



The Interview Success Guide™
Helping you have the best interview of your life



The IMX Interview Success Guide

A radically simple new approach to Interviewing Success for the Job Seeker

Let's face it. Whether you are looking to become the next VP of Marketing at Mycompany.com, or the newest seamstress at Bubba's fine clothiers, interviewing for any new job pretty much stinks. Sure, it can be an exciting time, but the actual interview itself is stressful, awkward and usually something you would rather just avoid. Hopefully, this guide will ease some of the pain in the process. In this guide, you will find simple lessons that will help you achieve higher levels of comfort in the interview process and give you the knowledge and skills you need to have the best interviews possible. It's all about improving your ability to interview better and getting the job you want.

Aside from some more traditional do's and don'ts, this 36 page guide (not including the reference library) also contains everything you need to know about a simple new approach to interviewing which has been proven to be incredibly effective. We call it "Self Interviewing™" and it involves a simple process of taking measure of what your natural talents are and getting to know yourself as best you can in preparation for selling yourself. A good sales person would never try to sell a product or service without first having a thorough understanding of its strengths and weaknesses. The interview is a sales call, plain and simple, so why would you try to sell yourself without possessing that same level of understanding.

Innermetrix is a management-consulting firm that specializes in measuring how people think and make decisions. We have worked with tens of thousands of people around the world. Through all of this work, we've picked up some pretty sound experience and insight. The purpose of this guide is to distill that experience down into a single source that will help you interview better than you ever have before.

Armed with the knowledge you will gain from this guide, go out and have one of the best interviews you've ever had.

Good luck and enjoy

J. Niblick
Innermetrix, Inc.

Introduction

We all approach looking for work with a weird mix of excitement and anxiety. It is a challenge that leaves us feeling not quite in control of the result. Why, because we're not in control...duh. Ultimately the decision to hire is in the hands of others, but that doesn't mean you can't have some control as well. In our firm's years of business experience we have seen one common denominator among the best "interviewees", or people who get the job. That one difference seems to be knowledge. More specifically, knowledge about one's own self in the form of strengths and weaknesses, abilities and the lack thereof. Theodore Roosevelt once said that self-mastery is one of the four keys to a successful life (along with courage, hard work, and intelligent action). This guide will help you gain the self-mastery you need to have the best job interview you can. Sorry, we won't be addressing courage, hard work or intelligence.

Self-mastery is about knowing who you are, what your strengths and weaknesses are and being able to make this knowledge work to your advantage. People who know themselves do better in interviews than people who don't. When a person is aware of their special talents, they are better able to communicate them to the interviewer, and make specific arguments for their benefit to an organization, rather than generic answers like "I'm a hard working team player". In the end, the person who is better able to help the interviewer see how they would benefit the organization in specific ways is in the better position to be hired. In order to do this, however, you must first possess a good level of self-awareness about yourself.

In the following pages we will reveal keys to achieving the ultimate interview success.

Special Note: This guide is designed to be used in conjunction with the IMX Interview Success Profile™. This report will show you what your greatest strengths and skills are, and is based on the work of Dr. Robert Hartman (Yale/MIT). It has been validated in more than 29 separate scientific studies.

It isn't a requirement that you get your own profile to benefit from this guide at all, there is still lots of good information in here. We think it is even better with the profile, however, so you can work with your own unique strengths and talents.

If you don't have your own Interview Success Profile, simply visit www.innermetrix.com/interviewing to see a sample profile and get your own.

Table of Contents

1. Why you need this guide.....	6
2. Simple techniques to read the Interviewer's personality type.	9
3. How to communicate with your interviewer's behavioral style	14
4. Your Strengths - How to show them off	16
5. Your weaknesses – How to blow them off	24
6. Kinds of interview questions and how to prepare for them.....	31
7. How to give interviewers the best answers they've ever heard.....	33
8. Conclusion	36
Library of Natural Talents	37





1. **Why you need this guide**

Why do you need a guide to interview better? Because there are certain truths about interviewing that many people simply don't know...three to be exact.

First, **you will always be the novice** in an interview. The person doing the interview is a professional interviewer. He or she may come off as a "good old boy" who isn't very good at these "interview things". They may not even be very good at actually interviewing, but rest assured, the person on the other side of the interview table knows more about how to interview you than you do about how to be interviewed. Even new managers get some training. They take courses, read books, learn tips from other managers, etc. Unless you have your own techniques and tips, all the control is in the interviewer's hands. With a little preparation, however, you can share some of that control too.

Second, recent research on over 40,000 workers reveals that **you are naturally at a disadvantage in the interview process**. According to a 2004 scientific study the average businessperson:

- is only **59%** aware of their own strengths and weaknesses
- is **78%** aware of the strengths and weaknesses of others
- spends **89%** of their effort focusing on evaluating others
- spends only **11%** of their time evaluating themselves with the same level of scrutiny

So, not only is the interviewer more experienced, better trained and in the stronger position; he or she is also working from a natural strength (i.e., 78% awareness of others) while you are working from a weakness (i.e., 59% self-awareness). It's not fair, but then no one ever said it had to be.

Finally, polls have shown that **being prepared is as significant a piece to the interview as is your history, resume and experience combined**. What constitutes preparation, however, has changed. It doesn't just mean a clean resume and well pressed suit anymore. As companies become more sophisticated in their hiring techniques more emphasis is being placed on qualifying a candidate's "soft skills" (e.g., thinking styles, natural talents, attitudes, etc.). If today's employers are paying more attention to your soft skills, don't you think you should be too?



Soft Skill Preparedness Challenge

So, you don't think you need such preparation? If you think you really know your strengths and weaknesses then take this simple challenge, but here's the trick...do it in less than 20 seconds.

In the spaces below list your 5 greatest soft skills (e.g., work ethic, initiative, self-confidence, etc.):

1. _____
2. _____
3. _____
4. _____
5. _____

Could you do it in time? What kind of answers did you give? Did they end up being the kind of answers you would expect everyone to put down (e.g., hard working, competitive, team player, etc.)? Could you quickly give an example of a time where that strength helped you do your job?

If you are prepared, you will be ready to answer these kinds of questions off the top of your head, in an open and honest way.

When the interviewer asks "why should we hire you" would you rather give old standards like this:

- "I'm hard working"
- "I'm a good team player"
- "I work well without supervision"
- "I'm honest and dedicated"

Or this:

- "My greatest strength is the level of personal commitment I bring to my work"
- "I am more of a self-starter than the average person"
- "One of greatest natural talents is for conceptual thinking and problem solving"
- "My natural ability for empathy allows me to really understand the people I manage."

If the interviewer asks how you know all of this, you'll simply produce your profile and tell him which page he can find it on. In this way they will know that you

aren't full of some first-class fluff. **You took the initiative to be prepared in a way most other candidates were not.**



2. **Simple techniques to read the Interviewer's personality type**

In 1928, Professor William Marston of Harvard University, the creator of the polygraph, published a book titled "Emotions of Normal People", wherein he established four primary types of behavior (Dominant, Influencing, Steadiness and Compliance). His theory was that each of these four dimensions of behavior exist in all people, but we tend to focus on one more primarily than the others so we have a prime behavioral style. This theory is one of the oldest and most widely used of its kind in the world and has been used by more than 100 million people around the world.

This chapter is a short course in these four behavioral types, how to identify which primary type your interviewer is and how that affects the best way for you to interview with them. Below is an expanded definition of the four primary types. You don't need to memorize this information, but it should help you create a picture in your head of what each is about.

The first of these four types of behavior is Dominance (D).

High D's tend to be direct, driven & decisive. D's are strong-minded, strong-willed people who enjoy challenges, taking action, and immediate results. Their focus tends to be on the bottom line. Dominance can be summarized as the factor of control. People with this factor prominent in their behavior tend to focus on the need to achieve and maintain a measure of authority and power over other people and, more specifically, the environment in which they live and work. Competitiveness and ambition are also associated with the D factor, and people showing this element will struggle to achieve their aims in life against great odds. Indeed, they seem to enjoy challenge, and rarely back away from a difficult or risky situation. Dominant individuals are not naturally trusting of others - they will seek to attain success on their own merits, without asking for or expecting help or support from those around them. Should a situation arise where the assistance of others is an unavoidable necessity, they will tend to issue orders directly, rather than asking for cooperation.

The second type is Influencing (I).

High I's tend to be influential, social, optimistic & outgoing. High I's are "people people" who prefer participating on teams, sharing ideas, and entertaining and energizing others. Influence is associated with a sunny, friendly and extrovert approach, warm and open to other people, sociable and gregarious. As you might expect, high-I's' often possess well-developed social skills and an urge to meet and talk with other people. The hardest thing for a High-I to accept is rejection. They need to interact positively with those around them, and their friendly, open style usually



helps them to maintain relations of this kind. The socially active nature of the highly Influential person is often an important factor in bringing other less gregarious styles together. By their nature, High-I's are extremely trusting and disingenuous. Their desire to be open with other people can lead them at times to reveal information or express feelings that more staid types might prefer to keep hidden. For this reason, they are sometimes seen as lacking in tact. Nonetheless, their natural communicative abilities often permit them to talk themselves out of any difficult situation resulting from their lack of diplomacy.

The third type is Steadiness (S).

High S's tend to be steady, stable, sympathetic & cooperative. S's tend to be helpful and team players. They prefer being behind the scene, working in consistent and predictable ways. They are often good listeners. As its name suggests, those who show a high level of Steadiness take a measured, steady approach to life. They are patient and undemanding, often showing sympathy for and loyalty to those around them. At least in western countries, Steadiness is relatively rare in comparison with the other three factors. While Dominance, Influence and Compliance are evenly spread throughout the population, Steadiness tends to appear less frequently. This is perhaps because the unassuming, amiable behavior associated with this factor tends to be less valued by society than those connected with the other three factors. When Steadiness does appear in a profile, it is more common to find it accompanied by high Compliance than standing alone. Despite this, there are a number of strengths linked to the Steadiness factor. People of this kind are patient and sympathetic listeners, with a real interest in the problems and feelings of others, and are particularly capable of fulfilling support roles. They also have a persistent approach, with powers of concentration that allow them to work steadily at a task. While other profile types might become bored or distracted, the High-S (*i.e.* person with high Steadiness) will continue to work until they complete an assignment. High-S's are resistant to change, and will prefer to settle into a predictable and constant environment. They have an intrinsically passive approach, and work best when given clear instructions and a high level of support. Because of this, they avoid conflict or confrontation if at all possible, and will instead seek to adopt the role of peacemaker if a dispute should break out.

The fourth and final type is Compliance (C).

High C's tend to be compliant, conscientious, concerned, cautious & correct. C's usually focus on quality. They plan ahead, constantly check for accuracy, and seek systematic approaches. This is perhaps the most complex of the four factors. Traditionally, High-C's (people showing a high level of Compliance) were categorized simply as 'rule-oriented'.



Recent investigation, however, has shown that this is only part of the story, and that the factor represents a far more sophisticated element, as we shall explain in this section. The root of this complexity lies in the combination of Control and Passivity. It is the factor of structure, detail and fact, and those displaying high levels are interested in precision and accuracy. Because they are naturally passive and reticent to speak out unless called on by others, it is often imagined that High-C's are lacking in ambition. In fact, this is not the case - in this specific sense, they are similar to highly Dominant individuals in their desire for control their environment. Because of their passive style, however, they will try to achieve this control using structure and procedure, insisting on rules and defined codes of conduct to achieve their ends.

This is the root of the 'rule-oriented' style we mentioned above. Individuals with high levels of Compliance dislike pressure, and will tend to adopt an evasive style when confronted with difficult circumstances. In extremely difficult situations, they are prone to disregard problems or delay actions until they become completely unavoidable. The rule-oriented aspect of the High-C often takes in wider aspects of life than simply corporate rule-structures or established procedures. Individuals of this kind usually have personal codes of behavior, and tend to regard etiquette and tradition as important. Because of their inherent desire for fact and detail, it is also common to find that Compliant styles have a relatively broad general knowledge, or specific knowledge or skills. This interest in the way things work means that Compliant individuals are often drawn to technical work, or jobs involving the organization of information, situations in which their personal talents can come to the fore.

These are the four styles. Next, we will teach you how to read your interviewer to determine which of these four behavioral types their primary style is. By understanding this, **you will be able to communicate with them** in the way they prefer. This will increase their receptivity, make them listen more to what you have to say, and create some camaraderie which will only help your cause.

The “Tell”

In poker, players look for what they call the “tell”. This is a unique sign that people make when they have a good hand. Some people touch their hair, while others starts tapping their toes or clearing their throat. If you can learn what a person’s “tell” is you can know when they have a good hand and bet accordingly. In behavior, each style has it’s own “tell”. **Learn to see them, and you learn how to communicate with the interviewer in the most effective way.** To become a real pro at this requires some time and effort, but we’re not seeking to make you professional behavioral analysts, just give you some pointers that can help you see a person’s behavioral tell.



High D's Tell

In an interview, high D's are usually:

- Straight forward and up front
- Confident, secure and comfortable speaking out
- Unafraid to confront difficult issues or ask sensitive questions
- Not big believers in lots of data or specifics
- Interested in practical results which you have accomplished, but not tons of detail
- In charge, controlling the process with confidence and a purpose
- Looking for signs of competitiveness, which they value
- Perceived as aggressive
- Hurried or impatient
- Easily distracted
- In a rush

High I's Tell

In an interview high I's are usually:

- Very talkative
- Sunny
- Open
- Energetic
- Very social and expressive
- Seeking approval
- Skilled in communicating with others
- Smooth, good talkers
- Likely to talk more than they listen

High S's Tell

In an interview, high S's are usually:

- More quiet than D's and I's
- Softer
- Less confident, more reserved
- Slow or unhurried, steady
- Patient or willing to listen
- Have a system they like to follow

High C's Tell

In an interview, high C's are usually:

- Very deliberate
- Exacting
- Very specific



- Interested in lots of detail
- Quiet and reserved, perhaps even timid
- “Perfectionistic” or very accurate
- Analytical
- Methodical

In the first 5-10 minutes, you should pay specific attention to how a person acts. Even before you meet them, you can watch their behavior as you approach and see if they are the upright, confident D or I, or the reserved somewhat shy or timid S or C. This should help you eliminate two of the four and then you can work to narrow it down to the final type. After you meet them, try to pay attention to how fast they jump right into the questions. High D's and high C's will get there fast, while High I's and S's will talk a lot more. The high D's and C's will not stop to get to know you nearly as much as the high S's or I's. High D's or C's may challenge you. The D's will do it because they are gruff and tend to doubt others. The C's will do it because they want so much detail and accuracy. High I's or S's, on the other hand, are less likely to challenge you. High I's because they are too busy getting to know you and talking, high S's because they wouldn't want to offend you.

Learn these tell tale traits of the four types and you can determine which behavioral type your interviewer is. In the next chapter, we'll explain how to make use of this to communicate in their language and have a better interview.



3. **How to communicate with your interviewer's behavioral style**

Figuring out your interviewer's behavioral style is only half the picture. Once you know that, then you have to deliver information in a way that is appropriate to their style. Learning to communicate with them in their language will help make your interview even better.

When interviewing with high D's:

- Get straight to the point, don't mess around with fluff and social formalities
- Have a sense of urgency, they are usually in a rush
- Leave the jokes at home, it's all business with the high D
- Don't challenge them, but be confident and competitive
- show some competitiveness
- exhibit a real "go get 'em" attitude, but not over the top because high D's don't like flamboyance
- keep it simple
- be practical, demonstrate how you get results, or have won competitions
- talk business because high D's usually prefer professional relationships
- show them how you can take charge when you need to
- demonstrate that you can lead and take command
- if a main reason why you want a new job is because you want more challenges, chances for success and a more competitive environment, this is good to share with the high D

When interviewing with high I's:

- be social, sunny and happy
- feel free to talk, but not more than they do
- discuss the interviewer and make it personal
- feel free to lighten things up
- focus on your ability to communicate with others and understand them
- show them that you understand people and have diplomacy
- respect others if you talk about why you left
- if you are seeking a new job because you didn't get along with others it won't hurt to let the high I know this

When interviewing with a high S:

- be calm, reserved and don't get too emotional
- be kind and show respect to everyone you talk about
- show them how dependable and consistent you are
- if you are someone who takes a slow, steady approach and can always be depended on to stick with it to the end, high S's will appreciate this a lot
- don't challenge authority



When interviewing with a high C:

- provide lots of detail and supportive evidence for what you say
- don't skimp on the specifics
- show your methodical side, if you have one
- demonstrate how accurate you can be
- talk about rules, structure and systems in a supportive way (e.g., bosses, company rules, laws, etc.)
- feel free to get analytical

This isn't meant to instruct you in how to lie to your interviewer. This would be a big mistake because acting as something you are not usually comes off as insincere and disingenuous. However, knowing the kind of information your interviewer thinks is important, and the way in which he likes to hear it, will help you highlight your strengths appropriately. Imagine being able to watch your interviewer as he watches a video of the interview just prior to yours. As he sat there talking to his friend about what he thought, you could take notes. Then, when it comes your turn to interview, you would know what to talk about and not, and how to talk about it.



4. **Your Strengths...How to Show Them Off**

More and more employers are placing greater emphasis on soft skills like problem solving, self-starting ability, empathy, etc. The purpose of this chapter is to teach you about your own natural talents, and how to highlight them in an interview. Fueled with this information, you will be able to approach any interview with greater self-awareness, and show off your true talents with knowledge, confidence and mastery.

If you haven't figured it out yet, one of the biggest benefits to this entire process is time. When you're in the middle of an interview, you don't have time to think about these things forever. Wouldn't you rather take a written interview where you had time to think about what you wrote, instead of live interviews where often we find ourselves wishing we could take back something we just said (or didn't say)? As you read your Interview Success Profile, you get the time to deliberately think about what you will want to say about yourself in an interview.

Now it's time to get your Interview Success Profile out. This profile looks at your natural talents for a variety of different areas. **Your task in this chapter is to learn more about yourself from this profile, and integrate them into examples from your past experience.** Simply regurgitating text from a profile won't do. To impress the interviewer you will have to be able to draw connections to how these strengths have made you a great employee, the kind they will want to hire.

There are two simple steps to creating self-awareness and using it in an interview.

- Step 1. Identify
- Step 2. Create Relevance

The following pages are exercise pages for you to print out and work on. These are important pages that you will want to keep with you to review just prior to an interview.

Step 1. Learn your Strengths Exercise
(print this page and complete)

Read your profile and find your **5** highest scores and write them in the spaces below. Then create your own definition for each one, in your own words. You can find an in-depth description of each skill in the reference library at the end of this guide, but create your own definition in your own words so when you explain it in an interview you will be using your words, not ours.

1. _____

My description:

2. _____

My description:

3. _____

My description:

4. _____

My description:

5. _____

My description:

Strengths

Step 2. Creating Relevance Exercise

(print this page and complete)

For each of the 5 strengths you've chosen, write 2 examples of a situation in your life where the strength was a benefit to you. Briefly describe the situation, the strength and its effect. The purpose here is to create relevance for your strengths in your actual life. Take your time here, and chose examples with significance because these are also the examples you will be using to show your strengths off to the interviewer.

Tips: (1) Find situations that had a **direct impact** on your success in your role. (2) Choose the most **significant** examples you can think of. (3) make the examples specific to gains (financial, personal, competitive, etc.). (4) Highlight the **company's** pain involved in the situation and how your strength was able to resolve it.

Below is a sample exercise.

Strength (1):

"Understanding
Others"

Situation:

As a sales representative for Acme Sales, I am always fighting to get to the real decision maker or economic buyer. Much of the time, I'm dealing with people who say they have the authority to make the decision, but do not. One of my greatest strengths is being able to read people well. When I took over the territory, the previous rep told me that John was the go-to-guy in the account. He was supposedly the one who could make the decisions and the one I should be trying to please. The former rep also told me John was a fan of Acme Sales and very helpful. It didn't take me long to realize that John wasn't quite being honest with me. I just had a gut feeling that he may not be the big supporter and decision maker he wanted us to believe he was. Eventually, I found out that not only was he not the key person, he was also running interference for our competition. Turns out that the competitive rep is a friend of his from college.

Benefit:

My natural talent for reading people's true intentions, body language and overall tone allowed me to see that John wasn't what he reported to be, either as a decision maker or as a supporter of our products. His words said one thing, but the overall picture told a different story. In the end, I positioned myself to meet others who actually were in a decision-making role and did not have any conflict of interest. The account has gone from being in the bottom quartile of my accounts to the number 4 biggest buyer, making my year and generating over \$385,000.00 in business for Acme.

Strengths

Now it is your turn.

Benefit:

Strength (3):

Situation:

Benefit:

Strength (4):

Strengths

Benefit:

Learn the relevance of these 5 strengths because what you just wrote above is your best bet for showing off your talents in the interview process. Print these pages, re-read them, and use this information in an interview to give unique, targeted, well thought out answers designed to get you noticed and remembered.



5. **Your weaknesses – how to blow them off**

Now that you've learned what your strengths are and how to show them off to the interviewer, you should go back through your Interview Success Profile, but this time with the focus on what you are not good at and how that could detract from your success with an organization. Blowing off your weaknesses doesn't mean ignoring them. It means finding ways to make them a non-issue. By being aware of what your weaknesses are, you will have taken the most important step in the interviewer's eyes. Knowing your weaknesses is the most important piece to making sure you don't rely on such weaknesses. Everyone has weaknesses and managers tell us all the time that they see those who are aware of their limitations as being much more productive than those who are not.

Blowing off your weaknesses also means eliminating your dependence on them. We all have weaknesses. Along with our strengths, they are a part of what makes us who we are. Learning what they are is just as important a part, perhaps even more, of the self-mastery we have discussed since the beginning of this document.

The best people we measure in an organization are NOT the ones that have the most strength. In actuality, they may even have less raw talents than others. Top performers in these organizations have in common the fact that they have better self-assessment capabilities. They know what they are good at, and not good at, and they make sure they don't depend on their weaknesses for their success. They truly know what they are good at and make sure they use it to achieve their goals.

Step 1. Learn your Weaknesses Exercise
(print this page and complete)

Read your profile and find your **5** lowest scores that relate to your work and write them in the spaces below. Then create your own definition for each one, in your own words. You can find an in-depth description of each skill in the library at the end of this guide, but create your own definition in your own words so in case you have to use this knowledge; at least it comes out of your mouth.

1. _____

My description:

2. _____

My description:

3. _____

My description:

4. _____

My description:

5. _____

My description:

Weaknesses

Step 2. Creating Relevance Exercise

(print this page and complete)

For each of the 5 weaknesses you've chosen, write 2 examples of a situation in your life where they got in your way. Briefly describe the situation, the weakness and its effect. **Most importantly, though, make sure you then write down what you learned about yourself and how that knowledge has helped you perform better.** You should feel confident discussing those things you are not as good at, and able to show the interviewer that you are aware of these things and that you won't let them get in the way.

Tips: (1) Highlight how you were able to work around the weakness and how you prevented it from getting in your way (3) show them anything you have done to try to address this weakness. Hiring managers know that no one is perfect, but polls have shown that they are impressed by people who acknowledge their limitations, and more importantly, have the initiative to do something about them.

Below is a sample exercise.

Strength (1):

"Concrete
Organization"

Situation:

As a sales representative for Acme Sales, it is important that I am organized and prepared for product demonstrations in the account. This involves making sure I coordinate my time and equipment, and have all the materials prepared in advance. One time I had a big client demonstration and I didn't have the materials I needed. For the demo. I got lucky and managed to borrow what I needed from another rep, but it reinforced the fact that I'm not naturally a terribly organized person. As a result, I force myself to make check-off lists that help me make sure I have everything I need. It's not natural for me to do that, and to be honest it annoys me, but it is also the best way I've found to stay organized.

Lesson Learned:

Although being very organized is not a natural talent for me, I've learned from experience that I can create a system of to-do lists and check-off sheets that force me to be organized. In my last demo, I simply made sure I checked off every task in preparation for the demo, it went great and the client ended up purchasing \$37,500.00 worth of product.

Now it is your turn.

Weaknesses

Creating Relevance Exercise
(print the following 3 pages and complete)

Weakness (1):

Situation:

Lesson Learned:

Weakness (2):

Situation:

Weaknesses

Lesson Learned:

Learn the relevance of these 5 weaknesses because what you just wrote above is your best bet for showing the interviewer that you are aware of what you are not great at, but you also know how to prevent those things from getting in the way of your success. Print these pages, re-read them, and use this information in an interview to give unique, targeted, well thought out answers designed to get you noticed and remembered.



6. **Kinds of interview questions and how to prepare for them**

Here is a list of six of the most common types of questions. When you prepare yourself to answer questions like these, you significantly increase your chances of having a successful interview.

There are two simple rules here: answer honestly and think big-picture.

Always be **open** and **honest**. We're constantly amazed at how many times someone thinks that they are bluffing well, when it is obvious they are not. If you go through an interview without admitting you stink at something, or laughing at yourself at least once, the interviewer is less likely to believe you.

Think **big-picture**, because while many of these questions ask for specific detail, they are all looking at the bigger picture.

Here are the kinds of interview questions we see most often:

- **Credential verification questions**
This type of question includes "What was your GPA?" and "How long were you at.... ". Its purpose is to place objective measurements on features of your background. Just be straightforward here, and remember...they can verify everything you say.
- **Experience verification questions**
This type of question includes "What did you learn in that class?" and "What were your responsibilities in that position?" Its purpose is to verify experiential features of your background. Aside from verification, you can turn it into a selling opportunity by inserting how such experience made use of one of your strengths, helped you discover it, or helped develop it.
- **Opinion questions**
This type of question includes "What would you do in this situation?" and "What are your strengths and weaknesses?" Its purpose is to subjectively analyze how you would respond to a scenario, and gauge your level of self-awareness. Here's another stellar chance to show off your self-awareness by practicing what you learned in the previous chapters.
- **Dumb questions**
This type of question includes "What kind of animal would you like to be?" or "What do you think Flubber is made from?" Its purpose is to get past your pre-programmed answers to find out if you are capable of an original thought. There is not necessarily a right or wrong answer, since it is used primarily as a test of your ability to think on your feet. Go with your gut, feel free to laugh at its silliness and always keep such answers light. The last thing you want to do is get too serious about these kinds of questions.
- **Behavioral questions**
This type of question includes "Can you give me a specific example of



how you did that?" or "What were the steps you followed to accomplish that task?" Its purpose is to anticipate predictable future behaviors based upon past responses. Here they are trying to get at something you already know from your Interview Success Profile, so supply answers from your worksheets in the previous section.

➤ **Competency questions**

This type of question includes "Can you give me a specific example of your leadership skills?" or "Explain a way in which you sought a creative solution to a problem." Its purpose is to align your past behaviors with specific competencies that are required for the position. If they are asking about specific competencies (problem solving, leading, initiative, etc.) then it is likely that these competencies are known to be vital in the position. Treat these as keys to the test.

Here are some actual examples of these different kinds taken from clients.

- Give me a specific example of a project that you were responsible for organizing from beginning to end. How did you go about it?
- Give me an example of a difficult problem you solved at work and describe how you went about solving it.
- What is the difference between activity and results? How do you personally define this difference?
- What is the one thing in your life that you have not been able to accomplish or complete that gives you the most frustration? Why didn't you complete it?
- Give me an example of a time when you knew the customer was wrong but you had to accommodate their wishes. How did you handle it?
- Is there ever a time when a customer who is wrong should be confronted? If so, give me an example of when that would be and how you would do that.
- Give me an example of a lesson you have learned from making a mistake. What did you do differently going forward?
- What do you consider to be the most effective way to influence someone to a particular point of view?



7. **How to give interviewers the best answers they've ever heard**

So many answers people give an interviewer are fluff-laden air balls that state no accomplishment, give no framework for success, or sound just like the same thing every other candidate says. You, however, want to show them that you are unique. There's little value in being a nameless face amid a sea of applicants. Your best bet is to stand out in a good way by using the self-mastery you have learned so far in this document.

For example, let's say they ask you: "why should we hire you". Aside from being the dreaded question it is, how would you answer it? Go ahead and say it out loud right now (in your head works too). What did you say? Was it compelling, or did it sound like it came out of a can of generic interview answers (e.g., I'm a hard worker, a good team player, I work well without supervision, I'm honest, etc.)? Was it as smooth as the first time you asked someone out in high school?

To stand out, shake them up and make them remember you. Each and every question the interviewer asks is a chance for you to demonstrate what you've learned in this guide, and show them how you will be a valuable addition to their team.

Here are some rules that will help guide your responses:

1. Always take a second to **think through what you are about to say**. A poll of managers showed that they are continually surprised by how people start talking before they are ready. There is an old proverb that says "it is better to remain silent and be thought a fool, then to speak and prove them right".
2. Try to find a **specific example of a personal strength or weakness** for you to support your answer. This is why knowing your report is so important. Be self aware and use the answers you wrote down in Sections 4 & 5
3. Qualify the question.
People buy what they want, not what they need. The interviewer is the buyer and you're the sales person. Don't make the mistake of trying to sell them what you think they should see. Make sure, instead to qualify what they are looking for. Often times, the best way to do this is by simply asking them to elaborate on the question. For example: when they ask "what makes you think you have what it takes to work in this job?", ask them what do they think top performers in this role do, then show them how you have it. You're not supposed to know how to do the job before you're ever hired, so don't be afraid to ask questions that qualify what they want.



8. Interview Protocol

There are certain rules for interviewing that should be followed in order to make the best impression. Here is a down and dirty list of some of the most important:

- Keep answers brief – you should only talk 1/3 of the time, and let the interviewer have the rest to ask his questions and answer yours. Never grab more than 50% of the time for yourself.
- Dress appropriately – some might tell you that it is appropriate to dress casually if the culture you're interviewing with is such. This may be true, but more often than not, we have seen people who "thought" it was a more relaxed environment when it wasn't. Unless you are explicitly told that business casual is OK, always dress business formal (i.e., suit or dress). Trying to make a statement about who you are with your clothing often sends the wrong message. There will be ample opportunity to demonstrate your individuality later. Your attire in the interview is usually not the place. If you wear a suit and one isn't required, it is less awkward than the other way around, so the safe bet is the conservative one in this case.
- Identify their goals up front – ask questions right from the beginning designed to tell you what they are looking for. In most cases, all you have to do is ask what they are looking for, take notes, then methodically go back through their response using the information in your profile to demonstrate to them that you are that person. If you are not, although it may be hard to imagine, this may not be the job for you and figuring that out up front will save you a lot of wasted time.
- Ask your way to the job – like with selling, interviewing goes best when you ask your way to the sale. In this case, you are asking your way to the job. Ask the interviewer what they want, what they think, how they know when they will have found it and their opinions. Seek then, simply to use the self-awareness you gained in this profile to demonstrate that you are the solution to their needs.
- Why you left – talking about why you left your last position can be difficult, but hiding the reason is even worse. Be honest, provide the essentials but don't go too heavy on the detail and keep it impersonal. Emotional outburst, disparaging comments or accusations about your previous employer will only hurt your interview. Find the practical reasons why you left, highlight how your move is the next advance for your career and turn the discussion back to how you hope to find that next step with the company you are interviewing with.
- Make a personal connection – making use of what you learned in the first section of this guide, seek to understand the interviewer on a personal level and make a connection there with whatever similar values, behaviors or strengths you feel you possess that are similar to their style.
- Close the interviewer – interviewing is a sales call, but like good selling, closing doesn't mean lifting your knee off their throat so they can say yes.



Selling yourself means not being afraid to ask someone what they are looking for in a solution and asking them what they think of your ability to be that solution. In other words, if you walk out of an interview without asking them what their opinion of you is and what the next step is, you are making a deadly mistake. We have seen managers say that they liked the candidate very much, but they said thanks for the time, stood up and walked away. They subsequently passed on those people. Try a statement like this: “Well thank you for your time. What is your opinion of my ability to do the job as you’ve described? What kinds of things are you’re comfortable with, or is there anything you have any reservations about”?

- Handling rejection – if in the above step you encounter rejection, or the interviewer expresses concern about your weaknesses, this is too late in the game to try and rebut them. If they make negative statements, be receptive to them, not rebellious. As they talk, see if you can’t find a way to show them how their concern hasn’t been a factor in the past, rather than argue that their concern doesn’t exist. For example: “I appreciate that you’re concerned about my lack of experience, but given the qualities you describe I hope you agree that I possess the strengths needed to do the job anyway.”
- Show them you are interested – don’t talk about yourself and your strengths and weaknesses all the time. Do your homework and familiarize yourself with all that you can about the company you are interviewing with. With the internet you should be able to become an instant expert in what they sell/make/do, for whom they do it, who their competition is and what their company’s position is in their industry. Ask questions and show interest in these things during the interview will help build a sense of familiarity.
- Beat them to the punch – if you have one weakness in the report that you feel could be a problem, bring it up before they ask about it. This disarms the negative and makes it a stated fact, not a dreaded, hidden dark weakness that the interviewer uncovered.
- Follow up – whatever happens, regardless, always follow up with a personal thank you note (hand written) sent out that day. Emails are efficient, but a hand written personal note shows personal effort that speaks much louder. If you don’t have a street address, or worry that it will take a week to get through the mailroom to him, we recommend both an email and a hand written note. In it do just two things...thank them and reiterate your interest. For example: “ Dear Mr. Smith, I just wanted to thank you for taking the time to consider me for the position. I enjoyed meeting you, and am very excited about the possibility to join the Acme team. Thanks and I look forward to hearing from you soon. Sincerely, John Doe”

Conclusion

In the end, interviewing for a job should be a fun and exciting time. It should be about new opportunities and a chance to correct what may have caused you to leave the last job. The biggest mistake we see people make is that they get rushed, look for any job in the storm and end up creating nothing more than a filler in a long series of jobs they will have over the course of their life. They rush into it without truly seeing the opportunity a new job brings. Why leave one place only to get a somewhat better situation somewhere else. Why not make it much better?

With the information in this guide, you have the chance to understand yourself like you never have before, and armed with that self-awareness you can make your next job the best one you've ever had.

Remember...you get what you accept.

Library of Natural Talents
Expanded definitions



Accountability for Others

The ability for a person to be responsible for the consequences of the actions taken by those under their management. Taking responsibility for the decisions and actions of subordinates, and not shifting focus on blame or poor performance back onto them, or somewhere else. This derives from an internal responsibility to one's self as a manager, and to be accountable and this internal willingness to accept this responsibility associated with being in a position of management. It involves understanding that it is the task of the manager to accurately evaluate and understand the abilities of his/her employees and to set realistic goals and expectations based on the resources and capabilities available.

Good score:

A person with a good score in this capacity will not try to make excuses for a bad decision, which resulted in poor performance by an employee. They will instead make every effort to try and identify the cause of both the poor performance and any mistakes they made in assigning the task. Their focus will be more on correcting the problem to ensure future success, than on protecting themselves.

Poor Score:

As in personal accountability, a low score in this area can indicate a person who is more concerned with appearance and image, than with results and success. They will seek to place blame for a bad decision on any factor, which does not lie solely with them, for doing so would detract from their abilities in the public image. Although achieving goals and success can be important to this person, their self-image is often fragile and protecting it is much more important.

Accurate Listening

(See “Evaluating What Is Said”)

Attention to Detail

The Ability to see and pay attention to details. To be able to recognize the component parts of a procedure or object, and to verify the correctness or error in an individual part or procedure.

Good score:

A person with a good potential will likely be thorough in the execution of their job responsibilities. They will define each job function at its most elementary level and be sure that each of the functions is properly completed

Poor Score:

Poor potential may cause a person to focus more attention on the completion of the overall project, rather than the component elements. This person may not enjoy, or have a desire for, checking details of the situation, but rather would prefer to have that responsibility delegated to someone else.

Attitude Toward Honesty

This capacity examines a person's view of Honesty, and of structure and order in society. It takes a look at the level of self-esteem available to accept the consequences of their own actions, and toward reporting the dishonesty of others.

Good Score: A person with a good score in this capacity has a positive image of the concept of honesty, structure and order in society. They have sufficient self-esteem to accept the consequences of being honest and the condemnation associated with reporting the dishonesty of others. They will not become so involved with others that they won't report any inappropriate actions

Poor Score: A poor score in this area may result from someone who has an unclear view of honesty, or someone who gets so involved with others that are overly reluctant to report any dishonest actions.

Attitude Towards Others

The ability to maintain a positive, open and objective attitude towards others.

An example of an improper attitude would be a situation in which one assigns attributes to a person based solely on an unsubstantiated prejudgment. This could cause a person to exercise an unnecessary degree of caution, producing a “stand-off” attitude, or could cause a person to place an unjustified amount of trust in a person thereby exposing him or herself to being manipulated.

The evaluation of this attribute is based on an individual’s personal insight into others, and the degree to which they are influenced by what they think the situation “ought” to be.

Good score:

A person with a high score in the capacity will tend to be free from prejudices that cause such prejudgments of others; therefore, more likely to develop an appropriate attitude towards people based on real life factors instead of misconceptions, biases, or prejudices based on conjecture. Such a person will be more likely to see people as they truly are.

Poor Score:

A person with a low score in this capacity may tend to prejudge others based on what they prejudge them to be like, and then to allow these feeling to override the logical interpretation of whom others really might be based on their actions. This may interfere with the progression of a genuine relationship with specific people.

Balanced Decision Making

The ability to be objective and to fairly evaluate the different aspects (people and other) of a situation, and to make an ethical decision that takes into account all aspects and components. It is the ability to maintain a “balance” between the needs of oneself, others and the company at the same time, and to provide equal importance to all three when making decisions.

Good score:

A person with a Good score in this capacity does not suffer from an imbalance in the amount of focus they place on any one factor (internal or external). They will most likely make decisions, which place equal emphasis on all involved parties or concerns; therefore, making decisions, which are more likely, to satisfy all needs.

Poor Score:

A Poor Score in this area indicates a person who does not place equal importance on all aspects of a situation. They may make decisions, which satisfy some, but not all of the factors or people involved.

Commitment to the job

(See “Personal Commitment”)

Conceptual Thinking

The ability to identify and evaluate resources and plan for their utilization throughout the execution of comprehensive, long-range plans. This capacity is much more abstract than concrete organization; it deals with the ability to allocate resources in a mental scenario, and accurately visualize outcomes.

Good scores:

A person with a Good score in this capacity can mentally role-play the execution of the long-range projection and make accurate predictions concerning the possible outcomes.

Poor Scores:

A person with a low score in this capacity may have difficulty clearly seeing such a mental scenario, thus tending to have a shorter focus-level and require greater input for predictive decision-making . They can; however, effectively execute conceptual organization by using team evaluations to handle scenarios designed to predict the outcomes of organizational plans or structures.

Concrete Organizing

The ability to understand the immediate, concrete needs of a situation and to establish an effective action plan for meeting those needs. This capacity deals primarily with the person's ability to properly allocate resources to accomplish a goal or plan. These resources are not limited to only physical components, but takes into account a person's ability to evaluate and utilize both human and physical resources.

Good score:

A person with a good ability in this capacity will be able to systematically and logically evaluate the components of a situation and then utilize them effectively to produce the desired result.

Poor Score:

A person with a Poor Score in this capacity may have difficulty in identifying the separate components of a situation, and therefore, have difficulty in deciding what steps to take to meet a goal.

Consistency/Reliability

This is the capacity to feel an internal need to be conscientious in their personal or professional efforts. The need to be both consistent and reliable in their life roles. This is an internal motivation, as opposed to being motivated by external forces such as job, peer or supervisory pressures.

Good scores:

Good potential in this capacity will make a person dependable and reliable, tending to perform in most situations with little or no direct supervision.

Poor Scores:

Poor potential in this capacity may result in a person who is not consistent or dependable. Their work performance and schedules might be erratic and undependable. They might work very hard for a period of time, but without external motivation or supervision, they might lack the internal desire to maintain this level of performance throughout the duration of the task at hand.

Conveying Role Value

The ability to draw upon a variety of capacities (empathetic, interpersonal and leadership) to instill, in an employee, a sense of value for the task at hand. It is the ability to convey to another, the value and importance that a given role carries with it. This is not a measurement of a person's ability to understand a role's value, but to communicate that value to another or group of others.

Good score:

A person with a Good score in this capacity will be able to effectively instill in an employee, or employees, a belief that what they are doing has value. They will be able to paint a clear picture of how and why that role is important...to themselves, to the company or to others.

Poor Score:

A Poor Score in this area can be indicative of two things. Either the person attempting to convey this value does not appreciate the value in a role adequately, or their ability to communicate ideas and concepts to others in such a way that they are perceived well is lacking.

Correcting Others

The ability to confront controversial or difficult issues in an objective manner. The ability to have non-emotion discussions about disciplinary matters. This capacity is directly related to the person's balance in their ability to evaluate others, and be empathetic.

Good scores:

A person with a Good score in this capacity can usually provide constructive criticism to another in such a way that it is not received as insulting or degrading. The balance they exhibit in weighing the needs of the situation versus the needs of the people involved allows them to address both adequately.

Poor Scores:

A person with a low ability in this capacity could either tend to be too insensitive or harsh in such correction, or be too sensitive and not willing to provide the necessary criticism or positive discipline, required to develop an employee. As to whether they tend to be too harsh or too sensitive, a correlation can be made based on their score in the empathetic ability capacity. Over attention to their empathetic ability may tend to result in someone who is so sensitive to the feelings of others that they place that person's emotions over the needs of correcting a problem. Under attention to this same ability can result in a person who views others more as functional work units rather than individuals, and discounts other's emotions in comparison to the importance of correcting a problem.

Creativity

Is John an innovative thinker whose views of himself and the world allow him to think outside the box?

Creativity and deep imagination are directly linked to one's preference for, or ability to see, the intrinsic dimension of thought. By valuing the intrinsic dimensions (infinite possibilities) above all else one is able to transcend the limits associated with the other dimensions (space, time, logical classification of groups and or systems). Such actions in thought allow for an appreciation for new and non-traditional ways of thinking not as achievable under the constraints of extrinsic and systemic thought.

Good scores:

A person with a Good score in this capacity will tend to be able to come up with unique ideas about how things could be done, and have a deeper imagination (one not tied to conventional ways of thinking) than those with lower scores in the area. Such novel thinking benefits business thought just as much as it does artistic thought.

Poor scores:

A person with a Poor score in this capacity will be more influenced by logical rationalizations, organizational limits, logistical complications, social impressions, etc. Anything extrinsic or systemic that could limit the creative process by imposing constraints on the infinite possible valuations possible with intrinsic thought. As a result they will be less likely to think way outside the box in revolutionary ways.

Developing Others

The ability to understand the needs, interests, strengths and weaknesses of others, and to utilize this information for developing others.

This score is derived primarily from a person's concern, their ability to evaluate others, and their ability to identify with others. It is affected by a person's focus on structure and order. The person with a focus on structure will tend to better understand the importance of building an organizational system. If the person also has positive empathetic skills, they will see the development of others as the way to build the organization through people.

Good scores:

A person with a Good score in this capacity will be able to: accurately identify the strengths and weaknesses of an individual, evaluate them against the requirements of a job or goal, and then design a program that will effectively elevate that person's skills to the level they need to achieve success.

Poor Scores:

A person with a Poor Score in this capacity may have poor empathetic abilities, and may not be able to determine who needs development or they simply may not consider it as important. In addition, a person with a low score in this area may not take a proactive approach to management, and fail to perceive the importance in planning ahead to develop contingent talent. Instead they may tend to be reactive, and deal only with the immediate, or that which presents itself in the now.

Emotional Control

The ability of a person to maintain rational and objective actions when experiencing strong internal emotions. Unlike “Internal Self Control” (which is an ability to prevent the feeling of others from negatively affecting your internal emotions), this capacity measures one’s ability to control their own internal emotions, and prevent them from affecting their actions, logic, objectivity, etc.

If Internal Self Control deals with an ability to keep outside emotions out, Emotional Control deals with keeping internal emotions in.

Good score:

A person with a Good score in this capacity will be able to be aware of their internal emotions, but compartmentalize them as such and make rational, objective decisions based on the facts at hand, rather than allowing their internal stress, fear, excitement, etc. to influence their decisions.

Poor Score:

A person with a low score in this area may have difficulty keeping their feelings under check. Instead of recognizing their emotions and keeping them separate from their actions and maintaining composure, they may allow their own emotions to lead their actions, and in doing so will no longer be managing a stressful situation, but instead will become caught up in it.

Empathetic Outlook

The ability to perceive and understand the feelings and attitudes of others. The ability to place oneself “in-the-shoes” of another and to be able to view a situation from their perspective. It involves being conscious of how your actions will impact others.

Good score:

A person with a Good score in this capacity will be able to appreciate how their actions impact others, and utilize this knowledge in a wide variety of scenarios from interacting with others to managing others.

Poor Score:

A person with a low score in this area may have difficulty understanding the needs and feelings of others. This may cause them to make decisions, which do not sufficiently consider the needs of others.

Enjoyment of the Job

The feeling that one's job is both fulfilling and rewarding and that it has a positive and useful benefit.

Good score:

A person with a Good score in this capacity will tend to view their job as more than simply a means to earn an income, but rather a valuable endeavor that proves beneficial to others as well as him or her self.

Poor Score:

A person with a low score in this area could have difficulty in enjoying the job due to internal prejudices or other factors outside of their control. It is possible to "love" the job, yet still score low in this capacity, due to being deeply frustrated by some aspect of that job that keeps them from doing the job as they would like to. This could be a lack of time or resources, inadequate skills, insufficient self-confidence, etc. If this capacity is low it is important to take a close look at the position and person and determine which scenario is involved (i.e., internal or external) since only then can movement be made towards correcting the problem.

Evaluating Others

The ability to make realistic and accurate judgments about others, to evaluate their strengths and weaknesses, and to understand their manner of thinking, acting and behaving. Examples would include being able to identify why someone did well or bad in a task, identifying whether the performance factor was caused by the person himself, or the nature of the environment.

This ability does not necessarily rely on a person's ability to quantitatively measure another's performance. Rather, their ability to discern the key components of the person's performance, and accurately predict levels of performance in future or different tasks. This involves an ability to use a strong gut-intuition. Success in this capacity is dependent on the absence of undue prejudice, or bias on the part of the evaluator.

Good scores:

A person having a good capacity in intuitively evaluating others needs less performance data about an individual in order to make good judgments about their ability to perform. They may also tend to feel more confident in making such evaluations in situations where there is either insufficient data or observation time.

Poor Scores:

A person with a low score in this area can still make good judgment concerning performance, but they will tend to require more data, and time in making these decisions. They might tend to feel rushed without this supportive data.

Evaluating What is Said

This is based on a person's openness to people and their willingness to hear what the other person is saying, and not what they think they should say, or are going to say. Critical to this capacity is the positive appreciation of other people and their opinions, and the positive approach to problem solving, being open to whatever solution may present as the most effective, depending on the situation.

Good score:

A person with a Good score in this capacity will be able to objectively evaluate feedback and "hear" the concerns, intentions or opinions being stated, as opposed to inserting their own feelings or opinions.

Poor Score:

A low score in this area can result in a person subjectively perceiving what they want based on pre-judged opinions or preset ideas as to what they "think" is happening.

Following Directions

The ability to effectively hear, understand and follow directions or instructions. It is the willingness of an individual to postpone making personal decisions, or taking action, until they have openly listened to do what they are being asked to do.

Good scores:

A person with a Good score in this capacity will tend to complete a task with less direct supervision than someone with a lower score (depending on the quality of the instruction). It is less an indication of the person's ability to understand or comprehend instructions, and more a sign of their willingness to adhere to the instructions as they were given...regardless of their personal opinions about how they "think" the task should be accomplished.

Poor Scores:

A person with a low score in this area may have difficulty completing tasks according to the directions. Again, it is less an indication that they do not intellectually understand the instructions being given, but rather that they simply feel they can make adequate decisions and successfully accomplish the task on their own, without the need for additional input.

We don't judge whether this assumption is right or wrong. Whether the person may in fact be perfectly capable of accomplishing the goal with no external instruction is irrelevant here. A low score in this area simply indicates a person's tendency to discount outside instructions and rely on their own innate abilities...regardless of competency.

Freedom from Prejudice

The ability to not allow the unfair implications of prejudged information to enter into, and affect, an interpersonal relationship. Not allowing a person's class, race, sex, ethnicity or personal philosophy to cause a person to prejudge the actions, potential, intentions or attitudes of others.

Good scores:

A person with a Good score in this capacity will tend to look at all the facts openly, will look at others without allowing a class identification to bias a judgment or decision. They will tend to be open to the fact that other people don't have the same cultural heritage or background, and accepting of that fact.

Poor Scores:

A person with a low score in this area may tend to identify another with a particular class group, and allow this identification to predetermine how they will react to them. They may allow this predetermination to influence their decision regarding that person, regardless of the fact that there is no supporting evidence, or basis, for such decisions.

Gaining Commitment

The ability to develop and invoke a self-starting attitude in employees in their pursuit of goals. It is the ability to motivate employees to do their best and to provide them with concrete, practical ideas and methods by which they can achieve their goals.

Good score:

A person with a Good score in this capacity will be able to effectively use empathetic ability, communication skills and leadership ability to create a sense of personal motivation to be successful in a given task. This motivation is instilled within the employee; therefore, they are acting on their own drive, as opposed to simply responding to outside supervision.

Poor Score:

A person with a low score in this area lacks the ability to effectively inspire another with this internal desire to succeed. They might fail to recognize the importance of such inspiration, and rely instead on direct supervision to accomplish goals through employees.

Goal Directedness

(See “Project/Goal Focus”)

Handling Rejection

The ability to handle rejection on a personal level is based almost solely on the individual's self-esteem, the ability of a person to see themselves as valuable, separate and apart from their role or position in life.

Good score:

A person with a Good score in this capacity is able to separate their self-value from their performance. They do not take rejection, or criticism, in an overly personal way. The security they have in their own value is based on their own appreciation of themselves as an individual, and not on the opinions of others.

Poor Score:

A person with a low score in this area will be prone to viewing rejection or criticism as a personal affront, a mark against who they are as a person, and will react accordingly (i.e., in a defensive, hostile or emotional manner). They can allow negative feedback to have a negative impact on their self-esteem.

Handling Stress

This is a person's ability to balance and defuse inner tensions and stresses, which, if allowed to build up, could interfere with a person's ability to perform to their potential. It is not the person's ability to handle stressful situations, but rather their ability to appropriately separate themselves from such stressful situations, and maintain their own separate inner sense of peace.

Good scores:

A person with a Good score in this capacity will be able to encounter a stressful situation, deal with it as need be, and then step away from the situation (resolved or not) in a way which releases their own emotional involvement, and allows them to move on to other matters. These stresses can also be "cumulative" in nature, and having this ability serves to prevent excess build-up of stress which, in sufficient enough levels, could begin to interfere with performance and physical well-being.

Poor Scores:

A person with a low score in this area may encounter difficulty accomplishing this emotional separation, therefore continuing to exist in the same stressful environment even when not at work (i.e., they bring it with them). Allowing this cumulative build-up of various stresses may serve to distract them from other tasks, or reduce their effectiveness in them, due to the preoccupation caused by the underlying stress. Being prone to such build-up may also effectively reduce the amount of external stress one is comfortable with, which might lead to a decrease in performance more rapidly than someone who is not as "full" of stress might.

Human Awareness Skills

The ability to be conscious of the feelings and opinions of others; to value others as people instead of just their organizational role or value. This ability would include seeing employees in their life roles as well as in their professional roles.

Good score:

A person with a Good score in this capacity tends to be more concerned with the employees as a person. They are conscious of the situations in a person's life that will affect the employee and their performance.

Poor Score:

A low score in this area can indicate a person who does not adequately appreciate others as individuals, and instead may tend to view them as components in a system. They may simply lack the ability to adequately understand another's needs, concerns, feelings and opinions.

Initiative

The ability to direct one's energies toward the completion of a goal, without an external catalyst. The ability to initiate actions based on one's own interpretation, or understanding, of a situation.

Good score:

A person with a Good score in this capacity has the ability to take action as a result of his or her own decisions. They feel comfortable enough in their own abilities to act on their own decisions without consulting others. They will adapt to a dynamic situation and move around unforeseen obstacles without waiting for supervisory instruction.

Poor Score:

A low score in this area would indicate a person who is not comfortable enough in these abilities to act in the above manner. They may have difficulty beginning a project without direct supervision.

Integrative Ability

The ability to evaluate what to do is also the ability to identify the elements of a problem situation, and understand which components are critical. Being able to see clearly the component dimensions of a situation gives a person the ability to see different types of situation structures, and thereby the ability to see different types of problem solutions.

Good scores:

A person with a Good score in this capacity is able to “integrate” all the variables of a situation into a single homogenous picture, and then use this understanding to make decisions regarding planning, resource allocation, problem solving, etc.

Poor Scores:

A person with a low score in this capacity may tend to sometimes not be able to see the most obvious problem solution. They may get mentally “blocked” by focusing too much on any one component in the problem (e.g., people, system structure, and resources).

Someone with a very low score in this capacity might also tend to have preset ways in which they solve problems, and sometimes find it difficult to break away from these narrow habits and utilize other problem solving techniques or methods.

Internal Self Control

This is the ability to maintain a steady and controlled level of internal emotion in a stressful or emotionally charged situation. Although it directly affects self-composure in a difficult situation, this capacity is more an examination of the tendency a person has to allow the external environment's level of stress to affect their internal levels.

If Internal Self Control deals with an ability to keep outside emotions out, Emotional Control deals with keeping internal emotions in.

Good score:

A person with a Good score in this capacity will be better able to keep their internal level of emotion (stress, excitement, fear, etc.) unaffected by external influence. A good example would be an emergency room physician. They must continually prevent the strong emotions of those whom they treat from interfering with their thought process. They must be able to separate themselves from the outside emotions involved and logically deal with the situation at hand.

Poor Score:

A person with a low score in this area may have difficulty accomplishing this separation. Instead of isolating outside emotions as those of others, they over empathize and allow themselves to become emotionally charged in the same manner. They do not separate themselves well and may instead become caught up in the excitement, fear, sorrow, etc.

Intuitive Decision Making Ability

The ability to accurately compile intuitive perceptions about a situation into a decision or action. Ability to be “intuitive” as opposed to intellectual (or requiring data and logical reasoning) in decisions making, and to be effective in doing it. This requires a good deal of understanding of people, and the outside world, and the ability to visualize the whole picture in a mental scenario.

Good score:

A person with a Good score in this capacity will be comfortable making decisions on their feet, without having to study a situation or requiring logical data to examine.

Poor Score:

A low score in this area indicates a person who is not comfortable making such decision until he/she has had sufficient information and time to analyze a situation

Job Ethic

This is the personal commitment an individual makes to execute a specific task.

Good score:

A person with a Good score in this capacity will have a positive self-direction, a realistic understanding of their role, and a positive goal and direction focus.

Poor Score:

A low score in this area indicates a low score in one of the above abilities, which may lead the person to have trouble applying their abilities to a given task.

Leading Others

The ability to organize and motivate people to get things accomplished where everyone feels a sense of order and direction. Effective leadership depends on a fine mixture of capacities that must match the environment in which the manager is asked to perform, but regardless of that mixture, every leader must be able to gain the trust of others and be able to solve problems among and for the group.

Good score:

A person with a Good score in this capacity will effectively combine such capacities as empathetic ability, problem solving ability, self-esteem, and role confidence and motivating others, into a cohesive approach to guiding others towards a mutual goal.

Poor Score:

A low score in this area are most likely indicative of a lacking in a person's empathetic and problem solving abilities.

Long Range Planning

The ability to identify long-range goals and design realistic plans to attain them. It is the ability to see the big-picture and then to determine which direction to take, and how resources should be used to attain future goals.

Good score:

A person with a Good score in this capacity is able to effectively “see into the future,” forecast needs, and comprehend how certain situations, or procedures, will meet those needs.

Poor Score:

A low score in this area might be due to a person’s being too “now” oriented, and their spending more time on solving current problems and attaining immediate results, than on looking into the future.

Material Possessions

Different cognitive values cause each person to have a different motivation. People with a more balanced value structure tend to have more “motivators” to which they are drawn. It is easier to provide this person with a reward structure that will motivate them to succeed. People with a much-focused cognitive structure may have fewer motivating forces, but often they respond more intensely to them. There are 6 Motivating forces measured in this report. Below is the description for “material possessions”.

“Material Possessions” This is the motivation that a person has, based in their belief in the importance of money, or material possessions. This person will feel that they can achieve worth and security through the collection of money or material possessions.

There are no “good” or “bad” scores in the category. It is simply an indication of the degree of influence each of the six “personal motivators” exerts on this individual. Ideally a balance will exist between these forces. An imbalance in this category (i.e., placing an inordinate amount of importance on any one motivator) will cause a person to over-focus on strictly that motivation).

Meeting Standards

The ability to see and understand the standard requirements established for a job, and their commitment to meeting them. This is an internal motivation, and combines the capacities of quality orientation, and a person's focus on structure and order.

Good score:

A person with a Good score in this capacity will have the internal motivation to strive to meet whatever standards have been set (either by himself or someone else), and will be able to focus the appropriate amount of attention to achieving these standards.

Poor Score:

A low score in this area can indicate a person who either focuses too little, or too much, attention to the task of achieving a standard. In the case of over-attention the person will place so much importance on meeting a standard that they may become overly perfectionist and demanding of either themselves or others. There appears very little room for error. In the case of under-attention the person does not place enough importance on this objective; therefore they may tend to miss standards in situations that are difficult, or repetitive.

Monitoring Others

The ability to focus on the actions and decisions of others in a practical and pragmatic way to identify both successes and mistakes. It is the ability to identify the causes of success and failure and to do so in an objective and accurate manner, not allowing personal feelings or biases to influence such decisions.

Good score:

A person with a Good score in this capacity will be able to accurately and effectively evaluate the performance of another. This objective evaluation is crucial in accurately leading, developing, and managing the person being monitored.

Poor Score:

A low score in this area can indicate that the person either does not place enough importance on systems and order. Therefore, they tend to discount the need to make systematic measurements in order to improve performance, or they may allow too much subjectivity into their assessment and will instead tend to see what they “think” the person is capable of, instead of seeing how they are actually doing.

People Reading

(See “Understanding Attitude”)

Persistence

This is a person capacity to stay the course in times of difficulty. It involves their personal commitment, their belief in what they are doing, and their project/goal focus. Having the ability to remain motivated to accomplish goals in the face of adversity or obstacles.

Good score:

A person with a Good score in this capacity will be able to remain motivated to achieve success through the support of an inner belief that what they are doing is right and important. There exists a drive to complete the task at hand.

Poor Score:

A low score in this area indicates a person who may have difficulty accomplishing goals in difficult situations, or when confronted with obstacles that were unforeseen. This can be due to an insufficiency in their role awareness, their self-esteem, or their project/goal focus.

Personal Accountability

The ability to be responsible for the consequences of one's own decisions and actions; taking responsibility for these decisions, and not shifting focus on blame or poor performance somewhere else, or on others. This derives from an internal responsibility to one's self to be accountable and this internal willingness to own up will tend to be exhibited outside in one's actions.

Good score:

A person with a Good score in this capacity will not try to make excuses for a bad decision and will normally make every effort to try and identify the cause of that bad decision. Their focus will be more on correcting the problem to ensure future success than on protecting themselves.

Poor Score:

A low score in this area can indicate a person who is more concerned with appearance and image, than with results and success. They will seek to place blame for a bad decision on any factor that does not lie solely with them, for doing so would detract from their abilities in the public image. Although achieving goals and success can be important to this person, their self-image is often fragile and protecting it is much more important.

Personal Commitment

The capacity to focus and stay committed to a task. It is the measure of a person's internal personal commitment, without any external influences or pressures. This commitment can also be directed at their goals and ambitions, and will be reflected in their focus toward a goal or task.

Good score:

A person with a Good score in this capacity will maintain a consistent level of activity toward a task and will stay busy with little direct supervision. They will work steadily at their task and stick solidly to their beliefs and goals.

Poor Score:

A low score in this area will be easily distracted from the task at hand. The distractions don't have to be from an outside source, it can be a daydream or random thought. The poorer the score the more problematic this will become. They may also have difficulty maintaining a sense of focus or direction toward obtaining personal or professional goals.

Personal Drive

This is a measurement of how strongly a person feels the need to achieve, accomplish or complete something. This “drive” can take many forms (e.g., tasks, knowledge, career, physical, etc.), but it involves the level of personal motivation a person is capable of bringing to bear on any given task which they feel is important.

Good score:

A person with a Good score in this capacity tends to focus considerable intent on the completion of a task or objective once they are convinced of the benefits involved in its completion.

Poor Score:

A person with a low score in this area may have difficulty committing substantial internal resources towards the completion of a task, even once convinced of its importance. This can be due to a variety of factors, but the most common by far in a business setting is usually based on inadequate “Role Awareness.” This capacity can be improved by improving the understanding, or awareness, a person has for their role.

Personal Relationships

Different cognitive values cause each person to have a different motivation. People with a more balanced value structure tend to have more “motivators” to which they are drawn. It is easier to provide this person with a reward structure that will motivate them to succeed. People with a much-focused cognitive structure may have fewer motivating forces, but often they respond more intensely to them. There are 6 Motivating forces measured in this report. Below is the description for “Personal Relationships”.

“Personal Relationship” This is the motivation generated by the importance of forming personal relationships with the people with whom they work. This person is motivated by being accepted and recognized as a person, not simply as a professional that is part of a team or group.

There are no “good” or “bad” scores in the category. It is simply an indication of the degree of influence each of the six “personal motivators” exerts on this individual. Ideally a balance will exist between these. An imbalance in this category (i.e., placing an inordinate amount of importance on any one motivator will cause a person to over-focus on strictly that motivation).

Persuading Others

The ability to convince others, to present one's viewpoint in such a way that it is accepted by others. It involves a person's intuitive insight, role confidence, practical thinking ability and the ability to think on one's feet.

Good score:

A person with a Good score in this capacity can see and talk from another's point of view. A person who has the ability to understand other's objections and concerns, and then to respond to these objections and concerns effectively.

Poor Score:

A low score in this area can indicate a person who is insensitive to others, not knowing what they want to hear. A low score can also be generated by having excessive role confidence and in thinking that the other person only wants, or needs, to hear what they think is important.

Practical Thinking

The ability to make practical, common sense decisions; to see and understand what is happening in a common sense way. To realistically identify problems and solutions in practical terms, rather than in theoretical or conceptual terms.

Good score:

A person with a Good score in this capacity will be able to balance getting things done in a timely manner, with getting things done in a quality manner.

Poor Score:

A low score in this area might indicate an inability to balance the two needs, thus over-focusing on either time (results at any cost) or quality (perfection regardless of time or expense).

Proactive Thinking

The ability of a person to evaluate future implications of current decisions and actions. This would include examining the long-range effects of a decision. The ability to mentally create the scenarios and outcomes of situations that could develop from decisions or plans of action

Good score:

A person with a Good score in this capacity will tend to evaluate current situations, needs and actions based on how they will change in the future.

Poor Score:

A person with a low score in this area will more than likely tend to “react” to events as they present themselves. The focus is on “now”.

Problem Management

The ability to keep critical issues in context so that one can understand what is happening, and effectively use one's knowledge to solve the problem. This would include the ability to assign resources to people in order to allow them to solve problems, to be able to change plans in order to minimize the effects of operational problems.

Good score:

A person with a Good score in this capacity will be able to efficiently balance all the variables of a problem, and keep them clear and separate. This will aid in their identifying and implementing appropriate solutions.

Poor Score:

A person with a low score in this area may have difficulty maintaining perspective on all of the variables in a given problem situation. They might focus too narrowly on any one aspect of a problem and "lose sight of the forest" so to speak.

Problem/Situation Analysis

The ability to identify the elements of a problem situation and to understand which components are critical. The ability to identify critical activities in a process, to be able to break down the process into its component activities. Based partially on a person's "Integrative Ability"

Good score:

A person with a Good score in this capacity will be able to clearly see the various dimensions of a cognitive structure. This allows the person to see different types of situation structures and thereby see different types of solutions.

Poor Score:

A low score in this area indicates an inability to see all sides of situation, and may miss the most obvious solution. They may be bound by an over-all focus on structure, excessive focus on people, or other excessive focuses.

Problem Solving Ability

The ability to identify alternative solutions to a problem and to select the best option. This basically means to be able to identify the system component that is causing the error, as well as the options available for resolving it and completing the task.

Good score:

A person with a Good score in this capacity is able to pool together multiple capacities and talents to assess all aspects of a problem from beginning to end, from identification to resolution.

Poor Score:

A low score in this area indicates an inability to isolate the process in which the error occurs, and to then identify the components of the process which need changing in order to correct the problem.

Project/Goal Focus

The ability of an individual to maintain their direction in spite of obstacles in their path. The ability to stay on target, regardless of circumstance. This score is derived from a person's clarity and focus on their self-direction and their appreciation of structure and order.

Good scores:

A person with a Good score in this capacity has a good ability to stay on track while involved in a project, even if there are unforeseen obstacles that occur during the process. They will tend to ignore the problems, but will stay on the path even if some event causes the course to be slightly altered. This person will also have the ability to keep a single task from diverting them from overall project goals.

Poor Scores:

A person with a lower score in this area may tend to be easily swayed from the prescribed course of action. Their Project /Goal focus can change quickly and without much effort. They may require direct supervision in order to stay focused on a particular task or project.

Project Scheduling

The ability to understand the proper allocation of resources for the purpose of getting things done within a defined timeframe. This capacity will include the ability to minimize dependence on one critical function of production. It will also include identifying alternatives in work tasks and maximizing the physical facilities available.

Good score:

A person with a Good score in this capacity can effectively allocate resources in an effective way so as to maximize their efficiency. They can make the best use of time; not wasting or allowing resources to sit idle.

Poor Score:

A low score in this area indicates a person who has difficulty in dealing with the complexity of satisfying multiple demands with a limited number of resources in a limited amount of time.

Quality Orientation

This capacity is a measure of a person's affinity for seeing details, grading them against a preset standard (internal or external) and identifying flaws. This is directly related to a person's preference for paying attention to detail. Whereas "attention to detail" is more a measure of how capable a person is to appropriately see detail, this capacity also measures their proclivity for such accuracy as well. Instead of simply ability it answers the question "how much of a desire do they have to ensure quality"?

Good score:

A person with a Good score in this capacity will have an underlying desire to constantly evaluate things at a subconscious level, to be comparing them to predefined set of standards.

Poor Score:

A low score in this area does not indicate the lack of ability to see details, but rather a lack of motivation to use their innate ability to see details to ensure that the quality of work is up to par. They either do not understand the standards, which have been set, or they are not capable of using their own judgment to set such standards for themselves.

Realistic Expectations

The ability to have expectations of others that can realistically be met. These standards can be either in quality of production, or quality of performance.

Good score:

A person with a Good score in this capacity will be able to accurately evaluate the capacities of a person and set standards and expectations at a realistic level. They can accept various performance levels and be open and accepting of a person who is not achieving at his/her maximum level.

Poor Score:

A low score in this area indicates a person who is not capable of accurately judging the capacities of another person. They will expect a person to be able to perform at a level established by them, and not at the level of a person's actual abilities. People with unrealistic expectations have standards that they expect others to fulfill, even if they do not have the right or authority to set these standards.

Realistic Goal Setting (for others)

The ability to set goals for others that can be achieved using available resources and operating within a projected timeframe. This capacity includes the ability to utilize previous measurable performance in the establishing of goals and/or quotas.

Good score:

A person with a Good score in this capacity is adept at understanding the potential of another individual, weighting the requirements of a job against their abilities, and setting realistic/attainable goals for them to pursue.

Poor Score:

A low score in this area indicates a person who may not have enough confidence to set goals where they should be. They may not have the drive to encourage others to achieve established goals; or they may not be able to see what is actually happening clearly enough to have a realistic view of the situation.

Realistic Personal Goal Setting

The ability to set goals for one's self that can be achieved using available resources and operating within a projected timeframe. Whereas setting realistic goals for others involves the ability to evaluate others strengths and weaknesses, this capacity deals with a person's ability to accurately evaluate their own strengths and weaknesses, and to use this information to set achievable goals for themselves.

Good score:

A person with a Good score in this capacity can clearly judge their own individual strengths and weaknesses, and weighting those against the task at hand, set realistic and attainable goals for them to pursue.

Poor Score:

A low score in this area indicates a person who may not have enough confidence, or understanding, of his/her own abilities to set goals where they should be. They may not have an accurate picture of what their own capabilities are, and they will set their own goals either unrealistically high or low.

Relating to Others

The ability to coordinate personal insights and knowledge of others into effective actions. The ability to make use of accurate interpersonal skills in interacting with others.

Good score:

A person with a Good score in this capacity is able to establish a good rapport with others, as well as a feeling of comfort between themselves and others.

Poor Score:

A low score in this area often indicates a person who feels the necessity to present an image of a person that is different from what they think they are. Not being comfortable with who we are can lead to others not feeling comfortable around us. It is very difficult to relate effectively with others, if you are not comfortable with yourself as a person.

Respecting Policies

The ability of a person to see and appreciate the value of conducting business affairs according to the intent of company policies and standards.

Good score:

A person with a Good score in this capacity generally understands the philosophies of the corporate structure and will strive to conduct business according to those standards. They will honor the concept of doing things according to the rules and regulations of the company.

Poor Score:

A low score in this area indicates a person who does not have a clear picture, or concept, of the function of rules and regulations. They may feel that a company policy is only to be utilized when they are practical and functional, but whenever a policy hinders the effective and practical execution of their job, the policy can be ignored or broken. This does not mean that they actively seek to violate company policy for the sake of breaking rules, but rather that they may honestly feel that the policies are only guidelines to be used in the execution of their responsibilities, not laws always to be obeyed.

Respecting Property

The ability of a person to see and appreciate the value of protecting and correctly using company property.

Good score:

A person with a Good score in this capacity will generally have a clear perception of the correct value and use of company property. They will not likely be wasteful, yet they will use the property and resources in the effective execution of their responsibilities.

Poor Score:

A low score in this area indicates someone who has a tendency to not be overly concerned with company property or resources. They may feel that company property and resources are there only as an aid to help them in the execution of their duties. However, if they do not value these resources for anything more than their assistance to their own job, they may be likely to lack any obligation to ensure resources and equipment are properly used. The lack of proper perspective in this area could cause a person to be wasteful.

Results Orientation

The ability to identify actions necessary to achieve task completion and to obtain results. This ability will be manifested in a person's ability to meet schedules, deadlines, quotas and performance goals.

Good score:

A person with a Good score in this capacity will view results as being important. They will lean towards tasks where the outcome or product occurs within a fairly short period of time. They need more direct rewards, abstract values and rewards are usually not as attractive to this person.

Poor Score:

A person with a low score in this area does not tend to be motivated by external results. They may view the importance in a situation on one specific area, which may not equal results on its own (e.g., being fast, enjoying the work, and being perfect, etc.). This lack of focus on all the variables involved in achieving results could lead to the result being incomplete.

Role Awareness

The ability of a person to be aware of his role in the world, or within a given environment. This is the ability to understand the expectations placed on a position, and to clearly see how those expectations are to be met.

Good score:

A person with a Good score in this capacity will understand what it is that they are doing, what is expected of them, and how they are suppose to be doing it. Having this understanding will allow them to utilize their other personal strengths and abilities to fulfill the role that they are in.

Poor Score:

A low score in this area indicates a lack of understanding for the role someone occupies. They are either unclear as to what it is they feel they should be doing, or they have not been informed adequately as to what the expectations are of their role or duties.

Role Confidence

The ability to develop and maintain an inner strength based on the belief that one will succeed. Role Confidence is a combination of a person's ability to see their role clearly, to view it as being positive, practical and functional, and to see themselves as valuable in that role.

Good score:

A person with a Good score in this capacity will be willing to give their opinions in situations where they do not have a thorough knowledge of all the particulars. They will most likely not be overly stubborn or insistent about their opinions.

Poor Score:

A person with a low score in this area will probably not be very assertive in the majority of professional situations. They may also lack the security in their opinions about what it is that they are doing, or supposed to be doing, so that they become indecisive...not sure how to proceed.

Seeing Potential Problems

The ability to structure current situations in an ongoing scenario and be able to identify developments that could cause problems in the future. This capacity involves the ability to break down a process into its component parts, identify the critical parts, and project the likelihood that problems will arise.

Good score:

A person with a Good score in this capacity has the ability to integrate "now" events into futuristic structures and determine what potential problems might arise. This requires a very flexible perspective.

Poor Score:

A person with a low score in this area may have limited flexibility in viewing situations or problems. They often have methods or standards through which they operate, and are not open to new or unique methods of operation. This person may also be a very "now" oriented person, choosing to solve problems as they arise rather than identifying them beforehand.

Self Assessment

The ability to practically and objectively identify one's personal management strengths and weaknesses. The ability of a person to take the skills and techniques that they have gained in evaluating external situations and applying them to evaluating their own performance and abilities.

Good score:

A person with a Good score in this capacity is capable of accurately evaluating his or her own strengths and weaknesses. They see themselves clearly.

Poor Score:

A low score in this area indicates a person who does not judge his or her own capabilities accurately. They either under or over evaluate their abilities, or can get into trouble when setting their own goals and expectations.

Self Confidence

This ability, often confused with self-esteem, is the ability to develop and maintain inner strength based upon the desire to succeed, and a person's belief that they possess the capabilities to succeed.

Good score:

A person with a Good score in this capacity will generally have a strong willingness to succeed based upon a combination of "drive" and functional knowledge. They believe in their abilities with accuracy.

Poor Score:

A person with a low score in this area may either lack the drive in the practical or functional knowledge, or does not trust their own abilities to perform a task or fill a role.

Self Discipline (Sense of Duty)

This is a measure of the strength one has in the norms with which they rule their own conduct. They feel a need to be consistent and true to themselves in their actions. It is the compulsion that one feels to be true to the ideals they have set for themselves.

Good score:

A person with a Good score in this capacity will have an inner strength, which enables them to weather even difficult situations. Since this strength is internal, as opposed to coming from an external force such as society or a supervisor, it will provide a sense of strength that the person will be able to use to bolster their belief in a chosen direction or course of action.

Poor Score:

A person with a low score in this area does not tend to focus an internal belief structure, and the lack of such an innate guide can result in a tendency to lack commitment to a chosen path or course of action. In difficult situations such a person may begin to question their own actions, or be easily swayed off course.

Self Direction

Balanced self-direction originates with an internal drive to excel in a chosen career path. It requires one to have a strong desire to be “better” than they currently are, no matter how good they actually become.

Good score:

A person with a Good score in this capacity will tend to set personal goals, operate with a passion in their endeavors, be open to change, and have a strong sense of duty to their own ideals and goals.

Poor Score:

A person with a low score in this area may be lacking in a sense of mission and willingness to do more than is asked of them. They can be averse to change, and may not work up to their full potential.

Self Esteem

The ability of a person to realize and appreciate their own unique self-worth. They base these feelings on internal factors, as opposed to external ones. This internal feeling of value allows them to appreciate themselves based not on what they do, what role they occupy or what success they attain, but rather how they judge themselves based on who they know themselves to be inside. This could also be considered the level of “self acceptance”.

Good score:

A person with a Good score in this capacity is able to value themselves as a unique entity aside and apart from their role or ambition. They base their value on their own internal standards. This internal “happiness” with one’s self plays a crucial role in job performance and satisfaction.

Poor Score:

A low score in this area can be a major deterrent and manifest itself in a person becoming dominant, “perfectionistic”, risk averse, and unable to handle criticism effectively. Such a person most likely tends to base their opinion of their own self-worth on the cultural programming of success, physical appearance, financial success, etc.

Self Improvement

Different cognitive values cause each person to have a different motivation. People with a more balanced value structure tend to have more “motivators” to which they are drawn. It is easier to provide this person with a reward structure that will motivate them to succeed. People with a much-focused cognitive structure may have fewer motivating forces, but often they respond more intensely to them. There are 6 Motivating forces measured in this report. Below is the description for “Self Improvement”.

“Self Improvement” This is the motivation that a person has based on the importance of improving oneself. This is motivation by the opportunity to obtain training and educational growth opportunities.

There are no “good” or “bad” scores in the category. It is simply an indication of the degree of influence each of the six “personal motivators” exerts on this individual. Ideally a balance will exist between these. An imbalance in this category (i.e., placing an inordinate amount of importance on any one motivator will cause a person to over-focus on strictly that motivation).

Self Management

An overall capacity comprised of multiple factors, which involve a person's ability to manage his or her own "self". Similar to a person's ability to manage others, which involves empathy, understanding, the ability to gain commitment and various other leadership qualities, this capacity measures a person's ability to marshal similar abilities toward managing themselves.

Good Score:

A person with a good score in this capacity will be able to objectively and accurately assess their own strengths and developmental needs, and tend to be realistic in deciding what they are capable of doing and in what time they can do it.

Poor Score:

A person with a poor score in this area may have trouble applying these capabilities towards themselves. This is not to say that they do not possess the proper tools to "manage." Rather, that they simply may not be very practiced at internalizing such efforts towards themselves. Without properly analyzing their own abilities they may fail to maximize their abilities to their fullest potential.

Self Starting Ability

The ability to find one's own motivation for accomplishing a task, and the degree to which a person will maintain that course in the face of adversity. This capacity is somewhat dependant on a person's level of persistence, focus and initiative.

Good score:

A good score in this capacity reflects a person who is adept at synchronizing their internal drivers (e.g., level of initiative, persistence, goal focus, etc.), and directing these combined abilities toward a common goal or task. They are also capable of marshalling these strengths on their own without much external supervision or motivation.

Poor Score:

A poor score in this area may reflect a person who has some lesser abilities in one or more of the key areas mentioned above. They may tend to require greater external influence to accomplish their goals, or become distracted from the target more easily then someone with a higher score.

Sense of Belonging

Different cognitive values cause each person to have a different motivation. People with a more balanced value structure tend to have more “motivators” to which they are drawn. It is easier to provide this person with a reward structure that will motivate them to succeed. People with a much-focused cognitive structure may have fewer motivating forces, but often they respond more intensely to them. There are 6 Motivating forces measured in this report. Below is the description for “Sense of Belonging”.

“Sense of Belonging” This characteristic is a measurement of how a person is motivated by the importance of feeling they are part of a team, a member of a group. This person wants to feel that the people they work for/with respect them and in return have concern and respect for them as well.

There are no “good” or “bad” scores in the category. It is simply an indication of the degree of influence each of the six “personal motivators” exerts on this individual. Ideally a balance will exist between these. An imbalance in this category (i.e., placing an inordinate amount of importance on any one motivator will cause a person to over-focus on strictly that motivation).

Sense of Mission

Different cognitive values cause each person to have a different motivation. People with a more balanced value structure tend to have more “motivators” to which they are drawn. It is easier to provide this person with a reward structure that will motivate them to succeed. People with a much-focused cognitive structure may have fewer motivating forces, but often they respond more intensely to them. There are 6 Motivating forces measured in this report. Below is the description for “Sense of Mission”.

“Sense of Mission” This is a measure of importance and commitment to one’s ideals and goals. The concept of performing well in jobs, simply for the purpose of doing a good job in whatever they are doing

There are no “good” or “bad” scores in the category. It is simply an indication of the degree of influence each of the six “personal motivators” exerts on this individual. Ideally a balance will exist between these. An imbalance in this category (i.e., placing an inordinate amount of importance on any one motivator will cause a person to over-focus on strictly that motivation).

Sensitivity to Others

The ability to be sensitive and aware of the feelings of others, but not to allow this awareness to get in the way of making objective decisions.

Good score:

A person with a Good score in this capacity will respond to the concerns of others, even if they don't relate to the situation at hand.

Poor Score:

A low score in this area is indicative of an inability to identify and relate with others on a personal level, such a person has a difficult time empathizing with the needs and concerns of those with whom they deal.

Status and Recognition

Different cognitive values cause each person to have a different motivation. People with a more balanced value structure tend to have more “motivators” to which they are drawn. It is easier to provide this person with a reward structure that will motivate them to succeed. People with a much-focused cognitive structure may have fewer motivating forces, but often they respond more intensely to them. There are 6 Motivating forces measured in this report. Below is the description for “Status and Recognition”.

“Status and Recognition” This is a measure of the importance of social role status and recognition to a person. It relates more to formal status and recognition than to informal or emergent status and more subtle types of recognition. Titles, authority, and competitive rewards are some of the things, which motivate these people. Over-emphasis on such motivation may cause a person to undervalue the means by which they can accomplish these rewards. The ends-justify-the-means can be a common mentality for someone who places more importance on this type of motivation.

There are no “good” or “bad” scores in the category. It is simply an indication of the degree of influence each of the six “personal motivators” exerts on this individual. Ideally a balance will exist between these. An imbalance in this category (i.e., placing an inordinate amount of importance on any one motivator will cause a person to over-focus on strictly that motivation).

Surrendering Control

The ability of a person to surrender control of a given situation, or outcome, over to another person or group of people. The ability to be comfortable in a situation where a significant portion of the responsibility for achieving a goal lies in the hands of others.

Good score:

A person with a Good score in this capacity will be comfortable with trusting other team members with the success of a mutual objective.

Poor Score:

A person with a low score in this area will have difficulty turning responsibility over. When the results of a task will impact them...they want the control.

Systems Judgment

Systems Judgment measures the balance of a person in getting things accomplished within the external system of people and things, within which one works. It is their affinity for schematic thinking.

Good score:

A person with an ideal balance in this capacity will be able to achieve a balance between the need to work within a set of guidelines and operating outside of set boundaries, in order to accomplish goals. They can also tend to be proactive.

Poor Score:

A person with a Poor Score will have an imbalance in this capacity that can lead to two extremes. Over or under attention is presented under the first page of the report under the "Talent Equilibrium" graph. Over-attention to the need for systems and order can lead to perfectionism and dogmatic inflexibility as to how things must be done (form over function). Under-attention to the concept of systems will result in individualistic behavior, a tendency to discount the importance of policies and planning, and become reactive instead of proactive. They fail to appropriately appreciate the importance of established systems and order.

Theoretical Problem Solving

An abstract version of “Problem Solving Ability” this capacity involves a person’s ability to apply their problem solving ability in a mental scenario. Creating, operating and identifying problems in a hypothetical situation, then to manufacture the appropriate response to resolve the problem. The difference is that this takes place strictly in a person’s mind and requires very little qualitative data. They can imagine the situation.

Good score:

A person with a Good score in this capacity is capable of identifying future problems, and formulating the appropriate steps, which would be needed to correct them. They are comfortable enough with their ability to take action on these decisions.

Poor Score:

A person with a low score in this area will have difficulty in picturing such a future situation, and will often be unwilling to commit to a course of action until they have collected adequate data. They need some sort of proof that the direction in which they are headed is the correct one. They require more time and information before making a decision.

Timing

The ability to accurately evaluate what is happening in such way that their statements, decisions and actions are effective, accurate and timely. This capacity evaluates a person's ability to look at the whole picture and effectively evaluate how their immediate request or action fits into the current timeframe

Good score:

A person with a Good score in this capacity will be able to effectively interact with others by adjusting the timing with which he/she presents ideas, suggestions, criticism, or solutions.

Poor Score:

A person with a low score in this area will tend to take inappropriate action, take the appropriate action at an inappropriate time, or a combination of both.

Understanding Attitude

The ability to “read between the lines” in understanding such things as body language, reticence, stress and emotions.

Good score:

A person with a Good score in this capacity will utilize more than simply words to gather information about another.

Poor Score:

A low score in this area indicates a lacking in the ability to measure another’s attitude through indirect signs or signals.

Understanding Motivational Needs

The ability to understand the needs and desires of employees enough that this knowledge may be used to motivate them to succeed. The ability to encourage a self-starting, active pursuit of goals and objectives

Good score:

A Good score in this area is indicative of someone who understands that everyone is unique, and motivated by different things. They value individual desires and take the time to get to know an individual's specific motivators.

Poor Score:

A person with a Good score in this capacity will tend to discount the importance an individual's desires and needs play in regards to managing or motivating that person.

Understanding Prospect's Motives

(See "Understanding Motivational Needs")

Using Common Sense

This capacity is determined by the person's focus on practical thinking, their ability to see the world clearly, and their general intelligence, as reflected in their scores in empathy, practical thinking, and organizational ability.

Good score:

A person with a Good score in this capacity will have use of everyday, informal knowledge that has not been formally evaluated and placed in the decision making process. The utilization of common sense in the decision making process appears to be more of a natural reflex than a logical thinking process.

Poor Scores:

A person with a low score in this capacity might be encouraged to use solid record keeping, organizational skills, and other tools, which aid them in obtaining a better, more objective decision.