

Issue#3

Business, Management



Name: Course: Lecturer: Date: Issue#3 Those who agreed that personality tests are good predictors of performance supported their view by observing that some personality tests have an open approach, and they give all the employees opportunities. They highlighted the ability of personality test in getting the right employees for the job. They noted that personality tests look more at a person's thought patterns, emotions and control. While these points were good, they were not strong enough to indicate why personality tests are good predictors.

They did not offer counter responses for their opponents, and they failed to capitalize on the weakness of those who disagreed with the motion. The second speaker had the opportunity of adding more points after hearing the arguments of the first opponent, but he did not do that. For instance, he could have observed the different types of personality tests, and focus on their strong points. He had the chance to point out the relative affordability of many personality tests, and offer different types of tests that would help in determining the employees' performance. The speakers who disagreed with the motion pointed out that the tests are expensive, and there were no regulators. They noted that employees are different, and one personality test would not suit everybody.

They also observed the unfair nature of the tests, noting that it was not possible to determine the employees personality based on a few questions. Those who disagreed with the motion presented strong and valid arguments. They not only looked at the weaknesses of the personality tests, but they also observed the limitations and weaknesses of the employees when doing the tests. They highlighted the fact that employees are likely to be dishonest

by lying when answering the questions. Employees can fake their answers, and they give the answers that the management expects of them. In addition, the team proposed other methods of determining whether the employees would be suited for a particular post. They offered solutions such as face-to-face meetings, and judging the employees based on their past behavior.

Those who agreed with the motion could have added many convincing points to their arguments. For instance, they could have pointed out the ability of personality tests in finding the most suitable positions for individual employees. Many people tend to exhibit a consistent type of personality throughout their lives. Understanding one's personality strengths will enable the person get the rightful position.

People perform better and they have increased productivity when they are interested in their jobs, and when they understand what they are supposed to do. They could have pointed out the expertise that goes into developing the tests to ensure their reliability and validity, which in turn enhance their suitability in predicting performance. The supporters of the motion could have done a better job by providing points, which would help to explain why personality tests remain a popular feature in present day organizations. Those who disagreed with the motion had points that were more objective, and they capitalized on the weaknesses of the personality tests.

I think they won the debate.