

Brain-job fit report (sample)

This is what you get for **each seat**. Fifty questions. How this brain works at work. Which jobs fit. Lookup by Report ID and the Employer ID *you* assigned. Name on our file: none. Print it, download it, keep it.

Report ID

RWC-RPT-086

Your ID: HR-1007 · no name

Composite

86 / 110

42 of 50 items correct

Keep (this employer)

911 / 1,000

Still employed at nine months ·
observational

How the hirer keeps this

- Print / Save PDF — the written report
 - Download HTML — the file you store in your own system
 - Open in database — <https://realworldcareers.com/report/?id=RWC-RPT-086>
 - Lookup is by Report ID (your file number) only. Never by name. Never SSN.
-
- Pages 2–3: white paper and citations
 - Pages 4–6: charts of this file's items
 - Pages 7–10: job-fit bars and recommendations with citations
 - Pages 11–12: federal families, interview probes, how to retrieve

INSTRUMENT

What was measured, and why it is a work sample

Hiring Fit is a 50-item timed battery of work-relevant tasks. It is not a personality quiz and it is not labeled as IQ. Each item is a behavioral work problem: prioritize, compute, hold a rule, see a pattern, judge a workplace case, or sequence a procedure. That design sits in the same family as cognitive work samples used in personnel selection for a century.

The scoring lock is published. Correct answer = 2.0 accuracy points. Speed bonus = 0.2 if the item is correct and fast (threshold in the bank). Maximum composite = 110 (100 accuracy + 10 speed). Six domains: Executive reasoning (9 items, 18 accuracy points), Quantitative and spatial (9 / 18), Verbal and working memory (8 / 16), Visual pattern (8 / 16), Workplace social judgment (8 / 16), Procedural sequencing (8 / 16). Current freeze: **2026.08-B-keybalance-v2**. Career Fit, Hiring Fit, and Federal Fit use separate stems.

This is demands–abilities fit: we measure how the person solves work, then map the profile onto occupational demands (O*NET-aligned catalog and the locked domain–career map). Person–job fit of this type is associated with higher satisfaction, commitment, and performance, and lower withdrawal and quit intent in meta-analysis (Kristof-Brown, Zimmerman, & Johnson, 2005). Cognitive work-relevant performance remains among the strongest predictors of later job performance in the Schmidt–Hunter tradition (Schmidt & Hunter, 1998), with modern re-analysis supporting meaningful prediction under more conservative range-restriction assumptions (Sackett, Zhang, Berry, & Lievens, 2022).

Use: decision support. Combine with structured interviews and job analysis. Structured interviews outperform unstructured ones (McDaniel, Whetzel, Schmidt, & Maurer, 1994). Schmidt and Hunter (1998) showed that pairing general mental ability with a second strong method raises composite validity (classic combinations often cited near $r \approx .63$ – $.65$). Real World Careers is that first structured input — not the hire stamp.

Scoring lock: methodology page. White paper: /whitepaper. Research library: /proof/research-evidence/

Citations that justify this class of method

Validity (r) is not a success percentage. Do not read “ $r \approx .51$ ” as “51% accurate.” It is the association, across many studies, between scores and later job performance after the corrections those papers describe.

Finding	What it means for this report	Source
GMA operational validity around $r \approx .51$ for medium-complexity jobs	Work-relevant problem-solving is among the strongest single predictors of performance	Schmidt & Hunter (1998), <i>Psychological Bulletin</i>
Validity often higher as job complexity rises	Use the profile more heavily for professional / technical seats	Schmidt & Hunter tradition; Hunter & Hunter (1984)
Conservative re-analysis lowers some classic coefficients, still supports ability measures	We do not sell inflated r . We sell a structured work sample plus fit map	Sackett et al. (2022), <i>JAP</i>
Person–job fit: 172 studies, 836 effect sizes — better attitudes, less withdrawal	Matching how people think to the job they will do is the keep mechanism	Kristof-Brown et al. (2005), <i>Personnel Psychology</i>
Structured interviews more valid than unstructured	Pages 11’s probes are the second method. Use them	McDaniel et al. (1994), <i>JAP</i>
European GMA / cognitive-ability generalization	The predictor class is not a U.S. curiosity	Salgado et al. (2003)
Professional standards for validation and documentation	Job analysis still required before consequential selection use	SIOP Principles (2018); Uniform Guidelines (1978)

RWC-specific retention is the $N = 1,000$ observation: 969 of 1,000 employed at 45 days; 911 of 1,000 at nine months, in a verified employment context. Observational. Not a guarantee. Literature r is not that observation.

What the 50 items are doing

Every item has a published construct, a task class, and a domain. Below is the map this employee ran. Hits and misses on pages 5–6 use this table. Stems are work problems, not trivia.

Domain	Items	Acc. max	What the items require
Executive reasoning	9 (Q1–Q9)	18	Prioritization under conflict, speed–quality tradeoffs, recovery after a blocked step, evidence vs authority, critical-path recovery, reversible choice under uncertainty, work design for hard thinking
Quantitative and spatial	9 (Q10–Q18)	18	Multi-step arithmetic, rates, percent change, ratios, net displacement, weighted averages, unit consistency, magnitude order
Verbal and working memory	8 (Q19–Q26)	16	Multi-part instructions, holding constraints, relational verbal reasoning, short-premise inference, definition use, contradiction, nested if-then, precise workplace wording
Visual pattern	8 (Q27–Q34)	16	Series extension, odd-one-out in records, grid rules, dual-update series, structure class, missing piece, transformations, match-to-sample
Workplace judgment	8 (Q35–Q42)	16	SJT: professional response, ethics, service recovery, peer conflict, inclusion, boundaries, corrective feedback, owning a miss
Procedural sequencing	8 (Q43–Q50)	16	Correct order, prerequisites, checklist fidelity, branching, safety/prep, parallel vs serial, recovery order, finish criteria

Item constructs from Hiring Fit public bank, freeze 2026.08-B-keybalance-v2. Domain–career families: locked map in product assets (operations, analytics, records, QA, people-facing service, SOP-heavy process work).

Item outcomes — executive reasoning and quantitative / spatial

Report ID RWC-RPT-086: 42 of 50 items correct. Accuracy 84 / 100. Speed bonus 2.0 / 10.

Composite **86 / 110**.

Executive reasoning — 8 of 9 correct · 16 / 18 accuracy

Q	Task class	Construct	Result
1	Prioritization under constraints	Time and deadline conflict	Hit
2	Tradeoff decision	Speed vs quality under a stated SLA	Hit
3	Recovery planning	Replan after a blocked step	Hit
4	Goal conflict	Short-term delivery vs longer-term development	Hit
5	Evidence-based choice	Evidence while acknowledging authority	Hit
6	Schedule recovery	Critical-path focus on a slipping plan	Hit
7	Resource vs time	Calendar time vs total effort	Miss
8	Uncertainty	Prefer reversible options	Hit
9	Work design	Blocks that support complex thinking	Hit

Read-out: this profile protects due-today work and the reliability SLA. The miss is effort-vs-calendar — coachable. Not a reason to park the seat.

Quantitative and spatial — 7 of 9 correct · 14 / 18 accuracy

Q	Task class	Construct	Result
10–13, 15, 17–18	Arithmetic, rates, percent, ratios, averages, units, order	Numeric relations under time	Hit (7)
14	Spatial net	Net displacement after moves	Miss
16	Multi-step word	Multi-constraint numeric word problem	Miss

Read-out: everyday workplace numbers are intact. Two misses: spatial tracking and a stacked word problem. Do not lead with a junior data-analyst seat. Pair with a numbers lead if the role is 1500-series heavy.

Item outcomes — language, pattern, judgment, procedure

Verbal and working memory — 7 of 8 · 14 / 16

Hit: instruction following, holding constraints, passage logic, definition use, contradiction, nested if-then, synonym precision. **Miss:** verbal analogy (Q21). Read-out: policy, tickets, and multi-condition rules are a strength. Analogical stretch items are not the peak. Target SOP-heavy desks (Kristof-Brown et al., 2005 — demands–abilities fit).

Visual pattern — 6 of 8 · 12 / 16

Hit: series extension, odd-one-out in records, grid rule, dual-update series, missing piece, match-to-sample. **Miss:** symmetry class (Q31), transformation track (Q33). Read-out: document and production patterns are usable. Abstract transform puzzles are weaker. QA / inspection is a moderate, not a lead, recommendation.

Workplace judgment — 7 of 8 · 14 / 16

Hit: professional SJT, ethics, service recovery, peer conflict, inclusion, corrective feedback, owning a miss. **Miss:** professional-boundary item (Q40). Read-out: this is a high domain (88% of domain accuracy). Executive reasoning is the peak (16 / 18). Put people-problems on the desk. Coach the boundary miss in onboarding — one item, not a pattern of seven misses.

Procedural sequencing — 7 of 8 · 14 / 16

Hit: ordering, prerequisites, checklist fidelity, branching, safety/prep, recovery order, finish criteria. **Miss:** parallel vs serial (Q48). Read-out: procedures get finished; prep is not skipped. Teach parallel paths on day one.

Pattern in one sentence: **people, process, and decisions under constraint — not a modeling seat first.** That is the fit you buy.

What the six scores mean in a workplace



Workplace judgment and executive reasoning together are the “keep” pattern: the person can run a desk with humans in it and still protect the due date (Schmidt & Hunter, 1998 — ability plus job knowledge acquisition; McDaniel et al., 1994 — structured evaluation of judgment). Verbal memory plus sequencing is the SOP / caseload pattern (locked domain map: administrative and records work; operations specialist). Quantitative and visual pattern are serviceable, not the peak — so the ranking on pages 9–10 down-weights analyst and cyber-alert seats that load those domains.

Why this predicts keep: person–job fit (demands–abilities) is negatively related to intent to leave (Kristof-Brown et al., 2005). Putting a high-judgment, high-procedure person into a numbers-first seat is a misfit. Putting them into operations, program support, or client success is a fit. That is the N = 1,000 retention observation in one employee’s language.

How a score becomes a job-fit rank

Each catalog role carries O*NET-aligned weights on the six domains (product jobs catalog, version 2026-08-09). Fit is a weighted combination of this person's domain percentages. Higher weight means the job demands that kind of problem-solving more. This is the same evidence-traceable chain used in the product: occupation and work activities → competencies and cognitive demands → assessment constructs → scores → interpretation (FAQ library; Holland 1997 for interest-structure context; O*NET as the occupational spine).

Domain percents in the ranker: ER 89, SJ 88, VW 88, PS 88, VP 75, QS 78. Composite 86 / 110 is not the match percent. Accuracy points are 2.0 per correct item (7 of 9 quantitative = 14 / 18; 7 of 8 judgment = 14 / 16).

Role (catalog)	O*NET	Heaviest weights	Fit index
Operations Coordinator	43-5061	Procedural 1.4 · Executive 1.3 · Social 1.2	86
Project Coordinator	13-1082	Executive 1.4 · Social 1.3 · Procedural 1.3	86
Training Specialist	13-1151	Verbal 1.5 · Social 1.4 · Executive 1.2	86
Healthcare Administrative Assistant	43-6013	Social 1.4 · Verbal 1.3 · Procedural 1.3	85
Customer Success Specialist	41-3091	Social 1.5 · Verbal 1.4	85
IT Support Specialist	15-1232	Procedural 1.3 · Executive / Verbal / Pattern 1.2	84
Quality Assurance Technician	19-4099	Procedural 1.5 · Pattern 1.3 · Quantitative 1.2	81
Junior Data Analyst	15-2051	Quantitative 1.5 · Pattern 1.4	79
Bookkeeping Associate	43-3031	Quantitative 1.5 · Procedural 1.4	79
Cybersecurity Analyst (entry)	15-1212	Pattern 1.4 · Quantitative / Executive / Procedural 1.3	82

FIT AT A GLANCE



IT Support 15-1232

84



Junior Data Analyst 15-2051 — do not lead

79



Fit index = $100 \times \Sigma(\text{domain}\% \times \text{weight}) / \Sigma(\text{weights})$, rounded. O*NET-aligned ranking, not a classification action.

Lead with these seats

These are the best fits for how this profile thinks. Each line is a recommendation you can brief, with the research family that supports using a structured profile this way.

1. **Operations Coordinator (O*NET 43-5061) — fit 86.** Peak procedural sequencing and workplace judgment. Coordinate schedules, inventory handoffs, and checklists. Citation: demands–abilities fit (Kristof-Brown et al., 2005); GMA / work-sample prediction of performance in medium-complexity jobs (Schmidt & Hunter, 1998).
2. **Project Coordinator (O*NET 13-1082) — fit 86.** Executive reasoning under constraint plus people-process. Multi-stakeholder schedule and decision tracking. Same literature family. Use structured interview probes on page 11 (McDaniel et al., 1994).
3. **Training Specialist (O*NET 13-1151) — fit 86.** Verbal memory and judgment. Design modules, check learner progress. Fit is about teaching process, not about being the quantitative lead.
4. **Healthcare Administrative Assistant (O*NET 43-6013) — fit 85.** High judgment, verbal, procedure. Clinic flow, records, routing. Sequencing items (checklist fidelity, finish criteria) map directly.
5. **Customer Success Specialist (O*NET 41-3091) — fit 85.** Service-recovery SJT hit. People-facing process. Person–job fit here is the keep lever (Kristof-Brown et al., 2005 — lower withdrawal when demands match).
6. **IT Support Specialist (O*NET 15-1232) — fit 84.** Ticket sequence, branching procedure, verbal explanation to non-technical staff. Not a security-analyst lead (see page 10).

Manager action this week: pick two of the six, write the job’s must-have tasks, and run the three structured probes on page 11 against those tasks. That is GMA-class signal plus structured interview — the combination Schmidt and Hunter (1998) treated as a high-utility pairing.

Use these with a partner. Do not lead with the rest.

Secondary — usable with support

- **Quality Assurance Technician (19-4099) — 81.** Procedure is strong; visual pattern is 75%. Pair with a pattern-strong inspector.
- **Cybersecurity Analyst, entry (15-1212) — 82.** Alert monitoring wants pattern + quantitative that are not this person's peak. Possible later, not first seat.
- **Management / program analysis support (0343 family).** Executive reasoning is high enough for option memos and process maps. Keep a quantitative partner on the spreadsheet.

Do not lead — misfit relative to this profile

- **Junior Data Analyst (15-2051) — 79.** Catalog weights quantitative 1.5 and pattern 1.4. This profile is 72% and 75% there. Forcing that seat is the opposite of keep-people-longer (Kristof-Brown et al., 2005).
- **Bookkeeping Associate (43-3031) — 79.** Same quantitative load. Procedure is a yes; the close-the-books numeric stack is a no-lead.
- **Any role whose first week is a spatial or stacked-word quantitative gauntlet** — those were the two QS misses (Q14, Q16).

This is the tangible value of the report: not a gold star, a placement rule. Put the brain where the job thinks the same way. That is the point of the report: put the work profile in front of the job. Retention after use of the report is 969 of 1,000 at 45 days and 911 of 1,000 at nine months (observational, not a guarantee).

Holland (1997) informs interest-structure context for exploration; this instrument leads with ability-to-demand fit, not RIASEC scores. O*NET codes are exploration and ranking, not a classification determination.

Occupational families and the second method

Federal Fit is the same 50-item science with occupational-family copy. This sample maps Report ID RWC-RPT-086 to families for exploration and workforce development.

Family	Why this profile	How to use this week
0300 General Administration	Sequencing, judgment, verbal memory	Program support, correspondence, caseload desks
0343 Management and Program Analysis	Executive reasoning under constraint	Process maps, briefings, option memos — with a numbers partner
1101 General Business and Industry	People-plus-process	Vendor coordination, customer-facing ops
0303 Miscellaneous Clerk and Assistant	Checklist fidelity, finish criteria	High-volume correct process, not policy invention
Later, not first: 1500-series math-heavy	QS 72%	Do not lead. Pair if the person later builds the skill

Structured interview probes (use these — they are the second predictor)

1. Four hours left. Ticket A needs three hours and is due today; B needs one hour Friday; C is optional. What do you finish, and why? (Maps to Q1 — ER prioritization.)
2. A teammate missed a handoff that hit a customer. Walk the next hour. (Maps to Q37–Q38 — service recovery and conflict SJT.)
3. A six-step procedure is missing a step. Find it out loud. (Maps to Q43–Q50 — sequencing.)

Score the interview on a shared rubric. McDaniel et al. (1994): structured interviews beat unstructured. Schmidt & Hunter (1998): GMA-class signal plus a second strong method is the high-utility pair. SIOP (2018) and the Uniform Guidelines (1978): document job relatedness. Human judgment stays in charge. Federal Fit does not determine eligibility, grade, clearance, or referral.

What this report is for — and the papers under it

Keep people longer with better job fits for the way they think. Observational retention in a verified employment context: 969 of 1,000 employed at 45 days (96.9%); 911 of 1,000 employed at nine months (91.1%). Not a guarantee.

Keep this report three ways

- Print / Save PDF — written copy
- Download HTML — your file, your drive
- Database lookup — /report/?id=RWC-RPT-086 — ID only, never a name

Walk it with TA, the hiring manager, or the CHCO. Then buy seats and run a live cohort.

References

- Advanced Learning Academy LLC. (2026). *Real World Careers: work-relevant assessment and person–job mapping* (technical white paper). Carmel, IN. <https://realworldcareers.com/whitepaper>
- Holland, J. L. (1997). *Making vocational choices: A theory of vocational personalities and work environments* (3rd ed.). Psychological Assessment Resources.
- Hunter, J. E., & Hunter, R. F. (1984). Validity and utility of alternative predictors of job performance. *Psychological Bulletin*, 96, 72–98.
- Kristof-Brown, A. L., Zimmerman, R. D., & Johnson, E. C. (2005). Consequences of individuals' fit at work: A meta-analysis of person–job, person–organization, person–group, and person–supervisor fit. *Personnel Psychology*, 58(2), 281–342. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.2005.00672.x>
- McDaniel, M. A., Whetzel, D. L., Schmidt, F. L., & Maurer, S. D. (1994). The validity of employment interviews: A comprehensive review and meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 79(4), 599–616. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.79.4.599>
- Sackett, P. R., Zhang, C., Berry, C. M., & Lievens, F. (2022). Revisiting meta-analytic estimates of validity in personnel selection: Addressing systematic overcorrection for restriction of range. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 107(11), 2040–2068. <https://doi.org/10.1037/apl0000994>
- Salgado, J. F., Anderson, N., Moscoso, S., Bertua, C., de Fruyt, F., & Rolland, J. P. (2003). International validity generalization of GMA and cognitive abilities: A European Community meta-analysis. *Personnel Psychology*, 56, 573–605.
- Schmidt, F. L., & Hunter, J. E. (1998). The validity and utility of selection methods in personnel selection: Practical and theoretical implications of 85 years of research findings. *Psychological Bulletin*, 124(2), 262–274. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.124.2.262>
- Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology. (2018). *Principles for the validation and use of personnel selection procedures* (5th ed.).
- U.S. Department of Labor / Employment and Training Administration. O*NET occupational information. <https://www.onetcenter.org/>

U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission et al. (1978). Uniform Guidelines on Employee Selection Procedures. 29 C.F.R. Part 1607.

Sample employee is labeled as a sample. Citations describe the scientific class of methods. They are not Real World Careers customer r statistics. Composite 86 / 110 is this sample's score, not a population norm table. Human judgment required.