

Assessment & Development

Matters



The
British
Psychological
Society



Official Publication of
The Psychological
Testing Centre

Vol. 1 No. 3
Autumn 2009

ISSN 2040-4069

Derailers and personality: Relationships between HDS and OPQ32i

Gillian Hyde

Measures used

The measures used were the Hogan Development Survey (Hogan & Hogan, 1997) and the OPQ32i (SHL, 1999).

THIS research explores the links between the Hogan Development Survey (HDS) and the OPQ 32i. The HDS is based on research into management derailment and identifies 11 patterns of dysfunctional interpersonal behaviour. These 'dark side' tendencies erode trust, loyalty and enthusiasm and are of particular concern in relation to managerial and leadership roles, as they can seriously hinder career progression and negatively impact on employee relationships, team effectiveness and organisational productivity. The OPQ 32i is based on an occupational model of personality. The measure consists of three themes – Relationships with People, Thinking Style, and Feelings and Emotions – covering 32 scales. A number of practitioners use both of these instruments, yet there is no prior research on the relationship between the two.

Personality is often defined within the framework of the Five Factor Model (e.g. Goldberg, 1990; Digman, 1997). Most measures of normal personality, such as the OPQ32i (SHL, 2006), can be aligned with the Five Factor Model (FFM). The HDS, though, focuses on extremes of personality that emerge when an individual is not successfully managing their social impression; it is linked to insecurities and anxieties. Therefore, in any correlation between a measure of normal personality and the HDS, only some of the HDS scales may relate to the FFM.

Based on (i) previous UK research linking the HDS with the FFM as measured by the NEO (Furnham & Crump, 2005) and the HPI (Psychological Consultancy Ltd, 1996); (ii) our experience of interpreting HDS profiles alongside FFM personality profiles; and (iii) our understanding of the FFM as measured by the OPQ32i we would expect to find significant correlations in this study between:

- (a) HDS Enthusiastic–Volatile and Careful–Cautious and those aspects of the OPQ32i measuring the Emotional Stability factor from the FFM (both negatively);
- (b) HDS Careful–Cautious, Independent–Detached and Vivacious–Dramatic with those aspects of the OPQ32i measuring Extraversion (negatively, negatively, positively);
- (c) HDS Imaginative–Eccentric with Openness to Experience (positively); and
- (d) HDS Diligent–Perfectionistic with Conscientiousness (positively).

Participants

The participants consisted of 98 executives, 79 male and 19 female, working in the private sector in the UK. They completed both the HDS and the OPQ32i as part of a work-based assessment process.

Analysis and results

Scale level

The first stage of the analysis examined the relationships between the HDS and OPQ32i at the scale level (web extra, table 4). All of the scales on the HDS significantly correlated (at the .01 level), with at least one OPQ32i scale, with the exception of the Focused–Passive Aggressive scale. It is also worth noting that while the Imaginative–Eccentric scale did correlate at the .01 level with two of the OPQ32i scales, the size of these coefficients was less than .30.

The three OPQ32i scales with the strongest relationships were:

Enthusiastic–Volatile: correlated with Optimism (-.35**), Relaxed (-.34**) and Outspoken (.32**), indicating that Enthusiastic–Volatile types tend to focus on the negative, feel tense and find it hard to unwind, and can be inclined to make their disagreements with others clear. This latter quality of being candid is an aspect of Enthusiastic–Volatile that is often overlooked and so it is interesting to see it highlighted here. The relationships with the Optimism and Relaxed scales of the OPQ32i provide support for hypothesis (a).

Shrewd–Mistrustful: correlated with Trust (-.52**), Competitive (.41**) and Persuasive (.30**) suggesting that Shrewd–Mistrustful types are suspicious of others and find it difficult to trust them, like to win and enjoy competing with others, and they can enjoy persuading others and trying to change their views.

Careful–Cautious: correlated with Worrying (.50**) as predicted in hypothesis (a), and Socially Confident (-.43**) and Outgoing (-.36**) as predicted in hypothesis (b). This indicates that Careful–Cautious types are more likely to feel nervous and worry about negative outcomes, may feel awkward in unfamiliar situations and prefer not to be the centre of attention.

Independent–Detached: correlated with Outgoing (-.50**) as predicted in hypothesis (b), Rule Following (.40**) and equally with Worrying and Emotionally Controlled (.36**). These relationships with OPQ32i illustrate a reserved individual who doesn't like to break the rules and who is somewhat nervous, worried and emotionally reserved.

Focused–Passive Aggressive: no significant correlations with any of the scales of the OPQ32i; this suggests that this scale is particularly complex with no obvious correlation with normal personality.

Confident–Arrogant: correlated with Controlling (.41**), Worrying (-.39**) and Modest (-.38**) suggesting that Confident–Arrogant types are likely to take control of situations and enjoy being in charge, feel calm and unflustered at key events and enjoy talking about their own achievements.

Charming–Manipulative: correlated most strongly with Outgoing (.58**), Data Rational (-.47**) and Persuasive (.42**) indicating that Charming–Manipulative types will be sociable and lively in group situations; they like to work with opinions and feelings rather than facts and figures, and enjoy selling, negotiating and persuading others.

Vivacious–Dramatic: correlated with Outgoing (.39**) as predicted in hypothesis (b), Conventional (-.39**) and Emotionally controlled (-.35**). These results indicate that Vivacious–Dramatic types will be talkative, enjoy being the centre of attention, prefer unconventional approaches to work and may be inclined to display their emotions.

Imaginative–Eccentric: no correlations above .30 with any OPQ32i scales. This is not surprising as, even though a relationship was found between this scale and the NEO Openness to Experience scale (Furnham & Crump, 2005), we have not found a similar relationship with other measures of this factor (e.g. with the Intellectance scale of the HPI) and would suggest that the Imaginative–Eccentric scale does not have any obvious

links with normal personality.

Diligent–Perfectionistic: correlated positively with Detail Conscious (.56**) and Conscientious (.41**) as predicted in hypothesis (d) and negatively with Outgoing (-.31**). Diligent–Perfectionistic types tend to be methodical, detail conscious, organised and conscientious about completing work, and perhaps quieter and more reserved in social situations.

Dutiful–Dependent: correlated negatively with Outspoken (-.34**) and Decisive (-.31**) and positively with Trusting (.34**) and Democratic (.31**) suggesting that Dutiful–Dependent types are unlikely to openly criticise others and may not like to proffer opinions; they are trusting individuals who prefer not to make decisions alone and tend to be cautious about making decisions.

Cluster level

The second phase of the analysis examined the relationships between the clusters of the HDS and the OPQ32i. The 11 scales of the HDS form three clusters, these characterise underlying insecurity or anxiety for any particular scale (Horney, 1950).

The HDS three clusters:

Moving Away – withdrawal: The first five scales of the HDS combine themes of insecurity, mistrust, hostility and social withdrawal.

Moving Against – aggression: The next four scales of the HDS share aspects of social self-confidence, impulsivity, energy, competitiveness, and a talent for self-display.

Moving Towards – compliance: The final two scales share themes of conformity, obedience, and eagerness to please.

OPQ32i and HDS scale relationships

There are six OPQ32i scales that show striking patterns of results across the Moving Away, Moving Against, Moving Towards themes, i.e. they are distinctively related to each cluster at the zero level, very positively or very negatively:

1. *OPQ32i Outgoing scale* – has generally low or negative relationships with the Moving Away scales, generally high positive with Moving Against and negative with Moving Towards.
2. *OPQ32i Modest* – relates mostly at around the zero or positive level with Moving Away scales, strongly negatively with Moving Against and at around the zero level with Moving Towards.
3. *OPQ32i Conventional* – has broadly low or positive relationships with Moving Away, strongly negative relationships with Moving Against and positive relationships with Moving Towards.
4. *OPQ32i Innovative* – tends to have zero or low negative relationships with Moving Away scales, significantly positive with Moving Against (except interestingly enough, Eccentric), and zero or negative with Moving Towards.
5. *OPQ32i Worrying* – has strongly positive relationships with most of the Moving Away scales, strongly negative with Moving Against and zero or positive with Moving Towards.
6. *OPQ32i Emotionally Controlled* – relates at the zero level or positively with Moving Away, strongly negatively with most Moving Against scales and non-significantly with Moving Towards.

Discussion

Although only partial support was found for the hypothesised relationships between HDS and OPQ32i, the relationships found are all sensible and interpretable and add a wealth of information to the practitioner using these instruments together. In addition, the relationships between the OPQ32i and the HDS clusters provide important interpretive information for six of the OPQ32i scales and support for the HDS taxonomy and its factor structure.

References

- Costa, P.T. & McCrae, R.R. (1988). *The NEO Personality Inventory manual*. Odessa, FL: Psychological Assessment Resources.
- Digman, J.M. (1997). Higher-order factors of the Big Five. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 73(6), 1246–1256.
- Furnham, A. & Crump, J. (2005). Personality traits, types and disorders: An examination of the relationship between three self-report measures. *European Journal of Personality*, 19, 167–184.
- Goldberg, L.R. (1990). An alternative ‘description of personality’: The Big-Five factor structure. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 59, 1216–1229.
- Hogan, R. & Hogan, J. (1997). *Hogan Development Survey manual*. Tulsa, OK, USA: Hogan Assessment Systems.
- Hogan, R. & Hogan, J. (1997). *Hogan Development Survey UK Edition manual*. Tunbridge Wells: Psychological Consultancy Ltd.
- Horney, K. (1950). *Neurosis and human growth*. New York: Norton.
- SHL Group. (1999). *OPQ32: Manual and user’s guide*. Thames Ditton: SHL.
- SHL Group, Bartram, D. & Brown, A. (2006). *Five Factor model (Big Five) OPQ32 report: OPQ32 technical manual supplement*. Thames Ditton: SHL.

The author

Gillian Hyde is a Director at Psychological Consultancy Ltd

PTC web extra:

Go to Topics of Interest on www.psychtesting.org.uk for this article with tables presenting the scales and correlation matrix for the HDS and OPQ32i.