City Research Online

City St George's, University of London

Citation: Zibarras, L. D. & Woods, S. A. (2010). A survey of UK selection practices across different organization sizes and industry sectors. Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 83(2), pp. 499-511. doi: 10.1348/096317909x425203

This is the unspecified version of the paper.

This version of the publication may differ from the final published version. To cite this item please consult the publisher's version.

Permanent repository link: https://openaccess.city.ac.uk/id/eprint/2213/

Link to published version: https://doi.org/10.1348/096317909x425203

Copyright and Reuse: Copyright and Moral Rights remain with the author(s) and/or copyright holders. Copies of full items can be used for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes without prior permission or charge, unless otherwise indicated, provided that the authors, title and full bibliographic details are credited, a hyperlink and/or URL is given for the original metadata page and the content is not changed in any way. For full details of reuse please refer to City Research Online policy.

City Research Online: http://openaccess.city.ac.uk/ publications@citystgeorges.ac.uk

Abstract

This paper presents results of a study examining the methods used to select employees in 579 UK organizations representing a range of different organization sizes and industry sectors. Overall, a smaller proportion of organizations in this sample reported using formalized methods (e.g. assessment centres) than informal methods (e.g. unstructured interviews). The Curriculum Vitae was the most commonly used selection method, followed by the traditional triad of application form, interviews and references. Findings also indicated that the use of different selection methods was similar in both large organizations and small-to-medium-sized enterprises. Differences were found across industry sector with Public and Voluntary sectors being more likely to use formalized techniques (e.g. application forms rather than CVs and structured rather than unstructured interviews). The results are discussed in relation to their implications, both in terms of practice and future research.

A Survey of UK Selection Practices across Different Organization Sizes and Industry Sectors

What are the methods that organizations use to select their employees? To what extent do organizations apply formalized methods of assessment developed by psychologists, and do some kinds of organization use them more frequently than others? The answers to these questions are important for Work Psychologists and Human Resource practitioners. Information about how selection practices are applied in different organizations allows practitioners to better understand the impact of research into selection assessment methodologies, and also allows managers to benchmark practices in their own organizations. Although survey studies of the prevalence of different selection practices have been published periodically over the past 20 years (e.g. Bartram, Lindley, Marshall & Foster, 1995; Hodgkinson & Payne, 1998; Keenan, 1995; Shackleton & Newell, 1991), a decade has now passed since the most recent, and that period has seen some important developments in selection research and in the environments in which organizations operate. The UK economy experienced significant growth up until the recent global economic downturn, and the number of small-to-medium sized enterprises (SMEs) has substantially increased (Curran & Blackburn, 2001). Selection research has progressed, most notably through the recognition of person-organization fit (Billsberry, 2007) and social process (Herriot, 1993) concerns during selection. The present study examined the prevalence of selection methods in a sample of 579 UK organizations in 2006. We examined differences in the use of selection methods across different industry sectors and organization sizes.

Surveys of selection practices in the UK

Selection in organizations has arguably received more attention by work psychologists than any other area of Human Resource Management. An important contribution of work psychologists to selection practice in organizations has been the development of a range of different assessment methods to differentiate between job candidates (e.g. psychological tests, biodata instruments, assessment centres), and a huge literature on the reliability and validity of these assessments has been accumulated (e.g. Schmidt & Hunter, 1998). In this paper we differentiate between two kinds of selection assessment method: first are informal or unstructured methods; by which we mean those that do not have a clear method underpinning their execution (e.g. unstructured interviews, CVs and 'trial periods' on the job). Second are formalized methods, by which we mean those that have a clear methodological underpinning in the way candidates are assessed (e.g. assessment centres, structured interviews, aptitude/ability and personality testing). In meta-analyses, formalized methods generally tend to produce higher validity coefficients than unstructured methods, but in practice, higher validity does not always equate with increased popularity in organizations. Several studies of the prevalence of different assessment methods have been conducted over the past 20 years. The results of these are summarized in Table 1 (note that for later comparative purposes, we also include the corresponding data from the present study in the last column of the table).

Robertson and Makin (1986) found that interviews were almost universally used, followed by references. Their sample was based on just over 100 organizations from the Times 1000 index (this gives a rank order of the top 1000 UK organizations, largely based on sales). They found only a small percentage of organizations used formalized methods such as biodata or assessment centres. Shackleton and Newell (1991) replicated the Robertson and Makin study to examine the changes over time in the use of management selection techniques in the UK, and

also compared selection method use in French and British organizations. Compared to Robertson and Makin, Shackleton and Newell reported an increase in the use of formalized methods such as psychometric tests, biodata and assessment centres in the 73 British organizations they surveyed, with interviews remaining the most prevalent tool. They also found 93.2% of organizations used application forms.

Further survey research has focused on methods used to select graduates in the UK. For example, Keenan (1995) surveyed 536 organizations in the UK and examined graduate selection only. He found that 94% of organizations used application forms as a pre-screening tool; 100% used interviews and 44% used assessment centres as part of their graduate selection. Hodgkinson and Payne's (1998) graduate selection survey compared UK, French and Dutch organizations and the UK sample had 176 organizations. They report some adoption of formalized techniques by UK organizations, but widespread use of some methods with 'doubtful' reliability and validity.

INSERT TABLE ONE

Organizational size and sector

The studies listed in Table 1 have generally concentrated on large organizations. The samples used in large-organization research (e.g. Times 1000) may be narrow in scope and may not elicit a clear picture of selection method use in UK organizations generally. In particular, questions are raised over the generalizability of the data to smaller businesses. This is important because currently over 99% of UK organizations employ less than 250 employees, and can therefore be classified as 'SMEs'; (as per UK Department of Trade and Industry, 2006). There are reasons to believe that large firms and SMEs might differ when it comes to employee selection (Barber, Wesson, Roberson, & Taylor 1999). Four main differences exist between

small and large firms in relation to selection. Large organizations: (1) have greater brand recognition in the market place, which may attract high numbers of applications; (2) have more vacancies; (3) may use formalized processes to filter large numbers of candidates; and (4) have more money for recruitment, and as such, dedicated HR involvement (Barber et al, 1999; Bartram et al, 1995). Therefore, assumptions cannot be made about the selection practices within SMEs (Carroll, Marchington, Earnshaw, & Taylor, 1999).

In one UK-based survey examining the selection practices in smaller organizations (those with less than 25 employees), Bartram et al (1995) found a low adoption of formalized techniques such as aptitude/ability tests (see Table 1). Similar findings have been found in US-based studies (e.g. Heneman & Berkley, 1999; Hornsby & Kuratko, 1990; McEvoy, 1984), which have also found a low uptake of formalized methods among SMEs. It is worth noting that these studies highlight disagreements over what constitutes a 'small' or 'medium' sized organization. Hornsby and Kuratko (1990) defined a 'small' organization as one with less than 150 employees, whilst Bartram et al (1995) defined 'small' as less than 25 employees. In the UK (and the EU) SMEs are formally defined as less than 250 employees (Department of Trade and Industry [DTI], 2006); whilst in the USA it is 500.

With respect to organizational sector, only one of the papers outlined above (Bartram et al, 1995) compared the use of selection methods across different sectors. Bartram et al. commented that interviews were used more frequently in the financial sector than the manufacturing sectors and that service sector organizations made more use of formalized selection methods than manufacturing organizations. However, the study examined selection practices in small organizations only, and the main focus of the paper was organization size and not sector. Bartram et al. did not report detailed findings for all selection methods and sectors.

The absence of data comparing practices across sectors is important because the potential for variation is noted elsewhere in the literature. For example, Boyne (2002) reported differences between public and private sectors relating to structure and management practices (Boyne, 2002). In particular, Boyne (2002) suggests that demands for accountability in public sector organizations lead to more formal decision-making procedures and bureaucratic structures compared with private sector organizations. This difference could feasibly promote the use of formal personnel procedures more strongly in the public sector. The potential for variation highlights the need for comparative data on the use of selection methods in different industry sectors.

The present study examined the application of different selection assessment methods in UK organizations. The study is a timely update to the literature on the use of selection assessments in UK organizations, making an important empirical contribution by extending previous research in two ways. First, we compared data from organizations of different sizes and second, we compared organizations from different industry sectors. Moreover, by focusing on UK organizations, we were also able to make comparisons with past studies. We adopted an exploratory approach to our analyses, and did not set any formal hypotheses.

Method

Participating Organizations

A total of 579 organizations participated in the study. Within each organization, the 'main hiring contact' completed our survey. Of 579 respondents, 165 were managers, 143 were directors or CEOs, and 188 were HR or recruitment managers. Respondents' mean tenure was

5.7 years. The demographic characteristics of the participating organizations, including organization size and industry sector, are shown in Table 2.

INSERT TABLE TWO

Survey

The survey design was informed by previous studies of the use of selection methods in organizations (Bartram et al, 1995; Heneman & Berkley, 1999; Hornsby & Kuratko, 1990; McEvoy, 1984, Robertson & Makin, 1986). The survey included three broad areas: (1) company demographics; (2) employee demographics, and (3) employee selection methods used. The relevant survey items are included in Appendix 1.

Procedure

All respondents were contacted by email and invited to complete the survey. Respondents were informed that they could complete the survey in three ways (proportion of actual responses indicated in parentheses); online via a weblink (84.0%); MSWord email attachment (15.7%); paper-based version with pre-paid envelope (0.3%). In order to ensure a representative sample of organizations, several possible sampling frames were considered. Common sampling frames for UK organizations such as the Value Added Tax, and Pay-as-you-earn Income Tax registers were unsuitable in this study, as they omit smaller businesses. We therefore used three alternative sampling frames. First, over 10,000 members of the Chambers of Commerce were identified using Chambers of Commerce membership websites. Fifty percent of this sample (N = 5000) were randomly selected and contacted. The second sampling frame was the Personnel Manager's Yearbook (PMY), a directory of companies that have HR departments or an individual responsible for HR functions. The PMY contains a total of 11,000 companies, 80% of which have contact details for the HR manager. Because the PMY only contains organizations that are

large enough to have a HR department (i.e. medium or large organizations), fewer organizations were sampled from this database than from others. 1,000 organizations were randomly selected and contacted. The third sampling frame was the Saros Database compiled by an independent research company who work with researchers to identify samples for social research. For the purposes of this study, a sample of 3000 organizations was compiled. The identified organizational contact within each one (comprising HR Managers, owners, managers, directors and CEOs) were contacted by email. The body of the email included information about the survey, details of how to complete the survey, and assurances that participation was voluntary, and that the data would be anonymously submitted and aggregated to preserve confidentiality. Respondents were also provided with a glossary of terms for the selection methods (available from the first author) in an attempt to ensure that these were interpreted in the same way. For instance, an unstructured interview was described as follows: "*This entails an interview with no clear structure and may be like an informal conversation. Different questions may be posed to different candidates*" whilst a structured interview was described as follows: "*For this type of interview the format and the questions are planned in advance, with possible probe questions also often prepared. All candidates are asked the same questions in more or less the same order and all candidates are likely to be provided with the same information about the job.*"

Out of a total 9000 emails sent, 3036 were returned undelivered, leaving a total sample of 5964. The overall response rate for the study was therefore 9.8%. The anonymous nature of the survey prevented us from calculating the response rates from the three different sub-samples. This response rate in our study is comparable to similar survey studies (e.g. Heneman and Berkley, 1999, reported 11.7% response rate).

Results

Frequencies and percentages of organizations' use of selection methods can be found in Table 3.

Prevalence of Selection Assessments in UK Organizations

Table 3 indicates the total prevalence of UK selection practices. Although curriculum vitae appear to be the most prevalent selection method, the traditional triad (Cook, 1991) of application form, interview and references remain a popular choice of selection method in this sample. Out of the six most prevalent selection methods, four could be classified as informal methods: CV, unstructured interview, references and trial period on the job. Organizations reported less frequent use of formalized methods (psychometric testing, assessment centres, group exercises and work samples).

INSERT TABLE THREE

Comparison of Organizations of Different Sizes and Industries

Organizations were classified according to five size categories: Micro (1-9 employees); Small (10-49); Medium (50-249); Large (250-1000); and Very Large (1000+). Although "Very Large" is not technically a category according to the DTI, this category was deemed useful to examine, given that there may be differences between organizations with 250 employees compared to those with over 1000. They were also classified according to four industry-sector categories: Business Services (including banking and financial services); Public & Voluntary; Manufacturing (including construction); and Other Services (including wholesale, retail, transport and utilities).

In order to examine associations between frequency of use of selection methods and organization size, and industry sector, both Pearson Chi-square (χ^2) and Cramer's V (*crv*) were

used; Pearson Chi-square indicates a relationship between independent (e.g. organization size or industry sector) and dependent variables (e.g. selection method use); whilst Cramer's V is interpreted as the strength of the relationship between category and selection method use (.10 - .20 indicates a weak relationship; .20 - .40 indicates a moderate relationship; and .40 - .60 indicates a relatively strong relationship). One limitation of using the Pearson Chi-square and Cramer's V statistics is that they only indicate whether or not there is a significant association *overall* between two variables, it does not indicate whether the observed frequency in any particular call is significantly different from the expected frequency. For this, we can use adjusted standardized residuals where those greater than +/- 2 are deemed significant (denoted by an asterisk in Table 3).

There were no significant associations between size of organization and the use of specific selection methods, with the exception of Group Exercise (χ^2 = 11.28, *crv* = .14, p = .02). A higher proportion of large and very large organizations reported using Group Exercises compared to micro, small and medium organizations.

There were significant associations between Industry sector and the following selection techniques: CV (χ^2 = 41.98, *crv* = .27, *p* < .001); References (χ^2= 13.10, *crv* = .15, *p* = .004); Structured Interview (χ^2 = 11.50, *crv* = .14, *p* = .009), Application Forms (χ^2 = 49.07, *crv* = .29, *p* < .001); Unstructured Interview (χ^2 = 17.58, *crv* = .17, *p* = .001); Criminal background check (χ^2 = 105.54, *crv* = .43, *p* < .001); and Drug / medical check (χ^2 = 29.82, *crv* = .23, *p* < .001). Compared to other sectors, a smaller proportion of organizations in the Public & Voluntary sector reported using the CV and unstructured interview. Moreover, a greater proportion of organizations in the Public and Voluntary reported using References, Structured Interviews,

Application Forms, criminal background and drug/medical checks compared with other industry sectors.

Discussion

In this study we examined the prevalence of selection assessment methods in UK organizations of different sizes and industry sectors. In general, a smaller proportion of the organizations we surveyed reported using formalized selection methods (e.g. psychometric tests, assessment centres) compared with informal methods. The most commonly used selection method was the Curriculum Vita (CV), followed by the 'traditional triad' of application form, interview and references (Cook, 1991). A greater proportion of organizations reported using structured interviews compared with unstructured interviews.

In general, the proportions of organizations using formalized selection methods were lower in our sample than in previous studies. In particular, when compared with previous large-organization studies, a smaller proportion of our sample reported using ability and aptitude testing, personality testing, and assessment centres. It is possible that this is due to the samples used in previous large-organization research. Organizations such as those in the Times 1000 index (a commonly used sampling frame in previous research) usually represent highly profitable, well-known brands. It may follow that these organizations are more likely to be able to invest in keeping up-to-date with new HR practices, and in the development of technical skills required to use formalized methods of assessment. Other large organizations may not have similar levels of resources to invest.

With respect to differences in selection practice across organizations of different sizes, the survey results also appear to highlight a misconception that large organizations are more

likely to use formalized methods than small organizations. Like previous studies (e.g. Bartram et al., 1995) we found that SMEs do report using unstructured methods, but proportions are no different to larger organizations. Moreover, in our study, a higher proportion of SMEs than in Bartram et al.'s reported using formalized methods. This is clearly encouraging for selection researchers. Possible reasons for the increased use of formalized methods by SMEs include greater availability of information on selection methods (e.g. the inclusion of psychological assessment techniques in non-psychology courses and books, as well as easier access to information on different techniques using the internet). This may mean that new developments are no longer accessible only to HR practitioners and psychologists, but also to small business owners and general managers. The introduction of new methods may also be comparatively straightforward in small organizations, which tend to have more procedural flexibility and fewer levels of bureaucracy to overcome compared with large organizations.

We found differences in the selection methods used by organizations from different industry sectors, consistent with findings by Bartram et al (1995). The present survey found that the Public & Voluntary sector is more likely to use formalized techniques, and to take up references, conduct criminal background checks and medical/drug tests. Boyne (2002) comments that on the whole, public organizations are strictly monitored and accountable for their actions, which may lead to the utilization of structured HR practices (Rainey, Pandey, & Bozeman, 1995) as found in this survey. Similarly, voluntary organizations rely on public donations and thus may share some of the characteristics of accountability and monitoring. Application forms and structured interviews may be viewed as standardized and therefore more legally defensible than CVs and unstructured interviews.

Implications

The survey results appear to highlight a gap between research and practice. Despite research findings that question the validity of informal, unstructured methods, many organizations still choose to use them. Smith and Abrahamsen (1992) demonstrated this when they found a negative relationship between the use of selection methods and their validity. This point has been commented on in previous surveys, most notably by Robertson and Makin (1986): "…in relation to the impact that current research should have upon selection practices, the results are depressing" (p. 51) Our findings do not present a reason to change that view substantially.

Some commentators (e.g. Guion, 1989) suggest that psychologists are at fault for the relative lack of impact of research on practice. Perhaps selection research has become overly technical at the expense of practitioner needs (Anderson, Herriot & Hodgkinson, 2001); organizations may prefer to use methods that require little technical capability to develop and implement. Alternatively, it could be that the gap between research and practice is due to the dominant positivist paradigm in selection research (Herriot, 1989; Herriot & Anderson, 1997), which some see as flawed and contrary to the perspective of many managers (Derous & De Witte, 2001; De Wolff, 1989; Herriot; 1989; 1993; 2002; Herriot & Anderson, 1997; McCourt, 1999). Selection techniques with less robust psychometric properties are popular because they serve purposes other than candidate assessment. For example, an interview can 'sell' an organization, provide an opportunity for candidates to learn more about the organization (Herriot, 2002), and help determine the extent to which candidates 'fit' with the team or organization (Anderson, 1992; Shackleton & Newell, 1991).

Limitations and recommendations for future research

There are a number of limitations that should be noted which, taken together, mean that our results should be interpreted with appropriate caution. First is the response rate, which is lower than ideal; however the absolute number of responses compares favorably to other studies published in the field (e.g. Keenan, 1995). Second is the fact that the survey did not specifically assess which selection practices related to different levels of entry. It is unlikely that organizations use the same process to fill every job; further research could address this issue by using the job as the unit of analysis, rather than the organization. A third limitation is that respondents were asked to indicate methods used, but not their frequency of use; thus there could have been an over-representation of some techniques used only occasionally in organisations. Fourthly, as with all questionnaire and survey data collection, it was not possible to ensure the survey was completed honestly and accurately. Fifthly, although we included a glossary of terms as a separate document for respondents, we could not determine whether the document was either read carefully or interpreted in the same way by all respondents. For example, the understanding of what constitutes a 'reference' could differ between organizations. Finally, whilst our multi-mode strategy of data collection may have encouraged participation, it is acknowledged that this strategy may have caused a mode effect. Nevertheless, the overwhelming majority of participants responded via weblink, so this limitation is minimized.

Final Comments

This study examined the prevalence of different selection assessment methods in UK organizations of different sizes and from different industry sectors, providing a timely update to similar previous studies. Our main finding was that as in previous studies, fewer organizations

use formalized methods of assessment compared to informal, unstructured methods. We also found clear similarities in the use of different selection methods in organizations of different sizes, and some variation in selection practices across different industry sectors.

References

Anderson, N. R. (1992). Eight Decades of Employment Interview Research: A Retrospective Meta-Review and Prospective Commentary. *European Work and Organizational Psychologist, 2*(1), 1-32.

Anderson, N., Herriot, P. & Hodgkinson, G.P. (2001). The Practitioner-Researcher Divide in Industrial, Work and Organizational (IWO) psychology: Where Are We Now, and Where Do We Go From Here? *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 74,* 391-412.

Barber, A. E., Wesson, M. J., Roberson, Q. M., & Taylor, M. S. (1999). A Tale of Two Job Markets: Organizational Size and its Effects on Hiring Practices and Job Search Behavior. *Personnel Psychology, 52*(4), 841-867.

Bartram, D., Lindley, P. A., Marshall, L., & Foster, J. (1995). The Recruitment and Selection of Young People by Small Businesses. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 68*(4), 339–358.

Billsberry, J. (2007). *Experiencing Recruitment and Selection.* Chichester: Wiley.

Boyne, G.A. (2002). Public and Private Management: What's the Difference? *Journal of Management Studies, 39,* 97-122.

Carroll, M., Marchington, M., Earnshaw, J., & Taylor, S. (1999). Recruitment in Small Firms. *Employee Relations, 21*(3), 236-250.

Cook, M. (1991). *Personnel Selection and Productivity.* New York: Wiley.

Curran, J. & Blackburn, R.A. (2001). *Researching the Small Enterprise.* London: Sage Publications.

Derous, E., & De Witte, K. (2001). Looking at Selection from a Social Process Perspective: Towards a Social Process Model on Personnel Selection. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology, 10*(3), 319-342.

De Wolff, C.J. (1989). The Prediction Paradigm. In M. Smith & I. T. Robertson (Eds.), *Advances in Selection and Assessment*. New York: John Wiley and Sons.

DTI (2006). National statistics. URL (Consulted: 3 February 2007): http://www.dtistats.net/smes/sme/smestats2005-ukspr.pdf

Guion, R. M. (1989). Comments on Personnel Selection Methods. In M. Smith & I. T. Robertson. (Eds.), *Advances in Selection and Assessment*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Heneman, H. G., & Berkley, R. A. (1999). Applicant Attraction Practices and Outcomes among Small Businesses. *Journal of Small Business Management, 37*(1), 53-55.

Herriot, P. (1989). Selection as a Social Process. In M. Smith & I. T. Robertson (Eds.), *Advances in selection and assessment*. New York: John Wiley and Sons.

Herriot, P. (1993). A Paradigm Bursting at the Seams. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 14*(4), 371-375.

Herriot, P. (2002). Selection and Self: Selection as a Social Process. *European journal of work and organizational psychology, 11*(4), 385-402.

Herriot, P., & Anderson, N. (1997). Selecting for Change: How Will Personnel and Selection Psychology Survive. *International handbook of selection and assessment*, 1–34.

Hodgkinson, G. P., & Payne, R. L. (1998). Graduate Selection in Three European Countries. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 71*(4), 359-365.

Hornsby, J. S., & Kuratko, D. F. (1990). Human Resource Management in Small Business: Critical Issues for the 1990s. *Journal of Small Business Management, 28*(3).

Keenan, T. (1995). Graduate Recruitment in Britain: A Survey of Selection Methods Used by Organizations. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 16*(4), 303-317.

McEvoy, G. M. (1984). Small Business Personnel Practices. *Journal of Small Business Management, 22*.

Rainey, H, Pandey, S, Bozeman, B (1995). Research Note: Public and Private Managers' Perceptions of Red Tape. *Public Administration Review, 55,* 567-574.

Robertson, I. T., & Makin, P. J. (1986). Management Selection in Britain: a Survey and Critique. *Journal of Occupational psychology, 59*(1), 45-57.

Shackleton, V., & Newell, S. (1994). European Management Selection Methods: A Comparison of Five Countries. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment, 2*(2), 91-102.

Schmidt, F. L., & Hunter, J. E. (1998). The validity and utility of selection methods in personnel psychology: Practical and theoretical implications of 85 years of research findings. *Psychological bulletin, 124*(2), 262-274.

Smith, M., & Abrahamsen, M. (1992). Patterns of Selection in Six Countries. *The Psychologist* (May), 205-207.

Tables

Table 1

Surveys of selection practices in large organizations and SMEs – percentage prevalence

	SME				Large				SME & Large
	M	H&K	BLMF	H&B	R&M	S&N	K	H&P	Z&W
N	(84)	(247)	(498)	(124)	(108)	(73)	(536)	(176)	(579)
Year	1984	1990	1995	1999	1986	1991	1995	1998	
Country	US	US	UK	US	UK / France	UK / France	UK	UK / France NL	UK
Interview**	90	100	91.4		99	100	100	97.6	
Work Sample			18.9	39.3					19.3
Ability / aptitude		30	15.3	30.1	29.2	69.9	97	78.3	39.0
Literacy / numeracy			18.2						28.2
Personality test			3.6		35.6	64.4	80	62.2	25.6
Application form	90	96					94	93.4	59.6
Background check				78.7					26.6
References		96		94.7	96.3	95.9	70	97.3	71.5
Biodata				91.0	5.8	19.1		16.7	27.3
Structured interview				70.6					69.4
Unstructured interview				86.8					41.8
Drug test		12							15.9
Assessment Centre					21.4	58.9	44	42.7	17.3

Note: ** Studies did not clarify whether the interview was structured or unstructured.

Key
M = McEvoy; H&K = Hornsby & Kuratko; BLMF = Bartram et al; H&B = Heneman & Berkley; K = Keenan; R&M = Robertson & Makin; S&N = Shackleton & Newell; H&P = Hodgkinson & Payne; Z&W = Zibarras & Woods, present survey.
NL = The Netherlands

Table 2

Demographic breakdown of the sample

Company Information	n	Percent
Organization Size		
Micro (0-9)	192	33.2
Small (10-49)	146	25.2
Medium (50-249)	102	17.6
Large (250-1000)	57	9.8
Very large (1000 plus)	82	14.2
Industry sector♦		
Business Services	279	48.2
Public and voluntary	118	20.4
Manufacturing	70	12.1
Other Services	112	19.3
Turnover*		
Less than £1m	209	36.1
£1 – 5m	111	19.2
£5 – 35m	110	19.0
£35m – 200m	73	12.6
£200m or more	67	11.8
Organization Age*		
0 – 5 years	123	21.2
6 – 10 years	109	18.8
11 – 25 years	162	28.0
25 or more years	182	31.4
Organization distribution		
Local	137	23.7
Regional	104	18.0
National	175	30.2
International	98	16.9
Global	65	11.2
HR Department?		
Yes	308	53.2
No	271	46.8

* N.B. some variable percentages do not round up to 100% due to missing cases

- There were no significant differences in organization size for each of the industries – thus there was an even spread across sizes for Industry

Table 3

Selection methods by Organization Size and Industry Sector (in descending order of total % organizations)

		Organization Size					Industry Sector			
	TOTAL (n=579)	Micro	Small	Medium	Large	V Large	BS	P&V	M	OS
CV	**84.8%**	83.3% *(160)*	88.4% *(129)*	81.4% *(83)*	82.5% *(47)*	87.8% *(72)*	91.0%* *(254)*	66.1%* *(78)*	90.0% *(63)*	85.7% *(96)*
References	**71.5%**	68.2% (131)	78.8% (115)	67.6% (69)	73.7% (42)	69.5% (57)	69.5% (194)	83.9%* (99)	61.4%* (43)	69.6% (78)
Structured interview	**69.4%**	69.8% *(134)*	69.2% *(101)*	70.6% *(72)*	73.7% *(42)*	64.6% *(53)*	65.6% *(183)*	82.2%* *(97)*	67.1% *(47)*	67.0% *(75)*
Application Form	**59.6%**	63.0% *(121)*	56.2% *(82)*	52.0% *(53)*	61.4% *(35)*	65.9% *(54)*	46.6%* *(130)*	83.1%* *(98)*	60.0% *(42)*	67.0% *(75)*
Trial period on the job	**58.2%**	60.9% *(117)*	60.3% *(88)*	56.9% *(58)*	40.4% *(23)*	62.2% *(51)*	59.1% *(165)*	50.8% *(60)*	57.1% *(40)*	64.3% *(72)*
Unstructured interview	**41.8%**	41.7% *(80)*	50.7% *(74)*	37.3% *(38)*	35.1% *(20)*	36.6% *(30)*	48.7%* *(136)*	26.3%* *(31)*	38.6% *(27)*	42.9% *(48)*
Aptitude / Ability test	**39.0%**	33.9% *(65)*	38.4% *(56)*	38.2% *(39)*	54.4% *(31)*	42.7% *(35)*	38.7% *(108)*	42.4% *(50)*	38.6% *(27)*	36.6% *(41)*
Numeracy / literacy test	**28.2%**	25.0% *(48)*	25.3% *(37)*	30.4% *(31)*	33.3% *(19)*	34.1% *(28)*	28.0% *(78)*	28.8% *(34)*	28.6% *(20)*	27.7% *(31)*
Biodata	**27.3%**	23.4% *(45)*	28.1% *(41)*	28.4% *(29)*	31.6% *(18)*	30.5% *(25)*	25.4% *(71)*	33.1% *(39)*	32.9% *(23)*	22.3% *(25)*

		Organization Size					Industry Sector			
	TOTAL (n=579)	Micro	Small	Medium	Large	V Large	BS	P&V	M	OS
Criminal Check	**26.6%**	23.4% *(45)*	30.1% *(44)*	20.6% *(21)*	28.1% *(16)*	34.1% *(28)*	17.2%* *(48)*	63.6%* *(75)*	11.4%* *(8)*	20.5% *(23)*
Personality Questionnaire	**25.6%**	25.0% (48)	24.7% *(36)*	26.5% *(27)*	31.6% *(18)*	23.2% *(19)*	25.4% *(71)*	21.2% *(25)*	28.6% *(20)*	28.6% *(32)*
Work Sample	**19.3%**	21.4% *(41)*	19.9% *(29)*	20.6% *(21)*	10.5% *(6)*	18.3% *(15)*	17.6% *(49)*	26.3% *(31)*	15.7% *(11)*	18.8% *(21)*
Assessment Centre	**17.3%**	19.3% *(37)*	11.0% *(16)*	14.7% *(15)*	21.1% *(12)*	24.4% *(20)*	16.8% *(47)*	23.7% *(28)*	8.6% *(6)*	17.0% *(19)*
Drug test / medical check	**15.9%**	13.5% *(26)*	15.1% *(22)*	20.6% *(21)*	15.8% *(9)*	17.1% *(14)*	9.0%* *(25)*	30.5%* *(36)*	20.0% *(14)*	15.2% *(17)*
Group Exercise	**14.9%**	14.6% *(28)*	10.3% *(15)*	10.8% *(11)*	24.6% *(14)*	22.0% *(18)*	14.0% *(39)*	17.8% *(21)*	8.6% *(6)*	17.9% *(20)*

Note. * denotes those cells with adjusted standardized residuals greater than + or - 2, indicating that the cell percentage is significantly different from what would be expected if there was no association with organization size

BS = Business Services; P&V = Public and Voluntary; M = Manufacturing; OS = Other services.

Appendix 1 – Research Instrument

About you
a) What is your role within your organization?
b) How long have you been working in your organization?

Part 1. Company Demographics

a) Please indicate the industry sector of your organization (please tick the main sector that applies)
   Construction
   Electricity, gas and water / energy
   Banking & Financial services
   Hotels & restaurants
   Manufacturing
   Other business services
   Other community services (e.g. voluntary)
   Public administration, education & health
   Transport & Communications
   Wholesale and retail

b) How would you categorize the distribution of your organization?
   Local / Regional / National / International / Global
c) How many years has your organization been in existence?
   0-5 years / 6-10 years / 11 – 25 years / 25 years or more
d) What was your organization's financial turnover last year?
   Less than £1m / £1 – 5m / £5 – 35m / £35m – 200m / £200m or more
e) Does your organization have an HR department?
   Yes / No

Part 2. Employee Demographics

a) Currently how many employees do you have on the payroll in your organization?
   1-9 / 10-49 / 50-249 / 250-1000 / 1000+

Part 3. Employee Selection Methods

a) The following section asks about the employee selection methods that your organization uses to choose candidates. Please indicate which of the following selection methods you use (please select all that apply):
   Application Form
   Curriculum Vitae
   Drug test / Medical check
   Criminal background check
   Aptitude / Ability test
   Numeracy / Literacy test
   Personality Questionnaire
   Trial period on the job
   Work Sample test
   Unstructured interview
   Structured interview
   Group exercises
   References
   Assessment Centre
   Biodata (e.g. qualifications and experience)