Who Cares?

Validation Study (2014)

Tests Direct

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1

THE STUDY

A concurrent validation approach was used. A cross section of 155 current Support Workers was drawn from care units in 9 different geographical regions across the UK. The median age banding (of those choosing to report their age) was 46-50 years. In terms of their work experience in care settings (of those choosing to report this) the median banding was 11-20 years. 73% of the group were female, and 27% male. Just over half the group elected to give their ethnic grouping, and these people came from 11 different ethnic backgrounds, with the biggest group being English / Welsh / Scottish / Northern Irish / British which accounted for 61% of that subset.

Seven different job performance criteria were used, and these were identified in an earlier job analysis study. These job performance criteria included ratings on key dimensions (professionalism, service user orientation, team working), on overall performance, and on whether the participant would be re-employed in the future.

The Service Manager of each participant was asked to rate them on each criterion using a six point rating scale (1=poor, 2=unsatisfactory, 3=a few shortcomings, 4=competent, 5=good, 6=excellent). The re-employment criterion was a straightforward 'yes / no / cannot say' question.

38 different Service Managers contributed ratings. The job performance data was obtained at the same time that the *Who Cares?* test was completed. The Service Managers were blind to the Support Worker test scores, and likewise Support Workers were blind to the Service Manager ratings. The study took place in late 2013 and early 2014.

The mean (average) scores and standard deviations for the Service Managers' ratings are shown below. The table shows a reasonable spread of ratings, considering that all those assessed were already employed as Care Support Workers.

Scale	Mean Score	Standard Deviation
Professionalism	4.89	0.83
Service User Orientation	5.03	0.81
Team Working	4.83	0.91
Overall Performance	4.88	0.76

2

THE RESULTS

The mean (average) scores and standard deviations for each test scale are shown below. There were no significant differences based on gender or ethnicity.

Scale	Range of Possible Scores	Mean Score	Standard Deviation
Professionalism	9 – 36	31.23	2.64
Service User Orient.	9 – 36	32.30	2.52
Team Working	9 – 36	32.07	2.56
Overall Performance	27 – 108	95.60	5.85

To calculate the correlations, the Pearson model was used. Shown below are the uncorrected figures.

Relationship between *Who Cares?* and managers' ratings of job performance - *Uncorrected*

Criterion	Correlation
Professionalism	0.30
Service User Orientation	0.20
Team Working	0.19
Overall Job Performance	**0.32**

All the above correlations are significant at the 1% level.

It is common practice to 'correct' correlations to take account of the recognised methodological problems with validation studies, including restriction of range, and unreliability of supervisor ratings. Such corrections aim to estimate the 'true notional validity', and usually serve to increase the correlations reported. For example, correcting this study for unreliability of supervisor ratings yields a correlation between test and **Overall Job Performance** of 0.51.

2

Of the 155 participants, 8 were identified by Service Managers as people who would not be re-employed again in a similar role in the future. Using this data, a discriminant function analysis was applied to determine the test's accuracy in correctly selecting the *wouldn't re-employs*, and in correctly selecting the *would re-employs.* The results are shown below.

Wouldn't re-employ	88% correctly identified
Would re-employ	88% correctly identified

In effect, *Who Cares?* correctly identifies 88% of the *wouldn't re-employs*. By way of comparison, random selection would correctly identify approximately 5% of the *wouldn't re-employs*.

3

SUMMARY

As this latest study demonstrates, *Who Cares?* again correlates well with overall Support Worker job performance, and is a powerful tool in identifying good Support Workers. These figures show that use of the test would, in a real world setting, significantly increase the probability of making the correct selection decision.

Tests Direct

Tel: +44 207 036 3883

Email: Admin@tests-direct.co.uk