with overall performance (filing and typing did not). Total test scores were signifi cantly correlated with overall performance, as were scores on the two short form of the total test. The sizes of the statistically significant correlations suggest favor able practical significance of the correlations as well.

Content Validation

Content validation differs from criterion-related validity in one important respect: no criterion measure is used in content validation. Thus, predictor scores cannot be correlated with criterion scores as a way of gathering evidence about a predictor's validity. Rather, a judgment is made about the probable correlation, had there been a criterion measure. For this reason, content validation is frequently referred to as judgmental validation.[14]

Content validation is most appropriate, and most likely to be found, in two circumstances: (1) when there are too few people to form a sample for purposes of criterion-related validation, and (2) when criterion measures are not available, or they are available but are of highly questionable quality. At an absolute minimum, an n = 30 is necessary for criterion-related validation.

Exhibit 7.16 shows the two basic steps in content validation: conducting a job analysis and choosing or developing a predictor. These steps are commented on next. Comparing the steps in content validation with those in criterion-related validation (see Exhibit 7.13) shows that the steps in content validation are part of criterion-related validation. Because of this, the two types of validation should be thought of as complementary, with content validation being a subset of criterion-related validation.

Job Analysis. Like criterion-related validation, content validation begins with job analysis, which, in both cases, is undertaken to identify and define tasks and

EXHIBIT 7.16 Content Validation