



prevueTM
approach to work

AssessAdvantage

Serviced By:
AssessAdvantage
Organisational Psychologists
support@assess.co.nz

Assessment Taken:
11/13/2017

Assessment Printed:
5/13/2019

Andrea Sample

Table of Contents

Part 1	Understanding this Report General information about this report and Prevue Assessments.	3
Part 2	Approach to Work Information about Andrea Sample's scores on the Approach to Work scales.	4
Part 3	Best Practice Information Guidelines for using Prevue Assessments and understanding this report.	7

Report Design Options Selected for this Report

Report Family: Screening & Selection
Type: Approach To Work Report
Scope: Personality (P)
Format: Comprehensive

Prevue Assessments presented in this report:

- ▶ Prevue Personality Assessment that provides information on thirteen Personality scales

For more information about Prevue Assessments and design options for Prevue reports see www.prevuehr.com

Part 1 - Understanding this Report

This report provides information on Andrea Sample's approach or response to a number of work-related subjects. The information is provided to assist management in gaining a better understanding of the candidate to support selection and development decisions. The Approach to Work Report will help to answer questions such as:

- ▶ Is the candidate inclined to take risks?
- ▶ Does the candidate live to work or work to live?
- ▶ Is the candidate better motivated by a fixed salary or flexible income?


The Approach to Work scales are derived from one or a composite of the Prevue Personality scales that are addressed in the Prevue Personality Assessment.

There are in fact two types of scales included in this Approach to Work report:

1. Eight of the eleven scales are composite scales. Each composite scale is composed of a combination of Prevue personality trait scales that are displayed in Prevue Selection and other Prevue reports. One might say therefore that a composite scale is a recipe comprised of portions of personality traits.
2. The other three scales in Approach to Work are referred to as "Aspects of Assertiveness" as they are all derived from the Submissive vs. Assertive personality scale that is exhibited in Prevue Selection and other Prevue reports.

The Prevue major and minor personality scales that are considered in Prevue Selection and other Prevue reports are trait scales that describe a candidate's personality traits or characteristics from which we infer certain behaviors. Composite scales, on the other hand, are a combination of personality traits that examine particular work subjects or situations which are significant to effective performance in most jobs.

Prevue Scoring



The assessment results collected from a very large sample of the general working population, when graphed, produces a bell shaped curve shown in the above diagram. The bell curve is divided into standard tenths ('stens') and the percentage of the population that will score on each sten is shown in the diagram.

Approximately 16% of the population will have sten scores in the 1-3 ranges and 16% in the 8-10 ranges. The other 68% will score in the middle ranges 4-7.

Example: A score of 9 in the Compensation Preference scale shown above would indicate that the candidate was more inclined to be paid by way of commission than 93% (the sum of the percentages for sten 1 to 8) of the general working population.

Part 2 - Approach to Work

This section of the report identifies Andrea Sample's scores on each of the Approach to Work Scales followed by an explanation of the significance of each score.

You may occasionally observe what appear to be conflicts between the description of a score on a trait scale in the Prevue Selection or other reports and the description of a candidate's score on an Approach to Work composite scale. This apparent conflict arises out of the fact there are several Prevue trait scales being considered in each composite scale and the scale descriptions for the more significant components of the composite scale can appear to conflict with the description of the score on the composite scale.

Generally, scores and descriptive text for the composite scales should take precedence where there is an apparent conflict with the description of a score on a trait scale because composite scales are examining very specific aspects of job performance and are able to take relationships between scales into account. Also, composite scales usually have higher coefficients of reliability than individual trait scales.

For more information on the Approach to Work scales and their relationship to the personality trait scales utilized in Prevue Selection and other Prevue reports, please see Understanding Approach to Work Scales.

		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	
Focus on Work	Works to Live				4							Lives to Work
Compliance	Questioning	1										Compliant
Leadership Style *	Democratic						6					Commanding
Compensation Preference	Fixed Salary									9		Commission/ Bonus
Approach to Listening *	Sympathetic						6					Controlling
Approach to Risk Taking	Careful							7				Daring
Preference for Change	Likes Routine									9		Likes Change
Approach to Conflict *	Accommodating						6					Forceful
Approach to New Ventures	Cautious					5						Optimistic
Task vs. Person Focused	Task Focused					5						Person Focused
Self vs. Relationship Focused	Self Focused		2									Relationship Focused

* See Aspects of Assertiveness

Focus on Work

WORKS TO LIVE (1) vs. LIVES TO WORK (10):

The Focus on Work scale provides information on the importance of work to Mr. Sample.

Some see work as a means to an end while others define themselves by their work. Andrea Sample's career is a means to an end, not a defining characteristic of his life. If there is a conflict between home and work, his personal life will often take priority. Home, family and leisure activities are important to him and probably help him to deal with a greater variety of business problems.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
			4						

Compliance

QUESTIONING (1) vs. COMPLIANT (10):

The Compliance scale indicates the most likely behavior regarding acceptance of an employer's rules and procedures.

Andrea Sample may question or even disregard some guidelines and, without external motivation, this employee will tend to be less engaged in routine or repetitive tasks. With fewer restrictions, Andrea is more likely to meet challenges, improvise when necessary, and take chances by bending rules. Rather than follow set protocol, Andrea will typically prefer to work in a new or personal way. Disruptive behavior, such as testing the limits of established practice, may be a response to long hours and job stress. Andrea does not follow rules blindly.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
1									

Compensation Preference

FIXED SALARY (1) vs. COMMISSION/BONUS (10):

The Compensation Preference scale identifies whether Andrea Sample is more motivated to work by a secure salary or by performance based remuneration.

Andrea Sample prefers striving for profit-sharing or performance-based remuneration rather than being on salary. He enjoys taking chances and likes the excitement of incentive-based bonus. Given a compensation package largely or exclusively salary, he will need support to see the value in this. Keep in mind that he will find ways to get around obstacles, even if that requires bending the rules. He does not always count the costs and can be a demanding leader.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
								9	

Approach to Risk Taking

CAREFUL (1) vs. DARING (10):

This Approach to Risk scale is measured from 1 for avoidance of risky behavior to 10 for willingness to engage in risk.

Andrea Sample may prefer rather swift and irregular solutions, but he will always curb this tendency if circumstances demand sound planning. He is slightly inclined to operate on the premise that "the end justifies the means," but he rarely behaves recklessly. Generally, he will avoid reflexive decisions and will want to balance risks with benefits. Clients will approve his willingness to make quick decisions and his ad hoc approach to problem-solving.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
						7			

Preference for Change

LIKES ROUTINE (1) vs. LIKES CHANGE (10):

All workplaces change. Change is lower and slower in structured settings with a steady rate of fixed routines. It is higher and faster in dynamic environments with a swift pace of variable tasks. This scale shows the level of change that supports optimal performance for Andrea Sample.

An active environment, with varying demands that may require quick responses, is often a good fit for this employee. Mundane work will be tolerable if Andrea is allowed to find a fresh approach for common tasks. Faced with personnel replacements, reorganization, downsizing, or expansion, this person tends to be proactive and is usually alert for unexpected developments. Sudden change will rarely decrease Andrea's work performance.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
								9	

Approach to New Ventures

CAUTIOUS (1) vs. OPTIMISTIC (10):

This scale distinguishes those who approach new ventures or issues with caution from those who approach new ventures with optimism. Andrea Sample is a well-grounded individual who is inclined to hold some pessimistic views. Although he could be uneasy about voicing negative opinion, he would not hide his concerns. Given his regard for consequences, he will proceed cautiously with new and potentially risky ventures. He recognizes that there are dangers in the business world but it is largely an exciting, rather than hostile, place for him.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
				5					

Task vs. Person Focused

TASK FOCUSED (1) vs. PERSON FOCUSED (10):

An employee's focus may range from the inanimate factors of the current assignment to the human aspects of the people doing the work. This scale shows where Andrea Sample is most often focused when performing a task.

With nearly equal focus on task and people, Andrea will be able to balance job requirements with the inclinations of other team members. This person will generally act to complete assignments while still participating in team activities to maintain connections to others. Andrea's best asset is dedication to both work and co-workers in support of overall team performance.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
				5					

Self vs. Relationship Focused

SELF FOCUSED (1) vs. RELATIONSHIP FOCUSED (10):

A team member's work focus ranges from a wholly internal view (looking only at him or herself) to a fully external view (considering relationships with others on the team). This scale shows where Andrea Sample is most likely to be focused when working with a team.

Andrea tends to have an internal focus, emphasizing self-created plans with less concern for exploring others' views. This person may be inclined to develop and prioritize personal tactics. Employees with intense self-focus can be edgy and somewhat unruly, but they are usually purposeful and determined to do well. Andrea's decisions may be based mainly on evidence, with minimal input from others, and often derived from answering questions such as "Where will I get the resources?" or "After I reach this goal, what is my next move?" Andrea will generally prefer job roles that offer personal latitude and recognize individual merit.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
	2								

Aspects of Assertiveness

SUBMISSIVE (1) vs. ASSERTIVE (10):

This personality scale influences a person's response to the following important work situations or circumstances:

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
					6				

LEADERSHIP STYLE - DEMOCRATIC (1) vs. COMMANDING (10):

Leadership Style is measured from 1 for those who prefer a nurturing style of leadership to 10 for those who are naturally inclined to a more demanding Leadership Style.

Andrea Sample is a well-balanced leader with a slight inclination to be explicit and directive. In a crisis, he can take command and make certain that the team knows what must be done and when. On the other hand, when a gentle approach is needed, he will excel as the "guide on the side" with a completely democratic style.

APPROACH TO LISTENING - SYMPATHETIC (1) vs. CONTROLLING (10):

The Approach to Listening scale is measured from 1 for a person who is an exceptionally sympathetic listener to 10 for a person who tends to dominate a conversation.

Andrea Sample tends to be enthusiastic about his own ideas but he still leaves room for others to express theirs. Being outspoken and self-confident, he will invite debate and probe for complete understanding of other points of view. In short, Mr. Sample is a good listener who may only require some skill enhancement to be really effective at obtaining and analyzing other people's ideas. He could be encouraged to recognize that others' hesitancy to speak out usually indicate shyness, not lack of commitment.

APPROACH TO CONFLICT - ACCOMMODATING (1) vs. FORCEFUL (10):

This scale distinguishes those who avoid conflict by being accommodating from those who are forceful in their approach to conflict.

Andrea Sample balances soft skills with a direct approach to conflict. Because he is sure of himself, he is efficient in debate and confrontation and will only occasionally be worn down by the impact of others. In highly-charged, emotional situations, he should be able to switch easily to a moderate, accommodating style of conflict resolution.

Part 3 - Best Practice Information

Assessment Administration: Best Human Resources practice recommends that assessments be administered to candidates in a controlled environment under the supervision of a proctor to ensure that:

- ▶ The person who completes the assessment is in fact the candidate.
- ▶ A candidate's responses to the assessment questions are not affected by collusion with others or by other actions that would invalidate the assessment.
- ▶ The supervisor is able to address unexpected conditions or problems affecting a candidate and to provide reasonable accommodation for candidates where required.

Where a candidate completes the assessments without supervision the accuracy of the results cannot be guaranteed. In such circumstances you may wish to have the candidate retake the Prevue Assessments in a controlled environment at the time they attend your offices for an interview. For more information on the administration of the Prevue Assessment, please see "Administering the Prevue Assessments" in the Prevue How To Guides posted at www.prevueonline.com.

Assessment Weighting: The weight given to the Prevue Assessments in any human resource selection or other high stakes decision should not exceed one-third of the total decision making process. The remainder of the process, including the candidate's work history, interview, background checks, etc., should be considered together with the results of this report.

Ensuring Fairness: When properly administered, the use of the Prevue Assessments will help to ensure that job applicants are treated fairly without regard to race, colour, religion, sex or national origin. The Prevue Assessments have been designed and developed to conform to the human rights legislative and best practice requirements prevailing in the various countries where the Prevue Assessments are distributed. This includes the EEOC Guidelines, the Americans With Disabilities Act, and the standards for test development published by the American Psychological Association, the British Psychological Society, and the Association of Test Publishers.