

# Amberjack's Model for Identifying Potential

## Part 1 - Research



### Introduction

In a constantly changing world with no certainty, yesterday cannot always predict tomorrow. With past-experience becoming an increasingly restrictive method of measuring the likelihood of a candidate's success, how do you ensure that the talent you hire is future-fit?

The answer lies in Potential. In an era marked by development and advancement, measuring a candidate's Potential enables you to identify individuals who will succeed at whatever tomorrow brings.

Historically, assessing candidates has relied on past-experience and attainment as the crucial component. We believe Potential should be the primary consideration instead.

Yet, the ISE's March 2022 poll highlighted that only 33% of employers are confident of their knowledge to understand candidate potential, and less than half (47%) were confident that they have enough knowledge of what is meant by 'potential'. It is increasingly clear organisations need help understanding, and assessing, potential.

Amberjack's mission, to enable a world where people are hired on their Potential, helping to remove barriers, is the next step for more diverse, more successful, more resilient, organisations.

We have spent many years developing our approach to identifying Potential to make it easily achievable, even in high-volume situations.

### Background

Here at Amberjack, we were keen to develop a model for Potential-based hiring due to a number of factors.

Most importantly, we saw the practices and processes used throughout the market, and what we saw, particularly in the Early Talent arena, was that selection processes tend to favour those who

have access to certain past experiences, often through privilege. This is likely why we experienced an increase in clients asking for an alternative method, something up to date.

As the world of work rapidly changes, what resulted in success yesterday, won't necessarily result in success today, much less tomorrow, and just because someone hasn't had an opportunity to do something in the past, it doesn't mean that they wouldn't excel at it.

Traditionally, with working practices established and controlled by majority groups, individuals of the same profile have had a greater chance of 'succeeding' than others. Using past performance as an indicator of future performance compounds those historical inequalities.

These are the reasons why we decided to focus on hiring for Potential. Our vision is for a world which removes barriers and increases diversity by welcoming talent based on potential to succeed, grow, and develop. Organisations with diversity of thought, behaviour, and a future-fit workforce, are more likely to be resilient and continue to thrive even in difficult times.

## Amberjack's Model for Identifying Potential

### What Do We Mean by Potential?

There are three types of Potential that matter. By identifying these in your candidates, we help you find the people who can make your organisation more resilient and future focussed. These three different areas all need to be considered when understanding an individual's overall potential:



#### Mastery Potential

The ability to master the role you are hired into



#### Growth Potential

The ability to grow, progress, and master the next role in the organisational hierarchy within the same job family.



#### Turn Potential

The ability to 'take turns'. This is not just about increasing your seniority, but also overseeing different areas within the business. Turn Potential is often what is meant when people talk about High Potential or Leadership Potential when looking at Early Talent.

By gaining a deep understanding of these areas, and the behaviours and abilities that influence them, we have been able to create our model for the Identification of Potential.

# Our Model for Identifying Potential (and the Research Behind It)

Using the available academic literature on Potential, over 5 years of application data, insights from our clients, and the thoughts of professionals in the changing world of work, we identified 4 key pillars which define a candidate with the potential to succeed and grow. This model is the foundation for our work and enables us to turn the concept of Potential into something which is identifiable and measurable.

**It is defined by its four key pillars.**



## Digital Mindset

With increasing automation in the workplace, it is important to identify individuals who have a natural inclination to utilising technology, leveraging it to think creatively, implementing technical solutions, automating, and digitalising.

Interviews with visionaries such as Ade McCormack, and inspiration from the works of futurologists like Ray Kurzweil, have revealed that excellence is not always about technical knowledge. The natural inclination towards technical solutions, automation, and digitalisation are important indicators of potential.

With Peterson et al.'s (2018) Learning Model for Digital Affordances highlighting the different affordances offered by technology; Functional (operation), Perceptual (interpretation), and Adaptive (adaption and innovation), it is clear that prior knowledge of technology is not necessarily the only way to assess an individual's strength in this area. Having a solution-based mindset and being able to explore new ideas is crucial to establishing a candidate's potential and Digital Mindset.



## Grit

As recent economic upheavals have highlighted, and many organisations are now noticing, resilience is key.

When the only certainty is that uncertainty is likely, and the pace of change is ever accelerating, individuals need to be able to adjust and apply their skills seamlessly from one situation to the next. People's ability to grow stronger through that change and remain determined is a predictor of success. The key components of Grit are drive, agility, and resilience.

Church and Silzer (2014) have identified resilience and emotional self-control as foundational personality characteristics that reliably predict leadership success and an individual's ability to deal with and influence others. Being able to identify this talent early on is critical, and is directly linked to future sustainability and business survival.



## Creative Force

---

With automation suited to logic-driven, linear tasks, or tasks that are traditionally 'left-brain', the added human value comes from 'right-brain' holistic and creative thinking. Those with high levels of Potential have the confidence to implement new ideas and solutions. The creativity involved in Creative Force differs from Digital Mindset in its process-driven and future-thinking nature, rather than the pure utilisation of creative digital solutions.

This future-orientated, self-driven behaviour, where an individual aims to bring change to their situation, is found to be a trait of employees who are more effective at their jobs (Bindl and Parker, 2011). Creativity is the basis behind innovation; innovators identify opportunities for success and challenge existing frameworks, as posited by Kirton's Adaptation-Innovation Theory (1989). In this way, our Creative Force pillar recognises candidates with the potential to add new ideas and approaches. Candidates with high levels of Potential enable significant change, challenge ineffective processes, and drive positive development (Howard, 2013).



## Applied Intellect

---

The basis for Applied Intellect is made up of three core characteristics; Social and Emotional Intelligence, Learning Agility, and Cognitive Ability.

Self-awareness and regulation are essential for continual improvement and progression. This is where Social and Emotional Intelligence becomes an important characteristic of individuals with high levels of potential. Self-management of activity and emotional wellbeing is crucial, especially in the hybrid working world; individuals need to be accountable for outcomes and less closely monitored. Social awareness and relationship management are essential for communication and effective group interactions whether they are physical, virtual, oral, or written.

Learning agility is the second key part of Applied Intellect. Learning agility, and the continual development this enables, has been found to more accurately predict long-term potential than past performance. Potential is about growth and persistent improvement, this is why "an individual's current skill-set is of secondary importance to their ability to learn new knowledge, skills, and behaviours that will equip them to respond to future challenges" (Mitchinson and Morris, 2012).

Finally, cognitive ability, the general mental capability involving reasoning, problem solving, planning, abstract thinking, comprehension, and learning from experience (Gottfredson, 1997; Plomin & von Stumm, 2018), helps identify an individual's capacity to apply their knowledge and intellect to a variety of situations. The flexibility and adaptability required to apply the learnings of one scenario to another is an important factor in a candidate's potential to succeed within an organisation.

## Using the Model to Assess for Different Types of Potential

With a strong foundation in our Model for Identifying Potential, we can assess potential in candidates using our blended assessment to look at a candidate's behaviours, situational judgement and applied intellect.

The Behavioural and Situational Judgement items tap into all areas of our model. The Applied Intellect items require candidates to draw conclusions from verbal and numerical challenges. Candidates answer the 'so what's' in an applied and relevant business setting (capturing evidence for the Cognitive Ability area of Applied Intellect). The assessment is rounded off with short video responses, reviewed by an assessor, assessing elements such as self-awareness and learning agility, which are harder to assess in more automated responses.

As our Assessment for Identifying Potential has been blended to include different types of assessment methods from first principles, you can gather the evidence across all pillars of the model in one assessment, providing a realistic view of the whole person, rather than capturing evidence across multiple stitched together, or staged instruments.

At Amberjack, at client request, we have also adapted our model for Identifying Potential for different working contexts. In addition to our main model, and the assessment to measure it, we have developed the Customer Service Potential Assessment, and Technical Potential Assessment. Further discussions to develop other sector-specific with clients are underway.

## Part 2 - The Success of Potential



Now we have provided an understanding of Amberjack's Model for the Identification of Potential, you are equipped for our deep dive into the results.

In part two, we will look at how you can assess for and identify those with the greatest potential, bringing this to life with case studies and the great results clients have already achieved using this model.

See part two to discover the success of our Model for Identifying Potential.

# The Research: Bibliography

## Applied Intellect

### Cognitive Ability

- Anderson, N., Salgado, J. F., & Hülsheger, U. R. (2010). 'Applicant reactions in selection: Comprehensive meta-analysis into reaction generalization versus situational specificity.' in *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 18(3), (pp. 291-304).
- Church, A. H., & Silzer, R. (2014). 'Going behind the corporate curtain with a blueprint for leadership potential.' in *People & Strategy*, 36(4), (pp. 50-58).
- Das, J. P., Kirby, J., & Jarman, R. F. (1975). 'Simultaneous and successive synthesis: An alternative model for cognitive abilities.' in *Psychological Bulletin*, 82(1), (pp. 87-103).
- Davis, S. K., & Humphrey, N. (2014). 'Ability versus trait emotional intelligence.' in *Journal of Individual Differences*, 35(35), (pp. 54-62).
- Ispas & Borman, (2015). 'Psychology of Personnel Selection' in Wright, J. (ed.) *International Encyclopedia of the Social & Behavioral Sciences*, (Second Edition).
- Ispas, Iliescu, Ilie, & Johnson., (2010). 'Examining the Criterion Related Validity of the General Ability Measure for Adults: A two sample investigation.' in *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*.
- Laher, S., & Cockcroft, K. (2013). 'Current and future trends in psychological assessment in South Africa: Challenges and opportunities.' in Laher, S., & Cockcroft, K. (Eds.), *Psychological assessment in South Africa: Research and applications* (pp. 535-552). Wits University Press.
- McHenry, J. J., Hough, L. M., Toquam, J. L., Hanson, M. A., & Ashworth, S., (1990). 'Project A validity results: The relationship between predictor and criterion domains.', in *Personnel Psychology*, 43(2), 335-354..
- Morgeson, F. P., Delaney-Klinger, K., & Hemingway, M. A., (2005). 'The importance of job autonomy, cognitive ability, and job-related skill for predicting role breadth and job performance.' in *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 90(2), (pp. 399-406).
- Murphy, K. R. (1989). 'Is the relationship between cognitive ability and job performance stable over time?' in *Human Performance*, 2(3), (pp. 183-200).
- Offermann, L. R., Bailey, J. R., Vasilopoulos, N. L., Seal, C., & Sass, M., (2004). 'The relative contribution of emotional competence and cognitive ability to individual and team performance.' in *Human Performance*, 17(2), (pp. 219-243).
- Pearlman, K., Schmidt, F. L., & Hunter, J. E., (1980). 'Validity generalization results for tests used to predict job proficiency and training success in clerical occupations.' in *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 65(4), (pp. 373-406).
- Schmidt, F. L., (2002). 'The role of general cognitive ability and job performance: Why there cannot be a debate.' in *Human Performance*, 15(1-2), (pp. 187-210).

### Learning Agility

- Church, A. H., & Silzer, R., (2014). 'Going behind the corporate curtain with a blueprint for leadership potential.' in *People & Strategy*, 36(4), (pp. 50-58).
- Dai, G., De Meuse, K. P., & Tang, K. Y., (2013). 'The role of learning agility in executive career success: The results of two field studies.' in *Journal of Managerial Issues*, 5(2), (pp. 108-131).
- De Meuse, K. P., Dai, G., & Hallenbeck, G. S., (2010). 'Learning agility: A construct whose time has come.' in *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research*, 62(2), (pp. 119-130).
- DeRue, D. S., Ashford, S. J., & Myers, C. G., (2012). 'Learning agility: In search of conceptual clarity and theoretical grounding.' in *Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, 5(3), (pp. 258-279).

Lombardo, M. M., & Eichinger, R. W., (2000). 'High potentials as high learners.' in *Human Resource Management*, 39(4), (pp. 321-329).

Mitchinson & Morris., (2012, January). Learning about learning agility [White Paper]. Center for Creative Leadership.

Schmidt, F. L., (2002). 'The role of general cognitive ability and job performance: Why there cannot be a debate.' in *Human Performance*, 15(1-2), (pp. 187-210).

## **Emotional & Social Awareness**

Bar-On, R., (2008). Emotional quotient inventory: Higher education (EQ-i: HEd). North Tonawanda, NY: Multi-Health Systems.

Bar On, R., Tranel, D., Denburg, N. L., & Bechara, A., (2003). 'Exploring the neurological substrate of emotional and social intelligence.' in *Brain*, 126(8), (pp. 1790-1800).

Davis, S. K., & Humphrey, N., (2014). 'Ability versus trait emotional intelligence.' in *Journal of Individual Differences*, 35(35), (pp. 54-62).

Emmerling, R., Boyatzis, R. E., & Emmerling, R. J., (2012). 'Emotional and social intelligence competencies: Cross cultural implications.' in *Cross Cultural Management: An International Journal*, 19(1), (pp. 4-18).

Farrelly, D., & Austin, E. J., (2007). 'Ability EI as an intelligence? Associations of the MSCEIT with performance on emotion processing and social tasks and with cognitive ability.' in *Cognition and Emotion*, 21(5), 1043-1063.

Flynn, M. L., (2019). Development and validation of a situational judgment test of critical social thinking in the workplace (Publication No. 4125) [Doctoral dissertation, Clemson University]. TigerPrints.

Kobe, L. M., Reiter-Palmon, R., & Rickers, J. D., (2001). 'Self-reported leadership experiences in relation to inventoried social and emotional intelligence.' in *Current Psychology*, 20(2), (pp. 154-163).

McHenry, J. J., Hough, L. M., Toquam, J. L., Hanson, M. A., & Ashworth, S., (1990). 'Project A validity results: The relationship between predictor and criterion domains.' in *Personnel Psychology*, 43(2), (pp. 335-354).

Offermann, L. R., Bailey, J. R., Vasilopoulos, N. L., Seal, C., & Sass, M., (2004). 'The relative contribution of emotional competence and cognitive ability to individual and team performance.' in *Human Performance*, 17(2), (pp. 219-243).

Petrides, K. V. (2011). 'Ability and trait emotional intelligence.' in T. Chamorro-Premuzic, S. von Stumm, & A. Furnham (Eds.), *The Wiley-Blackwell handbooks of personality and individual differences*. (pp. 656-678).

Seal, C. R., Boyatzis, R. E., & Bailey, J. R., (2006). 'Fostering emotional and social intelligence in organizations.' in *Organization Management Journal*, 3(3), (pp. 190-209).

Toumbeva, T. H. (2018). Development and validation of a situational judgment test that assesses managerial effectiveness in providing family-friendly supervision [Doctoral dissertation, Bowling Green State University].

## **Digital Mindset**

Bohn, R.E. (1994). 'Measuring and Managing Technological Knowledge.' in *MIT Sloan Management Review*, Fall 1994.

Gibson, K. (2008). 'Technology and technological knowledge: a challenge for school curricula.' in *Teachers and Teaching, theory and practice*, 14(1), (pp. 3-15).

Hansson, S.O. (2013). 'What is Technological Knowledge?' in *Technology Teachers as Researchers*, (pp. 17-31).

Peterson, F., Jollands, M., McKay, E., Pond, P., Rogers, I., & Heath, D. (2018). 'Digital work practices: where are the jobs, what are they, and how prepared are graduates?'. Final Report, June. Australian Technology Network of Universities.

Woods, S. A., Ahmed, S., Nikolaou, I., Costa, A. C., & Anderson, N. R. (2020). 'Personnel selection in the digital age: a review of validity and applicant reactions, and future research challenges.' in *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 29(1), (pp. 64-77).

## **Technological Embrace**

Houkes, W. (2009). 'The nature of technological knowledge.' in Meijers, A. (Ed.), *Handbook of the philosophy of science. Philosophy of technology and engineering sciences*, 9, (pp. 309-350). North-Holland.

## **Digital Creativity**

Davis, F. D., Bagozzi, R. P., & Warshaw, P. R. (1992). 'Extrinsic and intrinsic motivation to use computers in the workplace.' in *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 22(14), (pp. 1111-1132).

Hoffmann, J., Ivcevic, Z. & Brackett, M. (2016). 'Creativity in the Age of Technology: Measuring the Digital Creativity of Millennials.' in *Creativity Research Journal*, 28(2), (pp. 149-153).

Lee, M.R. & Chen, T.T. (2015). 'Computers in Human Behaviour.' in *Digital creativity: Research themes and framework*, 14, (pp. 12-19).

## **Creative Force**

### **Future-Focused**

Bindl, U. K., & Parker, S. K. (2011). 'Proactive work behavior: Forward-thinking and change-oriented action in organizations.' in *APA Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology, Vol 2: Selecting and Developing Members for the Organization*. American Psychological Association. (pp. 567-598).

Hinterhuber, H. H. & Popp, W. (1992). 'Are You a Strategist or Just a Manager?' *Harvard Business Review*, January – February 1992.

Phillips, P.A. & Moutinho, L. (2000). 'The Strategic Planning Index: A Tool for Measuring Strategic Planning Effectiveness.' in *Journal of Travel Research*, 38(4), (pp. 369-379).

### **Original Vision**

Goldsmith, R. E., & Foxall, G. R. (2003). 'The measurement of innovativeness.' in Shavinina, L.V. (Ed.), *The international handbook on innovation*, Elsevier Science Ltd. (pp. 321-330).

Goldsmith, R. E. & Matherly, T. A. (1986). 'Adaptation-Innovation and Self-Esteem.' in *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 127(3), (pp. 351-352).

King, A. A., & Baartartogtokh, B. (2015). 'How useful is the theory of disruptive innovation?'. in *MIT Sloan Management Review*, 57(1), (pp. 77-91).

Mitchinson & Morris (2012, January). *Learning about learning agility [White Paper]*. Center for Creative Leadership.

Price, E. (2018). *Measuring innovation potential: Traits that predict unique thought*, CQ Net.



## **Agent of Change**

Bindl, U. K., & Parker, S. K. (2011). 'Proactive work behavior: Forward-thinking and change-oriented action in organizations.' in APA Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology, Vol 2: Selecting and Developing Members for the Organization. American Psychological Association. (pp. 567-598).

Christensen, C.M., Raynor, M.E. & McDonald, R. (2015). What is Disruptive Innovation, Harvard Business Review, December 2015.

Church, A. H., & Silzer, R. (2014). 'Going behind the corporate curtain with a blueprint for leadership potential.' in People & Strategy, 36(4), (pp. 50-58).

Howard, C. (2013). Disruption vs. Innovation What's the Difference? Forbes.

King, A. A., & Baatartogtokh, B. (2015). 'How useful is the theory of disruptive innovation?'. in MIT Sloan Management Review, 57(1), (pp. 77-91).

Mitchinson & Morris (2012, January). Learning about learning agility [White Paper]. Center for Creative Leadership.

## **Grit**

Duckworth, A. L., Peterson, C., Matthews, M. D., & Kelly, D. R. (2007). 'Grit: Perseverance and passion for long-term goals.' in Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 92(6), (pp. 1087-1101).

McHenry, J. J., Hough, L. M., Toquam, J. L., Hanson, M. A., & Ashworth, S. (1990). 'Project A validity results: The relationship between predictor and criterion domains.' in Personnel Psychology, 43(2), (pp. 335-354).

## **Resilience**

Ackerman, C. E. (2019). How to Measure Resilience with these 8 Resilience Scales. Positive Psychology.com: Resilience and Coping.

Block, J. H., & Block, J. (1980). 'The role of ego-control and ego resiliency in the organization of behavior.' in W. A. Collins (Ed.), Minnesota symposium on child psychology., Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum. (pp. 39-101).

Church, A. H., & Silzer, R. (2014). 'Going behind the corporate curtain with a blueprint for leadership potential.' in People & Strategy, 36(4), (pp. 50-58).

Fletcher, D., & Sarkar, M. (2013). Psychological resilience: A review and critique of definitions, concepts, and theory. European Psychologist, 18(1), (p. 12).

Lombardo, M. M., & Eichinger, R. W. (2000). 'High potentials as high learners.' in Human Resource Management, 39(4), (pp. 321-329).

Mitchinson & Morris (2012, January). Learning about learning agility [White Paper]. Center for Creative Leadership.

## **Passion**

Campbell, J. P. & Pritchard, R. D. (1976) 'Motivation Theory in industrial and organisations psychology.' in M. D. Dunnette (Ed.), Handbook of industrial and organisational psychology Chicago: Rand McNally., (pp. 63-103).

Klein, H. J. (1989). 'An integrated control theory model of work motivation.' in Academy of Management Review, 14(2), (pp. 150-172).

Lombardo, M. M., & Eichinger, R. W. (2000). 'High potentials as high learners.' in *Human Resource Management*, 39(4), (pp. 321-329).

Perry, S. R. (2003). Big Five personality traits and work drive as predictors of adolescent academic performance (Publication No. 2190) [Doctoral dissertation, University of Tennessee]. Trace: Tennessee Research and Creative Exchange.

Petrides, K. V. (2011). 'Ability and trait emotional intelligence.' in T. Chamorro-Premuzic, S. von Stumm, & A. Furnham (Eds.), *The Wiley-Blackwell handbooks of personality and individual differences*. (pp. 656-678).

Reeves, R. V., Venator, J., & Howard, K. (2014). The character factor: Measures and impact of drive and prudence [Report]. Center on Children & Families.

Theys, E. (2019). How to Measure Drive. AON: Talent Assessment Blog.

Touré Tillery, M., & Fishbach, A. (2014). 'How to measure motivation: A guide for the experimental social psychologist.' in *Social and Personality Psychology Compass*, 8(7), (pp. 328-341).

## Delivery

Erdheim, J., Wang, M. & Zickar, M. J. (2006). Linking the Big Five personality constructs to organizational commitment. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 41(5): 959-970.

Essays, UK. (November 2018). Measurement tools for measuring commitment. Retrieved from <https://www.ukessays.com/essays/psychology/employment-of-measurement-tools-for-measuring-commitment-psychology-essay.php?vref=1>

Ganta, V. C. (2014). 'Motivation in the workplace to improve the employee performance.' in *International Journal of Engineering Technology, Management and Applied Sciences*, 2(6), (pp. 221-230).

Klein, H. J., Whitener, E. M., & Ilgen, D. R. (1990). 'The role of goal specificity in the goal-setting process.' in *Motivation and Emotion*, 14(3), (pp. 179-193).

Lunenburg, F. C. (2011). 'Goal-setting theory of motivation.' in *International Journal of Management, Business, and Administration*, 15(1), (pp. 1-6).

Naquin, S. S., & Holton, E. F. III. (2002). 'The effects of personality, affectivity, and work commitment on motivation to improve work through learning.' in *Human Resources Development Quarterly*, 13(4), (pp. 357-376).

Vandenberghe, C. & Ok, A.B. (2013). 'Career commitment, proactive personality, and work outcomes: a cross-lagged study.' in *Career Development International*, 18(7), (pp. 652-672).