Report of the Research Department
GOALS OF THE RESEARCH DEPARTMENT

1. The isolation of aptitudes and the study of their role in various occupations.

2. The development of accurate measures of aptitudes.

3. The investigation of the role of aptitudes in education.


5. The study of the processes involved in the acquisition of knowledge.

6. The development of accurate measures of knowledge.

7. The communication of research findings to the public.
FROM THE PRESIDENT

It's been an exciting year at Johnson O'Connor, with a lot more changes on the horizon.

We made some personnel changes to the Research Department last year. We are delighted to welcome Ryan Barry as our new Research Associate. He has a background in both industrial/organizational psychology and quantitative psychology, and is working toward a PhD in I/O psychology. Dave Schroeder, our longtime Research Manager, has transitioned into a consulting role. We are grateful that he has remained with us to continue to offer his expertise and wealth of institutional knowledge. Also, Kathleen Voss, an Aptitude Consultant in the Dallas office, has joined the team as a part-time Research Assistant.

Last year, we took our first steps toward developing digital versions of our tests. We embarked on a six-month discovery project with Cloudberry Creative, a software development company, to analyze each test and assess the practicality of developing a digital version. We worked with them to create a prototype of one test, Analytical Reasoning, as a proof-of-concept.

The in-person version of Analytical Reasoning involves split-second timing and a lot of manual manipulation of test equipment. We wanted to test the feasibility of digitalization on a test that would present a challenge. After the prototype was complete, we administered it to a sample of clients on an experimental basis. You can read in detail about our process in these pages. I’d like to thank the staff at the Chicago, Dallas, and Atlanta offices, for administering this test in their offices, and also to Seattle and New York for helping with data entry. Our testing staff has always been, and will continue to be, an important part of the research process.

The result of the overall discovery process and the experimental Analytical Reasoning administration was very encouraging, and in 2023 we will be embarking on the next phase, the digitalization of 19 of our tests. The research department will be closely involved in this project. They will work on equating and analyzing the validity of the new, digital versions, collaborate with the developers to create a robust database system, and much more.

Digitalized tests, along with a new, sophisticated database, will help improve and streamline how we collect and analyze what is the lifeblood of any research department: data. Data collection at the Foundation has always been, by necessity, a slow, painstaking process. Digitalization will allow us to collect data and get it to our researchers much more quickly and in a much more usable format, and will also allow us to gather many more data points than are currently possible.

Another benefit is that it will become much more possible to add new, experimental items to existing tests, or to develop and administer entirely new tests. Currently, introducing experimental items or an experimental test involves, at the very least, printing and distributing test papers and score sheets, and possibly also finding a supplier or manufacturer to provide us with physical test equipment—plastic chips, pins, boards, and the like. A digital format will allow us to streamline this process, which will in turn allow us to expand and enhance our test battery and the quality of our research.

Speaking of adding tests, in 2022 we began the process of adding another personality measure to our battery. The Big Five personality approach is a well-respected personality test that has been well-validated by other psychology researchers. With the help of outside collaborators, we have done some research already on the relationship between aptitudes and personality traits, but developing and administering our own measure will allow us to explore this subject more deeply.

All in all, we are embarking on a transformation that will open up new and exciting avenues for research and further our ongoing mission, as stated in our charter: “to further by research, tests, measurements, publication, and teaching, an understanding of human beings and of their actions.”

The form of our tests may change, but our mission is timeless.
RESEARCH TEAM

David H. Schroeder, Research Consultant, joined the Research Department in August 1984. He has a B.S. from the University of Illinois and an M.S. from Colorado State University, as well as an M.A. and a Ph.D. in personality psychology from The Johns Hopkins University.

Susan Park, Researcher, received her Ph.D. in psychometrics and quantitative psychology from Fordham University. She joined the Research Department in 2021 after working in research institutions that focused on education and career development as well as the intersection of technology and learning. Research topics in her past work have included psychometrics and the interplay among motivation, emotions, and goal pursuits, especially in career development. Prior to her career in psychology, Park worked as a vocational rehabilitation counselor.

Ryan Barry, Research Associate, joined the Research Department in October of 2022. He has a dual M.S. degree in industrial/organizational and quantitative psychology from Illinois State University and will complete his Ph.D. in industrial/organizational psychology from the University of Tulsa this fall.

Kathleen Voss, Research Assistant, joined the Foundation as a test administrator in Dallas in 2019, and was brought on as a contributor to the Research Department in 2022. She has a B.S. in psychology and child development and an M.S. in psychological sciences from the University of Texas at Dallas.

Holly Wilhelm, Research Coordinator, joined the Foundation staff as a test administrator in the Atlanta office in 2005, and has since contributed to multiple writing, research, and training endeavors. She became the chair of the Research Committee when it was first established in 2019 to form a stronger link between the research and the testing arms of the Foundation.
User Experience

A significant component of our project discovery work with Cloudberry Creative was the development of a working prototype of a digital version of our Analytical Reasoning test. The test design was fairly straightforward, as we wanted the new test to be closely aligned with the analog version. To that effect, the visual layout is very similar to the analog test and the instructions almost exactly replicate those given in the analog version. The test was designed to work on a laptop or desktop, with users employing a mouse or a trackpad to interact with test content.

During the UX design process, various iterations were given in the first round of user testing to determine which worked the best. One version allowed the examinees to read printed instructions to themselves, while the other presented spoken instructions. The users in the first group tended to skim through or skip the instructions and did not have a clear idea of what they were to do on the test, so we determined that the spoken instructions were an important component of the interaction model. Another experiment related to the physical interaction with the word tiles on the screen. One group had to click a tile to select a word and drag it into place, while the other group was to click a tile to select and then click the desired location for it to be dropped. The “drag and drop” group seemed more comfortable with the task, and several of the “click and click” users attempted to drag the words across the screen. The average speed of the two groups was roughly the same, so “drag and drop” was selected as the most user-friendly option for the test interaction.

When the digital test was completed, the research department, led by Susan Park, worked with the testing staff, led by Tommy Jensen and Holly Wilhelm, to design a preliminary study to equate the digital test results with those from the analog test. From a test administrator perspective, the study went smoothly. Very few clients had any difficulties with the digital test. Results from the preliminary equating study are detailed elsewhere in this report and in the soon-to-be-published SB 2023-3.

Clients in both the digital and the analog group took a four-question survey designed to assess their understanding and enjoyment of the respective test versions. The survey results were generally positive, with the majority of clients in both groups stating that they understood the instructions, had no difficulty moving the chips, and found the test at least moderately enjoyable. There was a small difference in the level of enjoyment between the two groups. This may be because the absence of a test administrator and a hands-on element made the test less enjoyable, or it may be because the digital version was generally given later in the test appointment. It is possible that this group may have been more tired and may have had more tests to compare with Analytical Reasoning. In the future, efforts will be made to standardize administration in order to more accurately assess effects such as this. Future digital tests may also incorporate additional elements to increase clients’ enjoyment of the experience.

Client responses indicated a slightly higher level of enjoyment for the analog than the digital version of Analytical Reasoning.
NEW DIGITAL TEST FOR ANALYTICAL REASONING (cont.)

Equating Study

The Johnson O’Connor Research Foundation (JOCRF), with support from the Dalio Foundation, conducted an exploratory study on digitalizing the Analytical Reasoning test (AR) (Form 244 IC). The goal of this exploratory study was to conduct a preliminary equating on the digital form of the Analytical Reasoning test (Form 244 JC). Equating is a statistical process that makes sure that a score for a test taken on one form (i.e., analog) is equivalent to a score for another form (i.e., digital).

The JOCRF used this process because it is important that the score one receives means the same regardless of what form taken. Equating ensures that there is no advantage or disadvantage to taking the test in the analog form over the digital form, or vice versa.

The gathering of the scores occurred during the summer of 2022 at the labs located in Atlanta, Chicago, and Dallas. The equating design was treated as a random-groups design. Table 1 presents descriptive statistics of the samples taken from the analog form and the digital form of the AR test. The raw score distributions of the analog form and the digital form are shown in Table 2.

The possible minimum raw score is 14 and the possible maximum raw score is 104 for the analog form of the AR Test. The mean raw score for the digital form is about 12 raw score points lower than the analog form. Moreover, the highest observed raw score for the digital form is 56 points leading to the conclusion that responses on the digital form are slower.

Due to the exploratory nature of this preliminary equating study, results from the mean equating, linear equating, and equipercentile equating were evaluated. Those evaluations included examining, for example, bootstrapped standard errors of equating, bootstrapped 95% confidence intervals, and how closely the equated percentile rank solutions aligned with the analog percentile rank solutions. Based on these analyses, the linear equating and equipercentile solutions were the preferred solutions. In addition, the linear equating solution had an advantage in that it can be performed with a smaller sample size (about 400 cases per form) in comparison to equipercentile equating (over 1,500 cases per form).
INDUCTIVE REASONING CHANGES

In the 2010s, the Research Department went through extensive studies of the Inductive Reasoning test. A bank of over 100 new items was created and given to clients in experimental administrations between 2010 and 2015. Ten test items with relatively poor performance were replaced with newly created items in late 2012.

After this, as was reported in a 2014 analysis, we continued to find some items with low item-total correlations on the test (SB 2014-4). Additionally, several of these items were consistently missed by most examinees, which is frustrating for both clients and administrators.

While staffing challenges, image file availability, and a global pandemic slowed our progress, we resumed our efforts in late 2022 and created a newly revised test form using items from the 100-item test bank. We removed seven items with item-total correlations below .20, which was deemed the minimum acceptable level. We removed three additional items that have become dated for a variety of reasons.

We selected ten of the best-performing items from the item bank. All have been given to at least two groups of examinees, have consistently shown item-total correlations over .20, and have a higher percentage of clients selecting the right answer.

**Item Total Correlations**

A more detailed explanation of the considerations and processes used in planning the changes will be provided in SB 2023-1 and SB 2023-2.

Offices will start giving the new version of Inductive Reasoning, form PA, in June of 2023. We are grateful for the efforts of Rusty Burke, Tim Fitzgerald, Kevin Fullam, David Ransom, and David Schroeder, who analyzed the experimental items’ performance, and the many TAs who helped with the creation of the items.
NEW PERSONALITY MEASURE – THE “BIG FOUR”

Another major development in the Foundation’s program involves assessing personality beyond the objective-subjective trait that our Word Association test measures. More specifically, outside research has identified five broad dimensions of personality (the “Big Five”) that provide wide coverage of the ways that people differ in personality. Although the Foundation has historically used performance tests to measure traits, outside research has identified effective self-report measures of the five dimensions, while attempts to develop performance measures of personality have shown rather limited success.

The outside research community, with leadership from Dr. Lewis Goldberg, has created the International Personality Item Pool (https://ipip.ori.org), which is a tremendous asset for people who are seeking to measure the Big Five personality dimensions. This public-access body currently contains over 250 scales and 3,000 individual items. We have selected Dr. John Johnson’s 120-item measure of the Big Five domains, which in turn was adapted from a longer instrument by Dr. Goldberg. We expect to assess four of the five dimensions and set aside the Neuroticism domain (in the language of the field, we will be administering the “Big Four” scales).

In 2023 we anticipate giving the Johnson measures on an experimental basis for several months, and this will enable us to construct initial age norms. We will also be assembling interpretive information in anticipation of adding Big Four results to our summary sessions with clients.
DISSEMINATION OF RESEARCH FINDINGS

In recent years we have continued to present findings from our research in scholarly outlets such as professional conferences and journals. More specifically, in the 2010s, we collaborated with Dr. Rex Jung on a series of neuroimaging studies of aptitudes. Articles from this work continued to receive attention in scholarly circles in 2022. The Jung et al. article in *Frontiers in Psychology* in 2015 has now been viewed 25,460 times and cited in 53 other scholarly articles. The 2014 *PLoS ONE* article by Dr. Jung and his team has been viewed by 3,947 persons and cited 17 times.

Other scholarly work sponsored by us continued to have impact in 2022. Our 2010 article with Dr. Richard Haier, with whom we collaborated on earlier neuroimaging research, and his associates in *BMC Research Notes* has now been viewed by over 14,000 persons and cited 26 times in other articles, while our 2012 *BMC* article by Dr. Schroeder and others has been viewed by 2,542 persons and cited 8 times. In addition, our 2009 article with Dr. Haier and others in *Intelligence* has been cited 119 times, and our 2010 article with Dr. Cheuk Tang and others in *Intelligence* has been cited 94 times.

With regard to earlier publications, Dr. Schroeder’s 2004 article with Drs. Timothy Salthouse and Emilio Ferrer in *Developmental Psychology* has now been cited in 205 scholarly publications, and his article with Salthouse in *Personality and Individual Differences* has been cited 117 times. Our 2001 *Intelligence* article by Dr. Scott Acton, a former research assistant in the Research Department, and Dr. Schroeder has been cited 109 times.

**Recent Statistical Bulletins**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Authors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2022-1</td>
<td>Norm-Construction Procedures and Age Curve for Tweezer Dexterity</td>
<td>David Schroeder, Susan Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020-1</td>
<td>Scoring Analysis of Memory for Design</td>
<td>Luke Robbins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019-1</td>
<td>Updated Occupational Plots for the Foundation’s Standard Test Battery</td>
<td>David Schroeder, Ashley Brown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019-2</td>
<td>The Foresight Aptitude and Creative Achievement</td>
<td>Linda Houser-Marko, Rusty Burke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019-3</td>
<td>Research Proposal: Video Game Designer Study</td>
<td>Alex Bureau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019-4</td>
<td>Occupational Plots for the Self-Directed Search Scales</td>
<td>David Schroeder, Ashley Brown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019-5</td>
<td>Occupational Plots for Satisfied Versus Dissatisfied Examinees</td>
<td>David Schroeder, Ashley Brown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019-6</td>
<td>Age Curves for the Graphoria, Number Memory, and Color Discrimination Tests</td>
<td>Ashley Brown, Linda Houser-Marko</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019-7</td>
<td>Occupational Plots for Art-Related Occupations</td>
<td>David Schroeder, Ashley Brown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019-8</td>
<td>Occupational Plots for the Grip Test</td>
<td>David Schroeder, Ashley Brown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019-9</td>
<td>How to Write a Statistical Bulletin</td>
<td>Amanda Summers, Linda Houser-Marko, Michele Ledbetter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018-1</td>
<td>Long-Term Stability for Number Facility</td>
<td>David Schroeder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018-2</td>
<td>Summary of Long-Term Stability Findings</td>
<td>Dave Schroeder</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Recent Technical Reports

2019-1 Occupational Plots for the Foundation’s Standard Battery Displayed by Occupation
David Schroeder
Ashley Brown

2017-1 Occupations in Education
Christopher Condon
David Schroeder

2013-1 Sex Differences in Variability
David Schroeder

2012-1 Aptitudes, Vocabulary, and Educational Attainment
David Schroeder

2012-2 The Aptitudes of Engineering Students
Christopher Condon
David Schroeder

2012-3 Four Studies of the Self-Directed Search
David Schroeder

Recent Presentations

Brown, A. D. (2021, May). Big 5 personality traits and broad versus narrow cognitive abilities. Poster session presented at the virtual meeting of the Association for Psychological Science.


**Recent Publications**
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