

CONFLICT PROFILES

(***USE WITH CAUTION***)

A Pre-Assessment Safety Audit for Profiling and Psychometric Tools

“Profiling tools can help you better understand someone’s default behaviors, or “personality,” but you still have to talk to the actual human being. Never let a four-letter acronym replace a face-to-face conversation.” — Nance L. Schick, Esq.

Personality and behavioral profiling tools—such as DISC, Myers-Briggs (MBTI), the Enneagram, or selection assessments like PXT Select—can offer instructive insights into communication preferences and hidden blind spots. However, when weaponized by an exhausted manager, these tools easily degenerate into instruments of categorization and structural discrimination.

Before you administer an assessment, share profile results, or use a behavioral type to diagnose an internal dispute, run your plan through this compliance and equity audit. Score your current organizational approach (1 for Yes, 0 for No).

Compliance and Structural Integrity

- ☐ **Validated Standards:** If you use psychometric assessments for hiring or promotion, do you utilize rigorous, job-fit tools like PXT Select that meet Department of Labor (DOL) and Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) standards?
 - ☐ **The Anti-Discrimination Floor.** Have you explicitly banned the use of profile types (e.g., DISC styles or Enneagram numbers) as a legal justification for adverse employment decisions like terminations, reassignments, or salary adjustments?
 - ☐ **Privacy Protection.** Are employee profile results treated as confidential data, shielded from public company channels where they can be used to mock, pigeonhole, or alienate staff members?
-

The Direct Engagement Standard

- ☐ **Meeting People Where They Are.** When an employee demonstrates a behavioral issue, do you approach them based on their actual real-time workplace actions, rather

than treating them based on where you *wish* they were?

- ☐ **Blind Spot Compassion.** When navigating an employee's professional blind spots, do you use the profile as a gentle bridge for mutual discovery rather than an intellectual hammer to prove you are right?
 - ☐ **Banishing the Label.** Do your managers completely avoid using profile labels as excuses for poor behavior (e.g., *That's just how an Introvert, INFJ, or High-D communicates*) and hold everyone to the same baseline standard of human dignity?
 - ☐ **The Direct Conversation Priority.** Is your primary resolution tool always a direct, face-to-face discussion with the people involved, treating the profile data merely as a supplementary reference sheet?
-

YOUR PROFILING RISK ANALYSIS

- **0–3 (High Risk / Discriminatory):** Your organization is using behavioral profiles as a lazy shortcut for actual relationship building. You are at high legal and cultural risk for creating a hostile environment based on perceived personality types. Stop using these tools immediately and focus on basic, direct communication.
- **4–5 (Instructive / Compliant):** You understand the boundaries of psychometric compliance and respect the legal floor. However, your team is still vulnerable to pigeonholing employees. Ensure your managers are trained to treat a profile as an opening question, never a final answer.
- **6–7 (Contextual / Safe Partnership):** You use profiling tools with excellent mindfulness and caution. You successfully meet your people where they are, honor individual human context over categorical abstractions, and preserve the absolute priority of direct, human-to-human conflict resolution.