

Sam Sample
27 Mar 2019

EXPERT

STANDARD REPORT

WORK ATTITUDE INVENTORY





REPORT STRUCTURE

The Standard Report presents Sam Sample's profile results in the following sections:

1. Guide to Using This Report

- Introduction
- The Standard Report
- Further Considerations

2. Attitude Towards Integrity

- Integrity Profile
- Low Integrity Items Endorsed
- High Integrity Items Rejected

3. Interview Guide

4. Additional Work-Relevant Measures

DISCLAIMER

This is a strictly confidential assessment report on Sam Sample which is to be used under the guidance of a trained professional. The information contained in this report should only be disclosed on a 'need to know basis' with the prior understanding of Sam Sample.

This profile arises from a self-report questionnaire and must be interpreted in the light of corroborating evidence gained from feedback and in the context of the role in question taking into account available data such as performance appraisals, actual experience, personality preferences, interests, abilities and skills. As such the authors and distributors cannot accept responsibility for decisions made based on the information contained in this report and cannot be held directly or indirectly liable for the consequences of those decisions.



GUIDE TO USING THIS REPORT

INTRODUCTION

Measures of integrity have consistently been shown to be good predictors of work-based performance across a range of roles and settings. Findings suggest the predictive utility of such measures are only bettered by tests of general intelligence – 'g'. Attitudes towards integrity have been found not only to predict honesty at work, but also to predict compliance with organisational rules systems and procedures, adherence to safety protocols, risk avoidance, etc. Having a well-defined sense of personal integrity, and a clear commitment to high ethical standards, has also been shown to be correlated with global ratings of work performance across many jobs.

Candidates' ability levels may influence their understanding of what constitutes integrity and probity in any given working environment, as might their level of work specific knowledge and skills. It is therefore important to consider such factors when interpreting WAI results. Aptitude tests can be used to assess ability, and work specific knowledge and skills can be assessed through job sample tests and assessment centre exercises.

It should be noted that while integrity is relevant to a broad range of jobs, a tendency to set oneself high ethical standards and to have a strong sense of allegiance to accepted codes of conduct, is often associated with a lack of expediency and, in the most extreme circumstances may result in the person being ridged and inflexible. Therefore the WAI may **not** be an appropriate screening tool for roles which require the incumbent to respond to situations in a flexible and expedient manner, and quickly grasp opportunities as they arise.

Please Note:

- The WAI does not assess whether someone is, or is not, honest. Rather it assesses that person's **attitude** towards honesty.
- While attitudes are known to be highly predictive of behaviour, they are only one of the many factors which influence behaviour. Other factors which influence behaviour are social/cultural norms, situational contexts, etc.
- When used for selection and assessment, the significance of the WAI results should be interpreted alongside information gained from other assessment methods and with reference to the employment context.

THE STANDARD REPORT

The Standard Report describes the respondent's attitude towards integrity and probity in the workplace. In addition to providing a description and integrity scale score, the report also lists the areas of most concern and where the respondent may have issues with integrity.



FURTHER CONSIDERATIONS

When interpreting the likely consequence of any given work attitude, the impact of environmental and cultural factors on behaviour should always be considered. The effect past experience and education have upon forming attitudes should be borne in mind, along with the possibility for attitudes to change in response to appropriate training and education.

The presence or absence of relevant personality traits, and values and motives, which may support integrity, can provide useful evidence to confirm the results obtained from the WAI. This information can be gathered via work relevant personality tests, and values and motives inventories. Past behaviour can be used as both a source of direct evidence about candidates' attitudes towards integrity, and as evidence of how those attitudes are likely to be expressed in a work context. Relevant past behaviour can be assessed through a critical review of candidates' work histories and references, and via the use of behavioural interviews, situational judgement tests, etc. To provide a more comprehensive view of this individual you may wish to look at the following assessments provided by Psytech International:

Fifteen Factor Questionnaire Plus (15FQ+)

The 15FQ+ is an assessment of personality and individual differences. The 15FQ+ is based on one of the most researched and respected models of personality, identifying behaviour preferences across Cattell's 16 personality constructs (Cattell, 1946) and the big five personality traits (McCrae and Costa, 1987). These provide insight into how people typically think, feel and interact in ways that may be productive or counter-productive for an organisation.

Values and Motives Inventory (VMI)

The VMI profiles a person's motivations to determine the amount of energy and effort they are likely to expend in different activities. The VMI measures occupationally relevant values under three main categories, these are: interpersonal, intrinsic and extrinsic.

General Reasoning Test (GRT2)

The GRT2 assesses the ability to reason using words, numbers and abstract concepts. It has been specifically designed to discriminate between candidates of average ability, whose aptitude is being assessed for general level employment and training. Tests such as the General Reasoning Test have consistently been found to be the best single predictor of both performance and trainability in roles that require a good level of general mental ability.


Critical Reasoning Test Battery (CRTB2)

Critical Reasoning is an ability that is central to all roles that require the incumbent to take logical decisions based on complex information. The test comprises two sub-tests which measure verbal and numerical critical reasoning. The Critical Reasoning Test Battery contains problems which are relevant to management and business functions and was designed to distinguish between individuals of high ability.



ATTITUDE TOWARDS INTEGRITY

Sam is likely to set himself lower standards of personal conduct and behaviour at work than most people. Moreover, he would be expected to have a significantly below average sense of commitment to following rules and regulations, and to maintaining consensual standards of probity. His responses to the attitude assessment indicate he is likely to be significantly less respectful of others' rights than are many people. As a result he may be rather prone to act in an expedient, self-serving way, even if this involves circumventing agreed ethical standards and codes of conduct. His responses further indicate that he has a less strong sense of right and wrong than most, and a fairly low sense of allegiance to consensual ethical standards. Consequently he might not be expected to be that motivated to act in accordance with established ethical principles and values.



Low Integrity Items Endorsed

Sam did not endorse any low integrity statements (i.e. he indicated that none of these behaviours were characteristic).

As Sam did not endorse any low integrity items, no interpretation of his individual item responses is provided.

High Integrity Items Rejected

Sam rejected two high integrity statements (i.e. he indicated that these behaviours were uncharacteristic). Only 7 percent of the population reject more than 2 such statements.

The high integrity items Sam rejected imply:

- Not believing dishonest behaviour is intolerable
- Not believing it is important to comply with rules.



INTERVIEW GUIDE

Structured behavioural interview questions are provided to attempt to elicit information about a respondent's attitudes and past behaviour. Such a technique is based on the premise that past behaviour is seen as the best predictor of future behaviour. Interviewees' responses are generally considered reliable because they are based on what they actually did, as opposed to offering opinions or hypothetical responses.

INTERVIEW MODEL

The interview model follows the STAR behavioural interviewing method in which evidence must be gained to indicate the context of the behaviour, the nature of the behaviour and the consequences of the behaviour. STAR is an acronym for:

Situation	Task	Action	Result
What was the context of the behaviour?	What needed to be achieved?	What behaviour resulted from the situation?	What was the outcome?

PROBING

The STAR interview questions are used to probe the individuals' responses from multiple angles. However, in most situations interviewers need only ask the "Situation" question as it is the main question which attempts to elicit examples from past behaviour. Interviewers are only required to use the other questions if the responses to the "Situation" are unclear or incomplete. In such cases interviewers can use the remaining STAR questions to further probe respondents and gain a better understanding of their behaviour, context of the behaviour and outcomes.

While the STAR interviewing method provides valid interview questions as well as further structure to how interviews are conducted and how responses are evaluated, interviewers are encouraged to:

- Identify which dimensions listed in the report are related to the context of the job.
- Develop their own list of questions and not rely solely on the interview questions provided.
- Determine what other job related factors are not covered in the report and prepare additional questions to cover those areas.
- Gather additional information about respondents from other sources such as background checks, references, role plays, past performance, etc.
- Utilise the evidence gathered from all the sources in order to make a decision.

SCORING

Scoring forms are provided as part of the interview guide. Interviewers are encouraged to use the forms to take notes and are advised to score responses using the following 5-point scale:

1	2	3	4	5
Only circumstantial evidence gained, or evidence gained which supports a low ability.	No explicit evidence gained, or little evidence gained which supports a low ability.	Explicit evidence gained which supports a moderate ability.	Explicit evidence gained which supports a strong ability.	Detailed evidence gained which supports a strong ability.



Commitment to following organisational rules

	Situation	Task	Action	Result
Q1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Give me an example of a situation where you had to go against organisational policies or procedures in order to get something done. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What were the procedures and why did you feel you had to disregard them? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How did you deal with the situation? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How did you balance between the need to get things done and the need to comply with organisational policies?
Q2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Describe a situation where you disagreed with you management over their decisions. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What were the decisions? Why did you disagree with them? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How did you deal with the situation? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How did you balance between your views and management's views?

Desire to conform to established principles of right and wrong

	Situation	Task	Action	Result
Q1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Have you ever witnessed a colleague or manager say or do something that was misleading or unethical? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What did you witness? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How did you handle the situation? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What was the outcome?
Q2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Have you ever found yourself in a situation in which honesty wasn't necessarily the best policy? What was the situation? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What were you required to say or do? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What did you do? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Why wasn't honesty the best policy for this situation?

Ownership and responsibility for own mistakes or errors

	Situation	Task	Action	Result
Q1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Tell me about a project/assignment you were involved in that did not go well. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What was the project/assignment? Why did it not go so well? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How were you involved and what was your contribution? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Who was ultimately responsible for the lack of achievement? Was there a negative response from others to the shortcomings in any way? Why?
Q2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Give an example of a project/assignment you were directly involved in and that you felt you could have done better on. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What were you trying to achieve? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What were your shortcomings? What did you do to correct them at the time? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To what extent did you feel responsible for the outcome and why? What did you learn from the experience?



Ability to work without close supervision			
Situation	Task	Action	Result
Q1 ■ Tell me about a situation where you had to set your own objectives and schedules.	■ What were you trying to achieve?	■ How did you set the targets and manage your time?	■ What was the outcome?
Q2 ■ Have there ever been a time where you had to work without any form of performance monitoring or supervision?	■ What work did you have to do during this period?	■ How did you manage your objectives and time during this period?	■ What was the outcome?

Use the following forms to calculate the overall interview score. Check (✓) the box corresponding to the appropriate score for each dimension being assessed.


Dimension	Score				
	1	2	3	4	5
1 Commitment to following organisational rules	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2 Desire to conform to established principles of right and wrong	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3 Ownership and responsibility for own mistakes or errors	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4 Ability to work without close supervision	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Scores from additional measures not included as part of the interview guide:					
6	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
7	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
8	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
9	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
10	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
OVERALL SCORE	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Comments



ADDITIONAL WORK-RELEVANT MEASURES

WORK-RELEVANT MEASURES PROFILE



Industriousness

Industriousness was rated as being Sam's strongest work characteristic. This suggests that Sam will most strongly emphasise the need to remain productive and efficient in the workplace. He is likely to appreciate the intrinsic value of work and be happiest kept busy and occupied with task. He is likely to work even if he did not have to.

Stress Tolerance

Stress Tolerance, while rated as Sam's second highest characteristic descriptor, is somewhat above the level of most other people. This would suggest that Sam may see himself as someone who is able to cope well in difficult situations. However being his own worst critic, he may be inclined to take on more than he can handle, which coupled with elevated nervous energy, may result in him finding it difficult to relax and unwind after a demanding or stressful day.

Meticulousness

Meticulousness, although being rated as Sam's third most characteristic attribute is still slightly above the typical level of most other people. This suggests that he is likely to place some emphasis on the importance of being systematic and orderly in his work. He is likely to set fairly high standards for himself and generally will expect the same from others. Purposeful and deliberate in his action, he is likely to prefer to plan for most contingencies rather than deal with issues as they arise.

Perseverance

Persistence, while rated as Sam's fourth most characteristic attribute, is still slightly above the typical level of most other people. This suggests that he is likely to place some emphasis on persevering with tasks that he undertakes. He is also likely to focus on the need to finish jobs that have been started and will be reluctant to leave tasks undone. Relatively undeterred by setbacks, he will be inclined to persist with tasks even under unfavourable conditions.

Agreeableness

Agreeableness was not rated as a characteristic that Sam would consider describes him. This would suggest that Sam is unlikely to go out of his way to develop or maintain harmonious interpersonal relationships. Relatively unconcerned about the sensitivities of friends and colleagues, he is likely to express his views or opinions quite directly even when there is a risk of causing upset or offence. he may be considered as curt and undiplomatic by more sensitive others.