



Validation Report

Success Rate for Leader Appointments 2020

By Emma Jonsson, 2022-01-18

Evaluation of the predictive validity of the Mercuri Urval Assessment Method

Description of the Sample and Method

The follow-up study is made on individuals employed to leader positions (positions categorised as Executives or Managers) in 19 countries during September 2019 and December 2020 after being assessed by Mercuri Urval experts using the MU Assessment methodology (Carlstedt, Hagafors, and Jonsson, 2020). The full sample consists of 721 individuals at Executive and Manager positions.

The follow-up is made through questionnaires being sent to hiring managers approximately 6 months after employment. This method is chosen since supervisor ratings are most used in research for evaluation of performance and success at work and data suggest that it is the most reliable kind of performance ratings (e.g., Alessandri, Borgogni, & Truxillo, 2015; Stokes, Schneider & Lyons, 2010; Viswesvaran, Ones, & Schmidt, 1996). Research into recruitment failure commonly cites a period less than 18 months after employee start date (e.g., Kiefer, Martin, & Hunt, 2020; Schmidt & Hunter, 1992).

Responses have been received for 271 of the total 721 individuals (38% response rate) for Executive and Manager positions. An analysis of the non-responses indicates no systematic pattern, and it is concluded that these are random and have no significant impact on the result of this study.

Validation

In the follow-up questionnaire, the hiring manager was asked to evaluate each leader's overall performance so far. This evaluation is made as a rating of overall achievement on a three-step scale:

1. The individual does not meet expectations.
2. The individual meets expectations.
3. The individual exceeds expectations.

The success-rate is analysed and presented in nominal values and percentages.

Results of evaluation

In the table 1 and 2 the outcome of the results of the employments during September 2019 and December 2020 in Executives and Managers position made in

Executive Search, Professional Recruitment and Selection assignments made by Mercuri Urval experts.

Table 1. Rated success for Executives and Managers, valid percentages.

	Total	Success rate	Do not meet expectations	Meets expectations	Exceeds expectations
Nominal values	271	255	16	191	64
Valid percentages	100.0%	94.1%	5.9%	70.5%	23.6%

The ratings show that the employments were evaluated as successful by the hiring managers. 94.1% of the evaluated individuals were rated as fulfilling or exceeding the demands on the position (response rate 38%).

Among the 271 employments one was assessed as not recommended by Mercuri Urval, this individual met the expectations.

In table 2 the follow-up result is presented by gender.

Table 2. Follow-up results presented by gender.

	Total	Success rate	Does not meet expectations	Meets expectations	Exceeds expectations
Men	130	91.5%	8.5%	66.2%	25.4%
Women	75	98.7%	1.3%	73.3%	25.3%

The difference between men and women is not statistically significant. Data on gender was not received in 66 of the cases (24%).

Conclusions

The analysis of the evaluations of the performance of employed candidates at Executives or Manager positions show that 94.1% were meeting or exceeding expectations on achievement. This replicates the results reported by Carlstedt, Hagafors, and Jonsson (2020) where 332 managers employed during 2011-2012 were evaluated by hiring managers. This evaluation resulted in 94.6% were fulfilling or exceeding expectations.

The response rate for digitally distributed questionnaires has in recent research been reported to be at the level presented in this report (see e.g., Ebert, Huibers, Christensen, and Christensen, 2018).

To cope with this methodological challenge, it is important both to make recurring follow-up studies and to investigate ways to increase the response rate. Research made by e.g., Rolstad, Adler, and Rydén (2011) provides give input to possible actions for influencing response rate.

These results show that Mercuri Urval experts using the Mercuri Urval Assessment methodology provides accurate recommendations and brings significant value for organisations.

References

- Alessandri, G., Borgogni, L., & Truxillo, D. M. (2015). Tracking job performance trajectories over time: A six-year longitudinal study. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology, 24*(4), 560–577
- Carlstedt, L., Hagafors, R. & Jonsson, E. (2020). *The Mercuri Urval Assessment method*. Technical Report
- Ebert, J. F., Huibers, L., Christensen, B., & Christensen, M. B. (2018). Paper- or Web-Based Questionnaire Invitations as a Method for Data Collection: Cross-Sectional Comparative Study of Differences in Response Rate, Completeness of Data, and Financial Cost. *Journal of medical Internet research, 20*(1), e24.
- Kiefer, K., Martin, J. A., & Hunt, R. A. (2022). Multi-Level Considerations in Executive Organizational Transfer. *Human Resource Management Review, 3*(1)
- Rolstad, S., Adler, J., & Rydén, A. (2011). Response burden and questionnaire length: is shorter better? A review and meta-analysis. *Value in Health, 14*(8), 1101-1108.
- Schmidt, F. L., & Hunter, J. E. (1992). Development of a causal model of processes determining job performance. *Current Directions in Psychological Science, 1*(3), 89–92.
- Stokes, C.K, Schneider, T.R., & Lyons, J.B (2010). Adaptive performance: a criterion problem. *Team Performance Management, 16*(3/4), 212-230.
- Viswesvaran, C., Ones, D.S., Schmidt, F. L. (1996). Comparative analysis of the reliability of job performance ratings. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 81*(5), 557-574

