might be liable if you do not say it! One final point on Part II—as with any legal material, it pays to read the endnotes. The information in the fine print at the end of the chapter is as interesting and informative as the main text.

Part III (Case Histories of Workplace Violence) includes "over 150" (I didn't count them) nonobject focused cases of workplace violence, all from the United States. The information was gleaned from newspaper and other news media, official reports, and similar sources—all of which are provided for each case. The range is vast—from a guy who shot his psychiatrist, to the 9/11 "Attack on America" and everything in-between.

For each case, Perline provides (a) motive, (b) focus, (c) goal, (d) workplace choice, (e) perpetrator or alleged perpetrator, (f) risk factors, (g) background, (h) crime, (i) disposition, and (j) references. Motive, risk factors, and such may have some subjectivity in Perline's assessment, but because he provides the references, interested readers can verify these choices. The amount of data is staggering. Maybe you can read through the cases from beginning to end in a couple of sittings, but I could not. There is too much information to absorb, much of it disturbing, to read it that way. Fortunately, the cases are organized into eight chapters of relatively homogeneous crimes (e.g., civil disorder, corporate and small business, schools, terrorist activities and hate crimes, and the ever popular U.S. Postal Service). Readers will probably concentrate on the topical areas that concern them the most. The cases may be of most benefit to researchers and theorists who can find much of what they need in this one location. I may use some in my organizational behavior class in the section on organizational misbehavior. Other instructors may find this a rich trove of examples.

Overall, I found this to be a useful and valuable book. I cannot say I enjoyed reading all of it—I shall take my violence in detective novels— but it provides a very helpful perspective and a load of information. I am recommending it to our university library and to some colleagues with special interests in the areas of violence and in organizational consulting. I do not know if the average human resource manager has the patience to read all of it, or the sophistication to understand the psychology, but those who provide services to these managers may find it worthwhile to read this book.

Herman Aguinis (Editor). **Test-Score Banding in Human Resources Selection.** Westport, CT: Praeger, 2004, 236 pages, $65.00 hardcover.
Reviewed by *Malcolm James Ree,* Associate Professor, Our Lady of the Lake University, San Antonio, TX.

Professor Aguinis, an energetic force in industrial psychology, has edited a volume about a timely subject and included the most important

scientific and legal investigators in the field. The use of test-score banding is analyzed from legal, technical, and societal viewpoints. Arguments are presented both in favor of and against the use of test-score banding. Useful guidelines for practice and innovative suggestions for research are presented.

Chapter 1 is an introduction by the editor and presents a preview of the remainder of the book. All of the remaining chapters are meritorious, but space prevents a complete explication of each. I have chosen a few for comments.

Cascio, Goldstein, Outtz, and Zedeck (Chapter 2) present a good overview of the theories, alternatives, and mechanisms of banding. Banding, in case the concept is new to you, is treating a pair of scores as the same after you have said they are different by some standard. Saying they are the same allows flexibility in choosing among candidates on a characteristic other than the one you originally evaluated. For example, if two applicants have scores 30 and 33 and the standard error of the difference is 3.5 points, one might argue that a statistical hypothesis test would fail to reject the null hypothesis of no difference (at some error rate) and consider the scores to be "not different." This would allow you to accept the candidate with the lower score of 30 on the basis of some other characteristic that is job-related or diversity-related. Also, it is good to remember that non-psychometric banding has been employed for decades by organizations. For example, when I was selected to work at the Air Force Human Resources Laboratory (AFHRL) in 1974, I was chosen from a list and that list was broken into two bands. One part was the "top three" and the other part was "all others." I was in the top three, chosen, and survived 25 years of civil service. Would I want to argue with such a successful application of banding?

Cascio et al. propose/dispose of potential objections to banding with a series of discussions. This chapter should be studied closely by both proponents and opponents. It is fair to say that the authors present most of the case for banding and can be seen as champions of banding.

Frank Schmidt and the late John Hunter (Chapter 8) situate the issue of banding as a test of scientific values. "The thesis of this is that the issue of SED based banding . . . is a test of the scientific values and scientific integrity of I/O psychology as a field." On the scientific front, they contend that testing a null hypothesis known to be false is a logical contradiction (not to mention silly, but that is a different argument). Further, they remind us that this statistical test must be one of low power and hence unlikely to reject a false null hypothesis. They can be seen as disparagers of banding who make a strong case.

The legal issues are ably handled by Barrett and Lueke. They begin with a review of court cases on banding, neatly assembled in a table complete with outcomes and comments/critical issues. I recommend that

all psychologists read the Federal Constitution and be cognizant of the distinction between law and science. My model says that science is a search for the truth, but law is a competition for victory. This is not damning law as untrue, but rather recognition that competition between two parties must be entered with zealous determination.

Foreshadowing the case made by Schmidt and Hunter in Chapter 8, Barrett and Lueke write, "There is no question that there is an issue of values here that should be directly addressed." Delving further into the outcomes of banding, they conclude that for all the theoretical benefits of banding as applied currently, it does not help to promote workforce diversity and reduce adverse impact. They state, "It is our view that if adverse impact is not decreased by banding, there is no legal or professional reason to negate the merit principle..." They also suspect that banding would fail the "Daubert" standards, which hold that the admissibility of scientific evidence should consider whether the reasoning or methodology is *scientifically valid* and if it can be properly applied to the specific issue(s) of the court case. Their chapter ends with three reasons not to use banding and the conclusion that there is not enough evidence to support the use of banding.

Murphy (Chapter 9) reminds us, "As the material presented in this section suggests, the question of who will be helped and who will be hurt by banding is a complex one." He further observes that the most contentious issue in banding is cost of replacing efficiency with equity. It might be added that who pays that cost is also contentious.

Much of the popular explanation of banding deals with social equity theory and the diversity of the workforce. The recent Supreme Court cases of *Gratz v. Bollinger* and *Grutter v. Bollinger* have found for affirmative action, citing diversity as a legitimate concern for the state. If you want to know how we got from the struggle for integration to diversity, I recommend Wood (2002). One of the most interesting points to be made about the book overall is the absence of owners as stakeholders in the human resources system. Not one of the authors mentions them. They mention applicants, human resources employees, governments, and unions, but not one author mentions equity holders, owners of organizations. The concepts of agency and fiduciary responsibility are important. Managers are the agents of the owners, they should not be agents for themselves and must make all decisions recognizing their responsibility to shareholders.

Despite the breadth of the chapters, several technical issues remain that I would like to see investigated:

(1) Are the errors found in the multiple hurdle model of selection also found in the use of sliding bands?

(2) What are the consequences of ceiling effects under circumstances of selecting a few from many?

(3) What is the effect of differential reliability of groups within a band or among adjacent bands in the sliding band model?

(4) Should banding be based on estimated true scores by group to be more realistic?

(5) What happens in this century as America becomes a "minority-majority" country?

(6) Wattenberg (2004) has written about the depopulating of America (and the rest of the world). What will the consequences be for personnel selection and in particular the use of banding as the workforce size diminishes?

My final assessment: To prepare to enter the banding debate, review your psychometrics, review regression analyses, and read this book.

REFERENCES

Wattenberg BJ. (2004). *Fewer*. Chicago: Ivan R. Dee.
Wood P. (2002). *Diversity: The invention of a concept*. San Francisco: Encounter.

Thomas W. Miller. **Data and Text Mining: A Business Applications Approach.** Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Education, 2005, 192 pages, $46.67 paper.
Reviewed by *John M. Ford,* Research Psychologist, U.S. Merit Systems Protection Board,* Washington, DC.

I appreciate a book that lands in my "zone of proximal development"— that efficiently reviews familiar material to establish context, then extends my knowledge into new areas. Written for graduate students in business, Miller's five-chapter introduction to data mining is appropriate continuing education for researchers who want to expand their skills in traditional statistical techniques to include data-adaptive methods and text analysis. It is a good read and "in the zone" for personnel psychologists.

In Chapter 1 (What is Data Mining?), Miller begins with a general discussion of applied research. He distinguishes several types of applied researchers by the data they analyze and the skills they need to do this effectively. He highlights differences between data mining and traditional research, discussing not only specific statistical procedures, but different approaches to selecting a statistical model and the requirements for testing the fit of an emergent model with new data. Miller situates data mining

---