's gonna be in the school newspaper and we'll have it in the handbook. And I think so that's all we have to do.

M: I don't know about this.
Dave: Hi, I'm Dave and um the Resident Director tells me that um there's been a lot of alcohol problems on campus this semester. Well, you know as I see it, the problem really is just enforcing the policy we have now. Uh, I think the best solution would be to have the police enforcement, the police enforce it and then there wouldn't be any problem.

Ken: Well, um, I've talked to several people on my floor about this and I've also read about the supposed increase in the number of alcohol related incidents that are going on here on campus this semester. The consensus, though, on my floor at least, is what's the problem. I mean, let's face it people kids are gonna party no matter what the policy has to say. They're away from home. They're just havin' fun. So given that, given that kids are gonna party regardless of the alcohol policy I think the only thing that's gonna work is some kind of tough punishment system for the underage drinkers.

D: Well, ya know I can understand it it's going to be hard to work on a policy that you don't think anyone's gonna listen to people are just gonna ignore. Um, that's why I think we need a lotta punishments. A good punishment system. If you have a lot of punishments and get the campus police involved I think then the alcohol problem will just go away and I won't have to deal with it.

Mike: Yeah, but I've been talking to some people on my floor and they tend to agree that there seems to be total confusion about what the policy is. No one agrees on what the rules are and the consequences of breaking them. And, um people are just doing illegal things, drinking in their rooms when they're underage and even the people who know it's illegal are still doing it. And everyone seems to agree that students need to know the policy, the consequences too. They also agree that it's going to be very very difficult to enforce.

D: Yeah, but I think what we really need is just to have good punishments for breaking breaking the rules. Um, I don't think this policy is going to be too hard to enforce but it's not just my responsibility. And I think the police should take care of it and they should inform people about the policy and the consequences of violating it. And, um, they don't and um...

M: Um, I think maybe the best way would be to have floor meetings or something and just explain it as a group
K: Yeah, yeah I would agree with that. Furthermore, I'd like to say that the real problem with the current system is that there just aren't enough penalties. There are just too many warnings. Basically, the way I see it you've got a bunch of underage drinkers running around causing all these problems and they just get off whenever they get caught. What we need is a good reliable set of punishments, penalties for these underage drinkers. I think that would be the best way to approach this. I mean after all, even Mike you said those two guys who were caught last weekend was under 21, right?

M: Yeah, well he was under 21, but I don't think it's a problem for people who aren't legal. I mean, I'm not legal and a lot of people on my floor aren't 21, but we know that the problem just isn't underage drinking and I think you do, too. I know of several incidents, accidents and fights where people who were over 21 got involved because they had too much to drink.

D: Well, it doesn't really matter you know who's causing the trouble, just so the policy starts to be enforced. It's gotta be somebody who who can make the students listen to the person and um I think we should talk now about some system for enforcement.

K: OK OK I think we should give one warning before we level a more severe punishment. I think that's the problem with the current system people are just warned and warned and warned. I also think that we should put a 50 dollar fine in addition to the warning. That way we put some teeth into the warning.

M: I don't think it's gonna work. I really don't think it's addressing the problem. I think there should be some sort of treatment program for people who have a drinking problem. So much stuff around this campus revolves around drinking. All the social events and parties and there's no place for people to go who don't drink or can't drink and people who need help can't go anywhere. I think we should have some kind of like AA program for the University and you know...

D: Well, ya know, I can understand why you're concerned about students who have drinking problems. I mean you know they need help. But, I think what we really need is strong enforcement and harsh punishments because we want to teach people what happens when they break the law.

M: We could have some place where people could go and listen to good music and a band and dance and you know maybe have something else to drink besides alcohol you know...
D: yeah, it would be good to have other drinks and you know food. Food would be good too because you know um takes away from he alcohol. I I went to a wedding this past month and um there were a lot of people there who were eating a lot and they didn't have to drink because there was good food there. And it was a good wedding, I don't know, there was good food there just a lot of of good food. It was at this really nice hotel. I I wanted to take food home but I don't know, you know you don't have to drink if there's good food around. So, um um well the problem is starting to get out of hand. Um, and you know the resident director suggested that we just start barring people from activities.

K: No, now wait a minute. That's gonna be way too hard to enforce. I mean what are you gonna do, for instance, ban people from going to the football game Saturday afternoons? It's just too difficult to enforce, really. How 'bout if we have something official - disciplinary probation.

D: Well, I think something's gotta be done. I think it should be something that the University does or the Campus Police do to make it more official.

M: Well, I think there should be a fine with disciplinary probation. How 'bout like 40 dollars or so because probation isn't gonna be a problem fort someone who doesn't have to worry about keeping his/her grades up

K: Yeah, I agree with that. I would also like to suggest that say on the third offense they are just suspended. I mean that'd really fix those freshman weasels who are always getting trashed all the time.

D: Well, ya know, the policy's gotta apply to everyone cuz it's not just the freshmen who are getting out of line and uh you know none of us has the um power to suspend people and I don't think the University is going to really go for that cuz it's gonna cause a lot of hard feelings and backlash from parents and students. It'd just I think it would be it'd cause more problems than it would solve

K: I don't know, OK I how 'bout a 100 dollar fine for the third violation?

D: well, um, thats, I think that ah we should talk about the people who are going to enforce the policy and that's gonna be the police. And if I could just get the police to take care of it, it would just take the problem out of my hands. Well, I guess we just agree that enforcing the policy is um, the most important thing and I think the
Campus Police should do it and I'm gonna tell the Director that we talked about it and we decided that. OK?
Appendix F
Experts' Across-Exercise Dimension Ratings by Performance Level: Candidate One

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Performance Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral Communication</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sensitivity</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning and Organizing</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis and Judgment</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Experts' Across-Exercise Dimension Ratings by Performance Level -
Candidate Two

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Performance Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral Communication</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sensitivity</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning and Organizing</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis and Judgment</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Experts' Across-Exercise Dimension Ratings by Performance Level - Candidate Three

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Performance Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral Communication</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sensitivity</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning and Organizing</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis and Judgment</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix G
ASSESSMENT CENTER ADMINISTRATION INSTRUCTIONS

I. PRELIMINARY ACTIVITIES

Before you start make sure you have a copy of all forms, the timetable, and a list of subjects.

Close door and put up do not disturb sign.

Introduce yourself to the subjects; make sure they are in the correct room. Give each subject an envelop of materials. Tell them:

Please do not put your name on any of the materials, put your social security number or ID number on the materials instead.

II. OVERVIEW OF THE ASSESSMENT CENTER

(a) As you heard in the training session, we are here to evaluate a new technique for hiring residence hall student assistants called an assessment center.

(b) Today, each of you will be observing SA candidates in a group meeting, a counseling session, and a roommate conflict.

Refer to assessment center timetable and ask subjects to refer to this table also. Go over the highlights of the assessment center.

Working quickly, but thoroughly and accurately is very important. Please note that the time allotted for the assessment center is tight.

Do you have any questions?

III. REVIEW OF HOW TO RECORD BEHAVIORAL OBSERVATIONS

(a) During the training session, you practiced making behavioral observations. You were given several reasons why it is important to make good behavioral observations. Good behavioral observations enable you to make accurate observation of others and allow you to
successfully communicate to the other assessors what the candidate actually said and did.

Refer them to their copy of “tips for observing and recording observations” and read this as they follow along.

(b). You were also given feedback on your observations. Most of the feedback focused on encouraging you to record more detail and pay closer attention to nonverbal behavior.

Pass out their critiqued practice forms.

(c) Do you have any questions about how to make good behavioral observations or about the feedback you received on your practice observation forms?

(d) Please note that if a person says or does the same thing several times during an exercise, you don’t have to write it down every time, You can just write the the SA said or did particular thing several times. For example you can write “He nodded his head several times while listening to the students”.

(e) Again, remember to write down details; write down verbatim quotes if possible, and note the context of things the SA said so that you will later be able to interpret what the person said.

(f) Do you have any questions?

IV. REVIEW OF DIMENSIONS

(a) Please refer to the dimension list that we discussed in the training session.

Hold up dimension list.

(b) Again, read each dimension and its definition. Do you have any questions?

V. OBSERVATION OF FIRST EXERCISE
(a) In this exercise, the student assistant candidate has been called in to help two roommates who aren't getting along.

Tell them what form to use (the behavioral observation form) and assign the subjects a candidate. Make sure that you tell them to watch the candidate assigned to your room.

(b) Please be sure to write the candidate's name, your social security number, and today's date on this form. Start the first tape. As soon as the conflict mediation is over, stop the tape.

VI. REVIEW OF CLASSIFICATION OF BEHAVIORS

(a) Now let's talk about how to classify behaviors under dimensions. After watching an exercise and recording the behaviors observed, you will classify those behaviors under the appropriate dimension using the behavior classification form. There is a form labelled "conflict mediation exercise" with all the dimensions listed on it.

Hold up the behavioral classification form and point to the appropriate space underneath as you are discussing it.

(b) You will use one behavioral classification form for each candidate. Classify the behaviors which represent Oral Communication under that category. Then classify the behaviors which represent Sensitivity under the "sensitivity" label. You will then classify behaviors under Planning and Organizing and Analysis and Judgment.

(c) You may classify a particular behavior under more than one dimension if you feel that the behavior is indicative of more than one dimension. Also, some behaviors may not be classifiable under the dimensions. If you feel that a behavior doesn't fit any of the dimensions, then don't classify it and don't report it to the other assessors.

Hold up a copy of the minimal standards for the Conflict Mediation.
(d) To help classify the behaviors under the proper dimension, refer to the minimal standards of performance for the exercise. Examples of behaviors that represent each dimension are given. If you notice a particular behavior on the minimal standards that a candidate exhibited, but you forgot to record, go ahead and classify that behavior under the appropriate dimension. However, do not simply transfer the behavior examples form the minimal standards to your behavior classification forms. You must be able to support them.

(e) Do you have any questions? You will have 15 minutes to classify behaviors. Remember, you need to work quickly but accurately.

(f) Go ahead and classify the behaviors you just observed on the videotape, using the minimal standards for the conflict mediation as a guide.

Give them a two-minute warning.

VII. RATER TRAINING

(a). Now you will rate the candidate on all dimensions in the conflict mediation

HAVE THE SUBJECTS TAKE OUT THEIR RATING SCALE

(b) Please note that a “3” denotes acceptable performance, not average performance. If you give someone a “3” you are saying that the candidate has performed at an acceptable level on that dimension.

(c) Remember to evaluate the candidate against the standard of the scale, not against each other. This is very important.

Have the subjects separate their minimal standards from the rest of their forms and use them in making their ratings.

(c) Use the minimal standards of performance to help you evaluate each candidate's performance on the dimensions. The behaviors listed under each dimension are indicative of performance on that
dimension. If a candidate exhibits most of the behaviors listed under that dimension, she is “acceptable” on that dimension and receives at least a rating of “3”. However, if a candidate does not meet these requirements, she has performed “below standard” on that dimension and therefore should usually be rated a “1” or a “2” on that dimension.

(d) In some instances, however, a candidate does not meet the minimal standards but may still earn a “3” rating. If a candidate exhibits half or more behaviors indicative of acceptable performance on the dimension really well, assessors may use their own judgment to decide whether that compensates for not exhibiting “minimal” behavior.

(e) If a candidate meets the minimal standards and exhibits additional behaviors indicative of good performance on the dimension, she is “above standard” on that dimension and should receive a rating of a “4” or a “5”.

(f) Do you have any questions?

VII. OBSERVATION OF SECOND AND THIRD EXERCISES

(a). The second exercise is the group meeting exercise. The assessor candidate has gotten together with two floor representatives to discuss alcohol problems on campus.

Tell them what form to use (the behavioral observation form) and assign the subjects a candidate. Make sure that you tell them to watch the candidate assigned to your room.

(b) Please be sure to write the candidate’s name, your social security number, and today’s date on this form.

Start the second tape. As soon as the group meeting is over, stop the tape.

(c). Now sort the behaviors into dimensions and make your ratings. You will have fifteen minutes.
Tell them which forms to use (the behavior classification form, rating scale, minimal standards)

GIVE THEM A TWO MINUTE WARNING

(d) The last exercise is the counseling session. The candidate has been called in to help a student who is having personal problems

Tell them what form to use (the behavioral observation form) and assign the subjects a candidate. Make sure that you tell them to watch the candidate assigned to your room

(b) Please be sure to write the candidate’s name, your social security number, and today’s date on this form.

Start the third tape. As soon as the counseling session is over, stop the tape.

(c) Now sort the behaviors into dimensions and make your ratings. You will have fifteen minutes.

Tell them which forms to use (the behavior classification form, rating scale, minimal standards)

GIVE THEM A TWO MINUTE WARNING

--------------------10 minute break---------------------
(switch rooms for integration session)

VIII. INTEGRATION SESSION

(a) Now you will share observations and rate the candidates on the dimensions in the exercises which you did not observe. This will be done one candidate at a time. You will first share behavioral observations and rate the person’s behavior on all dimensions in any exercise that you did not observe him in.

(b) Here are the ground rules for the integration session. You are to listen to the assessor’s report and take notes on what he/she says.
At this point, you are not to discuss what the assessor reports, even if you disagree with what the assessor said. You are to only ask questions on what the candidate said or did.

(c) If the reporting assessor reports a behavior which you feel is not indicative of the dimension under discussion, you are free to classify the behavior under the dimension or dimensions you think are appropriate. However, do not say anything to the other assessors.

(d) You will have three minutes to read your observations and then everyone has one minute to make their ratings. You do not have to write down everything the reporting assessor says. However, you do need to take enough notes so that you can make your ratings.

IX. OBSERVER TRAINING

THE FOURTH PERSON IN YOUR ROOM IS AUTOMATICALLY THE PROCESS OBSERVER. GIVE THAT PERSON A COPY OF THE OBSERVER FORM.

(a) Your observations and classifications from the tapes will still be used but instead of sharing your observations and ratings, you are needed to observe the other assessors make their reports. You are to evaluate the presentation quality of each assessor's presentations, but you don't need to write down everything the assessors say and do. Please use one form per assessor.

MAKE SURE THAT THE MEMBERS OF THE ASSESSOR TEAM FACE ONE ANOTHER. OBSERVERS ARE TO SIT OFF TO THE SIDE.

X. RUNNING THE INTEGRATION SESSION

Please refer to your the sheet labelled “Steps in the integration session” which outlines how you are to discuss each candidate.

FOLLOW THESE STEPS IN THE INTEGRATION SESSION
1. SHARE OBSERVATIONS ON MARK IN THE CONFLICT MEDIATION ON ORAL COMMUNICATION.

2. ASSESSORS MAY ASK QUESTIONS FOR CLARIFICATION (NO DISCUSSION)

3. INDEPENDENTLY RATE MARK ON ORAL COMMUNICATION

4. REPEAT STEPS 1-3 FOR EACH DIMENSION (SENSITIVITY, PLANNING AND ORGANIZING, AND ANALYSIS AND JUDGMENT).

5. REPEAT STEPS 1-4 FOR EACH EXERCISE (GROUP DISCUSSION, THEN COUNSELING SESSION)

6. INDEPENDENTLY RATE MARK'S OVERALL PERFORMANCE ON EACH DIMENSION ACROSS ALL EXERCISES.

7. COMPLETE THE PERFORMANCE MEASURE AND THE CONFIDENCE MEASURE FOR MARK

(a). Tell the assessors to read the instructions and complete the forms as quickly as possible. Ask assessors if they understand the Performance Measure and Confidence Rating Scale.
(b). Confidence Rating Scale: Remind the assessors that page 1 of the confidence rating scale refers to characteristics whereas page 2 refers to circumstances.
(c). Performance Measure: Remind assessors that the measure is 3 pages long. How to answer questions regarding the meanings of "effort" and "luck":

(1). "effort" is used in a positive sense; that is, the question is not how much lack of effort contributed to a candidate's performance - if an assessor feels that the candidate did not put forth any effort in the exercise, then that candidate would be rated low on the scale. Conversely, if an assessor feels that the candidate put forth effort in the exercise, then that candidate would be rated high on the scale.

(2). "luck" is used in this way: if an assessor feels that the candidate's performance was just "lucky", whether good luck or bad luck, he or she would be rated high on that scale. The important
point here is the degree to which the candidate's performance was influenced by luck.

8. REPEAT THIS PROCESS FOR DAVE AND THEN FOR JIM

XI. TIPS FOR RUNNING THE INTEGRATION SESSION

* Do not pass out the performance measure or the confidence measure until the first candidate's performance has been discussed

* Encourage assessors to ask clarification questions and to ask the reporting assessor whether the candidate met the minimal standards for each dimension.

* Remind students to use their minimal standards as a guide when making their ratings.

* Make sure that assessors do not compare one candidate's performance with another candidate's performance.

* Make sure that all statements regarding a candidate's performance are behaviorally specific.

* Don't let assessors take too much time reporting behaviors

XII. CLOSING

Thank you so much for participating in this experiment. I really appreciate your input. It seems like you all did a good job. You will receive a memo by mail, debriefing you about the experiment after all data has been collected.

COLLECT ALL MATERIALS.

SIGN THEIR CREDIT CARDS.. THE STUDY IS CALLED “ASSESSMENT OF JOB CANDIDATES” (#108) AND THEY SHOULD RECEIVE 4 CREDIT HOURS.
REMINDERS

1. Be enthusiastic !!!!!!!!!!

2. Go slowly: Remember that this is probably the subjects’ first experience with being an assessor.

3. Impress upon the subjects the need to do well and to feel free to ask questions. Ask for questions several times during the assessment center.

4. Be friendly but task-oriented.

5. Double check your packets to make sure they contain the correct forms.

6. Make sure the subject’s social security number is on each form.

7. Make sure that the subjects are using the correct forms at all times.

8. Do not allow the subjects to take any materials from the room.

9. If an assessor wants to know if a behavior they recorded is a good behavioral observation, refer them to their copy of “Tips for Observing and Recording Behaviors”.

10. Neither you nor any of the other assessors are to help subjects classify behaviors into the dimensions. However, you may clarify and help assessors understand the dimension definitions and the minimal standards. The schedule is very tight so time each segment. If you fall behind, you will probably not be able to catch up later on.

11. Do not sign their ‘credit cards’ until after the assessment center is over.

12. If an assessor reports a behavior that did not occur, don’t say anything about it.
13. Dress nicely (no shorts or sweats)


15. Put a “do not disturb” sign on the door. The room assignments have been double checked. If a professor or graduate student hassles you, tell him/her that you have reserved the room through appropriate university channels and they are to contact Dr. Gaugler (ext. 3419) if they have any problems. Do not give up the room. Write down his/her telephone number.

16. Hold up each form as they are to use it. Continually check to make sure subjects are using the correct forms.

17. You can read while they watch the tapes and classify behaviors but don’t make noise.

18. I will be there to help you out, so don’t worry if you’re not sure of exactly what to do at first. It is important that you appear confident, though, so try to do your best.
### ASSESSMENT CENTER TIMETABLE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>60 minutes</td>
<td>Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 minutes</td>
<td>Break</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 minutes</td>
<td>Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 minutes</td>
<td>Observe one candidate in roommate conflict exercise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 minutes</td>
<td>Classify behaviors/rate dimensions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 minutes</td>
<td>Observe another candidate in group meeting exercise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 minutes</td>
<td>Classify behaviors/rate dimensions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 minutes</td>
<td>Observe last candidate in counseling session exercise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 minutes</td>
<td>Classify behaviors/rate dimensions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 minutes</td>
<td>Break</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 minutes</td>
<td>Integration/Performance and Confidence Measure-MARK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 minutes</td>
<td>Integration/Performance and Confidence Measure-DAVE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 minutes</td>
<td>Integration/Performance and Confidence Measure-JIM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**4 hours**
TIPS FOR OBSERVING AND RECORDING BEHAVIORS

Recording Observations

- Write down specific behaviors and comments made. Grammar and sentence structure are not important

- Avoid generalizations. Saying that “he was hostile towards the students” does not give the assessors much information about what the SAs actually said and did.

- Use the Behavior Observation Form

Characteristics of Good and Poor Behavioral Observations

Good observations:

- State what a person says or does
- Are specific rather than general
- Are descriptive rather than evaluative
- Are confirmable by others

Poor observations:

- Make general classification statements
- Interpret actions
- Impart feelings
- Describe underlying personality makeup
OBSERVER FORM

Observer ID ____________ Date ____________

I. Name of first assessor observed

Quality of Presentation Rating: 1——2——3——4——5
Very Poor
Excellent

II. Name of second assessor observed

Quality of Presentation Rating: 1——2——3——4——5
Very Poor
Excellent

III. Name of third assessor observed

Quality of Presentation Rating: 1——2——3——4——5
Very Poor
Excellent

* Note: In making your quality of presentation rating, be sure to consider the reporting assessor's (1) clarity of presentation, (2) persuasiveness and (3) credibility.
MATERIALS FOR EACH ASSESSOR

TRAINING SESSION

1 consent form
1 Tips for Making Good Behavioral Observations
1 practice Behavioral Observation Form
1 List of Dimensions and Dimension Definitions
1 practice Behavior Classification Form
1 Steps in the Integration Session

EXERCISE SESSION

1 Assessment Center Timetable
1 List of Dimensions and Dimension Definitions
3 Behavior Observation Form
9 Behavior Classification Form
1 Minimal Standards for each exercise
1 Rating Scale
1 Steps in the Integration Session
3 across-exercise dimension rating forms

MATERIALS FOR EACH ADMINISTRATOR

Administration instructions
1 Copy of everything in the exercise session given to assessors
  1 observer form
  3 performance measure forms
  3 confidence measure forms
1 credit slip for each assessor
1 pencil for each assessor
Extra forms, pencils, and questionnaires
Appendix H
## Manipulation Check: Univariate F Values for Candidate One

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Performance Level</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Eta</th>
<th>Direction of Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oral Communication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>182.07</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>high &gt; low</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sensitivity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>526.42</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>high &gt; low</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning and Organizing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>450.50</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>high &gt; low</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis and Judgment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>411.68</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>high &gt; low</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

p < .0001
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Performance Level</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>$E$</td>
<td>$\eta$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral Communication</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>338.69</td>
<td>.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$M$</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sensitivity</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>727.72</td>
<td>.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$M$</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning and Organizing</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>754.21</td>
<td>.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$M$</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis and Judgment</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>681.92</td>
<td>.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$M$</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$p < .0001$
Manipulation Check: Univariate F Values for Candidate Three

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Performance Level</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Eta</td>
<td>Direction of Sig.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral Communication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>334.41</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>high &gt; low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sensitivity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>690.85</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>high &gt; low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning and Organizing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>463.51</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>high &gt; low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis and Judgment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>597.48</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>high &gt; low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

p < .0001