# The New Art of Hiring Smart: Matching the Right Person to the Right Job

#### Arlen T. Swenson

International Institute of Marketing Excellence, Inc.

In his book, *Right Person—Right Job*, Chuck Russell wrote: "Core personality is made up of traits that have been conditioned over many years. Such traits are critical in assessing a candidate's ability to perform virtually any aspect of any job" (1). Albert Einstein once said you cannot solve problems with the same kind of thinking that you used to create them (2).

If you keep on doing what you have always done, you will keep on getting what you have always gotten. Organizations and businesses spend an enormous amount of time and money in a neverending effort to train, coach, motivate, or develop marginal employees to a level of performance that is merely adequate. In organizations and businesses throughout the world, there are people who are not performing at the levels expected. At some time or another, virtually every person has been in a job that was not right for him or her. All the same, organizations hired each of these people with careful thoughts and positive expectations. Most people took those same jobs with every intention of succeeding.

It is very difficult and expensive to train your way out of a bad hiring decision. The process by which individuals are selected is clearly the most critical and controllable variable in the development of a productive and successful work team. However, traditional selection methods have several limitations for the accurate understanding of people and their performance. Traditionally, organizations have viewed people and their performance within the context of ability. Those with lots of ability can do almost anything well, and those with less are often assigned to jobs in which they won't cause significant damage. This type of thinking supports the belief that education, experience, training, and more training will enhance ability and, therefore, performance. If a person with perceived ability does not perform well after being trained, his or her problem is assumed to be motivational.

#### CORNERSTONES OF JOB PERFORMANCE

In reality, three factors may have impact on a person's ability potential: attitude (organizational match); technical competence (skills match); and cognitive ability, personality structure, and interests (job match).

# **Organizational Match**

Organizational match is the degree to which the candidate's attitudes, values, ethics, and grooming fit those required by the job position. Face-to-face interviews are typically used to evaluate these things. Being honest, drug-free, and not prone to hostility are also important factors, and are usually determined by use of various paper-and-pencil, electronic, and chemical tests, as well as by background checks. The perception,

intuition, and experience-based observations of a well-trained interviewer are invaluable in assessing certain qualities of attitude and match with an organization's culture. There are problems, however, with relying wholly on the face-to-face interview process.

One such problem, the halo effect, occurs when the interviewer sees a part of himself or herself in a job candidate. The interviewer may focus on a common experience, part of growing up, school, or some other aspect of background that he and the applicant share. A similar personality characteristic in the interviewee could generate a positive feeling of recognition within the interviewer. This self-recognition generates a "halo" that can cause a relatively mediocre candidate to glow with merit. On the other hand, another potential pitfall of the interview process is the unconscious bias, which is the opposite of the halo effect. The more a candidate is different from the interviewer, the more conscious effort is required on the interviewer's part to regard the candidate in a positive or neutral light. This is a fundamental characteristic of being human: when a candidate appears to be different in some way, there is always some effect. This effect may be large or small, good or bad. The important thing is that interviewers recognize the subjective nature of face-to-face interviewing.

Unfortunately, outstanding verbal and communication skills during an interview—or their opposite, lackluster responses—do not necessarily translate into job performance, just as the ability to talk knowledgeably about baseball and look good in a uniform would not necessarily translate into the ability to throw or hit a 95-mph fastball.

# Skills Match

Skills match is the degree to which a candidate's educational background, technical skills, previous job experience, and particular expertise matches those required for the position. There are many job positions that demand specific sets of knowledge or technical skills. Research has shown that people charged with selecting for these positions are often tremendously biased toward thinking that expertise highly important. On a broader scale, one of the common hiring myths is that highly intelligent people can do anything. Job match research has proven that people actually perform best when they are fully engaged by the challenges of a job. Unless highly intelligent people are provided with a steady source of intellectual challenges, they may not only become poor performers, but may even become counterproductive.

If organizational match or skills match, or both, are unsatisfactory, improvement of an individual's long-term job performance with training or coaching is almost impossible.

#### Job Match

Job match is an integral part of a candidate's actual on-the-job success. Job match refers to how well an individual's cognitive abilities, interests, and personality traits match those required for success in a particular job. To illustrate, let's paraphrase the parable "Let the Rabbits Run," from the book *Soar With Your Strengths* (3):

There were several young animals in the forest: a duck, a fish, an owl, an eagle, a squirrel and a rabbit. Each told his parents he wanted to go to school to improve

himself. The parents thought this was a good idea. They enrolled the young animals in a school with a curriculum of running, jumping, swimming, tree climbing, and flying.

On the first day of school, the little rabbit got up early to be in school on time. He brushed his teeth, combed his hair, ate his breakfast, and went to school with high expectations and excitement. His first class was running. He did great! His teacher told him he was a wonderful runner, and he got an A+ and his self-esteem got a boost.

The next day, the little rabbit went to jumping class. Again he did very well, received compliments from his teacher, and got an A+ and a boost to his self-esteem. The day after that, the little rabbit went to swimming class. He wasn't very good at it. His teacher said he didn't do very well at swimming, gave him a low grade, and told him he had to *learn* to enjoy being wet. His self-esteem suffered. The little rabbit was determined to succeed. For two weeks, the rabbit tried as hard as he could, but he just couldn't get the knack of swimming. He became discouraged and began to lose interest in school.

The rabbit was called to the principal's office with his parents. He was told that he was failing swimming class. As a remedy, the principal and the little rabbit's parents decided that he would be taken out of the running and jumping classes (because he could already do these things so well) and instead would be assigned to three swimming classes each day. The little rabbit tried to improve his swimming, but eventually became totally discouraged. When he was told that flying classes were next, he dropped out of school.

"Let the Rabbits Run" illustrates what happens when managers try to train their people for tasks or skills that are foreign to who they are. Knowing an individual's strengths and weaknesses, a manager can amplify (on the job) that person's strong points while minimizing (or avoiding) weak areas, thereby helping build the employee's self-esteem and increasing his job performance. A manager who hires a person without a natural job match and thinks he can overcome the new hire's shortcomings with training might as well be trying to train a rabbit to swim instead of hiring a fish.

The degree to which a candidate's cognitive abilities, interests, and personality fit those required by a particular position determines the degree of job match. People fail in a job not because they can't do the job, but rather because they don't match the job.

# Cognitive Abilities

Cognitive abilities are factors such as how quickly a person learns and what type of learning is most effective. In a business sense, this is a far more useful measurement than what is generally called intelligence. It is critical to match an employee's cognitive abilities with those required for the job. For example, exceptionally fast problem solvers thrive in a challenging environment. When placed in relatively routine situations, these same people quickly become bored, resulting in low performance or unexpected turnover. In comparison, slow learners become frustrated in environments that do not allow sufficient time to assimilate key information about the job.

#### Interests

Whether a person has an interest in or preference for working with people, data, or things is important. An individual may be capable of performing certain tasks, but may not be interested in those tasks. If that is the case, the person will probably not perform the tasks well for very long.

## **Personality**

Personality of the candidate consists of measurable characteristics of behavior that determine how an employee will behave in particular situations. Core personality is made up of traits that have been conditioned over many years. Such traits are critical in assessing a candidate's ability to function as part of a team, ability to close, ability to make decisions, ability to handle customers, and ability to perform virtually any aspect of any job.

Understanding organizational match, skills match, and job match is integral to understanding job performance. Each is a necessary part of any hiring or performance-enhancement decision. The idea of predicting job performance through the use of assessment tools has long been a dream of the business world, and until recently, an elusive dream. With the advent of fifth-generation assessment tools, organizations and businesses now have an instrument that offers remarkable accuracy and reliability, enabling information to be used in a number of applications that were not possible with older technologies. If management can acquire better information on people, it will inevitably make better decisions.

## **ASSESSMENT TOOLS**

First-generation assessment tools have two fundamental problems: they are easy to fake and they are *ipsative* (describing tendencies without using any point of reference). Second-generation tools add some evaluation elements that are *normative* (using established units of measure), but most are still ipsative. Third-generation tools offer vast improvements; however, the normal manager cannot use them because they must be administered by licensed psychologists, and further, they contain questions that legally cannot be asked of employees, or on job applications. Fourth-generation tools do measure cognitive skills and personality characteristics; however, the fact that their validity base was developed in 1972 causes significant validation errors when current applicants and employees are measured for the twenty-first century. In addition, several scales in the mental abilities section measure *crystallized knowledge* (specific knowledge that is dependent on cultural environment and education) versus *fluid knowledge* (fundamental reasoning ability independent of specific content).

Fifth-generation assessment tools, which produce quantified scales (normative) and evaluate the total person, can be used accurately and effectively by non-experts to generate job patterns. Developed in compliance with legal requirements of the United States, Canada, and Great Britain, fifth-generation instruments can also serve to document nondiscriminatory hiring practices. Fifth-generation tools measure

• Mental abilities (cognitive—can the person do the job?),

- Interests (conative—is the person interested in doing the job?), and
- Twenty-four personality factors. (Does the person have what it takes to do the job and does the person fit the organization's culture?)

**TABLE 1 Recommended Applications for Generations of Assessment Tools** 

APPLICATIONS	GENERATIONS								
	1 <sup>st</sup>	2nd	3rd	4th	5th				
Career Development	*	*	•	X	*				
One-on-one Counseling	*	*	•	X	*				
Pre-Employment Selection	X	X	Х	X	*				
Interviewing	*	*	•	X	*				
Promotion Decisions	X		•	X	*				
Simple Team Building	*	*	X	X	*				
Team Engineering	X	X	X	X	*				
Sales Strategies		*	X	X	*				
Performance Problems	X	X	X	X	*				
Day-to-day Management		*	X	X	*				
Training Strategies		*	•	X	*				
Re-Engineering	X	X	X	X	*				
Right Sizing	X		X	X	*				
Clinical Diagnosis	X	X	•	X	Х				
<b>★</b> RECOMMENDED		■ DDC	EECCIO	NAIS	ONI V				

★ RECOMMENDED

PROFESSIONALS ONLY

**OPTIONAL** 

**X** NOT RECOMMENDED

# LEGALITIES OF USING TESTING AND ASSESSMENTS

The reality is that the proper and consistent use of effective testing and assessment systems can dramatically strengthen an organization's legal position. Job-related testing and assessments are essentially the only ways to document objective and nondiscriminatory hiring practices. In the three parts of the selection process, the area most susceptible to bias or discrimination is organizational match, which is largely determined by interviewing. Only the testing components are purely objective. Skills match may or may not be measurable, depending on the job.

Only job match, when measured by the proper assessment instrument, is completely objective. As Joyce Hogan, in *Employment Tests: History and User Considerations*, correctly points out,

Bias is a social component of the decision-making process, not a feature of the test results; therefore a primary advantage of test use is that tests, unlike interviewers, are incapable of being prejudiced by the applicant's race, gender, ethnicity, national origin, religion, age, or disability. (4)

It is inconsistent with the spirit of (EEOC) and Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) (5) legislation to hire a person for whom the probability of reasonable success in the job is limited.

In the selection process, the greatest advantage of assessments is the potential use of the information that results to predict the future performance of applicants. Under the Uniform Guidelines on Employee Selection Procedures (1994), a selection process must provide fair and equal employment opportunities to all applicants. Testing may be used

- 1. To screen out those applicants who are not likely to be able to perform the job successfully,
- 2. To group applicants in accordance with the likelihood of their successful performance, and
- 3. To rank applicants, selecting those with the highest scores for employment.

It is important that the instrument used in the selection process meet certain standards(6):

- 1. The instrument should be copyrighted no earlier than 1991.
  - Two pieces of legislation that have directly impacted testing are the Civil Rights Act of 1991 and the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990.
  - The provisions of both of these acts must have been considered in the construction of any psychometric instrument used in making business decisions involving people.
- 2. The instrument must have been designed for use in a selection process.
  - Validation is a major element of compliance.
  - That the instrument measures what it claims to measure must be demonstrable.
  - The instrument can demonstrate its validity under the same circumstances in which it is being used.
  - Many instruments that were originally validated for use in counseling and selfdevelopment cannot be validated as hiring tools.
- 3. The technical manual for the instrument must provide thorough documentation of
  - The development of the scales used.
  - The development of the norms.
  - The diversity of the population used in the studies. (A robust sample would include several thousand people, representing a mixture of appropriate ages, sexes, cultures, and races.)
  - The psychometric studies that generated the original norms should be revisited once every 3 years or so to allow the instrument to adjust to changes in demographics and social values and attitudes.

The ADA mentions in Section 1211(d) that a company "may make pre-employment inquiries into the ability of an applicant to perform job-related functions"(7). This clearly permits the use of validated assessment instruments such as job match assessments and honesty tests (if used properly).

# USING JOB MATCH ASSESSMENTS WITH EXISTING EMPLOYEES

Have you ever worked with someone whose performance was not what you expected? Today, job match assessments can tell you why that happened and whether it can be changed. The accuracy of higher-generation assessment instruments has created extraordinary possibilities for analyzing and understanding the performance of existing employees.

Almost all managers or supervisors know who their best and worst employees are. What they generally do not know is why people hired by the same methods, doing the same job, and managed by the same person perform so differently. For centuries, businesses and organizations have relied on observation, opinion, and emotion to solve their people problems. At the same time, system solutions were based on objective data, quantified data, and common frame of reference. Modern assessment instruments can provide this same level of data about people.

The concept of the three cornerstones of job performance for selecting new employees is also essential to understanding the performance of existing employees. In the case of successful current employees, job attitude is a more precise terminology than organization match. Successful current employees typically have a can-do attitude and believe in the value of the contribution of each employee. They are positive and enthusiastic and are happy with their work place. Many factors affect this attitude, such as organizational leadership, work environment, and personal issues.

If job attitude is the only problem within an organization, motivational programs can work well toward improving performance. If, however, there is a more fundamental cause reducing performance, motivational programs can prove to be expensive and frustrating.

The second part of the puzzle of existing employees' performance is skills match. Well-constructed training programs may have a tremendously positive effect on skills match. The difficulty arises when training is viewed without consideration of job match. Job match, as described earlier, is the degree to which the employee has the cognitive abilities, interests, and measurable personality traits that are necessary to perform the job successfully. When job match is determined prior to training, the most effective training program is usually clear. The critical point is that unless job match is known, the best training is a hit-or-miss proposition: it can be frustrating for the employee and expensive for the organization.

# **Team Engineering Versus Team Building**

Personality assessments have been used for team-building exercises since the first half of this century. Often four personality types are identified: dominant, influencing, stable, and compliant, or driver, expressive, amiable, and analytical. Other assessments may identify eight or nine types. All of these typing methodologies are based on behaviorism, or behavioral style theory, a concept that is no longer supported in mainstream psychology. Team-building exercises based on these four quadrants, however, can be often very productive. The concepts are simple and easily understood. The construct is valid and accurate. The exercise normally does a superb job of describing each type and

how each type relates or communicates with other types. The problem is that there is no accurate way for these instruments to sort people into types. It is unlikely that just four sizes fit all.

The most recent generations of assessment tools incorporate a total picture of cognitive abilities, interests, and personality. All of these factors play key roles in team interaction. More importantly, these newer instruments measure a range of discrete elements with considerable accuracy. This enables specific analysis of team fit. It also has the capability to deal with teams that are relatively homogenous or with work teams composed of specialized positions. The level of specificity possible is reflected in the designation of the process as *team engineering*.

# **Reorganization or Restructuring**

The concept of job match is integral to any plan for reorganizing a work force. Without it, the outcome of the process becomes largely a matter of luck or hope. Job match assessments can be used to statistically analyze both the old system and the new configuration. The existing population of employees can then be compared to the new requirements of job match, and a strategic plan for transition can be developed. Some employees will fit easily into the new design, others will be phased in with training, and the ones that cannot make the change can be identified.

#### SUCCESSION PLANNING

Succession planning is basically a matter of an internal selection process. Job match assessments allow the analysis of an executive's career path relative to the various job matches that are available. Even when experience demands a period of time in a position of marginal benefit, that analysis enables a temporary adjustment of the expectations of performance during that period. This information can also be used to design individual training curriculum.

It is important to note that the numbers 1 through 10 make up the range of a scale. A person's holding any position(s) on the scale does not imply good or bad about that person. The numbers in the range are used to relate an individual's match to the requirements of a particular job. Everyone is a good match with some jobs and a bad match with others. In other words, accurate assessment tools do not judge a person good or bad; they only assess whether a person does or does not match the requirements of a particular job.

Please note that some of the words used to describe the person's personality characteristics don't necessarily mean what you and I usually think of when we use them. Psychologists have their own vocabulary.

Once you know the total person, you must be sure you know the job and its requirements. Then you must investigate the qualities a person needs to succeed in that job. You accomplish this by doing a study to determine what kind of person the job requires (organizational Match, skills match, and job match).

**TABLE 2 Fifth-Generation Assessment Tool** 

		ILIT	_	1	1			T		_	1
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	
General Ability											1
Working with											
Numbers											<u> </u>
Working with Words											
Working with											-
Shapes											
	IN	TERI	ESTS								
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	]
Working with		1	Ť		1				1	1	•
People											
Working with											
Data											
Working with											
Things											
	PE	RSO	NAL]	ITY							
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	
Diplomatic											Independent
Cooperative											Competitive
Submissive											Assertive
											Consciention
•											
nnovative											-
nnovative Reactive											Organized
nnovative Reactive											Organized Extrovert
nnovative Reactive Introvert											Organized
nnovative Reactive Introvert Self-Sufficient											Organized Extrovert Group- Oriented
nnovative Reactive Introvert Self-Sufficient Reserved											Organized Extrovert Group-
nnovative Reactive Introvert Self-Sufficient Reserved Emotional											Organized Extrovert Group- Oriented Outgoing
nnovative Reactive Introvert Self-Sufficient Reserved Emotional Restless											Organized Extrovert Group- Oriented Outgoing Stable
Spontaneous Innovative Reactive Introvert Self-Sufficient Reserved Emotional Restless Excitable Frank											Extrovert Group- Oriented Outgoing Stable Poised

**TABLE 3 Definition of Terms** 

Diplomatic	Avoids conflicts and chooses to encourage others.
Independent	Single minded and determined to win.
Cooperative	Contributes to the work of the team.
Competitive	Plays to win.
Submissive	Avoids conflict and takes a diplomatic approach to disagreements.
Assertive	Outspoken, always trying to dominate others.
Spontaneous	Flexible and nontraditional.
Conscientious	Likes to work within a set of strict personal and traditional rules.
Innovative	Has a casual attitude toward rules.
Conventional	Always follows the rules.
Reactive	Reacts to events only when they arise.
Organized	Works well in a controlled, rational, well-planned environment.
Introvert	Prefers the company of a few good friends.
Extrovert	Happiest when at the center of attention.
Self-Sufficient	Content to work alone quietly for long periods of time.
Group-Oriented	Has a strong need for association and to be in the center of things.
Reserved	Stays in the background in social situations.
Outgoing	Likes meeting new people and doing exciting things.
Emotional	Suspicious, wary of the unexpected.
Stable	Accepts people and criticism at face value.
Restless	Generally upset and irritated about something.
Poised	Takes a rational approach to life.
Excitable	Has difficulty coping with high levels of pressure.
Relaxed	Can manage life's pressures.
Frank	Usually candid and frank.
Social	Has desire always to present self in best possible light because of
Desirability	strong desire for social acceptance.

Evaluating the top and bottom performers in a job classification is the best basis for performing the study. Think for a moment about a key department in your organization.

- Can you identify the top people in the department?
- Do you know the bottom people?
- Do you know why they are different?

Normally, you didn't hire some of the people to be top performers and others to be bottom performers. However, when a study is made of your top and bottom people, the characteristics that make your top performers different can be identified and made into a job match pattern for new hires or effective training programs for existing employees.

**TABLE 4 Job Match Pattern** 

	Al	BIL	ITII	ES							
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	-
General Ability											
Working with Numbers											
Working with Words											
Working with Shapes											<u> </u>
	IN	TE	RES	STS							
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	
Working with People											
Working with Data											†
Working with Things											
	PERSONALITY									<u>-</u>	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	
Diplomatic											Independent
Cooperative											Competitive
Submissive											Assertive
Spontaneous											Conscientiou
Innovative											Conventional
Reactive											Organized
Introvert											Extrovert
Self-Sufficient											Group-
											Oriented
Reserved											Outgoing
Emotional											Stable
Restless											Poised
Excitable											Relaxed
Frank											Social
											Desirability

The job match patterns can be customized exclusively for your own organization—by job title and by department. A well-designed job match pattern can even take into account different management styles and expectations.

The shaded areas indicate the job match pattern for a particular job. Creating patterns is a major step forward for most organizations who do not have the job descriptions required by the Americans with Disabilities Act. These patterns can be customized for all the jobs in your organization, based on the qualities of your people who are already successful and the different management styles of your department heads.

**TABLE 5** Good Match, Candidate Compared to Job

	AR	ILIT	TES								
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	
General Ability								8			
Working with				ĺ	İ		0				İ
Numbers											
Working with						6					
Words											
Working with									9		
Shapes											
	IN	rrri	ESTS	2							
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	
Working with					T	6					]
People											
Working with Data			8								
Working with		2									
Things											
	DE	DCO	NAL	TTX7							
	1	<b>NSO</b> .	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	
Diplomatic		1	T	1	T		0	Ī	Í		Independent
Cooperative									9		Competitive
Submissive							0				Assertive
Spontaneous					6						Consciention
Innovative						6					Conventiona
Reactive					6						Organized
Introvert							0				Extrovert
Self-Sufficient					6						Group-
											Oriented
Reserved						0					Outgoing
Emotional						<b>(3)</b>					Stable
Restless					6						Poised
Excitable						0					Relaxed
Frank							0				Social
				1							Desirability

The shaded areas are the job match pattern and the black-encircled numbers are the candidate's score. You can quickly see that all of the numbers are within the shaded areas, indicating a good match. You can tell at a glance if a particular job candidate is like your top performers. You can quickly tell if the candidate is the right match or a miss.

Every score doesn't have to fall into a shaded area in order for a candidate to be a good match. A candidate whose score matches 80 to 85 percent of the job requirements would be considered a good match. Candidates with scores that match 70 to 75 percent of the job requirements may also prove to be successful with properly structured coaching and training.

TABLE 6 Bad Match, Candidate Compared to Job

	AB	ILI	ΓIES								
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	_
General Ability					6						
Working with					6						
Numbers											
Working with Words				4							
Working with Shapes						<b>6</b>					
	IN'	TER	EST	S							
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	_
Working with People				4							
Working with Data					6						
Working with Things						<b>(3</b> )					
PERSONALITY											
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	
Diplomatic			8								Independent
Cooperative						0					Competitive
Submissive			6								Assertive
Spontaneous				4							Conscientious
Innovative			6								Conventional
Reactive		2									Organized
Introvert					6						Extrovert
Self-Sufficient								8			Group-
											Oriented
Reserved						6					Outgoing
Emotional			1					8			Stable
Restless			1					8			Poised
Excitable			1	<u> </u>					9		Relaxed
Frank					6						Social
											Desirability

Again, the shaded areas are the job match pattern and the black-encircled numbers are the candidate's score. You can quickly see that several of the numbers are outside of the pattern, indicative of a bad match. Candidate scores matching less than 70 percent of the job requirements indicate a poor match.

To further validate the importance of matching people to jobs, the *Harvard Business Review* published results of a study involving more than 360,000 working people in 14 industries that had both high and low turnover rates. The study's objective was to examine the effectiveness of traditional hiring practices as a means of filling jobs with productive people. The study concluded: "It's not experience that counts, or college degrees or accepted factors; *success hinges on fit with the job*"(8).

TABLE 7 Comparison of Job Match or No Job Match and Effect on Turnover (8)

High-Turnover Industry Sample Size: 13,102

After 6 months	Percentage who quit or Were fired (%)
People with job match	24
People without job match	46

After 14 months	Percentage who quit or Were fired (%)
People with job match	28
People without job match	57

Low-Turnover Industry Sample Size: 5,941

Low Turnover medically sumple size. 3,571	
After 6 months	Percentage who quit or
	Were fired (%)
People with job match	5
People without job match	25

After 14 months	Percentage who quit or Were fired (%)
People with job match	8
People without job match	34

Clearly, the *Harvard Business Review* study indicates that if you want to cut your turnover rates and their resultant costs, start matching people to the job. As J. W. Marriott of Marriott Hotels once wrote, "Put the right people in the right job. Train and motivate them, give them an opportunity for advancement, and your company will grow and prosper."

#### REFERENCES

- 1. Russell, C. Right Person—Right Job: Guess or Know: The Breakthrough Technologies of Performance Information. Johnson & James Press, Alpharetta, Georgia, 1996.
- 2. Einstein Quotes. Colorado Springs, Colorado, 1998.

- 3. Coates, D. E. Soar With Your Strengths. Delacorte Press, New York, 1992.
- 4. Hogan, J. *Employment Tests: History and User Considerations*. PRO-ED Press, Texas, 1990.
- 5. Americans With Disabilities Act Handbook. EEOC and U.S. Department of Justice. U.S. Government Printing Office Press, Washington, D.C., 1991.
- 6. Duston, R. L. *The Effects of the ADA on Employee Selection Procedures*. University Publications of America Press, 1992.
- 7. Use of Integrity Tests for Pre-Employment Screening. U.S. Congress. Office of Technology Assessment, U.S. Government Printing Office Press, Washington, D.C., 1990.
- 8. Greenberg, H. M., and J. Greenberg. Job Matching for Better Sales Performance. *Harvard Business Review*, Vol. 58, No. 5, Sept.-Oct. 1980, pp. 128–133.