THE PSYCHOMETRICS USER FORUM

SPRING
NEW BEGINNINGS
CHAIRMAN’S STATEMENT

At our Annual General Meeting on Tuesday 5th February, members voted unanimously for the 16PF Users Group to extend its remit.

This means that we will seek to broaden and deepen our understanding in a range of psychometric tests including those that map onto the Big Five. In the past, we have explored other personality instruments so we regard this step as ‘evolution not revolution’. We will be seeking to develop links with leading test publishers and test users, as well as continuing to build on our relationship with OPP, and will keep you informed of progress through this Newsletter.

The members also agreed to the change in name to ‘The Psychometrics Users’ Forum’. We will be working on a new logo in the next month or two.

The change in remit and name should also allow us to benefit from collaboration with professional bodies who do not wish to be seen to support one specific personality instrument or test publisher over any other.

Our primary aim is to become a knowledgeable voice amongst test users in the field of psychometrics.

In order to help us take the Forum forward, we need your input. So please let us know what topics, instruments, or speakers you would like the Committee to try and organise for future events, as well as your ideas on other aspects such as membership benefits and how you would like us to operate as a Users’ Group. So please email any comments or questions to our administrator, Caro Leitzell, at admin@letzell.com, or to me, Ann Rodrigues at: ann@acer-hr.co.uk
NEW COMMITTEE MEMBERS

Michael Pratt and Harpal Dhatt

TEAM AND PERSONAL DEVELOPMENT

PROFILE
Bethan is a Chartered Occupational Psychologist, with experience both as a consultant, in several business psychology consulting firms, and also as an internal Learning & Development specialist for a global insurance firm, Aon. Bethan has worked with a range of public and private sector organisations including the MOD, Home Office, DfES, Metropolitan Police, ntl, Aon, Clifford Chance and Bass, in areas such as job analysis, competency frameworks, Assessment and Development Centres, competency-based interviews, psychometric testing, training, one-to-one coaching and 360 feedback, team development and facilitating behavioural change programmes.

She has presented at various conferences and published papers relating to online self-selection tools and gender and intelligence.

We were delighted to have Beth Jones address the February meeting of what was just about to become The Psychometrics Users’ Forum, on team and personal development, using the ‘Insights Discovery’ personality tool.

Before joining A&DC in December 2007, Beth managed the Catalyst leadership development programme at Aon. This is a comprehensive 2-year accelerated development programme for selected senior managers from all business divisions in the UK and EMEA, which aimed to help them to develop the competencies defined in the Aon Leadership Model. The intention was to support, stretch and challenge participants, and increase awareness of leadership strengths and development areas.

The first step was leadership assessment, using 360° feedback, plus Insights personality questionnaire, and an aptitude test, Able Critical Business Planning, to generate self-awareness. This was followed by a two-day leadership workshop and participation in a 6-month business project.

Earlier programmes used MBTI for personality assessment, but the L & D team found that, though the initial response from participants was positive, they ended...
up forgetting their MBTI type with a consequent reduction of impact. Therefore the current programme used the Insights Discovery System.

**WHAT IS INSIGHTS?**

The instrument is based on Jungian preferences, as with MBTI, but uses colour to denote 4 main ‘types’ or Insights Colour Energies, Fiery Red, Earth Green, Cool Blue and Sunshine Yellow, with a further 4 secondary colour preferences *(see diagram overleaf)*

The theory is that we each have all four colour energies within us but have a natural preference for one. The Jungian preferences of Introversion and Extraversion, Thinking and Feeling Sensing and Intuition can also be mapped onto the Insights Colour Energies. Beth had a useful diagram which maps the MBTI types against the Insights Colour Energies *(see second diagram overleaf).*

**The Insights Colour Energies**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COOL BLUE</th>
<th>FIERY RED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Showing no bias</td>
<td>Affirmative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective</td>
<td>Bold</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detached</td>
<td>Assertive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analytical</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EARTH GREEN</th>
<th>SUNSHINE YELLOW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Still</td>
<td>Cheerful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tranquil</td>
<td>Uplifting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calming</td>
<td>Spirited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soothing</td>
<td>Buoyant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
INSIGHTS AND MBTI

The results of the self-completion questionnaire are contained in a 70-page report, which is given to the individual to allow them to assess where they agree/disagree with the findings.

So how was it for Catalyst participants?
The results were fed back to the participants personally and as a team, and follow-up 1:1 feedback coaching sessions have also been provided so that participants deepen their understanding of the insights generated and convert them into development action plans.

Beth and her colleagues at Aon were very happy with using Insights. Most participants had a 90% level of agreement, with comments such as "my mother could have written this", "have you had cameras on me?" and "how did you do this?!" They found it user friendly – colours are intuitive and the language 'sticks' - it was visually appealing and fun but also brought genuine insights to inform personal and team development.
Our thanks to Beth for an informative and entertaining talk. A copy of Beth’s slides can be obtained from our administrator, Caro Leitzell, at admin@leitzell.com

For further info on Insights, go to http://www.insights.com

Ann Rodrigues
Acer HR Insights

THE QUESTIONS THEY ASK...
AND THE ANSWERS THEY GIVE...

Most of our readers, at some time, will have been on the end of a series of inappropriate or stupid questions that pass for an interview. Read on:

An acquaintance travelled to Truro for an interview. She was told to be prepared for a 2-hour stint. After about half an hour of rather ineffectual questions, she was finally asked what animal she would like to be if she came back to earth again. She walked out of the interview in disgust.

On the long train journey back she fumed and thought she should have answered “An ant, because I am industrious and a good team worker.”

Then she forgot all about it. Until a letter arrived offering her the job!

This anecdote reminded me of strange answers I have received to perfectly ordinary interview questions. Interviewing techniques have always interested me and I used structured interviewing as a freelance, working for a Japanese motor company setting up a new plant. Most readers will be familiar with the principles, if not the practice of this type of interview technique. The aim of course, is for the interviewer to get solid examples of behaviour against the company’s well-thought-out dimensions or characteristics.

It was extremely effective. However there were some unconventional answers. I made a note of them – verbatim – on the same day of the interview. I knew they’d come in useful one day. Here are just a few:

**WORKING CONDITIONS**
ME What sort of boss have you found to be the most effective?
A An easygoing one.
ME Give me an example of how he was easygoing.
A When I came in half an hour late, he didn’t go off the deep end. He took it calmly. I liked that.

**INITIATIVE**
ME What did you regard as your best achievement in your last job?
Getting one over on the management. We all liked that.

**COOPERATION**

**ME** Tell me about a time when someone disagreed with your ideas. And how did you handle it?

**A** It was in the Army. This 2nd lieutenant – I think he had a degree in architecture or something – he said you couldn’t load three of these generators on to the lorry. I said you could if you laid them at an angle. He said you couldn’t. I said you could.

**ME** And what happened?

**A** We went under a bridge and demolished it.

**ME** So he was right?

**A** I suppose he was really…

**JOB FIT**

**ME** What quality do you think you have been able to bring to the job?

**A** (After much thought, slowly, and in a flat Birmingham accent.) Enthusiasm, I suppose.

**ADAPTABILITY**

**ME** Tell me about an achievement of which you feel proud.

**A** It was at our town’s jubilee celebrations, I think. I was in the chess team. I played against a blind man.

**ME** What happened?

**A** I lost. And afterwards he was able to tell me where I went wrong.

**PROBLEM SOLVING**

**ME** When did you last have to learn something new?

**A** (After much thought) When we went decimal, I suppose. (Feb 1971!)

**ME** Tell me about any techniques you have for spotting things that might become problems.

**A** Well we always keep a look out for customers that may have been taken ill or ’owt like that.

**ME** Yes, go on. Please be brief.

**A** Dead. That’s what she was.

**COOPERATION**

**ME** Tell me about a time when you had to get along with someone with whom you had to make a big adjustment to maintain good working relationships?

**A** I was working on a dredger. I knew that the gland in the stern needed greasing. I found that the grease gun was empty. I filled it and did the job. The Dutchman I was working for said I hadn’t greased it. I told him I had. He said I hadn’t.

**ME** How did you resolve it?

**A** I emptied a bucket of grease over his head.

**ME** What did that do for your relationship?

**A** I think he saw the funny side of it…
ME  What do you like best about your job?
A  I like working outdoors. I like working in the sun.
ME  So why are you applying for a factory job?
A  I don’t know.

INITIAL PLEASANTRIES
ME  (To a young man who had just stated that this was the busiest time of the year for him.)
   So how did you manage to get away today for this interview?
A  I said I was going to the funeral of my great aunt.
ME  And have you got one?
A  Yes. I told them I had to drive my mother to the funeral.
ME  And did you?
A  No. I lied.

COOPERATION
ME  (To a scaffolder)
   Tell me about a time when you helped someone out at work.
A  We had to dismantle a bridge. All the bolts were rusty.
ME  What did you do?
A  I put a towrope on the 10-tonner, cleared everyone away and drove off in first gear.
ME  And the result?
A  The bridge collapsed and we all went home an hour early.

WORKING CONDITIONS
ME  Are there any conditions or assignments that you have particularly enjoyed?
A  I like working the really big cranes, ones where the cabins are about 50 feet up. I like working at heights.
ME  What about safety factors?
A  We have a safety harness. They’re tested regularly.
ME  How do you test it?
A  I strap it on and jump out of the cab.

David Roberts
Editor
INTERVIEW WITH PATTI STEVENS

COACH SUPERVISOR

by

Michelle Williamson

Our October 2007 meeting, which focussed on the use of psychometrics in coaching, was full to capacity. Our afternoon was spent in the company of Patti Stevens who introduced us to the Coaching Signature Model (CSM) a tool for on-going coach development. Supervision and CPD for coaches are likely to be ‘hot topics’ for many of our members so committee member, Michele Williamson, met Patti to find out more about the model and when she uses it.

MW: Remind me Patti, what is the CSM, what does it actually measure?
PS: The Coaching Signature Model is a tool that can identify the typical style used by a coach in their coaching relationships. It also explores whether the coach flexes their style to accommodate the needs of particular coaching clients. Simon Walker, who developed the theory and tool, describes Coaching Signatures as enabling “… coaches to recognise and understand their most developed and natural coaching style…Whilst all coaches and learners have a developed style, effective coaches and learners recognise the value of ‘roaming’, which is choosing alternative ways of coaching and learning for different contexts” (Simon Walker, 2004). It was the aspect of ‘roaming’ that I really liked when I first came across the model in 2003; that, and the aspects of Metaphor theory built into the Personal Ecology model.

MW: Simon Walker presented the Personal Ecology Profile to the 16PF User Group in April 2003. How does the CSM relate to what he presented to us in that session?
PS: The PEP is based on a social constructionist model of personality which sees life as an eco-system in which a person interacts with their environment; personality is based on behaviour that has become embedded because it has worked in the past and is then used as a strategy for the future; but personality can change. The PEP is a self-report projective tool which uses 58 questions as neutral cues to get the participant to create their own imaginary landscapes. For coaches, three of these landscapes are based on the coaching relationship with three different coaching clients and the metaphorical model is a safe and
powerful tool to explore the chosen coaching agenda and why tools or interventions are chosen by the coach. There are seven dimensions identified in the PEP theory, three that are closely aligned to personal development are used to produce a Coaching Signature report: Empathy, Linearity, Control. These identify which of the eight styles is typically used by the coach and which style is used with each of the three coaching clients.

**MW: How did you get into coaching supervision?**

**PS:** My interest in supervision stemmed from my background in psychology, psychotherapy and business; I started working as a counsellor a long time ago and so I was in a supervisory relationship myself for many years; I became a supervisor in that context. I made the transition to coaching about 10 years ago when I got involved with a coaching school; I had a professional concern and interest about the interpersonal nature of a coaching relationship: for their own support, coaches need to reflect on their client work in a formalised supervision environment.

**MW: So what is coaching supervision?**

**PS:** I define coaching supervision as “a formal process of professional support which ensures continuing development of the coach and effectiveness of his/her professional practice through interactive reflection, interpretive evaluation, and the sharing of expertise” (Bachkirova, Stevens & Willis; 2005). This is the definition that I have been using in my work with institutions, such as Oxford Brookes University, when developing courses in coaching and coaching supervision.

**MW: What does the coach, coachee and bill payer get from the supervision process?**

**PS:** Coaching supervision takes into account the coach, their purchasers and the coachee. The benefits of coaching supervision are about assurance, or reassurance: the coach gets support for their client work and gets space to reflect and explore issues that arise from the coaching relationship, and they reflect on their practice; it’s CPD – paying attention to their own professional development; it’s paying attention to their client work and to the payer and looking at organisational issues. In other words, all of the stakeholders are attended to. It’s a form of quality control. The coachee benefits from all of this: their work with the coach is robustly explored in supervision, and ethical practice is attended to.

**MW: Why is CSM useful in coaching supervision?**

**PS:** CSM is a useful reflective tool to see development of coaching style and ‘roaming’. Coaches tend to have a default style but they do need to ‘roam’ when coaching different clients. For example, a coach that normally adopts a ‘therapeutic’ style may need to be less empathetic and more performance-oriented when a ‘performance’ style might be more effective for the client, or for
the situation. The CSM provides a visible plot of the coach’s typical style and the style adopted for a particular coachee. This represents fertile ground for supervision as it facilitates discussion about the appropriateness of the style adopted in particular coaching relationships, and the supervisor can suggest altering the style to meet the client’s need. The CSM measures what is going on between coach and coachee, it is not looking at results of coaching but it monitors the coaching intervention via the supervision process.

MW: In what situations do you use CSM?
PS: There are three scenarios when I am likely to use CSM. Much of my work is as Coach Supervisor in organisations, either working with internal coaches, or external coaches on the organisation’s preferred supplier list. The CSM is helpful to show the purchasers of coaching that there are different coaching styles, it gives them a common language about these different styles and allows them to determine the one they want for a particular situation and to match coach and coachee. Just as there is a Coaching Signature arising from the PEP, it is also possible to produce a Learning Signature for the coachee, using these tools I can act as ‘match-maker’, where the match depends on what outcomes are required; we may not match like-with-like. The common language based on CSM is really useful in this situation.

The second scenario in which I might use CSM is where a coaching consultancy or supplier is pitching for business and wants to set out its coaching capability, in terms of the nature of its associates, to a potential customer; the CSM allows them to describe the coaching on offer.

Thirdly, I often use CSM in one-to-one coaching supervision. The CSM provides a dynamic view to see change with the original coachees used to generate a CSM, or new coachees. We can keep going back to the profiles; we can redo and redo the tool again and again. This produces a supervision log for a coach’s CPD – this has proved attractive to organisations that are keen on ROI because the model produces numbers on the coach’s profile and you can see how the scores shift as the coach roams their style to match that required for a particular coachee.

MW: If someone is interested in learning more about CSM or using it, how should they go about this?
PS: At the moment the Coaching Supervision Consultancy is the sole UK licensee for the CSM, so to use the tool people would need to contact me on info@coachingsupervision.co.uk. CSM has proved popular; I am constructing a website for it and planning to train independent practitioners to use it. To use the tool for their own personal development, coaches can contact me and do the profile on-line (it takes about 35 minutes to complete); we can then either do a one-off feedback session, or it can be used in the context of an on-going supervision relationship. To find out more about CSM you can look at the PEP
MW: Finally, Patti, tell me about APECS.
PS: I set up APECS (Association for Professional Executive Coaching & Supervision) with John O’Brien three years ago. The idea was to create a professional accrediting body for senior practitioners and their supervisors, and to have a corporate membership so that APECS could be aware of corporate needs. We have monthly meetings of cutting-edge topics and we have two accreditation panels, one for coaches and the newly launched one for the accreditation of supervisors. So far we have seventy accredited coaches and 21 corporate members. Have a look at the website: www.apecs.org

Michele Williamson

Book Review by Hugh McCredie

Personality And Individual Differences
Tomas Chamorro-Premuzic
BPS Blackwell 2007; Pb £19.99

I came across this book on sale at the BPS Occupational Psychology conference in January and was immediately drawn by its title. I then discovered that it was one of the series BPS Textbooks in Psychology and wondered if it might be too basic for ancient veterans in the field like me.

Well, the book is basic in its starting point but it is also comprehensive, bang up to date and it led me to follow up references to papers which had only been published in the last few years. It is also very ‘skimmable’ due to the author’s thoughtful inclusion of many tables, diagrams and key definitions carefully placed within the text. Examples of the latter are:

**Five Factor Model** a trait theory of personality which posits that there are five major and universal factors of personality, namely Neuroticism, Extraversion, Openness, Agreeableness, and Conscientiousness (also known as the Big Five)

**fluid intelligence (gf)** the ability to learn new things and solve novel problems, irrespective of previous knowledge, education or experience
Over the years, I have collected many volumes on the subjects of personality, intelligence and individual differences but I found the skimming this book helped me to clarify.

- What I knew
- What I thought I knew but needed some updating
- What I could usefully explore in greater depth and where I could do my exploring

Accordingly, I have pleasure in recommending this book to the interested lay person, to the newcomer into our field and to the seasoned professional. I am also looking forward to forthcoming titles in the series; Graham Davey’s *Psychopathology* may be interesting given recent assertions of Bob Hogan and Adrian Furnham concerning management career ‘de-railers’.

*Hugh McCredie*

**SELECTION: Some Dos and some more Dos**

Sometimes even experienced testers are apt to forget some basic steps that we should all exercise. Here are some of them. You will be able to add more.

- Check your knowledge of the organisation. What are likely to be the main characteristics of successful staff in its employ? (outgoing, go-getting, reflective, creative, analytical, etc?)

- Look at the job description and the person specification. Are they up to date? (The answer is usually ‘No’.) Identify essential, nice-to-have, and those traits that are less relevant.

- Determine whether the tests you propose to use can clearly identify the most relevant of these.

- Has the testing procedure been properly explained to the candidates? What has been said about feedback? Have they been tested before? If so, when?

- What arrangements are made for reporting to the commissioning manager?

- Will you be giving face-to-face feedback? If so, when and where? What documents, (profile sheets, reports etc.), are you going to show or give the candidate?
• Is the psychometric report computer-generated? If so, you would be well advised to spend some time turning it into ordinary English. An unedited report from a computer will do nothing for your reputation.

• Does the report adequately reflect the key competencies, or characteristics, that your client is looking for?

• Are there sentences or paragraphs in your report that the commissioning manager might regard as negative, thus devaluing the rest of the report in his eyes? (Some are inclined to reject a candidate at the first sign of what they perceive as a ‘negative' trait. They will look in vain for someone that is ‘perfect'.)

• If it is some time since you used a particular test, refresh your memory on administrative procedures, and on the test's pros and cons as a predictor. Skim through the technical manual, noting validity and reliability factors.

• Think about the normative data you might use. Occupational norms, or separate male/female or combined M and F norms?

• What stance might you take with the commissioning manager? Will you recommend a particular candidate or take the view that that will be solely for the manager to decide? (Argument: if the manager's happy, should you be? You won't have to work with the person selected, but you may be blamed later if the ‘wrong' person is chosen.)

• Is the testing room adequate? What about noise and possible interruptions? Check heating and lighting.

• If you are testing a group, it is advisable to keep a log of the tests and to note any occurrence that might affect a test result – undue noise for example.

• Put the individual or the group at ease.

• Explain the role of the tests as part – and only part – of the selection procedure. Emphasise that experience, qualifications, testimonials, and of course the interview, are all taken into account.

• After a few minutes check that candidates are answering the questions in the correct way.

• At the end of the test session thank the candidates, and ensure that everyone is clear as to what the next stage in the selection procedure might be.

David Roberts
Editor
June Newsletter: The sequel to the December article on creativity is being held over until June.

In the last Newsletter we mentioned that many members may no longer have a use for test material.

We struck gold. Geoff Hunt contacted the Editor to offer the following:

**FOR FORMS A & B**
- Tabular Supplement No.1
- Supplement of Norms, British Standardization of the 16PF
- 16PF Questionnaire Form A
- " " " " Form B
- British Undergraduate Norms
- Keys for Answer Sheet, 1 &2 (Cardboard cut outs - 2 copies of each)
- Ditto, but durable plastic
- Motivational Distortion Key, Form A only (plastic)
- Key for Validity Scales (cardboard)
- " " " " " " 1990 Edition

**For 16PF5**
- Questionnaire
- Standardization: Supplement of Norms and Technical Data
- Unused Profile Sheets(2)
- Unused Answer Sheets (5)
- (all in plastic folder)

Will those interested please contact Geoff direct on: ArundellG@aol.com
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