



**We Improve Productivity
Through People.**



Engineer I Assessment Report

Candidate: Jennifer Dumas

Date: 06/16/2008



Engineer I Assessment Report

Candidate: Jennifer Dumas
 Date: June 16, 2008

Date: 06/16/2008

Prepared For: Employers

Prepared by: John Lounsbury, Ph.D. & Lucy Gibson, Ph.D., Licensed Industrial-Organizational Psychologists

The following pages represent a report based on the results of a psychological assessment. The profile presented below summarizes key results in each area compared against general population norms (indicated by the descriptors Low, Below Average, Average, Above Average, and High) and with norms for high performers in the type of job for which the candidate is applying (indicated by the shaded areas). The candidate's score is indicated by the diamond symbol: ◆

ALL RESULTS SHOULD REMAIN STRICTLY CONFIDENTIAL

	Low	Below Average	Average	Above Average	High
Agreeableness				◆	
Assertiveness				◆	
Conscientiousness			◆		
Customer Service / Responsiveness		◆			
Emotional Stability			◆		
Extroversion			◆		
Impression Management					◆
Integrity			◆		
Openness			◆		
Optimism			◆		
Orderliness			◆		
Self-Confidence				◆	
Teamwork			◆		
Tough Mindedness			◆		
Work Drive			◆		
Overall Cognitive Aptitude					◆



Engineer I Assessment Report

Candidate: Jennifer Dumas

Date: June 16, 2008

Cognitive Aptitude Assessment

Compared to general adult norms using standardized tests which were validated for a wide range of positions, we estimate Jennifer's overall level of general intellectual aptitude to be in the **80-89 percentile** range. Her individual aptitude levels are:

Abstract Reasoning 80-89%ile

Numeric Reasoning 70-79%ile

Verbal Reasoning 80-89%ile

Jennifer has a high level of general cognitive aptitude. She can learn new information quickly, solve complex problems efficiently, and be able to handle a heavy information-processing load on this job.

Explanation of Cognitive Aptitude Scores:

The aptitude scores in this section reflect percentile rankings -- not percent correct on the test. With percentiles, the average is the 50%ile. Half of the people score below this score and half score above it. As another example, if a person scores 80-89%ile on a specific test in this report, it means that they scored as well as or better than 80-89% of the norm group, but not as high as 11-20% of the norm group.

The **Overall Cognitive Aptitude** is an average of the separate aptitude sections given to this candidate.

The lower the Overall Cognitive Aptitude score, we predict that the candidate will have difficulty learning new information and making decisions. For example, if they are well experienced in their occupation, they may be able to continue to perform well practiced tasks adequately, but have difficulty learning new things. As such, they will need additional training time and more support from supervisors. People who produce lower Overall Cognitive Aptitude scores generally prefer tasks that call for specific responses rather than ones requiring insightful solutions. They are also slower in processing information and are often easily overwhelmed by complex problems, especially ones they have not dealt with before.

The higher the Overall Cognitive Aptitude score, the more we predict that the candidate will learn quickly, pick up a lot of new information on their own without needing to be trained, handle a large information load easily, make decisions in an efficient manner, and show a great deal of insight about how to solve new and complex problems.



Engineer I Assessment Report

Candidate: Jennifer Dumas

Date: June 16, 2008

Personality Assessment

Strengths:

- She is motivated to have smooth, amiable working relationships. Jennifer tends to be accommodating and compliant, particularly when conflict arises.
- Jennifer is fairly strong-willed and assertive. She can usually bring her influence to bear on other people and confront problems directly.
- She is usually a person who keeps her word and does what she says she will do, when she says she will do it. However, Jennifer also shows a fair amount of discretion in how she meets her commitments and when she does so.
- She usually presents herself as stable and in control of her emotions. Jennifer can handle most normal forms of job stress without lowering her job effectiveness.
- Jennifer tends to be genial and pleasant in most work-based interactions. She is unlikely to be swayed by social factors when making decisions or attending to her own job tasks and duties. Jennifer will exchange important information with other employees in an efficient manner.
- She is highly aware of what is the correct thing to say and do in formal and informal situations. Jennifer is discreet and careful about how she presents herself at work.
- She is unlikely to do things which others would consider improper, illegal, or dishonest, yet she is not so rigid that she could not handle unusual situations on a case-by-case basis. She is reasonably ethical in her work behavior.
- She is moderately open to change and new learning. Jennifer is also fairly comfortable with tried-and-true methods. She is not one to change things about herself or her work just for the sake of trying something new.
- She takes many situations and people at face value, without preconceptions or advance judgments. While Jennifer is usually optimistic about most prospects and future contingencies, she is not gullible or unrealistic in her expectations. As a manager, Jennifer will typically set reasonable, but not overly taxing, goals for subordinates.
- She registers as being fairly careful and methodical in the way she performs many tasks and assignments.
- Jennifer is generally sure of herself and what she can do on the job. She has faith in her performance potential and ability to handle most problems capably on her job.
- She encourages independent action in the service of collective goals. Jennifer will try to promote a sense of common purposes among team members, while also communicating one-on-one with individuals as needed.
- She takes into account both objective facts and subjective cues when appraising problems and making judgments. Jennifer considers both analytical data and interpersonal factors when choosing a course of action.



Engineer I Assessment Report

Candidate: Jennifer Dumas

Date: June 16, 2008

- Her work drive is in the average range. Though not a workaholic, Jennifer usually invests sufficient effort into her job to meet its demands. As a manager, Jennifer will have reasonable expectations about the effort levels of subordinates.

Developmental Concerns:

- Jennifer can sometimes use too much discretion in deciding how and when she will carry out job tasks, duties, and responsibilities. She could be more conscientious and reliable, at times, in her work habits.
- Jennifer has a below-average level of customer service orientation. She may not always care enough about providing prompt, quality service to customers. If hired, she could probably benefit from mentoring, coaching, and training that reinforces the importance of good customer relations.
- She may lose her composure when confronted with heavy work pressure, perhaps reacting with excessive anxiety, irritability, or moodiness. Jennifer may need to find ways to buffer such stress and increase her emotional resilience.
- As a manager, Jennifer could probably strengthen her communication effectiveness by sharing information more frequently with subordinates and by making herself receptive to inputs from them. She could, at times, be more outgoing and warmhearted in her job-based interactions.
- She may sometimes come across as insincere or calculating. Jennifer could work on being more straightforward and authentic in her dealings with coworkers.
- Jennifer's score on the integrity dimension was in the average range. While this does not necessarily predict a future problem, it points to the need for a good on-the-job orientation and training about how to handle various situations, including "gray areas", in a manner consistent with the company's code of ethics. She needs to have a solid understanding of organizational rules and consequences for inappropriate behavior.
- Jennifer could be more willing to experiment with new ideas and procedures on her job. Some employees may perceive her as being unwilling to listen to ideas for change. She could be more interested in professional development and continued learning, both for herself and the people who report to her.
- As a manager, Jennifer may need to place more emphasis on teamwork and interdependence among her subordinates. She could do more to get them to work together cooperatively to attain shared goals.
- Jennifer may, at times, have difficulty viewing problems, situations, and other people in a realistic, objective manner. Her judgment may be clouded by her own feelings on occasion. Jennifer may give too much weight to the perceived feelings of other people in choosing among decision alternatives.
- Jennifer may, at times, need to be more willing to extend herself when long hours or an irregular work schedule are required. She may be reluctant to make any personal sacrifices for her job.



Engineer I Assessment Report

Candidate: Jennifer Dumas

Date: June 16, 2008

INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

After reviewing the assessment results for this candidate, you may want to conduct a structured interview to further explore and clarify some specific concerns. The interview questions listed below reflect areas of concern raised by the assessment results. You should keep asking questions until you have gained confidence in your assessment of the candidate. You can use some or all of these questions when interviewing the candidate. You will probably want to customize these questions to best fit your style and what you already know about the candidate as well as the job for which s/he is being considered. Most of these are behavioral description items which ask the candidate to describe specific behavior on the job. Some additional probes which you might want to use with individual questions are:

- * When did this take place?
- * What factors led up to it?
- * What were the outcomes?
- * What did others in the organization say about this?
- * How often has this type of situation arisen?
- * How would you handle it differently in the future?

CUSTOMER SERVICE

- No matter how hard you try, some customers are rude, annoying, or impossible to please. Describe the most difficult customer you have had to deal with and what efforts you made to accommodate him or her.
- Describe a situation where you went above and beyond your job description to make a customer satisfied. [Probes: What did you do? What was the outcome? How often has this type of thing happened in the last year?]
- Tell me about a time when you had to reconcile competing demands from the customer with company demands or needs.
- Tell me about a time when a customer gave you a difficult problem to solve.
- There are limits to how far an employee should go to try to satisfy customer demands and requests. Describe the criteria you use to decide when that limit has been reached.

EMOTIONAL STABILITY

- Tell me about a time when you had to keep on working despite having some problem or concern weighing on your mind. [Probes: How long did it go on? How was it resolved? How often has this kind of thing happened in the last six months?]
- Stress is a natural part of most work environments these days. Describe a situation where some significant form of stress has impacted you on your job and how you dealt with it.
- Describe a situation where you learned to live with something stressful at work.

INTEGRITY

- What would you do if you discovered that a coworker had been taking home office supplies without permission and without telling anyone?



Engineer I Assessment Report

Candidate: Jennifer Dumas

Date: June 16, 2008

- Under what conditions would it be acceptable to ignore or bend a company rule or policy?
- Describe what you would do if your boss asked you to keep quiet about some data he or she was falsifying for the annual company report.
- Under what circumstances would it be OK to claim a sick day (even though you were not sick) to deal with a personal problem at home?

OPENNESS

- Describe the most recent new job-related method, procedure, or technique you learned and how you felt about learning it. [Probe for when and how often this occurred.]
- Tell me about a time when you recommended or implemented a better way of doing things at work.
- Describe a situation where you felt that continuing demands to do new things on your job lowered your overall productivity or efficiency.
- Describe your plans (if any) for continued education, job-related training, or professional development you have for the coming year.

ORDERLINESS

- All of us learn from our errors and mistakes. Tell me about the most recent error or mistake you learned from. [Probes: What was the error or mistake? What did you learn from it? What did you do to prevent it from happening again?]
- Tell me about a time when your organizational skills paid off and helped solve or prevent a problem at work.
- Sooner or later all employees have to make some trade-offs between working quickly and doing a sufficient quantity of work versus working precisely and doing work of the highest quality. Tell me about an occasion at work when you traded off quality for quantity or when time constraints forced you to compromise on thoroughness or attention to detail. [Probe: How did you feel about having to make such a trade-off?]
- Describe the most significant thing you have done to help yourself become better organized on your job.

The information contained in this report is Resource Associates, Inc. business information intended only for the use of the individual or entities named above. If the reader of this report is not the intended recipient you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution or copying of this report is strictly prohibited. If you have received this report in error, please notify us immediately at (800) 840-4749 or by sending E-mail to info@resourceassociates.com.