

# **Increasing the Utility of Scenario-Based Testing at DEOMI**

Rolanda Findlay, M.S.  
Department of Psychology  
Virginia Tech



DEFENSE EQUAL OPPORTUNITY MANAGEMENT INSTITUTE

RESEARCH DIRECTORATE

Directed by Dr. Daniel P. McDonald, Director of Research  
Summer 2008

Internal Report Number 04-08

Abstract

At the Defense Equal Opportunity Management Institute (DEOMI) the Equal Opportunity (EO) Situational Judgment Test (SJT) is utilized to evaluate the effectiveness of the Equal Opportunity Advisor (EOA) training program. The objective of the present study is to increase the utility of the EO-SJT by increasing the EO-SJT item pool and expanding the EO-SJT item pool content to address all five EOA core duties. Increasing the EO-SJT item pool allows items to be retired after multiple assessment administrations to avoid item over-exposure. It also allows retired EO-SJT items to be used as EOA training tools in the classroom and on-the-job. Expanding the EO-SJT to address the five core EOA duty areas, as determined in EOA task analyses, produces a comprehensive measure of EOA performance and allows conclusions to be drawn beyond complaint processing to the entire EOA position.

**Opinions expressed in this report are those of the author and should not be construed to represent the official position of DEOMI, the U.S. military services, or the Department of Defense.**

Table of Contents

Abstract..... 2

Introduction .....5

    SJT Item Development .....6

    Equal Opportunity Situational Judgment Test..... 7

    Increasing Utility of the EO-SJT .....8

Current Study .....10

Method .....10

    Item Development .....10

Results..... 12

    EO-SJT Item Pool .....12

        Assessment items .....13

        Classroom training items .....13

        On-the-job refresher training items .....13

Discussion .....14

    EO-SJT Item Pool..... 14

        Assessment .....14

        On-the-job refresher training .....16

Summary .....16

References .....18

Appendix A .....21

    Table 1. EOA Core Duties and Task Listing .....22

Appendix B .....24

    Table 2. EO-SJT Item Classification Framework .....25

Author Note .....27

Footnote .....28

### Increasing the Utility of Scenario-Based Testing at DEOMI

Situational judgment tests (SJTs) are multidimensional, scenario-based assessment instruments. They have been shown to be practical, valid, and reliable measurement tools in a number of contexts (Chan & Schmitt, 2002; Hunter, 2003; Motowidlo, Dunnette, & Carter, 1990; Weekley & Jones, 1997). Each SJT item is an independent work sample (sample of performance), also known as a “low-fidelity” work simulation. They are considered “low-fidelity” because SJTs provide mental or visual work reproductions, as stimuli, as opposed to the tangible reproductions utilized in “high fidelity” simulations (e.g., flight simulators) (Motowidlo et al., 1990). Each SJT item presents a hypothetical scenario, similar to one that would be encountered in the workplace, followed by alternative options to address the given scenario. The following is an example SJT item<sup>1</sup>.

A Muslim officer calls you and asks to file a complaint against his superior Christian officer. The Muslim officer claims that while he was praying, his superior officer shouted orders at him, and that when he continued praying, the superior officer got upset and shouted the order a second time, telling him to “stop that garbage and obey my orders.” The Muslim officer said he tried to explain the importance of prayers to the Christian officer, but he claims the Christian officer ignored him, and subsequently punished him for disobeying orders.

Of the following, the most important advice to give the Muslim officer is to:

- Consider filing a report with the unit in charge of criminal investigations
- Explain the differences between pursuing the incident as an informal complaint versus a formal complaint
- Recommend that the Muslim officer pursue the incident through the chain of command

The assumption underlying SJT use is that an individual’s performance on the job can be predicted based on an individual’s performance on a job simulation (McDaniel & Nguyen, 2001). SJTs, as work samples/simulations, allow the measurement of complex,

multidimensional constructs outside of the environment where the construct would naturally be expressed (Becker, 2005; Chan & Schmitt, 2002; McDaniel, Morgeson, Finnegan, Campion, & Braverman, 2001). In short, SJTs can predict work performance outside of the actual work environment.

SJTs have been primarily used as selection tools; however, research has shown the utility of SJTs beyond the selection domain (Maraist, Doherty, & Olson-Buchanan, 2007). There is an increasing body of literature recognizing the value of SJTs in training and training evaluation (Fritzsche, Stagl, Salas, & Burke, 2006; Maraist et al., 2007; Ostroff, 1991). As realistic job previews, SJTs can be constructive and informative teaching agents beneficial for training. As predictive work samples, SJTs can indicate trainee performance in the workplace before the trainee leaves the training environment and returns to the work environment. By administering a SJT before and after training, it is possible to measure changes in trainee performance over the course of training (Ostroff, 1991). Improvements in trainee performance over the course of training, and positive distinctions among the performance of trained versus untrained personnel, are the hallmarks of an effective training program, and can be measured using SJTs.

#### *SJT Item Development*

There are a variety of ways to create a SJT. The standard protocol is to first identify and define the constructs to be measured (e.g., area of knowledge or competencies targeted in training). Next, critical incidents/situations from the job are gathered using job analysis and/or the assistance of subject matter experts (SMEs). Incidents are then grouped into similar content areas. The test developer, using these critical incidents, writes hypothetical scenarios that are representative of the applicable

content areas and will elicit information regarding the variable of interest. The scenarios are edited for length, format, interpretability, applicability, and appropriateness (Lievens, 2000; McDaniel & Nguyen, 2001). SMEs are asked to identify effective responses to the edited scenarios. It is likely that the responses obtained from SMEs will range in effectiveness, which allows different response options to be collected for each scenario. Response options are edited for length, format, appropriateness, and interpretability. The items (each scenario and corresponding response options) are then gathered and compiled to create a SJT (Lievens, 2000; McDaniel & Nguyen, 2001).

#### *Equal Opportunity Situational Judgment Test*

In 2004, the Virginia Tech Research Team began developing the Equal Opportunity (EO) Situational Judgment Test (SJT) for the Defense Equal Opportunity Management Institute (DEOMI)<sup>2</sup>. The EO-SJT is a 30-item assessment instrument which is administered to Equal Opportunity Advisor (EOA) trainees. Each item on the EO-SJT presents trainees with a hypothetical problem-scenario that is relevant to the EOA position. To date, the EO-SJT has focused solely on the complaint processing aspect of the EOA position<sup>3</sup>. Accordingly, the EO-SJT scenarios revolve around the intake, resolution, and follow-up of informal and formal EO complaints. The scenarios incorporate EO offenses that are based on race/national origin, sex, and religious affiliation.

The EO-SJT is currently utilized at DEOMI as a means of evaluating the EOA training course. Specifically, the EO-SJT is used to assess whether EOA trainees are able to transfer the information taught during the EOA training program into successful performance during an EOA job simulation. The EO-SJT is administered before (pre-)

and after (post-) EOA training to all EOA trainees. The pre- and post-training results are analyzed to determine if there is a difference in EOA trainee performance over the course of EOA training.

Administration of the EO-SJT began in 2005, and since that time has been administered to six Equal Opportunity Advisor Program (EOAP) training classes, and to three Equal Opportunity Advisor Reserve Component Course (EOARCC) training classes. Results on the EO-SJT have consistently shown that EOA trainees are better able to process complaints after receiving EOA training than if they did not receive EOA training (Findlay, 2006; Moore, 2008)<sup>4</sup>. In addition, the results provide indirect evidence that EOAs benefit from DEOMI training in terms of on-the-job performance once they have returned to the field and fleet.

#### *Increasing Utility of the EO-SJT*

While the EOA position encompasses more than complaint processing, that is the only duty area addressed in the current EO-SJT. In order to increase the utility of the EO-SJT, it is necessary to create a more comprehensive SJT item pool that includes the entire scope of the EOA position. The five core duty areas of the EOA position, as determined from EOA task analyses, are: complaint processing, climate assessment, special observance function, general EO/administration, and education, training and awareness (Marcum et al., 2008). While differing in levels of criticality, difficulty, frequency, and time spent, these five core duty areas and related tasks were all deemed to be essential components of the EOA position (Marcum et al., 2008). Expanding the EO-SJT to address these core duty areas creates an all-encompassing instrument which allows conclusions to be drawn in regards to the entire EOA position.



Expanding the content domains of the EO-SJT is not the only way to increase the utility of the EO-SJT. To date, the EO-SJT has been successfully employed as a measurement tool for evaluating the EOA training program. However, training evaluation is but one of the several possible functions of the EO-SJT items. EO-SJT items can be efficiently converted into classroom training tools and on-the-job training resources.

After multiple administrations, an EO-SJT item used for assessment can become compromised due to overexposure, which in turn, compromises the security of the test. In other words, the more often an item is used for assessment, the greater the likelihood that the item's security will decrease. An item that has diminished security is a compromised item. A compromised item cannot be relied on to accurately measure performance, thus, is not appropriate for use as an assessment tool. Overexposed and potentially compromised items must be retired from the EO-SJT.

Once an item is retired it can then be used as a training tool/supplement for the classroom and for on-the-job training. Specifically, at DEOMI, the retired scenarios can be incorporated into the EOA training program and used as work samples, discussion starters, and/or foundations for classroom role play. This provides trainees with an opportunity to envision realistic EOA situations and prepare appropriate reactions to the situation. Retired EO-SJT items can also be utilized as on-the-job refresher training tools. By hosting EO-SJT items online, for example on the DEOMI Resource Network (DRN), EOAs in the field and fleet can readily refer to the items as a resource while in action. Each EO-SJT item would be presented and furnished with the rationale for the correct response option, along with additional resources on the topic addressed.

In order to use the EO-SJT items as training tools, for the classroom or on-the-job, it is necessary to build a larger SJT item pool. It is economical to reuse retired assessment items by transitioning these items into training supplements. While it is important to retire items to ensure that assessment items are not overexposed or compromised, EO-SJT items cannot be retired until there are suitable replacements available; therefore it is imperative to create new items to increase the utility of the EO-SJT.

### Current Study

The objective of the current study is to increase the utility of the scenario-based testing, the EO-SJT, at DEOMI, by increasing the EO-SJT item pool and expanding the EO-SJT item pool beyond complaint processing. Achieving these objectives translates into three direct ‘deliverables’ for DEOMI. Deliverable 1 is a new EO-SJT instrument that is more comprehensive, as it addresses all five core EOA duty areas. Deliverable 2 is the release of retired scenarios to EOA curriculum developers to be used as classroom training tools. Deliverable 3 is the development of an EOA online resource toolbox to be made available on the DRN. The EOA resource toolbox will be comprised of retired EO-SJT items, followed by a rationale for the correct response and additional information/resources on the targeted issue.

### Method

#### *Item Development*

The first step in increasing and expanding the EO-SJT item pool was to identify and define the construct being measured. The construct targeted in the EO-SJT is EOA job performance. The EOA job performance is measured by the EOA’s ability to appropriately complete the responsibilities and expectations delegated to them. EOA

responsibilities and expectations were grouped into five core duty areas according to EOA task analyses (Marcum et al., 2008). The EOA core duty areas are: complaint processing, climate assessment, special observance function, general EO/administration, and education, training and awareness. For each core duty area, critical tasks and task descriptions were identified. Table 1 presents the EO core duty areas and related core tasks derived from the most recently completed EOA core task analysis (Findlay, 2007; Marcum et al., 2008).

Next, critical incidents/situations from the EOA position were gathered using information collected from the EOA job analysis, the EOA front-end analysis, and feedback from SMEs. The EOA front-end analysis was specifically helpful in providing critical incidents/situations, as it provided information on current EOA issues, barriers to EOA performance, EOA best practices, and emerging issues for EOAs in the field and fleet. In addition, EOA service manuals, military directives, and literature pertaining to EOA duty procedures, were used to identify pertinent EOA issues, standard protocols and alternative courses of action, as well as EOA best practices. Beyond these resources, records of informal and formal EO complaints provided another rich source for EO-SJT critical incidents/situations. Critical incidents were also gathered from SMEs (EOA trainers and exemplary EOAs active in the field and fleet) during focus groups and individual interviews held at DEOMI. Lastly, common EO issues publicized in the news, popular entertainment, and other media outlets were reviewed and used as additional inspiration in creating the EOA critical incidents.

Afterwards, the EOA critical incidents were classified into common duty areas, issue/offenses, and demographic areas (categories). A table of specifications/framework

identifying the duty areas, offense/issues, and demographics/categories addressed in the EO-SJT is presented in Table 2. The EOA critical incidents were then classified into this framework and used to create descriptive scenarios. Each scenario was written with the necessary detail to provide the respondent with the information required to respond effectively. The response prompt for a given scenario was then selected from a pool of potential question prompts (e.g., “The course of action you would take next is to...”), based on level of appropriateness. Finally, response options for each scenario were identified based upon SME opinion, research and resources reviewed regarding the EOA position, military protocol, and directives.

A complete SJT item consists of a hypothetical scenario, an appropriate response prompt, followed by applicable response options. All SJT items were then subjected to SME review (SMEs were selected by the Research Directorate) and evaluated for interpretability, applicability, appropriateness, realism, and clarity.

## Results

### *EO-SJT Item Pool*

The EO-SJT item pool was significantly increased. A total of 300 new EO-SJT items were created. Specifically, 100 items were created that deal with complaint processing, 85 items with climate assessment, 60 items with education, training, awareness, 30 items with general EO/administration, and 25 items with special observance function. Each core duty area purposely has an unequal number of items assigned/created. EOA task analyses show that the criticality, frequency, and time spent within each of the given duty areas is not equal (Findlay, 2007; Marcum et al., 2008). For this reason, the items were proportionately distributed to account for the criticality,

frequency, and time spent on each EOA core duty. SME review of these new EO-SJT items is currently underway. In addition to increasing the number of items and expanding the content areas of the item pool, three direct deliverables were provided to the Research Directorate.

*Assessment items.* Thirty new items were selected to replace the items used on the current EO-SJT. The current EO-SJT items will be retired after the graduation of the current EOA training class, since replacement items are now available. The new EO-SJT items are proportionately representative of the entire EOA position. Specifically, 10 items will be representative of the complaint processing duty, eight items in climate assessment, six items in education, training, and awareness, three items in general EO/administration, and three items in special observance function. Items are also representative of issue/offense categories and demographic categories. The new EO-SJT items will be pilot tested on the next EOA training class (EOA-P 2008). The items to be pilot tested as the new EO-SJT were delivered to DEOMI's Research Directorate.

*Classroom training items.* Thirty EO-SJT items, which will soon be retired, were delivered to DEOMI's Research Directorate. These items were forwarded to DEOMI's Curriculum Directorate and utilized in the current redesign of the EOA training curriculum. The scenarios were prepared in a manner that allows them to be discussed in terms of the entire EOA position, which includes: complaint processing, climate assessment, general EO/administration, education, training and awareness, and special observance function.

*On-the-job refresher training items.* Five EO-SJT items, which will soon be retired, were delivered to DEOMI's Research Directorate to be used as online resource

tools. Each item deals with an aspect of complaint processing and is presented with a detailed rationale for why one response option is better than the other options presented. Also, additional resources on the targeted EO issue (e.g., differential treatment) are presented for each item. The toolbox will be used as a form of on-the-job EOA refresher training available on the DRN.

## Discussion

### *EO-SJT Item Pool*

The EO-SJT item pool has been significantly increased. There are now 300 new EO-SJT items available for use. These items cover all five core EOA duty areas: complaint processing, climate assessment, general EO/administration, education, training and awareness, and special observance function. Based on the framework created, each item can be classified by EOA duty area, issue/offense, and demographic category. Incorporation of the five duty areas ensures that the future EO-SJT is truly representative of the entire EOA position. EO-SJT results can now be used to draw conclusions beyond complaint processing to the entire EOA position.

Due to the increased item pool, three distinct products or ‘deliverables’ were provided to DEOMI, which include: items for assessment, items for classroom training, and items for on-the-job refresher training. Future directions for each deliverable are offered below.

*Assessment.* The creation of the new EO-SJT items allows for the retirement of older EO-SJT items. Once the new items are evaluated for interpretability, applicability, appropriateness, realism, and clarity, pilot testing on EOA trainees will commence. In the future, a small number of items will be pilot tested during each EO-SJT administration.

This is a common practice utilized with other standardized tests (e.g., SAT), which allows items to be seamlessly transitioned into use.

Beyond utilizing the EO-SJT data to evaluate the overall effectiveness of the EOA training program, data derived from the EO-SJT can also be used to identify areas of the EOA training program that are successful and the areas that require further modification. In addition, considering that the same version of the EO-SJT is administered as both the pre- and post- test, there are concerns over practice effects. These concerns should compel future research to be geared towards the generation of parallel forms of the EO-SJT in order to reduce practice effects. Due to careful classification of items and a large item pool with multiple items in a particular classification, creating parallel forms of the EO-SJT is a possibility in the near future. It will be possible to use item data and classification information to determine equivalent items and thereby aiding in the development of parallel forms of the EO-SJTs.

Future research will also aim to validate the EO-SJT using criterion data. Criterion data will include performance data of EOAs in the field and fleet. The ability of the EO-SJT to explain variance in actual EOA job performance in the field and fleet will allow the EO-SJT to be used as an EOA competency exam and as a measurement of EOA performance in the field and fleet. Beyond that, then the EO-SJT can be utilized as a certification exam, whereby EOAs must pass the EO-SJT prior to EOA graduation and future work in the field and fleet.

*Classroom training.* As items are retired they will be provided to DEOMI Curriculum Directorate as training aides for EOAs in the classroom. Scenarios can be incorporated into the training curriculum without response prompts or response options.

This allows curriculum developers to embed the scenarios into the curriculum as work samples, discussion starters, and/or foundations for classroom role play. In the future, a clearinghouse/database where curriculum developers or EOA trainers can request specific types of scenarios or suggest items can be designed. This clearinghouse will ensure that the scenarios discussed in training are current and consistent across small group sessions within an EOA training class.

*On-the-job refresher training.* As EO-SJT items are retired they will be published on the DRN as an online resource tools for EOAs in the field and fleet. Each item will be presented and will engage users by requiring they select a listed response option to address the given scenario. After each selection, the user will receive feedback regarding the scenario and the rationale for the correct response. Additional information/resources on the targeted issue will also be provided for the user. The presentation of the EO-SJT items in this fashion will help to ingrain military established protocol and best practices in a given situation. The engaging and interactive nature of the toolbox will also increase the utility and popularity of DRN. In the future it is possible to create a clearinghouse/database where EOAs can request specific types of EO scenarios and suggest scenarios that should be included on the DRN, and/or EOAs can ask for additional information and assistance with a scenario they are currently facing.

### Summary

It is clear that the EO-SJT has provided utility as a training evaluation instrument. This is, however, not the only use of the EO-SJT items. SJTs items can also be utilized for classroom and on-the-job training. The utility of the SJT was maximized by increasing the SJT item pool and expanding the content areas of the EO-SJT. Increasing



the item pool allows for the retirement of EO-SJT items, that have been repeatedly used for assessment. Retired EO-SJT items can then be utilized after retirement in a number of ways. This project elucidates how the retired EO-SJT can be used in the training domain, as classroom and on-the-job training tools.

Several future directions for EO-SJT items in assessment, classroom training, and on-the-job refresher training were identified. The success of the EO-SJT and its utility for DEOMI continues to grow. The EO-SJT project provides a practical and convincing example of what is possible when using scenario-based testing in the diversity training domain. At DEOMI there are several courses that deal with diversity awareness and management, that could also benefit from scenario-based testing, such as the Senior Executive Equal Opportunity Seminar, Equal Employment Opportunity Counselor Program, Leadership Team Awareness Seminar, Mediation Certification Program, and the Special Emphasis Program Manager's Course.

References

- Becker, T. (2005). Development and validation of a situational judgment test of employee integrity. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 13(3), 225–232.
- Chan, D., & Schmitt, N. (2002). Situational judgment and job performance. *Human Performance*, 15(3), 233–254.
- Fritzsche, B. A., Stagl, K. C., Salas, E., & Burke, C. S. (2006). Enhancing the design, delivery, and evaluation of scenario-based training: Can situational judgment tests contribute? In J. A. Weekley & R. E. Ployhart (Eds.), *Situational Judgment Tests: Theory, Measurement, and Application* (pp. 301–318). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum & Associates.
- Findlay, R. (2006). *EOA training evaluation: The development and implementation of a situational judgment test*. Patrick AFB, FL: DEOMI.
- Findlay, R. (2007). *Equal opportunity advisor core task rating analysis*. Patrick AFB, FL: DEOMI.
- Hunter, D. R. (2003). Measuring general aviation pilot judgment using a situational judgment technique. *The International Journal of Aviation Psychology*, 13(4), 373–386.
- Lievens, F. (2000). Development of an empirical scoring scheme for situational inventories. *European Review of Applied Psychology*, 50, 117–124.
- Maraist, C., Doherty, M., & Olson-Buchanan, J. (2007). *Why use situational judgment tests for training and development?* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology, New York, NY.

- Marcum, R., Moore, L., Peterson, M., Moeser, E., Van Driel, M., Findlay, R., & Parks, K. (2008). *Equal opportunity advisor program front-end analysis report*. Patrick AFB, FL: DEOMI.
- McDaniel, M. A., Morgeson, F. P., Finnegan, E. B., Campion, M. A., & Braverman, E. P. (2001). Use of situational judgment tests to predict job performance: A clarification of the literature. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 86*(4), 730–740.
- McDaniel, M. A., & Nguyen, N. T. (2001). Situational judgment tests: A review of practice and constructs assessed. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment, 9*(1/2), 103–113.
- McGee, P., & Talbert, T. (2006). *The job behind the tasks: Expert views on job requirements EOA job task analysis*. Patrick AFB, FL: DEOMI.
- Moore, L.C. (2008). *Situational judgment test analysis summary*. Patrick AFB, FL: DEOMI.
- Motowidlo, S. J., Dunnette, M. D., & Carter, G. W. (1990). An alternative selection procedure: The low-fidelity simulation. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 75*(6), 640–647.
- Ostroff, C. (1991). Training effectiveness measures and scoring schemes: A comparison. *Personnel Psychology, 44*(2), 353–374.
- Truhon, S.A. (2006). *What do military equal opportunity advisors do: A job analysis*. Patrick AFB, FL: DEOMI.
- Weekley, J. A., & Jones, C. (1997). Video-based situational testing. *Personnel Psychology, 50*(1), 25–49.

Weekley, J. A., & Ployhart, R. E. (2005). Situational judgment: Antecedents and relationships with performance. *Human Performance, 18*(1), 81–104.

Appendix A

Table 1

*EOA Core Duties and Task Listing*

---

Climate Assessment

- Advising commanders of results of climate assessment evaluations
- Conducting unit self-inspections
- Analyzing results of climate assessment survey data
- Conducting organization climate assessments
- Advising unit commanders on recommended corrective actions addressing problem areas observed during climate assessment survey
- Analyzing results of climate assessment focus groups
- Conducting climate assessment out-briefings
- Conducting out-and-about assessments
- Conducting climate assessment in-briefings
- Analyzing results of climate assessment interviews
- Conducting inspections of subordinate units, such as Inspector General inspections
- Conducting focus groups
- Draft or write Climate Assessment reports
- Analyzing CA results for possible discrimination trends

Special Observance Function

- Briefing commanders on special observance celebrations, events, guest speakers, or displays
- Advising special observance committees or unit human relations counsel on procedures for celebrations, events, guest speakers, or displays
- Preparing and distributing special observance advertisements, such as invitations, flyers, programs, and articles
- Coordinating special observances with agencies such as public affairs
- Setting up special observance display booths
- Coordinating logistical requirements for special observance functions with action agencies
- Scheduling guest speakers for special observance events

Complaint Processing

- Conducting informal conflict resolutions
  - Advising complainant on alternate resolution avenues
  - Establish and maintain electronic records for each formal complaint received
  - Advising the complainant of her/his right to file a formal discrimination complaint
  - Monitoring complaint processing time limitations
  - Recommending referral agencies
  - Conducting Equal Opportunity(EO) Civil Rights(CR) mediation services
  - Develop interview questions based on written EO/CR complaints
-

Table 1 (continued)

---

General EO/Administration

Preparing and conducting formal briefings

Preparing and conducting informal briefings

Advising commanders or staff agency personnel on equal opportunity matters, such as capabilities, procedures, or programs

Assisting commanders in developing EO/CR policy

Briefing commanders, department heads, respective chiefs, or other agency personnel on human relations, EO, or CR programs and policies

Participating in staff or planning meetings

Drafting or writing memorandum for record (MFRs)

Education, Training, & Awareness

Recognizing sexual harassment in both overt and subtle forms

Conduct and monitor sexual harassment (SH) awareness training

Recognizing and assessing indicators of institutional and individual discrimination

Conduct and participate in EO or CR-related meetings, conferences, or working groups

Interpreting equal opportunity (EO) policies or directives for subordinates

Conduct and monitor EO training

Design training aides

---

Appendix B



Table 2.

*EO-SJT Item Classification Framework*

Category	Issue/Offense
Sex	Offensive Labels or Language – Use of Epithets and Slurs
	Offensive Beliefs or Attitudes – Use of Stereotypical Beliefs
	Inappropriate Message Content – Inappropriate Jokes or Comments
	*Labels Indicative of a Personal Relationship – Use of labels like “Honey”
	*Anonymous Threats – Physical or Psychological Threats from Unknown Source
	*Direct Threats – Physical or Psychological Threats from Known Source
	*Inappropriate Advances – Pursuit of an Unwanted Personal Relationship
	Work-Related Differential Treatment – Assignments, Rewards, or Punishment
	Violation of Work Place Policy or Regulations – Posting Offensive Material, Inappropriate Consensual Relationship – Personal Relationships that Violate Policy
	*Intimidation – Behaviors Intended to Embarrass or Intimidate (e.g., Stalking – Any Behavior Rooted in Sexual Desires Intended to Intimidate)
	*Inappropriate Touching – Pinching, Rubbing, Tickling, etc.
	*Physical Assault – Physically Harming Another (Sexual Assault – Unwanted Sexual Contact)
Race	Offensive Labels or Language – Use of Epithets and Slurs
	Offensive Beliefs or Attitudes – Use of Stereotypical Beliefs
	Inappropriate Message Content – Inappropriate Jokes or Comments
	*Anonymous Threats – Physical or Psychological Threats from Unknown Source
	*Direct Threats – Physical or Psychological Threats from Known Source
	*Work-Related Differential Treatment – Assignments, Rewards, or Punishment
	Violation of Work Place Policy or Regulations – Posting Offensive Material, etc.
	*Intimidation – Behaviors Intended to Embarrass or Intimidate
	*Physical Assault – Physically Harming Another
Religion	Offensive Labels or Language – Use of Epithets and Slurs

Table 2 (continued)

	Offensive Beliefs or Attitudes – Use of Stereotypical Beliefs
	Inappropriate Message Content – Inappropriate Jokes or Comments
	*Anonymous Threats – Physical or Psychological Threats from Unknown Source
	*Direct Threats – Physical or Psychological Threats from Known Source
	*Work-Related Differential Treatment – Assignments, Rewards, or Punishment
	Violation of Work Place Policy or Regulations – Posting Offensive Material, etc.
	*Intimidation – Behaviors Intended to Embarrass or Intimidate
	*Physical Assault – Physically Harming Another
Disability	
	Offensive Labels or Language – Use of Epithets and Slurs
	Offensive Beliefs or Attitudes – Use of Stereotypical Beliefs
	Inappropriate Message Content – Inappropriate Jokes or Comments
	*Anonymous Threats – Physical or Psychological Threats from Unknown Source
	*Direct Threats – Physical or Psychological Threats from Known Source
	*Work-Related Differential Treatment – Assignments, Rewards, or Punishment
	*Violation of Work Place Policy or Regulations – Posting Offensive Material, etc.
	*Intimidation – Behaviors Intended to Embarrass or Intimidate
	*Physical Assault – Physically Harming Another
Age	
	*Offensive Labels or Language – Use of Epithets and Slurs
	*Offensive Beliefs or Attitudes – Use of Stereotypical Beliefs
	*Inappropriate Message Content – Inappropriate Jokes or Comments
	*Anonymous Threats – Physical or Psychological Threats from Unknown Source
	*Direct Threats – Physical or Psychological Threats from Known Source
	*Work-Related Differential Treatment – Assignments, Rewards, or Punishment
	*Violation of Work Place Policy or Regulations – Posting Offensive Material, etc.
	*Intimidation – Behaviors Intended to Embarrass or Intimidate
	*Physical Assault – Physically Harming Another
General EO	
	*EO Resistance

*Note.* Duty areas include complaint processing, climate assessment, special observance function, general EO/administration, and education, training and awareness.

\*’ indicates that the issue/offense is not addressed for the special observance duty area in the EO-SJT.

Author Note

I would like to extend my sincerest thanks to the Defense Equal Opportunity Management Institute (DEOMI) Research Directorate for embracing the vision of the Situational Judgment Test (SJT) project and making this research opportunity possible. In addition, I would like to thank the Subject Matter Experts (SMEs) and Equal Opportunity Advisor (EOA) trainers and trainees for their many valuable contributions. Last, but not least, I would like to thank and acknowledge Dr. Neil Hauenstein, an Industrial and Organizational Psychology professor at Virginia Tech, a former summer faculty researcher at DEOMI, and my academic advisor. He is responsible for creating and launching the Equal Opportunity (EO) Situational Judgment Test (SJT) at DEOMI and continues to be the principal investigator on the project.

Foot Notes

<sup>1</sup> Item was taken from the Equal Opportunity (EO) Situational Judgment Test (SJT) currently utilized at DEOMI.

<sup>2</sup> A detailed description of the development of the EO-SJT is available in the technical report “EOA training evaluation: The development and implementation of a situational judgment test” (Findlay, 2006).

<sup>3</sup> Complaint processing is considered one of the most important EOA job duties across all branches of the military (Findlay, 2007; Marcum *et al.*, 2008). In addition, ‘complaint processing’ served as a convenient foundation for developing the EO-SJT because records regarding both formal and informal EO complaints were readily available. The documented complaints offered a rich data source for creating scenarios.

<sup>4</sup> A detailed description of the EO-SJT class results is available in the technical report “EOA training evaluation: The development and implementation of a situational judgment test”, Findlay, 2006 and “Situational judgment test analysis summary”, Moore, 2008.