APPENDIX II

SELECTION METHODS USED IN GREAT BRITAIN

In Great Britain selection to the Administrative Classes is made according to two methods: Method I and Method II.

Method I In Britain up to 1936 Method I was the only method of selection for the entrants to the Administrative Class. Method I is the traditional type of academic examination divided into two parts. The first part consists of a qualifying examination made up of an essay, an English paper and a general paper. Only those students who attain the requisite standard in this part are allowed to proceed for the more competitive second part, which consists of written papers in a wide range of studies concerning most university honours subjects and of an interview. Method I is similar to the competitive examination conducted by the Public Service Commissions in India.

Method II This situation changed after the war when the restricted labour supply situation created a decisive trend against undergoing the strains of competitive written examination for entry to the civil service, when equally attractive posts were available without such effort. Necessity to meet this trend and the successful use of the psychological tests applied by the War Office Selection Board in recruiting the army officers during the World War II have led the Civil Service Commission to devise
an alternative method of selection, familiar as Method II test, which applies a screening probe into a candidate's character and capacities. Consequently, since 1948 the new method has been in operation in the United Kingdom, for recruitment to the Administrative Class. This is not an exclusive but an alternative method. The original intention was to recruit by the old method about 74% and by Method II up to 25% of the officers. Since 1952, however, the proportion has been increased in favour of Method II, 25 - 30% being recruited on this basis. This method of selection is entirely new approach to the problem of the selection method.

Nature of the Method II Examination
Method II comprises of the following three stages: (a) A short written examination consists of (i) two papers in English, (ii) two general papers and (iii) an intelligence test. (b) On the result of the examination and (for those with borderline mark) on an assessment of their achievement at school and university, candidates are invited to the Civil Service Selection Board (C.S.S.B.) in groups of five for a series of tests and interviews extending over two days. The tests for each group are conducted by a chairman, an observer and a psychologist. There are two groups of tests. The first group consists of the following tests; they are, each separately marked out of 500, as follows:

(iv) A written appreciation, (v) a drafting test, (vi) a committee exercise: performance as chairman, (vii) a committee
exercise performance as member, (viii) a group discussion, (ix) an interview (40 minutes) with the chairman of the Selection Board who gives special attention to how a candidate has spent his time since leaving school, to his leisure pursuits and to his reasons for seeking a job in the public service. (x) an interview (40 minutes) with the observer, mainly to assess the quality of the candidate's mind, (xi) an interview (40 minutes) with the psychologist to assess his temperament and personality.

The second group consists of psychological and cognitive tests designed to measure aspects of intellectual ability, they are each separately marked on a seven point scale, as follows: (xii) two short intelligence tests which provide evidence of basic mental ability, and power of expression, (xiii) a statistical inference test which gives an indication of ability to think numerically, (xiv) a short exercise testing the range but not the depth of general information about current affairs.

At the same time a close attention is also paid to the reports from school and university, and the assessors have to make their best estimate to potential for future development. The marks given for the various tests are not added together to produce an aggregate score. When the tests are completed the chairman, the observer and the psychologist together consider the candidate's performance and agree on a final mark (out of 500). In agreeing this mark they take into account the candidate's marks on each of the separate tests; but their overall mark is their impression of the candidate's general performance in the
interviews mentioned above.

(c) Those reaching a certain minimum standard in the tests at C.S.S.B., then go before the Final Selection Board, which like the Final Interview Board of Method I is under the chairmanship of the first civil service commissioner, and determines the candidate's place in the competition. The Final Selection Board awards a mark out of a maximum of 300 for intellectual and personal qualities. The Final Selection Board takes into account the same kind of evidence at the Final Interview Board and, in addition, the candidate's performance in the Method II written examination together with the detailed assessment made by the C.S.S.B. of the candidate's intellectual and personal qualities and its recommendations on his suitability of appointment. The interview before this board is decisive, it determines whether or not the candidate will be offered an appointment in the service.

Defects of Method II

A serious defect of the Method II selection is that the determination of the suitability of the candidate to be offered appointment is the sole responsibility of the Final Selection Board. In considering the suitability of the candidate it pays attention to the marks given by the C.S.S.B. and to the reports of the chairman, observer and psychologist but it is not bound by the C.S.S.B.'s findings. Thus the system, as it has been observed by the Fulton Committee of 1968, gives too much weight to the general and (necessarily impressionistic) interview by the Final
Selection Board which lasts less than forty minutes, and too little weight to the tests at C.S.S.B. which last two days and which provide the basis for a searching and objective assessment. Therefore, in order to make the process of Method II more objective the Fulton Committee has provided three possible lines of suggestions:

(a) The assessment of a candidate should be based on the cumulative total of the marks he has gained at the various stages of the selection process. Methods of marking the performance in the various types of tests should be devised to make the aggregation possible.

(b) The Final Selection Board should be abolished and the suitability of the candidate should be determined at the end of the C.S.S.B. process because the Final Selection Board is bound to rely too much upon personal and social evaluation and also because the three-stage selection process is unnecessarily lengthy. The C.S.S.B. should be given a change in its composition by attaching representatives from universities, industry and the government departments to the C.S.S.B. for the appropriate stage of the proceedings.

(c) The last stage of the selection process should be an interview by a separate interview board, but this board should be limited to give its own mark for the interview it conducts (as in Method I). The final selection of the candidate for appointment would be made by the aggregate of the marks given by the interview board, by C.S.S.B. and by the examiners at the qualifying written examination.

It is evident from the above analysis that method II is essentially a modern approach which gives special emphasis on personality and quick wittedness instead of sheer intellectual ability. It is the less burdensome test of educational competence.

2 Idem.
and it produces more good entrants. Table 1 will show a comparative analysis of the actual performance in the service of recruits by Method I and Method II.

Table 1

Performance of Administrative Class (U.K.) Recruits According to Departmental Grading.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grading</th>
<th>Passed by Method II</th>
<th>Passed by Method I</th>
<th>Passed by M.I. but who had failed in M.II</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very good indeed</td>
<td>18 (13.6)</td>
<td>12 (5.2)</td>
<td>2 (2.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distinctly above average</td>
<td>60 (45.5)</td>
<td>69 (29.9)</td>
<td>18 (24.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well up to standard</td>
<td>45 (34.1)</td>
<td>117 (50.6)</td>
<td>39 (53.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total with good reports</td>
<td>123 (93.2)</td>
<td>198 (85.7)</td>
<td>59 (80.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rather below standard</td>
<td>8 (6.1)</td>
<td>27 (11.7)</td>
<td>10 (13.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsatisfactory</td>
<td>1 (0.7)</td>
<td>6 (2.6)</td>
<td>4 (5.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>132 (100)</td>
<td>231 (100)</td>
<td>73 (100)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Reproduced from the ARC Report of the Study Team on Recruitment, Selection U.P.S.C./State P.S.Cs. and Training, para 7.4.8.

What is discernible from the above table is that though the general standard of recruitment by both methods has given satisfaction, Method II appears to produce a higher proportion of good entrants.