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Abstract

What Is The Profile of the Ideal Christian Coach?

The question this writer would like to explore is: What is the profile of the ideal Christian Coach? Recently I sat down with Jonathan Reitz, CEO of CoachNet, one of the largest Christian coaching networking agencies in the world. Jonathan’s question to me was can we come up with a profile of the ideal coach? The goal is to answer the question by using materials from evaluations and assessments provided by CoachNet. These have been agreed upon to be readily available for the purpose of this project. The research and statistical analysis provided should present a profile from a random choice of eighty coaches in the CoachNet network. From these reviews and initial profile assessments we are hoping to find some common traits that will allow for easier targeting of coaches that will be more successful in helping people move forward in the life God has created them for.

Abstract length: 149 words.
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CHAPTER ONE

Introduction

One might think a lot of things when hearing the term coach, maybe flash back to someone yelling on a sideline, or a gentle encouragement after missing a fly ball, but today one might think of someone who is coming along side of another to help them reach their full potential toward a specific goal. Today the coaching phenomenon is in full swing, and with so many getting into the coaching field people are in pursuit of the best training with best practices available. People who are looking for coaches are looking for efficient coaches that can help them reach their goals. Satisfaction of the coaching industry is high, and is on the rise, and the effectiveness of coaching is being enjoyed by many. The International Coaching Federation says,

Once believed to be a fad in the ‘90s, today professional coaching is utilized by many around the world to address both personal and professional goals. According to the recent ICF Global Consumer Awareness Study, where 15,000 individuals representing 20 countries were polled, 51 percent of participants reported they were “somewhat to very aware” of professional coaching. Common areas in which study participants who had engaged in a coaching relationship were utilizing professional coaching included: “optimize individual and/or team performance,” “expand professional career opportunities,” and “improve business management strategies.”

Coaching is growing more and more popular every day and it appears that one of the greatest reasons is that it is helping people achieve goals and dreams. Coaching is being used on many levels for everything from seeking jobs through the use of employment coaching to writing dissertations with writing or dissertation coaches. People really seem to enjoy the benefits that

---

1 International Coach Federation Celebrates 15 Years; press release from www.coachfederation.org
coaching provides and the help it gives in moving through rough spots in life. Coaching is not only growing in its usage, but the training of coaches is also growing at a tremendous rate.²

With corporate downsizing and smaller budgets everyone is seeking an edge to be more competitive in today’s market driven world, and that is no exception for those who are Christian.³ In 2001 Michael McCullough said, “The coaching phenomenon is already well established in the United States, where the International Coach Federation counts 8,000 accredited members. Most Fortune 500 companies now employ in-house coaches or coaching consultants to help motivate and direct project teams.”⁴ According to a press release from the ICF (International Coaching Federation) they currently claim to be “the leading global organization for coaches, with over 16,000 members in more than 100 countries, dedicated to advancing the coaching profession by setting high ethical standards, providing independent certification, and building a worldwide network of credentialed coaches.”⁵

With this type of growth and expansion of the coaching field the question that arises is what makes a great coach, but since many have answered this question, the question soon becomes what kind of person makes a great coach, and for our discussion what type of personality and behavior makes a great coach. This is the question that this writer is seeking to answer in the following pages.

² International Coach Federation Celebrates 15 Years; press release from www.coachfederation.org: “As coaching has grown across the globe, the number of coach training programs has grown into the hundreds, possibly thousands,” points out ICF President Karen Tweedie, PCC.
Background

In a counseling class a professor mentioned the growing phenomenon of coaching. He mentioned how it worked and how people were gravitating towards the results it produced. This was the spark that this student needed to look deeper into the coaching phenomenon. Through a friend a connection was made with the CEO of CoachNet, Jonathan Reitz. In a meeting with Jonathan there were a few ideas that were on his mind that he would like to see a project done, and one was the question of personality and successful coaches. CoachNet is a network for coaches that provides training and seeks to produce quality coaches and leadership multiplication. The question that was narrowed down was: what is the ideal coach profile? This was the one question that excited this writer the most because of my interest in personality and behavioral profiles. This became the topic presented and accepted for writing this Doctor of Ministry thesis. Jonathan gave this as a reason in an email:

The behavioral profile of the ideal coach gives us two valuable pieces of information:

1. What is the target at which we should be aiming in order to be as effective as possible in training new coaches?
2. What measurable criteria can we assess a candidate for coach training at the beginning of the training process so that we can build a custom coach training experience for them?

Armed with these two pieces of information, we can raise the consistency and quality of the coach training process.

It is clearly seen that the goal from this email, and that the goal of CoachNet is to produce quality coaches and this type of information can be very beneficial to the process. As a part of the research process this writer is working toward coaching credentials with CoachNet, and plans for further credentials with the ICF.
Definitions

Some terms used in this writing will need to be defined as some may not be familiar to those outside the coaching world. The first term to define is coach. What is a coach? The term coach has evolved from a sports term to one that is using similar behaviors and encouragements applied to everyday life and business. Coaching is defined by the Harvard Business Review in their book Coaching People as “an opportunity to contribute to another person’s development. It is a two-way partnership in which both partners share knowledge and experience in order to maximize the coachee’s potential and help her achieve her goals.” 6 Gary Collins adds a deeper look into what coaching is by saying “coaching is not for those who need therapy to overcome disruptive painful influences from the past; it is for relatively well-adjusted people to build vision and move forward toward the future. Coaching is not reactive looking back; it is proactive looking ahead. It is not about healing; it’s about growing. It focuses less on overcoming weakness and more on building skills and strengths.” 7 Another aspect of coaching and directly related to the CoachNet team is from Bob Logan where he defines coaching as “not experts or know-it-alls – they are ordinary Christians who have the opportunity and privilege of coming alongside others and helping them succeed in fulfilling their God given potential.” 8 Coaching should be further defined as related to the initial question that is being asked, and that is to define what is meant by a Christian coach. “Christian coaching is the practice of guiding and enabling

---

6 Coaching People; Expert Solutions to Everyday Challenges, Harvard Business School Press, 2006 Boston, MA
8 Robert Logan and Sherilyn Carlton, Coaching 101; Discovering the Power of Coaching (St. Charles, Illinois: ChurchSmart Resources, 2003), 15.
individuals or groups to move from where they are to where God wants them to be.”9 This will be defined greater in chapter two, but should be understood for the sake of this work as a coach who happens to be a Christian. This is clarified in relation to coaching that would be directed at Christians only. From this writer’s perspective the Christian coaching world should not be understood as coaching for Christians only, but as a coach who happens to be Christian. This can be a great opportunity to share the hope of Christ with a world that feels hopeless, and needs to walk in life with someone who walks with Jesus. “Christian coaches anchor themselves in basic Christian values and beliefs. They take time to know God better and to listen for his voice.”10 There are some implications that can be impactful to the Christian being coached that could and should affect their personal Christian life and ministry, but as far as this project is concerned, it is a coach that happens to be a Christian.

Another definition to consider is the person who is being coached. This person is typically called the coachee. In the case of coaching this coachee is the one who is leading the direction and are considered the expert in the session as they move toward the desired goal.11 Another definition to consider is training. Although coaches do not require any training, the large majority of coaches going into the field today go through some kind of training. This is where an individual will connect with a coach or an organization to learn how to be a coach or to start a coaching business. Training coaches is big business and most coaches see the benefit of needing coach training. The ICF says “The number of ICF-approved programs has steadily

---


10 Ibid., 23.

grown from five in 1999 to 119 in 2009.”¹² This also is “demonstrating the heightened interest in coaching as a career over the last decade and thus the increase in training options. Through program approval, the ICF identifies for potential coaches and their future clients, qualified training programs that meet the highest standards set by the world's leading global organization of professional coaches.”¹³ With that being said, another definition to consider is that of credentials. It is noteworthy “that at present there is considerable debate among coaches about the value or need for credentials, including certification.”¹⁴ With the coaching field unregulated the need for some sort of approval as a qualified coach is necessary. Most coach training courses provide a stamp of approval or a stamp of completion to allow others to know that they have completed the course of study and are approved for coaching. There are different organizations that do credentials, and they are somewhat on different levels as far as credentials go. There are some larger and more widely recognized organizations, and one of those is the ICF. Most training organizations seek, or are seeking to be accepted by the ICF and this allows their training to go toward completion of the requirements that are listed to receive credentials by the ICF. The ICF requirements are extensive and require many hours of coaching before they allow you to be credentialed by the ICF. There are three levels of which the ICF gives credentials, the first is the Associate Certified Coaching (ACC) level and requires one hundred hours of coaching, the second is the Professional Certified Coach (PCC) level and it requires seven hundred and

---


¹³ Ibid.

fifty hours, and the third level is Master Certified Coach (MCC) and it requires twenty-five hundred hours of coaching.\(^1^5\)

Another definition to be defined is core competencies. Most of the training programs, including CoachNet and the ICF have a set of perimeters to define coaching excellence, and this is what core competencies are. They are the standards of which a particular group defines coaching. These would include a common understanding as we see in the competencies given by the ICF.

**Statement of the Problem**

In the future of coaching there seems to be an interest in making better coaches in a profession that has little or no parameters for coaching.\(^1^6\) This seems to be the direction of which the International Coach Federation is trying to tighten and sharpen the coaches that are being produced today. This also seems to be the approach of which CoachNet and their CEO, Jonathan Reitz, are seeking to go. One of the ideas Jonathan had was to see if there was a correlation between personality types and excellent coaches. Therefore, one of the reasons for this particular paper is for the very idea of seeking to better identify what particular personalities or personality types and behavior types make better coaches. This is the result of an organization that desires to be successful, and ask needed questions like, are we producing the highest quality of coaches that we can? This is a question that should be on any coach training organization’s mind. With the lack of regulations for coaches in the coaching world today, there should be the desire to produce the highest and best qualified coaches that an organization can produce. With that being said there is an understanding that coaching schools are not putting out the quality that they

\(^{1^5}\) http://www.coachfederation.org/getcredentialed/

would like to, and maybe the reason why, is that there is no restrictions put on who can be a coach, also, who is qualified to be a coach, and who would make better coaches. Coaching schools at their core are a business and are about making money, with this being the approach to coaching, and with an all welcome open enrollment, the coaching field has suffered. “The International Coach Federation (ICF) urges those pursing a coaching career to avoid programs promising to prepare you in just a weekend – those with a ‘get-rich-quick’ feel – and set their sights on coach training programs of the highest quality.”17 Coaching is for many an undisciplined discipline and without restriction leads many into the field where there is little respect from professional groups. This is why coach training, and understanding what makes better coaches, is so important. Coaching and coach training organizations today are producing better coaches and therefore are respected on a greater level, because groups like the ICF are making a standard for coaching that is raising the bar and coaching schools are being forced to get on board with the ICF and produce better coaches for the betterment and the acceptability of the coaching world as a whole.18

The question again is can we develop a better coach? As stated there is a desire from coach training programs like CoachNet that want to produce better coaches. The question that follows is can we produce a better coach training program? One of the ways Jonathan Reitz would like to tackle this question is by understanding the coach who is being trained better. Knowing what types of personalities for these quality coaches or more effective coaches is very important. If we can know what types of personalities produce better coaches, then we can target certain personality types in the training process. This also allows us to be able to pinpoint those

---

18 The Future of Coaching as a Profession – The Next 5 Years (2005-2010) © June 17, 2005 by Diane Brennan and David Matthew Prior
who do not have a certain personality profile that is better suited for coaching, and better help them in the coach training process to be the best coach that they can be. Bob Logan says “the basics of coaching aren’t difficult and anyone can learn them.”\textsuperscript{19} Anyone can be trained to know and carry out the coaching process, but it does not mean they will be the best coaches. This would lead to a tailor made type of coaching that would fit specific coach training to a specific personality types. This is a process in coach training that does not seem to be done today and while it may be more difficult, it could allow CoachNet to produce much better coaches. This training would produce coaches that are better trained toward their personality or behavior skill set, and would help them be the best coach they can be. This allows organizations like CoachNet in the beginning processes of their entry to coach training to be able to target coach training in such a way to help them be able to produce higher-quality, and more consistently better coaches from CoachNet. This is the approach that most coaching agencies want to see, a better product in the coaching world, which also helps everyone in the coaching world. This allows the coaching profession as a whole to reach certain standards, and in a realistic sense a better product will be produced. This will in turn increase the overall perception of the world and how it sees coaching.

**Statement of Limitation**

This project will be confined to the CoachNet network. The research and statistics that will be done will be analyzed from those who have participated through the network of CoachNet. This project will look at a quorum of coaches from CoachNet’s network that score a 55 or better on the online coaching assessment, and who have participated in the personality profiles and behavior profiles provided through the CoachNet network. These profiles will then

\textsuperscript{19} Robert Logan and Sherilyn Carlton, Coaching 101; Discovering the Power of Coaching (St. Charles, Illinois: ChurchSmart Resources, 2003), 16.
be compared and analyzed together to see if there are any patterns that can be confirmed. Following the initial look there will be consideration given toward those who scored less to see if there are similarities there as well. Since most personality and behavior profiles have four sections, we will be able to track the scores better, and this information will then be used toward the data that will be provided in the final presentation to CoachNet.\textsuperscript{20} This process is not seeking to produce a detailed coaching process, but only the results of which the analysis of the data can produce, and then suggestions will be made based upon the information given. While there may be a specific type of personality that consistently scores higher on coaching assessment, it is understood that there may not be a consistent type of personality that scores high as well.

Final thoughts concerning limitations are with the assessments to be given. The writer is certified with Uniquely You as a certified behavior consultant, and therefore will be using the DISC Personality Type Assessment, and the Insight Inventory Behavior Assessment, as well as the CoachNet Online Assessment which are provided by CoachNet through the CoachNet certification training. Through two personality and behavior assessments the project will only consider the main types and not seek to use excessive combinations of types unless otherwise detected from the analysis.

\textbf{Theoretical Basis}

The theoretical basis for this question is that CoachNet desires to produce the best coaches that it can with those that are seeking coach training through their organization. Does this mean that everyone is perfectly suited to be a coach, not at all? Some people do not make great coaches, but does that mean they cannot be a very effective coach? The answer is no. This

research allows CoachNet to target areas of a person’s personality and behavior that are not naturally suited for coaching, and target training that will strengthen these coaching weaknesses.

Coaching is a process that is very effective with the right person as a coach. This is to be understood with the idea that every person who claims to be a believer in Jesus Christ has been gifted, and given a personality type and gifts to accomplish the task that God has given to that individual. “God has called us to collaborative partnerships with other believers for accomplishing what he wants us to do.”21 In the book of First Corinthians the apostle Paul says “Now there are varieties of gifts, but the same Spirit; and there are varieties of service, but the same Lord; and there are varieties of activities, but it is the same God who empowers them all in everyone. To each is given the manifestation of the Spirit for the common good.”22 With this understanding certain people have a sort of gifting for coaching, and training organizations should seek to sharpen these gifts and produce the highest quality coaches they can. Coaching is a great tool for ministry, and provides for the common good of all believers and non-believers. In Second Corinthians Paul says we are to give the same comfort we have been given, and this is helping others walk in life, and many times down a similar path.23

Coaching is a very effective tool, and has at its core questions to provoke thought on behalf of the one being coached. This is an approach used by Jesus in many ways as he taught with questions that were thought provoking and heart searching. Jesus is coaching people to a desired point of understanding to accomplish a specific goal. Jonathan Reitz points this out and

---


22 The Bible (English Standard Version) 1 Corinthians 12:4-7. All quotes will be quoted from the ESV

23 Ibid; 2 Corinthians 1:4 ESV "who comforts us in all our affliction, so that we may be able to comfort those who are in any affliction, with the comfort with which we ourselves are comforted by God."
uses it as a teaching tool on the CoachNet web site. With this understanding of coaching, we should try to target those who have been given this gift by God to be a great encouragement to others and share in this journey called life. This type of target training for coaches helps people fulfill their calling, and helps an organization like CoachNet fulfill its calling to produce the best coaches it can.

**Statement of Methodology**

In this project the writer is asking the question: what is the profile of the ideal Christian coach? In this question proposed by Jonathan Reitz, the CEO of CoachNet, is the desire to produce the best coaches that he can produce, and to be able to sharpen the skills of those who go through the CoachNet training process. To answer this question, seven chapters will unfold in a way so as to define coaching and the training process, and to compare personality and behavior assessments to the CoachNet coaching assessment. The chapters will align in this manner:

| Chapter One: Introduction | This chapter identifies the question to be examined and provides an overview of the project and the process being used in this thesis. |
| Chapter Two: What is Coaching? | This chapter defines coaching in both a secular and Christian understanding. |
| Chapter Three: Assessment Introduction | This chapter analyzes the different assessments used in the report. |
| Chapter Four: Process and Results: Case Study | This chapter details the process and results of the study being conducted. |
| Chapter Five: Results and Effects: Coaching and Coach Training | This chapter considers how the results can affect coaching and the coach training process. |
| Chapter Six: Presentation to CoachNet | This final chapter summarizes the results that will be presented to CoachNet. |

---

Review of the Literature

*Carbonell, Mels*

How to solve people puzzle gives description for the different personality types in the disc personality assessments. Dr. Carbonell explains them thoroughly and how and why we relate to others the way we do. This is a valuable resource toward consideration to the personality types that we will be assessing with CoachNet. This will be used to see how each personality type fits with the different core competencies.

*Reinecke, Gary B. and Robert E. Logan*

Coaching 101 is an explanation to the coaching model which CoachNet uses. This book not only gives an introduction to coaching but also more specifically to the coaching model that is used in the CoachNet training process. This will give us a better understanding of what coaching is and what coaching seeks to accomplish. Coaching 101 is a book this writer used in the training for coaching certification with CoachNet and will be a valuable resource to this project.

*Logan, Robert E. and Tara Miller*

Another book by Bob Logan is from followers to leaders. This book is a descriptive trail of how coaching works. With a focus on leadership development Bob Logan and Tara Miller use the coaching process to explain how leaders are developed. This book gives insight and help toward understanding the coaching process from a Christian perspective, and gives scriptural support for the process. These Scriptures give a better understanding to the Biblical context of the why of coaching.
Logan, Robert E. and Sherilyn Carlton

Developing coaching excellence is a handbook used in the CoachNet training process. This workbook explains the process of coaching and its relationship to the core coaching competencies given by CoachNet. This book is not only for the use of understanding coaching better, but understanding the core competencies behind the CoachNet process.

Logan, Robert E. and Sherilyn Carlton

The coaching 101 handbook is also used in the CoachNet training process. This workbook gives greater insight into the coaching process and is accompanied with the CoachNet 101 book and gives a better practical understanding of the coaching process. This book moves through the five R's of the CoachNet process: relate, reflect, refocus, resource and review. It gives the questions that should be asked in each section and the how and why you should ask.

Handley, Patrick Ph. D.

This is the insight inventory test understanding yourself and others and is the test that will be used for the assessment. This test also includes an information section which explains their usage and differences in personalities. It explains the different traits and how they relate to others. This workbook and test is directly focused toward behavior outcomes rather than behavioral styles. This will help us see how people respond the way they do as coaches.

Collins, Gary

Christian Coaching is a premier resource in the Christian coaching world. This book has been used for many years in the coaching world and gives great explanation to what coaching is, and more specifically, to what Christian coaching is. This book helps us to have a greater understanding to how the coaching process works and how it can be effectively used for a Christian coach, and for coaching Christian.
Coaching people is an explanation for coaching from a secular perspective. It goes through a very similar approach to explaining coaching from a simpler and more practical point of view. This book gives a more rounded look into coaching from a non-Christian perspective. This is a very useful book, and gives a great understanding of coaching and how to coach.

*Ogne, Steve and T. Roehl*

Trans for missional coaching is a book that is speaking of the value of coaching. This book gives a practical view of coaching leaders and looks at this approach in a more holistic view. This book brings another dimension to the understanding of coaching and its effect on the person being coached. This holistic view to coaching brings a greater perspective to understanding the process and the coach.

*Stoltzfus, Tony*

Leadership coaching is a book written by one of the top Christian coach trainers. Stoltzfus is well known and much respected in the Christian coaching world, and brings a biblical perspective and support to the explanation of coaching. This brings a better understanding and support to the use of Christian coaching.

*Whitworth, Laura, Karen Kimsey-House, Henry Kimsey-House, and Philip Sandahl*

Co-Active Coaching is the hallmark of coaching books in the coaching world. This book is used in training organizations around the world. It is filled with information on best practices in coaching and is directed for the professional world. This book is a secular work and has a professional coaching perspective. This book speaks to the person seeking coach training for the executive and professional world.

*Whitmore, John*
Coaching for performance is a book that is respected around the coaching world. It is a classic and is used by many training organizations. It too, is a secular work that is focused toward the business world and seeks to define excellence in coach training. This book has an aspect of spirituality, but is from a humanistic perspective. This book not only adds to the understanding of coaching, but allows us to see the difference that many training organizations are focused on. This would be in distinct contrast to the core competencies of CoachNet's training where it pertains to the Holy Spirit.

**Wilson, Carol**

Best practice in performance coaching by Carol Wilson gives us another look at coaching and speaks specifically to the professional world. She helped define coaching and see the process of coaching. This will give a little background on the history of coaching and how it specifically relates to psychology and more particularly to the brief solution focused therapy.

**Cook, Marshall**

Marshall Cook helps us to see what good characteristics in coaching looks like in his book, and will allow us to see the connection between coaching competencies and the personality type in a clearer perspective. This book also shows how these characteristics play out in the workplace and help us see the behavioral process unfold. This book serves as a connector to the personality types and the effective coach.

**Biswas-Diener, Robert**

*The Journal of Clinical Psychology* has proved to be a worthy resource with several articles, one of which is *Personal Coaching as a Positive Intervention*. In this article there is a connection given between psychology and how psychologists are you using coaching today. It is seen as a positive move and many in the secular world are using coaching as a tool in the therapy
process. This resource gives us a better look at how coaching is being defined today and how it is progressing toward a larger acceptance in the world of psychology.

*International Coach Federation. [http://www.coachfederation.org](http://www.coachfederation.org)*

This website has been a major source of information in understanding what coaching is about and the process of coaching in the world today. It is a great resource for information regarding the current state of coaching as well as information for the future of coaching. Much of the coaching credential requirements are set by the ICF and are the standard of the industry.


The CoachNet website has been an anchor of much of research that has been done. This project is a case study and CoachNet is at the center of the research. It has a tremendous amount of information, but also free resources. CoachNet is a tool for coaches to use it has allowed a peek into what goes on in coaching. This is the place where the online coaching assessments are done, as well as the steps and requirements to achieve certification from CoachNet.

**Biblical Review**

*Acts 11:23*

This verse is where Barnabas goes to Antioch, and is a great picture of what coaching is. Bob Logan in Coaching 101 makes the comparison of “one who is called alongside to encourage, prepare, equip, and help others succeed.” This is a great point for the purpose of coaching.

*Matthew 28:19-20*

This is one of the most famous for making disciples. There is a part of coaching that is about making disciples, and in the process going forward in life we are to simply make people learners and followers of Jesus Christ.

*Romans 12:1-2*
This is another key verse for coaching. The idea is transformation, and not only
transformation, but a total commitment of self. Paul gives an image of this as an alter burning,
and of one placing themselves upon the altar of life, the living sacrifice. Coaching seeks to get
the most out of commitment, and it should ultimately lead to transformation. Coaching for many
is about renewing the mind.

*Ephesians 2:10*

Another verse to consider with coaching is the idea of seeking to do good works, and
helping people accomplish this for their life. This also has to do with living out ones purpose
and reason for creation.

*First Corinthians 10:31*

Coaching should always bring the idea of living to ones full potential and in everything
we do to bring glory to God. Bringing glory to God involves business, family, relationships, life,
church and everything we do. My goal through this project is to bring glory to God.

*First Corinthians 6:19 and Galatians 5:22*

These verses are very connected with coaching in the belief that all professing the name
of Jesus are gifted by the spirit, and has the Spirit of God indwelling within them. Coaching
seeks to bring people to the point of surrender to the Spirit, and to live within the gifts and power
that is been placed in the life of a believer. I am reminded that one of CoachNet's core
competencies is abiding in Christ, and at its core surrender to the Spirit in all coaching situations.

*John 10:10*

Coaching seeks to help people attain goals and live life to the fullest. Jesus said in John
10:10 that he came to provide an abundant life. This abundance is provided in the cross of Christ
and has made a way to live in joy through the blood of Jesus, and also allows us to fulfill the things God has planned for our lives.

*Colossians 4:5*

Coaching is about making the most out of the time you have available. It’s about achieving all that you can, and doing so as a light unto a dark world. This makes what CoachNet, and this project could do even more worthwhile. It allows for the opportunity to make the best coaches CoachNet can produce by looking for better ways to train and understand coaches.

*Luke 14:28*

Jesus gives some great advice about not running into things of which you have not given consideration to the cost. In this project we are trying to have a fair assessment of the cost. Is CoachNet allowing people to train for a coaching profession that would not be a very good coach? Or, is there a process that could better train them to strengthen areas of coaching that are weaker? We must count the cost, and see if there is a better way.

*First Chronicles 27:23*

In this passage David is counting the people. There are times he did this that he should not, and times that God told him to count them. There is a time to assess who we are, and what is necessary to fulfill our calling. Assessing is not meant to be bad, but to have an honest consideration of what you have. I believe that is the desire of CoachNet and this project.

*Nehemiah 2:11-16*

This is another situation where there is a consideration given to the task at hand. Nehemiah is surveying the damage to have a realistic understanding of what it will take to accomplish the task. This is the aim in this research is to see what the damage (not in a negative
sense) is. There is a desire to have a realistic view to be able to see if we can better accomplish the task of coaching.

Luke 19:17

Finally, the desire of this project is to present it unto the Lord with the desire not to receive accolades from others, but to be faithful to the opportunity to share in such a great task.

Summary

This project is for the purpose of fulfilling the requirements of the Doctor of Ministry and is seen as a great opportunity to be beneficial in many other ways. In the outset of this project the goal of this writer was to grow a greater knowledge of the coaching field, and to become more proficient in the use of personality and behavior profiles. This project provides both and will hopefully be very beneficial to many others. The idea of an ideal coach is simply one that is efficient and effective. With the direction of this research pointed at analyzing data provided through assessments, it is exciting to anticipate and present a product that could make a difference and help those who are seeking to be coaches, both professionally and in a lay ministry model. This work is presented only as a tool, and has no intention of making someone feel that they are a lesser coach, but intends only to see if there is a consistency with those of which score higher on an assessment designed to test efficiency and effectiveness. My goal as these pages unfold is to provide information that will help in understanding the process undergone in this study, and to culminate in a presentation to the group at CoachNet for evaluation of its usefulness to their training program.
CHAPTER TWO

What Is Coaching?

There are many definitions for coaching given in the mountain of materials available today, but in this attempted to define coaching the goal will be to wade through the sea of material and point out a well-rounded view of what coaching is. This can be somewhat difficult for the simple reason that much of the information provided is not confined to any academic standard, but much of the information is produced for the simple purpose of marketing. It is somewhat perplexing to find that the over-arching information is given by those who are seeking to advance a business verses providing information. If you consider a search from the web you will exhaust a plethora of pages before finding material not produced by the web page owner, but this is one of the many ways of marketing your coaching business. Welcome to the world of business. With the lack of regulation on coaching much of it seems like a mass “get rich quick scheme” or “cowboys who saw coaching as a means to a fast buck,” but a deeper look will show that a vast number of companies are using coaching because it is effective. If you search long enough the cream does eventually rise, and through this great volume of information there does seem to be some common strands that are given along the way that bring some credibility and encouragement to the necessity and success of coaching. For this reason there are many definitions given, and that each individual actually brings a different aspect to the coaching world. This is okay, because the people who are seeking coaching are coming in great numbers

and are very different in their needs. As we seek to define coaching we will consult the industry leaders and those who are producing quality materials from both a Secular and Christian view.

**Defining Coaching**

Harvard Business School Press defines coaching as “an opportunity to contribute to another person’s development. It is a two-way partnership where you both share knowledge and experience in order to maximize the coachee’s potential and help her achieve her goals.”

This is a well-rounded introductory statement to the world of coaching. There are a few key words mentioned in this statement and one is “two-way partnership.” Coaching cannot happen without two people, and should actually never happen without the permission of the one being coached. Therefore, it is a “partnership” for the purpose of achieving goals. Coaching should always have a purpose, and that purpose is oriented in change. “Coaching is practicing the disciplines of believing in people in order to empower them to change.”

Change is key to the coaching experience and seeks to arrive at the desired destination. “Simply stated, coaches are change experts who help leaders take responsibility for their lives and act to maximize their own potential.”

It does not matter what type of coaching is being done, or where it is taking place, the point of coaching is simply people getting to where they want to be. A general statement that is used when defining coaching is helping people get unstuck. “Coaches specialize in working with people who feel stuck and want help in getting out of their ruts.”

---


4 Ibid.

The idea of coaching is not therapy, but the moving of a person through a sticky place. This may be at work, marriage, schooling, sports, religion, or just about any other place in life. This is why it is so popular and widely used. It is non-threatening and does not allow the coachee to feel less than someone else, but empowers the person to look at moving forward.\(^6\) This is seen as advancement and progression, and does not come with the baggage of counseling. Therefore, everyone is open and feels free to get involved in a coaching relationship. The world we live in loves education and the thought of moving forward, and coaching can be a great agent to this type of progression. Coaching is not teaching, but allows the student to freely teach themselves through their own ideas and expertise. “Coaching is unlocking people’s potential to maximize their own performance. It is helping them to learn rather than teaching them.”\(^7\) Coaching is helping people get the things they know out of their own heads and into action and then releasing them to do it.

**Why is Coaching Effective?**

As we ask this question we need to begin with an affirmation that coaching is effective. There are two separate areas of coaching that must be identified – business and personal. In the area of personal coaching there is a very broad market that consist of life coaching or other types of coaching where an individual seeks coaching for a non-work related cause. Business coaching, or generally referred to as executive coaching, is retained by the employer and seek more efficiency and better performance. While these two types of coaching can cross over and often do, much of the measurements of effectiveness are done in the business world.


In a business coaching environment the question will always come to ROI (Return on Investments) and all out production. Companies expect results, and coaching seems to produce the desired outcomes. The ICF reports:

According to the 2009 ICF Global Coaching Client Study, companies that use or have used professional coaching for business reasons have seen a median return on investment of seven times their initial investment. Individual clients reported a median return on investment of 3.44 times their investment. Coaching can help with a variety of goal areas. Findings from the 2010 ICF Global Consumer Awareness Study, showed that more than two-fifths (42.6 percent) of respondents who had experienced coaching chose "optimize individual and/or team performance" as their motivation for being coached. This reason ranked highest followed by "expand professional career opportunities” at 38.8 percent and "improve business management strategies” at 36.1 percent. Other more personal motivations like "increase self-esteem/self-confidence" and "manage work/life balance" rated fourth and fifth to round out the top five motivation areas.8

In another study carried out by the Manchester Review it is reported that:

This study produced strong evidence of the effectiveness of executive coaching. Effectiveness was demonstrated across all five levels of evaluation, beginning with participants’ reactions: 86 percent of participants and 74 percent of stakeholders were “very satisfied” or “extremely satisfied.” Seventy-three percent of participants considered that they had achieved their goals “very effectively” or “extremely effectively,” as did 54 percent of stakeholders. There were only 12 cases where participants reported not sustaining at least one of their developmental priorities. Most exciting of all were the estimates of return on investment.9

The effectiveness of executive coaching is clear and it is seen by the growing usage in the business world today.

Personal coaching is a little harder to pinpoint because there is not as much information gathered on this part of the industry. In a recent study carried out by the ICF “There are currently an estimated 47,500 professional coaches worldwide. Results show a very diverse distribution in coaches across the globe, with areas of increasing maturity, rapid expansion and


9 THE MANCHESTER REVIEW • 2001 • VOLUME 6 • NUMBER 1 Maximizing the Impact of Executive Coaching:Behavioral Change, Organizational Outcomes,and Return on Investment, By Joy McGovern, Ph.D., Michael Lindemann, Ph.D., Monica Vergara, M.A., Stacey Murphy,Linda Barker, M.A., & Rodney Warrenfeltz, Ph.D.
growth potential.”\(^{10}\) The article goes on to say that “the total number of coaches that were actively coaching clients” is “(87 percent)”.\(^{11}\) With executive and leadership coaching at the top of the list, personal or life coaching is in the third place position. This shows that the usage of life coaching in the world today is very strong.

Coaching is effective and continues to grow. A very simple reason for this growth is given in the January 2009 issue of Harvard Business Review’s The Magazine in a research article entitled *What Can Coaching Do for You*, which states; “that clients keep coming back because “coaching works.”\(^{12}\) People simply do not use coaching because it is popular or makes them feel better; people use coaching because it is effective at helping them get to the places they want to be. One reason is because “coaching is extremely effective at transforming people, because you are always working at the point where your clients are most teachable: the place where they want to change.”\(^{13}\) Change is the goal and coaching is the answer. The ICF states that coaching is effective because “individuals who engage in a coaching relationship can expect to experience fresh perspectives on personal challenges and opportunities, enhanced thinking and decision making skills, enhanced interpersonal effectiveness, and increased confidence in carrying out their chosen work and life roles.”\(^{14}\)

**The Process of Coaching**

The process of coaching varies depending on each individual coach and the particular training that the coach received. Generally there are two involved in a coaching relationship,

\(^{10}\) http://www.coachfederation.org/coachingstudy2012/

\(^{11}\) Ibid.


\(^{14}\) http://www.coachfederation.org/find-a-coach/benefits-of-coaching/
“coachee and coach work together to design an effective working relationship that meets the coachee’s needs,” and the coachee is at the center of the conversation. The coachee is in control and leads in direction and outcomes. Coaching is very different as a discipline and the “coaching requires expertise in coaching but not in the subject at hand. That is one of its greatest strengths.” The coachee is the expert in the conversation. The coach only needs to be an effective listener and discerner of the information given and be willing to challenge the information given to ensure all areas of thought have been exhausted to reach the desired end for the coachee. “The coach is not a problem solver, a teacher, an advisor, an instructor, or even an expert; he or she is a sounding board, a facilitator, a counselor, an awareness raiser.” In this relationship the coach simply uses questions to draw from the coachee the information that is already known but is not thought of, and while questions are the catalyst, listening is vital to the success of the coach. Gary Collins says “listening is central to every part of coaching,” and not only listening, but the ability to hear what is really being said. “A coach believes that if you listen intently and intuitively to your clients, they will eventually tell you the answer. If you are caught up in what we call “the conversation in your head” – diagnosing and solving the client’s problems – you might miss it. Exploration involves listening closely; picking out what makes you most curious; then asking the client to expand on that.” These are the crucial points to most processes and tend to be very similar no matter the coach. This is the same for CoachNet, but following these essentials things can differ even though they stay similar. CoachNet uses the


17 Ibid, 42.


“5 Rs” of the coaching engagement and these are relate, reflect, refocus, resource, and review. This is the questioning process that unfolds the five phases of the CoachNet session, and they are pertinent to the question of effectiveness as this project will use these along with the CoachNet competencies to evaluate coaching effectiveness.

Counseling, Mentoring, and Consulting

Where does coaching fit in with counseling, mentoring, and consulting. There are behaviors, practices, and approaches in these disciplines that differentiate them from counseling, and the greatest is focus. With counseling there is a focus on past experience that must be dealt with, and often is never overcome. This is significantly different from coaching, which has forward focus and does not dredge the past to explain the course ahead. Gary Collins explains it well when he says, “coaching is not for those who need therapy to overcome disruptive painful influences from the past; it is for relatively well-adjusted people to build vision and move forward toward the future. Coaching is not reactive looking back; it is proactive looking ahead.”20 Mentoring is a relationship that is seeking someone to walk with them as an authoritative influence in a person’s life, and this person voluntarily is submitting to his influence. “This person is willing to commit time and emotional energy to a relationship that guides an understudy's growth and development.”21 Consulting is similar to mentoring in that they both are the expert in a particular field. The difference in coaching is that the coachee is the expert. “The coachee does acquire the facts, not from the coach but from within himself, stimulated by the coach.”22 Consulting generally has an expert that is paid to come into a

21 Ibid, 18.
business to give information or lead in some type of change. All of these differ with coaching in that the coachee is at the center, has all the answers necessary to achieve her goals, and is seeking a relationship to help herself see the things she already knows.

**Styles and Concentrations**

The most common movement within coaching today is in particular styles and concentrations. The question often asked is “What is your niche?” These particular foci have streamlined the coaching process and ultimately give the coachee a more refined coaching avenue. “Not all people or situations are the same, so you need to master some different coaching styles to adapt to different circumstances. In some cases you need to adopt a direct approach, particularly when working with coachees who are inexperienced or whose performance requires improvement. Other situations call for supportive coaching when you act more as a facilitator or guide.”

In the case of concentrations there are many that are used today. These concentrations range from marriage coaching to writing dissertations, and the more particular, the greater the advantage of being retained as a coach. The days of a general coaching practice seem to be gone and focused coaching is in.

**Coaching and Psychology**

While a section on coaching and psychology is going to present a greater understanding to the definition of coaching this thought stems from the similarities of Brief Solution Focused Therapy (BSFT) and modern day coaching. Both are forward focused and move toward a solution. This type of therapy (BSFT) has a brief meeting requirement that is generally less than a year. The coaching roots are varied and are typically not connected with psychology, but today

---


there is a great movement of many in the psychological world to the use of the coaching process in therapy. John Whitemore refers to how “Psychosynthesis offers a number of maps and models, the strands of which weave a very useful cradle for in-depth coaching.”

The psychological training in the coaching world for many is a must, and some consider the lack of coaching to be dangerous. Steven Berglas says:

“Over the past 15 years, it has become more and more popular to hire coaches for promising executives. Although some of these coaches hail from the world of psychology, a greater share are former athletes, lawyers, business academics, and consultants. No doubt these people help executives improve their performance in many areas. But I want to tell a different story. I believe that in an alarming number of situations, executive coaches who lack rigorous psychological training do more harm than good.”

Gary Collins says “counseling deals with negative psychology and helps people move from their problem areas to a point of stability, coaching deals with positive psychology and helps people move to higher levels of fulfillment.” The benefits would seem to be undeniable as long as the coaching process could stay the course. There could be a constant nagging to move to a more therapeutic type of process and when that happens coaching actually stops.

**Successful Coaches**

One thing that must be considered is how to define a successful coach. Gary Collins defines them in eight ways from “knowing themselves” to being “effective leaders.” These characteristics vary greatly and can depend on the particular system of which a coach is taught. Some real keys are listening, defining real issues, maintaining patience, and the having the

---
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ability hold someone to task. There are many characteristics that are given in many texts, but there are some measurements that should be established. For the purpose of this project, the ideal coach will be determined by the results of the 360 profile given by CoachNet. These characteristics are measured by the assessment and are centered on the nine core competencies of the CoachNet training. These competencies are inseparable from the CoachNet training and each will be examined later in this thesis. Many training programs use core competencies to anchor their coach training; but CoachNet distinguishes its program from others in that the first of its nine competencies is Abiding in Christ.

**Christian and Secular Coaching**

One thing is clear in the Christian world – if there is a need, then there is a Christian program for it. While this has tragically brought a divide to the world in which the believer is to have impact, there is no difference in the coaching world. There are many coaches and coach training programs in both worlds, and the difference is in an underlying reliance of God working in every coaching relationship. Coaching, whether Christian or secular, tends to have the same foundational structure in the coaching process, but the real difference is in the person who is doing the coaching. If you are a believer in Jesus Christ, then there is no way that belief can be separated from who you are. Gary Collins says “yes, coaching is about what you do, but, probably more important, coaching is about who you are as a person and who you are becoming. If you are a Christian, coaching is also about who you are as a follower of Jesus Christ.”

---

CHAPTER THREE

Assessment Introduction

The question that is seeking to be answered is: what is the profile of the ideal Christian Coach. This question has only to do with two specific topics: one is coaching and the other is assessing personality or behavior profiles. “The fact is each of us has our own style, our own preferences, and our own ways of facing life’s challenges. One person’s laid-back style is another person’s lack of motivation.”¹ In the use of the term profile, the question is directed at what is the personality or behavior type of coaches who seem to achieve a higher level of coaching success. Therefore, this chapter will define and explain the usage of assessments and how they are used to determine personality and/or behavior types.

The usage of personality profiles have risen greatly in the last thirty years, and are evident in the usage of assessments in the business world and educational institutions. Mels Carbonell says “master this information and you will be well on your way toward solving the people puzzle by understanding personality patterns”² If you have interviewed for a professional job or are a higher level university student you probably have been asked to take some sort of personality test. On the job front, the reason these assessments are used is to find the best "fit" for the job. The question is “who is the best fit for this position?” In many cases, human resource departments that are hiring for particular jobs know that certain types of personalities perform better at certain positions. Not only are profiles looked at for job placement, but also for


workplace harmony in the work environment. According to Robbins and Judge in their *Organizational Behavior* textbook, while referring to the Myers Briggs profile, they say "in training and development, it can help employees to better understand themselves, and it can help team members to better understand each other. And it can open up communication in work groups and possibly reduce conflicts."³ The ultimate goal is optimal performance and personal satisfaction. If employers can find the person with whom their personality is suited for a particular position, then everyone is happy; employees tend to have better performance and longer tenures with the company. Robbins and Judge state that "satisfaction is highest and turnover is lowest when personality and occupation are in agreement. Social individuals should be in social jobs, conventional people in conventional jobs, and so forth. A realistic person in a realistic job is in a more congruent situation than a realistic person in an investigative job. A realistic person in a social job is in the most incongruent situation possible."⁴ This speaks volumes to the coaching world as well. Coaches who tend to be more successful are probably those who have a personality that fits with helping people. “It has something to do with their innate God-given abilities, spiritual gifts, and probably their genes.”⁵ There are several variations of these types, but when people enjoy what they do; they will perform at a higher level.

Knowing who you are as a person, or as an employer knowing your employees, or employees knowing each other is of great importance. This is where personality and behavioral profiles can produce the greatest effectiveness, and allow people to enjoy a more fulfilling life.


⁴ Ibid., 122.

both inside and outside of the work environment.\textsuperscript{6} It could simply be said that the purpose of personality and behavior profiles are for people knowing people better.

**Human Behavior Science**

The research and usage of personality and behavioral profiles is derived from a field that is known by many as Human Behavior Science. This is not a new study and has roots that pre-date Christ. According to Mels Carbonell, "Hippocrates, the Father of Modern Medicine, is the first credited with classifying the four basic temperament types around 400 years before the birth of Christ. He believed these types were associated with the chemical make-up of our blood. He identified four types based on the color of the bile in our bodily fluids. He theorized that people's actions were identifiable chemically and behaviorally."\textsuperscript{7} “In our efforts to describe the four temperaments of Hippocrates – the Sanguine, Choleric, Phlegmatic, and Melancholic – we can stitch together the useful theoretical contributions of Jung, Kretschmer, Freud, Alder, Sullivan, and Maslow.”\textsuperscript{8} These and others have brought value to the study of human behavior and defined these styles in many ways. So, what have these studies produced? They have produced a reasonable accurate prediction of human behavior. Keirsey and Bates explain what can be accomplished in these studies by the use of temperaments and assert that “one’s temperament is that which places a signature or thumbprint on each of one’s actions, making it recognizably one’s own.”\textsuperscript{9} They go on to say “by knowing a person’s type we can anticipate


\textsuperscript{9} Ibid.
rather accurately what he will do most of the time.”

Human behavioral studies have led to a large number of personality profile tests that seek to pinpoint the type, style, behavior, and temperament of individuals. This understanding leads us to consider the various types of profiles.

**Types of Profiles**

Personality and behavioral profiles are used and developed by a number of different groups. They vary in the number of questions and what they seek to interpret, but typically have the same underlying structure. They point out whether someone is an introvert or extrovert, steady or laid back, passive or active, and if someone prefers to be with people or alone. Most behavior models can be summed up using some variation of these. Most profiles used today have their roots in Hippocrates theory, which leads to these similarities. Two of the most widely used profiles today would be Myers Briggs and the DISC model. These are used in many different areas of life, from the office to the classroom and in many other areas. Assessments play a great role in the coaching world, and according to a recent coaching report put out by Sherpa Coaching. “Almost every executive coach gets a running start with clients by using assessments. These assessments can measure colleagues’ opinions, clients’ communication styles, or leadership strengths and weaknesses.” According to this report, profile usage among executive coaches fall as follows: “360’ assessments lead the pack, hovering at a 26 percent market share. Next in popularity, there’s a group of assessments each with a market share around 15 percent: DISC, Myers-Briggs, Emotional Intelligence, and Strengths Finders.”

---


These profiles allow coaches to be better able to assist their clients at reaching their optimal self, and their usage appears to be on the rise. The Sherpa Coaching report goes on to say that “there’s a trend toward the use of assessments among executive coaches. Always a common practice, the use of assessments has become a standard practice. A couple of years back, eight percent of coaches did not use an assessment at all. Last year, that number dropped to four percent. This year, almost everyone reported using an assessment.” With the use of assessments in so many areas there are too many to look at with any depth. So for the purpose of this project we will focus on the two that will be used: DISC and Insight Inventory. These are going to be used because they are the assessments that have been used by CoachNet.

**DISC**

The DISC assessment is one of the most widely used assessments of all the personality assessments. The large body of those who use DISC attests to the validity and confidence in the results provided by the DISC assessment. As a certified Human Behavioral Consultant with Uniquely You, I can personally say that I believe the DISC to be one of the simplest and most readily accessible of all assessments. So what exactly is DISC? According to Dr. Mels Carbonell, “The DISC Model of Human Behavior describes the four basic temperament types: (Choleric) D-type, (Sanguine) I-type, (Phlegmatic) S-type, and (Melancholy) C-type. Everyone is a blend of DISC behavior.” We all fall into one of these categories or some combination.

One can readily see the connection with Hippocrates in the DISC and the four specific types that it points out. The image below shows the four quadrants of the DISC taken from the

---


Uniquely You website and gives a great reference point to its usage.\textsuperscript{15} As we look at the DISC we see the four distinct letters that make up the profile. The “D” in the top left is characterized by Dr. Carbonell as the “Dominant” personality. We can see from the image that “D” is active and task oriented. This is the driven person with a “my way or the highway” mentality. They are generally high achievers and are known to leave some “collateral damage” in the wake.

They are outgoing and get things done.\textsuperscript{16} The “I” is outgoing and people oriented. This personality enjoys being with others and loves the stage. They are characterized by Dr. Carbonell as “Inspiring.” They tend to be fun and enjoyable to be around, but fun can go too far,


as they are easily distracted. In the bottom right we see the “S” personality. The “S” is a reserved people oriented person. An “S” is characterized by Dr. Carbonell as being “steady” and “shy.” They love relationships and have a quiet personality. The final letter is the “C” personality. The “C” is characterized by Dr. Carbonell as “calculating” and “cautious.” The “C” is passive and task oriented; a “C” is a thinker and focused. They can be taken advantage of because they feel approval based on task and are sure to get things done. All people will find themselves in some variation of the DISC model. There are some that are characterized by one quadrant, while others are a mixture of two or more. We all have a place and a personality that God created us with, and we all can glorify God with who we are. Dr. Carbonell says, “no normal person has a bad personality.”

**Insight Inventory**

In this project the writer will use the Insight Inventory along with the DISC. The reason for the use of this profile is that it is the main profile used by CoachNet, and all coaches in training are required to take this assessment (the DISC profiles were used prior to the use of the Insight Inventory, and will have some availability as well). In the world of behavioral profiles there are many similarities in the different types being used, as we have seen thus far, and the Insight Inventory is very similar in its usage. Therefore, there are some assumptions that can be made, and many connections to the ideas of various personality types. Insight Inventory is different in that it is specific to how a person will respond in two particular areas. One is in the area of the work environment. It contains some similar attribute discoveries such as introverted

---


18 Ibid, pp. 31-35.


or extraverted, of which it titles reserved or outgoing, but the results are specified to how the individual responds in the workplace. Information is also provided for how a person responds in a personal setting (home situations). A person may be a certain way at work, and be different in a guarded environment like home. Insight Inventory is based on behavior and specific to types of performance in its environment. One might think a more personality driven, or thinking type of assessment would be better suited for this type of research, but behind this behavioral driven profile is the standard quadrant type assessment. It appears to be similar in its type of assessment in that it follows a very similar line of results that appear to be based on a temperament template (such as introvert/extrovert or passive/active), but different in its application. This is because the assessment is driven from a different engine. According to the Insight Institute they explain it in this fashion: "Since the Insight Inventory measures four traits, as does the Myers Briggs Type Indicator, MBTI, it is often assumed that they are related. However this is not the case. The MBTI is based on Jung’s theory of typology. The Insight Inventory, on the other hand, is based on the measurement of behaviors and personality traits and is more closely related to and aligned with the 16PF and Big Five personality tests."

Although Insight states a difference in the formulation of this theory, there is still a root to the behavioral styles, and it uses the base 16 style distinctions. Although they are determined by different factors, personality verses behavior, they give similar information and results. This is why the DISC and Insight Inventory can be used together for this type of project. They will produce similar information, although the usage and discoveries are different. In other words, it may describe how people think and respond, but they also tell us why (i.e. introvert or extravert;

---

passive or active; steady or laid back; etc.). As we look a little closer at the Insight Inventory we find some great similarities, and can see some differences.

Insight Inventory has eight total characteristics that are seen as opposites. One is then measured on a scale that spans between the two points.

**Figure 2. Insight Inventory Sample Profile**

---

There are basically four sections of measurements in the Insight Inventory that can be seen in the image above, and they begin with "direct" or "indirect." According to the profile, this is qualified as "getting your way."23 This person is either direct or indirect in their pursuit. The next section we see is the "outgoing" or "reserved," and is qualified as "responding to people."24 Does the person respond in an outgoing or reserved manner? The next section is "urgent" or "steady." This section is qualified by "pacing activity."25 Does the person being assessed act in an urgent or steady manner when working on a task? And the final section is "precise" or "unstructured." This section is qualified by "dealing with details."26 When on task do you focus on the details or not?

The distinction that stands out with this profile is the concentration toward behavior. This profile is predictive of how someone behaves based on typical actions. Also, it has a clear distinction between work style and personal style. The work style is performance based under certain types of pressure related to the work environment. The personal style is based on a more relaxed environment. These distinctions give a better picture of how someone will behave in various environments, and can help in understanding how a person will coach, or be coached, in various situations.

**How Assessments Work**

These two assessments (DISC and Insight Inventory) are a good representation of most assessments in their makeup and function. They not only give a good image of what most assessments are like, but also how they work. The one being assessed simply answers questions

---

24 Ibid.
25 Ibid.
26 Ibid.
based on certain scenarios and is given a score. Each question is given a certain value score that is weighted toward a personality trait. There are a certain number of questions that are used to allow for any manipulated answers or misunderstandings, and the result is a very reliable result. Although one can manipulate the scores toward a desired result if they try hard enough and have an understanding of how assessments work, but if honestly answered they can be very useful and predictive of certain types, styles and behavioral patterns. These results can be a powerful tool for an individual to know about themselves, but at times can be very troubling for some. We think we know who we are, or at least who we would like to think we are, and after taking an assessment find out we are different. Many times assessments will tell us what others will not, and that can be a growing moment. One thing that should always be remembered is that we are ever changing as individuals, and to know some things about ourselves can help us change for the better.

**The 360 Coaching Assessment**

When coming to the end of the CoachNet coaching certification course it is required for all coach trainees to take the 360 coaching assessment given by CoachNet. This assessment was designed for CoachNet to allow coaches to have a better understanding of their abilities in coaching, and to show the areas that need to be worked on. In this assessment the coach in training will take the assessment, and request the two people he has coached (required in the CoachNet training to coach two individuals) to take the assessment as well. The coach in training will respond to the questions based on how he sees himself as a coach, while the two coachees will respond to how they feel their coach has performed. This can be a very telling and informative assessment to the coaching ability of the coach. Upon completion the results are tallied together and the coach is given a score. The scores are based on the response compared
with the CoachNet nine competencies. The score given is broken down in each individual competency and shows a score for that section. The scoring range is from 0 to 80 with sections ranging from Low, Medium, and High with two distinctions in each.

**Low rating**
- 35 and less = poor
- 36-45 = below average

**Medium rating**
- 46-45 = average
- 55-59 = good

**High rating**
- 60-64 = very good
- 65 and more = excellent

With these distinctions CoachNet determines whether to certify individuals as coaches or not. These distinctions can be further dissected in each individual category pertaining to the coaching competency to determine what the coach needs to develop in their skill set.

**Assessments and Coaching**

One of the purposes for using assessments in coaching is to identify the coaching ability or coaching style that is to be used with a particular personality type or to determine the particular style used by a particular coach. Assessments can be used for coaching angles and determining action plans that will be appropriate for a particular client. Collins says “both coaches and counselors use assessments that can expedite career selection and development. Tests sometimes confirm what the client suspects, but they are tools that help to bring clarity
rather than devices that tell us what to do.”

In professional coaching assessments can voice what many will not say. “Assessment is an essential element of executive coaching. It is important because people in the workplace tend to avoid frankness when they deal with one another, especially when they interact with people to whom they report – bosses and those who formally evaluate and pay them.” Assessments can tell people more about themselves than someone can tell them. In all coaching this can tell the coach how they should coach a person, and what they can expect in response. In many cases assessments will determine whether a coach will or will not start a coaching relationship with a person at all. Assessments for many coaches are one of the initial steps for determining fit with clients.

So what about the coach? Assessments speak greatly to coaching styles as well. Is a coach more personal in his approach, or, does the coach adhere to a ridged structure? Is the relationship going to be enjoyable to be in for the coach and coachee? These questions and many others can be answered by taking assessments.

**Assessment and this Project**

In this project we are reminded that the question is: what is the profile of the ideal Christian coach? In asking what is the profile we are speaking of the coaches assessment results. Whether a coach uses an assessment in his practice or not is of no concern to this project, but all coaches that are certified in the CoachNet process must do two things. First, they are required to take a personal assessment (which is currently Insight Inventory, but previously used DISC) and to take the 360 coaching assessment. These assessments are given to allow a person to know who they are, and what their personality type is. It is very important for coaches to know a great
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deal about themselves and to know why they will coach a certain way.\textsuperscript{29} This is a great predictor in itself for success, and unfortunately many failures. The goal of this project is to take the assessment results of those who responded with a willingness to participate in this project, and compare the results of their DISC and/or Insight Inventory against their 360 coaching assessment.

CHAPTER FOUR

Process and Results – Case Study

In this chapter we will be looking at what was actually done in the process of gathering the necessary information to produce the actual data, and determining what results were produced. We are seeking to find some concrete information that can make the case for a particular personality, or a set of personality traits which make someone a more effective coach. The actual results for any project must be derived by starting a process that allows you to gather information. The information used in this project has been gathered from those willing to submit their test scores from the final assessment in the coach training program at CoachNet, and the personality profiles presented by the individual participants in the project. These scores and profiles were then simply put into a spreadsheet and analyzed to see what stands out among the high scores.

This process began by sending out a request for those who are in CoachNet training, or have been in CoachNet training in the past and are a part of the CoachNet database. The beginning of this process began with a simple request for participants that have been through the CoachNet training course to submit a signed consent form that was emailed to all current members of CoachNet. The letter simply asked if the participant would be willing to participate in the project and could we use the score that is on file with CoachNet for this doctoral project (Appendix). Also, the letter asked if they would present the results from either a DISC profile and/or the Insight Inventory profile that CoachNet uses in the Coach training process.

The response was less than great on the first round of emails. We had hoped for eighty responses to use for the project but only received thirty-three. We knew that it would be
necessary to send several rounds to get where we wanted to be, but did not expect it to be as slow as it turned out to be. With the second request we got a few more responses, but were still well short of what we were looking for. Another difficulty was in the replies. Many would send the consent forms in, but did not include any personality profile information. With a few more rounds of requests we received enough to proceed. We ended up with a total of ninety-four returns and sixty replies that were usable information to be analyzed. Usable information means that we had a score and profile information. The profile information that was given included either DISC or Insight Inventory, but the ideal response would include both. This would not be the case for most. Although not ideal, the different personality assessments are similar and allow for a simple determination of personality traits, such as introvert or extravert, active or outgoing, passive or reserved. After gathering the information, the first thing to be determined is the parameters of the results received.

**Parameters**

The first thing we were looking for was a score that was above 52 on the CoachNet training assessment. The score of 52 was derived from the use of the medium range of 46-59 used on the CoachNet assessment, and 52 is the median number. This test is very telling because it uses what the Coach in Training (CIT) thinks about his own ability to coach, and coupled with two people the CIT has coached for six months in the training process. Although scores can range from 20-80, the numbers we received ranged from 26.8 to 70. The tipping number seemed to be fifty, with no one scoring above 70. This score of 50 seemed to be a fair evaluation to the results, and reviewed in conversations with a CoachNet employee. Although 50 is a fair number it was determined to stick with the median number of 52 from the CoachNet medium range. This allows the determining number to be from CoachNet and not imposed by the writer of this
project. The next step in the process would be simple, look to see what personality profile results were given with the higher scores. Also, see if there are any patterns that are displayed and are significant to the higher scores. In order to see these results the data must be organized.

**Organizing Data**

Once we received the data via email from CoachNet we were able to enter it into Microsoft Excel. This particular program was used for its ability to manipulate the data through using different formulas and pivot tables to produce specified results to the questions given. This is simply asking questions of the data entered that will give specific results to the question. The data was manually entered into excel and categorized by: Sample Number, Male or Female, CoachNet Assessment Score, DISC, Insight Inventory, and the nine CoachNet Core Competencies. The following table represents the full sample of the results received.

**Table 1. Full Sample of the Data Received**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample #</th>
<th>M/F</th>
<th>Overall Score</th>
<th>DISC</th>
<th>INSIGHT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>58.3</td>
<td></td>
<td>IRSP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>57.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>69.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>56.5</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>DRSU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>56.9</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>DRSU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>60.5</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>58.7</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>51.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>60.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>50.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>58.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>50.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>61.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>57.2</td>
<td>DC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>61.9</td>
<td>DC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>58.7</td>
<td>DC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>57.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>53.4</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>DOUP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>57.6</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>University</td>
<td>Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>58.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>ISC</td>
<td>IOSU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>60.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>62.4</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>54.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>62.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>56.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>47.3</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>53.7</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>59.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>48.8</td>
<td>IRUU</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>57.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>57.6</td>
<td>CS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>IOSU</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>56.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>63.5</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>DOSU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>61.9</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>52.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>54.1</td>
<td>DC</td>
<td>DOUP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>50.4</td>
<td>ISC</td>
<td>IOUU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>52.3</td>
<td>DI</td>
<td>DOUU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>DI</td>
<td>DOUU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>50.8</td>
<td>DI</td>
<td>DOUU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>52.8</td>
<td>DI</td>
<td>DOUU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>53.1</td>
<td>DI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>57.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>40.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>44.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>56.5</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>IRSP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>60.1</td>
<td>DI</td>
<td>DOUP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>61.5</td>
<td>DI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>58.7</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>DOSU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>51.6</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>50.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>62.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>67.5</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>54.7</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>DOUU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>62.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>62.5</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>59.7</td>
<td>ICS</td>
<td>IOSU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>50.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>55.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>54.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>63.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>50.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>57.4</td>
<td>ISC</td>
<td>IOUU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>57.6</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>68.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>56.9</td>
<td>ID</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>46.7</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>49.9</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>IOUU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>58.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>44.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>58.7</td>
<td>DI</td>
<td>DOUU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>68.7</td>
<td>ISC</td>
<td>IOSU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>63.6</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>DOSU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>60.3</td>
<td>CS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>55.8</td>
<td>DI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>55.9</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>IOUU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>50.2</td>
<td>CS</td>
<td>IRSP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>61.1</td>
<td>IRSP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>39.7</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>26.8</td>
<td>DI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>55.8</td>
<td>DI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>50.6</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>53.9</td>
<td>DOSU</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>44.7</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>54.6</td>
<td>CS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>57.5</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>IOSU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>64.9</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>IOSU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>51.2</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>IOSU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>53.1</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>IOSU</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Questioning Data**

There were twenty-five questions asked of the data entered into the Excel file, and will follow with coordinating graphs and explanations. The first question to be asked of the data is the anchor of the entire presentation. Is there a personality profile, or combination that sticks out from among the data? The following graph shows that in the DISC profile the clear winner is the “I” personality and followed by a combination of the “D” and “I” personalities. The following
chart shows the number of profiles and combination of profiles present in the coaches that scored higher than 52 on the CoachNet assessment.

**Figure 3. DISC Traits that Scored Above 25% on the CoachNet Assessment**

![Chart showing DISC traits scored above 25% on CoachNet assessment.]

Although this seems like an open and shut case, when further analyzed the information will suggest some varying results. Interestingly there is a correlation between the DISC profile scores and the Insight Inventory scores. The outgoing personality seems to be a characteristic that stands out in the scores. Also, the Insight Inventory points to the “Direct” personality trait as a close second, which correlates with the “D” (Dominant) personality as a close second in the DISC profile. Both “D” and “I” are outgoing personality traits, and one thing is clear, they are the high scorers.

The Insight Inventory gives a greater detail to the personality combinations present in those scoring above 52, and leans a little more toward behavioral styles. Figure 4 shows the IOSU as the clear winner in the Insight Inventory profile. These will be seen in greater detail in the following chapter. One thing is clear from both figures (2 and 3); the outgoing and direct personalities are very effective in coaching.
The mirror question that is asked of the data is the same but of the lower scores. Is there a personality profile, or combination of profiles that sticks out from among the lower scores in the data? One specific trait that stands out is the highly relational trait. In a comparison of both figures (4 and 5), we find that the “I” trait is the winner in the lower DISC scores as well.

In the Insight Inventory we see a clear distinction when related to the higher scores.
There is a tie between IOSU and IOUU for the winner. Although the numbers are lower for the Insight Inventory, five of the six Insight scores are Indirect. This is a key factor when considering the higher number, and gives greater effect to the Direct nature of the coaching personality. When referring to the coaching relationship, Henry says “the coach is really on their side, respecting their vision and their action plans but also willing to be honest and direct for their sake.” One thing to note concerning both of the profile graphs, we are looking at the number of profiles that scored below 52. This is not in regards to the actual score of the traits, but the number of those below 52. This is why we see the same traits in both those that scored above 52 and below.

One interesting question to ask considering the information provided is in regards to gender. Who scores better, men or women? A great number of coaches today are woman, and the numbers seem to be growing. Although there are more men in the quorum than woman, the results are very clear among those who score 52 or better on the CoachNet assessment. The
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following pie chart clearly shows the result. There is no real significant difference among men and woman who are successful in coaching.

Figure 7. Averages of Men and Women that Scored Above 52%

The average for woman is 58.65 and the average for men is 58.79. Although we received three male responses to every one female, the female coach is just as successful as males. While this may be a side item question, the numbers are very conclusive.

**DISC Analysis**

At this point we will look at the three concluding sections that will support the information given by looking at the individual traits provided by the different profiles measured. We will begin with the DISC, and then look at the Insight Inventory, and finally the nine Core Competencies of the CoachNet assessment, which the coaches are measured for success. These profiles will be looked at individually to see if there is a particular trait, or combination of traits, that can be attributed to successful coaching. The following chart is the individual average scores of each personality trait in the DISC model. While we will unpack the contributions
provided by each in the next chapter, we will see what the data provides from the figure and a

glimpse at what it means.

Figure 8. DISC Average Scores per Trait

What we are looking for is the averages above the breaking point of 52. It is

important to note at this point, particular averages do not give us a conclusive result, because it
does not take into account the number of people with a particular trait, but simply gives the
average of those who scored above 52. While it may appear random at first glance, there is a
significant trait present. Also, there is a good representation of most of the types and
combinations traits represented above the cut line, and it is important to note, all personalities
have something to bring to the coaching table.

**D: Dominant**

As we begin with the DISC profile averages we will consider them in order, and follow
with their combinations. The average for the “D” is 55.01. The “DI” average is 52.88, and the
“DC” 57.98. As we have seen from prior information, the “D” traits are very successful in
coaching, but the high average present is the “DC” combination. This combination is task
oriented and does what it takes to get the job done. Outgoing and regimented is what all of these combinations have going for them to be successful in coaching.

**I: Inspiring**

The “I” personality trait is where we see a significant difference. The “I” averages 58.37. The combinations of “ID” average is 56.90 and “DI” average is 52.88. The combinations of “ICS” average is 59.70 and is the highest over all average of the entire DISC personality traits. The “ISC” also averages very high and has an average of 58.63. Except for the “SC” traits the “I” and combinations of “ISC” and “ICS” are the clear front runners. It is worthwhile to mention at this point the “SC” averages 59.45. There is a clear image of the relational factor of the “I” and “S” coupled with the regimented systematic “C” that is very effective. We will explore this greater in the following chapter, but it is clear to see the significance of the “I,” which desires to influence, combined with “S” and “C,” becomes a winning combination in coaching. The great thing about the CoachNet assessment is, this is how the coach is seen by the coachee as well.

**S: Steady and Shy**

The “S” which is highly relational averages 52.10, and the combination of “SC” as seen in the previous paragraph, averages 59.45. The “SC” is the second highest score presented in the information, and as mentioned before, this is believed to be the result of the relational effect of the “S” coupled with the consistant regiment of the “C.” Very relational, but always on task.

**C: Calculating and Cautious**

The “C” personality carries the lowest average (50.80) of all of the personality traits. There are only four “C” only coaches in the submission, and only two scored above a 52 average. It is important to note as well that one of the “C” only personalities scored 62.5, which is an excellent score and is obviously an excellent coach. The combinations are significantly
higher with “CS” averaging 55.68, and we have seen the effects of the “C” combinations coupled with the “I” that has great results. One might immediately ask why a “C” personality trait would score lower, and the answers could vary greatly, but the need to stay on task could rise above the relationship and leave the coachee less than satisfied. It is also important to note the high score of the previous mentioned “C” could be the direct result of the ability to move beyond what could be a weakness, and allow your strengths to out shine the weakness. The key to this would be in the awareness of our weaknesses, and the ability to keep it present in our mind, not to be seen as a detraction, but to be stronger in the knowledge of it.

**Insight Inventory**

Next we will consider the results of the Insight Inventory and what the averages are that were submitted. The Insight Inventory keys on the actual behavioral personality, and can give more solidity to what type of personalities are successful. The following figure shows the results received.

![Figure 9. Insight Inventory Average Scores per Trait](image)

Different from the DISC profile, the Insight Inventory has eight separate personality distinctions, and are given as a set of four. As we look at each, on an individual personality
basis, they will show how each contributes to the whole, and give a better picture as to specific
traits that make up a great coach.

**Steady vs. Urgent**

There are two immediate points that are noticed from Figure 9. One is the highest
average of 57.4 scored by the “Steady” personality trait. Second is the lowest average of 53.8 for
the “Urgent” personality. These are the counterpoints of the pace at which each personality
carries out activities. This is a very important key to what is believed to be a successful trait of
coaching. The key term to describe this particular point is patience. While urgency can be
effective, and in the overall scoring is well represented in the averages accompanied with other
traits, it could be perceived as pushy in coaching. Coaches need to be encouragers, and at times
be challenging, but being pushy could have negative effects.

**Direct vs. Indirect**

The “Direct” trait at 56.1 edges out the “Indirect” trait at 55.4. These traits are very
close in their averages, and both are seen in the higher combinations of the Insight Inventory
over all combined averages. It is important to note that while the “Indirect” trait scored higher in
the combined averages, the “Direct” trait is the second highest. This simply shows that both
“Direct” and “Indirect” traits are successful in coaching.

**Outgoing vs. Reserved**

“Outgoing” personalities scored an average of 55.8. The “Outgoing” trait has been seen
throughout the material provided as a clear trait of the successful coach, but in the individual
averages the “Reserved” trait is very close. The “Reserved” trait averaged 55.3. It is important
to note as well the relation of the “Resrved” trait to the DISC “S” and “C” traits and their
combined high score. Also, it is the belief of this writer that the Outgoing trait is far more likely
to become a coach. This is also seen in the mere number of “Reserved” personalities in the quorum of 6 verses the 24 “Outgoing” personalities. The DISC represents a similar conclusion with the “D” and “I” personalities being extraverts and having 43 represented in the quorum verses 12 introverted personalities of the “S” and “C.” It is worth noting that the both personalities seem to have an equal ability to be successful in coaching and the numbers seem to back that up.

Precise vs. Unstructured

The numbers in this final section of the Insight Inventory are interesting as well. They bring a similar question as the previous combination and the reasons could be related. The “Precise” average is 56.2, while the “Unstructured” average is 55.6. The “Unstructured” personality is overwhelmingly greater in the higher scores of the combined averages verses the combined “Precise” overall averages. The mere number of “Unstructured” traits again are worth mentioning at 24 verses the 7 “Precise” traits. It is also worth noting that of both the “Precise” and “Reserved” traits, there is one score of 48.8 and the rest are above 50. Four out of the six “Reserved” personalities scored above 52, and six out of seven “Precise” personalities scored above 52 as well. The Precise personality seems as well to be a great trait for successful coaching.

CoachNet Core Competencies

At this point we are taking our final look at the data presented and we want to consider the effect of certain types of personalities based upon the specific core compatencies from the CoachNet assessment. In order to accomplish this we will need to look at each competency compared with the individual style and/or combinations presented for the DISC and Insight Inventory personality profile in two sections. In the exploration of the data we are looking for
further support of what has already been seen, or bring to light greater details of particular personality traits. As we begin the first section with the DISC profiles, we will be looking for the distinctions of the particular traits as they unfold in each individual CoachNet Core Competency.

**Abiding In Christ**

As we begin this section we will be looking first at the core competency – Abiding in Christ. We will look at all the DISC profile types and combinations stacked in a graph to point out the highs and lows in reference to each competency.

*Figure 10. Average DISC Scores as They Pertain to the CoachNet Core Competency Abiding in Christ*

As seen from the bar graph there are five traits that top the 60 score for the “Abiding in Christ” competency. The “ICS” leads this competency with a score 62.90. Following close behind are the “DC,” “ID,” “ICS,” and “SC.” One common trend seems to be in the “C” combinations. One way that the “C” personality is characterized is consistency. Abiding is
about consistency and dependancy, and it shows from the high scores for this triat. The only deviation is in the “ID” which brings to light the devotion of the “D” trait. Again, this does not mean that other traits do not abide in Christ, but that the particular trait did not score as high as others. Another point to note is in the low scores of the “C” and “S” when standing alone.

**Self Assessing**

The second core competency we want to look at in relation to the DISC profile is in “Self-assessing.” The following graph shows a clear winner in the ability to self-assess. The “ICS” is the only personality trait to have an average score above 60 on the CoachNet assessment in the Self-assessing core competency. The combination of the “ISC” is a trait that tends to be reflective and concerned about how they are perceived by others. This could be the reason they score a better average. The “S” is the lowest average at 43.25.

**Figure 11. Average DISC Scores as they pertain to the CoachNet Core Competency Self Assessing**
Communicating

There are three types of personalities in this chart that average above 60 in the “Communicating” core competency. The high score is different from the last two, as the “SC” scores an average of 61.60. While all the averages above 60 have a combination the “C” personality, the “C” also carried the lowest average. This may seem like a discrepancy in the data, but it simply shows the variation of communication styles and how each can be effective. One would generally think that the “D” and “I” outgoing traits would be better communicators, but the ability of the “S,” which is highly relational, coupled with the ability of the “C” to stay on task, can be very effective in communicating. This would probably make for an enjoyable and productive coaching relationship.

Figure 12. Average DISC scores as they pertain to the CoachNet Core Competency Communicating
Establishing

“Establishing” is rooted in one’s relational ability, and it comes as no surprise that the “ISC” is the highest average, and is followed by the “SC.” These are two very relational combinations that find a great deal of enjoyment in the coaching relationship. The “C” occupies the lowest average and is generally the least relationally driven of all personalities. Again, this does not mean the “C” personality is not relational, but is generally not as relationally driven as the other personalities.

Figure 13. Average DISC scores as they pertain to the CoachNet Core Competency Establishing

Supporting

The “Supporting” competency could be considered the backbone of coaching. It carries the coaching relationship and has the primary responsibility of being an encourager. The results could be seen as surprising, as other personalities might be considered more encouraging, but the “SC,” which is the only average above sixty, adds an element that other personalities may tend to overlook. The key to these results could be in the accountability role. The “C” trait, coupled
with the “S” and other traits, might be more likely to be consistently aware of the follow up role of accountability, while other relational or outgoing traits could find themselves bogged down in the encouragement process.

**Figure 14. Average DISC scores as they pertain to the CoachNet Core Competency Supporting**

![Average DISC scores as they pertain to the CoachNet Core Competency Supporting](image)

**Concluding**

“Concluding” is the ability to draw the coaching relationship to an end. It also will look to extend the coaching relationship through a renewed agreement. “SI” is the highest average at 60.20. The “Concluding” competency has the closest competency average scores thus far, with only 10 points spreading the average of all the traits. Again, the combinations of “S,” “C,” “I,” and “D” traits are not too far behind, and seem to be very effective in concluding. It would seem that this trait, and combination of traits would look forward to the success and the renewal of the relationship. Although it could struggle with the need to drive toward a new coaching agreement, considering its introverted style of the “S” or “C.”
Diagnosing brings similar results as we have seen before in that the “ICS” is the highest average at 63.80, and followed by the “SC” traits. Diagnosing is the ability to read the coaching situation and make moves that are appropriate for the desired goal. Again we see the “C” and “S” combinations in both high averages. These combinations while typically scoring low as they stand alone, seem to be a winning combination together.
Planning

The “I” tops the high average again with an average score of 58.11 and is followed by the “SC” with an even 58 average. Not to much of a surprise with these two types, but the low number is a bit surprising. With “C” averaging 52.98, and being the lowest scorer, the surprise is that “C” personalities tend to be better planners. This could be the result of the necessity of setting goals and developing action plans. For while the “C” is a planner, they could struggle with the need to impose that on someone else.
Monitoring

The final core competency is the ability to evaluate and celebrate progress. The “SC” is the highest average with 60.10. The ability of the “S” and “C” combinations to celebrate and stay on task is a natural combination for these traits. The “SI” is the lower average and this could be the difference of having two relational driven traits, which would not tend to excel in the task of measuring progress. These traits would love the celebration, but may lose sight of the task.

In the second half of the core competencies we will consider the Insight Inventory and how they score in the individual sections head to head in each competency. Different from the sections before we will look at the core competency in reference to the Insight Inventory traits and consider the average scores of the traits.
What we find in Figure 19 is the average scores of the “Direct” traits verses the “Indirect” traits in each of the nine core competencies compared head to head. So what do we see? What jumps out first are the high averages. The “Indirect” seems to average higher in “Abiding in Christ”, where the “Direct” trait scores higher in “Establishing.” The low average for both is in “Self-assessing.” As seen from the graph, the “Direct” trait averages better on the whole and only has one trait below the 55 average, where the “Indirect” has three averages below the 55 average.
Outgoing vs. Reserved

In the “Outgoing” verses “Reserved” traits it is clear to see the consistent higher averages of the “Outgoing” trait. While the “Reserved” trait has two very distinct high and low averages.

The “Reserved” trait has a very high average for “Abiding in Christ” and a very low score for “self-assessing.” What this information clearly points to is the need of the “Reserved” trait to be aware of this as a tendency, and to focuss on growing one’s ability to self-assess. As for all the information provided, this does not mean that all “Reserved” traits are going to struggle with self-assessing, but that the averages scored substantially lower than the outgoing trait.
Steady vs. Urgent

The “Steady” verses “Urgent” graph (Figure 22) shows a clear higher average for the “Steady” behavior traits and the scores are higher in all categories.

This a very interesting and important visual to see, and has been a consistent theme throughout the data provided, that urgency in coaching does not seem to be as effective. One key to successful coaching seems to be patience, which is exhibited by the “Steady” behavioral style, and is clearly shown throughout the averages on the nine core competencies.
Precise versus Unstructured

Although a little more erratic, the “Precise” seems to average higher scores. This is one area that some information will appear different and show a higher average for the “Unstructured” type when coupled with other traits. It is also interesting that in much of the information provided concerning the “C” and “S” traits from the DISC profiles, that the precise nature would be consistent with these results.

This structured behavior would seem to deliver on much of the foreseen competencies, while being very strong in “Communicating,” “Planning,” and “Diagnosing.” It is also interesting to see that in all of the behaviors, all traits scored low in the “Self-assessing” competency. This would point to a direct need for more emphasis on self-assessing in the coach training process.
With the information provided we will turn more of our attention in the following chapter to what the provided information means, and how it can be useful to CoachNet in their training process. We want to see what, and if there is a personality that is more suited for coaching, and what could be done to strengthen areas that are less effective. One thing we have seen thus far is that all personalities can be effective, but that some traits can be stronger than others.

**Figure 22. Insight Inventory’s Precise and Unstructured averages in the CoachNet Core Competencies**

![AVG Precise vs Unstructured Chart](chart.png)
CHAPTER FIVE

Results and Effects – Coaching and Coach Training

In this chapter the attempt will be to make sense of the data and to seek to funnel the information into a few key conclusions. One thing we want to answer is; what is the ideal personality for a coach? Another key question to consider is; what personality is not ideal for coaching? The final thought would be what particular areas should be focused on for each personality type to be a successful coach? The goal of this chapter is not to simply duplicate the information provided in the previous chapter, but to point out the significant and distinctive points as well as give an explanation for them. From these explanations and results the previous questions will be answered. The results will be delivered in the following and final chapter as a presentation to CoachNet.

The Data Speaks

What does the data tell us? This is the question we want to answer in this section. As we begin there are some limitations that should be stated. One distinct limitation is found in the final compilation of the data. Out of the top ten scores only half came with both a score and their personality profile, and only one of the top four results had both a score and personality profile. While it might have provided more of a conclusive score, the results are still believed to be conclusive. Also, it did not affect the results pertaining to the nine competencies, and allowed for a greater number to consider in the analysis. Another limitation to consider is in the number of certain types of personalities that submitted results and profiles. The overwhelming number of “I” and “D” and combinations of traits far outweigh the four “C” and two “S” traits (Figure 1). Since “introverts outnumber are outnumbered about three to one by extroverts”, this comes as no
real surprise.\textsuperscript{1} It is interesting to note that with the “C” and “S” traits, they each find half above the 52 average score and half below the 52 average score (Figure 1). This is not believed to be too restrictive to the data either, but is simply a result that most people who seek to become coaches are probably not “C” or “S” personalities. Also, the “D” and “I” traits are far more likely to want to be coaches because of the desire to influence and drive others to accomplish greater things.\textsuperscript{2} Another thought concerning these two traits is that they also might be more likely to respond to the request to participate in the research. This response could be perceived by these personality traits as another way to contribute and influence. Carbonell says the “I” type personality feels that others “expect you to speak up and share your wisdom or wit.”\textsuperscript{3} So what does all this mean? The results simply say what they say, and do provide some valid information that is both interesting and usable.

DISC

What does the DISC personality profiles received say about those who presented their information from the CoachNet assessment? “I” is the clear winner (Figure 2). But the information is not as clearcut as the previous sentence would suggest. In fact, when broken down into a more digestible and balanced view of the information, what we see is the combination of particular traits that seem to be more successful at coaching. In the overall average from Figure 7 we see the “ICS” trait as the best average score, and this seems to be consistent with all the represented data.


\textsuperscript{3} Ibid., 26.
The reason for the difference from Figures 2 and 7 is in what the charts are saying. Figure 2 is giving the number of profiles presented, where Figure 7 is giving the averages. This is a key point to mention and points to the number of “I” traits represented in the data, and is also why the “I” trait leads in the low scores of Figure 4. The purposes of these charts are to represent the numbers of profiles presented for each trait, and to give the averages. When both are weighed together, what we find is more conclusive. The most successful coaching personality seems to be the combinations of the “ICS” personality traits.

The key to understanding these results are found in the culmination of averages in the overall scores and the individual competency scores. One key reason is presented over and again from the data, and that is the reoccurrence of the “Outgoing” personalities of the “D” and “I” traits. They are consistently average leaders, and are at the top in most of the measured areas. Along with the outgoing traits are the combinations of the “C” and “S” traits. These bring a level of success to the “I” trait that the “I” trait does not seem to accomplish on its own. While the “I” scores well across the board, the “I” can struggle with the very thing that makes him so successful, talking. The “I” can struggle with interjection. One of the main tools of coaching is listening. The “I” trait can tend to compete for the talking time, and “seems to suffer from “one-upmanship.” While the “I” can struggle with listening, when coupled with the “S,” a superb listener, coaching begins. The “C” and “S” traits seem to be the leveler, the traits that fulfill the coaching role. Logan and Carlton define coaching in this brief statement; “coaching is a
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6 Ibid.
relationship with a purpose.” 7 The “C” trait is driven by the task, and seeks to stay on the path to conclusion, or fulfilling purpose, while the “S” trait is driven by the relationship. From this definition, it’s no wonder the “C” and “S” traits lead to successful coaching, and when combined with the outgoing “I” trait, it leads to a fun and enjoyable coaching relationship that gets things done. Accomplishing tasks and enjoying people is what you get when you combine “I,” “S,” and “C,” and it really does not seem to be a huge difference in the order, as long as the “I” trait is high. When referring to these combinations in How To Solve The People Puzzle, Carbonnell says, “You are more of a people-person, but you also like completing tasks well.” 8 The “I” only struggles with completing tasks, and the “C” only can be too focused on completing the task, which could lead to a less than enjoyable coaching relationship. The “S” only will struggle as well, as it would be so consumed by the relationship that it could lose sight of the task at hand. 9 While the “S” and “C” struggle in the averages when alone, the “I” seems to hold its own in the averages. Also, the “S” and “C” traits combined are strong throughout the data averages. But, there is no doubt from the averages, that combined they are a winning combination.

Another high scorer is the “D” trait. While not as prevalent as the “I,” the “D” is represented well. The “D” trait is both outgoing and task oriented, which are very strong coaching traits, but can be so driven and direct that it could suffer in the relationship. 10 When referring to the “D” type personality, Dr. Carbonell says “You tend to be positive, aggressive,

9 Ibid, 127.
and assertive. You are stimulated by challenges and hate to lose.”¹¹ When the “D” trait is coaching he can be very persuasive, but at times can be too demanding.¹² This would especially be true when coaching certain personality types that need more encouragement than prodding. Which personality traits coach better with other traits is another interesting question, but cannot be dealt with in this project.

The “D” trait combined with “C” or “I” also is well represented in the averages. So what does this tell us about the successful coaching personality? First, there are a lot of factors that come into play in the coaching relationship, and there are many traits and combinations that can be successful, but there are some that will be more successful than others. From the data we see:

**Successful Coaching Scores**

- “I” and the “S” and “C” combinations are the well-rounded coach.
- “I” – the fun loving, outgoing, relational coach.
- “D”- the outgoing task oriented driver.
- “D” and the “I” or “C” combinations, relational and driven.
- “C” and “S” combined, relational and task oriented.

**Less Successful Coaching Scores**

- “C”- the task oriented introvert
- “S” – the relational introvert

It must be understood that there are coaches in the data that are both “C” only and “S” only that score above the 52 average, and can be seen in Figure 1. These results can also be swayed by the lack of profiles with the “S” and “C” traits. The information provided is a result of the averages for each trait alone and with its combinations. The information given is not

---


¹² Ibid.
exhaustive, but does give some key insight to what coaches can work to accomplish in the coaching relationship, and work on to help all coaches be more successful.

**Insight Inventory**

The Insight Inventory will provide information that will support many of the things that have already been stated. The connection of the DISC and the Insight Inventory results are like an overlay, which will give a more complete and enhanced view of the ideal coach. The behavioral style of the Insight Inventory brings greater light to the personality profile of the DISC, which in turn will bring more clarity to what has already been seen.

When moving from the DISC personality profile to the Insight Inventory we must first understand that we are going from a personality-based assessment to a behavioral based assessment. While they are closely related and even intertwined to make up who we are, the Insight Inventory focuses on how one will actually coach. Given the information from Figure 3 we find the IOUU traits to have the highest number of scores above the 52 average, and the DOUU traits coming in second. Again, it is important to understand that these numbers are by volume and not by average. In this section we want to consider, what are the key factors in the behavior patterns that point to successful coaching? As we consider the results in a more to head to head manner, we will be looking at the averages from Figure 8.

**Outgoing vs. Reserved**

What we find from the information, both in the DISC and Insight Inventory is that the results give a very similar picture. First we see the impact of the outgoing personality. As with the DISC (both “I” and “D” were among the leading averages), the “Outgoing” averages higher than the “Reserved.” This, as we have seen previously, could be from the sheer number of “Outgoing” traits, considering “Outgoing” traits more than double the “Reserved.” The average
gives a balanced view, and “Outgoing” trait is the clear winner. The reasons would be the same as with the DISC, but considers how they engage others. The ease of communicating coupled with the enjoyment of the activity would allow for great success in coaching, and a great enjoyment for the one being coached.\(^{13}\) The “Outgoing” trait is certainly a key to great coaching, but does not exclude the “Reserved.” Stoltzfus says, “If you are by nature more reserved, you may not realize that your natural responses are putting a damper on the client.”\(^{14}\) The “Reserved” would just need to be understanding of the engagement, and be especially aware of being with an extravert.

**Direct vs. Indirect**

As with the “Outgoing” behavior trait, the leader of this section is no real surprise. The “Direct” edges out the “Indirect.” These traits are not to be confused with the “D” and “I,” but have some related tendencies. The “Direct” trait would be connected with the “D” of the DISC. What is being considered is the way in which a person is “Getting Your Way.”\(^{15}\) This is somewhat of a toss up, and both traits have strong average scores. Some just work more directly than others, while others may work in a more strategic manner. This again may seem contrary to the previous information given concerning information from Figure 3, but again those are volume numbers not the averages. Although they are close in both, the “Direct” trait is the


\(^{15}\) Handley, Patrick. *INSIGHT Inventory: understanding yourself and others.* (pp. 2-3). Kansas City, MO: INSIGHT Institute, Inc., 1998.
leader. The “Direct” trait is going to confront and hold the person to task, which has been seen as a very productive coaching trait.\textsuperscript{16}

\underline{Steady vs. Urgent}

This also is an area where there is a significant difference. The “Steady” trait averages much higher than the “Urgent.” This is a major factor in the coaching process that is seen in the information as it is sifted. One could make the connection between the “D” personality of the DISC and the “Urgent” behavioral pattern here with the Insight Inventory. The persistent and driving nature could drive the coaching relationship to the point that would stress the progress.\textsuperscript{17} Peltier says, “It is always possible that the pushy coach could alienate his client or foster resistance.”\textsuperscript{18} Although this may at times encourage someone to make a move, it would seem from the averages that the “Steady” behavioral pattern would produce a greater result. The buzzword to keep in mind concerning this behavior would be patience. The ability of the coach to be patient, waiting and prodding when necessary, could be a major factor in the coaches success. This would also be seen in the information provided concerning the DISC profiles. The connection between the “Steady” behavior of the Insight Inventory and the “I” of the DISC would fall in to line as the “I” trait would tend to be more patient, and especially with the “S” and “C” combined with it. According to Carbonell this trait combination tends to be inspiring, supportive and calculated when it comes to planning a course of action.\textsuperscript{19} These traits would
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seem to fall in line with the “take action and make decisions after much deliberation” of which is characteristic of the “Steady” trait.

**Precise vs. Unstructured**

This final comparison with the Insight Inventory behavioral traits would seem to come as a surprise, when considering the information found in Figure 3. The “Precise” edges out the “Unstructured” in the overall averages. There is only a one point difference in the averages, and with the high number of “I” traits from the DISC, there should be no surprise that the “Unstructured” would score high. The somewhat surprise could be that the precise scores higher, but with the “C” combinations of the DISC scoring high this as well could be expected. The calculated planner that is always thinking and diligently working toward perfection would seem to line up directly with the “Precise” behavioral trait seen here in the Insight Inventory. The interesting trait that is unique, we do not find. The DOSP would seem to be the culmination of all the high averages. This would seem to be the nomination from the Insight Inventory. This would be the combination that would be “Direct,” “Outgoing,” “Steady,” and “Precise.” This would truly be the “Ideal” coaching profile.

**Core Competencies**

In this final section of this chapter we will be considering the personality traits and behavioral styles compared with the nine CoachNet Core Competencies. As with the previous sections our goal is to point out the distinctive features that we find. We will consider four of the competencies in comparison with both the DISC and Insight Inventory to see if there are any correlations present and why. Another point we want to consider in the core competencies is

---

what the data says for the CoachNet training process. This will be seen as we consider why some competencies have higher scores than others. Over all CoachNet has a strong average score of 55.79 when considering all of the competencies. The following figure will be referred to as we look for correlations as to why certain personality types and behavioral style my score the way they do. One thing to note with Figure 22 is the competency scores are based on the total number of CoachNet Assessments presented. As we consider these correlations we will only be looking at the highs and lows of the averages. This will give us four Competencies to consider: Abiding in Christ and Self-assessing as the high averages, and Diagnosing and Concluding as the lows.

“Abiding in Christ” is the second strongest representation of all the averages (57.5), and should be expected for a Christian coach training. One goal for CoachNet may be to consider how to move this to the highest average among the competencies. As with any personality trait, some will excel at certain competencies naturally, while others do not. In this competency most who would seek to be coaches through CoachNet would seem to have a desire to be reliant upon the Holy Spirit, and would feel it absolutely necessary to the coaching relationship. This is the crux of Abiding in Christ, reliance upon the Holy Spirit. When considering another reason for why the averages are high in this competency, we can immediately see the impact of the “ISC,” “ICS,” “ID,” “SC,” and the “DC” of the DISC, which all average above 60. The lows are “S,” “C,” and the “DI” combination. From this alone we can see the impact of the “S” and “C,” and the “D” and “I” in both the highs and lows, but the difference as we have seen previously is the combinations excel and the lone traits score lower. The exception is the “D” and “I”

---

combination, which seems to be dependent upon the order. If the “I” is more dominant the average is ten points higher. It is to be noted that this combination is neither the highest nor lowest of the scores. When considering the Insight Inventory we find the lowest combinations of the “Indirect,” “Reserved,” “Urgent,” and “Unstructured” (IRUU) with an average of 49.10. The highest combination is seen in the “Direct,” “Reserved,” “Steady,” and “Unstructured” (DRSU) with an average of 60.5. The interesting point to see here is in the “Steady” and “Urgent” traits, which we have seen before. Although the “Urgent” trait averages the lowest of all competencies, this could be a direct relation to the “S,” “C,” and the “DI” traits that we saw in the DISC. The “C” trait and the “DI” (D being the driver in this combination) being much more task-oriented than their counterparts. These traits could tend to move ahead of “spiritual” aspect of the coaching relationship to pursue the coaching task. While this is not meant to be a judgment call, it would seem to fit the personality traits that we see in the lower scores of the “Abiding in Christ” competency.

The highest Scores among the competencies are found in “Self-assessing.” This competency is about personal awareness and understanding who you are as a coach.\(^\text{22}\) It is interesting to note that when we consider “Self-assessing” among the scores with personality and behavioral profiles, this competency scores low, and it is seen clearly in the previous chapter. With all the scores included we find it as the highest average at 57.73. One reason can clearly be seen from all the information gathered to this point, and that is the presence of the outgoing personality traits. It would be highly probable that the scores we do not have personality or behavioral profiles for would trend more toward outgoing personalities, and the higher scores

would probably be combinations of “I” or “D” coupled with “S” and “C.” The reason this can be stated is in the information we have from Figure 10 where these combinations are higher. It should be noted as well that the “S” and “C” combined are what seem to be the key to “Self-assessing.” These traits are the thinking and feeling traits. The “S” and “C” traits are inner thinkers. They ponder things like personal development when combined, and when coupled with the outgoing “D,” and “I” especially, can be very good at “Self-assessing.” Another interesting point is the low scores of the “Reserved” traits in the Insight Inventory. The “Reserved” traits can be directly correlated with the “S” and “C” when they stand alone. When considering the high averages, it is clear that the outgoing personalities of “D” and especially “I” are very strong when coupled with the “S” and “C,” and when “S” and “C” are alone, they trend lower in the averages. This information simply allows the coach training, and the coach, to focus on where their strengths and weaknesses lie, and to be aware of where work needs to be done.

The weakest averages in the competencies are the “Diagnosing” competency (55.49) and the “Concluding” competency (55.40), which has the lowest average. “Diagnosing” is when the coach makes determinations as to what the issues are, and the steps to be taken to help someone over the hurdles they are facing. Again among the highest averages are the “SC” and the “ICS” traits of the DISC, which directly correlate with the high average of the “Steady” trait of the Insight Inventory. “Urgent is the counterpoint and is supported in the low scores of the “C,” “SI,” and the “DI.” The trait that seems to be out of place is the “SI” when one considers the correlation between the “C” and “DI” with the “Urgent.” But when one considers what Dr.

---


Carbonell says about the inability at times to say what needs to be said, one can see where this personality could shy away from “Diagnosing” and setting plans. The urgency of trying to solve the problem would be consistent with the “C” and “DI” traits, which could push the coaching relationship when it may need a little more time. It is understandable that these traits would need to be aware of their tendencies, and work to strengthen them when they can.

The “Concluding” competency has the lowest scoring average of all the Competencies. This is the point to which the coaching relationship is drawn to a conclusion and seeks to renew with another agreement. Again, the point that rises to the top is the Insight Inventory’s

Figure 23. Averages of the CoachNet Competencies from the CoachNet Assessment


“Steady” verses “Urgent” traits. The “Steady” behavioral trait stands out in the “Concluding” competency as the highest average and works well with the “SI” and “ISC” traits of the DISC. These personalities are very relational and would be very patient in the process of both bringing the relation to an end, and seeking to move forward in another agreement. The “Urgent” trait could find itself being pushy and too direct in concluding the coaching relationship. The DISC traits are “C” and “S,” and each can have its own reason for struggle when bringing the coaching relationship to an end. The “C” could find itself treating the conclusion like any other task to check off, and the “S” may never get to it (this would not seem to fit with the “Urgent” trait).

**Conclusion**

The key points to draw from this chapter are not so much with who struggles with what tasks; but who does what well. In fact any personality can be a good coach and even a great coach if they are aware of their pitfalls. Logan says “At its core, coaching is really quite simple. You don’t have to be an expert – anyone can learn to coach.” The concluding answer to the overall question of what personality makes the ideal coach is the “ICS.” According to all the information reviewed the “ICS” seems to be most successful coaching personality, and either of the outgoing personalities of “D” or “I” coupled with the “S” and “C” can be highly successful. The Insight Inventory seems to paint a very similar picture, and points to a set of traits that were not even presented in the data, but the ideal behavioral trait DOSP (Direct, Outgoing, Steady and Precise) brings all the averages in to play as individual traits.

---

There are six key points to the success of these combinations, and the first lies in the outgoing personality, and more specifically in their ability to deal with people. These personalities are driven by interaction with people and thrive on what it feels compelled to give in the relationship.\textsuperscript{28} The combinations of these types “tend to be more passive than active” and “have strong personality skills.”\textsuperscript{29} These outgoing combinations coupled with the “S” and “C” combinations bring these traits naturally and enthusiastically. The second key to the success of these combinations is seen in their reliance on the Holy Spirit. When one considers the ability to read people, and the effects it has on coaching, coupled with the scores seen from Figure 9 concerning “Abiding in Christ,” it’s not out of place to see these combinations excel. The spiritual side of coaching is vital to moving people forward. Neill says, “lasting, sustainable change nearly always happens in the vertical dimension – a deepening of the ground of being of the client and greater access to inspiration and spiritual wisdom.”\textsuperscript{30} The third key to the success of these traits manifests in their ability to listen. As previously seen, listening is a vital trait of successful coaching. This is where the “S” trait shines in these combinations. The “S” type is the king of listening, and also of being patient.\textsuperscript{31} These are critical to successful coaching and the two are greatly connected to what has been seen in this research. The fourth key is analytical thinking. These personality types are known for their analytical skills.\textsuperscript{32} These skills are driven by the “C” trait and its ability to be a “calculating” “problem solver”, which is crucial to asking
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quality questions and developing effective action plans. The fifth trait that comes from these combinations is in their ability to hold someone accountable. Accountability and holding someone to task is where the “D” and “C” traits bring support to the “I” and “S”. “Accountability is one of the essential underpinnings of the coaching relationship – it’s what gets things done.” These points are vital to getting people to the places they want to be, and is why they choose to be in a coaching relationship. Re-enlistment is the final key to the success of these traits. This is where the “C”, “I,” and “S” combinations join and not only have a great coaching experience, but become task driven to renew the coaching agreement. This is another place that we see these traits score high as seen from Figure 14, referring to “Concluding.” “Success breeds success.” Successful people continue to be in a coaching relationship, and successful coaches are great at re-enlisting.

It has been stated in this project before, success in coaching does not only come from these combinations of personality traits, but according to the information provided, these traits seem to excel more than others. In the next chapter we will conclude this project by gathering all the pertinent information to support these claims and present them as a presentation to CoachNet.

---


34 Ibid., 22, 40-41.


CHAPTER SIX

Presentation to CoachNet

Let me begin by thanking you for the opportunity to partner with you in the journey of both CoachNet and myself in the fulfillment of this project. From the first time we met and began to discuss some ideas that you wanted to consider for study it was evident that you have both a great passion for coaching, and the desire to produce the greatest and most effective coaches possible from CoachNet. Your desire to produce quality coaches is evident from your personal diligence in the coaching process and also seen through what CoachNet is producing from its training. One thing that can certainly be seen from the information gathered is that the overall scores from the CoachNet Online Assessments of 55.79 are a testament to the quality desired in the coach training process. While this is a great average I know that your desire would always be to challenge the present score and move to a higher average; to produce the best coaches possible from CoachNet. One way to accomplish this task is to increase the awareness of the coach in areas that could possibly be a weakness for his/her personality or behavioral style. This is one of the two major products this project has produced. The other is the main theme and question that was presented; what is the ideal personality of the Christian coach? These two products alone will present the availability to enhance the coach training process, and allow CoachNet to produce an even higher level of coaches.

As we unpack the information provided you are very aware of the process we undertook to receive the data that was considered in this project. One thing to mention is some of the limitations that were involved. One distinct limitation is found in the final compilation of the data. Out of the top 10 scores only half came with both a score and their personality profile, and
only one of the top four results had both a score and personality profile. While it might have provided more of a conclusive score, the results are still believed to be conclusive. Also, it did not affect the results pertaining to the nine competencies, and allowed for a greater number to consider in the analysis. Another limitation to consider is in the number of certain types of personalities that submitted results and profiles. The overwhelming number of “I” and “D” and combinations of traits far outweigh the four “C” and two “S” traits (Figure 1). Since “introverts are outnumbered about three to one by extroverts,” this comes as no real surprise. It is interesting to note that with the “C” and “S” traits, they each find half above the 52 average score and half below the 52 average score as seen in the Table 2.

Table 2. Full Sample of the Data Received

<p>| | | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>57.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>40.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>44.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>56.5</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>IRSP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>60.1</td>
<td>DI</td>
<td>DOUP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>61.5</td>
<td>DI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>58.7</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>DOSU</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>51.6</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>50.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>62.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>67.5</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>54.7</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>DOUU</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>62.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>62.5</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>59.7</td>
<td>ICS</td>
<td>IOSU</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>50.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>55.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>54.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>63.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>50.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>57.4</td>
<td>ISC</td>
<td>IOUU</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An interesting side note from Table 2 is in the gender category. Who scores better, men or women? Since a great number of coaches today are women, and the numbers seem to be growing, how do they compare? Although there are more men in the quorum than women, the results are very clear from the Coachnet assessment. The following pie chart (Figure 24) clearly shows the result. There is no real significant difference among men and women who are successful in coaching.
The average for women is 58.65 and the average for men is 58.79. Although we received three male responses to every one female, the female coach is just as successful as males.

Another thing we must consider is the parameters of what we were looking to do. The first thing we were looking for was a score that was above 52 on the CoachNet training assessment. The score of 52 was derived from the use of the medium range of 46-59 used on the CoachNet assessment, and 52 is the median number. Although scores can range from 20-80, the numbers we received ranged from 26.8 to 70. The tipping number seemed to be fifty, with no one scoring above 70. This score of 50 seemed to be a fair evaluation to the results, and reviewed in conversations with a CoachNet employee. Although 50 is a fair number it was determined to stick with the median number of 52 from the CoachNet medium range. This allows the determining number to be from CoachNet and not imposed by the writer of this project. The next step in the process would be simple, look to see what personality profile results were given with the higher scores. Also, see if there are any patterns that are displayed.
and are significant to the higher scores. So what did we find? As we move forward we will consider the data received in the DISC profile, Insight Inventory, and the nine core competencies from the CoachNet Assessment, and we will simply want to answer three things; what are the results, what do the results mean, and what could be done with the information?

**DISC**

What do the DISC personality profiles received say about those who presented their information from the CoachNet assessment? “I” is the clear winner according to Figure 25.

*Figure 25. Number of DISC traits that scored above 52% on the CoachNet Assessment*

But the information is not as clearcut as the previous sentence would suggest. In fact, when broken down into a more digestible and balanced view of the information, what we see is the combination of particular traits that seem to be more successful at coaching. In the overall average from Figure 26 we see the “ICS” trait as the best average score, and this seems to be consistent with all the represented data.
The reason for the difference from Figures 26 and 27 is in what the charts are saying. Figure 26 is giving the number of profiles presented, where Figure 27 is giving the averages. This is a key point to mention and points to the number of “I” traits represented in the data. The purposes of these charts are to represent the numbers of profiles presented for each trait, and to give the averages. When both are weighed together, what we find is more conclusive. The most successful coaching personality seems to be the combinations of the “ICS” personality traits.

What does it mean? The key to understanding these results are found in the culmination of averages in the overall scores and the individual competency scores. One key reason is presented over and again from the data, and that is the reoccurrence of the outgoing personalities of the “D” and “I” traits. They are consistently average leaders, and are at the top in most of the measured areas. Along with the outgoing traits are the combinations of the “C” and “S” traits. These bring a level of success to the “I” trait that the “I” trait does not seem to accomplish on its own. While the “I” scores well across the board, the “I” can struggle with the very thing that makes this trait so successful, talking. The “I” can struggle with interjection. One of the main
tools of coaching is listening.² The “I” trait can tend to compete for the talking time, and “seems to suffer from “one-upmanship.”³ While the “I” can struggle with listening, when coupled with the “S,” a superb listener, coaching begins.⁴ The “C” and “S” traits seem to be the leveler, the traits that fulfill the coaching role. Logan and Carlton define coaching in this brief statement; “coaching is a relationship with a purpose.”⁵ The “C” trait is driven by the task, and seeks to stay on the path to conclusion, or fulfilling purpose, while the “S” trait is driven by the relationship. From this definition, it’s no wonder the “C” and “S” traits lead to successful coaching, and when combined with the outgoing “I” trait, it leads to a fun and enjoyable coaching relationship that gets things done. Accomplishing tasks and enjoying people is what you get when you combine “I,” “S,” and “C,” and it really does not seem to be a huge difference in the order, as long as the “I” trait is high. I think Tony Stoltzfus sums up why this combination is so powerful when he says, “Coaching uses relational influence instead of command and control to get things done.”⁶ When referring to these combinations in How to Solve the People Puzzle, Carbonell says, “you are more of a people-person, but you also like completing tasks well.”⁷ The “I” only struggles with completing tasks, and the “C” only can be too focused on completing the task, which could lead to a less than enjoyable coaching relationship. The “S” only will struggle as well, as it would be so consumed by the relationship that it could lose sight

⁴ Ibid
of the task at hand.\textsuperscript{8} While the “S” and “C” struggle in the averages when alone, the “I” seems to hold its own in the averages. Also, the “S” and “C” traits combined are strong throughout the data averages. But, there is no doubt from the averages, that combined they are a winning combination.

Another high scorer is the “D” trait. While not as prevalent as the “I,” the “D” is represented well. The “D” trait is both outgoing and task oriented, which are very strong coaching traits, but can be so driven that it could suffer in the relationship.\textsuperscript{9} When referring to the “D” type personality, Dr. Carbonell says “you tend to be positive, aggressive, and assertive. You are stimulated by challenges and hate to lose.”\textsuperscript{10} When the “D” trait is coaching he can be very persuasive, but at times can be too demanding.\textsuperscript{11} This would especially be true when coaching certain personality types that need more encouragement than prodding. Which personality traits coach better with other traits is another interesting question, but cannot be dealt with in this project.

The “D” trait combined with “C” or “I” also is well represented in the averages. So what does this tell us about the successful coaching personality? First, there are a lot of factors that come into play in the coaching relationship, and there are many traits and combinations that can be successful, but there are some that will be more successful than others. From the data we see:

\textsuperscript{11} Ibid.
Successful Coaching Scores

- “I” and the “S” and “C” combinations are the well rounded coach.
- “I” – the fun loving, outgoing, relational coach.
- “D” -- the outgoing task oriented driver.
- “D” and the “I” or “C” combinations, relational and driven.
- “C” and “S” combined, relational and task oriented.

Less Successful Coaching Scores

- “C” only- the task oriented introvert.
- “S” only– the relational introvert

It must be understood that there are coaches in the data that are both “C” only and “S” only that score above the 52 average, and can be seen in Table 2. These results can also be swayed by the lack of profiles with the “S” and “C” traits. The information provided is a result of the averages for each trait alone and with its combinations. The information given is not exhaustive, but does give some key insight to what coaches can work to accomplish in the coaching relationship, and work on to help all coaches be more successful.

Insight Inventory

The Insight Inventory will provide information that will support many of the things that have already been stated. The connection of the DISC and the Insight Inventory results are like an overlay, which will give a more complete and enhanced view of the ideal coach. The behavioral style of the Insight Inventory brings greater light to the personality profile of the DISC, which in turn will bring more clarity to what has already been seen.

When moving from the DISC personality profile to the Insight Inventory we must first understand that we are going from a personality-based assessment to a behavioral based assessment. While they are closely related and even intertwined to make up who we are, the Insight Inventory focuses on how one will actually coach. Given the information from Figure
27, we find the IOSU traits to have the highest number of scores above the 52 average, and the DOUU traits coming in second. Again, it is important to understand that these numbers are by volume and not by average. In this section we want to consider, what are the key factors in the behavior patterns that point to successful coaching?

Figure 27. Number of Insight Inventory traits that scored above 52% on the CoachNet Assessment

As we consider the results in a more head to head manner, we will be looking at the averages from Figure 28.

Figure 28. Insight Inventory Average Scores per Trait
**Outgoing vs. Reserved**

What does it say? What we find from the information, both in the DISC and Insight Inventory is that the results give a very similar picture. First we see the impact of the outgoing personality. As with the DISC (both “I” and “D” were among the leading averages), the “Outgoing” averages higher than the “Reserved.” This, as we have seen previously, could be from the sheer number of “Outgoing” traits, considering “Outgoing” traits more than double the “Reserved.” The average gives a balanced view, and “Outgoing” trait is the clear winner.

What does it mean? The reasons would be the same as with the DISC, but the Insight Inventory considers how they engage others. The ease of communicating coupled with the enjoyment of the activity would allow for great success in coaching, and a great enjoyment for the one being coached. The “Outgoing” trait is certainly a key to great coaching, but does not exclude the “Reserved.” The “Reserved” would just need to be understanding of the engagement, and be especially aware of being with an extravert.

**Direct vs. Indirect**

As with the “Outgoing” behavior trait, the leader of this section is no real surprise. The “Direct” edges out the “Indirect.” These traits are not to be confused with the “D” and “I,” but have some related tendencies. The “Direct” trait would be connected with the “D” of the DISC. What is being considered is the way in which a person is “Getting Your Way.” This is somewhat of a tossup, and both traits have strong average scores. Some just work more directly than others, while others may work in a more strategic manner. This again may seem contrary to

---


the previous information given concerning information from Figure 26, but again those are volume numbers not the averages. Although they are close in both, the “Direct” trait is the leader. The “Direct” trait is going to confront and hold the person to task, which has been seen as a very productive coaching trait.15

**Steady vs. Urgent**

This also is an area where there is a significant difference. The “Steady” trait averages much higher than the “Urgent.” This is a major factor in the coaching process that is seen in the information as it is sifted. One could make the connection between the “D” personality of the DISC and the “Urgent” behavioral pattern here with the Insight Inventory. The persistent and driving nature could drive the coaching relationship to the point that would stress the progress.16 Peltier says, “It is always possible that the pushy coach could alienate his client or foster resistance.”17 Although this may at times encourage someone to make a move, it would seem from the averages that the “Steady” behavioral pattern would produce a greater result. The buzzword to keep in mind concerning this behavior would be patience. The ability of the coach to be patient, waiting and prodding when necessary, could be a major factor in the coach’s success. This would also be seen in the information provided concerning the DISC profiles. The connection between the “Steady” behavior of the Insight Inventory and the “I” of the DISC would fall into line as the “I” trait would tend to be more patient, and especially with the “S” and “C” combined with it. According to Carbonell this trait combination tends to be inspiring,

---


supportive and calculated when it comes to planning a course of action. These traits would seem to fall in line with the “take action and make decisions after much deliberation” of which is characteristic of the “Steady” trait.

**Precise vs. Unstructured**

This final comparison with the Insight Inventory behavioral traits would seem to come as a surprise, when considering the information found in Figure 27. The “Precise” edges out the “Unstructured” in the overall averages. There is only a one-point difference in the averages, and with the high number of “I” traits from the DISC, there should be no surprise that the “Unstructured” would score high. The somewhat surprise could be that the “Precise” scores higher, but with the “C” combinations of the DISC scoring high this as well could be expected. The calculated planner that is always thinking and diligently working toward perfection would seem to line up directly with the “Precise” behavioral trait seen here in the Insight Inventory.

The interesting trait that is unique, we do not find. The DOSP would seem to be the culmination of all the high averages. This would seem to be the nomination from the Insight Inventory. This would be the combination that would be “Direct,” “Outgoing,” “Steady,” and “Precise.” This would truly be the “Ideal” coaching profile.

**Core Competencies**

In the final section of this chapter we will be considering the personality traits and behavioral styles compared with the nine CoachNet Core Competencies. As with the previous sections our goal is to point out the distinctive features that we find. We will consider four of the


competencies in comparison with both the DISC and Insight Inventory to see if there are any correlations present and why. Another point we want to consider in the core competencies is what the data says for the CoachNet training process. This will be seen as we consider why some competencies have higher scores than others. Over all CoachNet has a strong average score of 55.79 when considering all of the competencies. The following chart will be referred to as we look for correlations as to why certain personality types and behavioral styles might score the way they do. One thing to note with Figure 29 is the competency scores are based on the total number of CoachNet Assessments presented. As we consider these correlations we will only be looking at the highs and lows of the averages. This will give us four Competencies to consider: Abiding in Christ and Self-assessing as the high averages, and Diagnosing and Concluding as the lows.

**Figure 29. Average of the CoachNet Core Competencies from the CoachNet Assessment**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competency</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring</td>
<td>56.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>55.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diagnosing</td>
<td>54.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concluding</td>
<td>55.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting</td>
<td>56.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establishing</td>
<td>56.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicating</td>
<td>57.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-assessing</td>
<td>58.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abiding in Christ</td>
<td>57.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
“Abiding in Christ” is the second strongest representation of all the averages (57.5), and should be expected for a Christian coach training. One goal for CoachNet may be to consider how to move this to the highest average among the competencies. As with any personality trait, some will excel at certain competencies naturally, while others do not. In this competency most who would seek to be coaches through CoachNet would seem to have a desire to be reliant upon the Holy Spirit, and would feel it absolutely necessary to the coaching relationship. This is the crux of “Abiding in Christ,” reliance upon the Holy Spirit. When considering another reason for why the averages are high in this competency, we can immediately see the impact of the “ISC,” “ICS,” “ID,” “SC,” and the “DC” of the DISC, which all average above 60. The lows are “S,” “C,” and the “DI” combination. From this alone we can see the impact of the “S” and “C,” and the “D” and “I” in both the highs and lows, but the difference as we have seen previously is the combinations excel and the lone traits score lower. The exception is the “D” and “I” combination, which seems to be dependent upon the order. If the “I” is more dominant the average is ten points higher. It is to be noted that this combination is neither the highest nor lowest of the scores. When considering the Insight Inventory we find the lowest combinations of the “Indirect,” “Reserved,” “Urgent,” and “Unstructured” (IRUU) with an average of 49.10. The highest combination is seen in the “Direct,” “Reserved,” “Steady,” and “Unstructured” (DRSU) with an average of 60.5. The interesting point to see here is in the “Steady” and “Urgent” traits, which we have seen before. Although the “Urgent” trait averages the lowest of all competencies, this could be a direct relation to the “S,” “C,” and the “DI” traits of which we saw in the DISC. The “C” trait and the “DI” (D being the driver in this combination) being much more task-oriented than their counterparts. These traits could tend to move ahead of “spiritual” aspect of

---

the coaching relationship to pursue the coaching task. While this is not meant to be a judgment call, it would seem to fit the personality traits that we see in the lower scores of the “Abiding in Christ” competency.

The highest scores among the competencies are found in “Self-assessing.” This competency is about personal awareness and understanding who you are as a coach. It is interesting to note that when we consider “Self-assessing” among the scores with personality and behavioral profiles, this competency scores low, and it is seen clearly in the previous chapter. With all the scores included we find it as the highest average at 57.73. One reason can clearly be seen from all the information gathered to this point, and that is the presence of the outgoing personality traits. It would be highly probable that the scores we do not have personality or behavioral profiles for would trend more toward outgoing personalities, and the higher scores would probably be combinations of “I” or “D” coupled with “S” and “C.” The reason this can be stated is in the information we have from Figure 1 where these combinations are higher. It should be noted as well that the “S” and “C” combined are what seem to be the key to “Self-assessing.” These traits are the thinking and listening traits. The “S” and “C” traits are inner thinkers. They ponder things like personal development when combined, and when coupled with the outgoing “D,” and “I” especially, can be very good at “Self-assessing.” Another interesting point is the low scores of the “Reserved” traits in the Insight Inventory. The “Reserved” traits can be directly correlated with the “S” and “C” when they stand alone. When considering the high averages, it is clear that the outgoing personalities of “D” and especially “I” are very strong when coupled with the “S” and “C,” and when “S” and “C” are alone, they trend lower in the

---


averages. This information simply allows the coach training, and the coach, to focus on where their strengths and weaknesses lie, and to be aware of where work needs to be done.

The weakest averages in the competencies are the “Diagnosing” competency (55.49) and the “Concluding” competency (55.40), which has the lowest average. “Diagnosing” is when the coach makes determinations as to what the issues are, and the steps to be taken to help someone over the hurdles they are facing.24 Again among the highest averages are the “SC” and the “ICS” traits of the DISC, which directly correlate with the high average of the “Steady” trait of the Insight Inventory. “Urgent” is the counterpoint and is supported in the low scores of the “C,” “SI,” and the “DI.” The trait that seems to be out of place is the “SI” when one considers the correlation between the “C” and “DI” with the “Urgent.” But when one considers what Dr. Carbonell says about the inability at times to say what needs to be said, one can see where this personality could shy away from “Diagnosing” and setting plans.25 The urgency of trying to solve the problem would be consistent with the “C” and “DI” traits, which could push the coaching relationship when it may need a little more time. It is understandable that these traits would need to be aware of their tendencies, and work to strengthen them when they can.

The “Concluding” competency has the lowest scoring average of all the Competencies. This is the point to which the coaching relationship is drawn to a conclusion and seeks to renew with another agreement.26 Again, the point that rises to the top is the Insight Inventory’s “Steady” verses “Urgent” traits. The “Steady” behavioral trait stands out in the “Concluding” competency as the highest average and works well with the “SI” and “ISC” traits of the DISC.

These personalities are very relational and would be very patient in the process of both bringing the relationship to an end, and seeking to move forward in another agreement. The “Urgent” trait could find itself being pushy and too direct in concluding the coaching relationship. The DISC traits are “C” and “S,” and each can have its own reason for struggle when bringing the coaching relationship to an end. The “C” could find itself treating the conclusion like any other task to check off, and the “S” may never get to it (this would not seem to fit with the “Urgent” trait).

**Conclusion**

As we have considered the information gathered we will consider what this could mean and how it can affect the coach training possibilities, as well as the coaching relationships. We will look at some recommendations that will allow for greater understanding from the coaches perspective on who he/she is as a coach and how their personality effects their coaching. Also, we will see the final answer to the question of what personality makes a good coach. We will finally look at how that personality or set of personalities and behaviors naturally fall into the coaching system.

**Recommendations**

The key points to draw from this presentation are who does what well, and how to grow in the areas we are naturally strong or weak in. In fact any personality can be a good coach and even a great coach if they are aware of their pitfalls. “Effective coaches know themselves. They are aware of their strengths and weaknesses.”


The suggestions made could enhance the CoachNet training to help the CIT be aware of whom they are as a coach, and add a few key components that could make a substantial difference in the coaches CoachNet produces.  So
what could be done with the information is the obvious question. Here are some suggestions from the results for CoachNet:

- Expand the behavioral section to enhance the personal understanding of who the coach is personally to allow them to know their tendencies in the coaching role.
- Assign or suggest the reading of a coaching from your personality type book.
- Have the CIT coach a different behavioral set and point out different behavioral tendencies when doing one on one coaching.
- Develop a strength and weakness handout that gives the CIT a better understanding of what they can watch or work on in order to strengthen their coaching style. This could be based on each Insight Inventory trait.
- A devotional type introduction could be added to each session of training tailored toward each particular competency, or a particular competency you want to enhance (such as Abiding in Christ).
- Develop the curriculum toward the core competencies based on their personality or behavioral style (this could be in a second or third level training).

These recommendations are not meant to be exhaustive, but could be a great starting point to other ideas that CoachNet would add. Since the CoachNet training process already has a behavioral section in which the CIT is given the Insight Inventory and discusses the results, this would be a great place to add to the training process.

The concluding answer to the overall question of what personality makes the ideal coach is the “ICS.” According to all the information reviewed the “ICS” seems to be most successful coaching personality, and either of the outgoing personalities of “D” or “I” coupled with the “S” and “C” can be highly successful, as well as the “SC” types combined. The Insight Inventory seems to paint a very similar picture, and points to a set of traits that were not even presented in the data, but the ideal behavioral trait DOSP (Direct, Outgoing, Steady, and Precise) brings all the averages in to play as individual traits. There are six key points to the success of these combinations, and the first lies in the outgoing personality, and more specifically in their ability to deal with people. These personalities are driven by interaction with people and thrive on what
it feels compelled to give in the relationship.\textsuperscript{28} The combinations of these types “tend to be more passive than active” and “have strong personality skills.”\textsuperscript{29} These outgoing combinations coupled with the “S” and “C” combinations bring these traits naturally and enthusiastically. The second key to the success of these combinations is seen in their reliance on the Holy Spirit. When one considers the ability to read people, and the effects it has on coaching, coupled with the scores seen from Figure 9 concerning “Abiding in Christ,” it’s not out of place to see these combinations excel. The spiritual side of coaching is vital to moving people forward. Neill says, “lasting, sustainable change nearly always happens in the vertical dimension – a deepening of the ground of being of the client and greater access to inspiration and spiritual wisdom.”\textsuperscript{30} The third key to the success of these traits manifests in their ability to listen. As previously seen, listening is a vital trait of successful coaching. This is where the “S” trait shines in these combinations. The “S” type is the king of listening, and also of being patient.\textsuperscript{31} These are critical to successful coaching and the two are greatly connected to what has been seen in this research. The fourth key is analytical thinking. These types are known for their analytical skills.\textsuperscript{32} These skills are driven by the “C” trait and its ability to be a “calculating” “problem solver,” which is crucial to asking quality questions and developing effective action plans.\textsuperscript{33} The fifth trait that comes from these combinations is in their ability to hold someone accountable. Accountability and holding


\textsuperscript{32}Ibid., 295.

someone to task is where the “D” and “C” traits bring support to the “I” and “S.”

“Accountability is one of the essential underpinnings of the coaching relationship – it’s what gets things done.” These points are vital to getting people to the places they want to be, and is why they choose to be in a coaching relationship. Re-enlistment is the final key to the success of these traits. This is where the “C,” “I,” and “S” combinations join and have a great coaching experience, but is task driven to renew the coaching agreement. The Core Competency, “Concluding,” is another area these combinations scored well. “Success breeds success.” Successful people continue to be in a coaching relationship, and successful coaches are great at re-enlisting.

Since coaching is a process, it makes sense that becoming a better coach would be a process as well. Being the best coach that you can be is the key, and to accomplish that you must be who you are, and grow comfortable with being you. This is done through knowing yourself better, and also who you are as a coach, and strengthening certain tendencies that will empower your coaching. When understanding your strengths one finds a sense of freedom allowing them to excel in comfort and experience which allows for a greater relationship in the coaching experience. It could be possible for some to feel too restricted as a coach if they adhere to a ridged coaching structure. It has been the experience of this writer in the coaching relationship, as a coachee, that many coaches make suggestions while coaching, and while coaching is generally understood in its purest form as somewhat passive in its interaction, with little or no interjection from the coach, in Christian coaching there must be a place for feeding into the

---


coachee. This would be seen as both natural and intentional, whether direct or indirect. This can be done in a clever fashion through questions that will allow a person to see the point for themselves. Some will do so without thought, while others may need to work on developing their skill. While many would frown on this from a rigid sense of coaching, your insight can be invaluable and even encouraged as you will be who you are. While this could be referred to as mentoring, we have seen previously that there is an intersecting point at which coaching can tip in that direction. This is why outgoing personalities are so effective in coaching, because these are natural tendencies for their personality types. So why restrict this natural ability in the coaching process? It’s this writer’s theory that while one should “proceed with caution”, this should not be taboo. Coaching in the freedom of who you are should be the goal of every coach.

Success is the purpose of this project, and more specifically being successful at helping people get to their desired goal is what coaching is all about. The journey of the coaching relationship is always understood with a sense of the ever present Spirit of God hovering over the relationship, and it’s this understanding of the spiritual that makes coaching Christian coaching. There is much at stake, and while some may consider the coaching task little more than checking off progress, the Christian coach must consider coaching with eternity in mind. This is where CoachNet separates itself from other coach training programs and sets itself up for success. Since CoachNet already has a very successful training program the desire of this project is to provide information that would not only answer the question of what personality makes a great coach, but also provide the results from the information to help all coaches in the CoachNet process be the best coaches they can be. Two questions that bring further thought to the personality dimension of coaching: what personality type, coach other personalities well, and how are the 14 micro-skills of CoachNet affected by personality type?
The information gathered in and through this project is both interesting and informative, and can be a valuable tool to the coaching process. It is the hope that CoachNet would find some usable points and value in this presentation. Thank you for your willingness to participate in this project, and to your kindness through the process of gathering the profile information. May you have much continued success at CoachNet as you seek to develop greater coaches.
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Summary. The Online Coach Assessment provides you with an accurate measurement of your overall effectiveness as a coach, pinpoints specific opportunities for improvement and gives guidance to help you design specific action plans for growth.

Qualitative Research. Dr. Robert Logan and Dr. Gary Reinecke conducted an international qualitative research project mentored by Dr. Charles Ridley to determine the competencies of excellent Christian coaches. The nine competencies can be organized into three categories:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Foundational</th>
<th>Relational</th>
<th>Strategic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abiding in Christ</td>
<td>Establishing</td>
<td>Diagnosing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-assessing</td>
<td>Supporting</td>
<td>Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicating</td>
<td>Concluding</td>
<td>Monitoring</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Each competency is defined by 5-7 specific behavioral dimensions called microskills. The research results and resources for increasing your effectiveness as a coach can be found in Developing Coaching Excellence by Robert E. Logan and Gary B. Reinecke (ChurchSmart Resources, 2003).

Validity and Reliability. Building on the results of the qualitative research project, Logan and Reinecke then designed an online questionnaire to be completed by the coach and others (those being coached, peers, and/or supervisors). The questions for use in this survey were selected scientifically by conducting a reliability test (Cronbach) on the pilot data. Further tests will be conducted with new data to verify how high scores correlate with coaches’ performance.

Scoring Summary. The scoring summary provides a quick total of your scores in each of the nine competencies and accompanying microskills that make up the Online Coach Assessment. The scores have been statistically normalized with a score of 50 as average compared to other coaches.

**Low rating**
35 and less = poor
36-45 = below average

**Medium rating**
46-54 = average
55-59 = good

**High rating**
60-64 = very good
65 and more = excellent

Competency Description Pages. This report contains two pages for each of the nine competencies. The first page provides a summary definition of the competency and microskills and your specific scores displayed graphically with interpretation of low, medium and high scores. The second page gives tips and helps, including reflection questions and a sample of improvement actions. Developing Coaching Excellence expands on the Tips and Helps given in this report. It goes deeper into the step-by-step process of identifying action steps in a Personal Development Plan. You will be challenged to master the nine competencies assessed in the online profile by referring to expanded material under "Coach Development" to create your plan.

Ways to Grow. CoachNet offers many opportunities to help you develop in your coaching ministry. Look at the final page of this report to see some of these opportunities and to join www.coachnet.org for the latest resources for coaches.

© 2004-2011 CoachNet, Inc. All rights reserved.
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APPENDIX B: ONLINE COACH ASSESSMENT SUMMARY

Online Coach Assessment Summary

Interpretation of Scores

**Low rating**
- 35 and less = poor
- 36-45 = below average

**High rating**
- 60-64 = very good
- 65 and more = excellent
**APPENDIX C: INSIGHT INVENTORY**

**INSIGHT Inventory**

Name:  
Date:  

**Instructions:** Shade in one of the blanks immediately to the right of each term according to how well it describes you.

- **Example:** 2. Talkative
  1.  
  2.  
  3.  
  4.  

**Definitions:** If you are unsure about the meaning of any term, read the definitions on the back of the scoring sheet.

**WORK STYLE**

Check the degree to which the words in the column below are descriptive of how you believe you are most of the time at work.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>not very descriptive</th>
<th>very descriptive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Competitive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Talkative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Patient</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Demanding</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Serene</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Animated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Perfectionist</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Dominering</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Easygoing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>High-spirited</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Structured</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Forceful</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Mild</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Systematic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Convincing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>Good mixer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Strong-willed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>Exacting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>Even-tempered</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>Enthusiastic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>Decisive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>Detailed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>Tolerant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>Intense</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>Life of the party</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>Daring</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>Restrained</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>Particular</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>Charming</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
<td>Laid-back</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.</td>
<td>Organized</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PERSONAL STYLE**

Some people (not all) behave differently away from work. Check the degree to which the words below describe the "at home" or personal you.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>not very descriptive</th>
<th>very descriptive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Decisive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Enthusiastic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Restrained</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Particular</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Intense</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Detailed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Good mixer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Serene</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Accurate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Competitive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Animated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Organized</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>High-spirited</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Exacting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Patient</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Talkative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>Easygoing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Forceful</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>Structured</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>Systematic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>Mild</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>Dominering</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>Charming</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>Even-tempered</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>Strong-willed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>Perfectionist</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>Convincing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>Laid-back</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>Demanding</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>Tolerant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
<td>During</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When finished, tear off this cover sheet and follow scoring instructions.
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1 **Uniquely You Questionnaire**

**FOCUS:**
- Male
- Female
- ORGANIZATION

**INSTRUCTIONS:** Notice each group of words below. For each group, ask yourself which words are MOST and which words are LEAST like you. Do not choose what you want to be or what you want others to think you are, but what you really are under pressure. Fill in ONLY ONE box in the "M" column MOST like you and fill in ONLY one box in the "L" column LEAST like you. All of the words or none of them may or may not describe you, but choose ONLY ONE group of words. Notice in the "Example" how ONLY ONE box is filled in under the "M" and "L" columns.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M</th>
<th>L</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Kind, Nice, Caring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Proper, Formal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Demanding, Asserting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Outgoing, Active</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Playful, Fun-loving</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Firm, Strong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Law-abiding, Conscientious</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Gentle, Soft, Humble</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Bold, Daring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Delightful, Pleasant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Loyal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Compassionate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Open</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Dependable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Fair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Orderly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>Determined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Honest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>Care</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>Obedient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>Promising</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>Straightforward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>Risk-taking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>Pleasing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>Considerate, Thoughtful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>Forceful, Strong-willed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>Hyper, Energetic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>Perfectionist, Precise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>Contented, Satisfied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>Compliant, Goes by book</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
<td>Brave, Adventurous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.</td>
<td>Enthusiastic, Influencing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.</td>
<td>Smooth talker, Articulate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.</td>
<td>Loving, Sincere, Honest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.</td>
<td>Persistent, Restless, Relentless</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36.</td>
<td>Right, Correct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37.</td>
<td>Positive, Optimistic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.</td>
<td>Entertaining, Clowning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39.</td>
<td>Shy, Mild</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.</td>
<td>Competent, Does Right</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41.</td>
<td>Competent, Does Right</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42.</td>
<td>Assertive, Sees clearly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43.</td>
<td>Persuasive, Expressive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44.</td>
<td>Controlling, Taking charge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45.</td>
<td>Merciful, Sensitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46.</td>
<td>Pondering, Wondering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47.</td>
<td>Persuading, Convincing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48.</td>
<td>Outspoken, Opinionated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49.</td>
<td>Inducing, Charming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50.</td>
<td>Inventive, Imaginative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51.</td>
<td>Hospitable, Enjoys company</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52.</td>
<td>Zealous, Eager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53.</td>
<td>Quiet, Reserved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54.</td>
<td>Organized, Orderly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55.</td>
<td>Exciting, Spirited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56.</td>
<td>Sociable, Interactive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57.</td>
<td>Serious, Unwavering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58.</td>
<td>Sweet, Tender, Compassionate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59.</td>
<td>Guarded, Masked, Protective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60.</td>
<td>Faithful, Consistent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61.</td>
<td>Responsive, Reacting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62.</td>
<td>Helpful, Assisting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63.</td>
<td>Bottom line, Straight-forward</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Example:**
- X Kind, Nice, Caring
- ♠ Proper, Formal
- ♠ Demanding, Asserting
- ♠ Outgoing, Active

**ML Example:**
- 65. ♠ Powerful, Unconquerable
- 66. ♠ Merry, Cheerful
- 67. ♠ Generous, Giving
- 68. ♠ Preparing, Researching

---

**Sample Page For Review Only**

To order, phone: (800) 501-0490 or on the internet, go to: [www.uniquelyyou.com/newsite/products/UYPP.shtml](http://www.uniquelyyou.com/newsite/products/UYPP.shtml)

**Once you have completed your choices on this page, go to the 3 Markings Sheet page and follow the instructions.**
APPENDIX D

Letter to the CoachNet network

To the CoachNet Family,

My name is Alan Coker and I am a student at Liberty University. I am pursuing the Doctor of Ministry and am writing a project that is in partnership with CoachNet. We are seeking permission to use your DISC profile and or Your Insight Inventory results. We would like to look at those in connection with your CoachNet Online Coaching Assessment to see if there are any patterns that could be used to help develop better training processes. No names are needed, only your approval to access the results of the assessments. If you know your DISC and or Insight results, we would request you return the results on the following form along with your permission to use the results in our analysis. Thank you for your participation and furtherance of the coach training process. Again, no names are needed, and nor will they be used.

Thank You,

Alan Coker
Letter used with email to the CoachNet network.

My DISC personality profile is_____________.

My Insight results are_____________._____________._____________._____________.

CoachNet has my permission to give my score of the CoachNet Online Coaching Assessment for the use of this project without the use of my name. Yes or No

My results can be used together for the purpose of this project. Yes or No

Thank You for your participation!
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