

**Samantha Sample | 1234**  
**27 Mar 2019**

**EXPERT**

# DERAILERS REPORT

**FIFTEEN FACTOR QUESTIONNAIRE PLUS**





## REPORT STRUCTURE

This report presents Samantha Sample's Personality Derailers profile in the following sections:

### 1. Guide to Using This Report

- Introduction
- Dimensions
- Results Scale
- Reference Group Used
- Response Style

### 2. Derailers Profile

- Derailers Profile Chart

### 3. Dysfunctional Behavioural Categories

- Eccentric – Absent-minded
- Appeasing – Acquiescent
- Suspicious – Mistrustful
- Volatile – Explosive
- Undisciplined – Nonconformist
- Detached – Disengaged
- Rigid – Perfectionistic
- Confrontational – Challenging
- Manipulative – Machiavellian
- Avoidant – Passive
- Arrogant – Self-centred
- Moody – Sullen

## DISCLAIMER

This is a strictly confidential assessment report on Samantha Sample. The information contained in this report should only be disclosed on a 'need to know basis' with the prior understanding of Samantha Sample.

The derailer profile arises from a self-report questionnaire and must be interpreted in the light of corroborating evidence gained from feedback and in the context of the role in question taking into account available data such as performance appraisals, actual experience, motivation, interests, values, abilities and skills. As such the authors and distributors cannot accept responsibility for decisions made based on the information contained in this report and cannot be held directly or indirectly liable for the consequences of those decisions.



## GUIDE TO USING THIS REPORT

### INTRODUCTION

Risk is an inevitable by-product of almost any activity. This holds true to the risk factors associated with hiring decisions, which are no more so evident than when hiring managers or leaders. While it is often not possible for organizations to eliminate their exposure to such risks entirely, organisations can work to understand the risks and manage their exposure more effectively by investigating individuals' tendencies towards counterproductive behaviour. Personality derailers help identify such challenging behaviours.

The derailers report describes respondents' Fifteen Factor Questionnaire Plus (15FQ+) assessment results in terms of a series of dysfunctional behaviours that can present challenges for organisations in a variety of work settings. The dysfunctional behaviours assessed in this report have been developed from the American Psychiatric Association's and the World Health Organisation's systems for classifying personality disorders and from the seminal work of Theodore Millon on dysfunctional personality types. Despite the origin of these behaviours it should be noted, however, that the report does not assess clinical problems, but rather personality types that can be problematic in work settings.

<b>1</b>	<b>Eccentric – Absent-minded</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>Rigid – Perfectionistic</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>Appeasing – Acquiescent</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>Confrontational – Challenging</b>
<b>3</b>	<b>Suspicious – Mistrustful</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>Manipulative – Machiavellian</b>
<b>4</b>	<b>Volatile – Explosive</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>Avoidant – Passive</b>
<b>5</b>	<b>Undisciplined – Nonconformist</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>Arrogant – Self-centred</b>
<b>6</b>	<b>Detached – Disengaged</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>Moody – Sullen</b>

While extreme personality profiles present significant challenges in most organisational and work contexts, they can also be characteristic of high achievers. (This reflects the fact that high achievers often have quite rare and extreme personality profiles.) Whether such profiles result in functional or dysfunctional behaviour is, in turn, dependent upon the demands of the specific job role, and on the nature of the organizational culture. For example, while someone who has a high score on the 'Confrontational-Challenging' behavioural category is likely to create discord, disharmony and destabilise most organizations, such behavioural categories are often found among effective change agents and innovators. Similarly, while someone who has a high score on the 'Manipulative-Machiavellian' behavioural category may be prone to destabilise most organizations by acting in a manipulative and self-serving manner, such behavioural categories are often associated with effective 'political' operators and negotiators.

Therefore, when basing selection and assessment decisions on this report, it is important to consider the specific demands of the job, and nature of the organisation/team Samantha Sample is/will be working with, as this will influence whether the behaviour will be functional or dysfunctional in that particular work context.

The behavioural categories assessed by this report are not pure personality types, but rather are collections of traits which, in combination, can have a negative impact upon a person's performance and culture fit within a given organisation. The dysfunctional behavioural categories consist of extreme scores on combinations of traits that occur quite rarely in the general population. Hence it is not uncommon for an individual to obtain no elevated scores on any of these dysfunctional behaviours. In such circumstances the Personality Derailer



Report will provide only limited information about that person's most likely performance, and typical behaviour, at work. In such situations assessors should refer to the other 15FQ+ reports (i.e. the Extended, Emotional Intelligence or Competencies Reports, etc.) to facilitate their selection and assessment decisions.

The report describes those dysfunctional behaviours that Samantha's 15FQ+ profile suggests she may be prone to display at work. These should be treated as hypotheses to be explored in greater detail through further assessment. Moreover, when basing selection and assessment decisions on this report it is important to mindful that how likely it is Samantha will display any of the behaviours that have been identified in this report, will be moderated by a number of factors. These included her ability level, and job specific skills and knowledge, as well as situational factors, such as the organisation's culture and climate. The report should therefore be interpreted with reference to the results of other relevant assessments. For example:

- Whether or not Samantha Sample has displayed any dysfunctional work behaviours in the past, can be assessed through a critical review of her work history, achievements and qualifications to date.
- Her propensity to display dysfunctional work behaviours can also be assessed through structured interviews, situational judgement tests, role-plays and assessment centre exercises.
- Her aptitudes and abilities can be assessed through the use of well-validated, work relevant psychometric tests.
- Samantha Sample's job specific skills and knowledge can be assessed through work sample tests, behavioural observation, role-plays and assessment centre exercises.

#### Please Note:

- The dysfunctional behaviour scores are calculated from Samantha Sample's responses on the 15FQ+ personality questionnaire. If this report is to be used to compare different individuals, it is essential that all the reports have been produced using the same norms.
- The report describes Samantha Sample's most typical behaviour. Whether or not she will display any identified dysfunctional behaviour in a particular work setting will be influenced by the factors outlined above.



## DIMENSIONS

Definitions of the 12 dysfunctional behaviours are presented below.

### DYSFUNCTIONAL WORKPLACE BEHAVIOURS

**Eccentric – Absent-minded:** Individuals with a high score on this dysfunctional behavioural category have little concern for practical matters. They may also be inattentive to practical everyday matters, be forgetful and drift off into flights of fantasy.

**Appeasing – Acquiescent:** Individuals with a high score on this dysfunctional behavioural category lack assertion and tend to worry about what others think of them. As a result they are prone to say things that they believe will please others and place others' personal needs over their own.

**Suspicious – Mistrustful:** Individuals with a high score on this dysfunctional behavioural category are suspicious and prone to doubt others' motives. Tending to take a cynical view of human nature, they are likely to believe people are out to further their own ends. As a result, they would be expected to have little tolerance for others and are likely to show their irritation and frustration with them.

**Volatile – Explosive:** Individuals with a high score on this dysfunctional behavioural category are tense-driven and lacking in composure. In addition to this, they may have difficulty controlling their emotions. As a result, they are likely to vent their frustrations without giving consideration to the impact their outbursts will have on others.

**Undisciplined – Nonconformist:** Individuals with a high score on this dysfunctional behavioural category are spontaneous and flexible in their attitude and approach towards work, and are unlikely to feel bound by organisational rules, regulations and procedures. They are likely to be inattentive to detail and to be prone to make careless errors and mistakes. They may also be prone to rejecting tried and tested methods out of hand, and to break with the past, simply for the sake of rejecting custom and practice.

**Detached – Disengaged:** Individuals with a high score on this dysfunctional behavioural category have little interest in other people and are likely to be viewed as being cut-off, distant and reclusive. As a result, they are likely to dislike teamwork, preferring to work on their own, away from what they may see as the distractions of other people.

**Rigid – Perfectionistic:** Individuals with a high score on this dysfunctional behavioural category are very perfectionistic and may be obsessive. Consequently, they are likely to be prone to become so focused on details as to lose sight of the bigger picture. As a result, they may be inflexible and rigid in their approach to problems.

**Confrontational – Challenging:** Individuals with a high score on this dysfunctional behavioural category are direct and may be pointed in their dealings with others. They are unlikely to be diplomatic and tactful, and would not be expected to hold back from saying what is on their mind, even if this might upset others. In addition to this they are likely to appear forceful and pushy, and be prone to be confrontational if challenged.

**Manipulative – Machiavellian:** Individuals with a high score on this dysfunctional behavioural category are cynical about human nature. As a result, they will be reluctant to deal with others in an open and upfront manner. Being disposed to approach working relationships in a political way, they might be expected to be inclined to respond to events in what they consider to be a 'politically expedient' manner. As a result, they might say things which they believe others want to hear.

**Avoidant – Passive:** Individuals with a high score on this dysfunctional behavioural category lack confidence and are prone to feel anxious in social settings. Consequently, they would be expected to be reluctant to express their views and opinions. Prone to self-doubt, they may avoid taking on tasks for fear of making errors or mistakes.

**Arrogant – Self-centred:** Individuals with a high score on this dysfunctional behavioural category are confident in social setting, and tend to present themselves as being very sure of their own views and opinions. As a result, others may consider them to be arrogant or even opinionated. They are also likely to have little interest in other people and would not be expected to be sensitive to other people's needs.


**Moody – Sullen:** Individuals with a high score on this dysfunctional behavioural category are prone to mood swings. Consequently their colleagues may find them to be changeable and unpredictable in how they react to events and situations. Having lower levels of energy and drive than most people, they are likely to have difficulty dealing with setbacks and failures, and may be inclined to give up when faced with adversity.



## RESULTS SCALE

A reference group is used to evaluate Samantha Sample's results and determine her tendency to exhibit dysfunctional workplace behaviours compared to others. Her results are presented as standardised scores on a scale of 1 to 10.

The following chart represents a distribution of individuals on a particular scale, where high scores represent greater tendency to behave in a particular manner and low scores represent a reduced likelihood of behaving in a particular manner. An overall level ranging from a "Low" to a "High" risk is provided to help highlight areas of concern.



## REFERENCE GROUP USED

The following norm was used to generate this report:

Test	Norm Used	Sample Size
<b>Fifteen Factor Questionnaire Plus (15FQ+)</b>	Professional Managerial	1186

## RESPONSE STYLE

The Fifteen Factor Questionnaire Plus (15FQ+) contains several scales which measure individuals' test taking attitudes and whether they were committed to portraying themselves accurately. Such measures inform practitioners of the degree to which they can trust and rely on the interpretation of respondents' profiles.


The results suggest that Samantha Sample could have been rather concerned to present herself in a socially acceptable manner. That is, she may have intentionally (or otherwise) selected answers that project a highly positive image that she considered to be advantageous to the outcome given the context in which the questionnaire was completed. It should be understood that this indication may occur for one of two reasons: It may be the result of a deliberate and considered strategy or alternatively a reflection her true personality, where her true personality is more a function of genuine altruism, a strongly internalised moral or behavioural code than a deliberate intention to present herself unusually positively.



# DERAILERS PROFILE

The dysfunctional behaviour scores are weighted composites of the traits that contribute to each behaviour. The score any given individual obtains on these scales depends not only upon that person's pattern of strengths and weakness across the behavioural categories, but also on the importance of each trait in contributing to the particular behavioural category.

Scores which pose 'High' or 'Moderate-High' risks should be investigated further. Descriptions of the behaviours which may impact Samantha Sample's work are provided in the following sections.





## ECENTRIC – ABSENT-MINDED

### ECENTRIC – ABSENT-MINDED PROFILE CHART

Dysfunctional Behaviour

Level

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Eccentric – Absent-minded

M



### RISK LEVEL

The scale score Samantha obtained on the 'Eccentric – Absent-minded' dysfunctional behaviour category falls within **the average range**. This suggests she is unlikely to display significant challenging behaviours within this category.

### POTENTIAL RISKS

- Her views and opinions are likely to be different from those of most people.

Although potential risks have been highlighted, the risk of such behaviours arising remains moderate. If such behaviours do emerge, they are likely to be when Samantha is stressed or working under extreme conditions.

### PROBING QUESTIONS

- What was the last idea you became preoccupied with? How did it influence your work?
- Do you think you spend more or less time, thinking about things, than might others in your working group?
- Compared to others in your working group, do you think you have a preference for decisions based on logic, or on personal values?
- Do you prefer to work on 'bigger picture' ideas or do you prefer to get involved in the details of matters? Please provide an example.





## APPEASING – ACQUIESCENT

### APPEASING – ACQUIESCENT PROFILE CHART

Dysfunctional Behaviour

Level

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Appeasing – Acquiescent

L



### RISK LEVEL

The scale score Samantha obtained on the 'Appeasing – Acquiescent' dysfunctional behaviour category falls within **the very low range (i.e. is 2 or less)**. This suggests it is very unlikely she will display challenging behaviours within this category.

### POTENTIAL RISKS

- No potential risks could be derived from her profile on this dysfunctional behaviour category.

### PROBING QUESTIONS

- Tell me about a work situation in which others voiced different feelings to yourself over something that was important to you. How did you handle it?
- Give me an example of when you last put your own wishes before those of others?
- What sort of person do you find most difficult to deal with and why?



## SUSPICIOUS – MISTRUSTFUL

### SUSPICIOUS – MISTRUSTFUL PROFILE CHART

Dysfunctional Behaviour

Level

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Suspicious – Mistrustful

M



### RISK LEVEL

The score Samantha obtained on the 'Suspicious – Mistrustful' dysfunctional behaviour category falls within **the average range**. This suggests she is unlikely to display significant challenging behaviours within this category.

### POTENTIAL RISKS

- She is fairly suspicious and somewhat prone to doubt others' motives.
- Tending to take a relatively cynical view of human nature, she is likely to believe many people are out to further their own ends.
- She would be expected to be somewhat mistrustful of others and slightly reluctant to give people the benefit of the doubt.
- She is likely to have a fair degree of difficulty forming mutually supportive relationships with her peers and colleagues, which are founded on trust and shared respect.
- She is likely to be somewhat reluctant to delegate work, and give control and responsibility to colleagues, with her doubting they will live up to her expectations of them.
- She is likely to be lacking in sympathy and understanding, and to be fairly critical and unforgiving in her attitude to others.
- She would be expected to not have a great faith in people and to be lacking in consideration and concern them.


Although potential risks have been highlighted, the risk of such behaviours arising remains moderate. If such behaviours do emerge, they are likely to be when Samantha is stressed or working under extreme conditions.

### PROBING QUESTIONS

- Give me an example of an occasion when you have doubted someone's intentions or motives, and have been justified.
- To what extent are you sceptical of what other people tell you?
- How tolerant are you of people who are underperforming?
- Is your natural style to keep a little distance between yourself and those you work with? How does this help you at work?



# VOLATILE – EXPLOSIVE



## RISK LEVEL

The score Samantha obtained on the 'Volatile – Explosive' dysfunctional behaviour category falls within **the below average range (i.e. is 4 or less)**. This suggests it is unlikely she will display challenging behaviours within this category.

## POTENTIAL RISKS

- No potential risks could be derived from her profile on this dysfunctional behaviour category.

## PROBING QUESTIONS

- Do you think those with whom you work closest are more relaxed than you, or less so? What evidence have you got for your views?
- Does your present job require a sense of urgency? Give an example.
- Do you think you are better at working under pressure than some of your colleagues? Please explain.



## UNDISCIPLINED – NONCONFORMIST

### UNDISCIPLINED – NONCONFORMIST PROFILE CHART

Dysfunctional Behaviour

Level

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Undisciplined – Nonconformist

MH



### RISK LEVEL

The score Samantha obtained on the 'Undisciplined – Nonconformist' dysfunctional behaviour category falls within **the above average range**. This suggests she is more likely than many to display challenging behaviours within this category.

### POTENTIAL RISKS

- Samantha is unlikely to feel strongly bound by organisational rules, regulations and procedures.
- Inclined to be unconventional in her attitudes and opinions, Samantha would be expected not to feel a strong sense of commitment to the organisation's ethical culture.
- Her profile suggests she may prone to reject tried and tested methods out of hand, and to break with the past, simply for the sake of rejecting custom and practice.
- At times others may feel her radical views are simply intended to shock, or to challenge established opinion, of which she is likely to be dismissive.
- Tending to believe respect has to be earned, rather than being due to a person's position or status, Samantha is relatively unlikely to accept authority without question.
- As her scores indicate she is socially bold, she will not be likely to hold back from expressing her unconventional opinions.

### PROBING QUESTIONS

- Do you have friends who ignore social niceties? What do you think of them? To what extent if any, do they embarrass you?
- Do you feel most people are focused on tried-and-tested solutions? Are there any merits to such solutions? Please explain.
- Can you think of an occasion when you did something which shocked or surprised a group of friends, or people at work?
- When did you last just 'say what you felt' when talking to your boss or someone else of importance?



## DETACHED – DISENGAGED

### DETACHED – DISENGAGED PROFILE CHART

Dysfunctional Behaviour

Level

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Detached – Disengaged

ML



### RISK LEVEL

The score Samantha obtained on the 'Detached – Disengaged' dysfunctional behaviour category falls within **the below average range (i.e. is 4 or less)**. This suggests it is unlikely she will display challenging behaviours within this category.

### POTENTIAL RISKS

- Samantha's profile indicates she has little interest in other people and is likely to be viewed as being cut-off, distant and somewhat aloof.
- She would be expected to have difficulty building rapport with others, and it is likely to take time for people to warm to her.
- She would be expected to have low levels of empathy and, as a result, she is unlikely to be a good listener.
- Tending to be quite insensitive to other people's emotional needs, Samantha's colleagues are unlikely to turn to her for help and support. This might result at times in them not informing her of issues she needs to know about.
- She is likely to have little interest in 'small talk', and in the casual social interactions that help build and maintain team cohesion.
- When relating to colleagues and clients, she is likely to do so in an impersonal way which may be viewed as being somewhat stilted and somewhat wooded.

Although potential risks have been highlighted, the risk of such behaviours arising remains low. If such behaviours do emerge, they are likely to be when Samantha is stressed or working under extreme conditions.

### PROBING QUESTIONS

- How much time have you spent on your own in the last week or so?
- Give me an example of a time you had to deal with a colleague who was sad or upset.
- How much time do you spend socialising in a day/week?
- What proportion of your work would you say requires you to operate on your own, rather than with others? Are you happy with this split? How would you change it if you could?
- Tell me about a work situation that required a lot of interaction with other people over a long period.
- Describe a team experience you found particularly rewarding. What made the experience rewarding?



## RIGID – PERFECTIONISTIC

### RIGID – PERFECTIONISTIC PROFILE CHART

Dysfunctional Behaviour

Level

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Rigid – Perfectionistic

ML



### RISK LEVEL

The score Samantha obtained on the 'Rigid – Perfectionistic' dysfunctional behaviour category falls within **the below average range (i.e. is 4 or less)**. This suggests it is unlikely she will display challenging behaviours within this category.

### POTENTIAL RISKS

- No potential risks could be derived from her profile on this dysfunctional behaviour category.

### PROBING QUESTIONS

- Give me an example of a work-related risk you took which paid off.
- Are there any aspects of your work which require you to look at 'the big picture', rather than be concerned with the detail?
- Tell me about a time someone approached you with an innovative idea. What did you do?
- Give me an example of when you initiated a change at work.



## CONFRONTATIONAL – CHALLENGING

### CONFRONTATIONAL – CHALLENGING PROFILE CHART

Dysfunctional Behaviour

Level

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Confrontational – Challenging

M



### RISK LEVEL

The score Samantha obtained on the 'Confrontational – Challenging' dysfunctional behaviour category falls within **the average range**. This suggests she is unlikely to display significant challenging behaviours within this category.

### POTENTIAL RISKS

- Her scores indicate she is likely to be forceful and pushy, and be prone to be quite confrontational if challenged.
- She would be expected to be keen to ensure she gets her own way and may be rather prone to 'ride rough shod' over others' views, opinions and needs.
- Her scores indicate she is confident in social settings and is likely to dominate group discussions.
- Her less assertive colleagues may have difficulty getting their points of view heard.
- Her colleagues are likely to view her as being quite brash and somewhat confrontational in her approach.
- She presents herself as being confident of her own intellectual abilities and, as a result, may be quite prone to be dismissive of others' views and opinions, particularly if she considers the other person to be less able than herself.

Although potential risks have been highlighted, the risk of such behaviours arising remains moderate. If such behaviours do emerge, they are likely to be when Samantha is stressed or working under extreme conditions.

### PROBING QUESTIONS

- How do you deal with opposition to your ideas or plans?
- Tell me about a (work) situation in which others voiced different feelings to yourself over something that was important to you. How did you handle it?
- Give me an example of a situation when the feelings of others got in the way of progress. What did you do about it?
- Give me an example of a time you had to stand up for an unpopular decision you made.



## MANIPULATIVE – MACHIAVELLIAN

### MANIPULATIVE – MACHIAVELLIAN PROFILE CHART

Dysfunctional Behaviour

Level

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Manipulative – Machiavellian

M



### RISK LEVEL

The score Samantha obtained on the 'Manipulative – Machiavellian' dysfunctional behaviour category falls within **the average range**. This suggests she is unlikely to display significant challenging behaviours within this category.

### POTENTIAL RISKS

- Samantha's profile suggests she is fairly cynical about human nature and is relatively inclined to believe others will try to take advantage of her if given the opportunity to do so.
- Having obtained a profile which suggests she is relatively suspicious of others, developing mutually trusting relationships with colleagues and clients is unlikely to be a great strength of her.

Although potential risks have been highlighted, the risk of such behaviours arising remains moderate. If such behaviours do emerge, they are likely to be when Samantha is stressed or working under extreme conditions.

### PROBING QUESTIONS

- Tell me about a time your trustworthiness was challenged by others. How did you respond?
- Do others in your group look to you to 'give it to them straight' or do they see you more as a diplomat. Give an example.
- Tell me about a time when you developed trust and loyalty with those you were working with.
- What approach do you use to sell your ideas to others in your organisation? What are the benefits of this approach?





## AVOIDANT – PASSIVE

### AVOIDANT – PASSIVE PROFILE CHART

Dysfunctional Behaviour

Level

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Avoidant – Passive

L



### RISK LEVEL

The score Samantha obtained on the 'Avoidant – Passive' dysfunctional behaviour category falls within **the very low range (i.e. is 2 or less)**. This suggests it is very unlikely she will display challenging behaviours within this category.

### POTENTIAL RISKS

- No potential risks could be derived from her profile on this dysfunctional behaviour category.

### PROBING QUESTIONS

- What if anything, makes you think you are more - or less - socially confident than those with whom you work?
- Tell me about a time when you stayed with an idea or project for longer than anyone expected you to.
- Describe a situation where you found it necessary to make an unpopular decision. How did you stand by your decision?
- Tell me about a time you had to communicate bad news to your team at work. What was the news and how did you communicate it?



## ARROGANT – SELF-CENTRED

### ARROGANT – SELF-CENTRED PROFILE CHART

Dysfunctional Behaviour

Level

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Arrogant – Self-centred

MH



### RISK LEVEL

The score Samantha obtained on the 'Arrogant – Self-centred' dysfunctional behaviour category falls within **the above average range**. This suggests she is more likely than many to display challenging behaviours within this category.

### POTENTIAL RISKS

- Samantha's profile indicates she is confident in social settings, and tends present herself as being sure of her own views and opinions. As a result, others may consider her to be rather arrogant or even somewhat opinionated.
- As she is likely to enjoy being the centre of attention, she may be inclined to 'perform to the gallery' and show off what she perceives to her high level of knowledge and skill.
- She may be prone to disregard others' point of view, particularly if she considers them to be less able than she is.
- When taken in combination with her tendency to present herself in a very self-assured manner, her social presence might be expected at times to antagonise others.
- There is a risk that she may be prone to overestimate her own ability and consequently may see little need to seek help and guidance from others, even when this is called for.
- She might be expected to be lacking in intuition.


### PROBING QUESTIONS

- In what ways do you think you need to grow or change?
- When tackling complex concepts or issues, do you try to understand them on your own or do you seek the support of others?
- Can you think of a recent occasion when you have been the centre of attention - perhaps at a gathering. How did you feel about that?
- How do you deal with bad ideas recommended by others?
- How do you respond when someone challenges you abilities?
- Have you ever volunteered for a task or project that was beyond your capabilities? How did you manage?



# MOODY – SULLEN

## MOODY – SULLEN PROFILE CHART



### RISK LEVEL

The score Samantha obtained on the 'Moody – Sullen' dysfunctional behaviour category falls within **the below average range (i.e. is 4 or less)**. This suggests it is unlikely she will display challenging behaviours within this category.

### POTENTIAL RISKS

- No potential risks could be derived from her profile on this dysfunctional behaviour category.

### PROBING QUESTIONS

- Do you regard yourself as more or less predictable than others in your work group?
- What do you do to maintain your enthusiasm during stressful work situations?
- How do you think others amongst your working group cope with boredom? Are you less tolerant or more tolerant of routine than others in your group?
- What are the things you look forward to most at work?