

Data analysts

General competency framework · Professional level · 5 competencies · approx. 75 minutes

How to use this guide

- Focus on these 5 competencies — the behaviours that matter most for this role — not a chronological career history.
- Ask every candidate the same core questions, then probe. Allow around 15 minutes per competency.
- Ask for real examples and use STAR — the Situation, the Task, the Action they took, and the Result.
- Stay neutral, capture what they say, and judge later. Gather evidence on one competency at a time.
- Rate each competency 1–5 against the positive and negative indicators, and note the evidence.

5 Outstanding 4 Good 3 Acceptable 2 Marginal 1 Poor

1. Analytical Skills

Breaks a problem down into its core elements. Draws on different data sources to inform their thinking, identifying the most pertinent issues within this. Incorporates the emotive elements of a situation into their thinking, before making sound inferences based on the available information.

Why this matters for Data analysts: The Skills England Data Analyst Apprenticeship Standard L4 names 'logical and methodical' as a core behaviour, statistical methods as core knowledge, and 'identify patterns and trends' as a core skill. Analytical reasoning across data sources is the entire purpose of the role.

Describe a time when you were faced with a complex problem to solve/the last time you had to analyse a lot of information or data.

- What made the problem complex?
- How did you go about analysing the situation/data?
- What information did you need? Where did the information come from?
- What kind of information is easiest for you to work with/most difficult?
- What were the key issues/angles that needed consideration?
- What information was most relevant?
- How did you ascertain what was relevant?
- What did you learn from the analysis?

Tell me about a time when your analysis into a situation revealed something unexpected or surprising.

- Why was this unexpected/surprising?
- What did you do to uncover it?
- What did you do with this revelation?
- How did it change your response to the situation?
- What lessons did you learn from the process?

Can you tell me about a time where you feel you took the wrong approach to problem solving?

- What led you to take this approach?
- With hindsight, what would have been the better approach?
- What was the outcome?
- What key lessons have you learned about problem solving?

NEGATIVE INDICATORS	1 · 2 · 3 · 4 · 5	POSITIVE INDICATORS
Gets overwhelmed by complexity – sees the problem as a whole rather than being able to break it down into component parts		Identifies the core elements/components of a problem. Breaks down complex issues/problems into smaller parts
Takes a rather unstructured approach to analysis – lacks logical and sequential steps		Takes a logical and systematic approach to analysis
Manages the symptoms of the issue rather than seeking to understand the root cause (superficial analysis)		Insightful – able to get to the root cause of issues and tackle these rather than deal with the symptoms
Gets lost in the detail and is unable to identify the pertinent information		Identifies relevant/pertinent information rather than getting lost in the detail
Is narrow in approach – fails to consider a range of angles or draw on different sources of data		Draws on different sources of data to inform their thinking – views issues from a broad range of angles
Fails to integrate data from different sources and spot themes, trends and patterns. Views different pieces of data in isolation		Integrates data from different sources, spotting themes, trends and patterns
Does not move beyond analysis to making interpretations and drawing conclusions from the data		Looks beyond analysing to interpreting the information they are presented with – e.g. identifying implications and causal links
Misinterprets or draws inappropriate conclusions from data		Makes sound inferences based on the information available
Fails to appreciate the people/emotive aspects of a situation. Focuses exclusively on the hard facts		Incorporates how people think feel and behave into their considerations – considers not just the facts but the people/emotive aspects of a given situation

Summary of evidence: _____ Rating (1–5): _____

2. Technical Capability

Has the necessary knowledge, skills and proficiency to conduct their role. Demonstrates mastery in their area of technical capability. Stays up to date with advances in their field and commits to their continuous development.

Why this matters for Data analysts: The Standard's knowledge covers tools (SQL, R/Python, Excel), data visualisation, and data architecture. SFIA Data Analytics (DTAN) and DDaT Data Analyst capability frameworks add depth. The technical floor is high and the toolset evolves continuously.

What have you done to develop your knowledge, skills and abilities to help you achieve in your role?

- In what ways would you say you have developed?
- What opportunities have you taken/created?
- What improvements have resulted? How have these helped you?
- Talk to me about your development plan? How are you building your technical capability? What will doing these things give you?
- What is the next step for you in your career? How will you get there?

What do you do to ensure that you have all of the information you require to perform effectively in your role?

- Where do you get the information from?
- How does this assist you in your role?
- How do you keep up to date with developments in/outside the business?
- Why is it important to do this?

- What do you see as the key challenges/changes in the industry over the next 5 years?

What aspects of your technical capability are you particularly proud of?

- Why are you proud of these aspects?
- How do they help you perform your role?
- What have you done to create these strengths?
- Which aspects of your technical capability need the biggest improvement?
- What are doing to improve them?

NEGATIVE INDICATORS	1 · 2 · 3 · 4 · 5	POSITIVE INDICATORS
Fails to identify development needs in technical capability or does so superficially		Can clearly articulate strengths and development needs in technical capability
Identifies needs but waits for these to be addressed – does not proactively create or seize opportunities to build technical capability		Acts on development needs – creates and seizes opportunities for continuous professional development
Is guarded about own development needs		Is open about own development needs
Is focused on development in the here and now. Is unable to articulate a development plan to support longer term career goals		Considers development for both current role but also future career aspirations
No evidence of really understanding the nature of the industry, the market and the competition		Understand the industry, the market and the competition
Fails to keep self up to date with the necessary knowledge to perform in role		Stays abreast of trends/changes in the market place and applies these to their role
Cannot articulate the key challenges/changes facing the business/industry		Demonstrates a sound appreciation of the medium/ long term challenges facing the business
No strong profile/network/reputation in their field or in the industry – has not capitalised on wider networking opportunities		Has built a strong network and profile in the industry – seen as a thought leader
Lacks essential knowledge of subject area for effective performance in the role		Possesses the knowledge necessary to carry out the role. Demonstrates mastery of their subject areas.
Lacks some of the necessary skills/proficiency for success in the role		Skilled and proficient in their area

Summary of evidence: _____ Rating (1–5): _____

3. Influencing and Persuading

Presents simple, impactful messages in a compelling manner. Changes their emphasis and approach to address resistance, focusing on the value their ideas will bring different stakeholders. Confidently negotiates effective outcomes.

Why this matters for Data analysts: The Standard's skills include 'communicate findings to non-technical audiences'; DDaT Data Analyst expectations include 'communicates analysis'. The whole point of the analysis is to drive action — that is Influencing & Persuading. Argument from data is sustained and consequential.

Describe a situation where you had to explain something to somebody who did not share your level of understanding on the subject.

- How did you make the message meaningful/accessibile?
- What were the main challenges with this communication?

- How did you deal with these? What approach did you take?
- How did you gauge the effectiveness of your communication?

There are times where no one is prepared to listen or it is hard to keep the attention of others. Give me an example of a time when this has happened to you.

- What were the main objections/issues/barriers to others listening?
- How did you overcome these?
- What insight did you get into your audience? How did you get this?
- How did you use this insight to inform your style of communication?
- How did you present your message? What worked well? Less well?
- What was the outcome of the communication?

Describe a situation where you persuaded someone to do something (e.g. accept your point of view/get on board with an idea/commit to buying a product or service).

- How did your opinion contrast with their initial position?
- What was the main point of contention? How did you win them round?
- What was the outcome? What agreement was reached?
- What were the key things you did that made you successful?
- Has there been an occasion when you have been unable to persuade?

NEGATIVE INDICATORS	1 · 2 · 3 · 4 · 5	POSITIVE INDICATORS
Fails to convey information in a simple and accessible manner. Uses unnecessary jargon or fails to appreciate the baseline level of understanding of the audience		Aware of the need to keep messages simple and impactful – avoids using jargon and tailors message to the base level understanding of the audience
Presents information without consideration of the needs/ style/preferences of the audience. As such message may lack impact/be less compelling		Considers the style and needs of the audience when communicating. Adjusts style/tone/content to ensure the message is compelling and resonates
Highly logical/rational/factual in approach – no passion or enthusiasm displayed in tone/pace/body language/words when communicating with others		Displays passion and enthusiasm when interacting with others
Fails to emphasise the value that their ideas will bring to each individual stakeholder. Does not sell on an individual/emotive level		Considers the benefits to individual stakeholders and sells on the basis of these. Presents the information of value to them rather than losing this in all of the facts/detail
Loses credibility by presenting imbalanced arguments (e.g. focusing on the pros and disregarding the cons)		Presents a balanced view of pros and cons rather than an overly rosy picture
Fails to pick up on cues from audience (e.g. resistance/ apathy/opposition) or picks up on these but chooses to ignore them and presses on with message regardless		Tuned into the audience and able to pick up cues of disinterest/apathy/opposition/resistance. Confidently surfaces and deals with these
Becomes overly apologetic or deferential when faced with objections/resistance. Lacks conviction.		Handles objections convincingly – displays confidence and conviction when faced with opposition
No evidence on changing emphasis/approach/tone based on insights gained/responses from the audience. Is firmly on transmit rather than receive when communicating		Prepared to change emphasis/tone of communication in the moment in response to insights gained about the audience

No evidence of proactively seeking feedback on effectiveness of communication		Seeks feedback to gauge the effectiveness of communication and applies learning to new situations
No evidence of checking understanding of audience to ensure that messages are landing effectively		Seeks to clarify understanding to ensure that communication has landed effectively
Is less confident in situations requiring negotiation		Confidently negotiates successful outcomes
Enters negotiations without clarity on where concessions can be made and with limited understanding on items of high perceived value to the other party.		Prepares well for negotiation. Understands where concessions can be made and appreciates and uses items of high perceived value.

Summary of evidence: _____ Rating (1–5): _____

4. Collaborative Working

Looks to understand others' perspectives and objectives. Respects different styles/approaches, whilst adapting their own style to enable them to work effectively with others.

Why this matters for Data analysts: The Standard's skills include 'collaborate with stakeholders to define requirements'; DDaT requires 'works inclusively' and 'manages stakeholders'. Data analysts sit between business questions and technical methods; coordination across both is core.

Tell me about a time when you proactively sought the views of/engaged others to resolve a business issue.

- How did you ensure that the right people were engaged?
- How did you demonstrate that you had understood their views?
- How did their input inform and shape the final decision?
- What feedback did you receive?
- With hindsight, what might you do differently next time?

Describe a situation where your personal views/objectives were at odds with the team/key people around you?

- How did you react?
- How did you demonstrate you understood/respected their perspective whilst being clear about your own?
- What was the outcome?
- What did you learn about how best to engage with others?

Describe a situation where you have had to work hard to really understand the perspective of another person?

- What was the reason for the lack of understanding?
- What made it difficult to gain this understanding/get under the skin?
- How did you manage this?
- How have applied the learning from this situation to enhance your interactions with others?

NEGATIVE INDICATORS	1 · 2 · 3 · 4 · 5	POSITIVE INDICATORS
Fails to engage and seek the views of others. Is more directive in approach and therefore may gain compliance rather than commitment to action/ideas		Proactively seeks the views and opinions of others when dealing with business issues – adopts a more collaborative/democratic approach to problem solving

Seeks to be seen to engage rather than actually demonstrating that they have heard the views and ideas of others (e.g. by adjusting their path or shifting their perspective in the light of the information gleaned)		Listens carefully to the thoughts and ideas of others and demonstrates that they have listened to and heard their views (e.g. by shifting own perspective in the light of the information given)
Adopts a "my way or the highway approach" – has strong views and may be less respectful of counter views or arguments		Shares own ideas/opinions willingly whilst recognising and respecting the views and opinions of others
Fails to manage conflict/divergent views or styles and approaches		Effectively manages conflict and potentially divergent views to get positive outcomes for all parties. Appreciates the need to work with others with different styles and approaches to their own
Seeks to be understood rather than truly understand the needs/objectives and perspectives of others. Transmits own views rather than questions to better understand		Takes steps to really understand the goals and objectives of others
Adopts a one style fits all approach. No evidence of adjusting/adapting style based on the needs of the situation and audience		Adapts style effectively based on understanding of the needs and objectives of others
No evidence of reflecting on the impact of their own style or of considering how they might be contributing to the breakdown of working relationships		Aware of the impact of own style on others and the need to check out assumptions they make about others and their style of working/needs/preferences

Summary of evidence: _____ Rating (1–5): _____

5. Dependability

Conscientious and thorough in their approach to work, delivering what they promise to the necessary standard. Behaves in line with the organisation's values and ethical principles.

Why this matters for Data analysts: The Standard's named behaviours 'thorough', 'takes responsibility' and 'professional', combined with data ethics and GDPR compliance and data quality requirements. The integrity of the data product depends on the analyst's reliability.

At times we all fail to deliver what's required or struggle to keep our motivation to see things through to completion. Describe a time when this has happened to you?

- Why were you unable to deliver/what caused you to lose motivation?
- How did you feel?
- What did you do to try to overcome the problem?
- What feedback did you receive? What did you learn?
- What have you done to prevent the same situation occurring?

Give an example of a time when you've had to compromise on quality in order to get a task completed on time?

- How did you feel about the compromise on quality?
- What were the issues that you anticipated as a result of this?
- What did you do to address these issues? Who did you consult/inform?
- Can you describe a time when you have not been prepared to compromise on quality/standards and have pulled out all of the stops to deliver to expectation?

Day-to-day, how do you monitor the quality/standard of your work?

- What measures are in place to allow you to do this?
- How useful is the information from the measures?
- How have you used the feedback to assist you in providing and maintaining high quality/standards in your work?

NEGATIVE INDICATORS	1 · 2 · 3 · 4 · 5	POSITIVE INDICATORS
Lacks personal accountability – prepared to let things slip or leave issues unresolved where this would require additional/discretionary effort		Takes personal accountability for performance and shows tenacity and commitment in the pursuit of goals. Works hard to self-motivate and maintain motivation
Quickly loses focus/enthusiasm or energy for a project/ activity when the going gets tough		Shows determination to see things through to completion. Remains focused on the task in hand when the going gets tough
Is prepared to cut corners to meet deadlines (or lets deadlines slip in the pursuit of perfection) – no evidence of weighing up the needs by context/ circumstances		Appreciates the balance between delivering to time and delivering to quality standards and consciously works to get the balance between these right
May not deliver on commitments – may over promise or under deliver. Trivialises the importance of delivery and honouring commitments to others		Delivers what they commit to – can be relied upon to deliver on promises
Is focused on quantity rather than quality of output. Completes tasks to tick the box rather than to ensure that quality standards are adhered to		Is focused on standards and quality of output
No evidence of measuring/assessing the quality of outputs either via formal or informal measures		Keeps a check on the quality and standards of work via formal and informal checks and measures
Is prepared to stand by rather than challenge behaviour that is not in line with organisational values. In doing so pays lip service to the values		Is prepared to put self out and challenge behaviour that is not aligned to the values of the business. Takes the values seriously and can make the link between the values and the success of the business
Cannot articulate the organisations values or give examples of how they have role modelled the values through their own behaviour		Seeks to role model the organisations values in all that they do – can provide clear examples of how the values have driven decisions/behaviour

Summary of evidence: _____ **Rating (1–5):** _____