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ABSTRACT

A study of the use of management selection methods and their perceived ability to accurately predict future job performance was conducted. Managers' perceptions of the validity of management selection methods were also compared with the research evidence of the 'actual' validity of those selection methods.

The correlation between the 'actual' validity of the selection methods and the perceived validity was small (Pearson $r = 0.471$). The respondents' perceptions of the validity of the management selection methods included in the questionnaire also had only a slight relationship with the use of those selection methods in New Zealand organisations ($r = 0.4882$).

Managers appear to have a reasonably accurate perception of the validity of the more uncommon selection methods such as graphology and astrology. However, their perception of the validity of some of the more common selection methods is incorrect. For example, they believe that ordinary interviews, references and work experience have high levels of validity when in fact they do not.

In some instances it appeared that managers were using selection methods they knew to be less valid more often than the selection methods they perceive to be more valid. For example, while situational interviews were perceived to be more valid than ordinary interviews they were used less often than ordinary interviews.
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