HR AVATAR™
EMPLOYMENT TESTS

Candidate: **Betty Penske**
Assessment: Cognitive Workplace Simulation - Management (Spanish)
Completed: April 10, 2024
Prepared for: Susan Bookman
HR Avatar Data Collection Account

Test Results and Interview Guide

The Cognitive Workplace Simulation - Management (Spanish) assessment measures key factors related to high performance and tenure in this job. Attribute types measured vary by test, but can include cognitive ability, skills, knowledge, personality characteristics, emotional intelligence, and past behavioral history. This report includes a one page summary, followed by detailed results with an embedded interview guide. Note that these results should always be used as a part of a balanced candidate selection process that includes independent evaluation steps, such as interviews and reference checks.

Overall

Candidate	Score	Interpretation
Betty Penske	**88**	

bettypenske@yourcompany.org
Cognitive Workplace Simulation - Management (Spanish)
April 10, 2024

The candidate's scores indicate high performance potential in most jobs. We recommend that this score be used in conjunction with a comprehensive process for evaluating potential performance, including the specific knowledge, skills, and abilities required for a particular job.

Key
▼ Candidate Score
████ Higher Risk
████ Lower Risk
──── Custom Baseline (Optional)

Competency Summary

Competency	Score	Interpretation
Cognitive Abilities (relates to job performance, problem-solving, ability to learn, etc.)		
Attention to Detail	82	
Analytical Thinking	94	

Comparison

Percentile scores indicate how the candidate compares to other test-takers within various groups. The candidate scored equal to or better than the fraction of test-takers indicated by the percentile.

Test-Taker Group	Percentile	0 10 20 30 40 50 60 70 80 90 100
Global	88th	
United States	73rd	
HR Avatar Data	81st	

Assessment Overview

This assessment provides scores for a number of important factors and competencies that are related to success on the job. Scores are presented based on their potential impact on job performance.

Scores are presented individually on a scale of 0-100. In most cases, including the overall score, higher scores represent higher expected job performance. However, for some competencies, either extreme low or extreme high scores indicate a risk of lower performance. Refer to the interpretation section of each competency for additional information.

Individual competency scores are also combined into a single overall score. Please note that individual competencies are weighted differently, depending on their type, and on fine adjustments based on data from the US Government's Occupational Data Network (O*Net).

Each competency measured includes one or more suggested interview questions, in an easy-to-use format. These questions should be used for additional probing, especially when the score shows an area of relative weakness.

Some of the competencies measured evaluate preferences for doing (or not doing) specific activities. Scores for these competencies can be used to evaluate job-fit.

We wish to emphasize that the data contained in this report should be used as part of a comprehensive process for evaluating job candidates. Additional data should include in-person interviews, job tryouts, resume review, and background checks.

Detail

Candidate:	**Betty Penske,** bettypenske@yourcompany.org
Assessment:	Cognitive Workplace Simulation - Management (Spanish)
Authorized:	April 10, 2024, by Susan Bookman, HR Avatar Data Collection Account, sue.bookman@richardson.biz
Started:	April 10, 2024, 3:47:28PM EST
Completed:	April 10, 2024, 3:47:28PM EST
Overall Score:	88

Cognitive Abilities Detail

This section contains a list of job-related cognitive abilities that have been evaluated in a job-like context using HR Avatar's simulation technology. Studies have demonstrated that cognitive abilities are highly correlated with job performance for many jobs. Abilities also correlate with problem-solving and the ability to learn quickly.

Detail	Interview Guide
Attention to Detail Score: 82 *Description:* This scale represents thoroughness, accuracy, and being concerned for all areas involved no matter how insignificant. Individuals who demonstrate high Attention to Detail produce work products that are consistently accurate and require little checking. They rarely forget schedule commitments or overlook even the smallest details. *Interpretation:* High scores in this area correlate with superior performance for many jobs. Able to achieve a high degree of thoroughness and accuracy in a work task. Concerned for all areas involved. Work products require little or no review or checking to maintain consistency.	Give me an example of a time you discovered an error that had been overlooked by either you or someone you were working with. What did you do? What was the outcome? ☆ 1 — Unclear or careless example. Can't describe what was overlooked. No action. ☆ 2 ☆ 3 — Moderately clear example. Some concern for details. Direct but passive action. ☆ 4 ☆ 5 — Very detailed. Concern for all relevant components. Clear, proactive actions.

Detail	Interview Guide

Analytical Thinking

Score: 94

| 0 | 20 | 40 | 60 | 80 | 100 |

Description:

This scale indicates the capacity to think in a thoughtful, discerning way, to solve problems, utilize resources, and analyze data. Individuals who demonstrate high amounts of analytical thinking are able to recognize patterns rapidly, navigate through problems, and resolve difficult problems systematically.

Interpretation:

High scores in this area correlate with superior performance for many jobs.

Able to think in a thoughtful, discerning way. Can often solve difficult problems, plan many-featured tasks and projects, organize multiple resources, and analyze complex data. Able to quickly recall and use information when needed or appropriate.

Tell me about a complex problem, situation, or planning task you had to deal with. What were the challenges, and how did you overcome them?

☆ 1 ☆ 2 ☆ 3 ☆ 4 ☆ 5

1	3	5
Example lacks complexity. Data seeking is limited, analysis may be lacking, actions unclear, not relevant, or ineffective.	Example is moderately complex. Shows some analytical thinking and problem solving. Actions have mixed or limited effectiveness.	Example shows complexity. Thorough investigation of all areas that might affect the decision. Actions are clear, relevant, and effective.

Identity Confirmation Photos

The following photos of the candidate and any identification were uploaded during the assessment session.

Photo Analysis Results	
- Risk:	Medium risk of cheating based on image inconsistencies
- Percent match among processed faces	100%
- Total images processed	17
- Total images with valid faces	14 (82%)
- Total pairs of faces compared	13
- Pairs in which faces matched	13 (100%)

Pre/Post-Test Photo   *ID Photo*   *In-Test Error Detected (No Face Detected)*   *In-Test Error Detected (No Face Detected)*

In-Test Error Detected (No Face Detected)   *In-Test Photo*   *In-Test Photo*   *In-Test Photo*

In-Test Photo   *Pre/Post-Test Photo*

Report Preparation Notes

- Hiring decisions should never be based on a single source of information. The most effective use of this assessment report is as a part of a multi-faceted program of candidate evaluation that includes resume review, interviews, and reference checks.
- Overall vs Percentiles Scores: The overall score reflects the success in the test, based on the mean (average) and standard deviation of the test scores. The percentile score reflects the percentage of test-takers who scored equal or below this overall score. We recommend you use the Overall Score as your primary evaluation criteria. However, percentile scores can often be useful in comparing specific candidates against one another and with a group, such as for test takers in a certain organization or within a certain account.
- Note that comparison information is calculated based on completed instances of this assessment at that time the assessment is scored. As additional instances are completed, the comparative data may change. You can always update a report to the current values by clicking on ''Recalculate Percentiles'' within the online results viewing pages at www.hravatar.com.
- Most competency scores are norm-based, which means that they can be interpreted in terms of their distance from the average or mean score. For all scales, a score equal to the mean receives a score of 65 and scores above and below this value are set so that a score change of 15 equals one standard deviation.
- For linear competencies, higher is better across the entire scale. For these scales a score between 65 and 80 (light green) represents 0 to 1 standard deviation above the mean and a score above 80 (dark green) represents more than one standard deviation above the mean. Similarly, a score of 50 - 65 (yellow) represents 0 to 1 standard deviation below the mean, while a score of 35 - 50 (orange) equates to 1 to 2 standard deviations below the mean, and a score below 35 represents more than 2 standard deviations below the mean.
- Sim ID: 1576-4, Key: 0-0, Rpt: 13, Prd: 1104, Created: 2024-04-10 20:47 UTC
- UA: Mozilla/5.0 (Windows NT 6.3; Trident/7.0; Touch; rv:11.0) like Gecko

Score Calculation Detail

The following table provides a summary of how the overall score was calculated from the individual competency scores. Competency scores are calculated on a 0-100 scale by first calculating a Z statistic based on test-taker responses and then transforming the Z value to a scale with target mean and standard deviation. Certain competencies have a normal score distribution where it is best to be closest to the mean. For these competencies we modify the Z statistic by multiplying its absolute value by minus 1 for the overall score calculation. Next, to calculate the overall score, a weighted average of all modified competency Z statistics is computed and this weighted average is itself transformed to a Z statistic, which is then transformed to a score with the same target mean and standard deviation. Finally outlier scores are adjusted if they are below 0 or above 100.

Competency	Score	How applied to overall	Score Value Used	Weight (%)
Attention to Detail	82.4841	Z-Statistic	1.1656	50.0000
Analytical Thinking	94.4818	Z-Statistic	1.9655	50.0000

Weighted Average of Competency Z-Scores:	1.5655
Mean applied to Raw Weighted Avg:	0.0000
Standard Deviation applied to Raw Weighted Avg:	1.0000
Normalized Raw Score:	1.5655
Mean:	65.0000
Standard Deviation Used:	15.0000
Final Overall Score:	88.4830

Notes

(This area is intentionally blank - it's reserved as space for your notes.)