

Participant: Simon Sample

Practitioner report

Strictly Private and Confidential

DATE:

About this report

This report has been produced for the exclusive use of practitioners who are professionally qualified in the use of personality measures and are conversant with the Congruity trait model of personality.

The results are derived from the participant's responses to the questionnaire and are shown in comparison to Managers and Professionals. Further explanation of the scores shown on the profile may be found in the Congruity manual.

Administrator and Participant versions of this report are also available, and include an expert interpretation of the participant's profile structured against relevant competencies. In addition, the Administrator Report contains an Executive Summary of the profile and suggests probe questions to corroborate the participant's self-description.

Since Congruity is a self-report measure, the results reflect the individual's self-perceptions. The data should therefore be treated as tentative, as providing clues for further exploration, rather than being regarded as definitive.

Personality data comes into its own when used as the basis for discussion at an interview. Inferences in this report can therefore be tested, refined, accepted or rejected based on further concrete evidence obtained from the participant. In this way, you can gain a more accurate understanding of the person.

As you use this report, be aware that personality is only one of a number of factors determining behaviour. Others include intellect, training and the particular context that the person is operating within. Used wisely, personality data is an insightful and powerful tool, but it is only one part of the picture.

The shelf-life of this report is one year. After this time, re-testing should be considered.

Please remember that the information contained in this report is potentially sensitive and every effort should be made to ensure that it is stored in a secure place. Practitioner reports should only be shown to participants in the context of a discussion with a qualified practitioner in which the meaning of the scales can be fully explained and explored with them.

For more information on the appropriate use of personality data, or to find out more about this tool including fuller definitions of the scales, please visit www.nscg.com.

Profile of Simon Sample

Openness		
Tough minded <i>(logic and evidence, measurement)</i>		Empathic <i>(feelings and sensitivities, engagement)</i>
Pragmatic <i>(grounded, concrete)</i>		Conceptual <i>(theoretical, creative)</i>
Focused <i>(here and now, reality)</i>		Diffuse <i>(thinking more than doing, disconnected)</i>
Conservative <i>(loyal, status quo)</i>		Change oriented <i>(challenge, radical)</i>
Conscientiousness		
Self referenced <i>(personal codes and preferences, irreverent)</i>		Rule conscious <i>(sense of duty, compliant)</i>
Less exacting <i>(accepting, easy going)</i>		Precise <i>(standards, need for achievement)</i>
Unstructured <i>(adaptable, comfortable amid ambiguity)</i>		Methodical <i>(order, clarity)</i>
Extraversion		
Detached <i>(avoids involvement, not popularity-seeking)</i>		Affiliative <i>(approachable, relationships)</i>
Self Contained <i>(low social contact, work alone)</i>		Sociable <i>(interactive, stimulated by social contact)</i>
Less stimulus hungry <i>(considered, serious)</i>		Enthusiastic <i>(active, impulsive)</i>
Impassive <i>(diplomatic, quiet)</i>		Expressive <i>(communicative, unrestrained)</i>
Measured <i>(guarded, formal)</i>		Direct <i>(straightforward, informal)</i>
Independent <i>(autonomous, separate)</i>		Team oriented <i>(collaborative, association)</i>
Shy <i>(reserved, social unease)</i>		Socially confident <i>(assured, rapport)</i>
Emotion		
Affected by feelings <i>(tendency to worry, apprehensive)</i>		Emotionally resilient <i>(maintains perspective, robust)</i>
Self doubting <i>(internalises anxieties, fear of failure)</i>		Self believing <i>(confidence, conviction)</i>
Pessimistic <i>(downbeat, problem focussed)</i>		Optimistic <i>(positive, empowered)</i>
Anxious <i>(uneasy, fretful)</i>		Calm <i>(relaxed, composed)</i>
Agreeableness		

Sceptical <i>(disbelieving, dubious)</i>		Trusting <i>(unquestioning, benefit of the doubt)</i>
Assertive <i>(forceful, insistent)</i>		Accommodating <i>(obliging, conflict avoidance)</i>
Need for recognition <i>(approval seeking, self promotion)</i>		Modest <i>(unassuming, humble)</i>

Summary

This executive summary provides an overview of the key elements of the profile.

Simon describes a strong desire to influence compared to other questionnaire respondents. He indicates the presence of a forceful nature, and a strong sense of his own significance. He is likely to be competitive and ambitious and not afraid of being in positions of authority. There appears therefore to be a basic motivation here to lead. His willingness to compromise and listen would be worth enquiring about at interview.

Oddly, although describing a high level of self-assertion, Simon's ability to influence may be impaired by a seemingly modest level of social confidence. He is likely to operate best when with familiar people. Interviewers will be best placed to assess the effect of this low level of social confidence on his ability to have impact.

Simon's social reticence is also seen in what appears to be a strong preference for being diplomatic and indirect in his approach. He describes being very careful about what he says and how it is put.

Simon describes being both assertive and having a preference for focussing on the objective considerations of task delivery. If a leader, this may mean less awareness of the feelings of others, less interest in putting himself in other people's shoes and seeing issues from their perspectives.

Simon's leadership style is not likely to be characterised by obsessiveness about standards. His self-assertion appears to be combined with some concern with standards, but he is not likely to be overly controlling in style. He appears to balance the requirements to provide some clarity whilst allowing the team sufficient autonomy and discretion.

The way Simon describes himself suggests a much less compliant and more individualistic approach at work. He seemingly likes to do things his own way. The implications of this apparent preference for referencing his behaviour against his own standards and rules may well need to be questioned at interview.

Simon describes, as suggested, less respect for rules and regulations than most. As might be expected, he also appears to be relatively unconcerned with order at the level of day- to-day planning and organising. This suggests he copes well with ambiguity and unpicking schedules. However, the apparent lack of interest in planning and being systematic in approach may well need to be explored.

Simon's responses suggest a level of general emotional resilience which is fairly typical of the group he is being compared with. With such an average score the work context normally becomes more important. Where there is an increased possibility of sudden and unanticipated demands for performance, Simon might struggle to cope and maintain a sense of perspective.

Simon appears currently to be experiencing a fair amount of anxiety. This suggests Simon is stressed, much more so than most people who complete the questionnaire. This is likely to make him more impatient and tense than others.

Coupled with the average overall emotional control Simon describes is what appears to be a tendency to worry a good deal and, for example, doubt his abilities and judgement. This raises questions about his ability to cope with an emotionally demanding setting.

Simon describes being reasonably affiliative and likely to build effective relationships with colleagues. Normally, people with scores like this put effort into building relationships where there is some role-related reason for doing so. Whilst reasonably friendly, he is not likely to over-identify with individuals or allow relationships to blur his professional judgement.

Whilst being unlikely to over-identify with individuals, Simon also describes much less need for social interaction and diversion than most. He appears to prefer environments where he is less likely to be distracted socially by others.

Simon also appears unlikely to over-identify with the team. He seems to be less convinced of the value of team-working than many people.

Although describing an average concern for personal involvement with others, Simon also reports much less interest in subjective issues, such as the feelings and sensitivities of others. He appears more focussed on objective realities. Therefore, his ability to see other perspectives would be worth exploring at interview.

When making a decision, Simon describes a willingness to think quite radically about the options available.

Interest in looking beyond current arrangements is also seen in the way he describes enjoying thinking conceptually and exploring abstract possibilities. So decision-making is likely to reflect a strong grasp of the broader context, and a willingness to look beyond the current time horizon.

Although seemingly willing to think quite radically and conceptually, Simon's responses elsewhere suggest his decision-making is less likely to be influenced by a concern with how others might feel about options.