

**JOHN DOE - ASSESSMENT**

**WORK APPROACH**

The assessments indicate that Mr. Doe is an energetic, dominant, bold leader who is highly independent-minded and forms his own opinions. Friendly to strangers and likely to make a good first impression, Mr. Doe is likely to be a good conversationalist. He is conscientious, neat, punctual and well organized, and is likely to strive for excellence in any endeavor he undertakes. He is willing to challenge the status quo, and to experiment with new and innovative ways of doing things, although he can also respect the value of tradition. He likes to control others and his environment, and can be persistent until he gets his way. Socially fearless and uninhibited, he is comfortable in group situations, is willing to share his true thoughts and feelings with others, and is likely to have a high need for influence and attention. The assessments state that Mr. Doe is likely to “enjoy the limelight”. He is generally confident and optimistic, and willing to take risks, although he may have self-doubt on occasion and may have blocked off awareness of some of his negative attributes. He had a difficult time in the interview articulating his weaknesses and describing any negative or developmental feedback that he had received during his career. On the positive side, he is self-critical, admits mistakes and is open to coaching and feedback about how he can improve his performance. However, when stressed or under pressure, he may become “threatened or alarmed” the assessments predict, adding that “he may require a lot of reassurance about his performance” which might become burdensome for his boss. Despite his insecurities, he is likely to be a resilient leader and to be energetically persistent in the face of obstacles and setbacks. At times, though, he may come across as “overly demanding or pushy” and the assessments caution, he may “intimidate colleagues.” In the interview, he mentioned that he used to motivate people “more with sticks than with carrots” but that he has learned that he “needs to go a little lighter on his team”. He is able to take unpopular stands and to give others candid feedback, even if it is negative, but may have some lack of awareness about others. His average level of emotional intelligence can make it difficult for him to understand others’ true motivations and concerns. The assessments caution that Mr. Doe “may be unaware of the effects or appropriateness” of his actions which means that cultural sensitivity is likely to be an area of weakness for him. He is likely to take an objective and unsentimental approach to work and to management, but is able to be empathic at times, and can be supportive to staff when necessary. At times he can be considerate to others, and responsive to requests for assistance. However, he may have a tendency to take credit too often which can be demotivating to others.

**INTELLECTUAL EFFECTIVENESS**

Mr. Doe tested in the 85<sup>th</sup> Percentile on the Wonderlic Personnel Test, which measures basic math and verbal skills and is like an SAT test. This score is acceptable, although at the lower end of acceptability for someone applying for a position as senior as vice president. Mr. Doe scored in the 15<sup>th</sup> percentile on the Watson-Glaser Critical Thinking Test, which is like the LSAT or the Analytic section of the GRE. This very low score, especially relative to other

**Mr. John Doe Assessment**

**Page 2 of 3**

candidates for positions at the level of the job for which Mr. Doe is being considered, raise serious concerns about his ability to be effective in the role. Part of the reason that he did not test well could be due to his personality, which the assessments describe as “impulsive” and “careless about rules and procedures”. Some of the mistakes that Mr. Doe made seem very basic, and like he wouldn’t have made them if he had paid more attention or taken the assessments more seriously. In the interview, Mr. Doe mentioned that he was concerned that he might not have done particularly well on the analytic assessment since “analytics are not one of my greatest strengths”. It would be helpful to ensure that reference checks and any additional interviews focus specifically on ascertaining whether Mr. Doe has the basic intelligence and problem solving ability to be successful in the vice president role. There is some indication that he would do better in divergent (creative) thinking tasks than in convergent (analytic, problem solving) tasks.

**INTERPERSONAL RELATIONSHIPS**

On the positive side of interpersonal relationships, Mr. Doe enjoys interacting with other people and prefers working collaboratively. He can also be candid with other people, and they will likely know where they stand with him at any given moment. However, the assessments raise some serious concerns about his ability to effectively lead and collaborate. According to the tests, Mr. Doe can be “self-critical, tense and moody” and as a result, may at times actually “yell at his staff”, “become abrupt and even irritable” and be “blunt and undiplomatic.” He is not an agreeable person, and the assessments warn that he can be “brusque or even rude in dealings with others.” He also is likely to be “impatient with others’ mistakes” and “unconcerned about annoying others” and “likely to express hostile feelings directly with little hesitation”. Mr. Doe is likely to risk alienating colleagues and staff because he puts “his priorities ahead of others” and acts “hastily and impetuously” and “before others understand his reasons”. The adjectives used to describe Mr. Doe in the assessments are extremely negative, and include “stubborn, critical, selfish, callous, competitive and antagonistic”. While he is unlikely to be well-liked by others, he may be respected for his critical independence. The assessments also mention that he is manipulative and “willing at times to flatter or trick people into doing what he wants” and prone to getting overly involved in office politics. Given the above, Mr. Doe would likely face substantial challenges in building loyal, cohesive teams and in setting a positive example as a leader.

**COMPETENCIES AND DEVELOPMENTAL NEEDS**

**Mr. John Doe Assessment**

Page 3 of 3

**Probable Competencies**

- Making a good first impression that draws upon his extraversion and sociability
- Boldness and willingness to take risks, take unpopular stands and confidently lead others
- Creativity, receptivity to new ideas, and willingness to change course if necessary

**Probable Developmental Needs**

- Difficulty in successfully solving complex problems that require analytic ability
- Challenges in leveraging emotional intelligence to understand and motivate others
- Coming across as rude, hostile, brusque, harsh, stubborn, manipulative and selfish
- Managing his own work and those of others in a consistent and disciplined manner

**SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

Although Mr. Doe has good experience and some of the personality attributes that could contribute to effective performance, his low cognitive ability test scores and problematic personality attributes raise serious concerns about his candidacy. Given a consistent and negative set of assessment results, the risks and costs of hiring Mr. Doe are likely to outweigh the potential benefits of hiring him, and therefore, he is not recommended for the position.

*The above summary is based upon the results of the Wonderlic Personnel Test, the Watson Glaser Critical Thinking Appraisal, the NEO PI-R, the Hogan Personality Inventory, and the 16PF tests (none of which were proctored or timed), and an interview. These tests of cognitive ability and personality are based on professionally conducted research and modern scale construction techniques. The results should be interpreted as probabilities since neither job performance nor human behavior can be predicted with one hundred percent accuracy. This report is intended to be used in conjunction with, not as a substitute for, other job relevant information gathered during the screening process. Ultimately, a final decision for any job candidate should be based on a combination of the results detailed above and other sources, such as candidate education, work experience, comprehensive reference checks, presentations or work samples, and face-to-face job interviews.*