Using the Personal Profile System for Windows™ for On-Line Coaching and Performance Management

Overview

The Personal Profile System® Software for Windows™ (PPSS) is a direct development of the Personal Profile System® (PPS), the widely used learning system designed to help individuals better understand their own behavior and the behavior of others. The Personal Profile System® Software for Windows™ combines the behavioral technology of the paper instrument with computer technology resulting a more comprehensive application of the DiSC™ System.

The response portion of the software, either keyboard or coin-rub paper, is identical with the response portion of the Personal Profile System®. However, the interpretation section is considerably expanded and application-oriented. In the paper (manual) version of the instrument, it is necessary to provide interpretive information on all behavioral styles; therefore, the amount of information describing any one person's behavioral style is limited. Using the technology available on personal computers, it is possible to produce a much more detailed report, focused specifically on the individual respondent.

In addition, the PPSS can be used as an "on-line performance coach", providing "just-in-time" performance coaching information. Once the information is stored in the computer it can be retrieved on screen for the immediate application of the information to a specific performance area.

Intelligence Augmentation

The Personal Profile System® Software for Windows™ can be used as both a Human Resource Decision Support System and a Performance Management System. The software can be used initially as HR decision support for work group analysis and career development, and then the information generated by the system can be used as an on-going performance management system. The PPSS is designed to be an Intelligence Augmentation (IA) system, in which the resources of the computer are used to *support* those capabilities most uniquely human rather than to *replace* human functioning, which is the intent of Artificial Intelligence or AI. Artificial Intelligence systems are different from IA systems in that they are designed to replace human expertise with an *expert system.* While expert systems have provided solutions in some areas, certain human capabilities remain difficult to replicate by machines.

Instead of replacing human reasoning, Intelligence Augmentation takes the approach of building human-machine cooperation based on what each does best. For example, there are three areas where the human mind is more powerful than any computer program yet designed: pattern recognition (visual and aural), evaluations based on judgment, and using a sense of context in processing information. These are all complex tasks performed by the human mind using the "wetware" processing abilities of the brain that are not yet understood at the neurological level, nor replicated by any hardware or software. Yet, there are three areas that computers clearly perform better than human minds: evaluation of computations, storing massive amounts of data and remembering things without forgetting.

The Personal Profile System® Software for Windows™ is meant to *augment* human decision-making and problem-solving abilities, <u>not</u> to replace them. The PPSS is designed to do the three things that computers do best: evaluate the computation of the response data, remember all the information on DiSC™ applications and provide an individualized report from the data on the applications of the DiSC™ system that has been stored. Using human judgment and reasoning ability is still essential for receiving the maximum benefit in using the information provided by the software. While the information printed out by the computer is comprehensive enough to stand on its own, it really becomes most useful when applied to specific situations by a skilled HR practitioner. The consultative and process skills of the HR practitioner are essential to full optimization of the system in HR decision support and performance management.

The Role Behavior Analysis

Included in Personal Profile System® Software for Windows™is the companion instrument to the Personal Profile, the Role Behavior Analysis, which covers the additional application area of the DiSC™ System. The Role Behavior Analysis® (RBA) provides specific DiSC™ behavioral statements for defining, describing and discussing expectations for role-based behavior. The Role Behavior Analysis® uses the DiSC™ System to collect and process perceptions of the behavioral expectations of 'how' a job, position, or role needs to be fulfilled to achieve maximum effectiveness. These perceptions are based on the role, *not* the person in the role. The Role Behavior Analysis® focuses on 'how' the role needs to be fulfilled *regardless* of who is in the role.

The DiSC™ System is used to bridge the gap between the 'how' and 'what' of role expectations. Position descriptions or job descriptions tend to focus on the 'what' of a job, defining tasks, duties, or responsibilities. Individuals may be able to define clearly 'what' should be done in a position, yet be unclear on 'how' those activities or tasks should be done. The Role Behavior Analysis® provides a specific set of DiSC statements to clarify and define role expectations, or 'how' the job needs to be done, eliminating the confusion that comes from using general or unclear statements to describe role expectations.

Confusing personalities with professions

Many people confuse role-based behavior with an individual's "personality" or natural behavioral style. This can be observed in comments like "all accountants must be S's" or "we need a high D for this job.” Both of these statements represent people confusing role-based behavior with a person’s behavioral style. It is unlikely that all people who study accounting and become accountants are high S’s. Many accounting positions may require considerable S role behavior, but not all accounting positions will require it. Some accounting positions may be characterized by more D, I or C role behavior depending on the other role functions. For example, an accounting position that involved making and communicating tough credit approval decisions may involve more D role behaviors such as “move forcefully even though others may be offended” or “take higher risks based on potential payoffs”. Or, the role may include some standard accounting functions as well as some interaction with people, such as financial counseling or tax and investment advising. This type of accounting position may require more Influencing role-based behaviors such as “resolve conflict through initiating and facilitating discussion” or “influence people through positive verbalization.”

Why use both the PPS and the RBA?

Frequently HR practitioners are asked to provide training and development interventions for improving performance. Naturally, the Personal Profile System® is seen as an essential part of the performance improvement process; however, the Role Behavior Analysis® may be the necessary and often missing component in fulfilling training and development needs. By using the Personal Profile System® exclusively, practitioners may be using the wrong tool for the task and get a similar result as using a hammer when they should be using a wrench.

In order to clarify when to use which assessment tool, it is necessary to reexamine the intention and philosophy behind training and development interventions. In training we are not trying to change *people*, we are trying to change *behavior.* The Personal Profile System® focuses on how a person sees him or herself as a *person*. The Role Behavior Analysis® focuses on what behavior a *role* requires regardless of the person in the role. When we are talking about changing behavior we are not talking about changing *who* the person is, which is described in the PPS, but *how* the person behaves in a specific role for which the expectations have been defined in the RBA. The success of the training and development intervention is not measured by changes in the PPS but by observing changes in the person’s ability to produce the behaviors required by the role. Therefore, using the PPS as a pre and post training “test” is inappropriate because we should not be trying to change *who* the person is but *how* the person behaves. Changes in the PPS scores and graphs would tell us about changes the person has made in how they see themselves as a *person* rather than changes in behavior required by the role. Or, the changes may simply tell us that we have taught the person that they need to give us different answers in the “test” because the first set of answers was unacceptable.

Ethical considerations

In addition to the practical aspects of using the right tool for the right task to get the right results, there is also an ethical and philosophical issue involved. If we attempt to change *who* someone is we are violating the integrity of the person because we have implied that they are "not okay" as they are and need to be changed *as a person* to be acceptable. Communicating that someone is "not okay" as a person and needs to be changed or fixed has a negative effect on self-esteem and does not demonstrate a respect for individual differences. However, if rather than changing people, our approach is to provide both clarification of the behaviors required for a role and the coaching necessary to develop those behaviors, while validating the dignity and integrity of *who* the person is as a unique individual, then we not only improve performance but contribute to creating a climate of respect and empowerment which will result in *sustainable* performance improvement.

Using the Personal Profile System™ in Performance Coaching

When reviewing the information in each section, it is important to keep in mind that this report represents potential behavior not the actual, observed behavior of the person. It represents how someone with these responses, and this behavioral style, may have a tendency to behave, acknowledging that factors like the person's values system and life experience may have caused them to modify some of these potential behaviors.

The information provided in the PPS section of the PPSS for Windows™ is designed to provide the language and structure for a dialogue about development and improvement whether that dialogue is an internal dialogue or a dialogue with another person. The Applications Manual included with the PPSS describes how each section can be applied to specific areas of behavior and performance. Each major section contains a worksheet that is designed for applying the information to a particular area of interest. The two management sections "How This Person Tends to Manage" and "How to Manage This Person" can be used to discuss both the effectiveness of the person's natural approach to each of the eight management activities listed in a particular work environment as well as to explore what this person needs from others in the same areas to be managed effectively. These sections are designed to be used with DiSC Management Strategies™ and the Managing Performance Action Planner™ The two sections "How to Create a Positive Relationship with this Person" and "How This Person Relates to People and His Environment" can be used to explore any relationship interaction from two perspectives. It can either be explored from how the person's natural approach to communicating, decision-making, problem-solving, managing time and handling stress meets the needs of the others in his environment. Or, it can be explored from the perspective of what this person needs from others in the areas of communicating, complimenting, giving feedback, problem solving, decision-making and dealing with in conflict. The section on the person's "Natural Approach to Selling" provides a concise description of potential areas for coaching in the seven step sales process. Each step describes which types of customers will respond positively to this person's natural approach and which customers are likely to require some modification in behavioral approach. The information in this section is designed to be used with the Sales Action Planner™ and DiSC Sales Strategies™.

Using the Role Behavior Analysis in Performance Coaching

The RBA requires some background information before we can talk about using it in performance coaching because the concept of role-based behavior is new to many people.

What is a role?

According to Webster, the term role comes from the French word rôle meaning literally "from a roll containing an actor's part". The contemporary definition includes "a part, or character, that an actor plays in a performance, a function or office assumed by someone" as well as "a socially expected behavior pattern usually determined by an individual's status in a particular society". The use of the term 'role' in the Role Behavior Analysis® is very close to all three Webster definitions. The RBA is used to define and 'script' how the part should be played by the person in the role. The process of using the RBA clarifies how the role needs to be played to meet the goals of the 'script' and the needs of the 'audience'. Additionally, the clear definition of role expectations provided by the use of the RBA helps in "casting the part" and in "coaching the actor".

How is a role different than a job or position?

Typically, jobs or positions are defined by the "what" of the position— the tasks, duties, accountabilities, responsibilities or objectives of the position. Defining a role focuses more closely on the "how" of the role or the description of the behavior that is desired in completing the "what" of the position. The differentiation of the two terms is essential for a number of reasons. One reason is that there may be significant differences in how a role is to be fulfilled from one organization to another even though the position title and job description are essentially the same in both organizations. Or, the roles may be different from department to department even within the same organization based on different needs and behavioral expectations.

For example, two organizations may have very similar job descriptions for the position of salesperson, yet have very different behavioral expectations, or 'scripts', for how that role needs to be 'played'. The differences in role behavior expectations may have to do with the type of product, the type of customers or how the company would like to be perceived in the marketplace. One company may want to be viewed as the "hard-charging, results-oriented people" while another may want to be seen as “the friendly, helpful partner”. The job description, or the ‘what’, may be very similar in both companies, yet the ‘how’ is quite different.

Also, a job or position may involve several different roles based on the number of needs met by that job. For example, the position of Manager of Accounting may involve directly multiple roles. In the position, one role might involve managing the activities of others, a technical/analytical function might comprise another role, and consultative support to other departments as yet another role. In addition, the job may include a role as a member of a management team, as well as another role as a member of a cross-functional quality team and each role may require different team member behavior based on the needs of the team.

How many roles comprise a position or job?

The number of roles differs from position to position, however, the general trend seems to be an increase in the number of roles within each position as work becomes more complex and collaborative. Also, as the rate of change increases, redefining roles frequently is essential because while the formal position titles may not have changed, the behavioral expectations for the roles may have changed significantly. Changes in market conditions or customer populations (internal and external), downsizing, flattening of the organization and corporate culture, all may contribute to a change in how the role needs to be performed behaviorally.

How does shifting roles affect performance?

If an individual is unaware of the differences in behavior required for each of the roles he needs to perform, he is less likely to shift to the appropriate behavior when necessary. What tends to happen most often is that either the person uses the behavior that is most natural for him in all the roles, or he uses the behavior perceived to be required for the *primary* role in all other roles. In either case, the behavior used is not likely to be the behavior most effective for meeting the behavioral expectations of the role. The gap between the expected behavior and the actual behavior is likely to result in less than adequate performance. Conscious awareness and understanding of the different behaviors required by each role can be used to increase effectiveness. By selecting and performing the behaviors required by the role, the person is able to do both ‘what’ is required and perform it ‘how’ it is required.

What is role-based behavior?

Role-based behavior is the behavior required to perform a specific role within a specific position/job/function, defined within a specific organizational culture. The cultural framework of the social unit (company, family, nationality, community, agency, etc.) contributes to the behavioral expectations of the role by defining what are the norms for behavior in that culture. In other words, the culture defines how “people like us” behave when performing a specific role. As cultures change, expectations for how roles are performed also changes. This is particularly relevant as companies go through mergers, acquisitions and become increasingly global. It is relevant also as expectations for social roles (spouse, parent, partner, etc.) change with changing social conditions.

What does it mean when the RBA graph is flat?

As a result of confusion between role-based behavior and an individual's natural style, when people first begin looking at what behavior a role actually requires, they may not have a clear perception of the necessary behavior. This may result in a RBA response in which all four role-based behaviors appear to be about equal. While this <u>may</u> be an accurate description of the behaviors required to be effective in that role, it may also indicate a lack of skill in defining role-based behavior or a lack of clarity in behavioral expectations due to role confusion or conflicting expectations. The most effective way to clarify this response is to have several people familiar with the role participate in a consensus discussion of the role behavioral expectations. Also, the graph may be flat because more than one role is combined in the perception. In that case the roles that comprise the position need to be more clearly defined and differentiated.

How does the RBA help in conflict situations?

The Role Behavior Analysis provides a process to address the hidden sources of stress or conflict in the work environment from the difference between the behavior required by a specific position, job or function and a person's natural behavioral style. An individual may need to use behavior that is not naturally occurring for him or her to meet the behavioral requirements of a particular role which may result in a personal-functional conflict if not identified and managed. The potential stress of 'stretching' and 'redirecting' behavior can be reduced if the areas of difference between the role behavior requirements and the individual's natural behavioral style are identified using the RBA Comparison Grid and an action plan is developed for managing those differences.

Understanding the difference between potential and actual behavior

The Role Behavior Analysis® and Personal Profile System® provide information on potential behavior. Actual behavior may differ from potential behavior for a number of reasons. The Personal Profile System® describes how someone would be most likely to behave if he/she was not modifying his/her behavior as a result of training, experience or values. Someone may have already adapted his/her behavior to meet the needs of the role as specified by the RBA, yet the Comparison Grid will show a "stretch" or redirect" because it is only describing potential behavior. The only way to determine actual behavior is through observation. Performance information can be gained by using the Performance Coaching questions supplied by the PPSS for Windows™ software. However, the information in the Comparison Grid and Goodness of Fit description should be treated cautiously until verified by observation of a person's actual behavior in the role.

Why use the RBA in performance management?

The Role Behavior Analysis® Comparison Grid uses thirty-two specific DiSC™ statements to describe the requirements for a role. These same statements are used to match role behavior to the person's natural behavioral style. As a result, the information on the Comparison Grid identifies which behaviors the role requires more of than is naturally occurring for the individual. These behaviors will require the individual to 'stretch' his behavior to meet the needs of the role. The RBA also identifies which behaviors the individual tends to have more of than is required by the role. These behaviors may need to be modified or 'redirected' so that the individual does not overuse those behaviors as compared to the needs of the role. In addition, the Comparison Grid identifies those behaviors where there is a 'good fit,' where the role requires the same amount of the behavior as tends to be naturally occurring for the person. The specific DiSC language statements can be used to develop a performance management action plan in three key areas: 'good fit', 'redirect', 'stretch'.

Guidelines for using the RBA in performance coaching

The RBA is used in performance coaching by comparing the behavioral expectations of a role, defined by a consensus process using the Role Behavior Analysis®, to an individual's natural behavioral style as described by the person's Personal Profile. The comparison of the RBA and PPS result in description of three categories of person-role performance matching'. The first category of behavioral matching is called 'good fit'. These are the behaviors where the role requires about the same amount of the behavior as the person tends to have naturally occurring (PPS and RBA scores fall within 20% of each other). The next category of behavioral matching is called 'stretches'. These are the behaviors that the role requires more of the behavior than tends to be naturally occurring in the person's behavioral style (greater than 20% difference between the PPS and RBA scores). The third category of behavioral matching is called 'overuses' or 'redirect'. These are the behaviors that the person tends to have more of in his/her naturally occurring behavioral style than the role requires (greater than 20% difference between the PPS and RBA scores), which means s/he may overuse these behaviors and may need to re-direct his/her naturally occurring behaviors to those behaviors required by the role.

For example, someone may have a naturally high D behavioral style which would mean he would have a natural tendency to use behaviors such as "speculate on untested ideas" and "move forcefully even though others may be offended." However, the role may require considerably less of those behaviors, so the person would need to re-direct his natural tendency to use these behaviors. Instead, he may need to use those behaviors required by the role which may represent a 'stretch'. The stretch may require using more of a role behavior such as "remain neutral when conflict first arises."

After identifying the specific role behaviors requiring “stretching” or “re-directing”, the next step in performance coaching is to determine whether the individual has the necessary skill to perform the required behaviors. Frequently, people <u>assume</u> that someone has the skill, however, unless the person has actually demonstrated consistent use of that behavioral skill, the assumption may be invalid. Demonstrated skill is the most accurate determination of an individual’s ability. If the person does not have the skill, a plan for learning the necessary skill needs to be developed. Various training, coaching and mentoring activities may be helpful in developing the *specific* role-based behavior required. When evaluating the developmental learning plan, it is essential to identify whether the specific skill will be developed through the learning method being considered.

IMPLEMENTATION

<u>Phase 1: Build Role Database</u>

Step 1: Define the roles that comprise the position

Most jobs/positions contain more than one role. Each role needs to be defined separately in terms of tasks, duties and activities because each role is likely to require distinctly different DiSC™ behavior. For example, the *position* of Accounting Manager may include four distinctly different *roles.* One role in the position of Accounting Manager may be defined as the tasks, duties, activities and behavior used to manage others, while a second role may involve performing technical accounting tasks and activities. There may be a third role that is defined by the tasks, duties and behavior required by the role of a management team member and a fourth role may be defined by the tasks, duties and behavior that comprise the role of support staff to other departments. Additional roles may involve other team or group involvement such as a special project team member or as a member of a network of affiliation within the organization. Each role is likely to have different behavioral requirements, as well as different activities, duties and responsibilities.

Step 2: Prioritize the roles

After each role has been defined, a Role Behavior Analysis® needs to be completed for each of the roles. In addition to using the RBA to define and assess the behavioral requirements of each role, the roles may need to be evaluated in terms of importance or frequency of use. The importance or emphasis on a particular role may change periodically as a result of changing organizational needs. Also, the roles and the priority of a particular role in a position may be different from organization to organization or within divisions of the same organization, even though the position has the same title. For example, the position of Accounting Manager in one organization may place the greatest emphasis on the technical accounting activities role, with secondary emphasis on technical support to other departments and much less emphasis on the roles of managing others and team member. Another organization may define the position of Accounting Manager in their organization with the role of managing others and member of special project teams as most important and place much less emphasis on the technical accounting activities role. The RBA can be used to clarify and define these differences.

Differences in role expectations and in the priority of each role involved in the total position description can clearly impact the effectiveness of the person in the position based on the “degree of fit” the person has with each of the roles. Because of the behavioral differences in the roles, it is likely that a person will have a ‘good fit’ with one or two of the roles in a position but will need to develop additional behaviors to be effective in the remaining roles.

Development of the additional behaviors required by the role then becomes part of a performance development and management plan. The RBA is used to define for each role the potential behaviors that may require ‘stretching’ and/or ‘redirecting’. The potential behaviors listed in the ‘stretch’ or ‘redirect’ categories are evaluated by interviewing or by observing performance to determine whether the person has already developed these behaviors or whether the behaviors will require additional training and coaching to be performed successfully. The behaviors identified as requiring additional skill development then become part of a written performance management plan with a specific learning plan and performance objectives with scheduled dates for review.

Step 3: Complete RBA for each role

There are a number of ways to develop an RBA for each position. One person can fill out the RBA— either a person in the position or a person managing the position. However, a single person response is less likely to be accurate than a multiple person response, so multiple person responses are the preferred approach. When using a multiple person response, the group evaluating the role can include a 360º view of the role: people in the role, people managing the role, customers of the role (internal and external) and direct reports.

Step 4: Defining the behavioral expectations for the role using multiple RBA responses

The preferred process is to have each person fill out the RBA individually, eliminating the ‘group think’ effect. After completing the RBA individually, the group response can be displayed. It is likely that there will be considerable difference in the responses. The next step is to have a dialogue about these differences in role behavior expectations and come to consensus on one RBA perception for the role which then becomes the Consensus RBA for the role. It is suggested that in all further application of RBA data, such as for career development and performance management, that the Consensus RBA be used rather than individual perceptions.

Using a dialogue process to come to consensus on role expectations is the preferred method for defining role expectations because the dialogue process frequently uncovers hidden expectations or a reasoning process that had not been considered by others. Hidden expectations or differences in logic may contribute to on-going conflict about performance expectations. Therefore, a valuable by-product of the consensus dialogue process is the uncovering and resolution of these conflicts on role behavior expectations. While it may seem to be a time-consuming process, clients who use the consensus process to define role expectations report that it has provided valuable insights on performance expectations that were unlikely to have occurred without the RBA consensus dialogue.

Conducting an RBA Consensus Dialogue Process

After each person has responded individually and the multiple perceptions have been plotted on the RBA Comparison Grid (manually or computer generated), each group of response items on the response form is discussed and the rank order of the response items is agreed upon by the respondents. This process is completed for each of the eight groups of response items. It maybe helpful to post the individual ranking of Group 1 response items on page 4 of the RBA instrument (or from the one page response form) on a flipchart prior to discussing the items. When discussing individual preferences for ranking, each person presents his rationale for his ranking. The group listens to and discusses the various rationales and comes to a new consensus ranking based on the information provided in the discussion. This procedure is followed for each of the eight groups of response items on the response form. After completing the consensus dialogue for the eight groups for the first role, the group uses the same process for each of the remaining roles that comprise the position. At the conclusion of this exercise, there will be several clearly defined roles that comprise a specific position, for a specific department within a specific organization. Each role will have clearly defined DiSC behavioral expectations, in addition to the defined tasks, duties, responsibilities and activities of the role. The consensus RBA then should become part of the position/role database for that department which will be used for performance management, career development and HR decision support.

Constructing a composite RBA from multiple RBA responses

Many people have expressed a desire to construct a mathematical composite from multiple RBA responses. Unfortunately, behavior is not additive and cannot be averaged with any degree of accuracy. Additionally, the question arises whether each response should be weighted equally or might the person in the position have a more accurate perception than someone two levels removed? In that case, some manner of weighting of the scores may be indicated. If someone desires to use a mathematical composite rather than the consensus process, it could be done by evaluating the frequency of the value associated with each response associated with each group. However, using the consensus process is not only likely to be more accurate, but it is also likely to generate results that have greater acceptability or “buy in” which will significantly impact the successful implementation of the RBA information in performance management and HR decision support.

Phase 2: Using the RBA/PPS Comparison for Performance Management

Step 1: Administer the Personal Profile

Administer the Personal Profile following the guidelines for administration in a work focus.

Step 2: Identifying the 'Degree of Fit' between the role and the person

The consensus RBA for each role in a specific position can be compared to an individual's Personal Profile to determine the "degree of fit" between the person's natural style (or natural potential for the behavior) and the behavioral requirements for each role. The RBA/PPS Comparison generates three categories of statements of potential behavior for each role: 'good fit', 'stretch' and 'redirect'. The behavioral statements in the categories 'stretch' and 'redirect' can be used to determine whether the person has already developed those behaviors or if the behaviors will require additional training to be able to demonstrate the behaviors in real-life situations. Behavioral competence can be determined through interviewing and observing performance, focusing on the person's ability to perform the specific DiSC™ behaviors identified as requiring 'stretching' or 'redirecting'. The RBA Comparison Grid only indicates *potential behavior*, the actual ability to 'stretch' or 'redirect' a specific behavior needs to be determined through observation of the person when performing the behavior in real life situations. Behavioral interviewing questions can provide information about the likelihood that the person can perform the behavior, but the interview responses may also represent idealized rather than actualized performance. Or, the interview responses may represent how the person thinks he *should* be able to perform rather than how he *is able* to perform. Ultimately, observation is the most accurate measure for determining behavioral skill.

Describing intensity levels of role behavior

The results of the RBA are displayed on the RBA Comparison Grid which has four different levels of intensity: moderately low, moderate, moderately high and high. When describing a particular behavior required by a role, the intensity level needs to be specified. For example, a role might require moderately high levels of the behavior "cite evidence emphasizing a specific point of view or desired results" and moderately low levels of the behavior "achieve results by overcoming the objections of others." When comparing an individual's Personal Profile to the behavioral requirements of a role, both need to be stated in terms of the level of intensity. For example, John may have to 'stretch' his naturally occurring moderate level of the behavior "cite evidence emphasizing a specific point of view or desired results" to the moderately high level required by the role. John may need to 'redirect' his naturally occurring high levels of "achieve results by overcoming the objections of others" to the moderately low levels required by the role.

Using the specific behavioral language of the RBA

The language of the Role Behavior Analysis has been carefully selected to accurately reflect specific DiSC™ correlates of role-based behavior. Each phrase is designed to be used as a complete statement exactly as it occurs, with little or no editorial freedom. People frequently unknowingly distort the meaning of the phrases when summarizing or re-stating the phrase. For example, the first phrase on the RBA Comparison Grid says “take unprecedented risks” which someone might restate saying, “Yes, we want people to take unprecedented risks in this role after they have had a chance to gather information and think about it for a while.” Such rephrasing changes the intent of the original statement that was a D behavior to either an S or C behavior. Or, people may summarize the eight specific Influencing role behavior statements by saying, “John needs to stretch his people skills.” The statement “improve people skills” in not used in the RBA because it is not an accurate statement of a specific, observable DiSC™ behavior, even though many of the behaviors listed are commonly considered “people skills”. Remaining close to a word-for-word use of the statement ensures an accurate DiSC™ description of the role.

Step 2: Assessing Behavioral Competence through Interviewing

The RBA/PPS Comparison generates statements that can be used to determine what degree of behavioral competence an individual has already developed in the behaviors identified as *potential* ‘stretch’ and ‘redirect’ requirements. The Performance Coaching Questions are framed to elicit a description of how the individual has produced the ‘stretch’ in behavior or ‘redirected’ a behavior in a prior situation. By using the specific behavioral language of the question, the interviewer can target his/her questioning to the specific behavioral competencies required by each role in the position. The RBA/PPS Comparison defines *potential* degree of fit between the role and the person’s natural style based on the responses to the RBA and the PPS, however the *actual* degree of fit can only be determined through interviewing and observing behavior.

Step 3: Observing Behavioral Competence

After the behavioral expectations for the various roles in a specific position have been identified and used to develop an individual performance management plan, the RBA provides the language for observing and assessing development of specific DiSC™ role-based behavioral competencies. For example, suppose it was identified that an individual needed to ‘stretch’ the behavior “remain neutral when conflict first arises” and ‘redirect’ the behavior “move forcefully even though others may be offended”. A learning plan for these specific skills was developed which included classroom training in assertiveness skills and peer coaching within the next 60 days. At the end of sixty days, the degree of skill that the individual had or had not developed could be observed in his ability to perform the specific behaviors in real life interactions. If the level of demonstrated behavioral skill remained low or nonexistent, alternate training and intervention plans would need to be implemented. The RBA statements describe observable behaviors that can be trained and assessed with a goal of increasing role-based behavioral skill competence.

Step 4: Using the RBA/PPS Comparison to develop learning plans

The RBA/PPS Comparison provides the information necessary to develop specific learning plans for developing specific behavioral competencies. The development of behavioral competence can be used as a pre and post skill assessment and will meet the level 3 criteria for measuring the effectiveness of transfer of training. By using the behaviors identified as 'stretch' and 'redirect' as the desired performance outcomes for a specific learning intervention, a particular learning method can be evaluated to determine how effective it will be in helping the individual develop a specific behavioral skill. For example, if an individual needed to 'stretch' her moderately low naturally occurring level of "facilitate interaction with others to achieve results" to the moderately high levels of that behavior required by the role of managing others in the position of Accounting Manager, the learning activity would need to be targeted to developing that specific behavioral skill. The key question in designing a learning plan is where and how would a person learn to do this—"facilitate interaction with others to achieve results"—what learning design would be optimal. The term learning is used rather than training because the learning design may or may not use training as a method for achieving behavioral competence. The desired outcome is learning *not* training; training is one *method* for achieving learning, not a performance outcome in itself. Training may not be the most effective learning method for developing the behavioral skill of "facilitate interaction with others". Mentoring and peer coaching may be a more effective method for developing competence in that skill.

