

validity for clear purpose measures ($\bar{r} = .55$) was higher than for general purpose ($\bar{r} = .32$).

2. Both clear and general purpose tests are valid predictors of job performance ($\bar{r} = .33$ and $\bar{r} = .35$, respectively).
3. Limiting the analysis to estimates using a predictive validation design and actual detection of theft lowers the validity to $\bar{r} = .13$.
4. Integrity tests have no adverse impact against women or minorities and are relatively uncorrelated with intelligence. Thus, integrity tests demonstrate incremental validity over cognitive ability tests and reduce the adverse impact of cognitive ability tests.

However, a more recent meta-analysis has called into question the validity of integrity tests. Using a smaller number of studies (104, to be exact), the study found that the overall average validities of integrity tests in predicting a variety of work-related outcomes are much lower than the validities in previous meta-analytic findings. For example, the average validity was $\bar{r} = .15$ for job performance, $\bar{r} = .32$ for counterproductive behaviors, and $\bar{r} = .09$ for turnover. Interestingly, the study found that validities were stronger when they came from studies authored by publishers of integrity tests.⁹⁸

So, you might ask, "Which results should I trust?" On the one hand, the meta-analysis with the weaker validities drew from more recent studies, in which case its results should be trusted more. On the other hand, the meta-analysis with the stronger validities was based on a larger number of studies, in which case its results should be trusted more. In any event, although it is clear that integrity tests do have some validity, the jury is still out on the strength of that validity. Although organizations would likely benefit from using integrity tests for a wide array of jobs, given the conflicting findings reviewed above, those who do so should consider conducting their own validation studies.

Criticisms and Concerns

Faking. One of the most significant concerns with the use of integrity tests is the obvious possibility that applicants might fake their responses. Consider answering the questions in Exhibit 9.8. Now consider answering these questions in the context of applying for a job that you want. It seems more than plausible that applicants might distort their responses in such a context (particularly given that most of the answers would be impossible to verify). This possibility becomes a real concern when one considers the prospect that the individuals most likely to "fake good" (people behaving dishonestly) are exactly the type of applicants organizations would want to weed out.

Embedded within the issue of faking are three questions: (1) Can integrity tests be faked? (2) Do applicants fake or enhance their responses to integrity tests? and (3) Does faking harm the validity of the tests, such that a "perverse inversion"