

Analysis of the Hay-McBer approach and side-by-side comparison to Performance-Values Assessment.

by Gregory L. Selker
Param Srikantia, PhD.

March 2004

1. The Hay-McBer methodology is steeped in an inquiry to discover effectiveness or success. PVA is steeped in an inquiry to discover greatness.

The Hay-McBer methodology at its core was fundamentally devised to determine maximum levels of effectiveness across an employee base. The reasoning being, that if you were able to determine the criteria defining the maximum level of employee effectiveness, and individuals to be hired and/or promoted were evaluated against this criteria, an overall employee base operating at maximum effectiveness would be created. The Hay Group's entire past approach, their database containing their lexicon of competencies, their interviewing style, the questions they ask, their terminology and the way in which they evaluate individuals are all framed within the context of determining the highest levels of effectiveness within organizations.

However, in recent years, beginning with Khandwalla's paper "*Thorny Glory: Toward Organizational Greatness*", continuing with Jim Collins' *From Good to Great*, and Jeff Pfeffer's *Hidden Value* and *The Human Equation*, there appears to be a discernible scholarly interest in drawing the distinction between greatness and effectiveness and the role greatness plays in developing a culture and environment of high-performance. Leading management theorists are beginning to recognize that the discipline of management has been focused on managerial effectiveness rather than on managerial greatness and that managerial effectiveness by itself does not deliver greatness within organizations.

Effectiveness at an individual level is in fact concerned more with the dimension of performance excellence. At the organizational level, effectiveness is concerned with management processes and competencies which maximize efficiencies within performance excellence. On the other hand greatness at an individual level appears to consist of performance excellence plus the production of a spiritually exalted contribution. At the organizational level, greatness is concerned with the management of people and processes which produce maximum efficiencies within performance excellence while delivering the result of value contribution to every individual who interacts with the organization. When an organization focuses on effectiveness as the desired state within the echelons of management instead of on greatness, it unwittingly produces a mindset of mediocrity in which it is almost impossible to produce an elevated organizational state and culture of value and contribution.

Many companies talk about the hiring and development of employees noting a commitment to "Great People" or "Best People." Many of these companies end up

incorporating this commitment into a values statement or into their mission itself. Microsoft is notable for taking it one step further and incorporating their value of “Great People with Great Values” into their mission statement stating “To enable businesses throughout the world to realize their potential”, the Hay Group appears to be on a different page by conducting their critical incident interviews around “successful moments”. This line of questioning also tends to support the analysis that The Hay Group is not cognizant of the fact that when interviewing individuals, the responses generated depend heavily upon the way the question is worded. In other words, the questions themselves shape the reality into which an interviewee examines the question and as a result, the questions asked highly influence the answers given. In this context, the fact that the Hay consultants asked Microsoft executives about moments when they felt “most successful” is of high concern.

Current research has demonstrated there are three states that may be probed for in a critical incident interview, effectiveness, success and greatness. If greatness is the highest or most exalted state within which people experience themselves, others and the organization as having and bringing value to themselves, others and the organization; and effectiveness is a less exalted state wherein people experience themselves, others and the organization at being efficient in their management of producing maximum results, then success is an even lower individual and organizational state. For of the three states, success appears to be the one that will call up and presence situations in the interviewee’s past in which the value of an individual’s behavior is dependent upon external perception of worthiness rather than self-perception of worthiness. This is therefore highly susceptible to the effects of contamination by impression management strategies, surface level packaging without depth, and the sense of playing to an external gallery of observers irrespective of inherent intrinsic merit of the course of action being pursued in the situation.

Greatness depends on and includes both effectiveness and success, but greatness transcends or is more than the individual or combined states of effectiveness and success. Effectiveness would appear to include success, but effectiveness does not necessarily depend on success and by itself or combined with success, effectiveness does not produce greatness. Success, at the bottom of the equation, does not include, depend upon nor naturally produce effectiveness let alone greatness. Yet, the Hay Group has used a line of questioning to solicit specific behaviors all based upon success as their framework.

2. The Hay-McBer approach is single-dimensional, focused on analytic discreteness and segmentation. PVA is multidimensional, focused on a holistic understanding of an individual and the world in which they work.

The Hay-McBer methodology is a single-focused inquiry into the external dimension (actions) of an individual and that individual’s perception of their external world (results). In the Hay-McBer approach, an individual and an organization is viewed as discrete skills and competencies. Even though the sum may be composed of the parts, the Hay-McBer methodology gives no access into the interconnectedness of the parts and how taken collectively; the total is greater than the sum of all the parts. PVA is a multi-dimensional and holistic inquiry. It illuminates an individual’s awareness of their internal

state (values), their external state (actions), and how these individual states relate to and fit within their external world (results) and the underlying values these results implies (culture).

The thoroughness of the PVA methodology yields an exceptionally well consolidated view of managerial behavior by linking together the phenomenology of the interviewee (their perceptual world) with their epistemological processes (how do they know what they know) with their ontology (who they are being). The PVA methodology encompasses a concerted attempt to elicit a very detailed understanding of the candidate's inner world and perceptual fields (phenomenology), the processes by which they develop knowledge about the external organizational realities (epistemology) and who they become (ontology). This is a very holistic approach to understanding the individual as a coherent system compared to the Hay approach that is more focused on analytic discreteness.

- 3. Given that the Hay-McBer approach focuses on distinguishing competencies associated with effectiveness and success, and PVA focuses on distinguishing competencies of greatness, there are significant differences in their applicability and use both as developmental tools and performance indicators.**

In a behavioral event interview, the interviewee draws from their past experiences and communicates an anecdote, that the act of remembering and talking about, literally brings forth into their present experience the competencies which were required and used in their past. This has the effect of reinforcing the past-based competencies and behaviors as desired present and future-based competencies and behaviors. This phenomenon occurs regardless of whether the originating question has the interviewee draw from experiences rooted in success, effectiveness or greatness and high-performance.

- a. The Hay-McBer approach reinforces and develops the competencies associated with effectiveness and success; and PVA reinforces and develops the competencies associated with greatness.**

Since the Hay-McBer approach is rooted in the phenomenology of success and effectiveness, the competencies which comprise the bulk of the anecdote in a behavioral event interview are themselves success and effectiveness-based competencies. This naturally reinforces the present and future importance of these success and effectiveness-based competencies in the experience of both the interviewer and interviewee. Since PVA is rooted in the phenomenology of greatness and high-performance, the competencies which comprise the bulk of the anecdote in a behavioral event interview are themselves greatness and high-performance-based competencies. This naturally reinforces the present and future importance of these greatness and high-performance-based competencies in the experience of the interviewer and interviewee.

- b. The Hay Mc-Ber approach uncovers the key performance indicators driving success and effectiveness. PVA uncovers the key performance indicators driving greatness and high-performance.**

Given that the Hay-McBer approach is rooted in discovering and enabling effectiveness and success-based competencies in individuals, the map of where an individual is self and organizationally perceived with respect to these competencies can be used to drive success and effectiveness with the individual and the organization. The same principle is applied to PVA with, however, different results. PVA can be used to drive greatness and high-performance with the individual and the organization.