



# TTI Performance Systems on Adverse Impact

## What is Adverse Impact and/or Disparate Impact?

Under the Disparate Impact rule, an employer may not use an employment practice (e.g., a pre-employment aptitude test) that, even though neutral on its face and applied to all applicants or employees disproportionately excludes members of a protected category. **An employer can defend its reliance on such an employment practice only if the employer proves that the challenged practice is job related for the position in question and consistent with business necessity.**

Applicants for employment, promotion, or other employment benefits who challenge the denial of the benefit to them will have to prove that the specific employment practice at issue has a disparate impact, unless the applicant proves that the elements of the employer's decision-making process are not capable of separation for analysis, in which case the entire decision-making process may be analyzed as one employment practice.

The Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) has long advocated the “80 percent” rule to assess when a particular employment practice has an unlawful disparate impact. Some standard is necessary because all employment criteria will exclude some applicants or employees.

Essentially, the EEOC has determined that if the selection rate of a particular employment practice for a protected category is less than 80 percent of the selection rate for the relevant comparison group, that employment practice has a disparate impact. While the administrative 80 percent rule has not been incorporated into statute, the EEOC and the courts look to the rule as a guide in determining disparate impact challenges.



## What is a Pre-Employment Aptitude Test?

An aptitude test by definition is any number of various tests given to measure abilities, such as manual dexterity, visual acuity, reasoning, or verbal comprehension, and used to assist in the selection of a career. By definition it is also assumed that a pass/fail rating is determined for such tests.

## How are Assessments from TTI Performance Systems Different?

Overall TTI assessments are not pass/fail assessments. **While on the surface some of the assessments appear to have ten as the best “score” this is not the case.** Each factor of measurement can be a strength on either end of the scale (a zero all the way to a ten). This is because of our job-related process. TTI does not recommend using assessments in hiring unless you have completed our job benchmarking process.

The job benchmarking process is designed to provide clarity as to the position requirements, key accountabilities, skills,

behaviors and motivators for each position within an organization. While TTI has over 7000 job benchmarks available, it is recommended to complete the process within each organization for each position.

Because the TTI assessments are not pass/fail, the “80 percent” rule has to be applied differently. In order to illustrate TTI’s compliance with this standard, we look at the mean of the measured factors for the general population as well as male/female, veteran status, disability status and ethnicity. The following charts will demonstrate that the TTI assessments do not have more than a 20 percent difference in how protected groups score versus the general population.

## Adverse Impact Study Completed in 2010

**Conclusion—There is no evidence to suggest any of the TTI assessments (DISC, Values, HVP) could cause adverse impact with regard to gender, race, disability or veteran status.**

Even though the means of the subgroups are statistically different from the means of the general population, they are all well within the EEOC guideline of 80 percent and well within the first standard deviation from the population mean.



# Behavioral/DISC Findings as of September 2010

## Random Sample N=35389

| Measurement | Mean  | Standard Deviation |
|-------------|-------|--------------------|
| Dominance   | 51.74 | 24.33              |
| Influence   | 57.58 | 25.75              |
| Steadiness  | 47.87 | 27.62              |
| Compliance  | 52.81 | 23.75              |

## Males N= 21814

| Measurement | Mean  | Standard Deviation | % Difference from Random Sample |
|-------------|-------|--------------------|---------------------------------|
| Dominance   | 55.56 | 23.53              | 3.82%                           |
| Influence   | 54.71 | 25.7               | 2.87%                           |
| Steadiness  | 43.72 | 27.02              | 4.15%                           |
| Compliance  | 53.47 | 23.18              | 0.65%                           |

## Females N=13575

| Measurement | Mean  | Standard Deviation | % Difference from Random Sample | % Difference from Non-Protected Group* |
|-------------|-------|--------------------|---------------------------------|--|
| Dominance   | 45.60 | 24.33              | 6.14%                           | 9.96%                                  |
| Influence   | 62.18 | 25.17              | 4.61%                           | 7.48%                                  |
| Steadiness  | 54.53 | 27.27              | 6.66%                           | 10.81%                                 |
| Compliance  | 51.76 | 24.61              | 1.05%                           | 1.71%                                  |



## Behavioral/DISC Findings as of September 2010

### *Caucasians N=14355*

| Measurement | Mean  | Standard Deviation | % Difference from Random Sample |
|-------------|-------|--------------------|---------------------------------|
| Dominance   | 52.32 | 25.39              | 0.58%                           |
| Influence   | 58.79 | 26.5               | 1.22%                           |
| Steadiness  | 48.35 | 28.69              | 0.48%                           |
| Compliance  | 51.63 | 24.2               | 1.18%                           |

### *African Americans N=2005*

| Measurement | Mean  | Standard Deviation | % Difference from Random Sample | % Difference from Non-Protected Group* |
|-------------|-------|--------------------|---------------------------------|--|
| Dominance   | 48.51 | 22.36              | 3.23%                           | 3.81%                                  |
| Influence   | 51.04 | 23.57              | 6.53%                           | 7.75%                                  |
| Steadiness  | 52.07 | 26.45              | 4.20%                           | 3.72%                                  |
| Compliance  | 57.65 | 20.44              | 4.84%                           | 6.02%                                  |

### *Hispanic N=1047*

| Measurement | Mean  | Standard Deviation | % Difference from Random Sample | % Difference from Non-Protected Group* |
|-------------|-------|--------------------|---------------------------------|--|
| Dominance   | 50.19 | 22.76              | 1.55%                           | 2.13%                                  |
| Influence   | 56.30 | 25.57              | 1.27%                           | 2.49%                                  |
| Steadiness  | 47.91 | 27.15              | 0.04%                           | 0.44%                                  |
| Compliance  | 55.30 | 22.92              | 2.49%                           | 3.67%                                  |



## Behavioral/DISC Findings as of September 2010

### *Asian N=705*

| Measurement | Mean  | Standard Deviation | % Difference from Random Sample | % Difference from Non-Protected Group* |
|-------------|-------|--------------------|---------------------------------|--|
| Dominance   | 47.89 | 23.89              | 3.85%                           | 4.43%                                  |
| Influence   | 50.28 | 25.22              | 7.29%                           | 8.51%                                  |
| Steadiness  | 50.78 | 27.56              | 2.91%                           | 2.43%                                  |
| Compliance  | 59.77 | 22.9               | 6.95%                           | 8.13%                                  |

### *Hawaiian/Pacific Islander N=75*

| Measurement | Mean  | Standard Deviation | % Difference from Random Sample | % Difference from Non-Protected Group* |
|-------------|-------|--------------------|---------------------------------|--|
| Dominance   | 47.43 | 20.69              | 4.31%                           | 4.90%                                  |
| Influence   | 55.48 | 28                 | 2.10%                           | 3.31%                                  |
| Steadiness  | 52.64 | 27.61              | 4.77%                           | 4.29%                                  |
| Compliance  | 55.67 | 23.84              | 2.85%                           | 4.03%                                  |

### *Disabled N=255*

| Measurement | Mean  | Standard Deviation | % Difference from Random Sample | % Difference from Non-Protected Group* |
|-------------|-------|--------------------|---------------------------------|--|
| Dominance   | 49.60 | 25.51              | 2.14%                           | 4.21%                                  |
| Influence   | 50.59 | 25.53              | 6.69%                           | 9.77%                                  |
| Steadiness  | 52.05 | 28.46              | 4.18%                           | 3.99%                                  |
| Compliance  | 57.99 | 24.53              | 5.18%                           | 7.03%                                  |



## Behavioral/DISC Findings as of September 2010

### *Disabled Veteran N=125*

| Measurement | Mean  | Standard Deviation | % Difference from Random Sample | % Difference from Non-Protected Group* |
|-------------|-------|--------------------|---------------------------------|--|
| Dominance   | 57.11 | 24.21              | 5.37%                           | 5.97%                                  |
| Influence   | 52.18 | 26.12              | 5.40%                           | 5.73%                                  |
| Steadiness  | 42.66 | 27.02              | 5.22%                           | 6.52%                                  |
| Compliance  | 54.69 | 21.22              | 1.87%                           | 1.92%                                  |

### *Vietnam Veteran N=402*

| Measurement | Mean  | Standard Deviation | % Difference from Random Sample | % Difference from Non-Protected Group* |
|-------------|-------|--------------------|---------------------------------|--|
| Dominance   | 55.53 | 25.22              | 3.79%                           | 4.39%                                  |
| Influence   | 50.77 | 26.08              | 6.80%                           | 7.13%                                  |
| Steadiness  | 45.34 | 29.26              | 2.53%                           | 3.84%                                  |
| Compliance  | 55.68 | 22.72              | 2.86%                           | 2.91%                                  |

### *Other Veteran N=1414*

| Measurement | Mean  | Standard Deviation | % Difference from Random Sample | % Difference from Non-Protected Group* |
|-------------|-------|--------------------|---------------------------------|--|
| Dominance   | 55.45 | 24.03              | 3.71%                           | 4.31%                                  |
| Influence   | 53.11 | 25.78              | 4.46%                           | 4.79%                                  |
| Steadiness  | 44.80 | 27.85              | 3.07%                           | 4.38%                                  |
| Compliance  | 54.44 | 22.89              | 1.63%                           | 1.68%                                  |



# Motivators/PIAV Findings as of September 2010

**Random Sample N=35388**

| Measurement     | Mean  | Standard Deviation |
|-----------------|-------|--------------------|
| Theoretical     | 57.50 | 14.47              |
| Utilitarian     | 60.95 | 16.08              |
| Aesthetic       | 30.71 | 16.53              |
| Individualistic | 52.71 | 13.54              |
| Social          | 59.01 | 14.75              |
| Traditional     | 39.12 | 17.01              |

**Males N=21813**

| Measurement     | Mean  | Standard Deviation | % Difference from Random Sample |
|-----------------|-------|--------------------|---------------------------------|
| Theoretical     | 59.16 | 14.49              | 1.66%                           |
| Utilitarian     | 62.93 | 15.85              | 1.99%                           |
| Aesthetic       | 28.06 | 15.6               | 2.65%                           |
| Individualistic | 55.64 | 12.88              | 3.02%                           |
| Social          | 56.04 | 14.41              | 2.97%                           |
| Traditional     | 37.17 | 17.16              | 0.99%                           |

**Females N=13575**

| Measurement     | Mean  | Standard Deviation | % Difference from Random Sample | % Difference from Non-Protected Group* |
|-----------------|-------|--------------------|---------------------------------|--|
| Theoretical     | 54.84 | 14.04              | 2.66%                           | 4.32%                                  |
| Utilitarian     | 57.75 | 15.93              | 3.20%                           | 5.18%                                  |
| Aesthetic       | 34.97 | 17.07              | 4.26%                           | 7.05%                                  |
| Individualistic | 47.99 | 13.23              | 4.86%                           | 7.88%                                  |
| Social          | 63.77 | 14.04              | 4.77%                           | 7.73%                                  |
| Traditional     | 40.67 | 16.66              | 1.59%                           | 2.58%                                  |



## Motivators/PIAV Findings as of September 2010

### **Caucasians N=14354**

| Measurement     | Mean  | Standard Deviation | % Difference from Random Sample |
|-----------------|-------|--------------------|---------------------------------|
| Theoretical     | 57.84 | 14.66              | 0.33%                           |
| Utilitarian     | 60.54 | 16.12              | 0.40%                           |
| Aesthetic       | 30.88 | 16.6               | 0.17%                           |
| Individualistic | 53.20 | 13.8               | 0.51%                           |
| Social          | 58.95 | 14.93              | 0.06%                           |
| Traditional     | 38.59 | 16.81              | 0.55%                           |

### **African Americans N=2005**

| Measurement     | Mean  | Standard Deviation | % Difference from Random Sample | % Difference from Non-Protected Group* |
|-----------------|-------|--------------------|---------------------------------|--|
| Theoretical     | 53.71 | 13.01              | 3.79%                           | 4.13%                                  |
| Utilitarian     | 59.51 | 15.49              | 1.44%                           | 1.03%                                  |
| Aesthetic       | 26.17 | 14.61              | 4.54%                           | 4.70%                                  |
| Individualistic | 49.60 | 12.18              | 4.24%                           | 4.74%                                  |
| Social          | 64.18 | 13.65              | 5.17%                           | 5.23%                                  |
| Traditional     | 47.82 | 16.03              | 8.97%                           | 9.93%                                  |

### **Hispanic N=1047**

| Measurement     | Mean  | Standard Deviation | % Difference from Random Sample | % Difference from Non-Protected Group* |
|-----------------|-------|--------------------|---------------------------------|--|
| Theoretical     | 58.77 | 14.09              | 1.27%                           | 0.93%                                  |
| Utilitarian     | 59.27 | 16.21              | 1.68%                           | 1.28%                                  |
| Aesthetic       | 31.59 | 16.12              | 0.88%                           | 0.71%                                  |
| Individualistic | 50.30 | 13.28              | 2.48%                           | 2.99%                                  |
| Social          | 60.03 | 14.69              | 1.02%                           | 1.08%                                  |
| Traditional     | 40.07 | 15.92              | 0.98%                           | 1.59%                                  |



## Motivators/PIAV Findings as of September 2010

### *Asian N=705*

| Measurement     | Mean  | Standard Deviation | % Difference from Random Sample | % Difference from Non-Protected Group* |
|-----------------|-------|--------------------|---------------------------------|--|
| Theoretical     | 63.66 | 14.79              | 6.16%                           | 5.82%                                  |
| Utilitarian     | 60.21 | 16.97              | 0.74%                           | 0.34%                                  |
| Aesthetic       | 30.78 | 15.76              | 0.07%                           | 0.10%                                  |
| Individualistic | 47.84 | 13.18              | 5.02%                           | 5.53%                                  |
| Social          | 59.22 | 14.19              | 0.22%                           | 0.27%                                  |
| Traditional     | 38.27 | 15.72              | 0.89%                           | 0.35%                                  |

### *Hawaiian/Pacific Islander N=75*

| Measurement     | Mean  | Standard Deviation | % Difference from Random Sample | % Difference from Non-Protected Group* |
|-----------------|-------|--------------------|---------------------------------|--|
| Theoretical     | 56.08 | 15.49              | 1.42%                           | 1.76%                                  |
| Utilitarian     | 57.71 | 18.23              | 3.24%                           | 2.84%                                  |
| Aesthetic       | 31.89 | 17.31              | 1.18%                           | 1.01%                                  |
| Individualistic | 49.56 | 12.42              | 3.24%                           | 3.75%                                  |
| Social          | 61.05 | 15.13              | 2.05%                           | 2.11%                                  |
| Traditional     | 43.67 | 15.56              | 4.68%                           | 5.46%                                  |

### *Disabled N=255*

| Measurement     | Mean  | Standard Deviation | % Difference from Random Sample | % Difference from Non-Protected Group* |
|-----------------|-------|--------------------|---------------------------------|--|
| Theoretical     | 57.64 | 14.62              | 0.13%                           | 0.11%                                  |
| Utilitarian     | 55.13 | 16.15              | 5.82%                           | 3.08%                                  |
| Aesthetic       | 31.86 | 17.3               | 1.15%                           | 1.43%                                  |
| Individualistic | 50.25 | 15.05              | 2.53%                           | 3.06%                                  |
| Social          | 61.71 | 16.58              | 2.70%                           | 2.65%                                  |
| Traditional     | 43.37 | 17.86              | 4.38%                           | 0.96%                                  |



## Motivators/PIAV Findings as of September 2010

### **Disabled Veteran N=125**

| Measurement     | Mean  | Standard Deviation | % Difference from Random Sample | % Difference from Non-Protected Group* |
|-----------------|-------|--------------------|---------------------------------|--|
| Theoretical     | 59.13 | 15.15              | 1.62%                           | 1.66%                                  |
| Utilitarian     | 57.38 | 17.02              | 3.56%                           | 3.01%                                  |
| Aesthetic       | 26.99 | 15.63              | 3.72%                           | 3.81%                                  |
| Individualistic | 57.10 | 14.1               | 4.53%                           | 5.66%                                  |
| Social          | 58.11 | 15.2               | 0.89%                           | 1.83%                                  |
| Traditional     | 41.12 | 16.3               | 2.06%                           | 1.42%                                  |

### **Vietnam Veteran N=402**

| Measurement     | Mean  | Standard Deviation | % Difference from Random Sample | % Difference from Non-Protected Group* |
|-----------------|-------|--------------------|---------------------------------|--|
| Theoretical     | 58.33 | 15                 | 0.83%                           | 0.86%                                  |
| Utilitarian     | 58.04 | 16.03              | 2.91%                           | 2.36%                                  |
| Aesthetic       | 28.06 | 14.75              | 2.65%                           | 2.74%                                  |
| Individualistic | 57.80 | 12.72              | 5.25%                           | 6.39%                                  |
| Social          | 56.71 | 13.84              | 2.30%                           | 3.24%                                  |
| Traditional     | 41.03 | 17.71              | 1.97%                           | 1.33%                                  |

### **Other Veteran N=1414**

| Measurement     | Mean  | Standard Deviation | % Difference from Random Sample | % Difference from Non-Protected Group* |
|-----------------|-------|--------------------|---------------------------------|--|
| Theoretical     | 59.66 | 14.4               | 2.16%                           | 2.19%                                  |
| Utilitarian     | 59.45 | 15.49              | 1.49%                           | 0.94%                                  |
| Aesthetic       | 27.52 | 15.51              | 3.19%                           | 3.28%                                  |
| Individualistic | 57.12 | 13.86              | 4.55%                           | 5.68%                                  |
| Social          | 56.90 | 14.69              | 2.11%                           | 3.05%                                  |
| Traditional     | 39.32 | 17                 | 0.20%                           | 0.48%                                  |



# Hartman Value Profile/HVP Findings as of September 2010

**Random Sample N=33152**

| Measurement        | Mean | Standard Deviation |
|--------------------|------|--------------------|
| Empathetic Outlook | 7.94 | 1.36               |
| Practical Thinking | 7.66 | 1.6                |
| Systems Judgment   | 7.48 | 1.37               |
| Sense of Self      | 7.41 | 1.27               |
| Role Awareness     | 6.91 | 1.44               |
| Self Direction     | 7.09 | 1.19               |

**Males N=20671**

| Measurement        | Mean | Standard Deviation | % Difference from Random Sample |
|--------------------|------|--------------------|---------------------------------|
| Empathetic Outlook | 7.98 | 1.3                | 0.41%                           |
| Practical Thinking | 7.77 | 1.48               | 1.10%                           |
| Systems Judgment   | 7.49 | 1.34               | 0.11%                           |
| Sense of Self      | 7.39 | 1.26               | 0.16%                           |
| Role Awareness     | 6.92 | 1.43               | 0.17%                           |
| Self Direction     | 7.04 | 1.19               | 0.56%                           |

**Females N=12481**

| Measurement        | Mean | Standard Deviation | % Difference from Random Sample | % Difference from Non-Protected Group* |
|--------------------|------|--------------------|---------------------------------|--|
| Empathetic Outlook | 7.87 | 1.47               | 0.69%                           | 1.10%                                  |
| Practical Thinking | 7.48 | 1.77               | 1.83%                           | 2.93%                                  |
| Systems Judgment   | 7.46 | 1.44               | 0.18%                           | 0.29%                                  |
| Sense of Self      | 7.43 | 1.27               | 0.27%                           | 0.43%                                  |
| Role Awareness     | 6.88 | 1.47               | 0.29%                           | 0.46%                                  |
| Self Direction     | 7.18 | 1.18               | 0.92%                           | 1.48%                                  |



## Hartman Value Profile/HVP Findings as of September 2010

### **Caucasians N=12806**

| Measurement        | Mean | Standard Deviation | % Difference from Random Sample |
|--------------------|------|--------------------|---------------------------------|
| Empathetic Outlook | 8.05 | 1.26               | 1.16%                           |
| Practical Thinking | 7.78 | 1.47               | 1.24%                           |
| Systems Judgment   | 7.56 | 1.3                | 0.82%                           |
| Sense of Self      | 7.15 | 1.15               | 0.58%                           |
| Role Awareness     | 6.99 | 1.3                | 0.83%                           |
| Self Direction     | 7.15 | 1.15               | 0.58%                           |

### **African Americans N=1841**

| Measurement        | Mean | Standard Deviation | % Difference from Random Sample | % Difference from Non-Protected Group* |
|--------------------|------|--------------------|---------------------------------|--|
| Empathetic Outlook | 7.41 | 1.75               | 5.24%                           | 6.40%                                  |
| Practical Thinking | 6.92 | 2.12               | 7.41%                           | 8.65%                                  |
| Systems Judgment   | 7.00 | 1.67               | 4.81%                           | 5.62%                                  |
| Sense of Self      | 7.52 | 1.25               | 1.13%                           | 0.73%                                  |
| Role Awareness     | 7.02 | 1.37               | 1.13%                           | 0.30%                                  |
| Self Direction     | 7.13 | 1.26               | 0.37%                           | 0.21%                                  |

### **Hispanic N=858**

| Measurement        | Mean | Standard Deviation | % Difference from Random Sample | % Difference from Non-Protected Group* |
|--------------------|------|--------------------|---------------------------------|--|
| Empathetic Outlook | 7.65 | 1.55               | 2.83%                           | 3.98%                                  |
| Practical Thinking | 7.36 | 1.73               | 3.01%                           | 4.25%                                  |
| Systems Judgment   | 7.24 | 1.44               | 2.32%                           | 3.14%                                  |
| Sense of Self      | 7.44 | 1.26               | 0.31%                           | 0.09%                                  |
| Role Awareness     | 6.95 | 1.42               | 0.48%                           | 0.36%                                  |
| Self Direction     | 7.09 | 1.18               | 0.00%                           | 0.58%                                  |



## Hartman Value Profile/HVP Findings as of September 2010

### *Asian N=621*

| Measurement        | Mean | Standard Deviation | % Difference from Random Sample | % Difference from Non-Protected Group* |
|--------------------|------|--------------------|---------------------------------|--|
| Empathetic Outlook | 7.20 | 1.75               | 7.32%                           | 8.48%                                  |
| Practical Thinking | 7.25 | 1.94               | 4.07%                           | 5.31%                                  |
| Systems Judgment   | 7.01 | 1.61               | 4.63%                           | 5.44%                                  |
| Sense of Self      | 6.95 | 1.39               | 4.59%                           | 4.99%                                  |
| Role Awareness     | 6.89 | 1.42               | 0.17%                           | 1.03%                                  |
| Self Direction     | 6.89 | 1.31               | 2.08%                           | 2.66%                                  |

### *Hawaiian/Pacific Islander N=64*

| Measurement        | Mean | Standard Deviation | % Difference from Random Sample | % Difference from Non-Protected Group* |
|--------------------|------|--------------------|---------------------------------|--|
| Empathetic Outlook | 7.91 | 1.5                | 0.27%                           | 1.42%                                  |
| Practical Thinking | 7.51 | 1.83               | 1.53%                           | 2.77%                                  |
| Systems Judgment   | 7.39 | 1.33               | 0.86%                           | 1.67%                                  |
| Sense of Self      | 7.45 | 1.1                | 0.48%                           | 0.08%                                  |
| Role Awareness     | 7.21 | 1.25               | 3.04%                           | 2.26%                                  |
| Self Direction     | 7.16 | 1                  | 0.73%                           | 0.15%                                  |

### *Disabled N=201*

| Measurement        | Mean | Standard Deviation | % Difference from Random Sample | % Difference from Non-Protected Group* |
|--------------------|------|--------------------|---------------------------------|--|
| Empathetic Outlook | 7.82 | 1.39               | 1.12%                           | 0.13%                                  |
| Practical Thinking | 7.43 | 1.82               | 2.24%                           | 1.33%                                  |
| Systems Judgment   | 7.19 | 1.54               | 2.91%                           | 2.12%                                  |
| Sense of Self      | 7.22 | 1.35               | 1.9%                            | 2.06%                                  |
| Role Awareness     | 6.75 | 1.62               | 1.56%                           | 2.20%                                  |
| Self Direction     | 6.75 | 1.37               | 3.2%                            | 3.89%                                  |



## Hartman Value Profile/HVP Findings as of September 2010

### Disabled Veteran N=105

| Measurement        | Mean | Standard Deviation | % Difference from Random Sample | % Difference from Non-Protected Group* |
|--------------------|------|--------------------|---------------------------------|--|
| Empathetic Outlook | 8.04 | 1.31               | 1.04%                           | 1.23%                                  |
| Practical Thinking | 7.56 | 1.8                | 1.01%                           | 0.71%                                  |
| Systems Judgment   | 7.27 | 1.65               | 2.02%                           | 1.92%                                  |
| Sense of Self      | 7.50 | 1.23               | 0.97%                           | 0.75%                                  |
| Role Awareness     | 6.64 | 1.65               | 2.65%                           | 3.23%                                  |
| Self Direction     | 7.07 | 1.57               | 0.23%                           | 0.67%                                  |

### Vietnam Veteran N=356

| Measurement        | Mean | Standard Deviation | % Difference from Random Sample | % Difference from Non-Protected Group* |
|--------------------|------|--------------------|---------------------------------|--|
| Empathetic Outlook | 7.86 | 1.4                | 0.76%                           | 0.57%                                  |
| Practical Thinking | 7.52 | 1.63               | 1.39%                           | 1.09%                                  |
| Systems Judgment   | 7.23 | 1.48               | 2.29%                           | 2.19%                                  |
| Sense of Self      | 7.46 | 0.95               | 0.58%                           | 0.36%                                  |
| Role Awareness     | 7.19 | 1.16               | 2.84%                           | 2.26%                                  |
| Self Direction     | 7.08 | 1.15               | 0.15%                           | 0.60%                                  |

### Other Veteran N=1277

| Measurement        | Mean | Standard Deviation | % Difference from Random Sample | % Difference from Non-Protected Group* |
|--------------------|------|--------------------|---------------------------------|--|
| Empathetic Outlook | 7.97 | 1.34               | 0.38%                           | 0.57%                                  |
| Practical Thinking | 7.68 | 1.57               | 0.21%                           | 0.50%                                  |
| Systems Judgment   | 7.40 | 1.33               | 0.75%                           | 0.65%                                  |
| Sense of Self      | 7.44 | 1.18               | 0.39%                           | 0.17%                                  |
| Role Awareness     | 7.06 | 1.29               | 1.57%                           | 0.98%                                  |
| Self Direction     | 7.09 | 1.16               | 0.02%                           | 0.43%                                  |

\*The percentage difference from the non-protected group compares the protected subgroup to the non-protected subgroup within the same EEOC category.



## About TTI

TTI Performance Systems, Ltd. is the worldwide leader in personal and professional assessment tools. With years of research and validation, TTI assessments are time-tested and proven to provide timely solutions for today's business challenges. Through a network of over 7000 Value Added Associates, TTI tools are utilized in over 50 countries and 26 languages to help businesses and organizations effectively manage their most valuable asset—people.

From recruitment to retention, TTI Performance Systems is a constant resource for new ideas and business applications. As a leader in the marketplace, we ensure the status of TTI assessments in the future by carefully managing our intellectual property and protecting the research and advancements TTI has made in the field. With several patents, copyrights and trademarks, TTI products are guaranteed to stand the test of time. Our staff is an expert resource in the assessment industry and continues to stay abreast of industry changes to enhance and expand the product line to provide unique solutions for the challenges businesses face everyday.

**TTI Performance Systems, Ltd.  
17785 North Pacesetter Way,  
Scottsdale, Arizona 85255**

**tel. (800) 869-6908  
fax. (800) 788-3472**

**[www.TTIassessments.com](http://www.TTIassessments.com)**