1. Lit search on faking simulation
2. Schmitt & Oswald (2006) simulation study:
   1. Criterion-related validity does not change much after removing simulees who are suspected fakers.
   2. Moderators manipulated: N, predictor-faking correlation, faking-criterion correlation, criterion-related validity, selection ratio, and proportion removed for suspected faking.
   3. Focused on impact of correction for faking on mean performance levels.
   4. Faking-predictor: -.2, 0, .2, .4; faking-criterion: -.1, 0, .1, .3
   5. Scores are just multivariate normal.
3. Komar et al. (2008) Simulation study:
4. Faking as a type of systematic error;
5. Faking on non-cognitive tests are prevalent and substantial, robust and adversely affect factor structure;
6. Fuller range of faking parameters than before:
   * 1. Variability: the extent to which individuals differ in their faking (within-sub effects are larger than between-sub 🡪 individuals may fake on items to varying degrees); faking is a function of the situation, individual differences, and opportunity.
     2. Magnitude: the average amount that applicants distort their responses (the average effect size (*d*) in the 2 meta-analysis)
     3. Proportion: the % of applicants within a validation sample who distort their response (expect a curvilinear relationship).
     4. Correlation between faking and conscientiousness: model when there’s a positive relationship and when there’s a negative relationship. (-.2, 0, .2)
     5. Correlation between faking and performance: faking meaningfully relates to performance and can result in validity gains; model both when there’s a positive correlation and a negative one. (-.2, 0, .2)
     6. Selection ratio: the proportion of applicants hired; upper end of predict-criterion validity.
   1. Results:
      1. The largest drops in validity: negative faking-perf. condition (-.226, 74% losses honest);
      2. Increase: negative faking-perf. Condition (.129, 47% losses honest);
      3. The relationship between faking and perf, proportion of fakers, and magnitude have the strongest effect on validity change;
      4. The association between several of the parameters and changes in criterion-related validity was conditional on the faking-perf. relationship.
      5. Curvilinear (proportion, selection ratio, and faking-perf. relationship).
7. Zickar, Rossse, Levin and Hulin (1996) simulation: little decrement in criterion-related validity in the presence of even extreme faking.
8. Ones et al. (1996) meta-analysis: concluded that social desirability does not affect validity (“Removing the effects of social desirability from the Big Five dimensions of personality leaves the criterion-related validity of personality constructs for predicting job performance intact.”)
9. Birkeland et al. (2006): conflicting results (using factor structure and IRT)
10. Possible reasons for the conflicting results (Mueller-Hanson, 2002)
11. Little consensus about definition of faking [social desirability (impression management, self-deceptive enhancement)
12. Faking detection scales are not adequate (mostly used are paper & pencil lie scale)
13. Little is known about the psychological processes that underlie faking behavior
14. Questions:
15. Is faking prevalent? Do people often fake in personality tests? Or it happens frequently only among applicants? (Is it an interaction between tests and situation?)
16. Faking detection: social desirability scales; person-fit statistic?

==============================================================

Talk:

1. Military: can see a negative corr., cut score is very low.
2. Faking: problem for military; individual difference, situation, chance.
3. The role of personality for perf. in the military; single-statement personality tests: too easy for faking
4. Len White AIM; SBIR
5. Looking at the overall validity change vs. looking at solely high-score participants
6. Regression line: job perf. onto personality skewed by faking group
7. Single-statement: more easy to fake; two alternative: (NPAS-navy);
8. Idea: if we can do a simulation figuring out why AIM and TAPAS tech report got different results.