

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.

70
6226 1/4

**The Perceived Validity and Reported Use of
Management Selection Methods in New Zealand Organisations.**

A Research Report Presented in Partial Fulfilment
of the Requirements for the
Degree of Masters of Business Studies.

Natalie Joy Harris

1991

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would to sincerely thank my supervisor Dr. Paul Toulson and my advisor Ms. Esther Livingston for their invaluable support and assistance with this research report. Many thanks also to Dr. Mike Smith and Amanda Waugh for their assistance with the development of the questionnaire.

In addition I would like to take this opportunity to thank Mr Nigel Armstrong and the Institute of Personnel Management New Zealand Inc. for distributing the questionnaires amongst the Institutes members. Last, but not least, I would like to thank all those managers who participated in the research and made this report possible.

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.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Acknowledgements	i
Abstract	ii
Table of Contents	iii
List of Tables	vii
Chapter One: Introduction	1
Chapter Two: Literature Review	4
2.1 Introduction	4
2.2 Interviews	4
2.2.1 One-to-One Interviews	5
2.2.2 Panel Interviews	9
2.3 Psychological Tests	12
2.3.1 Personality Tests	12
2.3.2 Cognitive Tests	15
2.3.3 Mechanical and Perceptual Tests	16
2.4 Work Sample Tests	17
2.5 Job Tryout	20

2.6	Realistic Job Previews	21
2.7	Peer and Self Assessment	22
2.8	References	24
2.9	Work Experience	26
2.10	Assessment Centres	27
2.11	Application Forms	28
2.12	Biodata	29
2.13	Curriculum Vitae and Academic Achievement	31
2.14	Unassembled Testing - The Accomplishment Record	32
2.15	Age	34
2.16	Medicals	34
2.17	Genetic Testing	35
2.18	Graphology	36
2.19	Astrology	37
2.20	Summary	38
Chapter Three: Research Method		39
3.1	Research Objective	39
3.2	Hypotheses	39
3.3	Methodology	40
3.4	The Questionnaire	41
3.5	The Sample	44
3.6	Analysis of the Data	45

Chapter Four: Results	46
4.1 Response Rate	46
4.2 Characteristics of the Respondents & their Organisations	47
4.2.1 Position Of Employment	47
4.2.2 Selection Responsibilities	48
4.2.3 Organisational Type	49
4.2.4 Number of People Employed	51
4.3 Use of Management Selection Methods	54
4.4 Perceived Validity of Management Selection Methods	57
4.5 Correlation Coefficients for Perceived Validity, 'Actual' Validity and Reported Frequency of Use	60
Chapter Five: Discussion	61
5.1 Use and Perceived Validity of Some Selection Methods	61
5.1.1 References	61
5.1.2 Curriculum Vitae	62
5.1.3 Ordinary Interviews	62
5.1.4 Astrology	63
5.1.5 Genetic Testing	63
5.1.6 Graphology	64
5.1.7 Unassembled Testing - The Accomplishment Record	64
5.1.8 Situational Interviews	65
5.1.9 Assessment Centres	66

5.1.10 Work Experience	66
5.1.11 Summary	67
5.2 The Relationship Between Reported Use and Perceived Validity	67
5.3 The Relationship Between Reported Use and 'Actual' Validity	69
5.4 The Relationship Between Perceived Validity and 'Actual' Validity	69
5.5 Limitations	70
Chapter Six: Conclusions	72
References	74
Appendices	82
Appendix I: 'Actual' Validity	82
Appendix II: Follow-up Letter	83
Appendix III: IPMNZ Reminder Notice	84
Appendix IV: Questionnaire	85
Appendix V: The 28 Selection Methods Included in the Survey	98
Appendix VI: Number of Respondents Who had Never Heard of Each Management Selection Method	99

LIST OF TABLES

	Page
Table One: Breakdown of Response Rate	46
Table Two: Respondents' Position of Employment	47
Table Three: Who Decided on the Management Selection Practices	49
Table Four: Organisation Categories	50
Table Five: Number of Employees	51
Table Six: Number of Managers	52
Table Seven: Approximated Number of New Managers Recruited Each Year	53
Table Eight: EEO Coordinators Input in Management Selection	54
Table Nine: Mean Frequency of Use of Management Selection Methods	56
Table Ten: Mean Perceived Validity of Management Selection Methods	59
Table Eleven: Correlation Coefficients for Perceived Validity, 'Actual' Validity and Use	60