

Niche Update

Special points of interest:

- Hogan Development Survey (HDS) Sub Scales
- Academic Fraud in research
- Christmas Hours

Christmas Greetings & Opening Hours

Well Christmas is nearly upon us and it is time for our short close down over the summer holidays.

As always we endeavour to try to meet our clients needs for urgent testing around this busy time. Please let us know if you will have testing needs that we should be aware of.

The following are our opening and closing hours over the Christmas holiday season.

Closing - Wednesday 23rd December 2015

Reopening - Monday 18th January 2016

Skeleton staff from Monday 11th January where we will check emails and action urgent requests



Inside this issue:

Christmas Hours	1
HDS Sub Scale Definitions	2
Introducing HDS Sub Scales	3
Misconduct and Fraud in Academic Research	4

From the staff at Niche we wish you a wonderful Christmas and a very happy New Year.

Warren Buffet Quote on Hiring People



“Somebody once said that in looking for people to hire, you look for integrity, intelligence and energy. And if you don’t have the first, the other two will kill you. If you hire somebody without integrity, you really want them to be dumb and lazy.”

Hogan Development Survey— The Sub Scale Definitions

HDS Scale	Subscale	Definition
Excitable	Volatile	Moody, often angered or annoyed, easily upset, hard to soothe
	Easily Disappointed	Initial passion for things which turns into disappointment
	No Direction	Lacking few beliefs or interests and has regrets about past behaviour
Skeptical	Cynical	Prone to doubts about the good intentions of others
	Mistrusting	Generalised mistrust of people and alert to signs of mistreatment
	Grudges	Holding grudges and unwilling to forgive real or imagined wrongs
Cautious	Avoidant	Avoids new people or situations to avoid possible embarrassment
	Fearful	Afraid of criticism or making mistakes leading to indecision or inaction
	Unassertive	Unwilling to act assertively and then prone to being overlooked
Reserved	Introverted	Valuing private time and prefers to work alone
	Unsocial	Keeps others at a distance and may be detached
	Tough	Indifferent to the feelings and problems of others
Leisurely	Passive aggressive	Overtly compliant but privately resentful or subversive
	Unappreciated	Believing one's talents are ignored & that there are perceived work inequities
	Irritated	Privately easily irritated by interruptions and work related requests
Bold	Entitled	Feeling one has special gifts and deserves special treatment
	Overconfidence	Unusually confident in one's abilities and believes will be successful at everything
	Fantasized talent	Believing that one has unusual talents and gifts
Mischievous	Risky	Prone to risk taking and may bend or break inconvenient rules
	Impulsive	Acts impulsively without thought of long term consequences
	Manipulative	Machiavellian tendencies using charm to manipulate; no remorse
Colorful	Public Confidence	Not knowing when to be quiet; expecting others to find their public performances engaging and fascinating
	Distractible	Easily distracted, needs constant stimulation & has minimal focus
	Self-Display	Wants to be centre of attention & uses dramatic attention seeking actions
Imaginative	Eccentric	Expresses unusual views that are creative or strange; self-absorbed
	Special Sensitivity	Believing has special abilities to see things others don't and understand things others can't
	Creative Thinking	Believing that one is especially creative and has strong imaginative problem solving abilities; easily bored
Diligent	Standards	Exceptionally high standards of performance for self and others
	Perfectionism	Perfectionistic and obsessed with details and completion
	Organised	Meticulous and inflexible about schedules, rules & procedures
Dutiful	Indecisive	Over reliance on others for advice & reluctant to act independently
	Ingratiating	Eager to please superiors; flattering and not contradicting bosses
	Conforming	Taking pride in supporting superiors and following orders without question


Hogan Development Survey— The introduction of Sub-Scales

The Hogan Development Survey (HDS) is an interesting leadership assessment which measures potential derailers to a leader's effectiveness. Used alongside a strong personality inventory such as the CPI (California Psychological Inventory), the HDS can give clues about the likely behaviours that may occur when a leader is put under high levels of stress or high workloads.

Recently the Hogan Research Division have updated the Hogan Development Survey to have subscales for each of the 11 potential leadership derailers which can assist greatly in the accurate interpretation of results. The sub-scales allow us to tease out the nuances of interpreting high scores on each of the scales which can have quite different meanings and emphasis. As you can see on page 2 the sub-scales of the HDS main scales are within the overall interpretation of the scale but now you could potentially have high and low scores on the sub-scales within an elevated main scale.

Without sub-scale scores, interpreters of the HDS can only assume that a person with a high HDS scale score will evidence *all of the* behaviours associated with the scale. However, this is often not the case and some aspects may be more pronounced and others may not be part of the observed behaviours at all. By now giving sub-scale level scores, the new HDS result offers a more detailed summary of a person's likely behaviours under stress.

By way of an example a person who scores high on Skeptical overall and in the sub-scales was high on sub-scales *Mistrusting* and *Grudges* but low on the sub-scale *Cynical*, may remain alert for signs of perceived mistreatment and hold grudges, but may not assume ulterior motives in others' actions.



Fraud and Misconduct in Academic Research

Many of us hold academics in high regard and we tend not to question the accuracy of the results that are published. As psychologists we look to the scientific research that has been peer reviewed to provide evidence that particular interventions and tools are valid and effective. Unfortunately, there has been quite a few recent cases of fraud and misconduct which raise some serious questions about how much trust we can put in some academic researchers and the research that gets published.

Daniele Fanelli (2009) from the University of Edinburgh conducted a meta-analysis of results from 21 surveys of academic researchers where they were asked whether they or their colleagues had fabricated or falsified research. He found nearly 2% of scientists admitted to having "fabricated, falsified or modified data or results at least once – a serious form of misconduct by any standard – and up to 33.7% admitted other questionable research practices. In surveys asking about the behaviour of colleagues, admission rates were 14.12% for falsification, and up to 72% for other questionable research practices." Most likely the numbers reported in colleagues is a more accurate reflection as people tend to under report on their own rates.

Type of Fraud or Misconduct	% that admitted they had done it	% that believed colleagues did it
Fabrication of results	1.97%	14.12%
Questionable research practices	33.7%	72%

It is sad to think that those we hold in esteem would resort to this type of misconduct. We saw the following in a psychology student's letter from April's 2012 issue of "The Psychologist" (the magazine of the British Psychological Society) and we think it nicely summarises the issues and how cheating and fraud potentially damages the quest for knowledge and foundations of science:

"My tardy entrance into higher education was fuelled by a rationalist revolution. Breaking down my world to embrace objectivity, atheism and empiricism, I recognised a higher sense of purpose in humans who work to find the truth. Science dictates endeavours taken on, not in order to prove oneself right, but to test whether an assertion is true. For five years I believed that anyone working within the sciences, either as student or scholar, had the same motivations.

At the end of those five years, I was sadly disillusioned. During my undergraduate degree I heard of scholars who use the peer review system to block papers which might potentially challenge their leading theory; how 'publish or perish' can be re-interpreted as 'perjure or perish' (a former supervisor of mine has openly said 'We're going to publish this, even though it's flawed'); students who declare that 'You can make these numbers look like anything, it doesn't have to make sense' and go unattested; ostensibly honourable scholars who predate at conventions for fresh young meat; and first class degrees being awarded of students who – and I quote – 'Don't know what an ANOVA is'; and let's not even start on the cheating.

I've met and spoken with countless experimental psychologists from the most illustrious of institutions, many of whom talk freely about proving their hypotheses, never about testing, or even supporting their ideas. And now as a graduate, I say this: to the data-peekers and cleansers, the status hungry, the removers of outliers and the out-and-out liars; you know who you are, and I'll be looking for you. I'd like to say that you're only cheating yourself, but we all know that isn't true. Your compromised integrity weakens us all."