

HFM TALENTINDEX

Part of the ASSESSIO GROUP



Select

Participant

John Example

Competency profile

Example

Client

HFMtalentindex

Created on

02-03-2021

This report was generated by the HFMtalentindex Online Assessment system. The data in this report are based on the answers given by the participant on one or more questionnaires and/or psychological tests. When interpreting this report, the user should be aware of the limitations of these instruments. HFMtalentindex doesn't accept any liability for the consequences of the use of this report. No rights can be derived from the outcome and content of this report in any way.

© 2021 HFMtalentindex. All rights reserved.

Introduction

The Select provides an overview of John Example's qualities. The scores in this report are based on his responses to the HFMtalentindex personality measurement, the Complete Intelligence Test ('VIT') and the HFMtalentindex motivations test; questionnaires specifically designed to analyse relevant personality traits, intelligence and motivations. Based on the results of these questionnaires, it is possible to make an assessment of the kind of behaviour John Example is likely to display, and of his potential for developing himself in the selected competencies.

When using this report, it is important to keep the following in mind:

1. The report is generated by HFMtalentindex' rule-based expert system, meaning that the measurement is performed in a highly objective and accurate manner. The system generates results based on a combination of the expertise of experienced organisational psychologists and extensive scientific research.
2. The scores in the report were determined by comparing John Example's response pattern to that of an extensive norm group of people, representing a variety of professional roles in various sectors. The report shows how John Example's scores compare to the average scores of the norm group.
3. The report is based on the answers provided by John Example regarding himself. This means that the measurement is based on John Example's self-image. It is therefore important to compare the results in the report with other sources of information, such as (previous) work experiences and results, an interview with John Example, his CV and references, if applicable.



Report structure


The Select consists of the below mentioned sections. John Example's results are discussed, based on a graphical representation of the scores for that particular element (paragraph 1) and a textual explanation (paragraph 2). The following elements of the results will successively be explained in further detail:

- General potential
- Competencies
- Intelligence
- Motivations
- Learning Agility

The final section of the report concludes with a number of interview questions for each competency, that are specifically selected, based on John Example's profile.

This report shows how John Example scores in comparison with the selected norm population. Some of John Example's scores are displayed on a nine-point scale. Each point on the scale corresponds to a part of a normal distribution (a stanine) that shows how often these results occur in the norm population. The more extreme the score, the less often it occurs.

Most people (54%) have an average score (stanines 4, 5 and 6 combined). The stanine scores 4, 5 and 6 can be explained as slightly below average, average and slightly above average. Just under a quarter of people (23%) have a high score (stanines 7, 8 and 9 combined). These stanine scores can be explained as clearly above average, far above average and very high. Also less than a quarter of people have a low score. The stanine scores 1, 2 and 3 can be explained as very low, far below average and clearly below average.



Competency profile

John Example's profile includes the following competencies:

Operational strength

Accuracy	Effectively handling detailed information and being consistently attentive to details.
Decisiveness	Independently making decisions and sticking to them; having the courage to make firm decisions.
Devotion to quality	Demanding a high quality of provided products and services, and acting accordingly.
Dutifulness	Demonstrating commitment to agreements.

Interpersonal strength

Client-focused	Identifying and actively responding to clients' wishes and needs.
Cooperation	Working with others in order to effectively contribute to a common objective.

Personal strength

Stress resistance	Being able to handle stress.
-------------------	------------------------------


Conceptual strength

Creativity	Providing original solutions to problems. Coming up with new work methods and alternative angles.
------------	---



1. Score overview

1.1 Graphical overview of the general potential



1.2 Textual explanation of the general potential

John Example has a slightly above average potential for the chosen competency profile.

Strongest competencies

- Devotion to quality
- Accuracy
- Dutifulness

Weakest competencies

- Stress resistance
- Decisiveness

John Example has a clearly above average score on the intelligence test. This means that he is very capable of processing new information, solving complex problems and identifying connections.

1.3 Preferred roles

The combination of John Example's key motivations results in the following preferred roles:

Preferred roles



Achiever



Anchor

Key motivations

- Realisation
- Quality
- Efficiency
- Analysing



2.1 Graphical overview of the competency scores

Overall score competencies 

Operational strength

Accuracy 

Decisiveness 

Devotion to quality 

Dutifulness 

Interpersonal strength

Client-focused 

Cooperation 

Personal strength

Stress resistance 

Conceptual strength

Creativity 



2.2 Textual explanation of the competency scores

Operational strength

Accuracy **Far above average**
John Example is an organised person by nature; it is important to him that things are handled accurately and precisely. Although he may take ownership of the tasks he considers important, he won't be as conscientious when the task at hand is less important to him. In addition, it is important to John Example to prevent mistakes. As such, he will put energy into the error-checking process.

Decisiveness **Far below average**
John Example can be somewhat insecure about the correctness of his ideas and decisions, and likes to consult others in order to receive support and confirmation for his proposals. In addition, although he enjoys having a say in the decisions that are made, he doesn't necessarily have to be the one making decisions. Because John Example has a tendency to worry about things, it will probably often be difficult for him to make a decision in practice.

Devotion to quality **Very high**
In general, John Example wants to do everything he does very well and is driven to provide quality. He considers it important to carry out the tasks as agreed and to provide the corresponding quality. He worries rather easily about matters and thus has a strong drive to prevent or repair errors.

Dutifulness **Slightly above average**
Although John Example has enough discipline to complete the things he starts, it may sometimes take him some time to get started. In addition, it is fairly important to him to honour agreements and deliver what was promised. Although John Example prefers to give an honest account of the situation, he will sometimes, if necessary, give an account that isn't completely accurate.

Interpersonal strength

Client-focused **Average**
John Example will usually act friendly and involved towards clients. In addition, he enjoys interacting with clients. However, he often desires some time to work things out for himself. Although John Example will try to come up with realistic solutions for clients, he risks overemphasising the impossibilities.

Cooperation **Average**
John Example recognises the usefulness of cooperation, and seeks out others if this has a functional purpose. Once he has committed to a collaboration, he makes an effort to honour his agreements. On account of John Example's sometimes rather sceptical attitude, he may somewhat suppress the energy needed to find solutions together.

Personal strength

Stress resistance **Very low**
John Example can worry rather quickly about how things are going. When he feels pressured, he is likely to take it very much to heart. John Example's self-critical attitude often leads him to doubt whether he has things under control.



Conceptual strength

Creativity

Slightly above average

John Example sometimes enjoys coming up with new ideas and 'thinking outside the box'. He has a fairly precise nature and strongly dislikes disorder. As a result, he may have difficulty being flexible enough to take a creative approach to things. Because of John Example's fairly broad range of interests, he is able to focus his creativity on different subjects, and is generally easily inspired.



3. Intelligence

The results of the VIT give a good indication of John Example's ability to make an inventory of new complex problems, analyse them, identify connections, form an opinion and formulate solutions. John Example's scores were compared with his norm group.

Overall score



John Example has a clearly above average score on the intelligence test. This means that he is very capable of processing new information, solving complex problems and identifying connections.

Numerical reasoning ability



John Example has a clearly above average score on numerical reasoning ability. This means that he is very capable of analysing and reasoning from numerical information.

Mathematical aptitude



John Example has a slightly above average score on mathematical aptitude. This means that he has a feeling for numbers and numerical relationships. As a result, he is capable of working with number-based problems.

Verbal aptitude



John Example has a clearly above average score on verbal aptitude. This means that he has a feeling for words and their mutual relationships. As a result, he is very capable of working with text-based problems.

Logical reasoning ability



John Example has a clearly above average score on logical reasoning ability. This means that he is very capable of assessing new information and drawing logical conclusions from this information.

How was John Example's score calculated?


Used norm:	Higher professional education
Number of completed questions:	51 of the 68 questions
Number of correct answers:	44 of the 51 questions
Used time:	30 of the available 30 minutes



4. Motivations

The results of the HFMtalentindex motivations test give a good indication of what motivates John Example in his work and which targets he strives for. To a certain extent, motivations determine the environment in which John Example feels comfortable and the way in which he works together with others.

4.1 Graphical overview of the preferred roles



Key motivations

- **Realisation**
Purposefully working on concrete results.
- **Quality**
Delivering accurate and flawless work.
- **Efficiency**
Working systematically, completing tasks properly in one go and not wasting time on irrelevant matters.
- **Analysing**
Thoroughly researching matters.



4.2 Textual explanation of the preferred roles

Achiever	Very strong preference
Style:	Achievers combine structure with result orientation. They enjoy arranging and organising things. They look for structural solutions. They make clear agreements and take responsibility for the results. Achievers usually have a management position at some point in their career.
Role in the team:	Achievers guide the team towards making clear agreements and a plan of action. It bothers them when there is no real structure in the team, or when there is too much emphasis on the social aspects of the team. Achievers step in, to get things done.
Strength:	Responsibility, realisation
Weakness:	Tunnel vision
Stressor:	Setbacks
Coping style:	Effort

Anchor	Strong preference
Style:	Anchors are perfectionists. They work meticulously and accurately, and have a strong need for structure. Anchors want to work towards results in an effective way. In doing so, quality is more important than speed. Anchors are often good at processing information and can pinpoint the causes of problems.
Role in the team:	Anchors' need for structure brings a systematic approach to the team. They prefer to know exactly what is expected of them, and will emphasise this in the collaboration.
Strength:	Continuity, trustworthiness
Weakness:	Inflexibility
Stressor:	Unpredictability
Coping style:	Structure



5. Learning Agility

Learning Agility is the ability to rapidly develop new effective behaviour, based on new experiences. It is a form of learning ability and thereby gives an indication of a person's potential. People with a high score on Learning Agility learn more and faster from new situations than people with a low score on Learning Agility. High scorers are able to benefit more from the experience, are constantly looking for new challenges, seek feedback in order to learn, recognise patterns in unfamiliar situations and effectively involve others, in order to give meaning and understanding to experiences.


On the next pages, you will first find an overview of John Example's scores on Learning Agility and its different facets. Following this overview, it will be explained how Learning Agility is measured and what characterises people who have high scores on the various facets of Learning Agility.

Why is Learning Agility important?

Learning Agility is used to measure whether a person has a general potential to rapidly understand new things. These things may not yet be relevant at the present time, but could become relevant in the future. People with a high Learning Agility are able to rapidly pick up and understand things in all sorts of new situations. Organisations notice that their world is changing faster and faster. That means that roles and positions are also changing more quickly. So if we know a person is currently suitable for position A, it very well may be that position A no longer exists tomorrow, or has strongly changed. In that case it is important to know how fast someone will be able to understand the new situation. Learning Agility provides a way to measure that ability. Learning Agility also appears to be a good predictor of High Potentials. Leadership talent in an increasingly complex environment is scarce. That means that knowing early on who your leaders of the future are, gives a competitive advantage to organisations.



5.1 Score overview



Change Agility Slightly below average
Curiosity, love to experiment, trying things, passion for new experiences.



Mental Agility Clearly above average
Creative, an open perspective, new ideas, easily handling complexity, creating clarity in ambiguous situations.



People Agility Average
Constructive to others, open to people with different backgrounds and opinions, desire to understand others.



Results Agility Slightly above average
Remaining calm under pressure, continue to show leadership, able to identify results in a new situations, creating focus.



Self-awareness Average
Knowing oneself, self-critical, development-oriented.



5.2 How is Learning Agility constructed?

Learning Agility is determined on the basis of a number of specific personality traits and motivations of John Example. Learning Agility is measured in four facets and one transcending factor: Self-awareness, which influences the scores on all facets.

Change Agility

People with a high score on Change Agility are characterised by a constant curiosity, that is fuelled by new unknown things. They like to experiment, try things, and have a passion for new experiences. As a result, they experience more. They are able to learn more from their experiences, because they are intrinsically motivated to investigate matters and enjoy when things are not yet known to them.

Mental Agility

People with a high score on Mental Agility enjoy using new ideas to create new insights when things are complex or unclear. They like to analyse and are often able to get to the bottom of things in new ways, by thinking outside the box. They have an open perspective and are challenged by new ideas. This helps them recognise patterns in new experiences more quickly than others. They quickly understand how the situation works and what they can learn from their experience.

People Agility

People with a high score on People Agility are constructive to others and are open to people with different backgrounds and opinions. They have a need to properly understand what others mean and take others' opinions seriously. This makes it easier for them to get in touch with others and they succeed better in learning from the input of others. In addition, they can adapt more easily, for example to people from other cultures. As a result, other people share more with them.

Results Agility

People with a high score on Results Agility have a strong desire to be successful and always look for the best way to achieve results. They are often ambitious, self-confident and remain calm under pressure. Because they are better able to set goals in new and unfamiliar situations, they maintain focus and learn quickly what is or isn't important in order to make new things successful.

Self-awareness

People with a high score on Self-awareness know their own strengths and weaknesses. They are often critical of their own performance and their actions. As a result, they are more keen on how they can do things better and their overall willingness to learn is higher. Therefore, Self-awareness has a special role in Learning Agility: a high score increases the possibilities on the other Learning Agility elements, while a low score limits them. For this reason, you will find a separate score for your Self-awareness Factor. If it is green, then your Self-awareness increases your options. If it is red, it is a limiting factor in your performance. The indicated factor is already incorporated in your scores.



6. Interview questions

Based on John Example's scores, a number of competencies has been selected for which he showed remarkable scores. For each of these competencies, a number of questions has been listed which may help clarify these competency scores.

Tips for asking the right questions

- Avoid using *theoretical questions* ('how would you...?'). These are open to speculation and giving desirable answers. You won't gain insight in what the candidate actually does.
- Ask for *specific examples of recent behaviour*. People change. Recent behaviour has the most predictive value.
- Try to avoid using *closed questions* (questions that can be answered with either 'yes' or 'no'). Rather start questions with words such as 'what', 'how' and 'why'.
- Ask *multiple questions* regarding the same competency.

Operational strength

Accuracy

- Can you give an example of a task that you took full ownership of? Can you give an example of a task on which you worked less conscientiously? In your opinion, what are the most important differences between these two tasks?
- How do you ensure that you stay focused on details? Can you illustrate this with an example?

Decisiveness

- Have you ever made a decision that had a major impact on your team? Can you illustrate this with an example? What was the basis for your decision? What did you experience as positive and negative aspects in this respect?
- Have you ever abandoned a decision in order to avoid conflict within your team? What was the basis for abandoning your decision? What did you experience as positive and negative aspects in this respect?
- Have you ever experienced that a problem had already resolved before you had reached a decision about it? How did this happen? Can you illustrate this with an example?
- What is the best way to describe your way of making decisions? Can you illustrate this with an example?
- What was the last independent decision you made? How did you reach this decision? In retrospect, are you happy with your decision?

Dutifulness

- Can you give an example of a situation in which you deliberately misrepresented a situation to a certain extent, in order to reach/secure your goals? Can you give an example of a situation in which you deliberately presented a situation in a complete and honest way, despite the fact that this could jeopardise your personal goals? How are these situations different from one another?
- While carrying out a task, have you ever found it difficult to motivate yourself to complete it? What was the situation? What action did you take at the time? What was the outcome?
- Have you ever found it difficult to motivate yourself to begin a certain task? What was the situation? What action did you take at the time? What was the outcome?



Interpersonal strength

Client-focused

- Do you enjoy working with clients? Can you illustrate this with an example?
- Has anyone ever commented on your way of presenting your ideas, saying that you place too much emphasis on the risks and impossibilities? Can you illustrate this with an example?

Cooperation

- What, in your opinion, is the added value of collaboration?
- How do you determine whether or not a collaboration will be functional? Can you give an example of a collaboration request that you accepted and a collaboration request you rejected? What, in your opinion, was the difference between these requests?
- What is the most important thing you gain from a collaborative project?
- Can you give an example of a colleague's or employee's request for help, which you didn't address? Can you give an example of a colleague's or employee's request for help, which you did address? How were these two requests different from one another?

Personal strength

Stress resistance

- Can you describe a situation in which the pressure on you rose considerably? How did you handle this? Why did you handle it in that particular way? What was the effect of your approach?
- Can you describe a situation in which you had to deal with a setback? How did you handle this? Why did you handle it in that particular way? What was the effect of your approach?
- Can you give an example of a difficult situation that you got out of, or a problem that you solved yourself? How did you approach this? Can you give an example of a difficult situation that you didn't get out of, or a problem that you were unable to solve yourself? How did you approach this? How were these situations different from one another?

Conceptual strength

Creativity

- Can you describe a situation in which things turned out differently than you had expected? What did you make of this situation? How did you handle it?



Social desirability

The HFMTalentindex personality measurement is checked for socially desirable answering tendencies, by the inclusion of control questions. We distinguish between two types of social desirability, which will be discussed here.

Self-deception

A high score (2 or 3) on self-deception indicates that the participant unconsciously overestimates the effectiveness of his actions and his way of thinking. The participant runs the risk of overestimating himself and may have a rather unrealistic impression of how effective his own actions are. Participants who score high on the self-deception assessment often have difficulty identifying their own weak points.

Tips for discussing the report

When discussing the report, we recommend that you ask these participants about any feedback they may have received from those around them. By assessing this feedback, you may be able to break loose from the possibly distorted perception of the participant. You can do so by asking specific practical examples. For example, you can use the following questions: what are the strong points you are complimented on by your current supervisor? What are the improvement areas? What qualities do your colleagues appreciate you for? On what issues do you sometimes clash with colleagues? What do your subordinates identify as positive about your managerial style? What do they see as points requiring your attention?

Impression management

A high score (2 or 3) on impression management indicates that the participant consciously reports desirable behaviour and suppresses undesirable behaviour. This is the most obvious and conscious form of social desirability. The participant purposefully paints a picture of himself that is too positive. There is a risk that those participants were looking for the answers they thought to be the 'right answers' when completing the questionnaire.

Tips for discussing the report

When discussing the report, we recommend that you continue asking about the participant's strong points emerging from the report. We recommend that you also use specific practical examples for this purpose. It often clarifies matters if the participant has to describe a situation in which something went well, and a similar situation in which the participant was less successful. How were these situations different from one another? In the event of high scores on this point, watch out for so-called 'positive weak points', such as 'people might even say I work too hard'.

A high score on one or both of the social desirability scales doesn't mean that the report is worthless. It indicates that you must be attentive to possible misrepresentations. The above explanation and tips may help you test the perception.

