**Scenario 1:** candidate A has less variance in its performance and thus it will perform near to 75 at most of the times. Thus it will give more good performance which is around 75. But this candidate will have less probability to perform beyond 75. Thus the probability to underperform is less but on negative side probability to outperform is also less.

Candidate B: This candidate will have less chances of performing around 75%. Thus this candidate has more variance in its performance which is not good. Manager will have less confidence in their performance as they can outperform and underperform with more probability.

Thus if we want to have a productivity of 75 then candidate A will be best fit as candidate B can under perform at many times.

**Scenario 2:** Candidate A: This will have less variance and most of the time this candidate will perform around 60. Thus manager can be sure of candidate’s performance that he/she will not vary in his/her performance.

Candidate B: This candidate will again have more variance in its performance but the average mean is high i.e. 80. Thus in spite of high variance this candidate will perform good around 80%.However its performance will vary from 70 to 90. Its minimum productivity is 70 which is still better than the mean of candidate A. Thus this candidate is better in this scenario.

**Scenario 3:** The problem is that this distribution is probably biased as most of the test observations are towards the right of the distribution. This distribution has a lot of bias and thus will not give accurate predictions.