Case Study – Job Benchmarking

Administrative Assistant Position

(Compares Job Candidates against Job Requirements)

Problem: The Managing Partner of a Professional Services consulting firm indicated she had previously 'mis-hired' two individuals to fill the firm's Administrative Assistant position – neither of them had "worked out."

Solution: The firm enhanced its hiring process by adding job benchmarking to the process. The Managing Partner interviewed and assessed the behaviors and motivators of each candidate, comparing each person's scores to the job's behaviors and rewards.

Result: The 3rd candidate interviewed had behaviors and values that closely matched what the job required and offered. The Administrative Assistant position was filled successfully.

(Note: Both candidates below 'interviewed well' according to the business owner who was trying to hire an administrative assistant, but their match with what the job requires was ***questionable***.)

Job Benchmark Information		Candidate #1		Candidate #2	
Behaviors the Job Requires in order to be successful **(listed in order of importance)**	**Job's Score**	**Person's Scores**	**Person's Match to the Job**	**Person's Scores**	**Person's Match to the Job**
#1. Organized Workplace	7.8	3.0	Fair	2.5	Fair to poor
#2. Analysis of Data	7.0	3.0	Fair	2.5	Poor
#3. Customer Oriented	6.8	10	Good	8.0	Exact
#4. Frequent Interaction with Others	5.7	9.0	Fair	9.0	Fair
#5. Competitiveness	3.0	2.0	Good	4.0	Exact
#6. Versatility	3.0	6.0	Fair to poor	7.5	Fair to poor
#7. Frequent Change	2.8	4.8	Good	6.5	Fair
#8. Urgency	2.5	1.5	Good	4.5	Exact to Good

Provided by Business Success Tools LLC
Tel. (860) 643-4744 Email. Info@BusinessSuccessTools.Biz
www.BusinessSuccessTools.Biz

Case Study – Job Benchmarking

Administrative Assistant Position

(Compares Job Candidates against Job Requirements)

Job Benchmark Information		Candidate #1		Candidate #2	
The Job's Values – identifies what is motivating and rewarding (enjoyable) about this particular position (listed in order of importance)		Person's Scores	Person's Match to the Job	Person's Scores	Person's Match to the Job
#1. Theoretical	5.5	5.3	Exact.	3.3	Fair
#2. Social	5.4	8.5	Fair to poor	8.3	Poor
#3. Aesthetic	4.5	4.2	Exact	6.2	Good
#4. Utilitarian	4.3	3.5	Good	3.3	Good
#5. Traditional	4.2	3.3	Exact	5.0	Good
#6. Individualistic	4.0	5.2	Good	3.8	Exact

Provided by Business Success Tools LLC
Tel. (860) 643-4744 Email. Info@BusinessSuccessTools.Biz
www.BusinessSuccessTools.Biz

Case Study – Job Benchmarking

Administrative Assistant Position

(Compares Job Candidates against Job Requirements)

A 3rd candidate also 'interviewed well'. In comparing the behaviors and motivators of the 3rd candidate to what the job requires, Candidate #3's **job fit** is extremely strong, much stronger than the previous two candidates.

Result: Candidate #3 was selected to fill the position and has done very well in the position.

Job Benchmark Information			Candidate #3	
Job's required behaviors (listed in order of importance)		**Job's Score**	**Person's Scores**	**Person's Match to the Job**
#1.	Organized Workplace	7.8	5.5	Good
#2.	Analysis of Data	7.0	6.0	Exact
#3.	Customer Oriented	6.8	9.5	Good
#4.	Frequent Interaction with Others	5.7	8.0	Good
#5.	Competitiveness	3.0	1.0	Good
#6.	Versatility	3.0	5.0	Good
#7.	Frequent Change	2.8	3.5	Good
#8.	Urgency	2.5	1.0	Good
Job's Values – identifies what is motivating and rewarding (enjoyable) about this particular position (listed in order of importance)				
#1.	Theoretical	5.5	4.0	Good
#2.	Social	5.4	7.3	Good
#3.	Aesthetic	4.5	6.2	Good
#4.	Utilitarian	4.3	6.2	Good
#5.	Traditional	4.2	1.7	Good
#6.	Individualistic	4.0	4.0	Exact