



**A Comparison of *DiSC*<sup>®</sup> *Classic* Classical  
Patterns to the Results of the *Team  
Dimensions Profile* and a Comparison of  
*DiSC* *Classic* Classical Patterns to Results of  
the *Personal Listening Profile*<sup>®</sup>**

Research Report

A Comparison of *DiSC*<sup>®</sup> *Classic* Classical Patterns to Results of the *Team Dimensions Profile* and a Comparison of *DiSC*  
*Classic* Classical Patterns to Results of the *Personal Listening Profile*<sup>®</sup>  
Item Number: **O-233**

©1996 by Inscape Publishing, Inc. All rights reserved. Copyright secured in the US and foreign countries.

"DiSC" and "Personal Listening Profile" are registered trademarks of Inscape Publishing, Inc.

---

## A Comparison of *DiSC<sup>®</sup> Classic* Classical Patterns to Results of the *Team Dimensions Profile*

### ***DiSC<sup>®</sup> Classic* (DiSC Dimensions of Behavior)**

This instrument asks respondents to describe how they tend to feel and behave in a particular environment. Responses are obtained as Most-Least preferences among 28 sets of four word choices. Scores from these responses are then plotted on four scales—Dominance, Influence, Steadiness, and Conscientiousness. An individual is led through an interpretation of his or her highest *DiSC<sup>®</sup>* dimension of behavior and an interpretation of one of fifteen classical patterns based on his or her scores for each of the four scales.

### ***Team Dimensions Profile***

The *Team Dimensions Profile* asks respondents to describe how they tend to think and behave when working with others to accomplish a specific task. Responses are obtained as rank-ordered preferences among 12 sets of descriptive phrases, and they are plotted on four scales—Conceptual, Normative, Spontaneous, and Methodical. From the scales five patterns emerge which describe the role respondents feel most comfortable taking in a team environment. The Creator pattern emphasizes Conceptual and Spontaneous approaches, resulting in a role where the focus is on generating concepts and ideas. The Advancer pattern, emphasizing Spontaneous and Normative approaches, produces a role in which the individual recognized the ideas and new directions in their early stages and develops ways to promote them. The Refiner pattern, emphasizing Conceptual and Methodical approaches, defines a role of challenging concepts in an effort to detect flaws and correct them before proceeding. The Executor pattern, emphasizing Methodical and Normative approaches, produces a role in which an individual follows up on team objectives and implements ideas and solutions. When all four approaches receive about equal emphasis, a Facilitator pattern is identified.

### **Question**

This study sought to determine what the relationship is between the classical patterns from *DiSC<sup>®</sup> Classic* and the innovation and team approaches as reflected in the *Team Dimensions Profile* and if scores on one of the instruments are predictive of scores on the other.

### **Methods of Comparison**

The instruments were completed at the same time by 122 respondents who represented typical respondent groups. The sample included primarily college graduates with a slightly higher percentages of female respondents than male respondents. A wide range of ages was represented, and about 87 percent of the sample were Caucasian.

---

Two kinds of comparisons were made. The first approach assigned each respondent to one of fifteen DiSC<sup>®</sup> patterns and one of five *Team Dimensions Profile* patterns based on individual scores. A matrix of co-occurrences was developed to identify how frequently a combination of two patterns occurred — one each from *DiSC Classic* and *Team Dimensions Profile*. If a high degree of association between the two instruments exists, one can expect to see visually that some patterns co-occur and others do not in a systematic fashion.

The second comparison used *DiSC Classic* patterns as a grouping factor in a one-way Analysis of Variance. Analysis of Variance reveals whether respondents with one DiSC pattern differ significantly from those with other patterns, by comparing their “mean” or average responses on each scale of the *Team Dimensions Profile*.

## Results

When a matrix of pattern co-occurrences is examined, results look like those represented in Figure 1. It is apparent from this graphic that no systematic relationship exists among the various patterns on each instrument. For example, individuals obtaining the Creator pattern on the *Team Dimensions Profile* are found among a variety of DiSC patterns, including those with Dominance, Influence, Steadiness, and Conscientiousness as the highest dimension. Empty cells are generally associated with low numbers of respondents in a particular column. There are only three to seven respondents displaying the DiSC patterns labeled Practitioner, Agent, Objective Thinker, Appraiser, Persuader, and Developer. The exception is the Inspirational Pattern, where Creator and Refiner patterns appear to be missing for reasons other than small sample size.

When results of the Analysis of Variance are examined, there is evidence of a greater-than-chance likelihood that DiSC patterns emphasizing Conscientiousness are associated with higher scores on the Methodical Approach scale of the *Team Dimensions Profile*. No other important differences are observed. And the relationship of Conscientiousness with Methodical Approach is not sufficiently strong to preclude persons scoring low on the “C” scale of the *DiSC Classic* from scoring high on Methodical. Likewise persons scoring high on the “C” scale can also obtain *Team Dimensions Profile* patterns incorporating higher scores on Spontaneous and lower scores on Methodical approaches (e.g., Creator, Advancer).

## Conclusion

While a statistically significant association between Conscientiousness and Methodical Approach was obtained from this sample, the relationship is not sufficiently strong to support generalization. The weight of evidence supports the conclusion that *DiSC® Classic* and the *Team Dimensions Profile* each measure different aspects of human behavior and that one cannot predict scores on one instrument from scores on the other.

**Figure 1. Relation of DiSC® Profile Patterns to Results of Team Dimensions Profile**

	Creator	Advancer	Refiner	Executor	Facilitator	N=
Perfectionist						23
Specialist						7
Practitioner						6
Agent						5
Objective Thinker						7
Counselor						10
Promoter						9
Appraiser						3
Creative						20
Inspirational						16
Persuader						4
Developer						5
Results Oriented						5
N=	34	174	15	37	26	

---

## A Comparison of *DiSC<sup>®</sup> Classic* Classical Patterns to Results of the *Personal Listening Profile<sup>®</sup>*

### **The *Personal Profile System* (DiSC<sup>®</sup> Dimensions of Behavior)**

This instrument asks respondents to describe how they tend to feel and behave in a particular environment. Responses are obtained as Most-Least preferences among 28 sets of four word choices. Scores from those responses are then plotted on four scales — Dominance, Influence, Steadiness, and Conscientiousness. From the scales, an individual is led through an interpretation of his or her highest DiSC<sup>®</sup> dimension of behavior and an interpretation of one of fifteen classical patterns based on his or her scores for each of the four scales.

### ***Personal Listening Profile***

This instrument asks respondents to describe how they tend to listen in a particular environment. Responses are obtained for 60 items on a four-point rating scale. Scores are plotted on five scales — Appreciative, Empathic, Discerning, Comprehending, and Evaluative, representing the likelihood of the respondent using each listening approach.

### **Question**

This study sought to determine what the relationship is between the classical patterns from *DiSC<sup>®</sup> Classic* and the listening approaches as reflected in the *Personal Listening Profile<sup>®</sup>* and if scores on one of the instruments are predictive of scores on the other.

### **Methods of Comparison**

The instruments were completed at the same time by 122 respondents who represented typical respondent groups. The sample included primarily college graduates with a slightly higher percentage of female respondents than male respondents; a wide range of ages was represented; and about 87 percent of the sample was Caucasian.

Two kinds of comparisons were made. The first approach assigned each respondent to one of the fifteen DiSC patterns and one of five listening approaches based on his or her individual scores. A matrix of co-occurrences was developed to identify how frequently a combination of two patterns occurred — one each from *DiSC Classic* and the *Personal Listening Profile*. If a high degree of association between the two instruments exists, one can expect to see visually that some patterns co-occur and others do not in a systematic fashion. These kinds of co-occurrences were not found, although patterns with high D or I dimensions tended to be associated more frequently with the Appreciative Listening approach.

---

The second comparison used *DiSC® Classic* patterns as a grouping factor in a one-way Analysis of Variance. Analysis of Variance reveals whether respondents with one DiSC pattern differ significantly from those with other patterns, by comparing their “mean” or average responses on each scale of the *Personal Listening Profile®*. Scale scores on the two instruments were not correlated in the usual sense, i.e., using a Pearson product-moment correlation. Correlational analysis is not advised, because the Most-Least response format on *DiSC Classic* limits the interpretability of results.

## Results

When a matrix of pattern co-occurrences is examined, results look like those represented in Figure 2. It is apparent from this graphic that no systematic relationship exists among the various patterns on each instrument. For example, individuals obtaining the Appreciative approach on the *Personal Listening Profile* are found among all of the DiSC Classical Patterns but one. Empty cells in Figure 2 are consistently associated with low numbers of respondents in a particular column. There are only three to six respondents displaying the DiSC patterns labeled Practitioner, Agent, Appraiser, and Developer. Results of the Analysis of Variance also failed to reveal that any significant differences in mean scores on the listening scales were associated with a particular DiSC pattern.

## Conclusion

The evidence strongly supports the conclusion that *DiSC Classic* and the *Personal Listening Profile* each measure a different aspect of human behavior and that one cannot predict scores on one instrument from scores on the other.

**Figure2. Relation of DiSC® Profile Patterns to Results of *Personal Listening Profile*®**

	Appreciative Listening	Empathic Listening	Discerning Listening	Comprehending Listening	Evaluative Listening	N=
Perfectionist						23
Specialist						7
Practitioner						6
Agent						5
Objective Thinker						7
Counselor						10
Promoter						9
Appraiser						3
Creative						20
Inspirational						16
Persuader						4
Developer						5
Results Oriented						5
N=	55	51	34	39	67	