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Evaluating cognitive ability, knowledge tests and situational judgement tests for postgraduate selection

Anna Koczwara,1–3 Fiona Patterson,1–3 Lara Zibarras,1–3 Maire Kerrin,1–3 Bill Irish1–3 & Martin Wilkinson1–3

OBJECTIVES This study aimed to evaluate the validity and utility of and candidate reactions towards cognitive ability tests, and current selection methods, including a clinical problem-solving test (CPST) and a situational judgement test (SJT), for postgraduate selection.

METHODS This was an exploratory, longitudinal study to evaluate the validities of two cognitive ability tests (measuring general intelligence) compared with current selection tests, including a CPST and an SJT, in predicting performance at a subsequent selection centre (SC). Candidate reactions were evaluated immediately after test administration to examine face validity. Data were collected from candidates applying for entry into training in UK general practice (GP) during the 2009 recruitment process. Participants were junior doctors (\(n = 260\)). The mean age of participants was 30.9 years and 53.1% were female. Outcome measures were participants’ scores on three job simulation exercises at the SC.

RESULTS Findings indicate that all tests measure overlapping constructs. Both the CPST and SJT independently predicted more variance than the cognitive ability test measuring non-verbal mental ability. The other cognitive ability test (measuring verbal, numerical and diagrammatic reasoning) had a predictive value similar to that of the CPST and added significant incremental validity in predicting performance on job simulations in an SC. The best single predictor of performance at the SC was the SJT. Candidate reactions were more positive towards the CPST and SJT than the cognitive ability tests.

CONCLUSIONS In terms of operational validity and candidate acceptance, the combination of the current CPST and SJT proved to be the most effective administration of tests in predicting selection outcomes. In terms of construct validity, the SJT measures procedural knowledge in addition to aspects of declarative knowledge and fluid abilities and is the best single predictor of performance in the SC. Further research should consider the validity of the tests in this study in predicting subsequent performance in training.
INTRODUCTION

Large-scale meta-analytic studies show that general cognitive ability tests are good predictors of job performance across a broad range of professions and occupational settings. Cognitive ability tests assess general intelligence (IQ) and have been used for selection in high-stakes contexts such as military and pilot selection. Cognitive ability tests have been used and validated for medical school admissions, but not yet for selection into postgraduate medical training. Previous research focused on medical school admissions; the use of cognitive ability tests in medical selection remains controversial.

This paper presents an evaluation of the validity and utility of cognitive ability tests as a selection methodology for entry into training in UK general practice (GP). The selection methodology currently used for entry into GP training demonstrates good evidence of reliability, and face and criterion-related validity.

The selection methodology comprises three stages: eligibility checks are succeeded by shortlisting via the completion of two invigilated, machine-marked tests, and this is followed by the administration of a clinical problem-solving test (CPST) and a situational judgement test (SJT). The CPST requires candidates to apply clinical knowledge to solve problems involving a diagnostic process or a management strategy for a patient. The SJT focuses on a variety of non-cognitive professional attributes (empathy, integrity, resilience) and presents candidates with work-related scenarios in which they are required to choose an appropriate response from a list. The final stage of selection comprises a previously validated selection centre (SC) using three high-fidelity job simulations which assess candidates over a 90-minute period, involving three separate assessors and an actor. These are: (i) a group discussion exercise referring to a work-related issue; (ii) a simulated patient consultation in which the candidate plays the role of doctor and an actor plays the patient, and (iii) a written exercise in which the candidate prioritises a list of work-related issues and justifies his or her choices.

In this study, two cognitive ability tests were piloted alongside the live selection process for 2009 in order to explore their potential for use in future postgraduate selection. Cognitive ability tests were considered here because if either cognitive ability test were to demonstrate improved validity over and above that of the existing CPST and SJT short-listing tests, this might indicate potential for significant gains in the effectiveness and efficiency of the current process. For example, cognitive ability tests might demonstrate improved utility because they are shorter (and thus take less candidate time) and are not specifically designed for GP selection and would therefore not require clinicians’ time during development phases. The first cognitive ability test was the Ravens Advanced Progressive Matrices. This is a power test focusing on non-verbal mental ability (referred to as NVMA in the present study) and measures general fluid intelligence, including observation skills, clear thinking ability, intellectual capacity and intellectual efficiency. The test takes 40 minutes to complete. The NVMA score indicates the candidate’s potential for success in high-level positions that require clear, accurate thinking, problem identification and evaluation of solutions. These are abilities shown to be relevant to GP training. The second cognitive ability test was a speed test designated the Swift Analysis Aptitude Test. It is a cognitive ability test battery (referred to as CATB in the present study) and consists of three short sub-tests measuring verbal, numerical and diagrammatic analysis abilities. This test allows three specific cognitive abilities to be measured in a relatively short amount of time, giving an overall indication of general cognitive ability. The whole CATB takes 18 minutes and therefore might offer practical utility compared with other IQ test batteries in which single test subsets typically take 20–30 minutes. Both the NVMA and CATB have good internal reliability and have been validated for selection purposes in general professional occupations, but not in selection for postgraduate training in medicine.

This present study examines the validity of two forms of cognitive ability test and the CPST and SJT selection tests in predicting performance in the subsequent SC. Table 1 outlines each of the tests evaluated in the present study. Example items are given in Table S1 (online). Theoretically, the NVMA is a measure of fluid intelligence; it measures the ability to logically reason and solve problems in new situations, independent of learned knowledge. Similarly, the CATB measures fluid intelligence, but also measures elements of crystallised intelligence (experience-based ability in which knowledge and skills are acquired through educational and cultural experience) because a level of procedural knowledge regarding verbal and numerical reasoning is required to understand individual items. The CPST measures crystallised intelligence, especially declarative knowledge, and is designed as a test of attainment examining learned knowledge gained through previous medical training. Finally, the SJT is a measure designed to test non-cognitive professional attributes.
In making judgements about response options, candidates need to apply relevant knowledge, skills and abilities to resolve the issues they are presented with.\textsuperscript{19,20}

We would anticipate some relationship among all four tests as they measure overlapping constructs. Because the two cognitive ability tests both measure similar constructs, we might expect a reasonably strong correlation between the two. The CPST, although essentially a measure of crystallised intelligence, is likely to also entail an element of fluid intelligence as verbal reasoning is necessary to understand the situations presented in the question items. Thus, we would expect the CPST to be positively related to the cognitive ability tests. The construct validity of SJTs is less well known; research suggests that they may relate to both cognitive ability\textsuperscript{21} and learned job knowledge.\textsuperscript{22} Indeed, a meta-analysis showed that SJTs had an average correlation of $r = 0.46$ with cognitive ability.\textsuperscript{20} In the present context, although the SJT was designed to measure non-cognitive domains, we may expect a positive association between the SJT and the two cognitive ability tests. This is because theory suggests that intelligent people may learn more quickly about the non-cognitive traits that are more effective in the work-related situations described in the SJT.\textsuperscript{23}

The present study aimed to evaluate the construct, predictive, incremental and face validity of two cognitive ability tests in comparison with the present CPST and SJT selection tests. In examining predictive and incremental validity, we used a previously validated approach\textsuperscript{11} with overall performance at the SC as an outcome measure. Performance at the SC has been linked to subsequent training performance\textsuperscript{14} and predicts supervisor ratings 12 months into training.\textsuperscript{24} We therefore posed the following four research questions:

1. Construct validity: what are the inter-correlations among the two cognitive ability tests, the CPST and the SJT?
2 Predictive validity: do scores on each of the tests independently predict subsequent performance at the SC?

3 Incremental validity: compared with the current CPST and SJT, do the cognitive ability tests (NVMA and CATB) each account for additional variance in performance at the SC?

4 Face validity: do candidates perceive the tests to be fair and appropriate?

METHODS

Design and procedure

Data were collected during the 2009 recruitment process for GP training in the West Midlands region in the UK. Candidates were invited to participate on a voluntary basis and gave consent for their scores at the SC to be accessed. It was emphasised that all data would be used for evaluation purposes only. Candidates successful at shortlisting were invited to the SC, where their performance on job simulations forms the basis for job offers. For each of the three SC exercises, assessors rated candidates’ performance around four of the following competencies: Empathy and Sensitivity; Communication Skills; Coping with Pressure, and Problem Solving and Professional Integrity. These competencies were derived from the previous job analysis and assessors were provided with a 4-point rating scale (1 = poor, 4 = excellent) with which to rate the candidate and behavioural anchors to assist in determining the rating. For each of the exercises, the sum of the ratings for the four competencies was calculated to create a total score. Exercise scores were summed to create the overall SC score.

Associations among all variables in the study were examined using Pearson correlation coefficients; note that none of the correlations reported in the results have been corrected for attenuation. To investigate the relative predictive abilities of the four tests in the study (two cognitive ability tests and the current selection methods, CPST and SJT), two types of regression analyses were conducted using overall performance at the SC as the dependent variable. Firstly, we used hierarchical regression analysis. With this method, the predictor variables are added into the regression equation in an order determined by the researcher; thus in the present context, the CPST and SJT predictors would be added in the first step, and then the cognitive ability test(s) would be added in the second step to determine the additional variance in the SC score predicted by the cognitive ability test. Secondly, we used stepwise regression analysis. With this method, the order of relevance of predictor variables is identified by the statistical package (svs Version X.XX; SPSS, Inc., Chicago, IL, USA) to establish which predictors independently predict the most variance in SC scores.

Sampling

A total of 260 candidates agreed to participate in the study. Of these, 53.1% were female. Their mean age was 30.9 years (range: 24–54 years). Participants reported the following ethnic origins: White (38%); Asian (43%); Black (12%); Chinese (2%); Mixed (2%), and Other (3%). The final sample of candidates for whom NVMA data were available numbered 219 because 26 candidates did not consent to the matching of their pilot data with live selection data and a further 15 candidates were not invited to the SC. The final sample of candidates for whom CATB data were available numbered 188 because, of the 215 candidates who initially completed the CATB, 13 consented to participate in the pilot but did not want their pilot data matched to their live selection data, and a further 14 candidates did not pass the short-listing stage and so were not invited to the SC. There were no significant demographic differences between the two samples and the overall demographics of both were similar to those of the live 2009 candidate cohort.

RESULTS

Table 2 provides the descriptive statistics for all tests for the full pilot sample (n = 260). The means and ranges for both cognitive ability tests were similar to those typically found in their respective comparison norm groups, which comprised managers, professional and graduate-level employees; thus the sample’s cognitive ability test scores were comparable with those of the general population. The CPST and SJT scores, the two cognitive ability tests and the SC data (including all exercise scores and overall scores) were normally distributed.

What are the inter-correlations among the two cognitive ability tests, the CPST and the SJT?

Significant positive correlations were found between the NVMA and the CATB (r = 0.46), CPST (r = 0.36) and SJT (r = 0.34), and also between the CATB and CPST (r = 0.41) and SJT (r = 0.47) (all p < 0.01) (Table 3). Thus, the cognitive ability tests have both
Table 2 Descriptive statistics and correlations among study variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NVMA</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>11.12</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>1–21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CATB</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>12.38</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>2–24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPST</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>254.62</td>
<td>39.49</td>
<td>99–326</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SJT</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>254.23</td>
<td>39.20</td>
<td>110–331</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group exercise</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written exercise</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simulation exercise</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC overall score</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hierarchical regression analysis

Step 1, $R^2 = 0.31$
- Constant: 13.77, SE = 2.51
- SJT: 0.07, SE = 0.01, $\beta = 0.49^*$
- CPST: 0.03, SE = 0.01, $\beta = 0.18^f$

Step 2, $\Delta R^2 = 0.01$
- NVMA: 0.15, SE = 0.09, $\beta = 0.10$

Stepwise regression analysis

Step 1, $R^2 = 0.29$
- Constant: 17.33, SE = 2.19
- SJT: 0.08, SE = 0.01, $\beta = 0.54^*$

Step 2, $\Delta R^2 = 0.01$
- CPST: 0.03, SE = 0.01, $\beta = 0.18^f$

Step 1, $R^2 = 0.29$
- Constant: 13.63, SE = 2.97
- SJT: 0.07, SE = 0.01, $\beta = 0.42^*$
- CPST: 0.03, SE = 0.01, $\beta = 0.20^f$

Step 2, $\Delta R^2 = 0.02$
- CATB: 0.21, SE = 0.10, $\beta = 0.15^f$

Table 3 Regression analyses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>NVMA dataset, n = 219</th>
<th>CATB dataset, n = 188</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$B$</td>
<td>$SE$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hierarchical regression</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 1, $R^2 = 0.31$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>13.77</td>
<td>2.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SJT</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPST</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2, $\Delta R^2 = 0.01$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NVMA</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Stepwise regression analysis

Step 1, $R^2 = 0.29$
- Constant: 18.26, SE = 2.53
- SJT: 0.08, SE = 0.01, $\beta = 0.51^*$

Step 2, $\Delta R^2 = 0.03$
- CPST: 0.03, SE = 0.01, $\beta = 0.20^f$

Step 2, $\Delta R^2 = 0.02$
- CATB: 0.21, SE = 0.10, $\beta = 0.15f$

* $p < 0.001$, † $p < 0.01$, ‡ $p < 0.05$

SE = standard error; NVMA = non-verbal cognitive ability test; CATB = cognitive ability test battery; CPST = clinical problem-solving test; SJT = situational judgement test

Correlations between variables were uncorrected for restriction for range. Numbers in parentheses are the reliabilities for the selection methods for the overall 2009 recruitment round. For the NVMA and CATB, these reliabilities are those reported in the respective manuals.

SD = standard deviation; NVMA = non-verbal cognitive ability test; CATB = cognitive ability test battery; CPST = clinical problem-solving test; SJT = situational judgement test; SC = selection centre.
common and independent variance with the CPST and SJT and to some extent measure overlapping constructs.

Do scores on each of the tests independently predict subsequent performance at the SC?

The analyses in Table 2 showed a positive correlation between NVMA scores and all SC exercises (group, \( r = 0.19 \); simulation, \( r = 0.29 \) [both \( p < 0.01 \)]; written, \( r = 0.15 \) [\( p < 0.05 \)]). However, in comparison with the CPST and SJT, both the CPST and SJT had substantially higher correlations with the three SC exercises (CPST, \( r = 0.19–0.32 \); SJT, \( r = 0.28–0.40 \) [all \( p < 0.01 \)]). Furthermore, both the CPST and SJT had higher correlations with overall SC scores (\( r = 0.38 \) and \( r = 0.50 \), respectively) compared with the NVMA (\( r = 0.30 \) [all \( p < 0.01 \)]).

Results show a positive correlation between the CATB and the SC exercises (group, \( r = 0.28 \); simulation, \( r = 0.32 \); written, \( r = 0.23 \) [all \( p < 0.01 \)]). The CPST correlated with the group and simulation exercises to the same extent as the CATB (\( r = 0.28 \) and \( r = 0.32 \), respectively [both \( p < 0.01 \)]), but had a lower correlation with the written exercise (\( r = 0.19 \) [\( p < 0.01 \)])(Table 2). The SJT had higher correlations with all exercises (group, \( r = 0.39 \); written, \( r = 0.28 \); simulation, \( r = 0.40 \) [all \( p < 0.01 \)]). Further, the CPST had a lower correlation with overall SC scores compared with the CATB (\( r = 0.38 \) and \( r = 0.39 \), respectively [both \( p < 0.01 \)]), but the SJT had a higher correlation (\( r = 0.50 \) [\( p < 0.01 \)]).

Thus, overall findings indicate that, of all the tests, the SJT had the highest correlations with performance at the SC. The SJT and CPST were more effective predictors of subsequent performance than the NVMA; the SJT was a better predictor of performance at the SC than the CATB, and the CPST had a similar predictive value to the CATB.

Compared with the current CPST and SJT, do the cognitive ability tests (NVMA and CATB) each account for additional variance in performance at the SC?

We established the extent to which the cognitive ability tests each accounted for additional variance above the current CPST and SJT. To examine the extent to which NVMA scores predicted overall SC scores over and above the CPST and SJT scores combined, a hierarchical multiple regression was performed (Table 3). Scores on the CPST and SJT were entered in the first step, which explained 31.3% of the variance in SC overall score (\( R^2 = 0.31 \), \( F_{(2,216)} = 49.24; p < 0.001 \)); however, adding the NVMA in the second step offered no unique variance over the CPST and SJT (\( \Delta R^2 = 0.01 \), \( F_{(2,215)} = 2.85; p = 0.09 \)). A stepwise regression was also performed (Table 3) to establish which tests independently predicted the most variance in SC scores. Scores on the SJT were entered into the first step, indicating that the SJT explains the most variance (28.9%) of all the tests (\( R^2 = 0.29 \), \( F_{(1,212)} = 88.02; p < 0.001 \)). Scores on the CPST were entered into the second and final step, explaining an additional 2.5% of the variance (\( \Delta R^2 = 0.03 \), \( F_{(2,211)} = 7.73; p = 0.01 \)). The NVMA was not entered into the model at all, confirming its lack of incremental validity over the two current short-listing assessments.

To establish the extent to which the CATB predicted SC performance over and above both the CPST and SJT, a hierarchical multiple regression was performed (Table 3), repeating the method described above. Scores on the SJT and CPST were entered into the first step and explained 28.6% of the variance (\( R^2 = 0.29 \), \( F_{(1,185)} = 56.99; p < 0.001 \); entering the CATB into the second step explained an additional 1.7% of the variance in overall SC performance (\( \Delta R^2 = 0.02 \), \( F_{(1,184)} = 4.44; p = 0.04 \)). A stepwise regression was also performed, entering SJT scores into the first step. This explained the most variance in SC performance (25.5%) of all the tests (\( R^2 = 0.26 \), \( F_{(1,186)} = 63.53; p < 0.001 \)). Scores on the CPST were entered into the second step, explaining an additional 3.1% of the variance (\( \Delta R^2 = 0.03 \), \( F_{(1,185)} = 8.05; p = 0.005 \)). Finally, scores on the CATB were entered into the final step, explaining an additional 1.7% of the variance (\( \Delta R^2 = 0.02 \), \( F_{(1,184)} = 4.44; p = 0.04 \)). Overall, findings indicate that the CATB does add some incremental validity in predicting SC performance.

A stepwise regression was also performed to establish which of the four tests (SJT, CPST, NVMA, CATB) independently predicted the most variance in SC scores. Scores on the SJT were entered into the first step, indicating that the SJT explains the most variance (25.5%) of all the tests (\( R^2 = 0.26 \), \( F_{(1,186)} = 63.53; p < 0.001 \)). Scores on the CPST were entered into the second step, explaining an additional 3.1% of the variance (\( \Delta R^2 = 0.03 \), \( F_{(1,185)} = 8.05; p = 0.005 \)). Finally, CATB scores were entered into the third step, explaining an additional 1.7% of the variance (\( \Delta R^2 = 0.02 \), \( F_{(1,184)} = 4.44; p = 0.04 \)). The NVMA was not entered into the model at all and thus lacked incremental validity over the other tests. Overall, findings indicate that the NVMA
does not add incremental validity in predicting SC performance, but the CATB does add some incremental validity.

Do candidates perceive the tests as fair and appropriate?

All participants were asked to complete a previously validated candidate evaluation questionnaire, based on procedural justice theory, regarding their perceptions of the tests. A total of 249 candidates completed the questionnaire (96% response rate), in which they indicated their level of agreement with several statements regarding the content of each test. These results are shown in Table 4, along with feedback on the SJT and CPST from the live 2009 selection process. Overall results show that the CPST received the most favourable feedback, followed by the SJT. Candidates did not react favourably to the NVMA, mainly as a result of perceptions of low job relevance and insufficient opportunity to demonstrate ability. The CATB was also relatively negatively received; feedback was slightly better than for the NVMA but still markedly worse than for the CPST and SJT. This notably reflected perceptions of the CATB as providing insufficient opportunity to demonstrate ability and as not helping selectors to differentiate among candidates.

DISCUSSION

Two cognitive ability tests were evaluated as potential selection methods for use in postgraduate selection and were compared with the current selection tests, the CPST and SJT. Results show positive and significant relationships among the CPST and SJT and cognitive ability tests, indicating that they measure overlapping constructs. For both the CPST and the SJT, the correlation with the CATB was higher than with the NVMA. This is probably because the CATB, CPST and SJT are all presented in a verbal format, whereas the NVMA has no verbal element and is presented in a non-verbal format.

Implications for operational validity

Considering both the predictive validation analyses and candidate reactions, the CPST and SJT (measuring clinical knowledge and non-cognitive professional attributes, respectively) have been shown to be a better combination in predicting SC performance.

### Table 4: Procedural justice reactions to the tests

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NVMA (% of candidates, n = 249)</th>
<th>CATB (% of candidates, n = 195)</th>
<th>CPST (% of candidates, n = 2947)</th>
<th>SJT (% of candidates, n = 2947)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The content of the test was clearly relevant to GP training</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The content of the test seemed appropriate for the entry level I am applying for</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The content of the test appeared to be fair</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The test gave me sufficient opportunity to indicate my ability for GP training</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The test would help selectors to differentiate between candidates</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NVMA = non-verbal cognitive ability test; CATB = cognitive ability test battery; CPST = clinical problem-solving test; SJT = situational judgement test; SD/D = strongly disagree or disagree; N = neither agree nor disagree; A/SA = agree or strongly agree; GP = general practice.
compared with the cognitive ability tests. The NVMA results showed a moderate correlation with SC performance, but no incremental validity over the CPST and SJT. Furthermore, the NVMA was negatively received by candidates. The CATB was moderately correlated with SC performance and showed incremental validity over and above the CPST and SJT; however, the CPST and SJT in combination demonstrated significantly more variance in SC performance than when either test was combined with the CATB. The results show that the test measuring non-cognitive professional attributes (the SJT) is the best single predictor of subsequent performance at the SC. For operational validity, the best combination of tests in terms of explaining the greatest amount of variance in SC performance included the CPST, SJT and CATB. However, the increase in variance explained by the CATB is not large and has to be weighed against the cost and time implications of increasing the amount of test-taking time per candidate.

Theoretical implications

As the SJT was the best single predictor of SC performance, it could be argued that the constructs that best predict subsequent performance in job simulations include a combination of crystallised and fluid intelligence, along with ‘non-cognitive’ professional attributes measured by the SJT. The construct validity of SJTs has been a subject for debate amongst researchers and we argue that the results presented here provide further insights. Motowidlo and Beier\(^2\) suggest that the procedural knowledge measured by an SJT includes implicit trait policies, which are implicit beliefs regarding the costs and benefits of how personality is expressed and its effectiveness in specific jobs (which is likely to relate to the way in which professional attributes are expressed in a work context). Results suggest that the SJT broadens the constructs being measured (beyond declarative knowledge and fluid intelligence) and therefore the SJT demonstrates the highest criterion-related validity in predicting performance in high-fidelity job simulations in which a range of different work-related behaviours are measured (beyond knowledge and cognitive abilities). However, in order to build and extend the current research and to test the ideas presented by Motowidlo and Beier,\(^2\) we recommend that future research exploring the construct validity of the SJT should also include a measure of personality and implicit trait policies to test this possible association. We therefore present Fig. 1, a diagram illustrating potential pathways among variables that could be considered in future research.

![Diagram](image)

Figure 1 Selection measures and their hypothesised construct validity. NVMA = non-verbal mental ability test; CATB = cognitive ability test battery; SJT = situational judgement test; CPST = clinical problem-solving test

Practical implications

Although the CATB may appear to offer some advantages relating to cost savings in terms of administration and test development, there are several reasons why replacing the CPST with the CATB might have negative implications in this context. The first reason relates to patient safety: using the general cognitive ability tests alone would not allow the detection of insufficient clinical knowledge. A test of attainment (e.g. the CPST) appears particularly important in this setting. Secondly, candidate perceptions of fairness are not favourable towards generic cognitive ability tests with regard to job relevance. This finding supports research on applicant reactions in other occupations in which cognitive ability tests were not positively received by candidates\(^26,27\) and were perceived to lack relevance to any given job role.\(^28\) Such negative perceptions among candidates can result in undesirable outcomes, such as the loss of competent candidates from the selection process,\(^29\) which has a subsequent negative effect on the utility of the selection process.\(^30\) Furthermore, extreme reactions may lead to an increased propensity for legal case initiation by candidates.\(^31\) By contrast, the CPST received the most approving feedback from candidates compared with all the other tests (NVMA, CATB and SJT) and its immediate job relevance and fairness were favourably perceived. In this context, rejecting applicants to specialty training on the basis of generalised cognitive ability tests alone may be particularly sensitive.
because the non-selection of candidates based on cognitive ability test scores may be at odds with their previous achievement of high academic success that enabled their initial selection into medical school. Our findings may suggest that there is a trade-off between costs and time constraints, positive candidate perceptions and using tests that identify clinical knowledge and clinically relevant attributes. This represents a dilemma in terms of balancing the need to reduce costs and administrative and development time, while ensuring that the most appropriate knowledge, skills and attributes are assessed during selection in a manner that is also acceptable to candidates.

Finally, results showed that the two current selection tests (the CPST and SJT) assess cognitive ability to an extent, but that they also assess other constructs likely to relate more closely to behavioural domains that are important in the selection of future general practitioners, such as empathy, integrity and clinical expertise. There is an added security risk associated with using off-the-shelf cognitive ability tests because they can be accessed directly from the test publishers and are susceptible to coaching effects. By contrast, there is a reduced risk with the CPST and SJT as they both adopt an item bank approach and access is more closely regulated.

This study demonstrates that the CPST and SJT are more effective tests than the NVMA and CATB for the purposes of selection into GP training. In combination, these tests provide improved predictive validity compared with the NVMA and CATB, but they are also perceived as having greater relevance to the target job role. It should be noted that the present paper represents a first step towards demonstrating the predictive validity of the cognitive ability tests as the outcome measure used was SC performance. The ultimate goal in demonstrating good criterion-related validity is to predict performance in postgraduate training; therefore future research might investigate the predictive validity of the NVMA and CATB by exploring subsequent performance in the job role. The methods used currently in the GP selection process have been shown to predict subsequent training performance and supervisor ratings 12 months into training, and these outcome criteria may be useful in future research.
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Dear Author,

During the copy-editing of your paper, the following queries arose. Please respond to these by marking up your proofs with the necessary changes/additions. Please write your answers on the query sheet if there is insufficient space on the page proofs. Please write clearly and follow the conventions shown on the attached corrections sheet. If returning the proof by fax do not write too close to the paper’s edge. Please remember that illegible mark-ups may delay publication.

Many thanks for your assistance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Query reference</th>
<th>Query</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>AUTHOR: Check affiliation linking numbers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>AUTHOR: Check affiliation linking numbers Author: check affiliation linking numbers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>AUTHOR: Check affiliation linking numbers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>AUTHOR: Check affiliation linking numbers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>AUTHOR: Check affiliation linking numbers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>AUTHOR: Check affiliation linking numbers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>AUTHOR: Insert name of department</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>AUTHOR: Insert city</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>AUTHOR: Please check the correspondence.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>AUTHOR: Check this citation of Table S1 is correct</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>AUTHOR: Please give software release number</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>AUTHOR: Please give name of department, institution for PC; include city, country if the institution has not been cited in the author affiliations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>AUTHOR: Please give include city, country for Pearson Education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>AUTHOR: Please give include city, country for Saville Consulting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>AUTHOR: check funding statement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>AUTHOR: Insert full name of approving committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>AUTHOR: Please ensure this page range is complete</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>AUTHOR: If there are fewer than 11 authors for this Reference, please supply all of their names. If there are 11 or more authors, please supply the first 3 author names then <em>et al.</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>AUTHOR: Check year</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>AUTHOR: Insert volume number</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AUTHOR: Insert page range detail</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>AUTHOR: Insert dates of conference</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>AUTHOR: Insert city of conference; include state/province abbreviation if in USA, Canada, Australia or Brazil</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>AUTHOR: Insert page range detail</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>AUTHOR: Check year</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>AUTHOR: Insert volume number</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>AUTHOR: Insert page range detail</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>AUTHOR: Please check this description is correct</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Author: Please check that this is correct or delete all mention of Table S1 and Supporting Information</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>AUTHOR: check this definition</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>AUTHOR: Please provide significance for the bolded values in Table 4.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>AUTHOR: Figure 1 has been saved at a low resolution of 104 dpi. Please resupply at 600 dpi. Check required artwork specifications at <a href="http://authorservices.wiley.com/submit_illust.asp?site=1">http://authorservices.wiley.com/submit_illust.asp?site=1</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
USING e-ANNOTATION TOOLS FOR ELECTRONIC PROOF CORRECTION

Required software to e-Annotate PDFs: Adobe Acrobat Professional or Adobe Reader (version 8.0 or above). (Note that this document uses screenshots from Adobe Reader X).

The latest version of Acrobat Reader can be downloaded for free at: [http://get.adobe.com/reader/](http://get.adobe.com/reader/)

Once you have Acrobat Reader open on your computer, click on the Comment tab at the right of the toolbar:

This will open up a panel down the right side of the document. The majority of tools you will use for annotating your proof will be in the Annotations section, pictured opposite. We’ve picked out some of these tools below:

1. **Replace (Ins) Tool** – for replacing text.

   ![Replace Tool](image)

   Strikes a line through text and opens up a text box where replacement text can be entered.

   **How to use it**
   - Highlight a word or sentence.
   - Click on the Replace (Ins) icon in the Annotations section.
   - Type the replacement text into the blue box that appears.

2. **Strikethrough (Del) Tool** – for deleting text.

   ![Strikethrough Tool](image)

   Strikes a red line through text that is to be deleted.

   **How to use it**
   - Highlight a word or sentence.
   - Click on the Strikethrough (Del) icon in the Annotations section.

3. **Add note to text** Tool – for highlighting a section to be changed to bold or italic.

   ![Add Note Tool](image)

   Highlights text in yellow and opens up a text box where comments can be entered.

   **How to use it**
   - Highlight the relevant section of text.
   - Click on the Add note to text icon in the Annotations section.
   - Type instruction on what should be changed regarding the text into the yellow box that appears.

4. **Add sticky note** Tool – for making notes at specific points in the text.

   ![Sticky Note Tool](image)

   Marks a point in the proof where a comment needs to be highlighted.

   **How to use it**
   - Click on the Add sticky note icon in the Annotations section.
   - Click at the point in the proof where the comment should be inserted.
   - Type the comment into the yellow box that appears.
5. **Attach File Tool** – for inserting large amounts of text or replacement figures.

Inserts an icon linking to the attached file in the appropriate pace in the text.

**How to use it**
- Click on the Attach File icon in the Annotations section.
- Click on the proof to where you’d like the attached file to be linked.
- Select the file to be attached from your computer or network.
- Select the colour and type of icon that will appear in the proof. Click OK.

6. **Add stamp Tool** – for approving a proof if no corrections are required.

Inserts a selected stamp onto an appropriate place in the proof.

**How to use it**
- Click on the Add stamp icon in the Annotations section.
- Select the stamp you want to use. (The Approved stamp is usually available directly in the menu that appears).
- Click on the proof where you’d like the stamp to appear. (Where a proof is to be approved as it is, this would normally be on the first page).

7. **Drawing Markups** Tools – for drawing shapes, lines and freeform annotations on proofs and commenting on these marks.

Allows shapes, lines and freeform annotations to be drawn on proofs and for comment to be made on these marks.

**How to use it**
- Click on one of the shapes in the Drawing Markups section.
- Click on the proof at the relevant point and draw the selected shape with the cursor.
- To add a comment to the drawn shape, move the cursor over the shape until an arrowhead appears.
- Double click on the shape and type any text in the red box that appears.

For further information on how to annotate proofs, click on the Help menu to reveal a list of further options: