sures, jobs, individuals, and so forth. Nothing is said about generalizing validity across those jobs and individuals. For example, if a predictor is valid for a particular job in organization A, would it be valid for the same type of job in organization B? Or is validity specific to the particular job and organization?

The situation-specific premise is based on the following scenario, which has its origins in findings from decades of previous research. Assume that 10 criterion-related validation studies have been conducted. Each study involves various predictor measures of a common KSAO attribute (e.g., general mental ability) and various criterion measures of a common outcome attribute (e.g., job performance). The predictor will be designated *x*, and the criterion will be designated *y*. The studies are conducted in different situations (types of jobs, types of organizations), and they involve different samples (with different sample sizes [n]). In each study, the reliability of the predictor (r_{xx}) and the criterion (r_{yy}), as well as the validity coefficient (r_{xy}), is calculated. These results are provided in Exhibit 7.18. At first blush, the results, because of the wide range of r_{xy} values, would seem to support situational specificity. These results suggest that while, on average, there seems to be some validity to *x*, the validity varies substantially from situation to situation.

The concept of validity generalization questions this premise.[17] It says that much of the variation in the r_{xy} values is due to the occurrence of a number of "artifacts"—methodological and statistical differences across the studies (e.g., differences in

EXHIBIT 7.18 Hypothetical Validity Generalization Example

Study	Sample Size n	Validity r_{xy}	Reliability Predictor (*x*) r_{xx}	Reliability Criterion (*y*) r_{yy}	Corrected Validity r_c
Birch, 2013	454	.41	.94	.94	.44
Cherry, 1990	120	.19	.66	.76	.27
Elm, 1978	212	.34	.91	.88	.38
Hickory, 2009	37	−.21	.96	.90	−.23
Locust, 2000	92	.12	.52	.70	.20
Maple, 1961	163	.32	.90	.84	.37
Oak, 1948	34	.09	.63	.18	.27
Palm, 2007	202	.49	.86	.92	.55
Pine, 1984	278	.27	.80	.82	.33
Walnut, 1971	199	.18	.72	.71	.25