TLNT

TLNT Webir

HR MANAGEMENT, **HR NEWS & TRENDS**

How Google Is Using People Analytics to Completely Reinvent HR

by Dr. John Sullivan on Feb 26, 2013, 8:09 AM | 83 Comments

Share **7,701** | Like 1.9k | Tweet 1,884

First of two parts

If you haven't seen it in the news, after its stock price broke the $800 barrier last month, Google moved into the No. 3 position among the most valuable firms in the world.

Google is clearly the youngest firm among the leaders; it has surprisingly been less than a decade since Google's IPO.

Most companies on the top 20 market cap list could be accurately described as "old school," because most can attribute their success to being nearly half a century old, having a long established product brand, or through great acquisitions. Google's market success can instead be attributed to what can only be labeled as extraordinary people management practices that result from its use of "people analytics."

A new kind of people management

The extraordinary marketplace success of Google (and Apple, which is No. 1 on the list) is beginning to force many business leaders to take notice and to come to the realization that there is now a new path to corporate greatness.

"New path" firms dominate by producing continuous innovation. And executives are beginning to learn that continuous innovation cannot occur until a firm makes a strategic shift toward a focus on great people management.

A strategic focus on people management is necessary because innovations come from people, and you simply can't maximize innovations unless you are capable of recruiting and retaining innovators. And even then, you must provide them with great managers and an environment that supports innovation.

Unfortunately, making that transition to an innovative firm is problematic because almost every current HR function operates under 20th century principles of past practices, efficiency, risk avoidance, legal compliance, and hunch-based people management decisions. If you want serial innovation, you will need to reinvent traditional HR and the processes that drive innovation.

Shifting to data-based people management

The basic premise of the "people analytics" approach is that accurate people management decisions are the most important and impactful decisions that a firm can make. You simply can't produce superior business results unless your managers are making accurate people management decisions.

Many do argue that product R&D, marketing, or resource allocation decisions are instead the most impactful decisions. However, each one of those business decisions is made by an employee. If you hire and retain mostly mediocre people and you provide them with little data, you can only assume that they will make mediocre decisions in each of these important business areas, as well as in people management decisions.

Google co-counder and CEO Larry Page

No one in finance, supply chain, marketing, etc. would ever propose a solution in their area without a plethora of charts, graphs, and data to support it, but HR is known to all too frequently rely instead on trust and relationships. People costs often approach 60 percent of corporate variable costs, so it makes sense to manage such a large cost item analytically.

Another major problem in HR is its traditional reliance on relationships. Relationships are the antithesis of analytical decision-making. The decision-making "currency" for most business decisions has long been data, but up until now, HR has relied on a different currency: that of building relationships.

In direct contrast, Google's success has to be attributed in large part to the fact that it is the world's only data-driven HR function. Google's business success should convince executives at

any firm that wants to grow dramatically that they must at least consider adopting the data and analytically based model used by Google. Its approach has resulted in Google producing amazing workforce productivity results that few can match (on average, each employee generates nearly $1 million in revenue and $200,000 in profit each year).

How does the Google approach reinvent HR?

HR at Google is dramatically different from the hundreds of other HR functions that I have researched and worked with. To start with, at Google it's not called human resources; instead, the function is called "people operations." The VP and HR leader Laszlo Bock has justifiably learned to demand data-based decisions everywhere.

People management decisions at Google are guided by the powerful "people analytics team." Two key quotes from the team highlight their goals:

- *"All people decisions at Google are based on data and analytics."*

- The goal is to … *"bring the same level of rigor to people-decisions that we do to engineering decisions."*

Google is replacing the 20th century subjective decision-making approach in HR. Although it calls its approach "people analytics," it can alternatively be called "data-based decision-making," "algorithm based decision-making," or "fact or evidence-based decision-making."

Top 10 reasons for Google's people analytics approach

The people analytics team reports directly to the VP and it has a representative in each major HR function. It produces many products, including employee surveys that are not anonymous, and dashboards. It also attempts to identify insightful correlations and to provide recommended actions. The goal is to substitute data and metrics for the use of opinions.

Almost everyone has by now heard about Google's free food, 20% time, and wide range of fun activities but realize that each of these was implemented and are maintained based on data. Many of Google's people analytics approaches are so unusual and powerful, I can only describe them as "breathtaking."

Below I have listed my "Top 10" of Google's past and current people management practices to highlight its data-driven approach:

1. **Leadership characteristics and the role of managers** –ts "project oxygen" research analyzed reams of internal data and determined that great managers are essential for top performance and retention. It further identified the eight characteristics of great leaders. The data proved that rather than superior technical knowledge, periodic one-on-one coaching which included expressing interest in the employee and frequent personalized feedback ranked as the No. 1 key to being a successful leader. Managers are rated twice a year by their employees on their performance on the eight factors.

2. **The PiLab** — Google's PiLab is a unique subgroup that no other firm has. It conducts

applied experiments within Google to determine the most effective approaches for managing people and maintaining a productive environment (including the type of reward that makes employees the happiest). The lab even improved employee health by reducing the calorie intake of its employees at their eating facilities by relying on scientific data and experiments (by simply reducing the size of the plates).

3. **A retention algorithm** — Google developed a mathematical algorithm to proactively and successfully predict which employees are most likely to become a retention problem. This approach allows management to act before it's too late and it further allows retention solutions to be personalized.

4. **Predictive modeling** – People management is forward looking at Google. As a result, it develops predictive models and use "what if" analysis to continually improve their forecasts of upcoming people management problems and opportunities. It also uses analytics to produce more effective workforce planning, which is essential in a rapidly growing and changing firm.

5. **Improving diversity** – Unlike most firms, analytics are used at Google to solve diversity problems. As a result, the people analytics team conducted analysis to identify the root causes of weak diversity recruiting, retention, and promotions (especially among women engineers). The results that it produced in hiring, retention, and promotion were dramatic and measurable.

6. **An effective hiring algorithm** – One of the few firms to approach recruiting scientifically, Google developed an algorithm for predicting which candidates had the highest probability of succeeding after they are hired. Its research also determined that little value was added beyond four interviews, dramatically shortening time to hire. Google is also unique in its strategic approach to hiring because its hiring decisions are made by a group in order to prevent individual hiring managers from hiring people for their own short-term needs. Under "Project Janus," it developed an algorithm for each large job family that analyzed rejected resumes to identify any top candidates who they might have missed. They found that they had only a 1.5% miss rate, and as a result they hired some of the revisited candidates.

7. **Calculating the value of top performers** – Google executives have calculated the performance differential between an exceptional technologist and an average one (as much as 300 times higher). Proving the value of top performers convinces executives to provide the resources necessary to hire, retain, and develop extraordinary talent. Google's best-kept secret is that people operations professionals make the best "business case" of any firm in any industry, which is the primary reason why they receive such extraordinary executive support.

8. **Workplace design drives collaboration** – Google has an extraordinary focus on increasing collaboration between employees from different functions. It has found that increased innovation comes from a combination of three factors: discovery (i.e. learning), collaboration, and fun. It consciously designs its workplaces to maximize learning, fun, and collaboration (it even tracks the time spent by employees in the café lines to maximize collaboration). Managing "fun" may seem superfluous to some, but the data indicates that it is a major factor in attraction, retention, and collaboration.

9. **Increasing discovery and learning** – Rather than focusing on traditional classroom learning, the emphasis is on hands-on learning (the vast majority of people learn through on the job learning). Google has increased discovery and learning through project rotations, learning from failures, and even through inviting people like Al Gore and Lady Gaga to speak to their employees. Clearly self-directed continuous learning and the ability to adapt are key employee competencies at Google.

10. **It doesn't dictate; it convinces with data** — The final key to Google's people analytics team's success occurs not during the analysis phase, but instead when it present its final proposals to executives and managers. Rather than demanding or forcing managers to accept its approach, it instead acts as internal consultants and influences people to change based on the powerful data and the action recommendations that they present. Because its audiences are highly analytical (as most executives are), it uses data to change preset opinions and to influence.

Tomorrow: *How Google is a talent competitor to your organization*

Dr. John Sullivan is a well-known teacher, author, and HR thought leader. He is a frequent speaker and advisor to Fortune 500 and Silicon Valley firms. Formerly the chief talent officer for Agilent Technologies (the 43,000-employee HP spin-off), he is now a professor of management at San Francisco State University. An expert on recruiting and staffing, he was dubbed the "Michael Jordan of Hiring" by Fast Company magazine. Contact him at johns@sfsu.edu.

Tags: [Best practices](#), [Change management](#), [HR](#), [HR analytics](#), [HR blog](#), [HR management](#), [HR trends](#), [Management](#), [talent management](#), [workplace data](#)

t f in | More

Like   1,908 people like this. Be the first of your friends.

83 Comments

83 Comments	TLNT		D Login ▾

Sort by Best ▾   Share 🡥   Favorite ★

Join the discussion…

Terry Murray • a year ago
I sense a lot of anxiety in the comments, but this is reflective of the direction that business is moving. The use of predictive analytics and advanced algorithms to spot subtle talent issues, not easily detected by the human eye, will empower HR with the statistical evidence to support their perspective. HR is no longer a cost

center (it never was or should have been viewed as such, in my humble opinion) in the Ideas Age, its place is at the strategic core of the firm.

Human beings, and their creative, collaborative talents, are now the raw material of value creation. Gaining insights into what I call "the granularity of the human continuum" is no different than the level of scientific detail we garnered regarding chemicals, biologics, metallurgy or myriad other raw materials that fueled the industrial age.

This statistical approach will help HR gain its rightful place at the leadership table long dominated by sales and marketing.

25 ∧ | ∨ • Reply • Share ›

Randy Patton → Terry Murray • 3 months ago
It certainly would have been nice to work for someone with your philosophy, Mr. Murray. In most of the jobs that I have held, working overtime, and being an innovator never got me anywhere. I was regularly passed over by those who could "sell themselves" more effectively, or the "squeaky wheel" that needed more grease.

1 ∧ | ∨ • Reply • Share ›

William Mougayar • a year ago
I'm confused about the take-aways of this. This sounds a bit like Google propaganda.

What Google does isn't always applicable to, or even feasible in other companies.

Managing people is not an HR function. It's a people/management thing.

These practices have been around for a long time. We used to call them rating, ranking, succession management, development plans, performance metrics, etc... I'm failing to see the innovation, and further it's a stretch to directly correlate this to the $1mil/200K rev/profit ratios. Google's products are a big factor in this, even if they didn't have all these people sub-optimizations. They are doing what any other well managed company of their size does.

24 ∧ | ∨ • Reply • Share ›

DK → William Mougayar • a year ago
It is for people like you that the attrition remains so high in other companies as compared to Google. Results speak large and loud. Chuck it, you will never understand it

6 ∧ | ∨ • Reply • Share ›

William Mougayar → DK • a year ago
The joke is on you. Argue the point instead of attacking the commenter, if you can.

What do you know about me.

17 ∧ | ∨ • Reply • Share ›

pritchardhall → DK • a year ago
Don't just drink the Kool-Aid DK. That's how you will find yourself wondering why you alone in a room when the science stops working because other HR tools are let go. I am a user of behavioral metrics - for many years - but people have lives, family deaths, drug problems, spouses, sick children, health problems, depression; and do not respond with the consistency of an algorithm.

12 ∧ | ∨ • Reply • Share ›

Stephen Portanova → DK • a year ago
Puff piece - just wanted to see how many times he could say "Analytics", "data", and "algorithm"

4 ∧ | ∨ • Reply • Share ›

totnuckers → William Mougayar • a year ago
"This sounds a bit like Google propaganda." Said by a true chief evangelist

∧ | ∨ • Reply • Share ›

William Mougayar → totnuckers • a year ago
There are nuances in evangelism :)

1 ∧ | ∨ • Reply • Share ›

Randy Patton → William Mougayar • 3 months ago
And self-righteousness in most nay-sayers.

∧ | ∨ • Reply • Share ›

Joe X • a year ago
I interviewed w/ the people analytics group. I found them bitchy and totally inflexible. I'd give details, but it's small enough that they would know who I am. The people involved with the early parts of the hiring process are also extremely arrogant. One time, for a different position, I got an email from them asking me if I wanted to relocate 1000s of miles away - one week after I submitted an application specifying one specific office (where the position was listed). Apparently, I was supposed to give them my decision despite not having any information beyond the very basics of the job description (certainly, no salary info was provided - and living near their HQ is extremely expensive). When I didn't reply within 12 hours, I got a follow up call, which suddenly turned into a somewhat rudely initiated non-consensual phone interview (that I obviously was not prepared for - I only answered the phone because I assumed the person called to answer my questions I sent back in the email). Then, a few days later, I got a rejection letter for that job (in the office I never even applied to). So, although they are the only company with a messy recruiting process, they are not upholding their image of consummate professionalism and perfection they seems to be how people view them.

Taking a step back from ALLL of that, though, I do think (or hope) that what they are doing will be good for the future - based on my understanding of their methods from interviewing with them. It would be a good example for other companies to follow - if they can get it together. It's just an empirical approach at heart...not a "lets just try it this way randomly and take credit for the success & blame someone else for the failure" approach that other companies use.

13 ∧ | ∨ • Reply • Share ›

Rage Against Fraudy → Joe X • a year ago
Google is so arrogant it is bound for a fall. It's inevitable.

∧ | ∨ • Reply • Share ›

mims → Rage Against Fraudy • a year ago
yeah, and you'll use bing instead? which by the way support's on Google's data

1 ∧ | ∨ • Reply • Share ›

Warren Franks, CPP • a year ago
From the "Top 10" look at this #1 reason: "periodic one-on-one coaching which included expressing interest in the employee and frequent personalized feedback ranked as the No. 1 key to being a successful leader." Sounds like "old fashioned" H.R. human relationships dependent management to me.

9 ∧ | ∨ • Reply • Share ›

pritchardhall → Warren Franks, CPP • a year ago
Ditto!

∧ | ∨ • Reply • Share ›

Eric Brooke • a year ago
Disturbing.. Takes the Human out of human resource

13 ∧ | ∨ • Reply • Share ›

Neil Martinez → Eric Brooke • a year ago
Eric,

Your comment sounds like the comments made by the Oakland scouts when confronted by "Moneyball" recruiting tactics. Data is a reliable tool but we should all remember that a tool is only as effective as the naked ape holding it.

No where in the article did I see that a group of DBAs were feeding data into a CPU, running a few algorithms, and determining who to hire and who to fire. I read that Google uses data as a tool within the context of it's hiring process -- which appears to involve groups of people. No doubt the opinions of the interviewers are hugely important in the final determination made on a potential employee.

I left DoubleClick the week before Google acquired it. Frankly, I was afraid. I

I left DoubleClick the week before Google acquired it. Frankly, I was afraid. I don't have a college degree and I know that one of the first wave of people to be fired would be those without degrees. I know I would have been a valuable employee but I wanted to control my future. Do I agree with broad hiring policies driving decisions between one individual and another? No. Absolutely not. But I do believe there is a place for analytics in HR.

3 ∧ | ∨ • Reply • Share ›

> **Eric Brooke** → Neil Martinez • a year ago
> I thoughtful comment deserves a thoughtful comment. My response was related to this "propaganda piece".
>
> Data is not always reliable.. Humans choose what to measure and how to measure it..
>
> I agree that analytics have a part in all forms of decision making. My worry is humans like to categorize and label and once a person is labelled, it is hard to change that label. Probably why most people leave a job to get a promotion. For example you are either an A player or B Player, really how limited is this understanding of human beings...
>
> Most analytical systems do not take into account context e.g. the leader, the impact of each team members personal life, the political situ, etc. All of these factors will be taken into account by the leader, but in a heavy analytical culture they will tend to be ignored by the leaders above.
>
> **see more**
>
> 3 ∧ | ∨ • Reply • Share ›

Jay Oza • a year ago
Google is doing well because it has an advertising business where they face very little competition. As far as I know Google does not do well in other parts of business where they face stiff competition. In fact it allows Google to pick off other businesses the way Microsoft used to do. Surprised that government has not looked into this more closely.

Google reminds me of the old Bell Labs. They had lots of smart people doing all kinds of great stuff. AT&T could support them since they had a monopoly in telephony. When their monopoly died, their culture of innovation died with it. What has AT&T come up with recently that is significant?

8 ∧ | ∨ • Reply • Share ›

> Hugo → Jay Oza • a year ago
> ¨As far as I know Google does not do well in other parts of business where they face stiff competition¨

Really?

Google is at the TOP in many categories, products or business: Search, Mobile(Android), Video(Youtube), Cloud Apps, Web Browser(Chrome), Advertising, Maps, Android, AI, Local Commerce, etc.

1 ∧ | ∨ • Reply • Share ›

Jay Oza → Hugo • a year ago

Do you have revenue numbers to back that up? They make about 90% of their revenue from search business. We are talking dollars not users.

5 ∧ | ∨ • Reply • Share ›

Paul Kearns • a year ago

Let's cut through the Google hype - there is no actual evidence presented in this article to support its thesis that "Google's market success can instead be attributed to what can only be labeled as extraordinary people management practices that result from
its use of "people analytics."" - nice ideas are 10 a penny - although based on this purely anecdotal account I'm not so sure Google's idea of people management is nice at all - isn't their motto 'Don't be evil'?

8 ∧ | ∨ • Reply • Share ›

LouA • a year ago

I'm dumbfounded that there are not more overwhelmingly positive comments about this post. I've known John for well over 10 years, and more times than not find reasons for disagreement. In this case, John is right on in every aspect. What's applicable at Google is applicable at every company, you just have to step back and understand the implications. In most companies HR has only been able to maintain the status quo regarding quality of hire. Google has figured out what drives quality of hire and performance and has implemented it successfully. HR has known most of this stuff for 30+ years, but rarely has it been able to implement it properly. While the implementation will be different at each company, the foundational principles John has laid out are spot on. Now it's up to HR to take this insight and apply it properly, rather than making up a bunch of silly excuses of why it can't be done.

8 ∧ | ∨ • Reply • Share ›

guest → LouA • a year ago

I think the problem is the assumption that all of this is new. I haven't seen a predictive algorithm for retention before but I've seen systematic processes that involve senior leaders rating people for flight risk based on their knowledge of the person. I agree an algorithm might be added value. The rest of the points? I'm astonished anyone thinks any of it is new. 1/10

1 ∧ | ∨ • Reply • Share ›

Denver → LouA • a year ago

I agree, this is good information for companies and HR professionals. Most companies do not invest adequate resources into people Analytics. HR is usually caught trying to get by with less and Analytics as a priority is lower on the list than other essential functions. It's a chicken and egg proposition, if we had dedicated staff to measure and analyze then we might be able to justify programs and resources, but we often barely have the resources to keep the lights on.

1 ∧ | ∨ • Reply • Share ›

ococoob → Denver • a year ago

Maybe these companies have the "wrong" people in HR to begin with.

∧ | ∨ • Reply • Share ›

ococoob → LouA • a year ago

Have you sir, ever been at the receiving end being told that you "failed" this so-called application 10x when applying for jobs? Well I have and it stinks! You can have the strongest work ethic, the knowledge, the experience and yet, they don't tell you why you're not "company" material or why they can't "mold" you they way they want to in their eyes.

I also know of a friend who is in management of a big company and he found this algorithms/applications that DON'T work because numerious times HR presents him with the newly hired and they turn out to be DUDS!

∧ | ∨ • Reply • Share ›

J Mark Franklin → LouA • a year ago

Lou, sounds like John has been influenced by performanced-based versus behavioral-based HR. In God we trust, everyone else bring data. How about the stark differentiation bewteen public and private administration entities concerning your "applicable at every company" broad brush statement?

∧ | ∨ • Reply • Share ›

Peter Gruben • a year ago

Measuring results is not what improves an athlete's performance –it just confirms it or good measure shows where is space for improvement –but this does not improve performance either –it provides a base line. The approach, the way how an athlete feels, eats, sleeps, runs, breathes and the surface, the shoes and track suit material can improve performance. Monitoring and making statements is not an actual performance changer but a great tool to identify what and where it needs to be changed.

8 ∧ | ∨ • Reply • Share ›

HomeFires • a year ago

"Beware of Geeks bearing formulas" Warren Buffett

7 ∧ | ∨ • Reply • Share ›

Tracey H • a year ago

Personally I love Google - I admire it's innovation and success - but when I read articles (written by admiring third parties) which deride the practices of companies, in comparison to Google, I get annoyed. Here's one that posits HR practices in (non-Google) organisations are built around relationships whereas Google, and possibly only Google, build their HR practices around rational data. Sigh!

7 ∧ | ∨ • Reply • Share ›

chawchee • a year ago

So when did Google become a cult exactly?

6 ∧ | ∨ • Reply • Share ›

neil_lewis • a year ago

What data does google use to decide who to recruit to assess the data?

4 ∧ | ∨ • Reply • Share ›

ococoob ➔ neil_lewis • a year ago

I like to know the answer to that one!

1 ∧ | ∨ • Reply • Share ›

RC Pittman • a year ago

This article brings out a lot of points that I believe, have resulted in a great deal of employee dissatisfaction in companies everywhere, However, a lot of the underlying principles are leadership principles that have been around for years. What is innovative is the model they have developed in order to put these principles to practice. A lot of this simply just makes sense.... and you dont have to be Google to create this environment. In fact, if you are smaller I would think it would be easier...

To me the critical part here, the foundation of it all being how they use their metrics...This model forces them to be honest with their data. I like how they are using it appropriately to leverage and cultivate their assets (people) instead of gambling with them...if that makes sense. Data is only as good as it is honest. I have heard stories of people fudging attrition data, which are missed opportunities. This model forces integrity and accountability in order to make it work.. Another aspect is they are letting their employees know they are valued by communicating it to their people, creating an enviroment of innovation and new ideas. Who doesnt like to know they are valued.....? This shouldnt be an issue but unfortunately a biggy in the world today. This really points to the leadership of the company and also its management. I never like those words associated together. In my opinion (disclaimer), these are 2 very different words with very different meanings I think many people get them confused.

I heard a senior manager once say, "Management would be great if I didnt have to work with people." If a manager doesnt like working with people, then why are they managing them? This model would take care of this....

A lot can be said about this article and as the author stated its worth highlighting. Personally it makes sense and it provides a great example.

3 ∧ | ∨ • Reply • Share ›

Lance Douglas • a year ago

Off the cuff, it reminds me of "Formula" development for babies by scientists... many babies died. Acquiring and retaining people doesn't take science or math, it simply takes the most base of positive human traits permeating the organization: trust, consistency, respect, reward. Google is not simply going too far, it is simply far too dehumanized.

3 ∧ | ∨ • Reply • Share ›

Randy • a year ago

I simply never understood the allure that anyone had for Google. All it shows is that a catchy name will get you somewhere. Their search engine doesn't do anything different than others. Its tools and word processing software is boring and lame. If Google was so great, how are they NOT able to monetize any of their so-called proprietary software, like Google Docs? No one uses them...
I agree with Tracey's comment regarding articles deriding practices of other companies as compared to Google. The author is a professor. It seemed to me that they basically just gave him the information and probably wrote the article for him. I know that I would never want to work at a company like Google....sorry.

3 ∧ | ∨ • Reply • Share ›

John Adamante ➜ Randy • a year ago

I'm not a fan of any particular company, and there are many Google products that I don't use because I believe that are better options. This said... its search engine DOES many things different than others. Also, I USE Google Docs, so it's not true that "No one uses them...". I don't understand the concept of "boring" word processing software, much less "lame". And I don't believe they have money problems, you don't need to worry.

I agree with the main idea: what applies to Google doesn't necessarily apply to others. And it might not even be the best for Google itself. But with your "arguments" I really think you would lose any discussion. Extremes are always dangerous, and you fell in one of them.

3 ∧ | ∨ • Reply • Share ›

Jonny • a year ago

Is this reliant on the person having JavaScript enabled? Does the code snippet go in their head or feet?

2 ∧ | ∨ • Reply • Share ›

Doug • a year ago

Interesting article:

It seems all is fair in war and business efficiencies...

It's all very impressive if you like to work in a petri dish. Study your every move. Takes the guess work out of behavior manipulation.
Pavlov would be proud.

I guess this is progress?

2 ∧ | ∨ • Reply • Share ›

ococoob → Doug • a year ago

It's not progress, it's dangerous. It's like searching for the "pure Aryan" race to weed out all the undesireables! It's another tactic getting around discrimation laws.

∧ | ∨ • Reply • Share ›

Jenn • a year ago

It makes sense that Google utilizes their own data to improve all facets of the company. That message is obvious. Evidently it has been a successful approach.

2 ∧ | ∨ • Reply • Share ›

Rula • a year ago

Note to self, remove Google from "places I'd like to work".

1 ∧ | ∨ • Reply • Share ›

Ruben Benmergui • a year ago

I couldn't agree more with William Mougayar. This is a regurgitation of the hackneyed debate about whether HR management is an Art or a Science. After a 40 year perspective as a Certified Human Resources Professional, I've come to my own personal conclusion that it is indeed a hybrid, and the proportionality of Art v Science is specific to the enterprise. For those "it's a Science" believers, see my HR Audit Toolkit Online for Carswell in Canada. This is my approach to the Science element in the hybrid model.

Google's approach is in keeping with their perspective of the world (arguably buttressed by its success) as a statistical vortex with minimal human engagement. If this sterile approach had applicability in the management of human capital (an algorithm to predict retention?) we would not have the plethora of workplace conflict or employment issues that we as Human Resource Management Professionals. We would simply apply the appropriate algorithm and prevent any problem.

Finally, another 40 year perspective. This is in line with much of the HR Management commentary, education, and edu-tainment de rigueur today. I am tired of being constantly characterized as a failure and amateur in the provision of HRM advisory services to management. Especially so, by those who objectify us as marketing targets by questioning our knowledge, wisdom, and practices. These armies of hidden-agenda marketers (including Consultants, Lawyers, Accountants..etc..) really do not have any respect for our professional standing. We play into their psyche by our silence when we encounter another "here's where you've gone wrong" tirade

and "seek our services for salvation"

Ruben Benmergui BA, MIR, LLM, CHRP
HRM Professional, Consultant, Author, Educator.

1 ⌃ | ⌄ • Reply • Share ›

Peter Gruben • a year ago

This is an excellent approach supported by technology. I would love to know if this analytical approach would allow for talents like Larry Page and Sergey Brin when selecting. Take their CV's and check it out :).

1 ⌃ | ⌄ • Reply • Share ›

pritchardhall • a year ago

The good doctor seems smitten with Google's "new science", however behavioral metrics have been in play for many years. I have used technology (OMS) since 2001 for some amazing results (retention, satisfaction, etc.) - and within a not-so-big budget. And, yes this does sound like Google propaganda, but it is good to see good tools - and management skills - be a priority.

1 ⌃ | ⌄ • Reply • Share ›

Penny B • a year ago

I agree with Guest when 'he' refers to the benefit of Google and Apple as being a new business in a new field that has only just emerged in the last 20 years and which in itself has revolutionised the way of doing business. Those that first entered these markets 20 years ago led I think by Yahoo made the mistakes and triggered the business interest in using the internet and web systems that others who have since followed and entered the market have gained from. This is a fast moving business and therefore needs innovation both in product and business model to stay ahead. So, yes I can see that Google have developed some of their business models beyond their previous use, in particular I like the time out for new ideas, but they should not state as the article suggests that other businesses small, medium & large, around the world do not also have innovative and forward thinking ways of hiring and engaging staff to benefit business and their own individual development. I have been in HR 30 years and worked in large organisations such as NHS and Government Organisations as well as small manufacture, health & engineering business and they have all had their differences in their culture but their underlying requirement is to provide a service or product which meets customer needs, of the highest possible quality, efficiently, timely and within prescribed costs or budget. HR & Management have always strived to achieve that with differing success.

see more

1 ⌃ | ⌄ • Reply • Share ›

Koshy Samuel • a year ago

great value is created by reinventing the way we think. Break the traditional ways of thinking and trash them to find more innovative methods.. The World and its business practices need a through re-think and change.. Change is Imminent..

1 ⌃ | ⌄ • Reply • Share ›

Peter Lanc @HRMexplorer • a year ago

WOW this is 2013 and we just figured it out????? Is this how far HR is of base!!! Come on is this really the best of top HR people can think of... 50 years behind times

1 ⌃ | ⌄ • Reply • Share ›

Gues ➜ Peter Lanc @HRMexplorer • a year ago

No, it's simply what the author is saying. HR has been doing almost all this stuff for years. The only item that's genuinely new in my experience is the predictive algorithm for retention. Although there's a consultancy called Talent Q in the UK (I have no connection) that specialises in personality questionnaires and retention strategy so for all I know their customers do something similar/better.

1 ⌃ | ⌄ • Reply • Share ›

Load more comments

ALSO ON **TLNT**   WHAT'S THIS?

What Do You Do If Your Team Is Too Tactical and Not Strategic Enough?

6 comments • 4 days ago

DeNeen Harold — This was a good article. Great point in relation to coming with a suggested solution to …

Leadership and Narcissism, or Things We Can Learn From Kanye West

2 comments • 7 days ago

Harvey McMillan — Manufactured confidence is like manufactured anything - it has a shelf life. …

Independent Contractor Compliance: What Employers Need to Consider

2 comments • 9 days ago

Emily Elder, CCWP — Matt we could not agree more it takes effort to stay aware of the changes on the State …

How to Finally Fix the Flawed Corporate Wellness Model

8 comments • 15 days ago

Dr. Deborah Teplow — Whatever the wellness program, the key to achieving the physical,mental, social or …

✉ Subscribe   Ⓓ Add Disqus to your site

Contact Us