SELECTOR

Selector Fluid Reasoning Assessment

Sean SAMPLE

Email:	sample@selectorgroup.com
Date completed:	Fri, 08 Oct 2021
Report version:	1.1.0

Understanding the report

Introduction

This report has been generated using Sean's results from the Selector Fluid Reasoning assessment. Selector Fluid Reasoning measures non-verbal abstract reasoning and working memory and is an estimate of fluid intelligence. It requires the ability to understand, mentally manipulate and recall visual patterns, to make sense of abstract data by forming constructs and the ability to apply critical thinking to concepts.

Normative sample

Sean's results are compared to a reference group; also called 'norm group'. The norm group used to generate this report is: Mixed Occupational NZ/AU.[1]

Scores

Results are reported as raw score and percentile score. A raw score is the number of correctly answered questions out of a possible score of 21. A percentile score is a score below which a certain percentage of observations fall.

In this example Sally scored at the 70th percentile. This means she scored higher or the same as 70 percent of the normative sample or, alternatively, 30 percent of the normative sample scored higher than she did.

Results

Raw score	Percentile	Description
14	76	Average-high

Sean answered 14 out of 19 test questions correctly. This corresponds to a percentile score of 76. This means Sean scored the same or higher than 76% of the norm group.

Conclusion

Sean's results suggest he is moderately more able than most to perceive, mentally manipulate and recall visual patterns, and is moderately more capable with non-verbal problems. He is slightly more able than most to extract meaning and make correct decisions when problem-solving and more able with analysing and solving novel problems. He is also likely to learn new concepts at a level greater than many others in the comparison group.

If the job requires Sean to envision interactions between 2D or 3D components, they are likely to perform better than many others. In addition, if the job involves ambiguity, novel problem solving and the ability to discern relationships and patterns Sean is more likely to perform effectively than others. Sean is suited to a role that requires flexible thinking and abstract problem-solving.

To verify these results, consider other measures of fluid reasoning such as assessment centre exercises and work samples. Also consider these results in the context of information gained from other sources.

Appendix A: Additional Information

Considerations

The contents should be used to supplement, not replace, an integrated selection process. Consider results in conjunction with other supporting evidence such as a competency-based interview and knowledge and skill testing.

Protect the results from unauthorised access or usage. Most countries have privacy laws relating to the collection, storage and disclosure of personal information. Follow these guidelines carefully when dealing with assessment results. For example, take great care never to release assessment results to a third party without the consent of the person concerned and ensure that any files you have are securely stored.

Fluid reasoning

As Selector Fluid Reasoning is largely diagrammatic it minimises the impact of language skills and educational disadvantage on performance on the assessment.

While universally job relevant, fluid reasoning is particularly important for success in STEM fields (science, technology, engineering, mathematics)[2]. Examples of roles it will be especially relevant to include technical and design jobs, engineers, planning, and construction. Fluid reasoning is fundamental within many contexts and especially those requiring working with novel situations.

References

1. This norm group is a sample of 7093 individuals made up of 40.3% female and 59.7% male of which 78.8% identify as European, 9.3% identify as Asian and 4.8% as Māori or Pasifika. Of the norm group 91.6% have English as a first language.

2. Wai J., Lubinski D., Benbow C.P. *Spatial ability for STEM domains: Aligning over 50 years of cumulative psychological knowledge solidifies its importance*. Journal of Educational Psychology. 2009; 101:817–835.

