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# Verify <br> G+ Report 

Name<br>Sample Candidate

## Date

14 September 2018

This G+ Report provides the scores from Sample Candidate's G+ Ability Tests. If these tests were unsupervised, there is a small possibility that these scores do not represent his actual level of ability.


## Details

## General Ability Description

The General Ability score is based on performance on all of the questions on this test across all cognitive abilities. Every candidate has strengths and weaknesses, but this score gives an indication of how the candidate is likely to perform on cognitively loaded tasks generally. For more specific information about the candidate's strengths and weaknesses, please refer to the feedback for each of the cognitive abilities included in the test.


## Language: English

Percentile compared to the OPQ32i French Professionals 1999 comparison group

Sample Candidate's estimated general ability is average when compared to the comparison group. The candidate's result is better than $65 \%$ of the people in this group. This suggests that the candidate will be as able as most in in cognitively loaded tasks generally as compared to the group.

## Inductive Reasoning Description

This test measures the ability to work with incomplete information and create solutions to novel problems from first principles. People who perform well on this test will have a greater capacity to think conceptually as well as analytically.

|  | 10 | 30 | 50 | 70 | 90 | Percentile |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Inductive Reasoning |  |  |  |  | 60 |  |

## Language: English

Percentile compared to the OPQ32i French Professionals 1999 comparison group

Sample Candidate's estimated inductive critical reasoning ability is average when compared to the comparison group. The candidate's result is better than $60 \%$ of the people in this group. This suggests that the candidate will be as able as most in understanding incomplete information and solving novel problems by creating solutions from first principles.

## Numerical Ability Description

This test measures the ability to make correct decisions or inferences from numerical data. The data presented and the tasks set are relevant to a business environment. The emphasis in these tasks is on understanding and evaluating data rather than on computation. People who perform well on this test tend to have the capacity to understand numerical data and interpret mathematical information correctly.

|  | 10 | 30 | 50 | 70 | 90 | Percentile |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Numerical Ability |  |  |  |  |  | 36 |

## Language: English

Percentile compared to the OPQ32i French Professionals 1999 comparison group

Sample Candidate's estimated numerical ability is average when compared to the comparison group. The candidate's result is better than $36 \%$ of the people in this group. This suggests that the candidate will be as able as most in understanding or interpreting numerical data and mathematical calculations as compared to the group.

## Deductive Reasoning Description

This test is designed to measure the ability to draw logical conclusions based on information provided, identify strengths and weaknesses of arguments, and complete scenarios using incomplete information.

|  | 10 | 30 | 50 | 70 | 90 | Percentile |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Deductive Reasoning |  |  |  |  |  | 95 |

## Language: English

Percentile compared to the OPQ32i French Professionals 1999 comparison group

Sample Candidate demonstrates well above average deductive reasoning ability compared to the comparison group. The candidate's result is better than $95 \%$ of the people in this group. This person is likely to be superior at making logical arguments, developing very sound solutions based on available data, and identifying even minute flaws in the logic of others. At work, this individual is likely to utilise very complex data effectively and make extremely well-reasoned decisions. This person appears to have an exceptional ability to identify and understand unstated assumptions in logical arguments as well as know how to develop near-flawless solutions to problems.

## Guidelines for using these results

## How to verify a result

There are many ways to confirm an individual's ability level. Some techniques are listed below:

| Consider information from other competency assessments | Use results from other assessments that relate to the competencies and/or skills important for performance in the job to evaluate the person's actual ability level. For example work simulations, or assessment centres. |
| :---: | :---: |
| Use information from other sources | Results from examinations, qualifications, grades and other attainment tests that are appropriate measures of a person's cognitive ability may help to evaluate the person's actual ability level. |
| Use structured interviewing techniques to probe related competencies | Competencies related to cognitive ability include: <br> - Presenting \& Communicating Information <br> - Writing \& Reporting <br> - Applying Expertise \& Technology <br> - Analysing <br> - Learning \& Researching <br> - Creating \& Innovating <br> - Formulating Strategies \& Concepts |

The final decision on how to confirm and use the person's test results should follow internal policies and guidelines. Companies should evaluate the risks involved, corporate policy/governance, the use of other screening and selection tools, time, cost and other factors. All of these may be important when deciding the most appropriate method to verify an individual's Ability Test results.

## Information about this report

 comparison group

How to interpret this information

- The bar chart displays the individual's percentile score from the Ability Test.
- The comparison group identifies the specific group of people this person's score is compared against.
- The percentile score indicates how well this person scored against the people in the comparison group.
- For example, a percentile score of 50 means that the individual performed better than $50 \%$ of the people in the comparison group.


## About cognitive ability tests

Cognitive ability is the most effective, single predictor of future performance in many different jobs. However, many other factors also play an important role in predicting job performance. The information in this document should be used as part of a broader evaluation of this person's suitability and potential for the job.

## More Information

Additional information and guidance on how to use the SHL Verify range of Ability Tests is available online at SHL.com.

## Technical information

T-scores and Sten scores are provided for users who are trained in their appropriate use and interpretation.
A T-score is a standardised test score with a mean of 50 and a standard deviation of 10. The Sten score is a standardised score on a 10-point scale. It has a mean of 5.5 and a standard deviation of 2.

Name: Sample Candidate
Type of Test: General Ability
Language: English
Comparison Group: OPQ32i French Professionals 1999


Sten score
T-score: $54 \quad$ Number Attempted: 30
Work Rate: 100\% (30/30)
Sten-Score: 6 Hit Rate: 67\% (20/30)

Name: Sample Candidate
Type of Test: Inductive Reasoning
Language: English
Comparison Group: OPQ32i French Professionals 1999


Sten score
T-score: 53
Number Attempted: 10
Work Rate: 100\% (10/10)
Sten-Score: 6 Hit Rate: 100\% (10/10)

Name: Sample Candidate
Type of Test: Numerical Ability
Language: English
Comparison Group: OPQ32i French Professionals 1999


Sten score
T-score: 46
Number Attempted: 10
Work Rate: 100\% (10/10)
Sten-Score: 5
Hit Rate: 60\% (6/10)

```
Name: Sample Candidate
Type of Test: Deductive Reasoning
Language: English
Comparison Group: OPQ32i French Professionals 1999
```



```
Sten score
T-score: \(66 \quad\) Number Attempted: \(10 \quad\) Work Rate: 100\% (10/10)

Sten-Score: 9

The Report also includes information to give you an indication of the candidate's accuracy while completing the test. 'Number Attempted' refers to the number of questions the candidate has seen during the test. The total may include questions that the candidate has not provided a response to.

Work rate provides a measure of how far the candidate has got through the test, and is the number attempted divided by the total number of questions in the test. This is expressed both as a percentage and as raw data.

Hit rate provides a measure of accuracy, and is the number of questions the candidate has answered correctly divided by the total number of questions attempted. This is expressed both as a percentage and as raw data.

Work rate and Hit rate provide measures of the number attempted and number answered correctly. More information on these measures is provided in the Verify User Guide. It is important to understand that because each candidate receives a different set of items, there is not a direct correlation between Hit rate/Accuracy and the Percentile, T or Sten score achieved; and individual with a lower hit rate may achieve a higher percentile score and vice-versa.

\section*{Assessment Methodology}

Questionnaire / Ability Test Comparison Group
Verify - G+ - UKE
G+ General Composite (INT) v1

\section*{Person Detail Section}

Name Sample Candidate
Report Verify G+ Report

\section*{About This Report}

This report shows the result(s) obtained from ability test(s). The use of these tests is limited to those people who have received the necessary training in their use and interpretation.

The report herein is generated from the results of test(s) answered by the respondent. This report has been generated electronically - the user of the software can make amendments and additions to the text of the report.

SHL Global Management Limited and its associated companies cannot guarantee that the contents of this report are the unchanged output of the computer system. We can accept no liability for the consequences of the use of this report and this includes liability of every kind (including negligence) for its contents.

\section*{www.shl.com}
© 2018 SHL and/or its affiliates. All rights reserved. SHL and OPQ are trademarks registered in the United Kingdom and other countries.

This Report has been produced by SHL for the benefit of its client and contains SHL intellectual property. As such, SHL permits its clients to reproduce, distribute, amend and store this report for its internal and non-commercial use only. All other rights of SHL are reserved.```

