

Summary of the evidence base for Values Based Recruitment

Screen / selection method	Evidence from literature review	Evidence from practice – HEIs	Evidence from practice - Trusts	Conclusions
Application forms, incorporating personal statements and references	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Despite widespread use of personal statements and autobiographical submissions in selection, the research evidence suggests they have poor predictive validity, low reliability and are not likely to reflect the true nature of candidates. Although references are used widely in selection in a variety of occupations, including healthcare, large-scale empirical studies consistently show that references tend to be unreliable, biased and ineffective at predicting job performance. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Application forms which include a personal statement and referee(s) statement is commonly used by HEIs as part of the screening process for the majority of programmes. The candidate's educational qualification is the information most likely to inform selection decisions. Many application forms are not scored against a predetermined scoring system suggesting there may be a degree of variability in the way in which different assessors/short-listers use the information for some programmes/institutions. Compared to other selection methods, application forms are less likely to be used to provide insight into a candidate's values. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Although commonly used for screening processes, application forms were not cited by Trusts as an example of VBR. 	<p>Whilst use is widespread and often necessary to manage numbers and ensure appropriate screening against entry criteria, there is little research supporting validity or reliability therefore an ineffective method for VBR.</p>
Situational Judgement Tests (SJT)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Offering improved validity over other selection tools (IQ and personality tests), SJTs can be mapped to organisational values and are less susceptible to group differences than other selection methods. Whilst SJTs can be relatively 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> SJTs are not commonly used by HEIs although when they are these are used at both screening and selection stages. They are more commonly used by Nursing programmes, likely to be in part because they offer a more efficient way of managing high 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is evidence of Trusts using SJTs however these tend to be used at the screening stage to help screen out unsuitable candidates. Practical constraints result in challenges associated with undertaking piloting and 	<p>Can be an effective method for VBR however requires investment in development and evaluation to ensure</p>

	<p>costly to design, they are machine-markable and can be delivered on-line, producing cost savings in high volume selection.</p>	<p>volumes of applications.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Many SJTs have been designed in-house and there is some variability in how they are developed, delivered and evaluated. 	<p>evaluation activity which impacts on the value or usefulness of the tools introduced.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tools which are designed to cover a broad range of roles and which have been developed without stakeholder consultation are likely to be less well received. 	<p>robustness, especially in screening.</p>
<p>Personality testing</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concerns regarding faking in operational selection and low face validity can compromise the validity of personality assessments. • Where there is a high risk of susceptibility to coaching, personality tests are best used to drive more focused questioning at interviews. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Personality testing is not commonly used by HEIs at either screen or selection. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Personality testing was not cited by Trusts as an example of VBR. 	<p>Could be effective to support VBR selection methods at attraction stages, as part of self-selection or to drive focused questioning at interviews.</p>
<p>Unstructured (or 'traditional') interviews</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Unstructured interviews have low reliability, low predictive validity, and poor legal defensibility due in part to being prone to bias and errors. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are few instances of HEIs using traditional or unstructured interviews as part of the selection process. • When used, they tend to be delivered by multiple interviewers (often including NHS staff) who are encouraged to explore a candidate's values but as the questions and scoring criteria are not predetermined there is likely to be inconsistencies in the approach taken and a greater risk of bias. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is variability in the degree of structured used by Trusts in their interviewing process and therefore it is likely that some are taking more of an unstructured approach. 	<p>Uncommonly used and an ineffective for VBR even when interviewers are encouraged to explore a candidate's values.</p>

<p>Structured interviews e.g. competency-based, situational</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Interviews based on a thorough role analysis, use structured and standardised questions with trained interviewers and appropriate scoring can be reliable and valid. • Research suggests that interviews that are better designed and developed specifically to assess particular constructs show greater evidence of construct-related validity. • Candidates prefer interviews to other methods although they are relatively resource intensive. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The majority of HEI programmes use a structured interview as part of the selection process. • This is typically delivered by multiple interviewers (often including NHS staff) and generally a large proportion of the interview is spent exploring a candidate's values. • In the majority of cases interviewers have flexibility to ask relevant follow up or probing questions. This is especially important when exploring a candidate's values. • Predetermined scoring systems are often used which will help to improve the consistency in decision making and reduce bias. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Trusts using structured interviews generally see this as an effective method of improving hiring decisions however they are also seen as resource-intensive. • The effectiveness of this method is reliant on the manner in which the interview is conducted and scored. • Organisational engagement and stakeholder consultation are seen as important aspects when developing structured interviews. • Access to appropriate assessor/interviewer training is also an important consideration. 	<p>Effective method for VBR when appropriately designed and delivered and interviewers are appropriately trained.</p>
<p>Multiple Mini Interview (MMI)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of good reliability and validity. Reliability increases with the number of stations however this also increases cost and resources required. Generally MMIs achieve favourable candidate reactions. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MMIs are becoming an increasingly popular selection method within HEIs, particularly with Undergraduate Medical and Dental programmes. • There is variability in the number of 'stations' candidates visit but the majority are based on a predetermined structure both in terms of the questions asked and the scoring system. • MMIs are more likely than a structured interview to assess a candidate's values based on responses to hypothetical situations. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MMIs were not cited by Trusts as an example of VBR. 	<p>Effective method for VBR when designed appropriately.</p>

<p>Group interviews/tasks</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Whilst group interviews appear more cost efficient in terms of assessor time, evidence for reliability, validity and fairness is lacking. • The evidence suggests although group interviews are better predictors of performance than academic criteria, they are significantly worse predictors when compared to one-to-one interviews. There is also an increased likelihood that candidates will perceive group interviews as unfair. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Group Interviews/tasks are the second most popular selection method within HEIs after structured interviews, they are most likely to be used by Nursing and Midwifery programmes. • There is a large degree of variability in how group interviews/tasks are used with sometimes 10 or more candidate's being assessed within a single group which runs for less than 30 minutes. • Often candidates are not asked predetermine questions. This is likely to make it challenging to manage the interaction and ensure all candidates are given ample opportunity to contribute. • Group interviews/tasks, unlike structured interviews, provide the opportunity to assess a candidates through the way in which they interact with others. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Group interviews/tasks were not cited by Trusts as an example of VBR directly, however they may form one part of a Selection Centre (see below). 	<p>Group interviews/tasks are generally an ineffective method for VBR unless carefully designed to minimise the influencing effects of other group members and used in conjunction with other methods.</p>
<p>Selection centres (SC) using work samples e.g. group exercises, written/in-tray task, presentations, interactive exercises</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • When designed appropriately (using a multi-trait, multi-method approach with work samples), SCs are valid predictors of job performance. • Candidates are positive towards SCs as they have multiple opportunities to perform. SCs are relatively expensive to design and implement, however most organisation feel that this level of cost was 'justified'. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Many HEI programmes incorporate a number of different methods into the selection process including those listed above as well as numeracy/ literacy test and written tests. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is evidence that Trusts have achieved improved recruitment outcomes following the introduction of a SC however the resource-intensive nature of the implementation is a key consideration and for this reason they may be considered appropriately only for certain roles. 	<p>Effective method for VBR when designed appropriately.</p>

