

# Analysis Aptitude Range

## Technical Summary



# Analysis Aptitude Range

## Technical Summary

---

### Contents

1. Analysis Aptitude Range Test Information
2. Norm Groups Available
3. Report
4. Practice and Preparation
5. Development
6. Languages
7. Reliability
8. Validity
9. Fairness
10. Analysis Aptitude Range-Rx (2015, 2017) Norms Summary
  - 10.1. International Professionals & Managers (2015, N=20235) Norm Group Description
  - 10.2. International Graduates - All (2015, N=28485) Norm Group Description
  - 10.3. International Graduates - Recent (2017, N=6377) Norm Group Description
  - 10.4. International Senior Managers & Executives (2015, N=7403) Norm Group Description
  - 10.5. International English as an Additional Language (2015, N=3760) Norm Group Description
  - 10.6. UK Professionals & Managers (2015, N=10511) Norm Group Description
  - 10.7. UK Graduates - All (2015, N=14421) Norm Group Description
  - 10.8. UK Graduates - Recent (2017, N=2944) Norm Group Description
  - 10.9. UK Senior Managers & Executives (2015, N=3192) Norm Group Description
11. Swift Executive Aptitude-Rx and Abstract Reasoning Aptitude-Rx (2015) Norms Summary
  - 11.1. International Professionals & Managers (2015, N=1180) Norm Group Description
  - 11.2. International Graduates - All (2015, N=1527) Norm Group Description
  - 11.3. International Senior Managers & Executives (2015, N=590) Norm Group Description
  - 11.4. International English as an Additional Languages (2015, N=499) Norm Group Description
  - 11.5. UK Professionals & Managers (2015, N=2510) Norm Group Description
  - 11.6. UK Graduates - All (2015, N=3653) Norm Group Description
  - 11.7. UK Senior Managers & Executives (2015, N=1031) Norm Group Description

12. Appendix 1: Development of Swift Executive Aptitude
13. Appendix 2: Development of Abstract Reasoning Aptitude
14. Appendix 3: Swift Analysis Aptitude-Rx Sample Report
15. Appendix 4: Swift Executive Aptitude-Rx Sample Report
16. Appendix 5: Internal Consistency Reliabilities for Sub-tests in Swift
17. Appendix 6: Method for Calculating Criterion Related Validity of a Single Test from the Equivalent Sub-Test in Swift Analysis/Executive Aptitude

## 1. Analysis Aptitude Range Test Information

- Randomized versions available of all tests in the Analysis Aptitude Range
- Available for unsupervised use online (Invited Access, IA)

Test	Total / Sub-Test	No. of Questions	Time Limit (mins)
Swift Analysis Aptitude	Total	24	18
	Verbal Analysis	8	6
	Numerical Analysis	8	6
	Diagrammatic Analysis	8	6
Swift Executive Aptitude	Total	28	18
	Verbal Analysis	8	6
	Numerical Analysis	8	6
	Abstract Reasoning	12	6
Swift Analysis Verbal & Numerical	Total	32	24
	Verbal Analysis	16	12
	Numerical Analysis	16	12
Verbal Analysis Aptitude	Total	32	24
Numerical Analysis Aptitude	Total	32	24
Diagrammatic Analysis Aptitude	Total	32	24
Abstract Reasoning Aptitude	Total	32	16

*Note: Supervised Access (SA) Analysis Aptitude Range tests using fixed content presented in a fixed order are available for follow-up testing but are not covered in this summary document.*

## 2. Norm Groups Available

### Analysis-Rx Tests

- International Professionals & Managers (2015, N=20235)
- International Graduates - All (2015, N=28485)
- International Graduates - Recent (2017, N=6377)
- International Senior Managers & Executives (2015, N=7403)
- International English as an Additional Language (2015, N=3760)
- UK Professionals & Managers (2015, N=10511)

- UK Graduates - All (2015, N=14421)
- UK Graduates - Recent (2017, N=2944)
- UK Senior Managers & Executives (2015, N=3192)

### **Swift Executive Aptitude-Rx and Abstract Reasoning Aptitude-Rx**

- International Professionals & Managers (2015, N=1180)
- International Graduates - All (2015, N=1527)
- International Senior Managers & Executives (2015, N=590)
- International English as an Additional Languages (2015, N=499)
- UK Professionals & Managers (2015, N=2510)
- UK Graduates - All (2015, N=3653)
- UK Senior Managers & Executives (2015, N=1031)

Please refer to Sections 10 and 11 for a visual comparison of the norms and norm group descriptions.

In addition to the core norm groups listed above, a range of regional and country-specific norms are also available. Please contact Saville Assessment for the latest norm availability information.

## **3. Report**

A sample report for Swift Analysis Aptitude-Rx is included in Appendix 3, and a sample report for Swift Executive Aptitude-Rx is included in Appendix 4. Sample reports for other assessments are available upon request from Saville Assessment.

## **4. Practice and Preparation**

Online practice tests are available and there are individual PDF preparation guides for each of the Analysis Aptitude Range areas:

- **Swift Analysis Aptitude (online)**
- **Swift Executive Aptitude (online)**
- **Swift Analysis Verbal & Numerical (online)**
- **Verbal Analysis (online & PDF)**
- **Numerical Analysis (online & PDF)**
- **Diagrammatic Analysis (online & PDF)**
- **Abstract Reasoning (online & PDF)**

These are designed to provide a realistic set of example questions in order to help familiarize the test taker with the format and style of the aptitude assessment questions, as well as additional information about the assessment process.

The online practice tests also provide individual feedback on the responses given, featuring realistic time limits which replicate a real assessment scenario. The preparation guides provide a flexible offline alternative to the online practice tests.

The aptitude practice and preparation materials can be found on the Saville Assessment website ([www.savilleassessment.com](http://www.savilleassessment.com)).

## 5. Development

The Analysis Aptitude Range consists of large banks of Verbal Analysis, Numerical Analysis, Diagrammatic Analysis and Abstract Reasoning items. Items are drawn from these banks to form the single Verbal, Numerical, Diagrammatic and Abstract tests and the corresponding sub-tests of Swift Analysis Aptitude, Swift Executive Aptitude and Swift Analysis Verbal & Numerical.

The development of Swift Executive Aptitude and Abstract Reasoning Aptitude can be found in Appendix 1 and Appendix 2 respectively.

## 6. Languages

We are engaged in an ongoing, active program of translation and localization for all of our aptitude assessments. For the latest availability information, please contact Saville Assessment.

## 7. Reliability

The internal consistency figures presented here are Separation Indices. This method produces similar figures to Cronbach's Alpha (Andrich, 1982<sup>1</sup>) and allows for an internal consistency calculation to be made in item-banked tests, rather than fixed-form tests.

This section presents internal consistency reliability figures for each of the Analysis Aptitude Range tests.

For Swift Analysis Aptitude, Swift Executive Aptitude and Swift Analysis Verbal & Numerical, it is worth noting that the greatest level of reliability is found at the total score level, which is designed to be the decision-making score. The sub-test scores provide additional test-taking information, but we would not recommend that these are used in isolation for decision making.

The mean percentage correct figures broadly reflect the design aim of giving a positive candidate experience where many candidates answer above 50% of questions correctly.

The large standard deviation values seen in these tables reflect the ability of the items to differentiate performance through a wide score range. This is required to give an accurate representation of test-takers' ability.

For details about mean performance in each of the norm groups, please refer to the 'Norms' section.

### Swift Analysis Aptitude Internal Consistency Reliabilities (N=95337)

	Mean % Correct	SD	SEm Sten	SEm 'T'	r
<b>Total</b>	60.67	19.62	.82	4.12	<b>.83</b>

**Swift Executive Aptitude Internal Consistency Reliabilities (N=22104)**

	Mean % Correct	SD	SEm Sten	SEm 'T'	r
Total	65.53	17.32	.85	4.24	.82

**Swift Analysis Verbal & Numerical Internal Consistency Reliabilities (N=28647)**

	Mean % Correct	SD	SEm Sten	SEm 'T'	r
Total	67.33	18.84	.72	3.61	.87

**Verbal Analysis Aptitude Internal Consistency Reliabilities (N=24740)**

	Mean % Correct	SD	SEm Sten	SEm 'T'	r
Total	74.49	16.48	.89	4.47	.80

**Numerical Analysis Aptitude Internal Consistency Reliabilities (N=24518)**

	Mean % Correct	SD	SEm Sten	SEm 'T'	r
Total	63.35	17.43	.80	4.00	.84

**Diagrammatic Analysis Aptitude Internal Consistency Reliabilities (N=8803)**

	Mean % Correct	SD	SEm Sten	SEm 'T'	r
Total	71.94	18.26	.75	3.74	.86

**Abstract Reasoning Aptitude Internal Consistency Reliabilities (N=27856)**

	Mean % Correct	SD	SEm Sten	SEm 'T'	r
Total	69.74	17.22	.82	4.12	.83

## 8. Validity

### Swift Analysis Aptitude

This summary document includes criterion-related validity information for the total score and three sub-tests in Swift Analysis Aptitude; based on the same sample of 308 individuals for whom third-party ratings of workplace performance were collected. The criteria used here represent a priori predictions of the areas of work performance which each test was designed to predict.

The internal consistency of the summed criterion used is .69. This suggests that it is an acceptable assumption to combine the three separate workplace criteria to make a total criterion measure. Because N=263 of this sample of respondents also engaged a second rater of their workplace effectiveness, it was possible to take into account the inter-rater reliability of the criterion which can artificially limit the validity estimate. The inter-rater reliability measure takes into account the fact that there will always be some degree of difference between multiple raters' judgments of effectiveness on the criteria of interest, which can force the validity coefficient down.

The greatest validity contribution comes from the Verbal Analysis sub-test, with the least coming from the Diagrammatic Analysis sub-test.

For further information about the criterion-related and other forms of validity evidence for the Analysis Aptitude Range assessments, please contact Saville Assessment.

#### Swift Analysis Aptitude Criterion-Related Validity (N=308)

	Correlation with Sum of Working with Words, Numbers and Systems (Rater) r (Uncorrected)	Correlation with Sum of Working with Words, Numbers and Systems (Rater) r (Corrected)
<b>Total</b>	.29	.54
	Correlation with Working with Words (Rater) r (Uncorrected)	Correlation with Working with Words (Rater) r (Corrected)
<b>Verbal Total</b>	.27	.48
	Correlation with Working with Numbers (Rater) r (Uncorrected)	Correlation with Working with Numbers (Rater) r (Corrected)
<b>Numerical Total</b>	.20	.34
	Correlation with Working with Systems (Rater) r (Uncorrected)	Correlation with Working with Systems (Rater) r (Corrected)
<b>Diagrammatic Total</b>	.10	.24

*Note: Any raw correlation higher than .12 is statistically significant at the p<.05 level (two-tailed) and any raw correlation higher than .10 is statistically significant at the p<.05 level (one-tailed). N=308. The criterion inter-rater reliability figures from Project Epsom (N=263) and the corrected figures are based on the inter-rater reliability figures for each of the Working with Words, Numbers and Details criteria (.31, .34 and .18 respectively). The criterion internal consistency of ratings (N=308) was .69.*

## Swift Executive Aptitude

The criterion-related validity information for the total score and three sub-tests in Swift Executive Aptitude is based on a sample of 214 high potential middle managers for whom third-party ratings of workplace performance were collected. The criteria used here represent a priori predictions of the areas of work performance which each test was designed to predict.

### Validation Study of Middle Managers N=214

	Boss Rating			
	Overall (Average of 9 ratings)	Judgment (Average of 3 ratings)	Drive (Average of 3 ratings)	Influence (Average of 3 ratings)
Total	.32	.45	.26	.06
Total (raw)	.17	.24	.14	.03
Verbal	.08	.13	.08	-.01
Numerical	.15	.19	.15	.03
Abstract	.10	.16	.26	.04

*Note: Any raw correlation higher than .16 is statistically significant at the  $p < .01$  level (one-tailed) and any raw correlation higher than .11 is statistically significant at the  $p < .05$  level (one-tailed).  $N=214$ .*

As can be seen, in this study the strongest prediction of workplace performance came from the Numerical sub-test, with the Abstract and then Verbal sub-tests close behind. The total corrected validities have been adjusted by a criterion reliability estimate of .28. The raw validities have not been adjusted for any criterion unreliability or restriction of range. The total score correlates particularly well with the Overall, Judgment and Drive criteria, with a notable corrected correlation of .45 against the boss ratings of workplace Judgment.

### Validity of Swift Executive Aptitude in Relation to Swift Analysis Aptitude

As the only difference between Swift Analysis Aptitude and Swift Executive Aptitude is the third sub-test (which is Diagrammatic or Abstract, respectively) and because the Abstract norm scores were originally calibrated from Diagrammatic norm scores (with a .72 correlation between the two test formats), the published Swift Analysis Aptitude validity (as given in the section above) provides a suitable additional source of evidence for the validity of Swift Executive Aptitude.

### Swift Analysis Verbal & Numerical

The Swift Analysis Verbal & Numerical shares the same content bank as Swift Analysis Aptitude and has eight more items in each sub-test. Therefore, it is appropriate to assume that the validity figures for Swift Analysis Verbal & Numerical will be aligned to those presented

for Swift Analysis Aptitude. Given the increased reliability of the longer Swift Analysis Verbal & Numerical test, the Swift Analysis Aptitude validities should be considered a lower-bound estimate of the validities of Swift Analysis Verbal & Numerical.

## **Analysis Aptitude Range Single Tests**

The Verbal Analysis, Numerical Analysis, Diagrammatic Analysis and Abstract Reasoning single tests are longer than the various Swift combined assessments and cover the same areas of aptitude in greater depth. It is appropriate to assume that the Swift Analysis/Executive Aptitude validities are a conservative and lower-bound estimate of the validity of the Analysis Aptitude single tests, which are likely to show incremental validity over the Swift assessments (see Appendix 3).

## 9. Fairness

### Gender Group Differences

Total Score - Swift Analysis Aptitude, Swift Executive Aptitude and Swift Analysis Verbal & Numerical

Test	Male N	Male Mean	Male SD	Female N	Female Mean	Female SD	Pooled SD Difference
SAA Total	20482	-.10	.64	10931	-.27	.60	.27
SEA Total	6023	-.14	.65	3630	-.17	.60	.04
SAVN Total	5817	-.02	.76	4152	-.12	.77	.13

### By Measure

	Test	Male N	Male Mean	Male SD	Female N	Female Mean	Female SD	Pooled SD Difference
Verbal	SAA sub-test	20482	-.13	.79	10931	-.23	.77	.14
	SEA sub-test	6023	-.09	.81	3630	-.11	.77	.02
	SAVN sub-test	5817	.01	.88	4152	.01	.87	.00
	Verbal Analysis Aptitude	7434	.28	.86	6201	.22	.86	.07
Numerical	SAA sub-test	20482	-.14	.79	10931	-.39	.74	.32
	SEA sub-test	6023	-.12	.79	3630	-.30	.75	.23
	SAVN sub-test	5817	-.06	.83	4152	-.26	.87	.23
	Numerical Analysis Aptitude	7557	-.11	.75	6094	-.38	.75	.36
Diagrammatic	SAA sub-test	20482	-.03	.83	10931	-.19	.78	.20
	Diagrammatic Analysis Aptitude	1429	.25	.90	617	.03	.82	.25
Abstract	SEA sub-test	6023	-.22	.86	3630	-.10	.82	-.14
	Abstract Reasoning Aptitude	13674	-.16	.91	6359	-.15	.91	-.01

The tables above present the gender group differences on the Total Scores for Swift Analysis Aptitude, Swift Executive Aptitude and Swift Analysis Verbal & Numerical, and separately the relevant tests that measure each of the four aptitude areas in Analysis range - verbal, numerical, diagrammatic and abstract.

Expressed in terms of raw theta (ability) scores, there was a small difference between males and females on the Swift Analysis Aptitude Total Score, but no notable difference on the Swift Executive Aptitude or Swift Analysis Verbal & Numerical Total Score.

In terms of individual measures, the verbal sub-tests in various Swift tests or the single Verbal Analysis test did not show any notable gender differences. There was also no notable difference between the two gender groups on the Swift version or the full-length Abstract Reasoning tests. However, there were small differences (ranged from .23 to .36 of a standard deviation) in the numerical sub-tests of Swift or the single Numerical Analysis test that males generally scored higher than females. The diagrammatic sub-test in Swift Analysis Aptitude and the single Diagrammatic Analysis test also show small gender differences (.20 and .25 of a standard deviation respectively) where males overall slightly outperformed females.

It is worthy of note that the small advantage for males on the numerical sub-test in Swift Executive Aptitude is compensated by the slightly higher average score for females on the abstract sub-test, meaning that effectively Swift Executive Aptitude shows no gender group difference on the Total Score.

## Age Group Differences

Total Score - Swift Analysis Aptitude, Swift Executive Aptitude and Swift Analysis Verbal & Numerical

Test	Under 40 N	Under 40 Mean	Under 40 SD	Over 40 N	Over 40 Mean	Over 40 SD	Pooled SD Difference
SAA Total	22593	-.06	.63	6435	-.47	.54	.67
SEA Total	5206	.00	.61	3485	-.36	.59	.61
SAVN Total	5345	-.14	.69	1668	-.28	.68	.21

## By Measure

	Test	Under 40 N	Under 40 Mean	Under 40 SD	Over 40 N	Over 40 Mean	Over 40 SD	Pooled SD Difference
Verbal	SAA sub-test	22593	-.08	.78	6435	-.44	.73	.47
	SEA sub-test	5206	.01	.78	3485	-.23	.80	.30
	SAVN sub-test	5345	-.01	.81	1668	-.18	.81	.20
	Verbal Analysis Aptitude	2936	.20	.90	3597	.18	.86	.02
Numerical	SAA sub-test	22593	-.15	.79	6435	-.49	.70	.44
	SEA sub-test	5206	-.08	.78	3485	-.33	.75	.33
	SAVN sub-test	5345	-.26	.77	1668	-.38	.75	.16
	Numerical Analysis Aptitude	3262	-.11	.80	3222	-.17	.74	.07
Diagrammatic	SAA sub-test	22593	.04	.81	6435	-.49	.70	.68
	Diagrammatic Analysis Aptitude	1329	.36	.86	507	-.27	.80	.74
Abstract	SEA sub-test	5206	.08	.80	3485	-.53	.76	.78
	Abstract Reasoning Aptitude	5602	-.14	.96	2256	-.57	.84	.47

The tables above present the age group differences on the Total Scores for Swift Analysis

Aptitude, Swift Executive Aptitude and Swift Analysis Verbal & Numerical, and separately the relevant tests that measure each of the four aptitude areas in Analysis range - verbal, numerical, diagrammatic and abstract.

Expressed in terms of raw theta (ability) scores, moderate differences (.67 and .61 of a standard deviation) were found between the younger group and the older group on the Swift Analysis Aptitude and Swift Executive Aptitude Total Scores, but the age group difference on the Swift Analysis Verbal & Numerical Total Score was small (.21 of a standard deviation). In all these comparisons, the Under 40 group, overall, scored higher than the Over 40 group.

In terms of individual measures, the verbal sub-tests in various Swift tests show small age group differences (ranged from .20 to .47 of a standard deviation); the younger age group generally scored higher than their older counterparts, but there was no notable age difference on the single Verbal Analysis test. Similarly, the numerical sub-tests of Swift Analysis and Swift Executive Aptitude showed small age group differences (.44 and .33 of a standard deviation respectively) but there was no notable age difference on the numerical sub-test in Swift Analysis Verbal & Numerical or the single Numerical Analysis test. Both the Swift version and the full-length Diagrammatic Analysis tests showed moderate differences (.68 and .74 of a standard deviation respectively) where the younger age group, in general, outperformed the older age group. The Swift version and the full-length Abstract Reasoning tests also showed moderate age group differences with the younger group scoring higher overall (by .78 and .47 of a standard deviation respectively).

One possible contributor for the age group differences found in our Analysis Aptitude Range tests is that cognitive ability has been rising over time (the Flynn Effect). Much of this rise is attributed to the increase of fluid intelligence as the younger generations have a greater capacity to deal with abstract information (the digital generation). This can be seen in the age group comparisons presented above that the differences in the diagrammatic and abstract measures are larger than those found in verbal and numerical.

Another potential explanation for the age group differences is the difference in reaction times between younger and older generations. It is likely that younger generations are generally faster at answering questions, resulting in a higher completion rate on the test which increases the likelihood of achieving higher scores. However, our tests have been designed to have high completion rates to minimize the impact of reaction and completion times on scores.

## Ethnic Group Differences

Total Score - Swift Analysis Aptitude, Swift Executive Aptitude and Swift Analysis Verbal & Numerical

Test	White N	White Mean	White SD	Other Ethnicities N	Other Ethnicities Mean	Other Ethnicities SD	Pooled SD Difference
SAA Total	11963	.01	.61	7075	-.30	.68	.49
SEA Total	4889	-.01	.57	3327	-.37	.67	.58
SAVN Total	4900	-.07	.66	3521	.02	.89	-.12

### By Measure

	Test	White N	White Mean	White SD	Other Ethnicities N	Other Ethnicities Mean	Other Ethnicities SD	Pooled SD Difference
Verbal	SAA sub-test	11963	.07	.73	7075	-.36	.81	.56
	SEA sub-test	4889	.12	.71	3327	-.45	.79	.76
	SAVN sub-test	4900	.08	.78	3521	.02	.98	.07
	Verbal Analysis Aptitude	9470	.33	.83	742	-.34	.95	.81
Numerical	SAA sub-test	11963	-.10	.77	7075	-.36	.81	.33
	SEA sub-test	4889	-.10	.75	3327	-.32	.81	.29
	SAVN sub-test	4900	-.23	.75	3521	.02	.96	-.29
	Numerical Analysis Aptitude	9507	-.20	.75	860	-.44	.89	.32
Diagrammatic*	SAA sub-test	11963	.06	.80	7075	-.18	.85	.30
Abstract	SEA sub-test	4889	-.07	.81	3327	-.34	.89	.33
	Abstract Reasoning Aptitude	12253	-.06	.88	1867	-.67	.93	.69

\*No comparison on Diagrammatic Analysis Aptitude due to insufficient data from the Other Ethnicities group (N<500).

The tables above present the ethnic group differences on the Total Scores for Swift Analysis Aptitude, Swift Executive Aptitude and Swift Analysis Verbal & Numerical, and separately the relevant tests that measure each of the four aptitude areas in Analysis range - verbal, numerical, diagrammatic and abstract.

Expressed in terms of raw theta (ability) scores, there were moderate differences between the white group and other ethnicities on the Swift Analysis Aptitude and Swift Executive Aptitude Total Scores (.49 and .58 of a standard deviation respectively). The white group generally scored higher on these tests than other ethnicities. However, the Swift Analysis Verbal & Numerical Total Score showed no notable difference between the ethnic groups.

In terms of individual measures, the Swift version or the full-length Verbal Analysis test show moderate to large ethnic group differences (ranged from .56 to .81 of a standard deviation) with the exception in Swift Analysis Verbal & Numerical sub-test having no notable difference. Small differences (ranged from .29 to .33 of a standard deviation) were found between the two groups on tests that measure Numerical Analysis. The white group outperformed other ethnicities on the numerical sub-test in Swift Analysis Aptitude and Swift Executive Aptitude, as well as the full-length Numerical Analysis test. However, other ethnicities overall scored higher than the white group on the numerical sub-test in Swift Analysis Verbal & Numerical. The difference between the two groups was small (.30 of a standard deviation) on the diagrammatic sub-test in Swift Analysis Aptitude, and the tests that measure Abstract Reasoning showed small to moderate ethnic group differences (ranged from .33 to .69 of a standard deviation). In all of these cases, the white group generally scored higher than other ethnicities.

These results are consistent with ethnic group difference findings for cognitive ability tests, with the differences for Verbal Comprehension generally being the largest.

The ethnic group differences found in Swift Analysis Verbal & Numerical appeared to be different from other tests that also measure the verbal and numerical constructs. The Other Ethnicities group overall outperformed their White counterparts on the SAVN Total Score and the numerical sub-test, and there was no difference in the verbal sub-test. These different patterns can be explained by the composition of the Other Ethnicities group in the data for this particular test that there was a high proportion of Asian ethnicities and in particular Chinese who the wider research literature indicates, on average, are slightly higher performers.

## Group Differences Summary

The data presented on the differences between the means for different groups reveal a number of group differences on the total scores. The differences here are broadly in line with the research literature and in some cases tend to be less pronounced than has been found in other studies. The differences on gender tend to be small (to almost non-existent). Small differences are seen on age with younger people, on average, achieving slightly higher overall scores. The largest differences are seen between white and other ethnicities with white groups on average performing higher.

The information presented here is from actual usage data of the Analysis Aptitude Range and as a result the differences on some variables may reflect differences in the composition of the various groups. For example, age differences could be related to longer tenure in organizations and generational differences. Similarly, observed gender and ethnic differences could be a reflection of other biographical differences in the composition of these groups (e.g., level and type of education), rather than actual group differences.

Moreover, the performance differences reported are at the group level, rather than being reflective of specific individuals. In all cases, the average group-levels of performance represent largely overlapping performance distributions, with greater variation in performance within any group than between groups. Based on these average group-level data, it is inaccurate and inappropriate to make any predictions or decisions about any given individual's performance as a result of their membership of a particular ethnic group.

It is also important to bear in mind that each sample of individuals is different and group differences should not be generalized beyond these specifically-reported samples in an excessively broad manner. For example, the ethnic differences seen with cognitive tests are likely due, at least in part, to a difference in socioeconomic status, education and language proficiency across the specific groups of people sampled. While those group differences which do exist are interesting, it is worth noting that it is frequently difficult to isolate these variables as the sole determinant of the apparent difference.

As measures of cognitive ability, Analysis Aptitude Range tests will occasionally reveal small to moderate differences between groups. To ensure that any group differences shown are meaningful, relevant and fair, it is important to make sure that the use of such tests can be justified. This is especially true when using a test in selection with a cut-off score. Justifying the use of any test involves making sure that the skills being assessed by the test are relevant and valid and that the level of any cut-off applied is demonstrably appropriate. The use of job analysis and, where possible, local validation studies is particularly important for demonstrating the link between a test and the job it is being used to select for.

In particular, the use of high cut-offs (e.g. above the 50th percentile) may require additional justification and analysis to ensure that this does not lead to adverse impact against any group. A further precaution is to use a behavioral measure, e.g. Work Strengths or Match 6.5, alongside aptitude to create a weighted overall fit score which can be expected to mitigate against the potential for adverse impact.


It is one thing for an assessment to be designed to be fair and valid, and another for it to be used fairly. The clearer and more consistent the structure and process presented for aligning the Analysis Aptitude Range to a job and agreeing consistent criteria for decision making based on the test, the less likely it is that the assessments will be unfairly applied by using different standards for candidates in different groups.

In general, the differences between age, gender and ethnic groups are small or moderate and we do not therefore advise that specific differences in profile interpretation should be warranted when considering test results from different groups defined according to these variables.

We do not, unless local legal frameworks permit or mandate such an approach, recommend using separate norms for age, gender or ethnic groups. For further information, please contact Saville Assessment directly.

### 10. Analysis Aptitude Range-Rx (2015, 2017) Norms Summary

In summary, the UK Graduates norm group are the highest performing group with a mean theta score of -.06. International Senior Managers & Executives are the lowest performing group with a mean theta score of -.29.



\*Based on average (mean) group theta values, also showing the range of one standard deviation above and below the mean.

## 10.1 International Professionals & Managers (2015, N=20235) Norm Group Description

Used for:

Swift Analysis Aptitude-Rx (IA)

Swift Analysis Verbal & Numerical-Rx (IA)

Verbal Analysis Aptitude-Rx (IA)

Numerical Analysis Aptitude-Rx (IA)

Diagrammatic Analysis Aptitude-Rx (IA)

This international group consisted of 20235 individuals employed in a range of job areas/functions<sup>1</sup>. Of these, 63% worked in the following job areas/functions: Finance, Sales, Engineering, Human Resources, Information Technology, Marketing, Operations, Consulting, Administration and Executive. The remaining 37% worked in other job areas/functions including: Production, Line Management, Health, Purchasing, Operations/Quality Assurance, Customer Service Research, Transport, Construction and Distribution.

The breakdown of the group is provided below (with response rates for each biographical section given in the foot notes):

### Gender<sup>2</sup>

33% of the group were female and 67% were male.

### Age<sup>3</sup>

The mean age of the group was 37 years.

### Education (highest qualification)<sup>4</sup>

40% of the group had a Bachelor's degree as their highest qualification, 38% had a Master's degree/Post-graduate qualification, 10% had school level or some college qualifications, 9% had a professional qualification, 2% had a doctorate or PhD qualification, with the remaining 1% of the group having 'other' or no formal qualifications.

### Level of Responsibility<sup>5</sup>

Approximately 36% of the group were at senior management level (including board or executive level, directors, vice-presidents and senior managers), 24% were managers, and 21% were professional individual contributors, with the remaining 18% were supervisors or team leaders.

<sup>1</sup>Based on 96% sample response

<sup>2</sup>Based on 100% sample response

<sup>3</sup>Based on 87% sample response

<sup>4</sup>Based on 94% sample response

<sup>5</sup>Based on 100% sample response

## Work Experience<sup>6</sup>

25% of the group had more than 20 years' work experience, 41% had 10-20 years', 18% had 6-9 years', and 12% had 3-5 years', with the remaining 4% having 1-2 years' experience.

## Cultural Background<sup>7</sup>

49% of the group described themselves as Other White (including White European, White Australian and White New Zealand), and 19% as Asian (including Chinese, Indian and Pakistani), 13% Other/Mixed (including Hispanic, Arabic and Mixed Race) and 10% White UK (including White British and White Irish) with the remaining 9% describing themselves as Black (including Black African, Black South African and Black Caribbean).

## Country of Completion<sup>8</sup>

10% of the group completed the Analysis Aptitude test in Denmark, 9% in the UK, 8% in the US, 8% in Australia, 6% in South Africa, 5% in Russian federation, 4% in China, 4% in Spain, 4% in New Zealand, 3% in Brazil and 3% in France. The remaining 34% completed the Analysis Aptitude test in various other countries (including Botswana, Sweden, Germany, Italy, Mexico, United Arab Emirates, Saudi Arabia, India, Panama and Belgium).

<sup>6</sup>Based on 98% sample response

<sup>7</sup>Based on 70% sample response

<sup>8</sup>Based on 100% sample response

## 10.2 International Graduates – All (2015, N=28485) Norm Group Description

Used for:

Swift Analysis Aptitude-Rx (IA)

Swift Analysis Verbal & Numerical-Rx (IA)

Verbal Analysis Aptitude-Rx (IA)

Numerical Analysis Aptitude-Rx (IA)

Diagrammatic Analysis Aptitude-Rx (IA)

This international group consisted of 28485 individuals employed in a range of job areas/functions<sup>1</sup>. Of these, 69% worked in the following job areas/functions: Finance, Engineering, Sales, Marketing, Human Resources, Information Technology, Consulting, Administration, Operations, Production and Executive or answered 'Not applicable'. The remaining 31% worked in other job areas/functions including: Research, Customer Service, Health, Operations/Quality Assurance, Education, Purchasing, Line Management, Law, Transport and Construction.

The breakdown of the group is provided below (with response rates for each biographical section given in the foot notes):

### Gender<sup>2</sup>

40% of the group were female and 60% were male.

### Age<sup>3</sup>

The mean age of the group was 32 years.

### Education (highest qualification)<sup>4</sup>

54% of the group had a Bachelor's degree, 44% of the group had a Master's degree/Post-graduate qualification, and the remaining 2% had a doctorate or PhD.

### Work Experience<sup>5</sup>

14% of the group had more than 20 years' work experience, 27% had 10-20 years', 16% had 6-9 years', 15% had 3-5 years', 9% had 1-2 years', and the remaining 19% had less than 12 months' work experience or said it was 'Not applicable'.

<sup>1</sup>Based on 80% sample response

<sup>2</sup>Based on 100% sample response

<sup>3</sup>Based on 86% sample response

<sup>4</sup>Based on 100% sample response

<sup>5</sup>Based on 94% sample response

## Cultural Background<sup>6</sup>

41% of the group described themselves as Other White (including White European, White Australian, and White New Zealand), 35% Asian (including Chinese, Indian and Pakistani), 9% Other/Mixed (including Hispanic, Arabic and Mixed Race) , 8% White UK (including White British and White Irish) and the remaining 7% described themselves as Black (including Black African, Black South African and Black American).

## Country of Completion<sup>7</sup>

9% of the group completed the Analysis Aptitude test in the UK, 9% in Australia, 9% in China, 9% in Denmark, 8% in the US, 6% in Spain, 4% in Russian federation, 4% in South Africa, 3% in Hong Kong and 3% in New Zealand. The remaining 36% completed the Analysis Aptitude test in various other countries (including Brazil, Sweden, Singapore, Germany, France, Italy, Botswana, India, Greece and Indonesia).

<sup>6</sup>Based on 71% sample response

<sup>7</sup>Based on 100% sample response

## 10.3 International Graduates - Recent (2017, N=6377) Norm Group Description

Used for:

Swift Analysis Aptitude-Rx (IA)

Swift Analysis Verbal & Numerical-Rx (IA)

Verbal Analysis Aptitude-Rx (IA)

Numerical Analysis Aptitude-Rx (IA)

Diagrammatic Analysis Aptitude-Rx (IA)

This international group consisted of 6377 individuals, employed in a range of job areas/functions<sup>1</sup>. Of these, 65% worked in Engineering, Finance, Sales & Marketing, Operations, Research, IT, Consulting, Human Resources and Customer Service. The remaining 35% worked in other job areas/functions including: Administration, Education, Hospitality, Construction, Health, Law, Purchasing, Data Processing, Executive and Design.

The breakdown of the group is provided below (with response rates for each biographical section given in the foot notes):

### Gender<sup>2</sup>

40% of the group were female and 60% were male.

### Age<sup>3</sup>

The mean age of the group was 25 years.

### Education (highest qualification)<sup>4</sup>

44% had a Post-graduate degree as their highest qualification and 56% had a first/undergraduate degree.

### Work Experience<sup>5</sup>

41% of the group had 3-5 years' work experience, 26% had 1-2 years', 14% had 6-12 months', with the remaining 19% having had less than 6 months' work experience.

### Cultural Background<sup>6</sup>

of the group described themselves as White (including European, British, and Irish), 28% Asian (including Malaysian, Indian, Chinese and Pakistani), 6% Arabic, 5% Hispanic, 5% Black (including African and Caribbean) and the remaining 5% described themselves as coming from Other/Mixed backgrounds (including Scandinavian, Native American and Mixed background).

<sup>1</sup>Based on 78% sample response

<sup>2</sup>Based on 100% sample response

<sup>3</sup>Based on 96% sample response

<sup>4</sup>Based on 100% sample response

<sup>5</sup>Based on 100% sample response

<sup>6</sup>Based on 65% sample response

## Country of Completion<sup>7</sup>

14% of the group completed the aptitude test in Denmark, 14% in Australia, 14% in the United Kingdom, 12% in Portugal, 6% in Malaysia, 5% in the United States, 3% in Ireland and 3% in Mexico. The remaining 29% completed the test in various other countries (including France, Bahrain, India, Italy, Greece, the Netherlands, Germany, New Zealand and Saudi Arabia).

<sup>7</sup>Based on 100% sample response

## 10.4 International Senior Managers & Executives (2015, N=7403) Norm Group Description

Used for:

Swift Analysis Aptitude-Rx (IA)

Swift Analysis Verbal & Numerical-Rx (IA)

Verbal Analysis Aptitude-Rx (IA)

Numerical Analysis Aptitude-Rx (IA)

Diagrammatic Analysis Aptitude-Rx (IA)

This international group consisted of 7403 participants employed in a range of job areas/functions.<sup>1</sup> Of these, 66% worked in the following areas/functions: Finance, Sales, Executive, Marketing, Human Resources, Operations, Information Technology, Administration, Engineering and Consulting. The remaining 34% worked in other job areas/functions including: Production, Line Management, Purchasing, Health, Operations/Quality Assurance, Distribution, Construction, Customer Service, Transport and Research.

The breakdown of the group is provided below (with response rates for each biographical section given in the foot notes):

### Gender<sup>2</sup>

28% of the group were female and 72% were male.

### Age<sup>3</sup>

The mean age of the group was 41 years.

### Education (highest qualification)<sup>4</sup>

36% of the group had a Bachelor's degree as their highest qualification, 41% had a Master's degree/Post-graduate qualification, 11% had professional qualifications, 9% had school level or some college qualifications and 2% had a doctorate or PhD qualification, with the remaining 1% of the group having 'other' or no formal qualifications.

### Level of Responsibility<sup>5</sup>

98% of the group were senior managers (including functional managers, business managers, group managers, corporate managers, and department managers). The remaining 2% of the group were at director/vice president level, executive/board level or business owners.

<sup>1</sup>Based on 96% sample response

<sup>2</sup>Based on 100% sample response

<sup>3</sup>Based on 84% sample response

<sup>4</sup>Based on 94% sample response

<sup>5</sup>Based on 100% sample response

## Work Experience<sup>6</sup>

Approximately 39% of the group had more than 20 years' work experience, 47% had 10-20 years' and 11% had 6-9 years', with the remaining 4% having 3-5 years' experience.

## Cultural Background<sup>7</sup>

48% of the group described themselves as Other White (including White European, White Australian and White New Zealand) 15% Asian (including Indian, Chinese and Pakistani), 13% Other/Mixed (including Hispanic, Arabic and Mixed Race), 12% Black (including Black African, Black South African and Black American) and the remaining 12% described themselves as White UK (including White British and White Irish).

## Country of Completion<sup>8</sup>

10% of the group completed the Analysis Aptitude test in Denmark, 10% in the UK, 8% in South Africa, 8% in the US, 7% in Australia, 7% in the Russian Federation, 5% in Botswana, 5% in Sweden, 4% in New Zealand and 3% in France. The remaining 33% completed the Analysis Aptitude test in various other countries (including China, Mexico, Germany, Brazil, Italy, the United Arab Emirates, India, Saudi Arabia, Spain and Belgium).

<sup>6</sup>Based on 98% sample response

<sup>7</sup>Based on 68% sample response

<sup>8</sup>Based on 100% sample response

## 10.5 International English as an Additional Language (2015, N=3760) Norm Group Description

Used for:

Swift Analysis Aptitude-Rx (IA)

Swift Analysis Verbal & Numerical-Rx (IA)

Verbal analysis Aptitude-Rx (IA)

Numerical Analysis Aptitude-Rx (IA)

Diagrammatic Analysis Aptitude-Rx (IA)

This international group consisted of 3760 participants employed in a range of job areas/functions. Of these, 67% worked in the following job areas/functions: Finance, Engineering, Marketing, Sales, Information Technology, Human Resources, Consulting, Operations, Research, and Health or answered 'Not applicable'. The remaining 33% worked in other job areas/functions including: Production, Executive, Operations/Quality Assurance, Administration, Purchasing, Law, Line Management, Customer Service, Science and Education.

The breakdown of the group is provided below (with response rates for each biographical section given in the foot notes):

### Gender<sup>2</sup>

38% of the group were female and 62% were male.

### Age<sup>3</sup>

The mean age of the group was 33 years.

### Education (highest qualification)<sup>4</sup>

Approximately 50% of the group had a Master's degree/Post-graduate qualification, 32% had a Bachelor's degree, 9% had high school/college qualifications, 5% had a Doctorate/PhD, and the remaining 3% had professional qualifications or no formal qualifications.

### First Language<sup>5</sup>

62% of the group spoke the following first languages: Arabic, Afrikaans, French (France), Greek, Danish, Polish, Swedish, Italian (Italy), Russian and German (Germany). The remaining 38% spoke other first languages including: Romanian, Indonesian, Portuguese (Brazil), Spanish (Mexico), Dutch (Netherlands), Portuguese (Portugal), Hungarian, Spanish (International Sort), Spanish (Traditional Sort) and Bulgarian.

<sup>1</sup>Based on 79% sample response

<sup>2</sup>Based on 100% sample response

<sup>3</sup>Based on 90% sample response

<sup>4</sup>Based on 94% sample response

<sup>5</sup>Based on 100% sample response

## Work Experience<sup>6</sup>

12% of the group had more than 20 years' work experience, 29% had 10-20 years', 17% had 6-9 years', 15% had 3-5 years', 12% had 1-2 years', and the remaining 15% had less than 12 months' work experience or answered 'Not applicable'.

## Cultural Background<sup>7</sup>

63% of the group described themselves as Other White (including White European, White South African and White South American), 19% Other/Mixed (including Arabic, Hispanic and Mixed Race), 9% Asian (including Chinese, Malaysian and Japanese), 9% Black (including Black African, Black South African and Black Caribbean), with the remaining few describing themselves as coming from a White UK background.

## Country of Completion<sup>8</sup>

14% of the group completed the Analysis Aptitude test in the UK, 14% in South Africa, 10% in Denmark, 6% in the US, 5% in Australia, 4% in the United Arab Emirates, 4% in Sweden, 3% in Saudi Arabia, 3% Greece and 3% France. The remaining 34% completed the Analysis Aptitude test in various other countries (including Poland, Germany, Italy, Spain, Finland, Romania, Switzerland, Egypt, Indonesia and the Netherlands).

<sup>6</sup>Based on 89% sample response

<sup>7</sup>Based on 69% sample response

<sup>8</sup>Based on 100% sample response

## 10.6 UK Professionals & Managers (2015, N=10511) Norm Group Description

Used for:

Swift Analysis Aptitude-Rx (IA)

Swift Analysis Verbal & Numerical-Rx (IA)

Verbal Analysis Aptitude-Rx (IA)

Numerical Analysis Aptitude-Rx (IA)

Diagrammatic Analysis Aptitude-Rx (IA)

This group consisted of 10511 individuals in the United Kingdom, employed in a range of job areas/functions<sup>1</sup>. Of these, 65% worked in the following job areas/functions: Finance, Sales, Information Technology, Engineering, Human Resources, Operations, Marketing, Production, Consulting, and Line Management. The remaining 35% worked in other job areas/functions including: Health, Education, Administration, Customer Service, Purchasing, Executive, Operations/Quality Assurance, Transport, Law and Research.

The breakdown of the group is provided below (with response rates for each biographical section given in the foot notes):

### Gender<sup>2</sup>

31% of the group were female and 69% were male.

### Age<sup>3</sup>

The mean age of the group was 38 years.

### Education (highest qualification)<sup>4</sup>

38% of the group had a Bachelor's degree as their highest qualification, 26% had a Master's degree/Post-graduate qualification, 17% had a professional qualification, 16% had school level or some college qualifications, 2% had a Doctorate or PhD qualification, with the remaining 1% of the group having 'other' or no formal qualifications.

### Level of Responsibility<sup>5</sup>

31% of the group were at senior management level (including board or executive level, directors, vice-presidents and senior managers), 29% were managers, 25% were professional individual contributors, and the remaining 15% were supervisors or team leaders

<sup>1</sup>Based on 97% sample response

<sup>2</sup>Based on 100% sample response

<sup>3</sup>Based on 88% sample response

<sup>4</sup>Based on 98% sample response

<sup>5</sup>Based on 100% sample response

## Work Experience<sup>6</sup>

39% of the group had more than 20 years' work experience, 34% had 10-20 years', 13% had 6-9 years', and 10% had 3-5 years', with the remaining 4% having 1-2 years' experience

## Cultural Background<sup>7</sup>

49% of the group described themselves as White UK (White Irish and White Scottish), 35% as Other White (including White European, White South African and White Australian), 10% as Asian (including Indian, Pakistani and Chinese), 4% Black (including Black African and Black Caribbean), with the remaining 2% describing themselves as coming from Other/Mixed background (including White & Asian, Hispanic and White & Black Caribbean).

<sup>6</sup>Based on 99% sample response

<sup>7</sup>Based on 97% sample response

## 10.7 UK Graduates - All (2015, N=14421) Norm Group Description

Used for:

Swift Analysis Aptitude-Rx (IA)

Swift Analysis Verbal & Numerical-Rx (IA)

Verbal Analysis Aptitude-Rx (IA)

Numerical Analysis Aptitude-Rx (IA)

Diagrammatic Analysis Aptitude-Rx (IA)

This group consisted of 14421 individuals in the United Kingdom, employed in a range of job areas/functions<sup>1</sup>. Of these, 60% worked in the following job areas/functions: Engineering, Sales, Information Technology, Finance, Marketing, Human Resources, Customer Service, Operations, Administration and Consulting or answered 'Not applicable'. The remaining 40% worked in other job areas/functions including: Education, Health, Hospitality, Production, Law, Purchasing, Research, Science, Line Management, Operations/Quality Assurance and Executive.

The breakdown of the group is provided below (with response rates for each biographical section given in the foot notes):

### Gender<sup>2</sup>

35% of the group were female and 65% were male.

### Age<sup>3</sup>

The mean age of the group was 31 years.

### Education (highest qualification)<sup>4</sup>

36% of the group had a Master's degree/Post-graduate qualification, 62% had a Bachelor's degree and the remaining 2% had a Doctorate or PhD.

### Work Experience<sup>5</sup>

17% of the group had more than 20 years' work experience, 22% had 10-20 years', 14% had 6-9 years', 18% had 3-5 years', 13% had 1-2 years', and the remaining 16% had less than 12 months' work experience or it was 'Not applicable'.

### Cultural Background<sup>6</sup>

44% of the group described themselves as White UK (including White British and White Irish), 31% as Other White (including White European, White Australian, and White South African), 16% Asian (including Indian, Pakistani, Chinese), 6% Black (including Black African, Black Caribbean and Black South African), with the remaining 3% describing themselves as coming from Other/Mixed backgrounds (including White & Asian, Hispanic and White & Black African).

<sup>1</sup>Based on 86% sample response

<sup>2</sup>Based on 100% sample response

<sup>3</sup>Based on 88% sample response

<sup>4</sup>Based on 100% sample response

<sup>5</sup>Based on 97% sample response

<sup>6</sup>Based on 96% sample response

## 10.8 UK Graduates - Recent (2017, N=2944) Norm Group Description

Used for:

Swift Analysis Aptitude-Rx (IA)

Swift Analysis Verbal & Numerical-Rx (IA)

Verbal Analysis Aptitude-Rx (IA)

Numerical Analysis Aptitude-Rx (IA)

Diagrammatic Analysis Aptitude-Rx (IA)

This group consisted of 2944 individuals in the United Kingdom, employed in a range of job areas/functions. Of these, 56% worked in Sales & Marketing, Engineering, Customer Service, Finance, Hospitality, Education, IT, Research, and Operations. The remaining 44% worked in other job areas/functions including: Administration, Consulting, Health, Human Resources, Law, Leisure, Construction, Data Processing, Purchasing, and Media.<sup>1</sup>

The breakdown of the group is provided below (with response rates for each biographical section given in the foot notes):

### Gender<sup>2</sup>

32% of the group were female and 68% were male.

### Age<sup>3</sup>

The mean age of the group was 23 years.

### Education (highest qualification)<sup>4</sup>

31% had a Post-graduate degree as their highest qualification and 69% had a first/undergraduate degree.

### Work Experience<sup>5</sup>

35% of the group had 3-5 years' work experience, 25% had 1-2 years', 16% had 6-12 months', with the remaining 24% having had less than 6 months' work experience.

### Cultural Background<sup>6</sup>

65% of the group described themselves as White (including British, European and Irish), 21% as Asian (including Indian, Chinese, Pakistani and Bangladeshi), 9% as Black (including African and Caribbean), and the remaining 5% described themselves as coming from Other/Mixed backgrounds (including Arabic, Hispanic and Mixed background).

<sup>1</sup>Based on 76% sample response

<sup>2</sup>Based on 100% sample response

<sup>3</sup>Based on 95% sample response

<sup>4</sup>Based on 100% sample response

<sup>5</sup>Based on 100% sample response

<sup>6</sup>Based on 97% sample response

## 10.9 UK Senior Managers & Executives (2015, N=3192) Norm Group Description

Used for:

Swift Analysis Aptitude-Rx (IA)

Swift Analysis Verbal & Numerical-Rx (IA)

Verbal Analysis Aptitude-Rx (IA)

Numerical Analysis Aptitude-Rx (IA)

Diagrammatic Analysis Aptitude-Rx (IA)

This group consisted of 3192 individuals in the United Kingdom, employed in a range of job areas/functions<sup>1</sup>. Of these, 70% worked in the following areas/functions: Sales, Finance, Operations, Human Resources, Marketing, Information Technology, Engineering, Executive, Line Management, and Consulting. The remaining 30% worked in other job areas/functions including: Health, Purchasing, Production, Education, Operations/Quality Assurance, Construction, Transport, Administration, Customer Service and Distribution.

The breakdown of the group is provided below (with response rates for each biographical section given in the foot notes):

### Gender<sup>2</sup>

26% of the group were female and 74% were male.

### Age<sup>3</sup>

The mean age of the group was 42 years.

### Education (highest qualification)<sup>4</sup>

36% of the group had a Bachelor's degree as their highest qualification, 26% had a Master's degree/Post-graduate qualification, 21% had a professional qualification, 16% had school level or some college qualifications and the remaining 1% of the group had a Doctorate or PhD qualification, 'other' or no formal qualifications.

### Level of Responsibility<sup>5</sup>

99% of the group were at senior management level (including senior managers, functional managers, business managers, group managers, corporate managers and heads of service or function). The remaining 1% of the group were directors, business owners or at board/executive level.

<sup>1</sup>Based on 97% sample response

<sup>2</sup>Based on 100% sample response

<sup>3</sup>Based on 87% sample response

<sup>4</sup>Based on 98% sample response

<sup>5</sup>Based on 100% sample response

## Work Experience<sup>6</sup>

57% of the group had more than 20 years' work experience, 35% had 10-20 years', and 6% had 6-9 years', with the remaining 2% having 3-5 years' experience.

## Cultural Background<sup>7</sup>


57% of the group described themselves as White UK (including White British and White Irish), 34% as Other White (including White European, White South African and White Australian), 6% Asian (including Indian, Pakistani and Chinese), 2% Black (including Black African, Black Caribbean and Black American), with the remaining 1% coming from Other/Mixed backgrounds (including White & Asian, Hispanic and White & Black Caribbean).

<sup>6</sup> Based on 99% sample response

<sup>7</sup> Based on 96% sample response

## 11. Swift Executive Aptitude-Rx and Abstract Reasoning Aptitude-Rx (2015) Norms Summary

In summary, the UK Graduates norm group are the highest performing group with a mean theta score of -.06. International English as an Additional Language are the lowest performing group with a mean theta score of -.28.



\*Based on average (mean) group theta values, also showing the range of one standard deviation above and below the mean.

## 11.1 International Professionals & Managers (2015, N=1180) Norm Group Description

Used for:

Swift Executive Aptitude-Rx (IA)

Abstract Reasoning Aptitude-Rx (IA)

This international group consisted of 1180 individuals employed in a range of job areas/functions<sup>1</sup>. Of these, 65% worked in the following job areas/functions: Finance, Human Resources, Sales, Operations, Information Technology, Executive, Marketing, Consulting, Engineering and Health. The remaining 35% worked in other job areas/functions including: Education, Customer Service, Administration, Line Management, Law, Hospitality, Construction, Purchasing, Research, Operations/Quality Assurance and Production.

The breakdown of the group is provided below (with response rates for each biographical section given in the foot notes):

### Gender<sup>2</sup>

31% of the group were female and 69% were male.

### Age<sup>3</sup>

The mean age of the group was 40 years.

### Education (highest qualification)<sup>4</sup>

Approximately 35% had a Master's degree/Post-graduate qualification as their highest qualification, 31% had a Bachelor's degree 16% had school level or some college qualifications, 15% had a professional qualification, 2% had a doctorate or PhD qualification, with the remaining few having 'other' or no formal qualifications.

### Level of Responsibility<sup>5</sup>

42% of the group were at senior management level (including board or executive level, directors, vice-presidents and senior managers), 22% were managers, 23% were professional individual contributors, and the remaining 13% were supervisors or team leaders.

### Work Experience<sup>6</sup>

42% of the group had more than 20 years' work experience, 38% had 10-20 years', 10% had 6-9 years', and 7% had 3-5 years', with the remaining 3% having 1-2 years' experience.

<sup>1</sup> Based on 94% sample response

<sup>2</sup> Based on 100% sample response

<sup>3</sup> Based on 87% sample response

<sup>4</sup> Based on 99% sample response

<sup>5</sup> Based on 100% sample response

<sup>6</sup> Based on 96% sample response

## Cultural Background<sup>7</sup>

49% of the group described themselves as coming from Other White backgrounds (including White Australian and White New Zealand and White European), 22% White UK (including White British and White Irish), 18% as Asian (including Indian, Chinese and Pakistani), 7% Black (including Black African, Black South African and Black Caribbean) and the remaining 4% from Other/Mixed backgrounds (including Arabic, White & Asian and Hispanic).

## Country of Completion<sup>8</sup>

49% of the group described themselves as coming from Other White backgrounds (including White Australian and White New Zealand and White European), 22% White UK (including White British and White Irish), 18% as Asian (including Indian, Chinese and Pakistani), 7% Black (including Black African, Black South African and Black Caribbean) and the remaining 4% from Other/Mixed backgrounds (including Arabic, White & Asian and Hispanic).

<sup>7</sup> Based on 85% sample response

<sup>8</sup> Based on 100% sample response

## 11.2 International Graduates (2015, N=1527) Norm Group Description

Used for:

Swift Executive Aptitude-Rx (IA)

Abstract Reasoning Aptitude-Rx (IA)

This international group consisted of 1527 individuals employed in a range of job areas/functions<sup>1</sup>. Of these, 63% worked in the following job areas/functions: Sales, Human Resources, Finance, Marketing, Customer Service, Information, Technology, Operations, Hospitality, Engineering, Consulting and Administration. The remaining 37% worked in other job areas/functions including: Education, Executive, Health, Research, Law, Line Management, Construction, Retail, Science and Call Centres.

The breakdown of the group is provided below (with response rates for each biographical section given in the foot notes):

### Gender<sup>2</sup>

39% of the group were female and 61% were male.

### Age<sup>3</sup>

The mean age of the group was 31 years.

### Education (highest qualification)<sup>4</sup>

58% of the group had a Bachelor's degree, 40% of the group had a Master's degree/Post-graduate qualification, and the remaining 2% had a doctorate or PhD.

### Work Experience<sup>5</sup>

19% of the group had more than 20 years' work experience, 25% had 10-20 years', 15% had 6-9 years', 18% had 3-5 years', 11% had 1-2 years', and the remaining 12% had less than 12 months' work experience or said it was 'Not applicable'.

### Cultural Background<sup>6</sup>

41% of the group described themselves as Other White (including White Australian, White European and White New Zealand), 26% UK White (including White British and White Irish), 22% Asian (including Indian, Chinese and Pakistani), 6% Black (including Black African, Black Caribbean and Black American) and the remaining 5% described themselves as coming from Other/Mixed backgrounds (including Arabic, White & Black African and Turkish).

### Country of Completion<sup>7</sup>

28% of the group completed the Aptitude test in the UK, 26% in Australia, 8% in the US, 6% in India, 5% in New Zealand, 2% in South Africa, 2% in Germany, 2% in Singapore, 1% in France and 1% in Malaysia. The remaining 19% completed the Aptitude test in various other countries (including Ireland, United Arab Emirates, China, Botswana, Belgium, the Netherlands, Greece, Hong Kong, Italy and Spain).

<sup>1</sup> Based on 80% sample response

<sup>2</sup> Based on 100% sample response

<sup>3</sup> Based on 87% sample response

<sup>4</sup> Based on 100% sample response

<sup>5</sup> Based on 88% sample response

<sup>6</sup> Based on 69% sample response

<sup>7</sup> Based on 100% sample response

## 11.3 International Senior Managers & Executives (2015, N=590) Norm Group Description

Used for:

Swift Executive Aptitude-Rx (IA)

Abstract Reasoning Aptitude-Rx (IA)

This international group consisted of 590 participants employed in a range of job areas/functions<sup>1</sup>. Of these, 70% worked in the following areas/functions: Finance, Human Resources, Executive, Operations, Sales, Information Technology, Health, Line Management, Education and Marketing. The remaining 30% worked in other job areas/functions including: Consulting, Engineering, Hospitality, Law, Customer Service, Administration, Purchasing, Retail, Distribution and Production.

The breakdown of the group is provided below (with response rates for each biographical section given in the foot notes):

### Gender<sup>2</sup>

26% of the group were female and 74% were male.

### Age<sup>3</sup>

The mean age of the group was 44 years.

### Education (highest qualification)<sup>4</sup>

Approximately 35% had a Master's degree/Post-graduate qualification as their highest qualification, 28% had a Bachelor's degree, 20% had professional qualifications, 15% had school level or some college qualifications, and the remaining 3% of the group had a Doctorate/PhD qualification or no formal qualifications.

### Level of Responsibility<sup>5</sup>

97% of the group were at senior management level (including senior managers, business managers, functional managers, group managers and general managers). The remaining 3% were at director level, executive level or business owners.

### Work Experience<sup>6</sup>

58% of the group had more than 20 years' work experience, 38% had 10-20 years', 3% had 6-9 years' and the remaining 1% had 3-5 years' work experience.

<sup>1</sup> Based on 91% sample response

<sup>2</sup> Based on 53% sample response

<sup>3</sup> Based on 58% sample response

<sup>4</sup> Based on 44% sample response

<sup>5</sup> Based on 53% sample response

<sup>6</sup> Based on 58% sample response

## Cultural Background<sup>7</sup>

52% of the group described themselves as Other White (including White Australian, White New Zealander and, White European) 26% UK White (including White British), 11% Asian (including Indian, Chinese and Malaysian) 6% Black (including Black African, Black Caribbean and Black South African) and the remaining 5% described themselves as coming from Other/ Mixed backgrounds (including Arabic, Hispanic and Lebanese-American).

## Country of Completion<sup>8</sup>

30% of the group completed the Aptitude test in the UK, 20% in Australia, 9% in the US, 7% in New Zealand, 6% in South Africa, 5% in India, 3% in the United Arab Emirates, 2% in Germany, 2% in Botswana and 1% in Saudi Arabia. The remaining 15% completed the Aptitude test in various other countries (including Singapore, France, Malaysia, Bahrain, Hong Kong, Ireland, the Netherlands, Malta, Spain and Zambia).

<sup>7</sup>Based on 44% sample response

<sup>8</sup>Based on 100% sample response

## 11.4 International English as an Additional Language (2015, N=499) Norm Group Description

Used for:

Swift Executive Aptitude-Rx (IA)

Abstract Reasoning Aptitude-Rx (IA)

This international group consisted of 499 participants employed in a range of job areas/functions<sup>1</sup>. Of these, 59% worked in the following job areas/functions: Finance, Sales, Human Resources, Information Technology, Customer Service, Consulting, Executive, Operations, Engineering and Hospitality or answered 'Not applicable'. The remaining 41% worked in other job areas/functions including: Line Management, Marketing, Distribution, Education, Administration, Health, Research, Construction, Law and Purchasing.

The breakdown of the group is provided below (with response rates for each biographical section given in the foot notes):

### Gender<sup>2</sup>

45% of the group were female and 55% were male.

### Age<sup>3</sup>

The mean age of the group was 32 years.

### Education (highest qualification)<sup>4</sup>

52% of the group had a Master's degree/Post-graduate qualification, 33% had a Bachelor's degree, 9% had high school/college qualifications, 4% professional Qualifications, and 2% had a doctorate or PhD or no formal qualifications.

### First Language<sup>5</sup>

51% of the group spoke the following first languages: Afrikaans, Arabic, Polish, French (France), Italian (Italy), German (Germany), Greek, Dutch (Netherlands), Chinese and Russian. The remaining 49% spoke other first languages including: Swedish, Romanian, Bulgarian, Turkish, Lithuanian, Spanish (Traditional Sort), French (Belgium), Hindi and Portuguese (Portugal).

### Work Experience<sup>6</sup>

18% of the group had more than 20 years' work experience, 24% had 10-20 years', 14% had 6-9 years', 17% had 3-5 years', 12% had 1-2 years', and the remaining 15% had less than 12 months' work experience or answered 'Not applicable'.

<sup>1</sup>Based on 100% sample response

<sup>2</sup>Based on 41% sample response

<sup>3</sup>Based on 49% sample response

<sup>4</sup>Based on 50% sample response

## Cultural Background<sup>7</sup>

67% of the group described themselves as Other White (including White European, White South African and White South American), 14% Asian (including Chinese, Indian, Malaysian), 13% Other/Mixed (including Arabic, Hispanic, and White and Asian), 5% Black (including Black African and Black South African), with the remaining 1% describing themselves as White UK.

## Country of Completion<sup>8</sup>

42% of the group completed the Aptitude test in the UK, 19% in Australia, 8% in South Africa, 3% in the United Arab Emirates, 3% in France, 3% in Germany, 2% in Greece, 2% in the Netherlands, 2% in New Zealand and 1% in Belgium. The remaining 15% completed the Aptitude test in various other countries (including Italy, Spain, Poland, Bahrain, Saudi Arabia, the US, Malaysia, Singapore, Sweden and China).

<sup>7</sup>Based on 88% sample response

<sup>8</sup>Based on 100% sample response

## 11.5 UK Professionals & Managers (2015, N=2510) Norm Group Description

Used for:

Swift Executive Aptitude-Rx (IA)

Abstract Reasoning Aptitude-Rx (IA)

This group consisted of 2510 individuals in the United Kingdom, employed in a range of job areas/functions<sup>1</sup>. Of these, 60% worked in the following job areas/functions: Finance, Human Resources, Information Technology, Operations, Health, Sales, Marketing, Customer Service, Education and Engineering. The remaining 40% worked in other job areas/functions including: Hospitality, Line Management, Consulting, Executive, Administration, Law, Construction, Purchasing, Retail and Distribution.

The breakdown of the group is provided below (with response rates for each biographical section given in the foot notes):

### Gender<sup>2</sup>

35% of the group were female and 65% were male.

### Age<sup>3</sup>

The mean age of the group was 38 years.

### Education (highest qualification)<sup>4</sup>

33% of the group had a Bachelor's degree as their highest qualification, 31% had a Master's degree/Post-graduate qualification, 19% had a professional qualifications, 14% had school level or some college qualifications, 2% had a Doctorate or PhD qualification, with the remaining 1% of the group having 'Other' or no formal qualifications.

### Level of Responsibility<sup>5</sup>

42% of the group had senior management or board level responsibility, 24% were managers, 21% were professional individual contributors, and the remaining 13% were supervisors or team leaders.

### Work Experience<sup>6</sup>

42% of the group had more than 20 years' work experience, 31% had 10-20 years', 13% had 6-9 years', and 10% had 3-5 years', with the remaining 4% having 1-2 years' experience.

<sup>1</sup>Based on 96% sample response

<sup>2</sup>Based on 100% sample response

<sup>3</sup>Based on 88% sample response

<sup>4</sup>Based on 99% sample response

<sup>5</sup>Based on 100% sample response

<sup>6</sup>Based on 99% sample response

<sup>7</sup>Based on 98% sample response

## Cultural Background<sup>7</sup>

Approximately 48% of the group described themselves as UK White (White British and White Irish), 38% as Other White (including White European, White Australian and White South African), 8% as Asian (including Indian, Pakistani and Bangladeshi), 3% Black (including Black African, Black Caribbean and Black American), with the remaining 3% describing themselves as coming from Other/Mixed background (including White & Asian, White & Black Caribbean and White & Black African).

<sup>7</sup>Based on 98% sample response

## 11.6 UK Graduates (2015, N=3653) Norm Group Description

Used for:

Swift Executive Aptitude-Rx (IA)

Abstract Reasoning Aptitude-Rx (IA)

This group consisted of 3653 individuals in the United Kingdom, employed in a range of job areas/functions<sup>1</sup>. Of these, 56% worked in the following job areas/functions: Sales, Customer Service, Human Resources, Finance, Information Technology, Health, Administration, Hospitality and Operations or answered 'Not applicable'. The remaining 44% worked in other job areas/functions including: Education, Marketing, Engineering, Consulting, Retail, Line Management, Construction, Executive, Call Centre and Law.

The breakdown of the group is provided below (with response rates for each biographical section given in the foot notes):

### Gender<sup>2</sup>

40% of the group were female and 60% were male.

### Age<sup>3</sup>

The mean age of the group was 30 years.

### Education (highest qualification)<sup>4</sup>

Approximately 60% of the group had a Bachelor's degree, 39% had a Master's degree/Post-graduate qualification, and the remaining 2% had a Doctorate or PhD.

### Work Experience<sup>5</sup>

17% of the group had more than 20 years' work experience, 17% had 10-20 years', 17% had 6-9 years', 25% had 3-5 years', 12% had 1-2 years', and the remaining 12% had less than 12 months' work experience or it was 'Not applicable'.

### Cultural Background<sup>6</sup>

Approximately 47% of the group described themselves as UK White (including White British and White Irish), 32% as Other White (including White European, White North American and White South African), 14% Asian (including Indian, Pakistani and Chinese), 5% Black (including Black African, Black Caribbean and Black South African), with the remaining 3% describing themselves as coming from Other/Mixed backgrounds (including White & Asian, White & Black African and White & Black Caribbean).

<sup>1</sup> Based on 85% sample response

<sup>2</sup> Based on 100% sample response

<sup>3</sup> Based on 89% sample response

<sup>4</sup> Based on 100% sample response

<sup>5</sup> Based on 96% sample response

<sup>6</sup> Based on 97% sample response

## 11.7 UK Senior Managers & Executives (2015, N=1031) Norm Group Description

Used for:

Swift Executive Aptitude-Rx (IA)

Abstract Reasoning Aptitude-Rx (IA)

This group consisted of 1031 individuals in the United Kingdom, employed in a range of job areas/functions<sup>1</sup>. Of these, 67% worked in the following areas/functions: Finance, Operations, Human Resources, Health, Information Technology, Sales, Marketing, Engineering, Executive and Hospitality. The remaining 33% worked in other job areas/functions including: Line Management, Education, Consulting, Customer Service, Distribution, Law, Purchasing, Operations / Quality Assurance, Production and Construction.

The breakdown of the group is provided below (with response rates for each biographical section given in the foot notes):

### Gender<sup>2</sup>

33% of the group were female and 67% were male.

### Age<sup>3</sup>

The mean age of the group was 43 years.

### Education (highest qualification)<sup>4</sup>

31% had a Master's degree/ Post-graduate qualification, 26% had a Bachelor's degree as their highest qualification, 25% had a professional qualification, 16% had school level or some college qualifications, and the remaining 2% had a Doctorate or PhD qualification, 'Other' or no formal qualifications

### Level of Responsibility<sup>5</sup>

98% of the group were at senior management level (including senior managers, business managers, group managers and functional managers). The remaining 2% of the group were at director level, board/executive level or business owners.

### Work Experience<sup>6</sup>

62% of the group had more than 20 years' work experience, 33% had 10-20 years', and 4% had 6-9 years', with the remaining 1% having 3-5 years' experience.

### Cultural Background<sup>7</sup>

53% of the group described themselves as White UK (including White British and White Irish), 41% as Other White (including White European, White Australian and White South African), 4% Asian (including Indian, Pakistani and Bangladeshi), 1% Black (including Black African, Black Caribbean and Black American), with the remaining 1% coming from Other/Mixed backgrounds (including White & Asian, Anglo-Iranian and Maori).

<sup>1</sup> Based on 97% sample response

<sup>2</sup> Based on 100% sample response

<sup>3</sup> Based on 88% sample response

<sup>4</sup> Based on 98% sample response

<sup>5</sup> Based on 100% sample response

<sup>6</sup> Based on 99% sample response

<sup>7</sup> Based on 96% sample response

## 12. Appendix 1: Development of Swift Executive Aptitude

Development of the Swift Executive Aptitude assessment began in 2009. It is based upon the Swift Analysis Aptitude assessment, however the third sub-test, Diagrammatic Analysis, has been replaced with Abstract Reasoning which is another measure of systematic logical reasoning. The verbal and numerical analysis items for Swift Executive Aptitude are taken directly from the large banks that power Swift Analysis Aptitude and are therefore directly comparable across the tests.

Based on analysis of data from the Diagrammatic tests, as well as client feedback, it was suggested that an abstract format of logical reasoning might be more face-valid and appropriate for some roles (e.g., senior and executive roles). The development of the abstract series format had the aim of producing a straightforward, language-free and globally applicable alternative to diagrammatic format tests, while still measuring the same performance criterion of 'Working with Systems'. The Abstract Series format also has the advantage that it requires less explanatory text, so is particularly suitable for translation and global use. Please refer to Appendix 2 for more information about the development of the Abstract Reasoning test.

The Swift Executive Aptitude assessment is formed of three sub-tests and takes a total time of 18 minutes to complete (six minutes per sub-test). The updated 2011 version features enhanced scoring based on the principles of Item Response Theory (IRT), and large banks of randomized item content powered by an increased number of norm groups compared to that of the original 2009 version. It also benefits from pace information, which is an enhanced method of measuring a test taker's completion rate. This score is displayed in the Aptitude & Pace Report which is available for all randomized tests.

## 13. Appendix 2: Development of Abstract Reasoning Aptitude

Development of an Abstract test format began in 2009. Based on analysis of data from the Diagrammatic tests, as well as client feedback, a new format for measuring systematic logical reasoning was targeted. Client feedback had suggested that an abstract format of logical reasoning might be more face-valid and appropriate in some roles (e.g., senior and executive roles). Saville Assessment began development of an Abstract Series format with the aim of producing a straightforward, language-free and globally applicable alternative to diagrammatic format tests, while still measuring the same performance criterion of 'Working with Systems'. The Abstract Series format also has the advantage that it requires less explanatory text and so is particularly suitable for translation and global use.

Items were written by members of the Research & Development team with a view to capturing established constructs of abstract reasoning which underpin a range of existing abstract format tests. As with all of the Saville Assessment aptitude tests, different item types were developed in order to capture multiple specific abilities within the overall construct of abstract reasoning. In order to be consistent with the Diagrammatic tests, which are designed to measure similar performance constructs, the item types used in creating the abstract items are similar to some of the item types used in the diagrammatic content: 'Identifying Rules', 'Comprehending Processes' and 'Understanding Logical Sequences'. The difference between item types for the abstract content is dependent on where the question mark ('?') sits in the abstract series. If the '?' is at the beginning of the series it is 'Identifying Rules'; if the '?' is in the middle of the series it is 'Comprehending Processes' and if the '?' sits at the end of the series it is 'Understanding Logical Sequences'. Testlets were constructed and arranged to sample these multiple item types and to get progressively harder, both within a testlet and across the test as a whole.

## Trialing

The initial trialing phase consisted of a group of paid volunteers completing a range of new and existing aptitude content including 64 abstract items. The time allowed for each testlet of four questions was three minutes. This was to allow for time vectoring, whereby trial candidates are given generous time limits in order to analyze the effect of different completion times and to determine the best time limit for a test. Following the trialing, item analysis was conducted to select the best items for the first version of Abstract Reasoning. A correlation of .72 was found between the Abstract Series and Diagrammatic Reasoning formats, confirming the high degree of similarity between these two formats, and providing reassurance that they are both valid assessments of systematic, logical reasoning. On the strength of this correlation, norms from the Diagrammatic test were calibrated across to the Abstract version so that they could be used with the new test, which was initially marketed as Global Abstract Series. This test was scored using the principles of Item Response Theory (IRT 3-Parameter model) and featured 36 items presented over 18 minutes.

In 2011-2012, international trialing took place using paid volunteers from a range of cultures and backgrounds. They completed a large number of aptitude tests including technical and comprehension assessments which were allocated to them based on their stated job roles. On the basis of this trialing, an updated version of the Abstract format was created, with an increased item bank size. This version, released in 2012, is known as Abstract Reasoning Aptitude and features 32 items drawn from a large bank presented in 16 minutes.

Each test comprises eight timed testlets. Each testlet comprises four items and has a time limit of two minutes. The time limit on each testlet helps the candidate to pace themselves throughout the test and helps to prevent a candidate being heavily penalized if they spend a long time on one question.

Testlets are drawn from a large testlet bank. All testlets are arranged into different levels of difficulty in the bank (for example, 'Easy', 'Medium' and 'Difficult'). For the system to build a test for a specific candidate, there are rules in place to ensure that the test remains highly reliable and also to prevent over-exposure to questions of similar difficulty. These rules are to balance which items are presented from the bank. This is accomplished by the system requiring a test to be built with testlets of specific levels of difficulty in each testlet position throughout the test. The first testlet position is graded as 'Easy' and the final testlet position is graded as 'Difficult' for example. Therefore, in the first position only testlets graded as 'Easy' can be drawn from the bank and for the final position only testlets graded as 'Difficult' can be drawn from bank. Consequently, each candidate is presented with a randomized test but with a closely controlled and very similar level of difficulty.

Final equivalence is provided for all candidates using IRT to equate scores to ensure that all candidates are measured on a consistent and comparable scale.

Abstract Reasoning Aptitude features enhanced IRT scoring and a larger bank of randomized item content powered by an increased number of norm groups. It also benefits from pace information, which is an enhanced method of measuring a test taker's completion rate. The Pace score is based on the candidate's response time for the questions they completed compared to the average response time for the same questions. It can be defined as how quickly a candidate has responded compared to the average for the same questions. This score is displayed in the Aptitude & Pace Report available for all randomized tests.

A supervised access online parallel form of Abstract Reasoning Aptitude was developed in 2014. This provides the reassurance of having a supervised follow-up test available if so required. As is consistent with the other Supervised Access tests in the Saville Assessment Aptitude test portfolio, this test is scored using the principles of Classical Test Theory and features fixed content. This will permit the creation of a parallel hardcopy supervised version, which can be hand scored, in due course. Following trialing on a group of paid volunteers and live client usage in 2013, the test was made commercially available in 2014 with an initial standardization norm. Further norms will be released in due course.

For further information about Saville Assessment's development processes and for an in-depth explanation of the principles of IRT, please refer to the Analysis Aptitude Range handbook.

14. Appendix 3: Swift Analysis Aptitude-Rx Sample Report



Assessment Report  
Sample Candidate



Swift Analysis  
Aptitude-Rx

## Contents

Introduction to Assessment Report.....	3
Total Score.....	4
Aptitude & Pace Information.....	5
Improving Abilities.....	6
Online Test Access Summary (For Assessor Use).....	7

## About this Report

This report is based upon Swift Analysis Aptitude, an online test of the ability to reason with information presented in verbal, numerical and diagrammatic formats.

The results are compared against an international group of 20,235 professionals and managers. The results in this report are presented on a 1 to 10 Sten scale, where 1 indicates low performance and 10 indicates high performance on the test. The margin of error that should be allowed before concluding that there is a difference between scores is indicated by the diamond shape.

When reading this report, please remember that it is based on the information gained from the test completion only. It describes performance on this particular test, rather than performance at work or study. Research suggests that ability tests can be powerful predictors of successful performance in study and work activities.

The information contained in this report is confidential and every effort should be made to ensure that it is stored in a secure place.

The information contained within this report is likely to provide a valid measure of aptitude for 12 to 24 months.

The report is based on the results of the online test that the respondent was invited to complete under unsupervised conditions. The identity of the actual respondent has not been verified by a test administrator. Further testing under supervised conditions is recommended for high-stake decision making.

This report was produced using Saville Assessment software systems and has been generated electronically. Saville Assessment do not guarantee that it has not been changed or edited. We can accept no liability for the consequences of the use of this report.

The application of this test is limited to Saville Assessment employees, agents of Saville Assessment and clients authorized by Saville Assessment.



## Introduction to Assessment Report

This report provides feedback on the responses of Sample Candidate to the Swift Analysis Aptitude test.

### Total Score

This test measures verbal, numerical and diagrammatic analysis, which are important in the world of work for a variety of roles. This section of the report provides a total test score relative to the comparison group: Professionals & Managers (INT; IA; 2015)

The Total Score indicates how well Sample Candidate has performed overall on the test.

### Aptitude Area Sub-Scores

The sub-scores provide information on how Sample Candidate performed on each of the aptitude sub-tests. The pattern of results indicates relative strengths and weaknesses across the following areas of aptitude:

**Verbal** - assesses the ability to understand, interpret and evaluate written information.

**Numerical** - assesses the ability to understand, interpret and evaluate numerical data.


**Diagrammatic** - assesses the ability to analyse diagrams, sequences and transformations.

### Aptitude & Pace Comparison

Aptitude and pace scores are shown for each of the areas in the test. These scores are compared in a graph using a 1 to 10 sten scale, with the sten values given in brackets. The pace score is based on the candidate's response time for the questions they completed compared to the average response time for the same questions. Pace is shown from slow at the bottom of the graph to fast at the top. Aptitude runs from low on the left of the graph to high on the right.

### Total Score

This page shows the Total Score relative to the Professionals & Managers (INT; IA; 2015) comparison group on a 1 to 10 sten scale.



### Interpretation Guidelines

Comparison Group: Professionals & Managers (INT; IA; 2015)

- Sten 1: higher than about 1% of the comparison group
- Sten 2: higher than about 5% of the comparison group
- Sten 3: higher than about 10% of the comparison group
- Sten 4: higher than about 25% of the comparison group
- Sten 5: higher than about 40% of the comparison group
- Sten 6: higher than about 60% of the comparison group
- Sten 7: higher than about 75% of the comparison group
- Sten 8: higher than about 90% of the comparison group
- Sten 9: higher than about 95% of the comparison group
- Sten 10: higher than about 99% of the comparison group




## Aptitude & Pace Information

This page displays aptitude and pace information for each of the areas in the test relative to the Professionals & Managers (INT; IA; 2015) comparison group.

## Aptitude Area Sub-Scores

		Scores									
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Aptitude Areas	<b>Verbal</b> (Average - 54%ile) Likely to find working with verbal information as easy as other people.										
	<b>Numerical</b> (Above Average - 82%ile) Likely to find working with numerical information easier than other people.										
	<b>Diagrammatic</b> (Average - 66%ile) Likely to find working with diagrammatic information as easy as other people.										

## Aptitude & Pace Comparison



## Improving Abilities

Some tips for improving abilities are provided below:

### Verbal

- When you read newspapers and articles, try to establish the main points.
- Look up the meaning of unfamiliar words.
- Read passages of text and pick out the key details.
- Compare written arguments, looking for similarities and differences between them.
- Look at something you have written and rewrite it more concisely.

### Numerical

- When you read newspapers and reports, pay attention to numerical information.
- Complete calculations both with and without a calculator.
- Look for differences such as percentage changes in numerical trends.
- Check calculations done by others.
- Take on responsibilities which involve working with numbers.

### Diagrammatic

- Examine diagrams in books and newspapers.
- Study flowcharts of processes and procedures.
- Improve your logic by solving puzzles.
- Try to clarify different types of relationships within diagrams.
- Create diagrams in order to illustrate sequences of events.



### Online Test Access Summary (For Assessor Use)

This section of the report provides additional information about the test completion.

Initial Access: 09/04/2015 (13:32 GMT)  
Responses Saved: 09/04/2015 (13:42 GMT)  
Language: English (United States)  
Administrator Resets: 0  
Candidate Aborts: 0  
Time Adjustment: None

## 15. Appendix 4: Swift Executive Aptitude-Rx Sample Report



Assessment Report  
Sample Candidate



Swift Executive  
Aptitude-Rx



### Contents

Introduction to Assessment Report.....	3
Total Score.....	4
Aptitude & Pace Information.....	5
Improving Abilities.....	6
Online Test Access Summary (For Assessor Use).....	7

### About this Report

This report is based upon Swift Executive Aptitude, an online test of the ability to reason with information presented in verbal, numerical and abstract formats.

The results are compared against an international group of 590 senior managers and executives. The results in this report are presented on a 1 to 10 Sten scale, where 1 indicates low performance and 10 indicates high performance on the test. The margin of error that should be allowed before concluding that there is a difference between scores is indicated by the diamond shape.

When reading this report, please remember that it is based on the information gained from the test completion only. It describes performance on this particular test, rather than performance at work or study. Research suggests that ability tests can be powerful predictors of successful performance in study and work activities.

The information contained in this report is confidential and every effort should be made to ensure that it is stored in a secure place.

The information contained within this report is likely to provide a valid measure of aptitude for 12 to 24 months.

The report is based on the results of the online test that the respondent was invited to complete under unsupervised conditions. The identity of the actual respondent has not been verified by a test administrator. Further testing under supervised conditions is recommended for high-stake decision making.

This report was produced using Saville Assessment software systems and has been generated electronically. Saville Assessment do not guarantee that it has not been changed or edited. We can accept no liability for the consequences of the use of this report.

The application of this test is limited to Saville Assessment employees, agents of Saville Assessment and clients authorized by Saville Assessment.

## Introduction to Assessment Report

This report provides feedback on the responses of Sample Candidate to the Swift Executive Aptitude test.

### Total Score

This test measures verbal analysis, numerical analysis and abstract reasoning, which are important in the world of work for a variety of roles. This section of the report provides a total test score relative to the comparison group: Senior Managers & Executives (INT, IA, 2015)

The Total Score indicates how well Sample Candidate has performed overall on the test.

### Aptitude Area Sub-Scores

The sub-scores provide information on how Sample Candidate performed on each of the aptitude sub-tests. The pattern of results indicates relative strengths and weaknesses across the following areas of aptitude:

**Verbal** - assesses the ability to understand, interpret and evaluate written information.

**Numerical** - assesses the ability to understand, interpret and evaluate numerical data.

**Abstract** - assesses the ability to understand sequences of patterns and relationships.


### Aptitude & Pace Comparison

Aptitude and pace scores are shown for each of the areas in the test. These scores are compared in a graph using a 1 to 10 sten scale, with the sten values given in parentheses. The pace score is based on the candidate's response time for the questions they completed compared to the average response time for the same questions. Pace is shown from slow at the bottom of the graph to fast at the top. Aptitude runs from low on the left of the graph to high on the right.



### Total Score

This page shows the Total Score relative to the Senior Managers & Executives (INT, IA, 2015) comparison group on a 1 to 10 sten scale.



### Interpretation Guidelines

Comparison Group: Senior Managers & Executives (INT, IA, 2015)

- Sten 1: higher than about 1% of the comparison group
- Sten 2: higher than about 5% of the comparison group
- Sten 3: higher than about 10% of the comparison group
- Sten 4: higher than about 25% of the comparison group
- Sten 5: higher than about 40% of the comparison group
- Sten 6: higher than about 60% of the comparison group
- Sten 7: higher than about 75% of the comparison group
- Sten 8: higher than about 90% of the comparison group
- Sten 9: higher than about 95% of the comparison group
- Sten 10: higher than about 99% of the comparison group


### Aptitude & Pace Information

This page displays aptitude and pace information for each of the areas in the test relative to the Senior Managers & Executives (INT, IA, 2015) comparison group.

### Aptitude Area Sub-Scores

Scores		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Aptitude Areas	<b>Verbal</b> (Average - 54%ile) Likely to find working with verbal information as easy as other people.										
	<b>Numerical</b> (Average - 46%ile) Likely to find working with numerical information as easy as other people.										
	<b>Abstract</b> (Average - 42%ile) Likely to find working with abstract information as easy as other people.										

### Aptitude & Pace Comparison





### Improving Abilities

Some tips for improving abilities are provided below:

#### Verbal

- When you read newspapers and articles, try to establish the main points.
- Look up the meaning of unfamiliar words.
- Read passages of text and pick out the key details.
- Compare written arguments, looking for similarities and differences between them.
- Look at something you have written and rewrite it more concisely.

#### Numerical

- When you read newspapers and reports, pay attention to numerical information.
- Complete calculations both with and without a calculator.
- Look for differences such as percentage changes in numerical trends.
- Check calculations done by others.
- Take on responsibilities which involve working with numbers.

#### Abstract

- Work with abstract materials.
- Examine information presented in abstract forms in books and newspapers.
- Complete logic puzzles and games.
- Look for patterns and relationships in information.
- Practice creating diagrams which represent relationships, connections and sequences.

### Online Test Access Summary (For Assessor Use)

This section of the report provides additional information about the test completion.

Initial Access: 13/04/2015 (13:22 GMT)  
Responses Saved: 13/04/2015 (13:36 GMT)  
Language: English (United States)  
Administrator Resets: 0  
Candidate Aborts: 0  
Time Adjustment: None

## 16. Appendix 5: Internal Consistency Reliabilities for Sub-tests in Swift

The following tables show the internal consistency reliability coefficients for the sub-tests in Swift Analysis Aptitude, Swift Executive Aptitude and Swift Analysis Verbal & Numerical. The sub-test scores provide additional test-taking information and should not be used in isolation for decision making. Therefore, we are not seeking the sub-tests to have reliability estimates higher than .70.

### Swift Analysis Aptitude Internal Consistency Reliabilities (N=95337)

Sub-Test	Mean % Correct	SD (%)	SEm Sten	SEm 'T'	r
Verbal	63.62	24.16	1.23	6.16	.62
Numerical	53.60	25.42	1.13	5.66	.68
Diagrammatic	64.80	24.20	1.18	5.92	.65

### Swift Executive Aptitude Internal Consistency Reliabilities (N=22104)

Sub-Test	Mean % Correct	SD (%)	SEm Sten	SEm 'T'	r
Verbal	66.98	23.53	1.25	6.24	.61
Numerical	56.28	24.88	1.15	5.74	.67
Abstract	70.74	19.74	1.13	5.66	.68

### Swift Analysis Verbal & Numerical Internal Consistency Reliabilities (N=28647)

Sub-Test	Mean % Correct	SD (%)	SEm Sten	SEm 'T'	r
Verbal	69.39	20.89	1.00	5.00	.75
Numerical	65.27	21.15	0.89	4.47	.80

## 17. Appendix 6: Method for Calculating Criterion Related Validity of a Single Test from the Equivalent Sub-Test in Swift Analysis/Executive Aptitude

It is possible to calculate the criterion-related validity of each of the full-length, single tests based on validity evidence from the equivalent Swift sub-test. The variables used to derive the validity figures presented in this document are outlined below.

### Verbal Analysis, Numerical Analysis and Diagrammatic Analysis – based on Swift Analysis Aptitude (SAA)

Test	Criterion Related Validity	Raw Criterion Related Validity of Equivalent SAA Sub-Test (Epsom N=308)	Reliability of Equivalent SAA Sub-Test*	Inter-Rater Reliability of SAA Sub-Test's Equivalent Criterion (Epsom N=308)	Reliability of Single Tests**
Verbal Analysis Aptitude	.55	.27	.62	.31	.80
Numerical Analysis Aptitude	.38	.20	.68	.34	.84
Diagrammatic Analysis Aptitude	.27	.10	.65	.18	.86
		$(r_{xy})$	$(r_{xx})$	$(r_{yy})$	$(r_{zz})$

### Abstract Reasoning – based on Swift Executive Aptitude (SEA)

Test	Criterion Related Validity	Raw Criterion Related Validity of Equivalent SEA Sub-Test (Middle Managers N=214)	Reliability of Equivalent SEA Sub-Test*	Inter-Rater Reliability of SEA Sub-Test's Equivalent Criterion (Middle Managers N=214)	Reliability of Single Test**
Abstract Reasoning Aptitude	.21	.10	.68	.28	.83
		$(r_{xy})$	$(r_{xx})$	$(r_{yy})$	$(r_{zz})$

\* Reliability figures for the equivalent Swift sub-tests are all internal consistency figures from the largest sample size available.

\*\* Reliability figures for the single tests are all internal consistency figures from the largest sample size available.

# Saville Assessment

CI Tower  
1st Floor  
St George's Square  
New Malden  
KT3 4HG  
United Kingdom

Tel +44(0)20 8619 9000

[info@savilleassessment.com](mailto:info@savilleassessment.com)

# Saville Assessment

## WillisTowersWatson

Saville Assessment Ltd  
CI Tower  
1st Floor  
St George's Square  
New Malden  
KT3 4HG  
United Kingdom

Tel: +44 (0)20 8619 9000

[info@savilleassessment.com](mailto:info@savilleassessment.com)



Working with **50 International Partners** across **80 countries** in **35 languages**

Argentina • Australia • Austria • Bahrain • Belgium • Botswana • Brazil • Bulgaria • Canada  
Caribbean • Chile • China • Colombia • Czech Republic • Denmark • France • Germany  
Greece • Honduras • Hong Kong • Hungary • India • Indonesia • Ireland • Italy • Japan  
Mexico • Netherlands • New Zealand • Panama • Poland • Portugal • Romania • Russia  
Saudi Arabia • Singapore • Slovakia • South Africa • South Korea • Spain • Sweden  
Switzerland • Turkey • UK • Ukraine • United Arab Emirates • Uruguay • USA • Venezuela