On p. 189, R & M write "Because range restriction biases the validity coefficients, the general principle to follow in validity studies is to plan them so as to avoid such curtailment of variance." This is easy to say, but harder to do.

Think of a \*specific\* situation in which you might want to assess the relationship between your test and a criterion, and identify \*two practical steps\* you could take to reduce the risk of restriction of range in that situation.

For Campus Connections we are often times interested in crimes committed by a youth after completion of the program. This can lead to the outcome of Committed a crime or did not commit a crime 6 months after the completion of the Campus Connections Program. We often use a risk measure as an indicator of their likelihood to continue committing crimes. However, a way to stop the restriction of range in order to make better use criterion measure would be either a.) use the number of crimes that the outh had committed after Campus Connections or by ranking the severity of the crime. Therefore, not only would it provide us with a deeper understanding of the risk measure’s predictive ability, but it would also give us less restriction of range.

Another example includes using a measure to understand time spent participating physical activity. If a study were to use either above or below a threshold of time spent participating in physical activity, then this would also cause the restriction of range. However, instead, it would make more sense to measure the minutes spent participating in physical activity, thus, giving it a much larger range.