



The CORE MAP Difference

For a general understanding of how CORE MAP compares to other profiles on the market, CORE will be compared to the two most common types of profiles available.

Profile Type One

This type of profile uses adjectives to measure self-perception (when self-administered) or observable traits (when administered or used by others). Whether we are assessing ourselves or being assessed by someone else, we use the traits we are able to observe to make the assessment. Some commonly used profiles that fit into this category are DISC, Wilson, Hire Success, PREP and Personality Plus. The profiles that use colors rather than names to differentiate the four styles also fall into this group. Among those are the Birkman Method, the Color Code, and the Drake personality profile.

All of these, except DISC, are derivatives of the Hippocratic model, which uses adjectives to describe the four basic traits of Choleric (Driver, Red, Green or some other substitution. We use Commander and the color red in part one of the CORE profile); Melancholy (Analytical, Yellow, Green or other substitution. We use Organizer and the color green); Phlegmatic (Amiable, Blue, White or other substitution. We use Relater and the color blue); and Sanguine (Expressive, Yellow, Red or other substitution. We use Entertainer and the color yellow).

Both our choice of terms and of colors were intended to make CORE quickly integrated into the minds and language of its users. Commander, Organizer, Entertainer and Relater all describe a primary attribute of each of the four types. Psychologically, red represents action, aggression, fire, power; all Commander type attributes. Green represents earthiness, cool (as in springtime meadows), solidity, finances (money); Organizer type attributes. Blue represents fluid water, a tranquil sky, peacefulness, flow; Relater type attributes; Yellow represents sunshine, a sunny personality, happiness, high energy, playfulness; Entertainer type traits.

DISC is a derivative of the model developed by William Moulton Marston, which suggests that all people possess to some degree four primary traits; Dominance (Drive has been substituted by some DISC instruments), Inducement (Influence is sometimes substituted), Steadiness and Compliance (Conscientiousness is sometimes substituted). Within each of these primary traits are sub-traits. For example: within the Dominance trait we find direct, daring, forceful, blunt, decisive, competitive, aggressive, domineering, powerful, controlling, self-starter, results-oriented, strong ego drive, etc.

The problem with the Marston model is that the attributes assigned to Dominance are largely aggressive in nature (ambitious, forceful, direct, challenging), the attributes assigned to Influence are mostly promotional (persuasive, enthusiastic, talker, convincing), the attributes assigned to Steadiness are mostly passive (mild, inactive,

complacent, relaxed) and the attributes assigned to Compliance are mostly conforming (restrained, conventional, courteous, diplomatic). When these terms are used along a continuum, as Marston envisioned, the problem is lessened, but people are still put into fairly small boxes. Human beings are far too complex to be narrowed down to just two primary attributes.

Marston's theory was that by narrowing behaviors down to two axis, it would be possible to apply the scientific powers of observation to them, allowing the viewer to be objective and descriptive, rather than subjective and judgmental. He believed that people tend to learn a self-concept, which is basically in accord with one of the four factors, and to function from that self-concept. He also stated that these traits can be observed and the DISC model is designed as a instrument for the discernment of *observable traits*.

We agree that people learn a self-concept and function from it, and we also agree that many human traits can be discerned through direct observation. But we take function further by asking whether what was learned and adopted is *beneficial to the individual and congruent with his or her natural inclinations*.

Marston's model states that dominance (aggression) exists on one end of scale one, with steadiness (passivity) on the other. On scale two influence (pushing forward) exists on one end of the scale, with conformance (holding back or obeying) on the other.

Marston believed that the dominance/passivity scale was the primary one and that the primary drive in humankind was the drive to dominate or win, which is why "D" is in the first position. Behind the drive to dominate or win, to a greater or lesser degree, is the determination of what works best for getting what you want; influencing others or obeying others. Marston stated that everyone fits somewhere along each continuum and expresses their position through their behaviors, which are those described under each attribute.

Under this model, a Commander/Entertainer would be observed to be primarily an aggressive promoter, while a Relater/Organizer would be seen to passively obey. And while this **can** be the case, it is generally truer of the *undeveloped, negative types*, and *not* of the well-developed, positive types.

We agree that all people do have all possible traits and we agree that anyone **can** manifest those traits, but to assume that they **do** manifest all the possible traits, of even one behavioral style, is a mistake.

In examining the descriptors for the four primary behaviors as described by Marston, we can see, that *Dominance* generally fits the range of traits that can be broadly assigned to *Commander*. *Inducement* correlates with *Entertainer* in a broad and very general sense, *Steadiness* with *Relater*, and *Compliance* with *Organizer*. In every case, the correlation is only a broad and general one however, and does not apply *across the board* to the types we call Commander, Organizer, Relater and Entertainer.

Positive Commanders, for example, often do *not* display traits such as domineering, controlling or impatient. They have the *potential* for those traits, but they may not have ever possessed them and they will not identify with them. To label a positive Commander, Organizer, Relater or Entertainer with a broad spectrum of *potential* traits (including the negative) is a disservice to positive types.

To honor the negative types with labels like responsible, directed, problem-solvers (for the Dominant type, for example) is also a disservice, not to the individual, but to those who deal with that individual.

Yes, negative types also have the *potential* for positive traits, but to assume that they *do* have them and are using them can get us into a lot of trouble.

DISC states that the higher the “D” in a DISC pattern, the shorter the fuse of the individual. That would be true for *negative* Commanders, but *not* for positive Commanders. Many people reject their nature because they believe they will inherit the whole range of traits, both positive and negative, if they adopt that style. **Nothing** could be further from the truth!

The “S” and “C” traits seem to be more intermixed in the introverted types (Organizer and Relater) than do the “D” and “I” traits in the extroverted types (Commander and Entertainer) but there is bleed-over in all of them to some extent. For example, a trait assigned to “S” (Relater correlate) is non-emotional. Typically Organizers (“C” correlate) are far less “emotional” than Relaters, who can get *very* emotional at times and who feel deeply all the time.

Some generalized assumptions inherent to DISC are:

All high “D”s are status conscious, aggressive, impatient, distrusting, and anger easily.
All high “I”s are open-minded, enthusiastic, influential, inspiring and personable
All high “S”s are passive, possessive, complacent, stable, trusting, and non-emotional
All high “C”s are perfectionistic, patient, courteous, critical, fearful and obedient.

Some of the “constants” fit the positive end of the spectrum and some fit the negative end, but positive and negative traits are never seen in equal measure in an individual. In assuming the traits all come as a packaged deal, it’s easy to understand why some people fear or reject their nature.

Some examples of how the traits fail to fit into a neat little package are:

Positive Commanders can be patient and courteous (C traits), even with Organizer (C) dormant, and negative Organizers can anger easily and be impatient (D traits), even with Commander (D) dormant.

Positive Relaters (S) are almost always courteous and patient (C traits), where negative Organizers (C) almost never are.

Positive Organizers (C) are stable and trusting (S traits), but not perfectionistic or overly fearful (C Traits).

Positive Entertainers can be driven, self-starters (D), personable and inspiring (I), trusting and stable (S) and patient and courteous (C).

So, while the traits, as described in DISC correlate in a general way with part one of the CORE profile, they also bleed over into the other CORE types to a greater or lesser extent, and lean too heavily in the direction of one specific attribute to correlate closely.

Type One in General

Most of the profiles on the market that use the *type one* profiling method are very effective for what they are actually designed to measure, which is the observable traits that one can perceive in oneself or that can be observed by someone else.

The problem is not necessarily with the instruments themselves, but with the fact that observable traits are often those that have been *conditioned*. When that is the case, what gets reported is the conditioned self rather than the authentic self. People functioning from a place of conditioning are rarely happy and content and rarely as effective in life, at work or in relationships as they could be if functioning from their natural, authentic CORE selves.

Although the DISC system measures what it calls “natural” and “adapted” styles, based on the profiler’s “most” and “least” choices, people who have been conditioned to a particular style early in life are not consciously aware of what they would like most OR least, were they functioning from their natural style. The “least” choice is likely to be the most accurate of the two, but there is no way to check that, except to ask the profiler, who will generally report, sometimes erroneously, that the results are correct because that’s all they are aware of. Whether they are happy or effective in that role is another question altogether and it’s a question CORE asks.

When conditioned traits are what are seen and reported, the only thing any profile (without a self-checking system) can do is reflect the erroneous self-report. When this occurs, the conditioning gets reinforced rather than discovered and dealt with in the most effective and beneficial manner. *CORE has a self-checking system to catch erroneous reporting.*

Profile Type Two

This type of profile looks at how individuals function in the world rather than at how they view themselves or are viewed by others via their observable behaviors. This type of profiling is derived primarily from the work of Carl Jung and was popularized by Meyers and Briggs in the mid 1950's. The better known versions of this type of profile are the Meyers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI) and Keirsey. Some attribute the DISC model to Jung's work, though it actually fits the Hippocrates model more closely.

The Jung model looks at how people approach activity and interaction and at what they do with the information they take in. The means of approach was called "attitudes" by Jung and given the designations of "introvert" and "extrovert". Jung called the means for taking in and assimilating information "functions", which he separated into two scales, which make up four categories. He surmised that the thinking/feeling function set (or scale) was the first and primary means by which we gather information. He called this set the "rational" function set. The second set (or scale) described by Jung was the sensing/intuition set, which he called the "irrational" set. By "irrational", he meant that this function set was not used to reason or judge from a conscious perspective and therefore lacked conscious, logical motivation. The reasoning, judging, conscious motivation faculty comes through the thinking/feeling functions, according to Jung's theory. The sensing/intuition functions simply perceive, observe and collect data in a non-rational or non-judging way. The "irrational" functions are concerned with the *process* itself, as opposed to the *reason* for the process.

According to Jung, all four functions can express through either of the two attitudes. That is, thinking, feeling, sensing and intuition can be expressed in an introverted or an extroverted way. *(See your facilitator's manual for a detailed description of how each of the functions express from the introverted and extroverted attitudes.)*

Jung used the terms "judging" and "perceiving" to describe the two function sets. They were not intended as functions themselves, but as ways to discriminate between the "rational" and "irrational" function sets. However, when Meyers and Briggs began developing an instrument based on Jung's work, they used the judging/perceiving descriptors as though they were a part of the function set in order to determine the order in which the functions expressed without having to shift their order.

They used judging and perceiving to point to which function in a set series was dominant. However, the descriptors used to determine whether judging or perceiving was chosen by the profile taker actually describe the general attributes of the thinking and feeling types, both of which belong to the "judging" function set, according to Jung.

In the MBTI instrument the general attributes of thinking types are assigned to "judging" and the general attributes of the feeling types are assigned to "perceiving".

The stated intention was not to strengthen or diminish the thinking/feeling functions, but rather to order the functions. Yet, because the judging descriptors correlate with

thinking and the perceiving descriptors correlate with feeling, the result is that judging choices add strength to thinking and the perceiving choices add strength to feeling.

The MBTI descriptions of type bear this out, but their assigned order of dominance does not. The rules are flipped between introversion and extroversion in the MBTI, which reverses some of the assumptions of dominance. However, nothing in Carl Jung's original work indicates any reason for this. In that Jung stated that introversion and extroversion influence the functions equally, CORE does not change the rules based on introversion and extroversion (and neither *in practice* does the MBTI). (See pages 35 and 36 of your facilitator's manual for a more detailed explanation).

However, in making comparisons between CORE and MBTI, you will notice that half of the Meyers-Briggs function designations do not agree with CORE as to which function is dominant in a set. This disparity occurs because, while Meyers-Briggs in theory is using the "J" and "P" factors to point to whether the judging (T/F) or perceiving (S/I) function is dominant in a set, in fact the "J" and "P" functions strengthen or diminish only the judging (T/F) function set.

For example, with ENTJ, the "J" adds strength to Thinking so that combination would be an Extroverted, Thinking, Intuitive type. With ENTP, there is no added emphasis on "T" so the order remains as it is and reads as Extroverted, Intuitive Thinking. The reverse is true when Feeling is the preferred function. With ENFJ, the "J" adds no strength to the Feeling function, so the order remains the same and reads as Extroverted, Intuitive, Feeling. With ENFP, the "P" adds strength to the feeling function, making the order now read Extroverted, Feeling, Intuitive. This is not the way the J/P set was intended nor is it how their influence is explained by Meyers-Briggs. It is nonetheless how it plays out, which often causes a great deal of confusion.

It is generally assumed that judging places emphasis on the thinking/feeling function set, and perceiving places emphasis on the sensing/intuition set, and if it was laid out according to Carl Jung's intention and Meyers-Briggs' explanation, that would be true, but that is not the effect that was created when Meyers-Briggs developed the instrument.

Since Carl Jung's original work did not include the judging/perceiving set or describe them as functions, and since the shuffling of trait dominance using the J/P factor seems to cause considerable confusion, we opted not to use it in part two of the CORE profile. Instead, we use upper and lower case to designate introversion and extroversion, and order the functions *exactly* the way they are used by each type of person.

For example, the code for an Extroverted, Thinking, Sensor is TSif, which means that thinking is in the first or dominant position, sensing is in the secondary or auxiliary position, intuition is in the tertiary or backup position and feeling is in the last or dormant position. It also shows that thinking and sensing are extroverted (upper case) while intuition and feeling are introverted (lower case). This eliminates confusion and allows users to quickly correlate the preferred attitudes and functions with observable traits.

(Read more about how CORE compares to MBTI in the online report called *Comparing CORE Theory to MBTI Theory*)

In the above example, since thinking is in the dominant position, judging is the faculty that dominates. That would also be true where feeling falls into the first position. (FSit, for example) Where Sensing or Intuition fall into the dominant position, the perceiving faculty dominates (ITfs or sfTI, for example). When it is understood that thinking and feeling are expressed through the judging or “rational” function set or faculty, and sensing and intuition are expressed through the perceiving or “irrational” function set or faculty, it is not necessary to try to incorporate those faculties into the function sets, thereby increasing the complexity of reading and understanding the results.

Type Two in General

As with profile type one (part one of CORE MAP), most profiles based on Carl Jung’s work (profile type two and part two of CORE MAP) are very effective at what they are designed to do, which is to measure and describe the attitudes and functions which are *currently* being used.

As with type one profiles, what is not measured or taken into account on type two single dimensional profiles is whether the attitudes and functions being reported are natural ones or have been conditioned.

Years ago in America (and even now in many parts of the world) left-handed children were forced to switch to their right hand at the earliest possible moment. If the switch wasn’t made at home, it was forced upon the child in the first grade of school. It was believed that it was wrong (and in some cultures, evil) to use the left hand. As a result of the switch, children with very strong preferences for left-handedness often began to stutter, develop tics, eye twitches or other signs of stress, which often continued throughout life. I have not seen any studies as to how these children fared later in life, but based on the research we’ve done concerning other forced functional alterations, it is highly likely they were never as effective or “comfortable in their own skin” as they might have been if the forced alteration had not occurred.

All functions can be altered, either voluntarily or involuntarily and, unless there is a way to determine whether the currently used functions are natural or altered, the resultant report will have much the same outcomes for this type of profile as they do for the type one profile. The profiler will get an erroneous report that validates and strengthens the conditioned box, rather than leading the individual to greater understanding and awareness.

The right-handed adult, who was conditioned there and pushed away from his natural left-handedness, will fully believe, and will report, that he is right-handed. He may have lousy penmanship, a serious stutter, and a persistent eye twitch, and report (if asked) that he feels tense and out of sorts much of the time, but he will still see himself, and

report himself, as right-handed, and will have no idea that his poor penmanship, stutter, twitch and tension are related to his forced hand usage.

The MBTI is probably one of the best researched instruments in the world today. Millions of profiles that span more than seventy years have been studied and those participating in the research reported accuracy more than 80% of the time. Yet much of the data raises big questions both in light of what we have discovered through the CORE MAP instrument and in comparing MBTI's own data.

For example: MBTI research states that 70% of the U.S. population falls into the dominant sensor category, with only 30% in the intuitive. This is in direct conflict with the fact that those with sensation dominant from a natural (non-opposition) position (Organizer and Relater) are both introverts, which MBTI research shows as occupying only 25% to 27% (depending on the reports you read) of the population.

That means that if 73% to 75% of the population are extroverts, as reported in MBTI research, two-thirds of them have been conditioned toward sensing. When you factor for conditioning, and look at the fact that U.S. school systems are highly sensory based and prefer nice, quiet children, who follow the rules and always put "A" after "B" and "B" after "C", it's easy to see how all those little extroverts can become conditioned to fit the environment (like left-handed children used to be). The fact that U.S. Corporations also tend to favor the sensing function would explain why the conditioning persists.

Another telling bit of data is the thinking/feeling percentages. MBTI research shows that 75% of males profile as thinking types, while 75% of females profile as feeling types. We could throw the effects of estrogen and testosterone into that mix and agree with it, if it weren't for the fact that our research does not bear those percentages out. We find that the mix (when you get past the socialization that says women are *supposed* to be feeling types and men are *supposed* to be thinking types) is about 50/50, with *both* male and female leaning slightly toward thinking. There are as many feeling males as females, however, and as many thinking females as males.

Even more confusing is the data on perceiving types at 70% of the population versus judging types at 30%. To fully appreciate the confusion behind this data, compare the descriptors for judging and perceiving to the four functions and compare those that correlate. Then look at the data connected to the correlates.

Judging descriptors: resolved, decisive, fixed, controlled, closed, planned, structured, definite, scheduled, deliberate (30%)

Perceiving descriptors: pending, flexible, adaptive, open, fluid, tentative, spontaneous, relaxed, indefinite, open-ended (70%)

Thinking descriptors: objective, firm, decisive, logical, detached, analytical task-focused (75% males, 25% females)

Feeling descriptors: subjective, flexible, relational, humane, caring, empathetic, people-focused (75% females, 25% males)

Sensing descriptors: sequential, present-oriented, realistic, actual, factual, practical, specific, detailed (70%)

Intuitive descriptors: random, future-oriented, conceptual, theoretical, imaginative, ingenious, generalist (30%)

Using the descriptors, Judging correlates with Thinking most and with Sensing more than Intuition, yet MBTI research shows only 30% are Judging types, while the correlating Thinking types make up 50% of the population (since half the population is male and half female), and the Sensing types make up 70%. According to the Thinking/Feeling research, almost all Judgers would be male, but this correlate does not hold true with the data on Judging types.

Perceiving correlates with Feeling most and with Intuition more than Sensing, yet MBTI research shows 70% of the population as Perceiving types, while the correlating Feeling types make up only 50% of the population (again because half the population is male and half female) and the Intuitive types make up only 30%. According to the Thinking/Feeling research, almost all Perceivers would be female, but this correlate does not hold true with the data on Perceiving types.

The only explanation is that people are reporting their conditioning in the more highly conditioned areas more than they are in the less conditioned areas. Intuitives are reporting that they are sensors, for example, because the school systems told them they must be. Thinking women are reporting that they are feeling types because family or society told them they should be, and feeling men are reporting that they are thinking types for the same reasons.

Try not to get tripped up on the Judging/Perceiving set. It's the erroneous assumptions and applications attributed to these faculties that generally cause so much confusion within and between MBTI, Keirsey and others who argue the specifics of Jung's work. In truth, there are *no* judging or perceiving functions and *no* judging or perceiving types. Judging and perceiving define the faculties that are used in connecting with the world.

As for types, there are only Thinking Intuitives, Thinking Sensors, Feeling Intuitives, Feeling Sensors (these types use the judging faculty as their primary way of viewing the world), Intuitive Thinkers, Intuitive Feelers, Sensing Thinkers and Sensing Feelers (these types use the perceiving faculty as their primary way of viewing the world). There are introverts of each type and there are extroverts of each type. That's it, and that's all that is needed to describe and define all of the types.

The only other thing you need to remember about functions is that Sensing in the dominant position correlates with Introversion, and Intuition in the dominant position

correlates with Extroversion. People can and *do* function as Extroverted Sensors or Introverted Intuitives, but those that do rarely, if ever, report that they are happy and content with themselves.

Conclusion

While the better single dimensional profiles of both types do what they are designed to do, they cannot see or correct misreporting, nor do they try.

For the portion of the population that is self-aware enough to profile accurately, any of the profiles will produce a good result. However, far less than half the population is reporting accurately even when they try. Add to that, the fact that almost everyone who has ever taken a personality profile knows how to skew most profiles to get the result they want, and your chances of getting an accurate result is very slim on single dimensional profiles. *CORE MAP has eliminated that factor.*

No single dimensional profile has sufficient cross-checking features to check for erroneous reporting or purposeful skewing. CORE, being multi-dimensional, does.

No single dimensional profile can see whether or not the reported traits are developed and functioning well. CORE can. And research shows that development levels and reactionary styles (the package called emotional intelligence or EQ) is just as important to success in all areas as matching the right traits to the right career, relationship, etc. Both CORE MAP and CORE PEP measure EQ.

No single-dimensional, un-facilitated profile can be in-depth enough to go beyond here and now reporting (how the individual is behaving or functioning in the current environment at this particular time). Because Core Map is facilitated by highly trained facilitators who know how to discover and help develop the authentic person, CORE MAP can and does take individuals to their place of authenticity and their highest level of functioning in better than 96% of cases. This is a percentage previously unheard of in the profiling arena.

The goal of the CORE team is to make the CORE profiling system the assessment standard to strive for in the future. CORE MAP and CORE PEP represent a whole new dimension in profiling. With the aid of these powerful new instruments and the elite force trained to facilitate them, people will finally be able to move beyond negative conditioning and discover their authentic selves. From a place of authenticity they will be a lot freer, a lot happier, and a whole lot more effective.

*Nothing is so powerful as an insight into human nature . . .
what compulsions drive a man, what instincts dominate his actions.
If you know these things, you can touch man at the CORE of his being.
William Bernbach, 1911-1982*

As a Certified CORE Facilitator, you are among the elite in effecting changes that can profoundly and positively alter the course of the human condition. By altering the course of mankind, one person at a time, we can ultimately alter the course of history.

*Never doubt that a small group of
thoughtful, committed people can change the world;
indeed it is the only thing that ever has.*

Margaret Mead, anthropologist (1901-1978)