

Copyright is owned by the Author of the thesis. Permission is given for a copy to be downloaded by an individual for the purpose of research and private study only. The thesis may not be reproduced elsewhere without the permission of the Author.

**NEW ZEALAND PERSONNEL CONSULTANTS AND  
THE SELECTION PROCESS**

A thesis presented in partial fulfilment  
of the requirements for the Degree of  
Master of Business Studies  
at Massey University

**Natalie Joy Harris**

**1992**

## ***ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS***

I would like to express my sincere gratitude to my supervisors Ms Esther Livingston and Dr. Paul Toulson for their continued support, guidance, and constructive criticism while completing this research.

Dr Philip Dewe's working knowledge of SPSSx was invaluable. I appreciate the time he spent discussing which statistical tests would be suitable and how to best use SPSSx.

To Jocelyn Grainger, Dr. Frank Sligo, Judy McGregor and again Dr. Philip Dewe many thanks for proof reading the questionnaire, and your attention to detail. Through you I have learnt a lot about question design, questionnaire layout, and the importance of having patience. A special thanks also to Jocelyn who read and reread drafts of this report.

I am very grateful to the consultants who participated in the pilot study and I appreciate the time it took to complete the questionnaire and the feedback I received. Thanks also to the personnel consultants who completed and returned what turned out to be a long and complex questionnaire. Without their cooperation I would not have got this far.

Last but not least I would like to thank Nigel Curran for his support and encouragement over the past two years while I completed my Masterate.

## ***ABSTRACT***

A survey of New Zealand personnel consultants was conducted which focused on the managerial selection process. Overall, the results were found to be similar to other New Zealand and overseas studies for the use and perceived validity of selection methods. Personnel consultants do not appear to have an accurate perception of the validity of most selection methods. They also frequently use those selection methods which are not particularly valid.

The correlation between the reported validity of the 27 selection methods included and the perceived validity of these selection methods was small (Spearman's  $\rho = 0.319$ ). As was expected, the respondents' perception of the validity of the managerial selection methods included in the questionnaire had a stronger relationship with their use of those selection methods ( $\rho = 0.622$ ,  $p < .01$ ). However, when one looks at the individual Pearson product moment correlations for each individual selection method, only half were significant.

The correlation between use and reported validity was only slight. Surprisingly it was also negative ( $\rho = -0.220$ ). A disturbing result was found when calculating this relationship using only the most frequently used selection methods. The correlation was again negative, however, it was a lot stronger,  $\rho = -0.62$  ( $p < .05$ ). This means that for the most frequently used selection methods the higher the reported validity of a selection method the less often personnel consultants used it and the lower the level of validity the more frequently personnel consultants used it.

# **TABLE OF CONTENTS**

<b>ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS</b> .....	<b>i</b>
<b>ABSTRACT</b> .....	<b>ii</b>
<b>TABLE OF CONTENTS</b> .....	<b>iii</b>
<b>LIST OF TABLES</b> .....	<b>ix</b>
<b>LIST OF FIGURES</b> .....	<b>xi</b>
<b>CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION</b> .....	<b>1</b>
<b>CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW</b> .....	<b>4</b>
2.1 Introduction .....	4
2.2 The Point-to-point Relationship .....	4
2.3 Interviews .....	5
2.3.1 One-to-One Interviews .....	6
2.3.2 Panel Interviews .....	11
2.4 Psychological Tests .....	13
2.4.1 Personality Tests .....	14
2.4.2 Cognitive Tests .....	16

2.4.3 Mechanical and Perceptual Tests . . . . .	18
2.5 Work Sample Tests . . . . .	19
2.6 Job Tryouts . . . . .	22
2.7 Realistic Job Previews . . . . .	23
2.8 Assessment Centres . . . . .	24
2.9 Peer and Self Assessment . . . . .	26
2.10 References . . . . .	28
2.11 Work Experience . . . . .	30
2.12 Application Forms . . . . .	32
2.13 Biodata . . . . .	34
2.14 Curricula Vitae and Academic Achievement . . . . .	36
2.15 Unassembled Testing - The Accomplishment Record . . . . .	37
2.16 Age . . . . .	39
2.17 Medicals . . . . .	41
2.18 Genetic Testing . . . . .	42
2.19 Graphology . . . . .	43
2.20 Astrology . . . . .	46
2.21 Personnel Consultants as Selectors: A Review of New Zealand Studies . . . . .	47
2.22 Overseas Correlation Studies . . . . .	48
2.23 Summary . . . . .	49
 <b>CHAPTER THREE: RESEARCH METHOD . . . . .</b>	 50
3.1 Research Objectives . . . . .	50

3.2 Research Questions .....	50
3.3 Procedure .....	51
3.3.1 Pilot Survey .....	51
3.3.2 The Questionnaire .....	51
3.3.3 The Sample .....	57
3.3.4 Response Rate .....	59
3.3.5 Analysis of the data .....	59
3.3.6 Assumptions .....	60
<b>CHAPTER FOUR: RESULTS .....</b>	<b>61</b>
4.1 Introduction .....	61
4.2 Response Rate .....	61
4.3 Characteristics of Consultancies .....	62
4.3.1 Location of Other Branches .....	63
4.4 Respondents' Statistics .....	65
4.5 Selection Responsibilities .....	66
4.5.1 Amount of Selection Conducted Per Year .....	67
4.6 Sources of Job Information .....	68
4.6.1 The Importance of Job Descriptions and Person Specifications .....	70
4.6.2 Job Analysis .....	71
4.6.3 The Frequency of Use of Selection Methods when Shortlisting Applicants .....	72
4.7 The Final Selection Process .....	75

4.7.1	The People Involved in the Final Selection Decision . . . . .	75
4.7.2	The Use of Selection Methods when making the Final Selection Decision . . . . .	75
4.8	Validity and Selection Methods . . . . .	77
4.8.1	Validation of Selection Methods . . . . .	80
4.8.2	The Perceived Validity of Managerial Selection Methods . . . . .	80
4.9	Correlation Coefficients . . . . .	83
4.10	Selection-Related Publications . . . . .	86
4.10.1	The Perception of Research Findings and Validity . . . . .	86
4.10.2	How Often Selection-Related Publications are Read . . . . .	87
4.10.3	The Perceived Relevance of Selection-Related Publications . . . . .	88
<b>CHAPTER FIVE: DISCUSSION . . . . .</b>		<b>91</b>
5.1	Introduction . . . . .	91
5.2	Selection Responsibilities . . . . .	91
5.3	Job Analysis, Job Descriptions, and Person Specifications . . . . .	92
5.3.1	Job Analysis Techniques . . . . .	93
5.4	Perceived Validity and Frequency of Use of Some Selection Methods . . . . .	94
5.4.1	Astrology . . . . .	94
5.4.2	Graphology . . . . .	95
5.4.3	Genetic Testing . . . . .	96
5.4.4	Assessment Centres . . . . .	96
5.4.5	Interviews . . . . .	97
5.4.6	Unassembled Testing - Accomplishment Tests . . . . .	98



5.4.7 Work Experience .....	99
5.4.8 Age .....	99
5.4.9 References .....	100
5.4.10 Curricula Vitae .....	101
5.4.11 Academic Achievement .....	102
5.4.12 Application Forms .....	102
5.4.13 Psychological Testing .....	103
5.4.14 Summary .....	104
5.5 Validity and the Selection Process .....	104
5.5.1 Defining Validity .....	104
5.5.2 Reasons for not Replacing Less Valid Selection Methods .....	104
5.5.3 Validation of Selection Methods .....	106
5.6 The Relationship Between Shortlisting Use and Perceived Validity .....	106
5.6.1 The Correlation for Mean Shortlisting Use and Perceived Validity .....	106
5.6.2 Individual Correlation Coefficients for Use and Perceived for Each Selection Method .....	107
5.7 The Relationship Between Mean Perceived Validity and Reported Validity .....	108
5.8 The Relationship Between Mean Shortlisting Use and Reported Validity .....	109
5.9 Selection-Related Publications .....	110
5.9.1 Perceived Relevance of Selection-Related Publications .....	112
5.9.2 Reasons for Not Reading Publications .....	113

5.10 Limitations .....	113
5.11 Future Research .....	115
<b>CHAPTER SIX: CONCLUSIONS .....</b>	<b>116</b>
<b>REFERENCES .....</b>	<b>120</b>
<b>APPENDICES .....</b>	<b>129</b>
<b>Appendix I: Reported Validity .....</b>	<b>129</b>
<b>Appendix II: Questionnaire .....</b>	<b>130</b>
<b>Appendix III: Telecom Telephone Directories .....</b>	<b>150</b>
<b>Appendix IV: Covering Letter .....</b>	<b>151</b>
<b>Appendix V: Summary Request Form .....</b>	<b>152</b>
<b>Appendix VI: Follow-up Letter .....</b>	<b>153</b>
<b>Appendix VII: Second Follow-up Letter .....</b>	<b>154</b>
<b>Appendix VIII: The 11 Most Frequently Used Selection Methods Used to</b> <b>Calculate the Relationship Between Use and Reported Validity. . . .</b>	<b>155</b>

## *LIST OF TABLES*

<b>Table One:</b> Breakdown of Response Rate . . . . .	62
<b>Table Two:</b> Number of Consultants with IPC Certificate . . . . .	63
<b>Table Three:</b> Percentage of Consultants with IPC Certificate . . . . .	64
<b>Table Four:</b> Location of Other Consultancy Branches . . . . .	64
<b>Table Five:</b> Years Employed as a Selection Consultant . . . . .	65
<b>Table Six:</b> Time Spent By Consultants Selecting Managers Personally . . . . .	67
<b>Table Seven:</b> Percentage of Offices' Time Spent Selecting Managers . . . . .	68
<b>Table Eight:</b> The People Who Helped Decide Which Selection Methods Are Used to Select a Candidate for a Managerial Position . . . . .	69
<b>Table Nine:</b> Sources of Job Information . . . . .	70
<b>Table Ten:</b> Use of Job Analysis Techniques as a Percentage . . . . .	72
<b>Table Eleven:</b> Mean Use of Selection Methods For Shortlisting in Rank Order . . .	73
<b>Table Twelve:</b> Frequency of Use of Selection Methods when Shortlisting Applicants . . . . .	74
<b>Table Thirteen:</b> The Mean Use of Selection Methods when Making the Final Selection Decision in Rank Order . . . . .	76
<b>Table Fourteen:</b> Use of Selection Methods When Making the Final Selection Decision . . . . .	78
<b>Table Fifteen:</b> Reasons For Not Replacing Less Valid Selection Methods . . . . .	79
<b>Table Sixteen:</b> Mean Perceived Validity of Selection Methods in Rank Order . . . .	81
<b>Table Seventeen:</b> Perceived Level Of Validity of Managerial Selection Methods . .	82

<b>Table Eighteen:</b> Spearman's Rank Difference Correlation for Mean Perceived Validity, Reported Validity and Mean Use when Shortlisting Managers . . . .	83
<b>Table Nineteen:</b> Pearson's Product Moment Correlation Coefficients for Shortlisting Use and Perceived Validity for Each Selection Method in Rank Order . . . . .	85
<b>Table Twenty:</b> Level of Reading of Selection-Related Publications . . . . .	88
<b>Table Twenty-One:</b> Relevance of Selection-Related Publications to Personnel Consultants . . . . .	89
<b>Table Twenty-Two:</b> Reasons for Not Reading Publications . . . . .	90

## *LIST OF FIGURES*

<b>Figure One:</b> Rating Scale Used to Assess the Frequency of Use of Selection Methods . . . . .	53
<b>Figure Two:</b> Scale Used to Assess the Level of Perceived Relevance of Selection- Related Publications to the Role of Selection Consultant . . . . .	54
<b>Figure Three:</b> The Rating Scales Used to Determine whether or not Respondents Agreed with a Given Statement . . . . .	55
<b>Figure Four:</b> Rating Scale Used to Measure the Perceived Validity of Selection Methods . . . . .	56
<b>Figure Five:</b> Rating Scales Used to Determine Whether or not Respondents Thought They Understood What the Term Validated Meant . . . . .	57