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THE DESIGN OF A DIFFERENTIAL SELECTION MODEL FOR SPECIFIC STUDY DISCIPLINES AT A TECHNIKON

"It is in fact nothing short of a miracle that the modern methods of instruction have not yet entirely strangled the holy curiosity of inquiry; for this delicate little plant, aside from stimulation, stands mainly in need of freedom; without this it goes to wrack and ruin without fail." Albert Einstein

by

SONIA SWANEPOEL

Study leader: Prof SW Theron
Department: Human Resources Management
Degree: D Com (Human Resources Management)

In 1999 the Department Human Resources Management received 1 625 applications for admission to the National Diploma course in Human Resources Management and in 2000, 1 750. Only 70 students could be admitted. By comparison the Industrial Engineering Department received only 331 applications in 1999 and 430 in 2000 of which only admit 100 students could be admitted. To date senior certificate results are weighted (Swedish formula) and used as the only method of selection. Given the current problems in education and the environmental constraints of the majority of applicants, the Swedish formula can no longer be used as the sole selection mechanism.

The purpose of this research, therefore, is to design a selection model which can be utilised to select students for the abovementioned courses.
During the theoretical investigation the concept of selection and the compilation of selection models was emphasised in all the forms, as well as validity strategies to determine validity. The problems relevant to the criteria for success were also researched.

Three main categories of predictors were scrutinised, viz. —

- matric subjects,
- Swedish formula,
- traditional psychometric tests, and
- popular tests such as Discuss, Myers-Briggs and the Nowicki-Strickland & Lefcourt I/E scales.

Calculations of the relations between Technikon major subjects and these predictors were done.

A multiple hurdle model for selection is presented (refer to Figures 11.1 and 11.2) for the Human Resources Management and Industrial Engineering programmes.

The first hurdle in the both the selection models is the Swedish formula based on matric subjects.

The second hurdle is internal locus of control, which relates to both Personnel Management and Industrial Engineering subjects.

The third hurdle for Personnel Management applicants is the Discuss while for the Industrial Engineering applicants the Myers-Briggs is used to correlate results.

The aim of the study which has been achieved and has culminated in the presentation of two selection models for the different disciplines. These findings can be fine-tuned in the quest for an ultimate selection model.