



premium candidate report

Jonathan Sample

01 February 2010



preface

MAPP is a self-report questionnaire designed to measure characteristics that are important in the occupational setting.

These characteristics may be categorised under four headings:

- People - interpersonal style including influencing, leadership, and team membership
- Task - approach to work including innovation, problem solving, planning and decision making
- Feelings - emotional self-assurance, resilience and response to stress
- Values - satisfiers and dissatisfiers in relation to the content and context of the job

Response Style is also measured. This provides an indication of the respondent's style in answering the questions rather than their personality in the broader context.

This report is based solely on the respondent's answers to the MAPP questions. The statements in this report are included on the basis that they are generally true for someone who has given similar answers to this respondent, but **CANNOT** be guaranteed to be accurate in every detail. No questionnaire is infallible. Although the results are generally very reliable, either the respondent or the assessor may disagree with some of the following descriptions.

When using this report you should also remember that the questionnaire is a self-report instrument and therefore provides an indication of how the respondent perceives their own personality and values. The questionnaire has been developed to highlight typical behaviours and preferences, but does not provide measures of ability. Furthermore, there are no rights or wrongs in personality. Different profiles can be linked with success and job satisfaction in particular occupational roles, but there is no such thing as a profile which is generally good or generally bad.

The scores which are indicated graphically in this report, and the statements derived from these scores, are based on comparisons of results with a specific comparison group (**NOT** the general population).

Copyright 2009 Knight Chapman Psychological Ltd. All rights reserved.



leadership

Jonathan is not the sort who always has to get his own way. He doesn't see himself as a natural leader and he is fairly ready to compromise with differing viewpoints, not stubbornly insisting that people should always go along with what he wants. He prefers to operate as a team member rather than pushing himself to the fore, and he probably dislikes being in situations where he has to tell others what to do. He is generally more prepared to submit himself to the authority of someone else than most in the comparison group, and is likely to favour co-operation more than conflict. He is reasonably willing to take on board other points of view, being less domineering and uncompromising, only taking on the leadership initiative when there is no other obvious candidate.

Jonathan is a Participative leader with low situational flexibility. This means he will be more people oriented than task oriented in his leadership style, and will see "achievement through others" as the most appropriate route to task success. His primary concerns in managing others are likely to be the well-being, motivation and commitment of his team. He will typically involve colleagues and subordinates in planning and decision making, not only on a consultative basis, but often in a fully democratic manner, allowing himself to be influenced by others even if the consensus view is not entirely consistent with his own. He will favour a friendly, cohesive and co-operative working environment, avoiding autocracy and deliberately underplaying differences in authority or status. His lower than average situational flexibility suggests that he will be quite consistent in this style of leadership, using the same approach in most management contexts and rarely seeing fit to adapt his style to the characteristics of subordinates (or team colleagues) or to other situational factors.

People score is 6.6

Task score is 4.3

Situational flexibility score is 1

Directive leaders are high on Task but low on People. Consultative leaders are high on People and Task. Participative leaders are high on People but low on Task. Laissez-faire leaders are low on both People and Task



team membership/sensitivity

Jonathan is unlikely to mince his words. He is extremely open and candid, saying exactly what he thinks in most situations. He expects others to take him as they find him, and he in turn will let them know precisely where they stand. He dislikes dissembly and artifice, telling others frankly what he thinks. It is likely that others will consider him to be blunt or tactless on occasion, for Jonathan spends little time analysing the feelings and motives of others, finding it hard to get to the bottom of these. He is less observant when it comes to picking up the signals that people are sending out, and so he may be inclined to put his foot in it. He concerns himself with what people do rather than why they might be doing it, and will rarely see fit to adapt his response to the subtleties of the situation in which he is operating.

2 Implementer
2 Plant
3 Coordinator
3 Resource Investigator
3 Team Worker
4 Completer Finisher
5 Monitor Evaluator
6 Shaper

Jonathan's primary team role is Shaper. Shapers are competitive and goal oriented. They strongly dislike complacency and can be critical of others. They are "driven" and may have high levels of nervous energy. Shapers are prone to frustration and disappointment. They go all out to succeed by whatever means they can and may react badly to setbacks. The Shaper's high level of energy coupled with a single-minded pursuit of targets can bring them into conflict with other team members. They are not concerned about relationships in the team, solely getting results. They come into their own when teams are functioning badly and need someone to drive matters forward.

Jonathan's secondary team role is Monitor Evaluator. Monitor Evaluators bring cool, detached analysis to the team. They may lack any real commitment to goals and the group, perhaps being detached or indifferent, but they are careful decision takers. Relying on logic and rigorous analysis, they consider matters objectively and help ensure that the best ideas are taken up and the weaker ones discarded. Monitor Evaluators are hard-headed but may lack the all round skills to motivate others.



influencing style

Jonathan is reasonably comfortable when meeting new people - certainly as much as is typical for the comparison group. He may not always feel totally at ease in unfamiliar company, sometimes being a little reticent about contributing to discussions, but he is no more shy in this respect than most. He is also willing on occasion to persist in trying to influence others to his point of view, perhaps not to the extent that he always feels that he can convince others, but this is relatively typical of most in the comparison group. Although Jonathan may not consider himself a natural salesperson, he doesn't shrink from situations where a degree of persuasiveness is required.

Jonathan is a reasonably sociable person in the sense that he enjoys having some contact with other people. He is not overly dependent upon others, however, and can be quite happy on his own from time to time. He probably enjoys the sort of job that provides him with some scope for social interaction as well as opportunities to operate in a more solitary way, not always being surrounded by others. He is rather less warm and affectionate than many, however, and he may be less inclined to express sympathy for others readily. As a result, he may come over as someone who is less interested in people's problems, and be regarded as quite aloof or distant. Therefore, whilst deriving satisfaction from time to time by having company, he is probably seen as less approachable and friendly.





innovation/strategic orientation

Jonathan is more strategic than operational in his style of task management. He tends to address himself more to long-term considerations and broader ramifications, than the nitty gritty of task execution. Furthermore, he likes to take a fresh and possibly creative approach to most problems, and dislikes simply doing things by the book. He feels constrained if required to work within a rigid structure of established rules and systems: he will tend to avoid preconceived ideas and develop his own systems where necessary. He is therefore likely to feel most at home with objectives which call for less concern with implementational details and more concern with the wider issues. He will often set about meeting these objectives via less conventional routes. His personality is less suited to responsibilities requiring a more down to earth, pragmatic approach.





problem solving and decision making

He is fairly quick to make up his mind, sometimes taking decisions rapidly in order to seize opportunities. Although he is inclined to take risks by making decisions on the basis of limited information, he will bring to tasks a balanced style of thinking, generally taking a fairly objective, logical approach, but also allowing himself to be influenced by gut feel impressions. His analysis of problems will tend to reference hard, factual information, but will not necessarily involve a rigorous scientific or critical evaluation of the data. This analytical process will tend to be brief, with Jonathan coming to a rapid conclusion rather than pondering at length. His approach is therefore well matched to a role which requires him to think on his feet and deal quickly with crises.





planning and implementation

Jonathan is fairly orderly and systematic in his management of tasks. He will usually spend some time prioritising and planning before throwing himself into a piece of work. He prefers foresight, tidiness and punctuality to crisis management, and has a conscientious attitude to task completion. Jonathan will be quite disciplined in seeing tasks through to their conclusion. He will generally avoid distractions and persevere, even with tedious work, until final objectives are met. He is likely to be organised, methodical and structured in his work style, and should therefore be a reliable implementer, drawing on his tenacity, concentration and determination to get jobs properly finished off.



emotional resilience

Jonathan may occasionally experience self-doubts but no more so than most. He has a fairly typical level of self-esteem, and probably feels, at an emotional level, neither inferior or superior to his peers. Jonathan's internal perception of his own worth is likely to be quite realistic, and temperamentally he is fairly calm and stable, rarely feeling tense or on edge. He is quite laid back, and generally finds it easy to switch off from work-related problems. He will usually be relaxed unless there is something critical to worry about; he will, for the most part, take pressure in his stride, and is unlikely to experience stress unless in exceptional circumstances.



response to stress

He is generally thick skinned, rarely taking offence at remarks or criticisms made by others, even if these are unfair. He could not be described as emotionally sensitive; he is difficult to provoke or upset and tends not to experience strong reactive feelings. On the rare occasions when he does feel inwardly emotional (perhaps angry or frustrated or disappointed) he is unlikely to express his feelings freely. Jonathan usually avoids revealing his emotional state. He keeps his feelings under some control, and rarely sees fit to "let off steam". This emotional silence will have the advantages that Jonathan will be perceived as stable, resilient and unlikely to display any signs of volatility. However, his inscrutability may make him rather difficult to relate to, especially by people who like to freely discuss and express their feelings.



job content

He requires a degree of variety in his work, but no more than most respondents making up the comparison group. This suggests that he may dislike a highly predictable and unchanging role, but nevertheless is likely to tolerate a fair degree of repetition or stability without losing interest.

Jonathan puts little emphasis on creativity or individuality as satisfiers at work. He has a low need for self-expression, and does not see the workplace as appropriate for self-discovery or affirmation. He is not looking for reinforcement in the form of opportunities to apply unique or original ideas.

He is balanced in his inclination towards altruism, having some concern for the welfare of others, and enjoying to some extent the job satisfaction that comes from seeing that his efforts can have direct benefits to people other than himself. However, this is unlikely to extend to great personal sacrifices to help those in need, and Jonathan is unlikely to feel demotivated in a given job specifically because it fails to address social issues.

Jonathan is not particularly impressed by intellect. He believes that theoretical or abstract arguments are often irrelevant, that academics are sometimes out of touch with reality, and that society generally attaches too much value to intelligence and not enough to other human assets. He will tend to avoid involvement in highbrow conversation, finding any kind of pseudo-intellectual debate at best tedious and at worst repellent.

Jonathan has an unremarkable value for intimacy. Like most people he attaches some value to close relationships and feels that, to a degree at least, work provides an opportunity to meet people and make friends. He enjoys affection and camaraderie, but is not strongly dependent on human warmth and may be reluctant to allow relationships to influence work related decisions.

He likes to look at the funny side of situations and will typically take a light-hearted view even when dealing with quite serious issues. He enjoys jokes and jovial people, and will probably feel bored or restless if constantly surrounded by people who are much more solemn and serious-minded than himself. This certainly does not mean that Jonathan will never be serious about anything, but does indicate that he sees humour as healthy and desirable in many situations.



job context

Jonathan has a very low value for material wealth. He is not interested in money as a motivator, and will subordinate material gains to other aspects of job satisfaction. His score is quite extreme and, as such, may indicate an active rejection of material values.

He is balanced in his orientation towards co-operation and competition. He may sometimes evaluate his achievements on a relative basis, but his value for competition is in the average range and will not prohibit team-work or collaboration. Jonathan may not be particularly well suited to a very competitive environment, but may respond well to a culture which supports a moderate degree of competition amongst employees.

Jonathan is more motivated by process than outcome. His commitment stems more from enjoyment of job content than from seeing the fruits of his labours in the form of results. He is able to feel contented at work, even when not aiming towards a specific, concrete goal. He has a low need for achievement in comparison with others, and is probably best suited to a role where concern with approach and methodology is of more direct importance than bottom-line considerations.

He has a very low need for recognition from others. He can maintain motivation without positive feedback and support from colleagues, and takes little interest in other people's perceptions of his work. This non-reliance on approval from others means that Jonathan is well suited to an environment where he can expect little thanks for good work, and where overt respect and praise are something of a rarity.

Jonathan has little value for personal authority. He dislikes using his own status to influence people, and resents having to submit to the authority of others. Instead he values democratic styles of decision making and is therefore much better suited to participative management environments than autocratic or hierarchical management structures. He will want to feel free to question authority, and, in turn, is likely to feel tolerant of his own opinions and plans being questioned by subordinates.

He is not at all attracted by responsibility as a motivator in its own right. He is very happy to work on tasks that other people are in charge of, and is equally prepared to share accountability for outcomes which strictly fall within his own remit. He may even feel uncomfortable with the pressures of burdensome responsibilities and prefer that someone else is ultimately answerable.

Jonathan's need for job security is quite low. He rarely worries about his long-term career and may even dislike the idea of a safe, secure and closely defined future. This means that he can afford himself a reasonable degree of opportunism in his career choices, even if this implies some risk in terms of occupational stability.

He attaches little value to work for its own sake. This is not to say that he lacks motivation at work, but rather that he does not strongly identify himself with his job/employer, and would probably be happy to spend his time in other ways if he did not need to work for financial reasons. Other aspects of life may be more important to Jonathan than work, and, if given the choice, would probably prefer a role which gives him more rather than less leisure time.



principal motivators

Democratic management and participative decision-making culture.
Tasks with non-intellectual emphasis.
Working environment oriented towards humour and joviality.
Culture which subordinates the work ethic to other values.
Culture which favours openness in expression of opinions.
Scope to deal with problems in a fresh or creative manner.
Scope to deal with issues at global, strategic levels.
Tasks requiring an organised, systematic, methodical approach.
Scope to take risks and seize opportunities.



potential causes of dissatisfaction - general

Culture with strongly materialistic values.

Culture where emphasis is on results (at any price) with relatively little concern for process by which results are achieved.

Autocratic management style; hierarchical structure, status oriented culture; lack of opportunities to participate in decision-making.

Excessive responsibility; accountability for highly critical outcomes.

Culture which strongly values the work ethic.



potential causes of dissatisfaction - interpersonal

Serious-minded, solemn or humourless working environment.

Tasks requiring outward expression of interpersonal warmth.

Company politics; culture with low value for openness/candour; work requiring interpersonal flexibility, tact or diplomacy.

Work requiring assertive direction of others.



potential causes of dissatisfaction - task

Tasks with extensive abstract/intellectual content; intellectually oriented colleagues.

Being tied to rules and regulations; having to toe the line; having little scope to deal with problems in a fresh, unconstrained or creative manner.

Little or no opportunity to deal with issues at global, strategic levels; excessive operational/implementational task content.

Crisis management; having little or no opportunity to plan ahead; having to deal with issues in an unsystematic manner.

Having to wait for decisions; Being delayed when wanting to act quickly; cultures which are risk-averse.



management competence - planning/task management

POSSIBLE STRENGTHS

Systematic, organised and methodical style of task management. Plans and prioritises in advance. Keeps things tidy and up to date.

Q. Tell me about a recent project you ran. How did you set about planning it?

Q. What systems have you currently put in place to monitor your personal progress against targets?

Strategic orientation. Takes a more global perspective. Concerned with wider implications and longer-term plans.

Q. What contribution have you made to the long term goals and plans of your organisation?

Q. To what extent do you involve yourself in operational matters?

Conscientious and disciplined approach to implementation and task completion. Avoids distractions and concerned to meet deadlines.

Q. Under what circumstances are you distracted from the task in hand?

Q. How do you ensure that you meet deadlines?

POSSIBLE LIMITATIONS

Strategic/theoretical orientation may result in a less pragmatic style of task management. May fail to take account of shorter-term operational details.

Q. To what extent do you like to become involved in strategic and longer range issues in your work?

Q. Under what circumstances have you operated with a practical and less strategic focus?

Preference for systematic style of task management may cause difficulties in dealing with unforeseen problems, or more ambiguous situations where systems cannot be applied.

Q. Please give me an example of when you have had to react quickly to a sudden change in plans. What did you actually do?

Q. How do you typically respond when faced with ambiguous, poorly defined situations?



management competence - managing others

POSSIBLE STRENGTHS

Open and frank about own views and opinions. Candid; lets people know where they stand.

- Q. To what extent are you open about your views when talking to others?
- Q. How would you describe yourself as a politically sensitive person at work?

Prepared to compromise and accepts consensus. Avoids conflict by capitulating or making concessions.

- Q. What are the kinds of things that you are stubborn about at work?
- Q. Please tell me about a situation where you have worked to achieve a compromise?

Reasonably confident in social interactions.

- Q. What sort of group situations are most likely to make you feel apprehensive?
- Q. To what extent do you normally speak up and air your views at meetings?

Reasonably convincing but not overly persistent in persuading others to a point of view.

- Q. Please describe a situation where you have had to be persistent in persuading someone else to your point of view?
- Q. Under what circumstances do you prefer to agree to differ rather than force the issue?

Enjoys company of others sometimes but also happy to spend some alone. Not overly dependent on social contact.

- Q. To what extent do you look for social contact at work?
- Q. When are you more likely to prefer to work on your own?

POSSIBLE LIMITATIONS

Submissive and unassertive. Uncomfortable in a leadership role.

- Q. To what extent do you enjoy taking charge of people and situations?
- Q. Under what circumstances do you prefer to let others take control?

Uninterested in people's feelings and motivations. Less perceptive.

- Q. How much of your time do you devote to trying to fathom out people's underlying motives?
- Q. Tell me about a situation where you have had to motivate someone to do a task they are unhappy about?

Would rather capitulate than risk conflict. Frequently makes concessions and compromises. May lack conviction. Avoids confrontation.

- Q. To what extent do you pursue your own goals in an uncompromising way?
- Q. Tell me about a time when you have had to confront someone at work?

Cool, guarded. May appear indifferent to others problems. Aloof and less approachable.

- Q. Please describe a situation where you have been consulted by a colleague about a personal problem?
- Q. To what extent would you describe yourself as approachable?





Blunt or tactless. Overly frank. May lack tact and diplomacy.

Q. How far would you describe yourself as politically aware at work?

Q. Tell me about a recent situation where you have had to handle a difficult interpersonal problem?



management competence - managing self

POSSIBLE STRENGTHS

Unconcerned by others views. Is not dependent on recognition and praise. Doesn't expect thanks for doing the job.

Q. When is it important to you that others give you praise for a job well done?

Q. What sort of account do you take of other people's views of how well you do your job?

Calm, relaxed; cool under pressure. Rarely experiences work-related anxiety.

Q. What are the sorts of thing that tend to make you anxious?

Q. What do you find most stressful about your current/previous job?

Enjoys some competitiveness at work but not to the extent of needing to win at all costs. Willing to cooperate on occasion.

Q. Under what circumstances are you most likely to feel competitive at work?

Q. How much do you like to compare your own achievements with those of others?

Not plagued by self-doubt nor self-satisfied and smug.

Q. What kinds of things have caused you to doubt yourself in the past?

Q. In what ways do you feel superior to your peers?

POSSIBLE LIMITATIONS

Low need for achievement. Low value for results. More oriented to process than outcome.

Q. How important is it to you that you have particular goals to strive for?

Q. What are the main satisfactions that you have gained in your career to date?

May prefer others to take charge. Dislikes sole responsibility and accountability. Likes others to share in important decisions.

Q. How do you feel about sharing responsibility and accountability with others?

Q. Give me an example of a situation where you have felt more comfortable knowing that someone else is in charge?

Laid-back and untroubled by pressure. May lack anxiety as a source of drive and motivation.

Q. What sorts of things make you feel stressed at work?

Q. In what ways do you motivate yourself to give of your best?



management competence - information/decision making

POSSIBLE STRENGTHS

Takes a creative approach. Can look at problems from different angles. Doesn't merely accept the status quo.

Q. Tell me about an idea that you have come up with which you felt was quite original?

Q. To what extent do you prefer to work within existing systems and rules?

Rapid decision-maker. Opportunistic. Prepared to take risks. Dislikes delays and hold-ups.

Q. Please describe a circumstance where you were able to exploit an opportunity that others had not seen?

Q. To what extent does a protracted decision making process frustrate you?

Will take account of hard data as well as experience. Can balance analysis with a more intuitive style.

Q. To what extent do you like to immerse yourself in hard data when resolving problems?

Q. When are you more likely to reflect on your feelings and experience when faced with a problem?

POSSIBLE LIMITATIONS

Likes to do things in novel ways. May ignore established systems rules, or procedures.

Q. Tell me about a recent innovation that you have made. How did it work out?

Q. How do you go about adapting yourself to existing systems and procedures?

Fast decision making and impatience with delays may result in hasty actions or impulsive risk-taking.

Q. To what extent do you like to take your time before arriving at a final decision?

Q. When might you have made a hasty decision?



jungian type

INTJ - Introverted Intuition with Thinking

Approach to People

People with INTJ preferences tend to be private individuals. Their focus is on tasks and they may be oblivious to others around them. They can appear to be rather aloof and wrapped up in themselves, perhaps keeping their thoughts to themselves and not sharing their ideas with other people. They are unlikely to engage in small talk: this would not fit in with their strong concern for the task.

They are often quite radical thinkers and may disregard social conventions and be anti-authority. The potential exists, therefore, for them to come into conflict with colleagues who have a more traditional approach to work.

The INTJ's drive to get things done can cause them to appear to be hard taskmasters who lack sensitivity to the needs and motives of those around them.

Approach to Task

INTJs are great innovators. They challenge the status quo and established ways of doing things. Of all the types, they are possibly the most independently minded, having a clear conviction that their ideas are right. This carries with it a degree of stubbornness.

Their imagination is not purely theoretical. INTJs want to see their ideas put into practice and they are willing to put in as much effort as it takes to make that happen. They are extremely persevering and expect others to put in the same amount of commitment and effort. INTJs are often found in science, research and development or politics.

Their strong results orientation may mean that they overlook other possibilities, perhaps ignoring input from others who may have equally good ideas and failing to demonstrate their appreciation of the efforts that others are making.

Routine is alien to the INTJ. A role that afforded no creative stimulus would be intolerable.



Contribution to the Team

INTJs are a strong source of creativity in the team. They like to make things even better than they currently are, seeing not only where improvements can be made but also how they can be turned into reality. They do this by standing off the here and now, constantly looking at problems from new angles.

At the same time, INTJs are not just the grit in the oyster. Ideas that have no practical application do not interest them. Once the idea has formed, they are then tenacious in seeing it through to a conclusion.

They are alive to time pressures and the need to stick to a schedule. When the team has agreed on a course of action, they'll expect everyone to do their utmost to bring it to fruition.

Developmental Hints

INTJs tend to have under-developed social skills and may not appreciate the people around them. It may be beneficial for them to identify others in the team who can complement their imagination with some of the softer skills of team cohesion and harmony.



unusualness

Although the respondent has a lower score on Assertive, the score on Free-thinking is higher
This respondent has a lower score on Assertive but also a lower score on Cautious
Although this person scores higher on Free-thinking, they have a lower score on Uncompromising
This respondent has a higher score on Free-thinking, but this is combined with a lower score on Responsibility
Has a higher score on Free-thinking but a lower score on Self-expression
Has a higher score on Strategic but a lower score on Intellect
Although a higher scorer on Levity, is a lower scorer on Distractible
Despite having a higher score on Systematic, this person has a lower value for Results

