

*CMI: GA

COMPETENCY **M**EASURING **I**NSTRUMENT: **G**ENERIC **A**SSESSMENT

REPORT

John Friggo

ID: 910550xxxxxxx

Assessment Date: 2019-11-19

CT INSURANCE

Programmer

Report date: 2021-06-29

°Competency Ability, Skill, Aptitude, Proficiency, Attitude, Attribute, Disposition, Trait, Characteristic, Orientation, Construct, Property



*CMI: GA

ORG: CT INSURANCE
JOB TITLE: PROGRAMMER

COMPETENCY MEASURING INSTRUMENT: GENERIC ASSESSMENT

SUMMARIZED REPORT

Assessment Date: 2019-11-19

NAME: John Friggo
ID: 910550xxxxxx

PART I - 1. COGNITIVE			7
1.1 Verbal Analytical & Logical Reasoning	Verbal Reasoning	9	8
1.2 Verbal Deductive Reasoning			10
1.3 Non-Verbal Perceptual Reasoning	Non-Verbal Reasoning	7	6
1.4 Non-Verbal Acuity Reasoning			8
1.5 Technical Reasoning			6
1.6 Numerical Reasoning			5
1.7 Original, Creative & Intuitive Thinking/Reasoning – Inferred			8
1.8 Accuracy –Cognitive Integrity			8
PART II COMPOSITE INTEGRITY : CIAS-MODEL			6
2. INTEGRITY – Classic and Historically Proven Integrity Properties			5
2.1 Reliability & Dependability			5
2.2 Honesty			6
2.3 Transparent & Openness (by implication the opposite to Counterproductive Work Behaviour/Orientation)			3
2.4 Sincerity, Positivity & Helping Others – individually and corporately (related to OCB)			5
2.5 Consistency & Stability			8
3. WORK ETHIC – Workplace Integrity-Related Properties			7
3.1 Motivation, Tenacity & Result/Goal/Completion Driven			6
3.2 Responsibility, Accountability, Sense of Duty & 'Taking Ownership'			9
3.3 Time - Perception, Keeping & Utilisation			6
3.4 Violation of Policies, Rules & Regulations			6
3.5 Conscientiousness – diligent, thorough, dedicated, attentive & strict			7
PART III - 4. PERSONALITY- Typical Dispositional & Trait Forces at play in Work			6
4.1 Friendly, Empathetic, Agreeable, Amiable & Accommodating			5
4.2 Patient and Cautious			5
4.3 Internal Locus of Control – in control of self			7
4.4 Susceptibility to Pressure & Vulnerability to Influence			6
4.5 Devious Disposition (manipulation, rationalisation, projection, justification, denial, defence mechanism & self-centeredness)			5
PART IV - 5. BEHAVIOUR – General Behavioural Orientation			5
5.1 Stress/Pressure & Emotion Handling			5
5.2 Problem-solving & Decision-making			6
5.3 Independence & Self-Reliance, Self-Confidence & Self-Assuredness			6
5.4 Detail, Accuracy and Quality			5
5.5 Self Development			5
PART V - 6. COMPETENCY – Established Capabilities			6
6.1 Know Own Skills/Competencies			6
6.2 Determine what (task/'job') must be done			6
6.3 Prepare to do the 'job' at hand			7
6.4 Do the 'job' at hand			5
6.5 Provide Feedback			6
PART VI - 7. MONITOR			9
7.1 Lie Detector			9
7.2 Consistency			9
7.3 Unnatural Exaggeration			10
INTEGRATED COMPETENCY RATING (ICR)			6
ADAPTED COMPETENCY RATING (ACR)			6

*Competency Ability, Skill, Aptitude, Proficiency, Attitude, Attribute, Disposition, Trait, Characteristic, Orientation, Construct, Property

Report Date: 2021-06-29

Probability of Work Success



PART 1

1 COGNITIVE CRITICAL MENTAL ABILITIES

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

This represents the candidate's General Mental Ability to deal with issues in applying cognitive awareness, sharpness, speed and the ability with which the candidate perceives, recognises and derives meaningful constructs, relationships, inter-plays between relationships, establishing order and rapidly producing solutions to complex and diverse situations through accurate, sound and logical verbal and non-verbal technical and numerical reasoning, conceptual insight, situational judgement and original, creative & intuitive thinking.

"The specific Mental Abilities constituting the candidate's intellect (mental capacity) needed by him¹ to effectively perform the critical cognitive functions associated with the job at hand."

Verbal Reasoning

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

This is the candidate's ability to typically use (or preferring to use) the spoken and written language domain in dealing with mental problem-solving from identifying the various factors constituting the situation/problem, to analysing them, to developing various ways of dealing with them and to verbally selecting the best 'approach' to solve the problem at hand.

1.1 Verbal Analytical & Logical Reasoning

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

This is the ability to verbally identify the various elements/parts a complex situation/problem consists of and how it interacts in a critical, objective, logical (cause-effect) manner, generating ways and means to deal with these issues and taking balanced and sound decisions as to which solution(s) will deal with the situations best.

1.2 Verbal Deductive Reasoning

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

This is the ability displayed by the candidate to evaluating and understanding the problem at hand by breaking mental problem-solving down into the component processes that make problem-solving possible – the componential approach, e.g. Inferring the analytical, creative and practical way.

Please Note : For the ease of reading, the *male gender* is used in this document, but also refers in all instances to the *female gender*.

Non-Verbal Reasoning



This is the candidate's ability and competency/aptitude to typically use (or preferring to use) symbols and figures (rather than the language domain) in dealing with mental problem-solving.

1.3 Non-Verbal Perceptual Reasoning



This represents the candidate's ability to *conceptualise* the various outcomes of perceived elements and how it interacts in a critical, objective, logical (cause-effect) manner in order to generate the foundations on which to base solutions.

1.4 Non-Verbal Acuity/Detail Reasoning



This is the candidate's ability to be *sensitive* and sharp to detail and in spotting small variations, deviations and/or concepts and/or problems consisting of a wide variety of variables and not to allow for obvious oversights or make unnecessary mistakes.

1.5 Technical Reasoning



This is the candidate's general inclination to the technical regime of feeling at home in dealing with technical matters, being sufficiently technically minded in the sense of understanding and applying the basic principles at play in a technically orientated discussion or environment without having the technical jargon, but being able to keep abreast by 'informed' technical reasoning.

1.6 Numerical Reasoning



This is the ability to be speedy and accurate in identifying a numeric base to a situation/problem, e.g., series and sequence formation and to effectively deal therewith in performing arithmetic computations such as adding, subtracting, multiplying, dividing and/or a combination thereof in providing solutions to the situation/problem.

1.7 Original, Creative & Intuitive Thinking/Reasoning



This is the ability to generate new and novel ideas and ways/approaches that represents a fresh look at the situation in terms of a break-away from the traditional, obvious and stereotype ways of thinking – especially in cases where applying such original and directive thinking patterns is a prerequisite to effectively solving/dealing with the situation – in finding solutions to problems.

1.8 Accuracy – Cognitive Integrity



Although not a cognitive property per sé, this scale is indicative of the candidate's behavioural disposition regarding the degree of accuracy with which he typically applies his cognitive capacity in dealing with situations or solving problems in practice. The higher the score on this scale, the more careful he tends to be in applying his mental ability accurately in solving problems and making decision in general terms – less risk-taking in the process.

PART II

COMPOSITE INTEGRITY – CIAS-MODEL

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

The candidate's Composite Integrity is the particular core set of internalized attitudes regarding all moral, ethical, values, beliefs, principles and 'real-life' phenomena the person was influenced by over his lifespan that constitutes his unique cognitive, and behavioural dispositions regarding these and related matters in a congruent, authentic and balanced way in dealing with all facets of life in the work situation – in summary, his integrated wholeness in dealing with his (work)/life in a sincere, reliable, honest, committed, motivated, accountable, consistent, balanced, responsible and conscientious manner.

2. INTEGRITY - CLASSIC & HISTORICALLY PROVEN INTEGRITY PROPERTIES

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

This embodies the candidate's internalised value system, relating to the 'classic' perception of the concept of integrity in terms of his integrated wholeness in dealing with his (work-)life in a honest, reliable, transparent, open, sincere, positive, consistent and stable way.

"Classic and proven qualities related to the construct of integrity – in general terms; whether in the personal, family and social or work domain."

2.1 Reliability & Dependability

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

This area assesses the candidate's orientation to acting in a predictable and expected way in terms of timekeeping, dealing with confidentiality, his history of honouring undertakings and his word in general as well as reaching his goals, etc. irrespective of the circumstances, conditions and time pressure.

2.2 Honesty

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

This area assesses the candidate's orientation to truthfulness, trustworthiness and credibility as a typical behavioural disposition and presenting and proving himself as such over time – not deviating from the norms and standards of righteousness and the tenacity of ownership; e.g., never stealing, lying, not open to bribery of any kind, etc., irrespective of the situation, circumstances or conditions – being steadfast regarding his orientation without being 'pushy' in living it out in his (work-)life.

2.3 Transparency & Openness (by implication the opposite of CWB in essence)

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

This represents the degree and general disposition on the part of the candidate to share information and open himself to others in a trusting, informative and discussional fashion as well as to be known to others as such, opposed to typically keeping matters 'close to his 'chest', being secretive in dealing with others while keeping them at a distance and where an extremely low score tends to co-inside with the typical characteristics related to 'The Dark Trait of Personality'; demonstrating the tell-tale symptoms of Counterproductive Work Behaviour (CWB).

2.4 Sincerity & Positivity & Helping Others – individually & corporately (related to OCB)

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

This is the overall impression the candidate has on people as being a frank, upfront, straightforward and genuine person you can work with, share your needs/problems with and rely on his intention and eagerness to serve your best interest and assisting you where possible without expecting anything in return – related to the concept of Organisational Citizenship Behaviour (OCB).

2.5 Consistency & Stability

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

The more the candidate favours a consistent, steady, predictable, stable, etc. work situation and (by implication) the more control he can ensure/accomplish in the process, the higher the score will be on this scale. This is particularly applicable to himself – the more consistent and (also emotionally) stable he is (can be), the higher the score will be on this scale.

3. WORK ETHIC - CIAS BASED WORKPLACE DIFFERENTIATION IN AN ETHICAL SENSE

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

This assesses the candidate in terms of his degree of motivation, goal attainment, responsibility, accountability, sense of duty, optimal utilisation of time, compliance to policies and standards and his conscientiousness in being diligent and thorough – i.e., his positive and dedicated orientation, in an ethical sense, to his work and the organisation per sé.

“Part of CIAS© (Composite Integrity Assessment Strategy-Model) of differentiating between Good & Bad, in an ethical sense, in the world of work.”

3.1 Motivation, Tenacity & Result/Goal/Completion Driven

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

This is the degree of commitment and drive the candidate is bringing to the table in performing his work and in completing his goal(s) as a typical orientation in doing his job.

3.2 Responsibility, Accountability, Sense of Duty & ‘Taking Ownership’

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

This is the extent to which the candidate is able and willing to demonstrate a sense of duty and taking responsibility as well as being accountable; in taking ownership for the tasks and objectives allocated to him (coming his way) - walking the extra proverbial mile.

3.3 Time - Perception, Keeping/Punctuality & Utilization

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

This is describing the candidate’s general orientation and perception of time (e.g., negative vs. positive) – a higher score on this scale is indicative of whether the candidate is good at time management and the optimal using of the time to his disposal (even creating time towards the extreme high levels), while the opposite on the scale also applies.

3.4 Violation of Policies, Rules & Regulations



This is the extent to which the candidate, in line with his overall internalized orientation to policies, rules, realisation and standard per sé, tends to willingly adhere to and be guided by them and not deliberately ignoring, 'working around' or breaking them himself, but also promoting others to be the same way inclined.

3.5 Conscientiousness – diligent, thorough, dedicated, attentive & strict



The more well-developed the candidate's inherent level and set of norms and standards are regarding taking his duties and life seriously, in terms of being dedicated, diligent, thorough, attentive to detail, strict, committed, reliable and morally and ethically soundly based in the process, the higher the score is – *the fruit of the tree*.

4 PERSONALITY - TYPICAL DISPOSITIONAL AND TRAIT FORCES AT PLAY



This part of assessing and predicting the probability of the candidate to excel in the effective performance of work per sé, focuses on measuring the personality dispositional and typical trait forces related to enhanced work behaviour embodied in the functional requirements profile of the work/job at hand in general terms – e.g. good human relations, friendly, empathy and amenable while displaying a patient and an accommodating approach with a strong locus of control and stance against being susceptible to pressure and making himself guilty of devious practices in dealing with others (clients, e.g. superior, subordinates, co-workers, clients, etc.)

“Dispositions, orientations & traits typical to a person – representing guiding/directing forces to determine behaviour in general as applicable to the work situation.”

4.1 Friendly, Empathetic, Agreeable, Amiable & Accommodating



This represents the candidate's friendly, open and accommodating disposition to others/clients and the willingness and ability to effectively deal with their needs and different standpoints in an empathetic, agreeable and human way.

4.2 Patient & Cautious



The person scoring at the lower levels of the scale would typically opt for the more bold and higher risk aversion orientation in a particular (uncertain) situation than people scoring at the higher levels – the former person also tends to associate patience and cautiousness with being weak and submissive; presenting more of a loser-mentality which is of course a fallacy.

4.3 Internal Locus of Control - in control of self



This describes the person's basic and inherent orientation of not being the victim of 'life's streams', but in control thereof, not to let fate determine the outcome of his life, but being master of his own future - displaying a natural and typical disposition to dealing with each situation by taking responsibility and control thereof rather than capitulating and accepting a 'go with the flow' attitude (especially if he may benefit in the process - 'being selfish') and blaming other people or the situation for the dilemma he is in; using defence mechanisms like projection, denial, rationalisation, etc.

4.4 Susceptibility to Pressure & Vulnerability to Influence



This represents the probability of the person to being susceptible to the pressure *others/clients* may bring to bear on him (e.g., 'giving-in' to their demands/wishes even if these wishes are in oppositions to the views/standard of the candidate or what is in general terms expected of him in this regard) or to submit to the opportunities the '*situation*' (not necessarily involving other people/clients) may offer him.

4.5 Devious Disposition (manipulation, rationalisation, projection, justification, denial, defense mechanism & self-centeredness)



This represents the candidate's inclination to 'instinctively' demonstrate a devious orientation in dealing with others (e.g., using manipulation, denial, rationalisation, cunning, evasiveness, self-centredness, etc.) that may help him reaching his objective, but may at the same time carry with it, in its very nature, the real danger of detrimentally effecting his trust, as well as reliable and effective relationships with others.

PART IV

5. BEHAVIOUR – GENERAL BEHAVIOURAL ORIENTATION



A wide variety of behavioural factors proved to be closely related to effective work performance in general terms as reported on in research conducted in the world of work over many years and covering a wide (rather indefinite) spectrum of job-types – especially at the lower organisational level; not particularly including the executive hierarchical level, but neither excluding it specifically, either. An adapted Stepwise Regression Analysis (SRA) process was used to determine the five most significant 'role-players' in this regard in terms of declaring the (total) variance related to the (rather 'generalized') success of the work/job-types involved in the randomly selected research studies. It proved to be more the human side associated to the effective functioning (i.e., doing the job) per sé – e.g., independent and self-assured functioning, stress and emotional controlling, problem-solving and decision-making, accuracy and self-development.

"Behavioural orientation as it established itself in the candidate in general terms and is not necessarily related to the concept of 'Good vs Bad' (in an ethical sense) or representing a specific skills-base per sé related to the job at hand."

5.1 Stress/Pressure & Emotion Handling



This scale reflects on the candidate's typical dealing with situations at work where stress and emotions are involved. This represents the candidate's typical attitude and orientation to and way of handling and reacting to stress, pressure-causing and emotion-related situations. People scoring at the lower levels of the scale tend to live on a continuous basis at higher stress levels and respond more negatively and extremely to pressure and stress- and emotion-evoking situations as well as panic more easily and extremely when things 'go wrong'. At the more extreme lower levels, people tend to become less effective in cognitively dealing with issues, especially with decision-making and to overlook important aspects related to the matter at hand and to become less self-assured – especially when dealing with someone or situations on his own.

5.2 Problem-solving & Decision-making



This represents the candidate's willingness and ability to, not only considering the obvious problem at hand, but also those related to the issue in its wider context as well as the consequences it may have in applying it in practice – and/or following it up.

In most cases a low score on this scale is caused by the reluctance on the part of the candidate to actually making a decision per sé, but also on lacking self-assurance – i.e., poor ego-strength or not trusting the effectiveness of the decision he can produce to deal sufficiently with the issue/situation at hand.

5.3 Independence & Self-Reliance, Self-Confidence & Self-Assuredness



This is describing the candidate's willingness and ability to rely on his own skills and abilities to function in an independent way in dealing with the main issues comprising his day-to-day job and to perform it successfully without needing constant guidance and assistance from other people – for e.g., other experienced colleagues, superiors or supervisors. A person that is found lacking in self-reliance and functioning in an independent way under these circumstances are becoming a burden rather than a benefit to his employer. This orientation is particularly presenting itself at the lower level scores on this scale.

This scale differentiate, along a constant continuum, to what degree the candidate can function effectively in an independent and self-reliant manner under 'normal' and even uncommon and trying circumstances – it proves to have an inherent willingness and competence element to it and is not only, or primarily, related to the experience the candidate has at offer, but also his self-confidence and self-assurance. The latter is particularly coming through on the higher level scores on this scale.

5.4 Detail, Accuracy and Quality



This scale reflects on the degree of detail the candidate covers, as a typical behavioural disposition, in performing his function. It is taken for granted that he may tend to invest more time and effort in the process – i.e., opting for a higher degree of accuracy (and by implication a low level of mistakes) which produced a higher level of quality of results. This scale is focussing on the former, i.e., more detail and the higher probability of producing a higher level of accuracy and better quality of results. It is silent on the possibility that he may, as a result of this, produce at a lower volume level.

5.5 Self Development



This scale reflects the extent to which the candidate favours development per sé; the value thereof in general terms, but also for himself as well as the probability that he may partake therein. The middle scores on the scale are indicative of a person that will most probably make use of a development facility if offered to him by his employer. If it is not provided, he will respond like the low-scorer – not really interested, even opposing training in all its facets. The higher the score, the higher the possibility that the person will even ‘create’ his own development facility and use it on a continuous basis.

PART V

6. COMPETENCY – CAPABILITIES ESTABLISHED TO IMPROVE WORK PERFORMANCE



Longitudinal research conducted with the main purpose of determining what competency-related variables significantly differentiate amongst people with sufficient/adequate life and work experience regarding their **effective performance** in the workplace, proved beyond doubt that the **‘doing phase’** of the performance property (embracing the following naturally interlinked range of competencies: Knowing own competencies, Determining what (‘job’/project) must be done, Preparing to do the ‘job’, Doing the ‘job’ at hand and Providing feedback – including the finalization, evaluation and reporting on the final result), represent the most important differentiating and common denominators/competencies.

“The degree to which the above interlinked range of competencies are possessed and effectively demonstrated by the candidate (related to the job/project in the workplace), the higher the score on the relevant ability/competency scale will present itself.”

6.1 Know own skills/competencies



The better the candidate knows what particular arsenal of competencies and proven skills he has to his disposal and the depth of such knowledge and practical experience in applying them, the higher his score would be on this scale.

6.2 Determine what task/‘job’ must be done



The more positive and dedicated the candidate is to precisely establish **what** the project/work to be done consist of, the more sound and well-based the planning, conducting and successful completion thereof in practice would tend to be – and of course, the higher the score on this scale (in general terms) prove to be.

6.3 Prepare to do the ‘job’ at hand



There exists a significantly high correlation between the (productive) time spend on preparing to do a project/job (e.g., developing goals and schedules and communicating with others involved in the new job before starting it, as well as ensuring that everything needed to do the job is available) and the effective performance and completion thereof – the higher the score on this scale the better.

6.4 Do the 'job' at hand



The probability that the candidate will effectively and efficiently perform the job, is 'predicted' by the magnitude of the score obtained in this scale.

6.5 Provide Feedback



The orientation/practice of the candidate to keeping his superior/client involved and informed/updated about the progress being made or possible changes required in the planned goals and/or schedules as well as his following the superior/client up after a few months on completing the job in order to establish whether he is still satisfied with the outcome, is being assessed in this scale – the higher the score the better.

PART VI

7. MONITOR - ENSURING THE VALIDITY OF INFORMATION PROVIDED IN COMPLETING THE TEST



This part contains the *controlling mechanism* and *certifying division* of the test. This composite scale assesses the degree of objectivity, open-mindedness, accuracy and truthfulness with which the candidate completed this self-reporting instrument. The testee is providing the information on the specialized area covered and assessed by the instrument regarding himself by responding to questions posed to him. In the first instance it is only human that people would like to present themselves as *best* they can. Secondly, there is always a question whether they are sufficiently in *command of the language* the test is posing the questions in. Thirdly, people may tend to *inflate* the information they provide. These 'questions' are covered in the following three scales which this composite scale is based on.

"Checks and Balances" to determine how accurately the candidate completed the test – i.e., to provide reliable and valid information about himself."

7.1 Lie Detector



The Lie Detector portion of the Monitor Part of the test assesses the *degree* to which the testee was open-minded, truthful and 'honest' in providing the information on himself during the assessment process. The test employs *four approaches* in collecting data about the Lie Detector issue, namely:

- Specifically devised ten 'Lie-Questions.'
- Ten 'Force-Field Questions'
- Five Stem Factors and
- Five deliberately 'Confusing Questions.'

This Lie Detector score is by implication also indicative of the candidate's inherent orientation to honesty, basic trustworthiness and accountability. A Low-Score is a strong indication of a *dishonest orientation* on the part of the candidate, considering the fact that the testees are warned against misrepresenting themselves during the completion of the questionnaire. A score below '5' is considered to be a knock-out in that the user of the test cannot rely on the truthfulness of the information supplied by the candidate.



*CMI: GA

ORG: CT INSURANCE
JOB TITLE: PROGRAMMER

COMPETENCY MEASURING INSTRUMENT: GENERIC ASSESSMENT EXTENDED DEFINED REPORT

NAME: John Friggo

7.2 Consistency



The Consistency portion of the Monitor Part of the test assesses mainly the *degree* to which the testee is consistently deviating from the truth as well as whether he is in *command of the language* used in the assessment process and how well he *comprehended* the *meaning* of each question put to him and the *purpose* of the test. The degree of Consistency is also presented on a sten scale in the Summarized Report of the test and a score of lower than a '5' on this scale should be viewed with apprehension.

7.3 Unnatural Exaggeration



The Unnatural Exaggeration portion of the Monitor Part of the test assesses the *degree* to which the testee is prone to *inflating* the information he supplies in the instrument. The degree that a person tends to consistently inflate/exaggerate himself, in dealing with others/clients, as a typical behavioural disposition, is particularly concerning. A score of '4' and below on this scale should not be ignored.

INTEGRATED COMPETENCY RATING (ICR)



This composite scale best represents all above areas of assessment produced by the CMI-GA as a single weighted integrated score.

ADAPTED COMPETENCY RATING (ACR)



This scale represents a converted score of the above ICR by adjusting it to the degree the candidate 'lied' in completing the CMI-GA as well as taking his Consistency and Unnatural Exaggeration scores in consideration – leaving the user with a much more reliable single score on the total CMI-GA.