

Index

Page references followed by *fig* indicate an illustrated figure.

A

ABCDE model of coaching, 147
Abilities: age and generation differences in, 118; definition of, 78; demands-abilities motivators, 123; improving performance by improving, 115; testing to identify different types of, 85–87. *See also* Knowledge, skills, and abilities (KSAs)
Ability tests: creativity, 86; deductive reasoning, 86; dexterity, 86; inductive reasoning, 85; numerical reasoning, 85; sensory ability, 86; spatial ability, 86; verbal reasoning, 85
ACHIEVE model of coaching, 147
Action learning, 144–145
Actualization, 101–102
AFL-CIO compensation report (2000), 84
Age differences: changes in motivation by, 118–119; summary of motivation trends by, 122*fig*
Amazon, 32, 34*fig*
Ambler, T., 40
American Express: approach to creating an employer brand by, 52–56; “challenging Work with a Purpose” employer brand at, 55; employer value proposition (EVP) of, 56; *For Living* campaign of, 55; Global Talent Acquisition and Management team at, 52; *Powered by Innovation, Engineered by You* campaign of, 55; updating the outdated Careers website of, 53
American Society for Training and Development, 128
AmplifyTalent, 43
Anti-discrimination laws, 66–68
Apish Morphonology, 79, 82*fig*
Apple: job analysis on, 7; Universum list of top companies (2014) inclusion of, 32, 34*fig*
“Artist” cohort archetype, 120
Assessment: capability, 58–95; employee development, 128, 133–140; performance management use of, 170, 172; psychometric, 67–68, 97–126*fig*; risk and value, 59–66; succession planning role of, 161; summary of assessing, developing, and supporting staff, 178–179*fig*. *See also* Evaluation; Questionnaires; Testing

Assessment centers: description and origins of, 88–89; five different simulation types used at, 89; matrix used to put together a, 90*fig*; role and number of assessors at, 90–91; simple example of a, 91*fig*
Astrology personality models, 105
AT&T assessment center, 89
AT&T brand, 43
Atlantic Health System, 31, 34*fig*

B

Baby Boomer’s (born 1943 to 1960), 119, 120, 121, 122*fig*
Bain and Company, 31, 34*fig*
Balanced psychological contracts, 132*fig*, 175–176
The Balanced Scorecard, 173
Ball Brothers Mason Jar Study, 4*fig*
Bank of America Merrill Lynch, 33, 34*fig*
Baptist Health, 31, 34*fig*
“Barnum effect,” 100
Barnum, P. T., 100
Barrow, S., 40
Behavior competencies benchmarking survey (2006), 14
Behavioral change programs, 143–145
Behavioral competencies: challenge of defining, 13–17; comparing capability with, 15; creating organization-wide framework for, 16–25; definition of, 11; job description category of, 11–13; process of establishing a new habit and, 143; self-awareness for employee development need and, 135–136, 137; summary of assessing, developing, and supporting staff, 178, 179*fig*. *See also* Competencies
Behavioral competency framework tradeoffs: custom or generic content, 18; functional or organizational span, 19; issues to consider, 17–18; leveled or flat structure, 18–19; separate or blended content, 19–20*fig*
Behavioral competency frameworks: examining the task of building a, 16–17; examples of blended, 20*fig*; the good and bad of, 21–25; the tradeoffs when building a, 17–21

- Bernreuter Personality Inventory for Neurotic Tendency, Self-Sufficiency, Introversion, and Dominance, 107
- Bersin and Associates, 28, 46, 173
- Best Employer Brand (ERE), 44
- Big Data: monitoring change through, 173–175; performance management use of, 170–171, 176. *See also* Data; Technological tools
- Big Five (Five Factor Model of Personality), 110
- Binet standardized IQ test, 80, 83
- Biodata personality model, 106
- Biographical interviews, 68, 71
- Blair, T., 143
- Blended competency framework: example of a, 20*fig*; separate content or, 19–20
- Blended learning programs, 140–141
- Blogging4Jobs, 38
- Borman, W., 6
- The Boston Consulting Group, 30, 34*fig*
- Boyatzis, R., 13
- British Civil Service: assessment center used in post-World War II, 88–89; job analysis used by the, 3
- British Psychological Society (BPS), 111
- Burns and McDonnell, 30, 34*fig*
- BusinessWeek*, 32
- C**
- California Personality Inventory, 107
- Calipers (Cranionometry), 79, 80*fig*
- Camden Property Trust, 30, 34*fig*
- Cameron, 32, 34*fig*
- Candidate experience: Australian poll conducted on, 57; blame placed on organization for poor, 57; CEB study on failure to collect data on, 173; identifying what goes wrong with the, 58; increasing company focus on the, 57–58; interviews and, 69–70; legal requirements related to the, 66–68; social media used to share poor, 57. *See also* Experience
- Candidate misrepresentation: potential for psychometric assessment and, 98; surveys confirming incidents of, 60; value and risk evaluation to guard against, 60–66
- Candidates: chemistry and mismatched personalities of recruiters and, 74–75; dishonest misrepresentation by, 60; evaluation to guard against misrepresentation by, 60–66; fundamental attribution error and placing blame on the, 72–73; knowledge, skills, and abilities (KSAs) of, 68, 77–87; point of comparison and internal, 73; snap judgments made by assessors on, 71–72; understanding job requirements and potential to fill them by, 58
- Capabilities: comparing behavioral competencies with, 15; creating organization-wide framework for, 16–25; job description, 15–16; performance = capability x motivation formula on, 97, 126; 10,000-hour rule on development of, 84
- Capability assessment: difficulties in coming up with one rating, 75–77; fundamental attribution error and placing blame during, 72–73; genetic cognitive ability (IQ or its derivatives), 58, 78–85; how chemistry and personality issues impact, 74–75; increasingly used by companies, 65; interviews used for, 68–77; issue of using out of context data, 95; knowledge, skills, and abilities (KSAs) and IQ testing for, 77–87; measuring candidates against current needs versus future potential issue, 94–95; other traditional tools used for, 58–59; point of comparison issue of, 73–74; questions to ensure appropriate measures for, 95–96; snap judgments by recruiters impacting, 71–72; value and risk, 60–66; work simulations used for, 88–94
- Capability framework tradeoffs: custom or generic content, 18; functional or organizational span, 19; issues to consider, 17–18; leveled or flat structure, 18–19; separate or blended content, 19–20*fig*
- Capability frameworks: examining the task of building a, 16–17; the good and bad of, 21–25; the tradeoffs when building a, 17–21
- Card sort, 10*fig*
- Career development. *See* Employee development
- Carleton College, 72
- “The carrot or the stick,” 101
- Carter, G., 23
- Case study program, 141
- CEB: Employer Branding at, 38; findings on drop in identifying high potentials (2005–2010) by, 166; high potential model of, 164; on high rate of significant changes by organizations, 155; rating effectiveness of different development programs, 141–142; reporting (2014) on average spent on employer branding, 40; reporting (2004) on executive coaching use, 129; reporting on high level of change (2008–2012), 169; study on failure to collect data on candidate experience, 173; succession planning research (2013) by, 160
- Center for Creative Leadership, 128, 166

- CEOs: compensation disparity between workers and, 84–85; succession planning for, 159–163
- Change: Big Data and monitoring, 170–171, 173–175, 176; CEB reporting on high level (2008–2012) of, 169; examining process of organizational culture, 156–176; how the psychological contract can be broken by, 156, 157–159, 168; identifying high potentials to prepare for, 163–168; moving from balanced to transactional psychological contract to manage, 175–176; as part of any health organization, 155; planning for succession, 159–168; various forms taken by, 155. *See also* Organizations
- Charles Schwab brand, 43
- The Chartered Institute of Personnel Development, 69
- Chemistry issue, 74–75
- Chevron, 31, 34fig
- CHG Healthcare Services, 30, 34fig
- Clinton, B., 143
- Coaches: internal versus external, 148; joint responsibilities of participant and, 148; mentors versus, 146; qualifications of, 149; various models of coaching used by, 147
- Coaching, 129, 146–151, 179fig
- Coaching survey (2003), 146
- The Coca-Cola, 7, 32, 34fig
- Columbia University, 53
- Communicating, the company brand, 47
- Companies. *See* Organizations
- Compensation: disparity between CEO–worker, 84–85; employer value proposition (EVP) on, 35; as employment relationship component, 22; how other factors are more important to employees than, 35–36; increasing differences in, 84–85; psychological contract violations related to, 158
- Competencies: creating organization-wide framework for, 16–25; hypothetical *Eating and Drinking*, 15; three components of, 15. *See also* Behavioral competencies
- Competency-based interviews, 68–69fig, 71
- Competency framework tradeoffs: custom or generic content, 18; functional or organizational span, 19; issues to consider, 17–18; leveled or flat structure, 18–19; separate or blended content, 19–20fig
- Competency frameworks: examining the task of building a, 16–17; examples of blended, 20fig; the good and bad of, 21–25; issues to consider, 17–18; the tradeoffs when building a, 17–21
- Complementary person-environment fit, 123, 127, 132
- Concurrent validity, 63
- Confidentiality issues, 138, 153
- Conscientious competence, 143
- Conscious incompetence, 143
- Construct validity, 62, 63fig
- Content validity, 62, 63fig
- Core values: age differences and impact on shared, 119; branding by establishing, 47; creating frameworks for, 20; generation differences related to shared, 121; Protestant Work Ethic (PWE), 119; psychometric assessment of employee's shared, 112–115; workplace culture and shared, 113–114
- Costco Wholesale, 31, 34fig
- Craniometry, 79, 80fig, 81fig
- Creativity ability, 86
- Criminals: Apish Morphology to predict, 79, 82fig; image of seventeen known, 82fig
- Criterion validity, 63fig
- Critical incident, 9, 10fig
- Csikszentmihalyi, M., 144
- Custom competency framework, 18
- D**
- Darwin, C., 84
- Data: employer branding inclusion of qualitative and quantitative, 51; employer value proposition (EVP) qualitative and quantitative, 36–37. *See also* Big Data
- David Weekley Homes, 30, 34fig
- Day-in-the-life experiences, 92
- Deci and Ryan's Self-Determination Theory, 104
- Deci, E., 104
- Deductive reasoning ability, 86
- Deloitte, 32, 34fig
- Demands-abilities motivators, 123
- Development centers, 136, 138
- Development challenge, 128, 179
- Dexterity ability, 86
- Dictionary of Occupational Titles (DOT), 3–4, 6
- Diderot, D., 3
- Distributive justice, 113
- DPR Construction, 30, 34fig
- Drogan, O., 174
- E**
- Earth Rabbit personality (passage 1), 99, 100
- Eastman Chemical, 31, 34fig
- Eating and Drinking* competency, 15
- Ectomorphs personality, 105
- Edelman, 31, 34fig
- Educational level, O*Net on, 5

- Edward Jones, 30, 34*fig*
- Eichinger, R., 166
- Einstein, A., 100
- Employee branding, American Express approach to, 52–56
- Employee development: assessment for, 133–140; HR survey (2011) on formal assessments of, 128; as means of communicating to employees they are valued, 127–128; offering mentoring and coaching supports to, 129, 146–151, 179*fig*; performance management inclusion of, 171, 172; psychological contract to frame the, 128–133; psychological contract violations related to, 158, 168; psychometrics of potential outcomes of, 135; self-awareness programs, 128, 134–137*fig*; summary of assessing, developing, and supporting staff, 178–179*fig*; three components of, 128–129; work simulations operating as development centers, 136
- Employee development components: organizational support through mentoring and coaching, 129, 146–151, 179*fig*; self-awareness of developmental needs, 128, 134–137*fig*; some form of development challenge, 128, 179
- Employee development programs: action learning approach to, 144–145; behavioral change, 143–145; blended programs, 140–141; case study or role playing, 141; company-organized training aligning to core business processes, 140; formalized training program in given skill area, 140; job rotations and assignments, 141, 142–143, 179*fig*; online development platform used for, 145; potential benefits and failures of, 151–153; rating the effectiveness of different, 141–142; self-awareness programs, 134–137*fig*; summary of assessing, developing, and supporting staff, 178–179*fig*; traditional classroom training, 128; webinars, 141. *See also* Organizational support
- Employee engagement: options available to improve, 115–118; relationship between motivation and, 115–118
- Employee generated content (EGC): creating trust and transparency through, 47; as starting place for understanding, EVP, 47–48
- Employee motivation: “the carrot or the stick” concept on, 101; changes with age and generations, 118–122*fig*; changing the workplace to improve, 116; definition of, 11, 97; employee engagement driven by, 115–118; extrinsic versus intrinsic, 101; fulfillment of needs driving, 98, 101–104; improving the employment relationship by understanding the, 97–98; job description category of, 11–13; performance = capability x motivation formula on, 97, 126; person-environment expressed through, 122–126*fig*; personality traits driving, 98, 104–112; shared values driving, 98, 112–115; summary of assessing, developing, and supporting staff, 178, 179*fig*. *See also* Psychometric assessment
- Employee needs: age differences related to, 118; generation differences related to, 120–121; Herzberg’s model of motivation and, 102, 103; investing in employees’ psychological contract by responding to, 117–118; Maslow’s Hierarchy of Needs theory on motivation and, 101–102, 103; motivation tied to fulfillment of, 98, 101–104; needs-supplies motivators, 123; as sometimes in conflict with private sector practice, 103–104; Warr’s “vitamin model” on motivation and, 102–103
- Employee trust: Chicken and egg problem of building, 30; created through credibility, respect, and fairness, 29; providing transparent and honest depictions of company for, 47, 52
- Employee turnover: calculating the costs of, 1; motivators for, 101
- Employees: challenge of selecting them for recruitment or promotion, 57; creating trusted relationship with, 29–30; employer branding as providing information about company to, 42, 44–45; HR problem of failing to consider vantage point of, 156; identifying high potentials among, 163–168; offering mentoring and coaching supports to, 129, 146–151, 179*fig*; performance ratings on, 135, 167, 170; Solid Potentials, 164, 165*fig*; summary of how to assess, develop, and support, 178–179*fig*; talent profiles of, 162. *See also* Psychological contracts
- Employer brand: building employee trust in, 29–30; characteristics of, 41; company investment in their own, 40; comparing three lists on top companies with great, 29–35; connection between EVP and, 41–42; description and process of, 28–29; distinction between marketing campaign and, 45–46, 52; how it impact employees, 42, 44–45; maintain consistency in the, 52; making it memorable, 52; making sure recruiters are trained on the, 50; origins of the term, 40; product brand impact on the, 43; various definitions of, 40–41. *See also* Organizations

- Employer branding: attracting talent as outcome of correctly done, 46; as being about giving employees information about company, 42; building on the existing employer brand, 45; Glassdoor's *Employer Branding for Dummies* on, 41; human resources creative approach to, 44; need to understand your audience for, 45; as process of shaping perceived reputation, 41; SHRM on top actions taken for, 47
- Employer branding channels: employee generated content (EGC) for, 47–48; face-to-face interactions as, 50; issues to consider for, 46–47; physical interactions with people who represent the brand as, 49–50; social networking used as, 48–49
- Employer Branding for Dummies* (Glassdoor), 41
- Employer branding lessons: build transparency and trust, 52; don't focus on quantitative data, 51; know the difference between a campaign and brand, 52; maintain consistency in the employer brand, 52; make the employer brand memorable, 52
- Employer of choice, 41
- Employer value proposition (EVP): American Express, 56; compensation and work hours components of, 35–36; connection between employer brand and, 41–42; describing workplace reality through use of, 35, 36; EGC as starting place for understanding, 47–48; finding ü themes of, 33, 39; how different companies may popularize the, 39; quantitative and qualitative data collection on, 36–37; what a good one looks like, 38. *See also* Value assessment
- Employer/employment relationship: change and the, 155–176; components of a healthy, 127; employee and the line manager, 157–159; employee development that transforms the, 127–153; examples of employer brands that set expectations about, 42–43; *Fortune's* 100 Best Companies to Work For on the, 29–31, 34fig; Glassdoor's top companies (2014) on the, 31–32, 33, 34fig, 35; improved by understanding employee motivation, 97–98; supplementary fit in the, 127; Universum top companies (2014) on the, 32–33, 34fig. *See also* Person-environment fit
- Endomorphs personality, 105
- ERE's Best Employer Brand, 44
- Ernst and Young, 32, 34fig
- Esteem need, 101
- Evaluation: of person-environment fit, 122–126fig; Hay system of, 23; of jobs, 22–23; process of and criteria for, 22; of value and risk, 59–66. *See also* Assessment
- Executive coaching, 129, 146–151, 179fig
- Executive coaching survey (2003), 146
- Expectancy Theory, 113
- Experience: definition of, 11; establishing the criteria for, 1–2; job description category of, 11–13; summary of assessing, developing, and supporting staff, 178, 179fig. *See also* Candidate experience
- Extrinsic motivation, 101
- F**
- Face-to-face branding interactions, 50
- Facebook: as channel for employer branding, 49; Glassdoor top twenty-five companies list (2014) inclusion of, 31, 34fig; membership size of, 48; Universum's Ideal employer list (2014) inclusion of, 33, 34fig
- Fair Work Act (2009), 66–67
- Fair Work Australia, 66
- Fair Work Division (Federal Court), 66
- Fair Work Division (Federal Magistrates Court), 66
- Fair Work Ombudsman, 66, 67
- Fairness, 29
- FBI, 32, 34fig
- Feedback: action learning and important role of, 145; employee development, 133–134; by managers used to identify high potentials, 167; performance ratings form of, 135, 167, 170; 360-degree, 136–138, 170, 179fig; timing of, 139
- Financial Services Authority, 140
- "Find Your World" (Marriott), 45
- Fitts, P., 143
- Five Factor Model of Personality (Big Five), 110
- For Living* campaign (American Express), 55
- Forer, B., 100
- Fortune* magazine's 100 Best Companies to Work For, 29–30
- Fortune* magazine's top ranking for social recruiting list, 44
- Fundamental attribution error, 72–73
- G**
- Galton, F., 79
- Gartner, 32, 34fig
- Gates, B., 84
- GEICO, 41
- Genentech, 30, 32, 33, 34fig
- Generation differences: description of, 119; employee motivation and, 119–122; summary of motivation trends by, 122fig

- Generation Me (born 1970 to the present), 119
- Generation X (born 1961 to 1981), 119, 120–121, 122*fig*
- Generation Y (Millennial Generation) [born 1982 to 2005], 119, 120, 121, 122*fig*
- Generic competency framework, 18
- Genetic cognitive ability. *See* IQ (genetic cognitive ability)
- GI Generation (born 1901 to 1924), 119
- Gilbreth, F., 3
- Gilbreth, L., 3
- Gladwell, M., 84
- Glassdoor: *Employer Branding for Dummies* by, 41; on formation of psychological contracts, 130–131; Glassdoor Talent Warrior, 38; on relationship between information source and trust in the information, 46–47; top companies (2014) list by, 31–32, 33, 34*fig*, 35
- Goals: performance management concern of cascading, 171; performance management SMART, 170
- Goldman Sachs, 32, 34*fig*
- Google: rated as top company, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34*fig*; “20 percent time” policy of, 29
- Gordon Training International, 143
- Gould, S., 83–84
- Graphology (penmanship) personality model, 105
- Great Depression, 3
- Great Place to Work Institute, 29, 30, 33, 34
- Group exercise simulations, 89
- GROW model of coaching, 147
- Guidewire, 31, 34*fig*
- H**
- Hay Group, 23, 115
- Hay system of evaluation, 23
- “Hero” cohort archetype, 120
- Herzberg, F., 102
- Herzberg’s model of motivation, 102, 103
- Hierarchical task analysis, 9, 10*fig*
- High potential employees: CEB findings on drop (2005–2010) in identifying, 166; CEB high potential model to identify, 164–165; identifying, 163–168; learning agility of, 166–167, 168; nine-box grid on potential and performance of, 164, 165*fig*; three conditions required for designating a group of, 168
- Hilcorp, 30, 34*fig*
- Hill, B., 35, 36
- Hiring decisions: based on knowledge, skills, and abilities (KSAs), 68, 77–87; biased judgments and self-fulfilling prophecy coloring the, 72; how fundamental attribution error influence, 72–73; legal requirements for, 66–68; problem of predicting the outcome of, 1; questioning the traditional methods used for, 58–59; require understanding of job requirements and potential to fill them, 58; on selecting staff for recruitment or promotion, 57. *See also* Recruiting talent; Talent acquisition
- Hiring experience: Australian poll conducted on candidates and their, 57; high percentage of candidates blaming organization for poor, 57
- Home inspector analogy, 59, 77
- Homeland Generation (born 2006 to 2025), 119
- Howe, N., 119
- HR employee development survey (2011), 128
- HR Examiner*, 43
- Huffington Post* 100 Most Social HR Experts on Twitter list, 43
- Human resources (HR): branding creativity by, 44; problem of failing to consider employees’ vantage point, 156; rating effectiveness of development programs, 141. *See also* Practitioners
- Hygiene motivation factors, 102
- I**
- IBM, 169
- Imperial China, 2
- In-trays simulations, 89
- Individual development plan (IDP), 170
- Inductive reasoning ability, 85
- Innate talent. *See* IQ (genetic cognitive ability)
- Institute of Personnel and Development, 174
- Internal placements, 51
- Inter-rater reliability, 61, 63*fig*
- Interactional justice, 113
- Interactive Intelligence, 31, 34*fig*
- Internal candidates: placement made with, 51; point of comparison issue and, 73–74
- Internal consistency reliability, 61, 63*fig*
- International Coaching Federation, 149
- “International Perspectives on the Legal Environment for Selection” (Myors), 66
- Interview recommendations: compare the technique over time, 77; structure the interview, 76; train the interviewers, 76–77
- Interview types: biographical, 68, 71; competency-based, 68–69*fig*, 71
- Interviews: assessment by, 68–77; candidate experience related to, 69–70; chemistry

- issue of, 74–75; competency-based, 68–69*fig*; difficulties of coming up with one rating of, 75–77; Fair Work Act (2009) on legal requirements for conducting, 67; fundamental attribution error and placing blame during, 72–73; inaccuracies and poor predictions of, 70–71; point of comparison and use of, 73–74; snap judgments made by assessors during, 71–72
- INTP personality (passage 3), 99, 100
- Intrinsic motivation, 101
- Intuit, 30, 31, 33, 34*fig*
- IO psychology, 6
- Ipsos Mori poll (2006), 115
- IQ (genetic cognitive ability): Binet standardized test of, 80, 83; debate over, 78–79; declining reliance on, 84; history of and defunct theories about, 79–84; knowledge, skills, abilities (KSAs) assessment using, 78–85; questioning the relevance of, 58
- IQ theories: Apish Morphonology, 79, 82*fig*; Binet's test to identify learning disabilities, 80, 83; continued debate over, 84; Craniometry, 79, 80*fig*, 81*fig*; Gould's approach to, 83–84; Recapitulation, 79, 82*fig*, 83*fig*
- J**
- Job analysis: advantages of using a, 7–8; the art and science of, 8–13; early historic origins and evolution of, 2–3; O*Net's classification of jobs used in, 4–7; the origins of, 2–8; people decisions and role of, 1–2
- Job analysis techniques: card sort, 10*fig*; critical incident, 9, 10*fig*; hierarchical task analysis, 9, 10*fig*; job sample, 9, 10*fig*; repertory grid, 9, 10*fig*; structured observation, 8–9, 10*fig*; visionary interview, 10*fig*; work logs, 8
- Job description: bundling, 10–11; five key ingredients of any job, 11; as least evolved recruiting tool, 48; providing a more realist and engaging, 48; updating as necessary, 12; vague language of many, 12
- Job description categories: behavioral competencies, 11, 178, 179*fig*; experience, 11, 178, 179*fig*; key activities, 11, 178, 179*fig*; motivation, 11, 178, 179*fig*; skills, 11, 178, 179*fig*. *See also specific category*
- Job experience. *See Experience*
- Job previews, 48
- Job rotations and assignments, 141, 142–143, 179*fig*
- Job sample, 9, 10*fig*
- Job skills. *See Knowledge, skills, and abilities (KSAs)*
- Jobs, S., 84
- John Deere, 31, 34*fig*
- Johnson & Johnson brand, 42
- Journal of Brand Management*, 40
- Joy, B., 84
- J.P. Morgan, 32, 34*fig*
- Judgment: situational judgment tests assessing, 92; snap judgments made by assessors on candidates, 71–72
- Justice: distributive, 113; interactional, 113; procedural, 113
- K**
- Kaplan, R., 173
- Kenexa, 169
- Kennedy Assassination, 119
- Key activities: definition of, 11; job description category of, 11–13; of pulling shots of espresso, 11; summary of assessing, developing, and supporting staff, 178, 179*fig*. *See also Work activities*
- Kimpton Hotel and Restaurants, 31, 34*fig*
- Knowledge, skills, and abilities (KSAs): definition of, 11; differentiating between abilities, skills, and knowledge, 78; establishing criteria for job skills, 1–2; hiring decisions based on, 68, 77–87; job description category of, 11–13; O*Net on, 5; “psychological state of flow” level of, 144; summary of assessing, developing, and supporting staff, 178, 179*fig*; 10,000-hour rule on development of, 84. *See also Abilities*
- Knowledge, skills, and abilities (KSAs) assessment: home inspector analogy of, 77; IQ (genetic cognitive ability) used for, 58, 78–85
- Korn Ferry, 166
- KPIs, 51
- KPMG, 32, 34*fig*
- Kropp, B., 169, 174
- L**
- LaMotte, S. S., 44–46, 50
- Learning agility, 166–167, 168
- Learning disabilities: Binet asked to develop test to identify, 80; three principles used by Binet to test for, 80, 83
- Legal requirements: Fair Work Act (2009), 66–67; government agencies overseeing, 66; performance management and related, 172
- Lincoln, A., 3
- Line managers: identifying high potentials using feedback from, 167; performance ratings provided by, 135, 167, 170; psychological contract violations by, 157–158, 168;

- strategies for preserving psychological contract with employees, 158–159
- LinkedIn: as channel for employer branding, 49; Glassdoor top twenty-five companies list (2014) inclusion of, 31, 34*fig*; new member rate of, 48
- Lombardo, M., 166
- Love need, 101
- M**
- Major League Baseball, 32, 34*fig*
- Management: building employee trust through credibility of, 29; employee unhappiness with, 36; performance, 168–172
- Managers: identifying high potentials using feedback from, 167; performance ratings provided by, 135, 167, 170; psychological contract violations by, 157–158, 168; strategies for preserving psychological contract with employees, 158–159
- Marketing campaign: American Express' *For Living*, 55; American Express' *Powered by Innovation, Engineered by You*, 55; distinction between employer brand and, 45–46, 52
- Marriott: "Find Your World" employer brand, 45; Susan Strayer LaMotte on her branding experience at, 44, 46
- Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs, 101–102, 103
- MathWorks, 32, 34*fig*
- McCarthy, K., 52–56
- McKinsey and Bain, 52
- Mentoring relationships: four types of, 150; long-lasting nature of, 149–150
- Mentors: coaches versus, 145; long-lasting mentoring relationship with, 149–150; offered as developmental support, 129, 149–151
- Mesomorphs personality, 105
- Microsoft: expectations set by their brand, 42; job analysis on, 7; Universum list of top companies (2014) inclusion of, 32, 34*fig*
- Millennial Generation (also Generation Y) [born 1982 to 2005], 119, 120, 121, 122*fig*
- Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory, 107
- Mischel, W., 72
- Mismeasure of Man* (Gould), 83
- Mokina, 43
- Mommsen, C., 52–56
- Morgan Stanley, 32, 34*fig*
- Motivation. *See* Employee motivation
- Munsterberg, H., 3
- Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI), 100, 108
- Myors, B., 66
- Mystery shoppers, 50
- N**
- National Research Council, 3
- NBCUniversal, 33, 34*fig*
- Need-based motivation: Herzberg's model on, 102, 103; Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs theory on, 101–102, 103; as sometimes in conflict with private sector practice, 103–104; Warr's "vitamin model" on, 102–103
- Need-supplies motivators, 123
- Nestle Purina PetCare, 31, 34*fig*
- Newell, S., 89
- Nike, 32, 34*fig*
- Nike brand, 43
- Nokia, 145
- "Nomad" cohort archetype, 120
- Nordstrom, 33, 34*fig*
- Norton, D., 173
- NPR, 43–44, 49, 53
- Numerical reasoning ability, 85
- O**
- O*Net: creation of, 4, 6–7; description and scope of, 5; job breakdown by four categories by, 4–5; limitations of, 7
- Occupational Personality Questionnaire (OPQ), 108, 109*fig*
- Occupational requirements, O*Net on, 5
- Occupational Research Program (U.S. Employment Service), 3–4
- The Office* (TV show), 121
- "OK plateau of acceptable performance," 143–144
- O'Keefe, R., 38–39, 47
- "Old boys' club," 51
- 100 Influencers in Human Resources list (*HR Examiner*), 43
- 100 Most Social HR Experts on Twitter list (*Huffington Post*), 43
- Online simulations, 91–92
- Orbitz Worldwide, 31, 34*fig*
- Organizational culture: core values of, 20, 47, 112–115, 119, 121; examining the process of changing, 156–176; organizational DNA as part of the, 160, 163; person-environment fit with, 122–126*fig*, 127, 132–133, 178–179*fig*
- Organizational DNA, 160, 163
- Organizational justice: distributive, 113; interactional, 113; procedural, 113
- Organizational support: coaching, 129, 146–151, 179*fig*; mentoring, 129, 146, 149–151. *See also* Employee development programs
- Organizational tagline, 47

- Organizations: high percentage of candidates blaming poor hiring experience on, 57; offering mentoring and coaching supports to employees, 129, 146–151, 179*fig*; socialization of employees by, 124; succession planning in, 159–163; three types of organizational justice by, 113; truth through transparency and honest depictions of, 47, 52, 167. *See also* Change; Employer brand; Psychological contracts; Workplace
- OSKAR model of coaching, 147
- Outliers (Gladwell), 84
- P**
- Parallel-forms reliability, 61–62, 63*fig*
- PDRI, 6
- Peake, P., 72
- People decisions. *See* Hiring decisions
- Pepsi, 7
- Performance: choosing between improving employee ability or motivation to improve, 115–116; “OK plateau of acceptable performance,” 143–144; performance = capability x motivation formula on, 97, 126
- Performance management: assessment used as part of, 170, 172; debate and controversy over, 168–169; development activities included in, 171, 172; elements of successful, 169–170; individual development plan (IDP) and SMART goals for, 170; legal requirements related to, 172; potential problems and issues of, 170–172; recent trend of massive investment in, 169; *Society for Human Resource Management Handbook* (2011) on, 171–172
- Performance ratings, 135, 167, 170
- Person-environment fit: applied to employee motivation, 122–123; complementary, 123, 127, 132; description of, 122, 178; as employment relationship component, 127; evaluation of, 123–126; five ingredients of the, 178–179*fig*; key characteristics of the, 126*fig*; questionnaires used to measure, 124–125; socialization to increase, 124; supplementary, 123, 127, 132–133. *See also* Employer/employment relationship
- “Personal Data Sheet” (World War I), 107
- Personality: “Barnum effect” response to descriptions of, 100; definition of, 104; psychological model of personality of, 98; three passage experiment on, 99–100
- Personality questionnaires: Bernreuter Personality Inventory for Neurotic Tendency, Self-Sufficiency, Introversion, and Dominance, 107; California Personality Inventory, 107; Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory, 107; Myers Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI), 100, 108; Occupational Personality Questionnaire (OPQ), 108, 109*fig*; “Personal Data Sheet” (World War I), 107; triat- and type-based tools, 108
- Personality three passage experiment: Earth Rabbit personality (passage 1), 99, 100; INTP personality (passage 3), 99, 100; Pisces personality (passage 2), 99, 100
- Personality trait models: astrology, 105; biodata, 106; context-dependent perspective of, 108; Five Factor Model of Personality (Big Five), 110; graphology (penmanship), 105; integrated perspective of, 108; phrenology, 105*fig*–106*fig*; projective techniques, 106, 107*fig*; psychometrics testing, 110–112; questionnaires, 106–109*fig*; Rorschach test, 106; Sheldon’s model on body shape tied to temperaments, 105
- Personality traits-based motivation: age differences related to, 118–119; debate over use in occupational settings, 104–105; description of, 98, 104; generation differences related to, 121; models on assessing personality traits, 105–112
- Phrenological organs image, 105*fig*
- Phrenology personality models, 105*fig*–106*fig*
- Physiological needs, 101
- Pinder, C., 97
- Pisces personality (passage 2), 99, 100
- Plante Moran, 31, 34*fig*
- POSITIVE model of coaching, 147
- Posner, M., 143
- Potential talent trust: chicken and egg problem of building, 30; created through credibility, respect, and fairness, 29; providing transparent and honest depictions of company for, 47, 52
- Powered by Innovation, Engineered by You* campaign (American Express), 55
- Practice: multiple examples of combination of context and, 84; 10,000-hour rule on, 84
- PRACTICE model of coaching, 147
- Practitioners: behavioral competencies language used by, 2; candidate prescreening consideration by, 87; challenge of defining behavioral competencies by, 13–17, 18–19; debate over consideration of candidate’s personal life by, 107–108, 110–112; defining psychological contract role by, 178; employer value proposition (EVP) used by, 35–42, 47–48, 56; ensuring employee motivators are being heard, 126; ensuring that legal requirements are followed, 172;

- establishing criteria about hiring purpose, 1–2; guiding company through change, 159, 175–176; on importance of self-awareness, 134–135; looking after best interests of employees and companies, 153; need to understand company vantage point, 156; providing flexibility in their pay negotiations, 22; psychological contract terminology refined by, 130; responsibility to maintain rigor of the interview process, 71; return on investment for services of, 117; role in improving person-environment fit by, 178–179; summary of assessing, developing, and supporting staff tools used by, 178–179/fig; surveys (2011, 2013) on assessment used in development, 128; techniques for conducting a job analysis by, 8–13, 161; various job evaluation approaches used by, 22–23. *See also* Human resources (HR)
- Predictive validity, 63
- Presentations simulations, 89
- Prickett, Tricia, 71
- Procedural justice, 113
- Procter & Gamble, 33, 34/fig
- Product brand, 43
- Projective techniques of personality, 106, 107/fig
- Promotion: challenge of selecting staff for recruitment or, 57; psychological contract violations related to, 158; turnover due to lack of, 101
- “Prophet” cohort archetype, 119
- Protestant Work Ethic (PWE), 119
- Psychological contract forms: balanced, 132/fig, 175–176; relational, 132/fig; transactional, 131, 132/fig, 175–176; transitional, 132/fig
- Psychological contract violations: employee and line manager focal point of, 157–158; identifying high potentials and risk of, 168; strategies for preserving contract after, 158–159
- Psychological contracts: complementary fit element of the, 132; description of, 129–130, 178; employee monitoring of the, 131; four different types of, 132/fig; how change can break the, 156, 157–159; interactions that either strengthen or weaken the, 131; moving from balanced to transactional, 175–176; relational obligations as part of the, 131, 132–133; strategies for preserving, 158–159; supplemental fit element of the, 132–133; transactional obligations as part of the, 131, 132, 175–176; unwritten status and formation of, 130–131. *See also* Employees; Organizations
- Psychological model of personality, 98
- “Psychological state of flow,” 144
- Psychometric assessment: employee needs, 98, 101–104; legal requirements related to testing for, 67–68; person-environment fit, 122–126/fig, 127, 132–133, 178; personality traits, 98, 104–112; potential for misrepresenting candidates, 98; of potential of development program outcomes, 135; shared values, 98, 112–115; threats to, 110–112; three personality descriptions experiment on, 98–100. *See also* Employee motivation
- PwC, 32, 34/fig
- ## Q
- Qualcomm, 31, 34/fig
- Qualitative data: employer branding lesson on including, 51; employer value proposition (EVP), 36–37
- Quantitative data: employer branding lesson on not focusing only on, 51; employer value proposition (EVP), 36–37
- Questionnaires: identifying high potentials, 167; person-environment fit, 124–125; personality, 100, 107–109/fig. *See also* Assessment
- Quicken Loans, 30, 34/fig
- ## R
- RACI model for planning, 145
- Recapitulation, 79, 82/fig, 83/fig
- Recruiters: chemistry and mismatched personalities of candidates and, 74–75; fundamental attribution error influencing perception of candidates by, 72–73; home inspector analogy of, 59, 77; legal requirements governing actions by, 66–68; making sure they are trained on the employer brand, 50; “mystery shoppers” used to train, 50; snap judgments made by, 71–72; training them to interview, 76–77; value and risk evaluation by, 60–66
- Recruiting talent: challenge of selecting staff for promotion or, 57; employer value proposition (EVP) factor in, 35–39; how employer branding impacts the, 28–35; how technology has changed process of, 27–28, 50–51. *See also* Hiring decisions; Talent acquisition
- Red Hat, 32, 34/fig
- RedBalloon poll, 101
- Relational psychological contracts, 132/fig
- Reliability: description of, 61; inter-rater, 61, 63/fig; internal consistency, 61, 63/fig; parallel-forms, 61–62, 63/fig; test-retest, 61, 63/fig

- Repertory grid, 9, 10*fig*
- Reputation: employee brand defined as, 41; employer branding as process of shaping perceived, 41
- Respect: building employee trust by treating them with, 29; Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs on esteem and, 101
- Risk assessment: analogy of home inspection, 59; four forms of reliability used for, 61–62, 63*fig*; recruiters task of, 60–66; three forms of validity used for, 62–63*fig*
- Riverbed Technology, 31, 34*fig*
- Robert W. Baird and Co, 30, 34*fig*
- Role play simulations, 89
- Role playing, 141
- Rorschach personality test, 106
- Ryan, R., 104
- S**
- S&P 500, 30
- Safety need, 101
- Salesforce.com, 30, 34*fig*
- SAP, 169
- SAS, 30, 34*fig*
- SCARF model of coaching, 147
- Schmidt, L., 43–44, 48, 49
- Scientific Management, 3
- Scripps Health, 31, 34*fig*
- Self-awareness: as component of career development, 128; summary of assessing, developing, and supporting staff, 173–179*fig*
- Self-awareness programs: common methodologies and tools for, 134–135; as component of career development, 128; confidentiality and data use issues of, 138; improving behavioral competencies ingredient of, 135–136, 137; negative outcomes and possible problems related to, 138–139; power relationship inherent in the, 139; 360-degree feedback contributing to, 136–138, 170, 179*fig*
- Self-Determination Theory, 104
- Sensory ability, 86
- Servants' employment agency image, 106*fig*
- Sexual Revolution, 119
- Shackleton, V., 89
- Shared values: age differences related to, 119; employees' self-concept impact by, 112–113; formation of, 112; generation differences related to, 121; motivation driving, 98, 112–115; Protestant Work Ethic (PWE), 119; workplace culture and, 113–114
- Silent Generation (born 1925 to 1942), 119
- Situational judgment tests, 92
- Skills. *See* Knowledge, skills, and abilities (KSAs)
- Slalom Consulting, 31, 34*fig*
- SMART goals, 170
- Smedstad, S., 38, 41, 42, 48–49
- Social media: Facebook, 31, 33, 34*fig*, 48, 49; poor candidate experience shared on, 57; Twitter, 31, 34*fig*, 49; YouTube, 48
- Social Science Research Council, 3
- Socialization of employees, 124
- Society for Human Resource Management (SHRM): employer brand as defined by, 40–41; EVP (employer value proposition) as defined by, 35; reporting (2008) on companies with formalized employer brand, 40, 42; reporting on employee branding role in acquiring better talent, 46; reporting on top actions taken when branding, 47; *Society for Human Resource Management Handbook* (2011) by, 171–172
- Socrates, 3
- SolarCity, 31, 34*fig*
- Solid Potentials, 164, 165*fig*
- Southern Ohio Medical Center, 31, 34*fig*
- Southwest Airlines, 32, 34*fig*
- SPACE model of coaching, 147
- Spacial ability, 86
- Starbucks, 33, 34*fig*
- Stereotypes, 72
- Strauss, W., 119
- Structured observation, 8–9, 10*fig*
- Success Factors, 169
- Succession planning: formalized assessment used for, 161; identifying high potentials and the learning agile as part of, 163–168; organizational importance of, 159–160; taking a structured and pragmatic approach to, 160–163; Talent Board used for, 161–162*fig*
- Supplementary person-environment fit, 123, 127, 132–133
- SWOT analysis model for strategy, 145
- T**
- Talent acquisition: employer branding done well leads to, 46; establishing the criteria for, 1–2; most effective techniques for, 51. *See also* Hiring decisions; Recruiting talent
- Talent acquisition techniques: employee referrals, 51; internal placements, 51; professional networks, 51
- Talent Board, 161–162*fig*
- Talent Drain, 101
- Talent profiles, 162
- Tande, C., 35, 36
- Target, 33, 34*fig*
- Tasks: methods of job analysis of, 8–13; O*Net on, 5
- Taylor, F., 3

- Technological tools: O*Net on, 5; online simulations, 91–92; the recruiting talent process changed by, 27–28, 50–51; webinars, 141. *See also* Big Data
- 10,000-hour rule, 84
- Test-retest reliability, 61, 63*fig*
- Test the Nation* (UK TV show), 80
- Testing: to identify different types of abilities, 85–87; theories on IQ, 79–84. *See also* Assessment
- Thomson Reuters, 52
- Three passage experiment on personality, 99–100
- 360-degree feedback, 136–137, 138, 170, 179*fig*
- TMP Worldwide Advertising and Communications, 38
- Towers Watson, 35
- Training programs. *See* Employee development programs
- Trait-based personality tools, 108
- Transactional psychological contracts, 132*fig*, 175–176
- Transitional psychological contracts, 132*fig*
- Transparency: building employee trust through, 47, 52; of high potential programs, 167
- Trust. *See* Employee trust; Potential talent trust
- Twenge, J., 119
- Twitter: as channel for employer branding, 49; Glassdoor top twenty-five companies list (2014) inclusion of, 31, 34*fig*; 700 YouTube videos shared every minute on, 48
- Type-based personality tools, 108
- U**
- Über themes (EVP): identifying organization, 38; organizational decisions on popularizing, 39
- Ultimate Software, 31, 34*fig*
- Unconscious competence, 143
- Unconscious incompetence, 143
- University of South Florida, 6
- University of Wisconsin, 53
- Universum top companies (2014), 32–33, 34*fig*
- U.S. Department of Labor, 4, 7
- U.S. Department of State, 33, 34*fig*
- U.S. Department of the Treasury, 33, 34*fig*
- U.S. Employment Service, 3
- USAA, 30, 34*fig*
- V**
- Valence-Instrumentality-Expectancy Model, 113
- Validity: concurrent, 63; construct, 62, 63*fig*; content, 62, 63*fig*; convergent, 62; criterion, 63*fig*; description of, 62; predictive, 63
- Value assessment: analogy of home inspection, 59; four forms of reliability used for, 61–62, 63*fig*; recruiters task of, 60–66; three forms of validity used for, 62–63*fig*. *See also* Employer value proposition (EVP)
- Verbal reasoning ability, 85
- Victorian Equality Opportunity and Human Rights Commission, 67
- Vietnam War, 119
- visionary interview, 10*fig*
- Vitamin model of motivation, 102, 103
- Vroom's Expectancy Theory, 113
- W**
- Walt Disney Company, 32, 34*fig*
- Warr's "vitamin model" on motivation, 102, 103
- Watergate, 119
- Watson Wyatt study (2009), 115
- Webinars, 141
- Wegmans Food Markets, 30, 34*fig*
- Wheelchair-accessible facilities, 67
- W.L. Gore and Associates, 31, 34*fig*
- Woodruffe, C., 14
- Work activities: methods of job analysis of, 8–13; O*Net on, 5. *See also* Key activities
- Work context (or environment): O*Net on, 5; person-environment fit, 122–126*fig*, 127, 132–133, 178–179*fig*
- Work logs, 8, 10*fig*
- Work simulations: assessment center used for, 88–91*fig*; description of, 88; increasing use of online-, 91–92; issues to consider and trends for, 91–94; operating as development centers, 136, 138
- Worker characteristics (O*Net), 4
- Workplace: intangible benefits of improving environment of, 117; motivating employees by changing the, 116; person-environment fit, 122–126*fig*, 127, 132–133, 178–179*fig*; reality of, 30–39. *See also* Organizations
- Workplace reality: comparing the three lists on top companies, 30–35; employer value proposition (EVP) to describe, 35–39
- Written exercise simulations, 89
- Y**
- Yancey, G., 174
- YouTube, 48