Introducing MAP3

Redefining Personality Tests for the Future

Assessio now launches the most ambitious update of the personality test, MAP, ever – please welcome MAP3. In the following, the background and benefits of the update are outlined, and the changes and considerations are described in detail.

MAP3 launches a new and improved version of personality testing, built for the future of occupational assessment and includes several new initiatives, including:

- Improved perception of relevance in a work context
- More accurate differentiation of candidates
- Changes in Facet names and content readjusted to meet future needs of occupational testing
- Less risk of discrimination of different demographic groups

Why do we make changes to an existing assessment?

Although psychometrics and personality assessment have been known for well over a century, it is not a static discipline. As a provider of psychometric assessment methods, we see it as our duty to ensure that our tests are continuously updated and maintained as the job market and society change, research shed light on the field, and as advanced data and new methods enable even more accurate assessments.

The following are examples of factors that apply to the quality of a test over time and that may be worth paying attention to:

- New generations grow up in different circumstances than the previous ones, which can induce different personality traits and change the image of what is socially desirable and important in a work context. Thus, new generations are influencing what the workforce will look like in the future.

- Candidates are becoming more and more used to being tested in selection processes, and many know the theoretical basis better and better, which risks affecting their answers and thus their assessment results but also opens the possibility of presenting the results in new ways.

- The context in which tests are included and the way they are used evolve over time, which can also have an impact on the way candidates answer. Today, tests are used for everything from screening, feedback sessions and as an interview tool in recruitment to personal, competency and team development or as a foundation for strategic development of the organization, which puts on more demands on the span of the assessment, than previously.

- The job market changes over time, and the balance of power between employee and employer, which depends on the talent pool and labor supply, can also affect the average answers and what is perceived as important in a work context.

- New research that points to inexpediences in previous models or presents completely new possibilities, theories and methods, sometimes calls for the revision of existing tests or development of new ones based on new knowledge.

- New technologies continuously create new opportunities. Recently, artificial intelligence (AI) is revolutionizing the way of working by providing access to advanced language models with new ethical dilemmas as a result – also in the work with psychometric testing.

- Awareness and perceived importance concerning key aspects of the assessment itself changes due to societal changes. An increased focus on discrimination and limitation of bias is an example of that kind of tendencies.

Overall, these implications often mean that average scores change, thus affecting the quality of an assessment tool over time. For example, it can become more and more difficult to differentiate candidates if the average increases and more and more people have high underlying scores.

As part of our continuous work and responsibility to uphold the highest possible quality of our assessments, we have identified areas for improvements on MAP related to these tendencies and development in the psychometric field. In the last year, we have been testing more than 700 new items, collecting data from more than 15.000 candidates to update and fine tune MAP based on this evaluation.

What were the reasons for revising MAP?

Recent research has shown that contextualized personality tests (i.e., tests with questions that are particularly relevant to a work context) have a stronger predictive power compared to more traditional personality measures. Also, candidates typically perceive a contextualized test as fairer in recruitment, simply because they find it more relevant.

In recent years, more emphasis has been placed on bias and risk of discrimination in selection processes, which has led to new best practices in development and documentation of psychometric tests. One of the biggest challenges with many of the existing personality tests on the market, especially when used for recruitment, is social desirability bias. In terms of discrimination, the focus has been broadened to include age and gender as key aspects to consider.

More and more research supports the use of the five-factor model of personality as the leading theoretical framework. At the same time, it is important that a personality assessment includes the elements or facets that are most important to the current workforce and that contribute to the insights relevant in a work context in the most efficient way.

What does this mean to me?

In the update of MAP, we have made a big effort to uphold all the best elements of the existing personality test. Therefore, much is still the same.

All changes are tied to the personality questionnaire itself. Assessio's Performance Framework, the competences, the lenses and the calculations of match scores will be unaffected.

Because we have preserved MAP in its basic form, MAP3 is still a certified test. With a DNV certification comes an obligation to annually document the changes that are made and their effect on the quality of the test. This process is followed closely.

The changes that will likely be most noticeable are:

- **More accurate differentiation of candidates**
  Some candidates will have lower scores other higher. Over the years there has been a tendency for scores to be denser around the middle of the scale. If someone retakes an assessment, they may experience score differences because the scales have been corrected and the items enhanced.
- **Facet names and content readjusted to meet the future needs of occupational testing**
  Some facets or subscales have been renamed to better reflect the content of the scales and their relevance to a work context. Similarly, some facets have been replaced to accommodate new demands and ensure the best possible psychometric properties. All facets are still founded in the five-factor model of personality. For an overview of the specific changes, see below.
- **Less risk of discrimination of different demographic groups**
  MAP3 itself is built to minimize the risk of bias in terms of gender and age, which provides a great opportunity to prevent discrimination in, for example, selection and promotion processes.
- **Improved perception of relevance in a work context**
  More candidates will find the questions in the assessment relevant and fair due to the contextualized nature of the items. Together with the other updates and the improved quality, this will contribute to the candidates being better able to recognize themselves in the results.

How will these changes work in the platform?

Existing candidates in the recruitment module will retain their results.

In all newly started recruitment processes, MAP3 will be used from 10th of June.

If a new candidate is added to a recruitment process that was created before 10th of June, the previous version of MAP is used. This enables comparison of candidates in existing processes.

If candidates from previous processes are added to a new recruitment, they will be asked to complete MAP3 and will not have the option to reuse their existing results. This enables comparison of candidates in new processes.

Employees in the development module will be asked to complete MAP3 to ensure the best possible basis for their future development processes.

What are the major changes?

Of the 25 facets, 11 have changed names, primarily to create increased work relevance and reflect the items and content of the facet in question better. In addition, the content of four facets has changed significantly, and one facet has been replaced, which has mainly been done to avoid an overlap between facets and ensure a better factor fit (ensuring that MAP is a true measure of the five factors). See the table for an overview of the new names and revised content and the reasons for the changes.

Overview of Changes in Facet Names and Content			
Previous Name	**New Name**	**Reasons for Name Change**	**Content Change**
EX3 – Pace of Life	EX3 – Work Pace	To better reflect the content of items and relevance in the work context	No major changes
EX4 – Excitement Seeking	EX4 – Risk-Taking	To better reflect the content of items and relevance in the work context	No major changes
AG2 – Communication	AG2 – Diplomacy	To better reflect the revised content of the facet and avoid confusion regarding direction of the scale	**Revised**
AG3 – Altruism	AG3 – Helpfulness	To make the content clearer and more separable from Compassion	No major changes
AG5 – Affection	AG5 – Conflict Aversion	To highlight that it is a new facet with new content and items	**Replaced**
CO1 – Intensity	CO1 – Accountability	To better reflect the revised content of the facet and separate it effectively from other facets	**Revised**
ES1 – Emotions	ES1 – Unconcern	To avoid confusion regarding direction of the scale	No major changes
ES2 – Temper	ES2 – Mood Stability	To avoid confusion regarding direction of the scale	No major changes
ES4 – Self-Control	ES4 – Self-Control	–	**Revised**
ES5 – Stress	ES5 – Stress Tolerance	To avoid confusion regarding direction of the scale	No major changes
OP3 – Emotional Sensitivity	OP3 – Self-Reflection	To reflect the revised content of the facet and make it separable from facets within Emotional Stability	**Revised**
OP4 – Experiences	OP4 – Variety	To better reflect the content of items and relevance in the work context	No major changes

The facets not included in the table have not been subjected to a name change and the revision has not introduced major changes to the content either.

AG2 – Communication → Diplomacy (Revised Facet)

The previous operationalization of AG2 (Communication) came from the Five Factor Model (FFM) facet Straightforwardness. However, in research, this has generally proven problematic in relation to the Agreeableness trait. Therefore, the new operationalization of the facet (Diplomacy) focuses more on the degree of adaptation and diplomacy an individual applies to their communication to ensure a better factor fit to Agreeableness.

AG5 – Affection → Conflict Aversion (New facet)

The previous AG5 facet (Affection) showed too much of an overlap with other Agreeableness facets, notably Altruism and Compassion, and was therefore removed. To follow the Agreeableness trait in FFM more closely and to add a facet with more work relevance, the new facet (Conflict Aversion) was introduced as a counterpart to the Compliance facet from FFM, which was previously lacking in MAP.

CO1 – Intensity → Accountability (Revised Facet)

Within Conscientiousness in MAP, the previous CO1 facet (Intensity) had a disproportionately large overlap with Ambition as well as facets from other traits, such as Pace of Life (Work Pace) from Extraversion and Stress (Stress Tolerance) from Emotional Stability. To separate it from these facets, it was revised. Additionally, the revised facet (Accountability) provides another angle on the Competence facet from FFM (which both the old Intensity and the new Accountability is based on), that was otherwise missing in MAP.

ES4 – Self-Control (Revised Facet)

The previous ES4 facet (Self-Control) in Emotional Stability in MAP was somewhat similar to Self-Discipline in Conscientiousness and therefore, its content was revised. A focus on the tendency to control one's emotional expressions in the interaction with others was implemented, as it is more work-relevant than impulse control and resistance to various temptations, however, the new version of Self-Control facet is still an operationalization of the Impulsive (reversed) facet from FFM.

OP3 – Emotional Sensitivity → Self-Reflection (Revised Facet)

As the previous OP3 facet (Emotional Sensitivity) from Openness contained many nuances (including focusing on own feelings, understanding other's feelings, valuing deep feelings and spending time on self-reflection), it resulted in a low internal consistency and an overlap with Compassion in Agreeableness. To avoid this overlap and make the facet more specific and work-relevant, the revised version of the facet (Self-Reflection) focuses on one's tendency to acknowledge and reflect on one's feelings.

Content and interpretation of the new and revised scales

AG2 – Diplomacy

Assesses the level of diplomacy and consideration in the way an individual communicates.

The Diplomacy subscale indicates the level of thought and concern a person puts into their communication. People with high scores in this subscale tend to be diplomatic, considerate, and mindful of other people's feelings when communicating. They typically think before they speak and make an effort to be neither hurtful nor insulting in their interactions with others, sometimes running the risk of being less clear or even vague. People with low scores are often more likely to be frank and undisguised in their communication. They do not shape their way of communicating but tend to be more direct, sometimes even brutal, and run the risk of hurting other people with their bluntness. However, they may also come across as more honest and clearer when giving feedback or sharing their expectations.

Low
More straight-forward and direct communication style, prioritizing honesty and transparency in their interactions over a more diplomatic communication.

Moderate
Balanced communication style, blending honesty with a degree of caution. Can be transparent when expressing themselves but sometimes also shows consideration and diplomacy.

High
More diplomatic and vague communication style, being mindful of how they present their true thoughts and opinions out of concern for the receiver and to avoid being considered hurtful.

AG5 – Conflict Aversion

Measures willingness to compromise their own beliefs to uphold stability and a positive mood in relations with others

The Conflict Aversion subscale measures the extent to which a person tends to shy away from conflicts and a tense atmosphere. High scorers tend to give in rather than engage in a discussion to get their way. They do not necessarily have a very strong will or have any problems not getting the final say. On the contrary, they are typically content with compromises and find it more important to ease the mood in a group and do not like to stir up disagreement or share their difference of opinions. Their Conflict Avoidance might risk their contribution not being taken into account. Low scorers do not mind opposing others and find it more important to be heard than to limit disputes or avoid conflict. They are often stubborn and will fight for what they believe, which may make them come across as idealistic. Their viewpoints may be considered more often because they are not afraid to share them and hold on to them; however, that does not necessarily entail that they are more valid.

Low
More willing to engage in arguments and fight for their personal cause, showing strength of will whenever they believe in something.

Moderate
Often argues for what they believe in and are willing to engage in discussions as long as they do not result in open conflict or a bad atmosphere.

High
More concerned with reaching compromises and avoiding conflicts, typically giving in and letting others have their will if that means they are able to uphold a positive atmosphere.

CO1 – Accountability

Measures the individual's need for control and believe in their own competences - wanting to do things in a certain way, questioning others' decisions and taking a responsibility that exceeds their own tasks.

The Accountability subscale indicates the level of responsibility an individual takes accountability for at work. A person with high scores often finds themselves both competent, efficient and smart. They may have a hard time delegating tasks either because they feel responsible or because they think they might be better suited to complete the tasks themselves. They focus on the right solution to a task and act to ensure that their perspective is properly handed over, which to some may come across as meddlesome or even controlling. When troubles arise or mistakes happen, they will typically take responsibility and consider what they could have done differently to avoid the situation. Individuals with low scores do not consider themselves any more competent than others and tend not to meddle in other people's business or how they complete a task. They find it easy to delegate and do not feel particularly responsible for other people's mistakes or bad decisions. Note that this scale does not reflect whether or not a person actually is capable or suitable to perform a certain task, only whether or not this person perceives themselves as suitable and capable.

Low
More open to delegating tasks, focusing on individual responsibilities, staying out of how others complete their tasks but also not feeling accountable if anything goes wrong.

Moderate
Feeling responsible for and competent when working with tasks that are within their specific area of expertise and when they have authority to influence and are accountable for the quality.

High
More inclined towards feeling responsible for more than their own tasks, believing that they are competent and able to improve processes, decisions and task completion but with a risk of being perceived as controlling.

ES4 – Self-Control

Measures the individual's tendency to appear collected and keep their feelings to themselves.

The Self-Control subscale measures the extent to which a person keeps their feelings to themselves. High scorers often take pride in acting professionally and may be hard to read. They make a great effort to appear collected and will rarely talk about their feelings or overshare. They may seem closed and sometimes even emotionally cold to others, but their self-control may mask their actual feelings, and their appearance will not necessarily reflect how they truly feel. Low scorers may have a hard time hiding how they feel. They tend to give vent to their emotions and actively share their feelings with others. They will appear very authentic when interacting with others and may overshare. Their transparency may seem overwhelming to some but can also make it easier for others to navigate accordingly. They do not necessarily experience stronger emotional reactions than high scorers but have a more immediate response to them.

Low
More transparent and inclined to show emotions and to be authentic in expressing their feelings.

Moderate
Generally manages feelings and reactions in a balanced way, sometimes sharing their emotions and sometimes not.

High
More controlled and unanimated in emotional expressions, appearing professional and rarely sharing how they feel with others.

OP3 – Self-Reflection

Measures the weight an individual assigns to their emotions and the awareness of and reflection on their own feelings and reactions.

The Self-Reflection subscale indicates how receptive a person is to their own emotional state and how they tend to react in different situations. High scorers tend to notice, reflect and assign weight to their emotions and reactions. They use self-reflection as a means to understand themselves and often let their feelings guide them in decision making and self-development. Individuals with high scores often have a deep interest in understanding themselves and prioritize to be loyal to how they feel in a specific situation. Individuals with low scores are less inclined to listen to or reflect on their emotions. They do not spend much time thinking about their feelings, and do not give their emotions as much space or ascribe them as much importance and might find high scorers somewhat irrational.

Low	**Moderate**	**High**
More interested in rational than emotional aspects, paying little attention to their own feelings and does not think much about their own reactions.	Somewhat aware of their own emotions and reactions and often able to reflect on how they affect their work but may also at times neglect or overlook them.	More interested in understanding their own feelings and reactions, reflecting on how they feel and how their emotions affect their work.