Careers4.0 Skill Assessment Tool Standardization Report – User's manual

Author:

Progressus Research & Counselling

Co-funded by the European Union

Imprint

The Careers4.0 tests standardization report – user's manual is a product of the Careers4.0 project consortium, which is funded by the Erasmus+programme of the European Union. The views expressed are those of the authors. The European Commission cannot be held responsible for any use which is made of the information published in this toolkit.

Published by:
Progressus Research & Counselling

Contents

Introduction

The world of work is undergoing profound changes driven by the fourth industrial revolution, characterized by rapid digitalization, automation, green transition, and evolving business models. These transformations are reshaping the economy, society, and individual career paths at an unprecedented pace. Navigating this new landscape requires not only technical expertise but also resilience, adaptability, and a broad set of skills that can meet the demands of emerging industries and work forms. In this context, preparing individuals for lifelong career development and successful transitions has become more important than ever.

The **Careers4.0 project** was developed to support career guidance professionals and individuals in managing career planning within this changing environment. At the heart of the project is the **Career Competencies 4.0 Framework**, which identifies and maps 18 core hard and soft skills essential for success in the evolving labour market. Drawing from international standards like ESCO, OECD PIAAC, and the EU Key Competencies Framework, the framework provides a shared language for future-oriented skills, supporting career decision-making, profiling, and adaptability. It addresses the need for practical, transferable skills that can be learned and developed over time, empowering individuals to respond flexibly to new job opportunities and labour market shifts.

This manual introduces the **Skills Assessment Tool** built upon the Career Competencies 4.0 Framework. The tool is designed to assess individual proficiency across the 18 identified skills, offering valuable insights for both career counsellors and end-users. It helps identify strengths, areas for improvement, and possible career pathways aligned with one's skill profile. Importantly, it recognizes that not every skill is equally relevant to every job or career path; instead, it encourages a tailored approach based on personal strengths and evolving career goals.

Through the use of this tool, career professionals and users are better equipped to face the challenges of the digitized, globalized labour market. Whether for young graduates, low-skilled individuals, or those seeking continuing education, the Careers4.0 Skills Assessment Tool aims to foster greater career adaptability, mobility, and inclusion, paving the way for sustainable career growth in the new world of work.

The aim of the present report is two-folded: (a) to present the standardization process of the Careers4.0Skill Assessment tool so as to ensure that the proposed psychometric tool is suitable, reliable and valid to assess the skills of youngsters and (b) to serve as a user's manual for career professionals who want to make use of the tool.

1. The Careers 4.0Skill Assessment Tool

The **Careers4.0 Skill Assessment Tool** was developed to support career practitioners in delivering more targeted and effective services to their young clients. Its primary goal is to provide concrete and realistic profiles of an individual's soft and transversal skills, helping users identify their strengths as well as areas for improvement. The tool also serves multiple stakeholders: it can assist employers in selecting candidates whose soft skillsets match specific job requirements and guide educational institutions in designing training programs aligned with current and future labour market needs. The structure of the tool is grounded in a solid theoretical base, drawing from major European and international skills frameworks such as ESCO, OECD PIAAC, the EU Key Competencies Framework, and ILO competency standards, ensuring that the skills assessed are globally recognized, relevant, and transferable.

The development methodology of the Careers4.0 Assessment Tool follows rigorous psychometric principles, based on internationally accepted standards for psychological and educational testing. Careful attention was paid to ensuring the tool’s validity, reliability, and usability, while minimizing measurement errors. The development process involved multiple phases, including the careful construction of items, piloting, and the analysis of the tool's psychometric properties. In designing the tool, particular emphasis was placed on balancing test length and quality: ensuring a comprehensive assessment without overburdening respondents. The number of questions and the size of each Careers 4.0 scale was determined based on the need to include as many questions as possible, as in the next stages of testing - piloting, several of them are likely to be rejected as inappropriate. Shorter scales reduce the burden on respondents and thus potentially improve quality of data. However, shorter scales may have worse measurement properties than longer scales, as having fewer questions might decrease their reliability and validity (Kankaras, 2017). Therefore, Careers4.0 attempts to have good psychometric properties with as few items as possible. The Careers4.0 tool first version included more than 8 items per main scale with the aim to reduce items for use in the final version after the piloting.

Each scale within the Careers4.0 tool was developed through a collaborative, expert-driven process. Psychologists and psychometric experts worked together to craft items based on

an extensive literature review, ensuring that each question is clear, relevant, and directly tied to the skill being measured. Items were structured as closed-ended statements using a 3-point Likert scale, following best-practice guidelines for item development. This format makes the tool easy to administer and interpret, while producing data that is suitable for further analysis and action planning. After initial testing, item pools were refined to ensure strong psychometric properties, aiming for reliable and valid measurement with as few items as possible. The process resulted in a shorter but comprehensive enough pool of items.

The Careers4.0 Skill Assessment Tool evaluates 18 key competencies essential for success in the future labour market, including **communication, teamwork, leadership, organisation, problem solving, intercultural competence, creativity, willingness to learn, stress tolerance, ethical competence, emotional competence, adaptability, entrepreneurship, digital skills, literacy, numeracy, physical-manual skills, and environmental awareness**. Through its structured approach, the tool empowers career practitioners to provide young people with clear, actionable insights about their current skills and future development opportunities. Ultimately, the tool fosters greater self-awareness, encourages proactive skill development, and supports more informed and future-ready career choices.

-

2. Linguistic and cultural adaptation

The Careers4.0 assessment tool was developed in English and, subsequently, it was translated and adapted to the partners' languages: Greek, Romanian, Italian and Spanish. The linguistic and cultural adaptation procedure is described below:

Items' review by expert groups

Before proceeding with the translation and adaptation of the Careers4.0 Skill Assessment Tool, it was essential to conduct an expert evaluation to ensure the content validity of the items. It is widely acknowledged that the use of expert panels is one of the most effective and reliable methods for item review (DeMaio & Landreth, 2004; Presser & Blair, 1994; Willis, Schechter, & Whitaker, 2000). For this purpose, 15 experts (three per participating country) were engaged, including psychologists, psychometrists, and human resources professionals, all with considerable experience in skill assessment, psychometric evaluation, and career counselling. These "subject matter experts" were tasked with reviewing the initial pool of items, focusing on their relevance to the content domains, their clarity and simplicity, and identifying any potential biases.

Each expert received a list of items organized by the corresponding competence, along with the associated Learning and Labour Outcomes. The experts were asked to evaluate each item using a 3-point Likert scale to assess comprehensibility and relevance: 1 (low relevance/comprehensibility), 2 (moderate relevance/comprehensibility), and 3 (high relevance/comprehensibility). For any item rated as "1" (low), experts were required to provide explanations for their rating and suggest improvements or alternative phrasings. This feedback was crucial for refining the questions to ensure they were both meaningful and easily understandable for the target audience of young people aged 16–29.

Experts assessed each item on a 3-point scale regarding its relevance, clarity, and simplicity (1 = not relevant, 3 = very relevant). Content Validity Indexes (CVI) were then calculated at the item level (I-CVI) and scale level (S-CVI). Items with I-CVI scores below 0.79 were flagged for revision or deletion. The results indicated excellent content validity across the tool, with scale-level CVIs ranging from 0.95 to 0.99, and item-level CVIs from 0.80 to 1.0. Following the review, five items were deleted due to low ratings, and minor revisions were

made to the wording of several other items to improve clarity without altering the intended meaning.

The structured feedback process and the use of both qualitative suggestions and quantitative validation ensured a highly robust evaluation of the Careers4.0 assessment items. By carefully integrating expert feedback, the tool was refined to better measure the targeted soft skills accurately and clearly, ultimately increasing its reliability and relevance for career practitioners supporting young people's skill development and career decision-making.

Translation and adaptation of the tests

To ensure the effective use of the Careers4.0 Skill Assessment Tool across different linguistic and cultural contexts, a standardized translation and cultural adaptation procedure was implemented. The aim was not only to translate the instrument from English into Greek, Italian, Romanian, and Spanish but also to ensure conceptual equivalence and cultural relevance. Following best practices outlined by Hambleton (2005) and Sireci et al. (2006), the translations were designed to maintain the intended meaning and usability of the original English version, while being fully understandable to young people aged 16–29 in each country. Translators were specifically instructed to avoid literal translation, as it often results in awkward or unclear wording, and instead focus on preserving the original concepts and making the text fluent and culturally appropriate.

The translation process followed a structured back-to-back translation method. A team of three people was established in each country: Person A, an excellent speaker and writer in the local language with good English skills; Person B, highly proficient in English with good knowledge of the local language; and Person C, another fluent speaker and writer of the local language with sufficient English understanding. Initially, Person A translated the original English items into the target language. This translation was then hidden from view and given to Person B, who performed a back translation into English without consulting the original. Person C then translated the back-translated version back into the local language. This iterative method allowed for inconsistencies or misunderstandings to surface and be corrected through comparison.

After completing these individual translations, a consensus conference was organized among Persons A, B, and C. In these virtual meetings, the translation team discussed discrepancies and agreed on the most accurate, culturally adapted final version of the questionnaire. Attention was given to preserving grammatical correctness, clarity, and punctuation. It was crucial that the final product be easily comprehensible to the target group, ensuring that no cultural or linguistic barriers would hinder the understanding or validity of the assessment. Whenever necessary, terminology was adapted to local standards to resonate more naturally with the target audience while maintaining fidelity to the original constructs.

The translation and adaptation process revealed the necessity of minor revisions in certain languages, particularly Spanish, where slight cultural nuances required additional adjustments. Overall, by combining rigorous linguistic translation procedures with careful cultural adaptation, the final national versions of the Careers4.0 Skill Assessment Tool succeeded in achieving both linguistic accuracy and cultural relevance. This methodical approach guarantees that the tool remains a valuable, reliable resource for career practitioners assisting young people across different European countries.

3. Psychometric Properties: Validity and Reliability

The present chapter aims at presenting the final validation results and the internal consistency reliability estimates for all testing components. Moreover, a thorough description of the procedures used in the validation studies and the results of those studies will be provided.

Two studies were conducted.

In the first study for the Skill Assessment tool, we calculated item frequencies and descriptive measures to assess whether the items have adequate discriminative power to distinguish between individuals with high levels of the construct being measured from those with lower levels (Price, 2017). Moreover, each item's contribution in internal reliability coefficients of the corresponding subscale. Forty-six items seemed to have poor construct validity or reduced the reliability coefficients and were eliminated. The remaining items had discriminative power between 0.20 and 0.80, while all reliability coefficients were above 0.70; and the vast majority above 0.80. The study resulted in revising the Careers4.0Tool.

Internal Consistency Reliability Estimates

Internal consistency reliability refers to the consistency of people's responses across the items on a multiple-item measure. In general, all the items on such measures are supposed to reflect the same underlying construct, so people's scores on those items should be correlated with each other. Reliability coefficients above 0.70 are considered quite satisfactory. Tables 2 and 3 present the reliability coefficients of the Skills evaluated.

Table 2. Internal Consistency Reliability of the Careers4.0 Skill Assessment Tool

Adaptability	0.73
Communication	0.78
DigitalSkills	0.74
EmotionalCompetence	0.75

EntrepreneurialSkills	0.71
EnvironmentalAwareness	0.79
EthicalCompetence	0.69
Innovation	0.77
InterculturalCompetence	0.71
Literacy	0.84
Leadership	0.76
Numeracy	0.81
Organisation	0.74
PhysicalManualSkills	0.85
ProblemSolving	0.73
StressTolerance	0.77
Teamwork	0.76
WillingnesstoLearn	0.72

The internal consistency of the skill assessment tool was assessed using Cronbach's alpha. All scales demonstrated acceptable to good reliability, with alpha values ranging from 0.71 to 0.85 (only exception the ethical competence scale). This indicates that each scale is internally consistent and suitable for further analysis.

Careers4.0 Skill Tests' validity

Validity is the extent to which the scores from a measure represent the variable they are intended to. There are many kinds of validity. The Careers4.0tool provides strong evidence for content and construct validity.

Content validity is the extent to which a measure "covers" all the aspects of the construct of interest. Content validity is not usually assessed quantitatively. Instead, it is assessed by carefully checking the measurement method against the conceptual definition of the construct. As described above items were, also, developed taking into consideration the following: (a) thorough review of relevant literature to ensure content adequacy, (b) make sure items address a single issue, and (c) make sure statements are culturally appropriate. For each skill to be measured, a working group of experts was composed, consisted of 2-3 experts in the field, such as mathematicians, ICT experts, physicians, engineers,

neurologists, to propose the appropriate items for each relevant field. Moreover, the group included 2 psychologists, 1 sociologist and an expert in psychometrics. The test development team specified an exhaustive list of potential indicators of each scale and the representative sample of indicators was selected from this list. Then, the team proceeded to the development of items that supposedly measure the selected constructs. Each member of the working team proposed several items measuring the construct under evaluation. The next step was to evaluate each of the proposed items in terms of representativeness and content redundancy. The process resulted in a shorter but comprehensive enough pool of items, following the rule of including 2- or 3-times larger number of items (Devellis, 2017), with the aim to reduce those finally used after the item analysis/factor analysis.

Construct validity evaluates whether a measurement tool really represents the thing we are interested in measuring. A commonly used method to investigate construct validity is factor analysis, a method that reduces the overall number of observed variables into latent factors based on commonalities within the data.

Exploratory Factor Analyses (EFA) were conducted to examine the underlying structure of the skill assessment tool and to confirm whether the items within each predefined scale loaded onto a single coherent factor, supporting construct validity. Principal Component Analysis (PCA) with Varimax rotation was used as the extraction method. For each of the 18 skill scales, items were entered into separate analyses to determine whether they formed a distinct, interpretable factor.

To determine the suitability of data for factor analysis, the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) Measure of Sampling Adequacy and Bartlett's Test of Sphericity were examined. All scales had acceptable KMO values ranging from 0.69 to 0.79, indicating sufficient sampling adequacy. Bartlett's test was significant for each scale ($p < 0.001$), confirming the appropriateness of factor analysis.

Items with factor loadings below 0.40, low communalities, or significant cross-loadings on multiple factors (>0.30) were excluded to enhance scale unidimensionality and clarity. Factor loadings for retained items across scales ranged from 0.42 to 0.74. An example of the procedure is illustrated in Table 2, where each scale's construct validity is summarized, including the range of factor loadings and any item exclusions along with justification.

The results support the unidimensionality and construct validity of each skill domain, ensuring that retained items contribute meaningfully to their respective constructs.

Construct Validity of Scales via Exploratory Factor Analysis

Skill Scale	Factor Loading Range	Items Removed	Reason for Removal
Adaptability	0.45–0.72	3, 32	Low factor loading (<0.40)
Communication	0.46–0.74	33,82	Low factor loading (<0.40) &Cross-loading with Emotional Competence
Digital Skills	0.43–0.71	129,131	Low factor loading (<0.40)
Emotional Competence	0.44–0.70	51,80,96	Low loading
Entrepreneurial Skills	0.46–0.73	92,125	Cross-loading with Innovation
Environmental Awareness	0.45–0.70	–	-
Ethical Competence	0.44–0.71	27, 45	Low factor loading (<0.40)
Innovation	0.48–0.74	106	Low factor loading (<0.40)
Intercultural Competence	0.44–0.72	37,84	Low factor loading (<0.40)
Literacy	0.42–0.71	–	Low factor loading (<0.40)
Leadership	0.45–0.73	38,85,120	Low factor loading (<0.40)
Numeracy	0.44–0.70	–	–
Organisation	0.43–0.71	40,86	Low factor loading (<0.40) &Low communality
Physical Manual Skills	0.44–0.69	–	–
Problem Solving	0.46–0.72	87,105,121	Low factor loading (<0.40) &Cross-loading with Organisation
Stress Tolerance	0.45–0.71	59	Cross-loading with Emotional Competence
Teamwork	0.46–0.73	83	–
Willingness to Learn	0.47–0.74	73	Cross-loading with Teamwork

During the exploratory factor analysis, we applied established psychometric criteria to ensure the construct validity of each scale. Specifically, items were excluded if they demonstrated low factor loadings (below 0.40), low communalities (indicating limited

shared variance with other items in the scale), or cross-loadings greater than 0.30 on multiple factors, which would compromise the unidimensionality of the construct. As a result of this process, 1 to 3 items were removed from several scales. For example, in the **Adaptability** scale, items3 and 32 were excluded due to insufficient loading, while item 82 in the **Communication** scale and item 92 in the **Entrepreneurial Skills** scale were removed due to significant cross-loading with other constructs. These decisions aimed to improve the clarity and internal consistency of each scale and ensure that only items with strong, clean loadings on their respective factors were retained. The remaining items in each scale demonstrated coherent structure and satisfactory factor loading ranges, supporting the tool's construct validity.

Norms & Scoring interpretation

For an assessment to be helpful, it needs a basis for comparison. For example, someone's score in communication skills has meaning only if we know the score that most people achieve in communication skills. Therefore, we can determine whether this individual has a high, moderate or low score in communication skills. For scores on any test to be useful, there must be a basis of comparison and for that reason we use normative scores (norms).

The process of standardization of the tests provides normative scores that represent the general population of our target group. Standardized tests are ones that have specific directions that are used in the same way every time the test is given. This is because test scores can only be compared when the test is identical for all participants who take it, including both the items and the testing instructions. Careers4.0 Assessment Tool was standardized using a sample of more than **300 participants (303)**. **More specifically, 137 were males and 167 females. Regarding the country of origin, we had 25% from Romania and Italy, 20% from Greece, 17% from Spain and 13% from Cyprus.** Scores were rank ordered and, subsequently, converted to percentile rankings. To facilitate their use, the results are not reported in percentiles to the test takers but on deciles, which are much easier for the test takers to understand. In Annex 1, we present the tables with norms per skill and per category (gender, country).

The scoring of the Careers4.0 questionnaire is provided automatically via the Careers4.0 platform. A vector of the 18 scales is provided, presenting the results in a range of 0- 10 (deciles). The interpretation of the scores is presented below:

- 0-3: Low score. People with score between 0-3 belong to the 30% of people with fewer skills on this area. Those people seem to face difficulties when is needed to use the evaluated skill.
- 3.5-7: Moderate score: People with score between 3.5-7 are as skilled in this area as the majority of people. They may be able to perform activities that require the skill under evaluation, but there is still space for improvement.

- 7.5 – 10: High score. People with score between 7.5-10 belong to the 30% of people with higher skills in this area. They are highly skilled and can perform at a high level in activities that require the evaluated skill.

4. Relation with background variables

Further analyses were conducted in order to explore whether the gender and the language used have an impact on the performance of users in the different skills. The results per variable are presented in the following sub-chapters.

4.1/ Gender

To determine whether gender plays a role in the development of key skills, we conducted independent samples t-tests using gender as the independent variable and the 18 skill areas as dependent variables. The analysis showed a statistically significant gender difference in *stress tolerance* ($t = -3.10$, $df = 425$, $p < .01$), with men scoring higher than women. This difference may reflect sociocultural conditioning that encourages men to project emotional resilience and control (Yung, 2023). Previous studies have found similar trends, noting that men often report higher self-efficacy under pressure, even when objective stress responses are comparable (Zimmerman & Blume, 2018).

Men scored significantly higher than women in several other areas: *digital skills* ($t = -2.61$, $df = 276$, $p = .01$), *entrepreneurial skills* ($t = -2.12$, $df = 276$, $p < .01$), *numeracy* ($t = -2.53$, $df = 276$, $p < .05$), and *physical-manual skills* ($t = -3.97$, $df = 276$, $p < .001$). These findings are consistent with previous literature showing male overrepresentation in STEM fields and hands-on vocational sectors (OECD, 2019). Early gendered exposure to technology and mathematics, along with social expectations for male competence in practical domains, may account for these gaps (Eccles, 2007; Papadopoulos & Malechi, 2020).

On the other hand, women outperformed men in *literacy* ($t = -2.86$, $df = 276$, $p < .005$), *emotional competence* ($t = -2.16$, $df = 276$, $p < .05$), and *organisation* ($t = -2.23$, $df = 276$, $p < .05$). These results align with established findings showing that females often demonstrate stronger verbal communication skills and emotional intelligence (Mayer, Salovey, & Caruso, 2008). Women's higher scores in organisation may stem from greater engagement in multitasking and coordination roles, both professionally and socially (Hyde, 2005). The emotional

and social training girls typically receive from early childhood may lead to enhanced self-perception in these domains (Denham et al., 2012).

4.2/ Country

ANOVA analyses revealed several significant differences between countries. The strongest country-based differences were observed in *adaptability* ($F = 5.721$, $df = 4, 273$, $p < .001$) and *communication* ($F = 5.177$, $df = 4, 273$, $p < .001$), where Tukey post-hoc tests showed that participants from Italy scored significantly higher than those from Romania. Italy also showed higher scores in *entrepreneurial skills* ($F = 5.173$, $df = 4, 273$, $p < .001$) and *environmental awareness* ($F = 7.591$, $df = 4, 273$, $p < .001$) compared to Spain. These results may be attributed to Italy's recent education reforms emphasizing transversal competencies and sustainability, as well as a cultural focus on innovation and expressive communication (European Commission, 2022).

Finally, the ANOVA also revealed significant country differences in *stress tolerance* ($F = 9.100$, $df = 4, 273$, $p < .001$), with Italy scoring significantly higher than both Spain and Greece. This may reflect systemic factors such as national differences in employment expectations, education styles, or coping strategies cultivated by culture. Southern European countries, though often grouped together, have nuanced differences in youth support systems, mental health education, and job market structures (Kousis et al., 2019). These contextual findings support the need for culturally sensitive approaches when interpreting assessment outcomes and designing targeted interventions.

5. Use of Careers4.0 skill assessment tool

The Careers4.0 Skill Assessment Tool is designed to support the career development of young people aged 16–29 by helping them identify their soft and hard skills. It serves multiple important functions across various user groups:

(a) **Supporting Career Practitioners Working with Young People**

Career practitioners can use the Careers4.0 tool to assess the skill profiles of their young clients. Administering the assessment helps young people recognize and articulate their strengths and areas for development, empowering them to make informed career choices. Knowing their skills enables young jobseekers to target job vacancies that match their capabilities, thus increasing their chances of professional success and satisfaction. It also prepares them to confidently address common interview questions such as "What can you contribute to our organization?" or "Which problems can you help us solve?". Moreover, career practitioners can guide young clients to complete the Careers4.0 assessment independently through the platform and encourage them to include the results in their CVs or online profiles, enhancing their employability and visibility to potential employers.

(b) **Assisting Employers in Recruitment and Staff Development**

Employers can use the Careers4.0 tool as part of their recruitment process to evaluate the skillsets of young candidates objectively. Skills assessment provides concrete, evidence-based insights that go beyond what can be inferred from CVs or interviews alone, reducing biases and increasing the chances of selecting the most suitable applicants. Additionally, for existing young employees, the tool can highlight areas where further development is needed. This information enables employers to design personalized training plans that address specific skill gaps, supporting employee growth and enhancing overall organizational performance.

(c) **Designing Training and Upskilling Programs Tailored to Young People's Needs**

Education and training institutions can also benefit from using the Careers4.0

tool. By identifying common skill gaps among young people, these organizations can design targeted, relevant, and effective upskilling programs. Whether through formal education, vocational training, or specialized workshops, the information derived from the Careers4.0 assessments ensures that initiatives align closely with the needs of both young individuals and the evolving demands of the labour market.

(d) **Supporting Public Institutions and NGOs Working with Youth**

Public organizations, NGOs, and community centers that support young people's career integration can also use the Careers4.0 tool. By systematically assessing the skill levels of the youth they serve, these organizations can better understand their clients' strengths and needs. This insight enables the development of tailored support services, including personalized training programs, workshops, or employment counseling, all aiming to improve young people's employability and facilitate their successful entry into the workforce.

6. Instructions of the Careers4.0 Skill Assessment tool

*The **Careers4.0 Skill Assessment Tool** is a brief and user-friendly questionnaire designed to help young people identify their skills and build a personal career profile aligned with their potential. Before beginning the assessment, it is important to be familiar with the following instructions to ensure accurate and meaningful results:*

- ***Question Format:** You will be presented with one question and three possible answers at a time. Carefully read all the options and choose the one that best describes you.*
- ***Honesty is Key:** There are no right or wrong answers. The purpose of the assessment is to reflect your real skills and preferences. Be honest with yourself to obtain an accurate profile.*
- ***Trust Your First Instinct:** Respond based on your first reaction. Avoid overthinking or trying to predict "ideal" answers. Your spontaneous choice often reflects your true tendencies and abilities.*
- ***Focus on Reality, Not Aspirations:** Answer the questions according to your actual behaviors, habits, and preferences, not according to what you think is socially desirable or what you wish you were.*
- ***No Time Pressure:** The assessment is not timed. Take your time to think clearly and complete the test in a quiet, distraction-free environment to maintain focus and ensure genuine responses.*
- ***Complete All Questions:** The full assessment includes **72 questions**. It is important to answer each one to generate a complete and reliable skill profile. Partial completion may affect the accuracy of the results.*
- ***Approximate Duration:** The assessment typically takes about **20 minutes** to complete.*

By following these instructions, users can maximize the effectiveness of the Careers4.0 tool and obtain valuable insights that will support their career development journey.

Question example

How do you handle deadlines for multiple tasks simultaneously?

Answer 1: I prioritize tasks and allocate time strategically for each.

Answer 2: I work on all tasks simultaneously to ensure completion, asking help if needed

Answer 3: I focus solely on the most urgent task and ignore the others.

ANNEX 1: NORMS

Adaptability Norms

		Gender		Language				
Deciles	***Raw scores***	***Men***	***Women***	***Greece***	***Romania***	***Spain***	***Italy***	***Cyprus***
1	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	2.0	3.0	3.0	4.0
2	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	3.0	4.0	5.0	5.0
3	5.0	5.0	5.0	4.0	4.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
4	5.0	5.0	5.0	4.0	5.0	5.0	6.0	5.0
5	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	6.0	5.0
6	6.0	6.0	6.0	5.0	5.0	6.0	6.0	5.6
7	6.0	6.0	6.0	6.0	5.2	6.0	7.7	6.0
8	7.0	7.0	7.0	6.0	6.8	7.0	8.0	7.0
9	8.0	8.0	8.0	7.0	7.0	8.0	8.0	8.0
10	8.0	8.0	8.0	8.0	8.0	8.0	8.0	8.0

Communication norms

		Gender		Language				
Deciles	***Raw scores***	***Men***	***Women***	***Greece***	***Romania***	***Spain***	***Italy***	***Cyprus***
1	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0
2	4.0	4.0	4.0	3.0	4.0	4.0	5.0	4.0
3	4.0	4.0	5.0	4.0	4.0	5.0	5.0	4.0
4	5.0	5.0	5.0	4.0	5.0	5.0	7.0	4.0
5	6.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	7.0	5.0	7.5	5.0
6	7.0	7.0	6.0	6.0	7.0	6.0	8.0	6.6
7	7.0	7.0	6.0	6.0	7.0	6.0	8.0	7.0
8	7.0	7.0	7.0	7.0	7.0	7.0	8.0	7.0
9	8.0	8.0	8.0	7.0	8.0	7.0	8.0	8.0
10	8.0	8.0	8.0	8.0	8.0	8.0	8.0	8.0

Digital skills norms

		Gender		*Language*				
Deciles	***Raw scores***	***Men***	***Women***	***Greece***	***Romania***	***Spain***	***Italy***	***Cyprus***
1	3.0	4.0	3.0	3.0	4.0	3.0	3.0	4.0
2	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0
3	4.0	5.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	5.0	5.0
4	5.0	5.4	5.0	5.0	5.4	5.0	5.0	5.0
5	6.0	6.0	5.0	5.0	6.0	5.0	6.0	5.0
6	6.0	6.0	6.0	6.0	6.0	6.0	6.0	5.6
7	6.0	7.0	6.0	6.0	7.0	6.0	6.7	6.0
8	7.0	7.0	7.0	6.0	7.0	7.0	7.8	7.0
9	7.0	8.0	7.0	7.0	7.0	7.6	8.0	8.0
10	8.0	8.0	8.0	8.0	8.0	8.0	8.0	8.0

Emotional competence norms

		Gender		*Language*				
Deciles	***Raw scores***	***Men***	***Women***	***Greece***	***Romania***	***Spain***	***Italy***	***Cyprus***
1	4.0	3.0	4.0	4.0	3.0	3.4	4.0	3.1
2	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	4.8	5.0	5.0
3	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	6.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
4	6.0	5.0	6.0	5.0	6.0	5.6	5.4	6.0
5	6.0	6.0	6.0	6.0	6.0	6.0	6.0	6.0
6	6.0	6.0	6.0	6.0	6.0	6.0	6.0	7.0
7	6.0	6.0	7.0	6.0	6.0	6.0	7.0	7.0
8	7.0	7.0	7.0	7.0	6.8	7.0	7.0	7.0
9	7.0	7.0	7.6	7.0	8.0	7.0	8.0	7.0
10	8.0	8.0	8.0	8.0	8.0	8.0	8.0	7.0

Entrepreneurial skills norms

		Gender		*Language*				
Deciles	***Raw scores***	***Men***	***Women***	***Greece***	***Romania***	***Spain***	***Italy***	***Cyprus***
1	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	4.0	2.4	3.0	3.0
2	3.0	4.0	3.0	3.0	4.0	3.0	3.0	4.0
3	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	3.2	4.0	4.0
4	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.4	4.0
5	5.0	5.0	4.0	5.0	5.0	4.0	6.0	5.0
6	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	7.6	5.0
7	5.0	6.0	5.0	6.0	5.0	5.0	8.0	5.0
8	6.0	6.0	5.0	6.0	5.0	5.0	8.0	6.0
9	8.0	8.0	7.0	8.0	6.0	6.0	8.0	8.0
10	8.0	8.0	8.0	8.0	7.0	7.0	8.0	8.0

Environmental awareness norms

		Gender		*Language*				
Deciles	***Raw scores***	***Men***	***Women***	***Greece***	***Romania***	***Spain***	***Italy***	***Cyprus***
1	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	2.0	3.0	3.0
2	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	3.0	4.0	4.0
3	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	4.0	5.0	5.0
4	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	4.0	6.0	5.0
5	5.0	5.0	5.0	6.0	5.0	5.0	7.0	5.0
6	6.0	6.0	6.0	6.0	5.0	5.0	8.0	6.0
7	6.0	6.0	6.0	6.0	6.0	5.8	8.0	6.0
8	6.0	6.0	7.0	6.0	6.0	6.0	8.0	6.0
9	8.0	8.0	8.0	7.0	7.4	6.0	8.0	6.9
10	8.0	8.0	8.0	8.0	8.0	8.0	8.0	8.0

Ethical competence norms

		Gender		Language				
Deciles	***Raw scores***	***Men***	***Women***	***Greece***	***Romania***	***Spain***	***Italy***	***Cyprus***
1	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0
2	4.0	4.0	4.0	3.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	3.0
3	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.8	4.0	5.0	3.3
4	5.0	5.0	5.0	4.4	5.0	4.0	6.0	4.0
5	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	6.0	6.0
6	6.0	5.0	6.0	5.0	6.6	5.0	8.0	6.0
7	6.0	6.0	7.0	5.0	7.0	5.0	8.0	6.0
8	7.0	7.0	7.0	6.0	7.0	6.0	8.0	7.0
9	8.0	8.0	8.0	7.9	7.0	6.6	8.0	7.0
10	8.0	8.0	8.0	8.0	8.0	8.0	8.0	8.0

Innovation norms

		Gender		Language				
Deciles	***Raw scores***	***Men***	***Women***	***Greece***	***Romania***	***Spain***	***Italy***	***Cyprus***
1	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.1	3.0	3.0	2.1	3.0
2	4.0	4.0	3.8	4.0	4.0	3.0	3.0	3.0
3	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0
4	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	5.0	4.0
5	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	4.0	4.0	6.0	5.0
6	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	7.0	5.0
7	6.0	6.0	6.0	6.0	6.0	5.0	7.0	6.0
8	7.0	7.0	7.0	7.0	7.0	6.0	7.0	6.8
9	7.0	7.0	7.0	7.0	7.0	6.0	8.0	7.0
10	8.0	8.0	8.0	8.0	8.0	8.0	8.0	7.0

Intercultural competence norms

		Gender		Language				
Deciles	***Raw scores***	***Men***	***Women***	***Greece***	***Romania***	***Spain***	***Italy***	***Cyprus***
1	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	2.4	4.0	4.0
2	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	5.0	5.0
3	5.0	4.0	5.0	4.0	5.0	4.0	6.0	5.0
4	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	6.4	5.0
5	6.0	5.0	6.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	7.0	5.0
6	6.0	6.0	6.0	6.0	6.0	6.0	7.0	6.0
7	6.0	6.0	6.0	6.0	6.0	6.0	7.7	6.0
8	7.0	7.0	7.0	6.8	6.0	7.0	8.0	6.0
9	8.0	8.0	8.0	7.0	8.0	8.0	8.0	8.0
10	8.0	8.0	8.0	8.0	8.0	8.0	8.0	8.0

Literacy skills norms

		Gender		Language				
Deciles	***Raw scores***	***Men***	***Women***	***Greece***	***Romania***	***Spain***	***Italy***	***Cyprus***
1	3.0	2.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	4.0	4.0
2	4.0	3.2	4.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	5.0	5.2
3	4.0	4.0	5.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	6.0	6.0
4	5.0	5.0	6.0	4.0	5.0	4.0	6.4	6.0
5	6.0	6.0	7.0	5.0	6.0	4.0	7.0	7.0
6	7.0	6.0	7.0	6.0	7.0	5.0	7.0	7.0
7	8.0	7.0	8.0	7.0	8.0	6.0	8.0	8.0
8	8.0	8.0	8.0	8.0	8.0	7.0	8.0	8.0
9	8.0	8.0	8.0	8.0	8.0	7.0	8.0	8.0
10	8.0	8.0	8.0	8.0	8.0	8.0	8.0	8.0

Leadership norms

		Gender		Language				
Deciles	***Raw scores***	***Men***	***Women***	***Greece***	***Romania***	***Spain***	***Italy***	***Cyprus***
1	4.0	3.6	4.0	3.0	4.0	4.0	4.1	4.1
2	5.0	4.2	5.0	4.0	5.0	4.0	6.0	5.0
3	5.0	5.0	5.0	4.3	5.0	5.0	6.0	5.0
4	5.0	5.0	6.0	5.0	5.0	6.0	7.0	6.0
5	6.0	6.0	6.0	5.0	5.0	6.0	7.0	6.0
6	6.0	6.0	7.0	6.0	6.0	7.0	7.0	6.0
7	7.0	7.0	7.0	6.0	6.0	7.0	7.0	6.0
8	7.0	7.0	7.0	7.0	7.0	7.2	7.0	7.0
9	8.0	8.0	8.0	8.0	8.0	8.0	8.0	7.9
10	8.0	8.0	8.0	8.0	8.0	8.0	8.0	8.0

Numeracy skills norms

		Gender		Language				
Deciles	***Raw scores***	***Men***	***Women***	***Greece***	***Romania***	***Spain***	***Italy***	***Cyprus***
1	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	4.0	4.0
2	4.0	4.2	4.0	3.2	3.0	3.0	5.0	4.0
3	5.0	5.0	4.0	4.0	5.0	4.0	5.0	5.0
4	6.0	6.0	5.0	5.0	6.0	4.0	7.0	5.0
5	6.0	6.0	6.0	6.5	6.0	5.0	8.0	6.0
6	7.0	7.0	6.0	8.0	6.0	6.0	8.0	6.0
7	8.0	8.0	7.0	8.0	6.2	6.0	8.0	7.7
8	8.0	8.0	8.0	8.0	7.0	7.0	8.0	8.0
9	8.0	8.0	8.0	8.0	8.0	8.0	8.0	8.0
10	8.0	8.0	8.0	8.0	8.0	8.0	8.0	8.0

Problem solving norms

		Gender		Language				
Deciles	***Raw scores***	***Men***	***Women***	***Greece***	***Romania***	***Spain***	***Italy***	***Cyprus***
1	4.0	4.0	4.0	3.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.1
2	5.0	5.0	5.0	4.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.2
3	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	6.3	7.0
4	6.0	6.0	6.0	5.0	6.0	6.0	7.0	7.0
5	7.0	7.0	7.0	6.0	7.0	6.0	7.0	7.0
6	7.0	7.0	7.0	7.0	7.0	7.0	8.0	7.0
7	7.0	7.0	7.0	7.0	7.0	7.0	8.0	7.0
8	8.0	7.8	8.0	7.0	7.0	7.2	8.0	7.8
9	8.0	8.0	8.0	8.0	8.0	8.0	8.0	8.0
10	8.0	8.0	8.0	8.0	8.0	8.0	8.0	8.0

Stress tolerance norms

		Gender		Language				
Deciles	***Raw scores***	***Men***	***Women***	***Greece***	***Romania***	***Spain***	***Italy***	***Cyprus***
1	2.0	3.0	2.0	2.0	4.6	2.4	4.0	2.0
2	4.0	4.0	4.0	3.2	5.0	4.0	5.2	2.0
3	5.0	5.0	4.0	4.0	5.0	4.0	6.0	2.0
4	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	6.0	4.0	6.0	4.4
5	6.0	6.0	6.0	5.0	6.0	5.0	7.0	6.0
6	6.0	6.0	6.0	6.0	6.0	5.0	8.0	6.0
7	6.0	6.0	6.0	6.0	6.0	6.0	8.0	7.0
8	7.0	7.0	7.0	6.0	7.0	6.0	8.0	7.0
9	8.0	8.0	8.0	7.0	8.0	7.0	8.0	7.0
10	8.0	8.0	8.0	8.0	8.0	8.0	8.0	8.0

Teamworking norms

		Gender		Language				
Deciles	***Raw scores***	***Men***	***Women***	***Greece***	***Romania***	***Spain***	***Italy***	***Cyprus***
1	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	5.0	5.0	4.1
2	5.0	5.0	5.0	4.0	5.0	5.0	6.0	5.0
3	6.0	5.0	6.0	5.0	6.0	6.0	6.0	5.0
4	6.0	6.0	6.0	5.0	6.0	6.0	7.0	5.0
5	6.0	7.0	6.0	6.0	7.0	7.0	7.0	6.0
6	7.0	7.0	7.0	6.0	7.0	7.0	7.6	7.0
7	7.0	7.0	8.0	6.7	8.0	7.0	8.0	7.0
8	8.0	8.0	8.0	7.0	8.0	8.0	8.0	7.0
9	8.0	8.0	8.0	8.0	8.0	8.0	8.0	8.0
10	8.0	8.0	8.0	8.0	8.0	8.0	8.0	8.0

Willingness to learn norms

		Gender		Language				
Deciles	***Raw scores***	***Men***	***Women***	***Greece***	***Romania***	***Spain***	***Italy***	***Cyprus***
1	4.0	3.0	4.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	4.0	4.1
2	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.2	4.0	4.0	5.0
3	5.0	5.0	5.0	4.0	5.0	4.0	5.0	5.0
4	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	6.0	5.0
5	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	6.0	5.0	6.0	5.0
6	6.0	6.0	6.0	5.0	7.0	5.4	8.0	6.0
7	7.0	7.0	6.8	6.0	7.0	6.0	8.0	7.0
8	7.0	7.0	7.0	6.0	7.0	6.0	8.0	7.0
9	8.0	8.0	8.0	7.9	7.0	7.0	8.0	7.0
10	8.0	8.0	8.0	8.0	8.0	8.0	8.0	8.0

Organisation norms

		Gender		Language				
Deciles	***Raw scores***	***Men***	***Women***	***Greece***	***Romania***	***Spain***	***Italy***	***Cyprus***
1	3.0	2.0	3.0	2.1	3.0	3.0	3.0	4.0
2	4.0	3.0	4.0	3.0	4.0	3.0	4.0	5.0
3	5.0	4.0	5.0	4.0	5.0	4.0	5.0	5.0
4	5.0	5.0	6.0	5.0	6.0	5.0	5.0	5.4
5	6.0	5.0	6.0	5.0	6.0	5.0	6.0	6.0
6	6.0	6.0	6.0	6.0	7.0	6.0	6.0	6.0
7	7.0	6.2	7.0	6.0	8.0	6.0	7.7	6.0
8	8.0	8.0	8.0	7.0	8.0	6.2	8.0	7.8
9	8.0	8.0	8.0	8.0	8.0	8.0	8.0	8.0
10	8.0	8.0	8.0	8.0	8.0	8.0	8.0	8.0

Physical -manual skills norms

		Gender		Language				
Deciles	***Raw scores***	***Men***	***Women***	***Greece***	***Romania***	***Spain***	***Italy***	***Cyprus***
1	2.0	3.0	2.0	2.0	3.0	2.0	2.0	2.0
2	3.0	4.0	3.0	3.0	3.2	3.0	3.0	2.2
3	3.7	4.0	3.0	4.0	4.0	3.0	4.0	3.0
4	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	3.6	4.0	3.0
5	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	6.0	4.0
6	4.0	5.0	4.0	5.0	4.0	4.0	7.6	4.0
7	5.0	6.0	4.0	5.0	4.0	4.0	8.0	5.0
8	6.0	7.0	5.0	6.0	5.0	5.0	8.0	6.0
9	8.0	8.0	7.0	7.0	7.0	5.6	8.0	8.0
10	8.0	8.0	8.0	8.0	8.0	8.0	8.0	8.0