Electronic Supplementary Material for

Fisher, P., Risavy, S. D., Robie, C., König, C. J., Christiansen, N. D., Tett, R. P., & Simonet, D. V. (2020). Selection myths: A conceptual replication of HR professionals' beliefs about effective human resource practices. *Journal of Personnel Psychology*. https://doi.org/10.1027/1866-5888/a000263

Certifications Held by Participants in the Study

CHRP: Certified Human Resources Professional; CHRL: Certified Human Resources Leader; CHRE: Certified Human Resources Executive; CPHR: Chartered Professional in Human Resources; aPHR™: Associate Professional in Human Resources™; aPHRi™: Associate Professional in Human Resources-International™; PHR®: Professional in Human Resources®; PHRca®: Professional in Human Resources-California®; PHRi™: Professional in Human Resources-International®; SPHR®: Senior Professional in Human Resources®; SPHRi™: Senior Professional in Human Resources-International™; GPHR®: Global Professional in Human Resources®; SHRM-CP: SHRM Certified Professional; SHRM-SCP: SHRM Senior Certified Professional.

Table E1. Comparison of potential remedies for the research–practice gap

Myth	Possess certification % false (% uncertain) *n* = 261	Don't possess certification % false (% uncertain) *n* = 192	Difference test	Effect size
(1) Although people use many different terms to describe personalities, there are really only four basic dimensions of personality, as captured by the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI)	22.4% (27.6%) *M* = 1.78 *SD* = 1.28	18.4% (32.2%) *M* = 1.80 *SD* = 1.23	$F(1, 451) = .06$ $p = .810$	$d = .02$
(2) Conscientiousness is a better predictor of overall job performance than general mental ability/IQ	17.2% (25.0%) *M* = 1.98 *SD* = 1.23	21.5% (26.1%) *M* = 1.84 *SD* = 1.27	$F(1, 451) = 1.56$ $p = .213$	$d = .11$
(3) Companies that screen job applicants for values have higher overall job performance than those that screen for general mental ability/IQ	18.8% (17.2%) *M* = 2.08 *SD* = 1.25	17.2% (23.4%) *M* = 2.02 *SD* = 1.23	$F(1, 451) = .44$ $p = .507$	$d = .05$
(4) Integrity tests don't work well in practice because so many people lie on them	19.8% (29.7%) *M* = 1.81 *SD* = 1.25	25.3% (31.4%) *M* = 1.61 *SD* = 1.27	$F(1, 451) = 2.76$ $p = .097$	$d = .16$
(5) Integrity tests have adverse impact on racial minorities	39.8% (34.6%) *M* = 1.12 *SD* = 1.19	31.8% (47.5%) *M* = 1.10 *SD* = 1.07	$F(1, 450) = .03$ $p = .856$	$d = .02$
(6) The most valid employment interviews are designed around an applicant's unique background	22.9% (17.7%) *M* = 1.96 *SD* = 1.30	25.8% (16.9%) *M* = 1.89 *SD* = 1.33	$F(1, 450) = .31$ $p = .578$	$d = .05$
(7) Being very intelligent is actually a disadvantage for performing well on a low-skilled job	53.6% (16.1%) *M* = 1.07 *SD* = 1.32	45.0% (23.5%) *M* = 1.18 *SD* = 1.30	$F(1, 450) = .82$ $p = .364$	$d = .08$
(8) There is very little difference among personality inventories in terms of how well they predict an applicant's overall job performance	45.3% (20.3%) *M* = 1.23 *SD* = 1.34	33.1% (33.1%) *M* = 1.35 *SD* = 1.25	$F(1, 450) = .83$ $p = .362$	$d = .09$
(9) Emotional intelligence is a better predictor of overall job performance than general mental ability/IQ	29.7% (15.6%) *M* = 1.80 *SD* =1.36	25.3% (23.4%) *M* = 1.77 *SD* = 1.31	$F(1, 451) = .03$ $p = .856$	$d = .02$
(10) A skilled graphologist (i.e., handwriting analysis expert) can be helpful in predicting overall job performance	47.9% (27.6%) *M* = 1.01 *SD* =1.21	46.4% (33.0%) *M* = .95 *SD* = 1.14	$F(1, 451) = .29$ $p = .588$	$d = .05$

Table E1 continued

Myth	Hold traditional HR job % false (% uncertain) *n* = 288	Hold non-traditional HR job % false (% uncertain) *n* = 156	Difference test	Effect size
(1)	22.9% (32.6%) *M* = 1.66 *SD* = 1.26	14.7% (25.6%) *M* = 2.04 *SD* = 1.20	***F*(1, 442) = 9.80** ***p* = .002**	*d* = .31
(2)	19.4% (26.4%) *M* = 1.89 *SD* = 1.26	19.2% (23.7%) *M* = 1.95 *SD* = 1.26	*F*(1, 442) = .23 *p* = .632	*d* = .05
(3)	18.1% (23.3%) *M* = 1.99 *SD* = 1.24	16.7% (15.4%) *M* = 2.19 *SD* = 1.21	*F*(1, 442) = 2.64 *p* = .105	*d* = .16
(4)	21.9% (33.0%) *M* = 1.68 *SD* = 1.25	25.0% (25.6%) *M* = 1.74 *SD* = 1.30	*F*(1, 442) = .18 *p* = .673	*d* = .05
(5)	34.4% (45.1%) *M* = 1.07 *SD* = 1.08	38.1% (35.5%) *M* = 1.15 *SD* = 1.19	*F*(1, 441) = .55 *p* = .461	*d* = .07
(6)	22.6% (15.3%) *M* = 2.02 *SD* = 1.30	27.6% (20.5%) *M* = 1.76 *SD* = 1.33	*F*(1, 442) = 3.82 *p* = .051	*d* = .20
(7)	49.7% (20.1%) *M* = 1.11 *SD* = 1.30	47.4% (20.5%) *M* = 1.17 *SD* = 1.32	*F*(1, 442) = .21 *p* = .650	*d* = .05
(8)	38.5% (28.1%) *M* = 1.28 *SD* = 1.28	37.8% (26.3%) *M* = 1.33 *SD* = 1.30	*F*(1, 442) = .13 *p* = .722	*d* = .04
(9)	25.7% (19.8%) *M* = 1.83 *SD* = 1.32	30.8% (19.2%) *M* = 1.69 *SD* = 1.36	*F*(1, 442) = 1.13 *p* = .288	*d* = .10
(10)	48.3% (33.7%) *M* = .88 *SD* = 1.09	44.9% (25.6%) *M* = 1.14 *SD* = 1.27	*F*(1, 442) = 5.19 *p* = .023	*d* = .22

Table E1 continued

Myth	Read peer-reviewed journal articles % false (% uncertain) *n* = 257	Don't read peer-reviewed journal articles % false (% uncertain) *n* = 195	Difference test	Effect size
(1)	20.6% (26.1%) *M* = 1.86 *SD* = 1.27	19.5% (35.9%) *M* = 1.70 *SD* = 1.23	*F*(1, 450) = 1.88 *p* = .171	*d* = .13
(2)	19.5% (19.1%) *M* = 2.04 *SD* = 1.26	20.0% (34.4%) *M* = 1.71 *SD* = 1.24	***F*(1, 450) = 7.37** ***p* = .007**	*d* = .26
(3)	19.1% (15.2%) *M* = 2.12 *SD* = 1.25	16.4% (28.2%) *M* = 1.94 *SD* = 1.22	*F*(1, 450) = 2.37 *p* = .125	*d* = .15
(4)	24.5% (30.4%) *M* = 1.66 *SD* = 1.27	21.0% (31.3%) *M* = 1.74 *SD* = 1.25	*F*(1, 450) = .51 *p* = .475	*d* = .06
(5)	36.2% (37.0%) *M* = 1.18 *SD* = 1.19	33.8% (48.7%) *M* = 1.01 *SD* = 1.02	*F*(1, 450) = 2.41 *p* = .121	*d* = .15
(6)	22.3% (13.7%) *M* = 2.06 *SD* = 1.29	27.7% (22.1%) *M* = 1.73 *SD* = 1.33	***F*(1, 449) = 7.06** ***p* = .008**	*d* = .25
(7)	46.5% (18.8%) *M* = 1.23 *SD* = 1.35	51.8% (22.6%) *M* = .99 *SD* = 1.25	*F*(1, 449) = 3.62 *p* = .058	*d* = .18
(8)	35.2% (26.6%) *M* = 1.41 *SD* = 1.31	42.6% (29.2%) *M* = 1.14 *SD* = 1.24	*F*(1, 449) = 5.12 *p* = .024	*d* = .21
(9)	30.0% (16.7%) *M* = 1.77 *SD* = 1.36	23.6% (24.1%) *M* = 1.81 *SD* = 1.30	*F*(1, 450) = .12 *p* = .730	*d* = .03
(10)	47.1% (26.1%) *M* = 1.07 *SD* = 1.24	47.2% (36.9%) *M* = .85 *SD* = 1.04	*F*(1, 450) = 3.98 *p* = .047	*d* = .19

Table E1 continued

Myth	Conduct validity studies % false (% uncertain) *n* = 171	Don't conduct validity studies % false (% uncertain) *n* = 245	Difference test	Effect size
(1)	15.2% (21.1%) *M* = 2.12 *SD* = 1.20	23.7% (33.5%) *M* = 1.62 *SD* = 1.25	***F*(1, 414) = 16.70** ***p* < .001**	*d* = .42
(2)	21.1% (19.3%) *M* = 1.98 *SD* = 1.28	20.0% (27.3%) *M* = 1.85 *SD* = 1.26	*F*(1, 414) = 1.05 *p* = .306	*d* = .10
(3)	17.5% (10.5%) *M* = 2.26 *SD* = 1.21	18.8% (26.5%) *M* = 1.91 *SD* = 1.25	***F*(1, 414) = 8.44** ***p* = .004**	*d* = .28
(4)	28.7% (25.1%) *M* = 1.64 *SD* = 1.32	19.2% (33.1%) *M* = 1.76 *SD* = 1.24	*F*(1, 414) = .99 *p* = .321	*d* = .09
(5)	39.4% (25.3%) *M* = 1.31 *SD* = 1.31	33.1% (50.6%) *M* = 1.00 *SD* = 1.00	***F*(1, 413) = 7.78** ***p* = .006**	*d* = .27
(6)	19.4% (12.9%) *M* = 2.16 *SD* = 1.25	27.8% (18.8%) *M* = 1.79 *SD* = 1.34	***F*(1, 413) = 7.94** ***p* = .005**	*d* = .29
(7)	45.9% (10.6%) *M* = 1.41 *SD* = 1.43	51.8% (23.7%) *M* = .97 *SD* = 1.23	***F*(1, 413) = 11.29** ***p* = .001**	*d* = .33
(8)	34.7% (18.8%) *M* = 1.58 *SD* = 1.37	40.4% (32.7%) *M* = 1.13 *SD* = 1.21	***F*(1, 413) = 12.29** ***p* = .001**	*d* = .35
(9)	28.1% (11.7%) *M* = 1.92 *SD* = 1.36	26.9% (23.7%) *M* = 1.72 *SD* = 1.32	*F*(1, 414) = 2.39 *p* = .123	*d* = .15
(10)	43.3% (22.8%) *M* = 1.25 *SD* = 1.32	51.4% (33.9%) *M* = .78 *SD* = 1.03	***F*(1, 414) = 16.35** ***p* < .001**	*d* = .40

Note. Bolded values are significant at $p < .05$, corrected for false discovery rate according to Bejamini and Hochberg (1995).