

Selection of Chairs of Primary Care Trusts: Evidence of Reliability and Validity

Abstract

Purpose – Following an extensive review of the literature, this paper examines empirical evidence of the criterion, construct, and face validity of two processes commonly used in selection – selection interviews and assessment centres (ACs) – in the selection of Chairs of Primary Care Trusts.

Design/methodology/approach – A critical review of the literature and an empirical investigation.

Findings – Evidence is presented of the reliability and the predictive, construct, and face validity of using a combination of selection interviews and AC methodology in appointments to public office. In the light of the evidence of the potential benefits of using more than one approach, it is suggested that a combination of AC methodology and panel interviews be used in making public sector appointments.

Practical implications – The evidence presented supports the decision of the Appointment Commission to use AC methodology in the selection for positions in public office, and points to ways in which the process could be improved.

Originality/value – The paper provides empirical evidence of the reliability and validity of two methodologies used in selection to posts.

Keywords – Selection interview, Assessment centre, Construct validity, Predictive validity, Face validity, Chairs, PCTs

Paper type – Literature review and empirical investigation.

Reference:

This paper has been submitted to a peer-reviewed journal: Alban-Metcalfe, J., Alimo-Metcalfe, B. & Hughes, M. (2010). Selection of Chairs of Primary Care Trusts: Evidence of Reliability and Validity. *Journal of Health & Organizational Management* (accepted for publication).