



THE iMAP SURVEY PERSONALITY AND INTEREST MODELS

A description of the models on which the IMS is based

A. Personality

The Personality-oriented items in the iMap Survey are of two types:

The first type of item consists of statements about the respondent (the person answering the Survey). Respondents describe themselves by indicating the extent to which they agree with certain statements about themselves. Each statement is accompanied by five possible responses, ranging from *Just like me* to *Not at all like me*. For example, a statement might say, *I like variety and novelty*. Respondents who think this statement is true about themselves will choose the first or second response. Respondents who think the statement is not true about themselves will choose the fourth or fifth response. Respondents who are not sure for whatever reason can choose the third response.

Respondents' collective responses to these statements are represented as their **Strengths**.

The second type of item consists statements are *comparative* in nature: for example, *I like variety and novelty more than other people*. In other words, Respondents are invited to compare themselves to other people. Respondents' answers to these comparative statements are represented as their **Expectations** of other people. Essentially, **Expectations** represent a judgment or opinion of other people. These does not mean that **Expectations** are necessarily judgmental, but that they arise out of the differences or similarities the respondents see between themselves and other people.

Generally speaking, respondents perform their tasks, work with others, achieve personal, team and corporate goals etc. by capitalizing on their personal **Strengths**. It's important to note that respondents are usually capable of showing these strengths regardless of whether other people behave according to their **Expectations**. For the most part, respondents remain effective even if they are working in situations with people who are very different from the respondents' expectations.

However, for nearly all respondents, there will be occasions when they start to feel pressure. Most of the time this occurs when *consistently or over a long period of time* they find themselves in situations that fail to meet their expectations. At some point, their discomfort increases to the point that they stop using their **Strengths** to perform their tasks or work effectively with other team members and instead start to **React**. This **Reactions**-based behavior can take one of two forms: either 1) showing an exaggerated form of their strengths to try and make their surroundings conform to their expectations, or 2) changing their behavior in some way to try and make their surroundings conform to their

expectations. In other words, respondents' judgments or opinions about other people progressively cease to be neutral and begin instead to cause problems.

For example, a group of respondents may see themselves as fairly assertive – more assertive than other people. Their **Expectations** are that other people will generally be less assertive than themselves. Let's suppose that they find themselves *consistently* or *over a long period of time* being with other people who are *very* assertive – people who don't meet the respondents' expectations. At some point, this group of respondents may feel sufficiently uncomfortable that they start to exhibit **Reactions**-based behavior. They either 1) start to show an exaggerated form of their strengths in order to change those other people (instead of being assertive, they now become *over-assertive*); or they try to become *less* assertive and use reason or some other means to change those other people.

It is important to understand that there are three considerations with this **Reactions**-based behavior.

- First of all, it doesn't use respondents' **Strengths**.
- Second, **Reactions**-based behavior is not directed towards achieving goals or working productively and effectively but towards trying to change other people or situations to meet respondents' **Expectations**.
- Thirdly, respondents typically fail to recognize – at least initially – that they have moved from their **Strengths**-based behavior to their **Reactions**-based behavior. In certain cases, that recognition may take a long time, and in rare cases it *never* occurs. By the time respondents realize what they have done, a great deal of damage may have occurred.

The IMS is used to show respondents:

- Their unique, **Strengths**-based behavior;
- Their **Expectations** of others;
- What can happen in terms of their **Reactions**-based behavior if those expectations are unmet *consistently* or *over a long period of time*;
- Perhaps most important of all: How to avoid **Reactions**-based behavior. **It is respondents' own business to deal with their Expectations** – it is *not* anyone else's responsibility. If a respondent finds that other people are less friendly than he prefers, it's his job to seek out friends. If a respondent finds that other people are more idealistic than she prefers, it's her job to seek out competitive situations.

Most IMS-based reports are *prescriptive* in nature: that is, they offer suggestions to respondents as to how to arrange their lives so that 1) their **Expectations** stop causing them problems; 2) they can make more effective use of their **Strengths** instead of falling into **Reactions**-based behavior.

B. Interests

The IMS Interest Survey is a Holland-based interest survey and is a modified version of a Survey that has been in use for over 25 years. Its items score onto one and only one of six categories of interest. Like the iMap personality Survey, the Interest Survey uses a five-point Likert scale.

The items are task-based, not career- or job-based. The Survey consists of sixty task-based items, and respondents are asked about the extent that they would like to do each of the tasks. They are asked, and are reminded on each item, *not* to concern themselves with what they would earn, the status of the tasks, and so forth: they are to respond purely on the basis of which they would like to perform the tasks.

Two sets of scores for the six Interest scales are derived from the Survey: absolute scores and relative scores. Absolute scores show the absolute level of interest: thus it is possible for respondents to have little overall interest in any of the scales, considerable interest in most or all the scales, or (most usually) a high level of interest in some of them and a low level of interest in the others. The relative scores emphasize the *range* of interest of respondents and their *ranking*.

The absolute scores are used mainly for advanced individual work with respondents. The relative scores are used to drive the iMap interest-based libraries and for career-matching purposes with the 900+ occupations and the huge amounts of information on those occupations generated by the US Department of Labor and the National Center for Education Statistics.