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Abstract

The purpose of this qualitative descriptive study was to explore research-based evidence regarding how DISC personality traits influenced routine interactions (Lykourentzou et al., 2016) of communication and adapting to change within a law enforcement team of 37 members in southern North Carolina. The theoretical framework in the study included Marston’s (1928) Personality Trait Theory, including Dominance (D), Influencing (I), Steadiness (S), and Conscientious (C), or DISC personality traits. The two research questions included *How do DISC personality traits influence routine team communication*, and *How do DISC personality traits influence routine team adapting to change?* Thirty-seven sworn officers and civilian employees completed the DISC Personality System profile online. Data collection consisted of DISC individual and team aggregate results, a sample size of 6 in a focus group interview, and 13 open-ended semi-structured interviews. Results from the study indicated that DISC personality traits influenced personal and team routine communication and adapting to change in a law enforcement team. Findings included that (a) DISC personality trait composition of a team influenced routine communication and adapting to change, (b) DISC personality traits influenced awareness and adapting to change, and (c) team members desired departmental leadership to use DISC trait results for human resource assignments. Practical implications could assist law enforcement leaders and team members in using DISC personality traits in personal and team communication, change adaptation, and awareness.

*Keywords: Change, communication, IML DISC Insights Personality System Profile, law enforcement, personality, team, trait*
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Chapter 1: Introduction to the Study

Introduction

As organizations continue to expand globally and remain competitive in an ever-changing economic environment, a symbiotic relationship between teamwork and leadership must exist for optimal organizational effectiveness (Browne, Dreitlein, My, Manzoni, & Mere, 2016; Sohmen, 2013). Further, as business becomes technologically dependent and knowledge-intensive, the importance for researchers to study personality and the influence it has on leadership and team performance intensifies (Keogh, 2017; Sohmen, 2013). The optimization of team member personality traits, communication, and change are a few areas that require attention if interprofessional teamwork is to achieve full potential (Korner, Wirtz, Bengel, & Goritz, 2015; Lykourentzou, Antoniou, & Naudet, 2015; van den Tooren & Rutte, 2016). Jong, Song, and Song (2011) reported that there is a connection between leader personality and performance; therefore, establishing team norms through interpersonal processes assists in member and organizational success. In the 1920’s, Jung identified four types of personalities and in 1928, Marston outlined measures connecting consciousness and behavior in his book Emotions of Normal People. This book, recently reprinted in 2013 contains Marston’s (1928) personality trait theory based on four factors: Dominance (D), Influencing (I), Steadiness (S), and Compliance (C), currently labeled DISC.

Various instruments exist to measure personality, including Marston’s (1928) Dominance, Influencing, Steadiness, and Conscientious (DISC) Personality System. Personality is an instrumental behavioral variable and a consistent dynamic in people that
plays a role in team development (Angood, 2017; Belbin, 2010; Marston, 1928). James (2012) and Keogh (2017) indicated that use of the DISC traits assists teams in establishing a common language, as members understand others’ personality characteristics. Although numerous organizations use the DISC Personality System, few published studies incorporated this personality system (Puccio & Grivas, 2009). Whereas James (2012), Kerr (2009), and Kim and Yang (2016) suggested that use of the DISC Personality System assists individuals in building effective communication by understanding others’ traits and characteristics, the literature is sparse regarding the connection of DISC personality traits to leadership and team member routine communication and adapting to change (Lykourentzou, Antoniou, Naudet, & Dow, 2016; Puccio & Grivas, 2009). Uhl-Bien, Riggio, Lowe, and Carsten (2014) suggested that there is a need for more empirical investigation in the interactions of follower and leader traits.

Up to 2018, researchers have not used the DISC Personality System to connect DISC personality traits to team members conducting routine communication and adapting to change (Kerr, 2009; Lykourentzou et al., 2016; Sanglim & Sungeun, 2016). Lykourentzou et al. (2016) recommended further study as to (a) how DISC personality testing affects populations other than crowd sourcing, (b) how DISC personality traits influence team members performing routine tasks, and (c) examining personality with regard to the mode of interaction. Although empirical evidence links the DISC Personality System to balancing team member personalities within teams (Lykourentzou et al., 2016), it was not known how DISC personality traits influence team members’ routine communication and adapting to change. This presents a gap in the literature this
study addressed. In response to this gap, this study focused on law enforcement team members performing routine communication and adapting to change.

Understanding the influence of DISC personality traits in a law enforcement team conducting routine tasks had distinct merits. The purpose of this qualitative descriptive study was to explore research-based evidence regarding how DISC personality traits influenced routine interactions (Lykourentzou et al., 2016) of communication and adapting to change within a law enforcement team of 37 members in southern North Carolina. Using these findings, based on Marston’s (1928) DISC Personality Trait Theory increased understanding of how DISC personality traits influenced routine communication and adapting to change within teams (Lykourentzou et al., 2016) as evidenced through an examination of the phenomenon with law enforcement team members.

The remainder of Chapter 1 contains the background of the study, including the history and present state of the problem and identification of the gap in research. The next sections include the problem statement and the purpose of the study, as well as identification of how the completion of the study occurred. Following these sections, presentation of the overarching questions occurs, how scientific advancement of knowledge occurred through findings, and then discusses the significance of the study. The final sections of Chapter 1 include methodology rationale, study design, term definition, assumptions, limitations, and delimitations, concluding with a summary.

**Background of the Study**

Organizations rely on teamwork to improve productivity and empower stakeholders (Belbin, 2010; Pandey & Karve, 2017). According to Gilley, Morris, Waite,
Coates, and Veliquette (2010) when a team integrates and engages successfully, members display a more positive work culture, communicate effectually, and show a stronger commitment and better performance. Gilley et al. (2010) reported that when individual personalities clash, a person experiences inner conflict, tension, and struggle with team and personal growth. In most customary business environments, collaboration effectiveness depends on the compatibility of singular personalities (Belbin, 2010).

Personality includes how people handle conflict and stress, think, make conclusions, communicate (Marston, 1928), behave, and expect others to act (Angood, 2017; Keogh, 2017).

Traditionally, researchers focused on how individuals used cognitive processes to solve problems; however, team-based problem solving has begun to garner more focus by researchers (DuBois, Koch, Hanlon, Nyatuga, & Kerr, 2015; Hung, 2013). By assessing personality traits of individuals, effective team-based problem solving evolves through improved engagement, performance, and decision-making, thus enhancing organizational success (Fink, 2012; Sutalaksana, Anatasia, & Yassierli, 2016). Halfhill, Nielsen, and Sundstrom (2008) conducted 31 studies and reported that the group’s personality composition and individual traits can significantly affect teamwork and performance outcomes.

The hallmarks of using personality traits to enhance team interaction are imperative to organizational efficiency and effectiveness. Puccio and Grivas (2009) conducted a quantitative study with 137 students in a leadership program, measuring creativity and personality traits individually, however did not address leaders or teams. Sutalaksana et al. (2016) conducted a study using DISC personality traits and a
questionnaire to explore the relationship between behavior type and workers’ safety climate perceptions, however did not address routine interactions of change or communication. Sohmen (2013) researched an optimal balance between effective leadership and team performance, yet omitted personality trait incorporation in team members and leaders in a case study environment. Johnstone and Manica (2011) conducted a quantitative study where pairs and teams performed simulated games, experiencing joint decision-making and intrinsic or extrinsic leadership styles; however, there was no use of the DISC Personality System. Shih et al. (2009) conducted a quantitative study regarding Big 5 personality traits, leadership, and performance using a data correlation analysis. Shih et al. recommended a different performance measurement method to capture personality traits, performance, and leadership competence. Uhl-Bien et al. (2014) recommended a need for more empirical investigation into the interaction of leader and follower traits.

Outside of the opportunity to use a prevalent personality system in this study, identifying influential dispositions within team members and leaders were possible due to the distinctive DISC personality traits (Angood, 2017; James, 2012; Kerr, 2009). Although researchers conducted studies using various personality systems, findings concerning how the DISC personality traits directly influenced organizations conducting routine tasks (Lykourentzou et al., 2016), particularly law enforcement are rare. The DISC Personality System instrument contains measurement in numerous areas, specifically what each personality type seeks, likes/dislikes, strengths, and challenges, as well as how each type makes decisions, is motivated, evaluates and influences others, and contributes to the team (Davenport, 2018; PeopleKeys, 2008; Price, 2015). Therefore, the
study includes addition to the body of knowledge by identifying how DISC personality traits influenced law enforcement team members’ communication and adapting to change through findings in this qualitative descriptive study.

**Problem Statement**

It was not known how DISC personality traits influenced law enforcement team members’ routine interactions (Lykourentzou et al., 2016) of communication and adapting to change in a law enforcement team of 37 in southern North Carolina. Although empirical evidence links the DISC Personality System to balancing team member personalities within teams and in crowdsourcing, discovery allowed leadership a greater insight as to how DISC personality traits influenced law enforcement team members’ communication and adapting to change through learning the workstyle of each team member. Consequences from restructuring and global expansion to remain profitable in a competitive economy have organizations turning to working teams to use employee talents (Browne et al., 2016; Johnson & Johnson, 2013). Teams facilitate employee participation and have the capability to assemble, strategize, set goals, produce, and disband quickly (Johnson & Johnson, 2013). Leaders assign human resources to a team based on availability and technical skills, versus using personality traits for team formation, resulting in teams that break down and fall apart (Jeong, Bozkurt, & Sunkara, 2012).

Although numerous organizations use the DISC personality system, few published studies used this personality system (Lykourentzou et al., 2016; Puccio & Grivas, 2009). More empirical study recommendations from Uhl-Bien et al. (2014) and Lykourentzou et al. (2016) exist regarding team member interaction and completion of
routine tasks. Fewer studies and researchers have connected DISC personality traits to the leaders and individual team members regarding communication and adapting to change (Kerr, 2009). For example, Shih et al. (2009) used the Big 5 personality traits, leadership, and performance, and recommended a different performance assessment to capture personality traits and leadership style. Additionally, Sohmen (2013) researched the relationship between effective leadership and team performance yet did not address personality traits of team members and leaders. Exploring how DISC personality traits influenced routine team member interaction was vital to this study because findings contained further evidence of how personality traits influenced organizational awareness and effectiveness. People have preset expectations and stereotypes when interacting with family, peers, and team members (Angood, 2017). When communicating with others, it is imperative to know how to deliver a message, as well as how the person receiving it may react and respond (Angood, 2017; Keogh, 2017).

**Purpose of the Study**

The purpose of this qualitative descriptive study was to explore research-based evidence regarding how DISC personality traits influenced routine interactions (Lykourentzou et al., 2016) of communication and adapting to change within a law enforcement team of 37 members in southern North Carolina. Sanglim and Sungeun (2016) reported that the DISC theory is an effective behavioral model used by many organizations. Lykourentzou et al. (2016) recommended future researchers use the DISC Personality System to identify how DISC traits influence organizational team member conducting routine interactions. Kerr (2009) posited that few researchers connected DISC traits to communication and adaptation to change, while Uhl-Bien et al. (2014)
recommended a need for greater investigation into the collaboration of leader and follower interactions. The phenomenon under examination was the influence of DISC traits with routine communication and adapting to change in the team environment (Lykourentzou et al., 2016; PeopleKeys, 2017; Sanglim & Sungeun, 2016).

The connection between the influence of DISC personality traits on law enforcement team members and how use of these traits during routine interactions created effective and competitive organizations, contained the definition of the over-arching research problem (Robinson, Hogg, & Higgins, 2014). This research included the investigation of how a team functioned by exploring the role played by team member personality, as well as potential changes in personalities of group members after DISC profile assessment regarding routine communication and change. The findings of this qualitative descriptive study helped determine how DISC personality traits influenced team members’ communication and adapting to change in any type of organization using a team structure (Jeong et al., 2012).

Research Questions

Personality is a consistent behavioral variable within individuals that includes imperative dynamics in leader and team member development. Prior research included a need to understand personality traits in connection with team members conducting routine interactions (Lykourentzou et al., 2016; Shih et al., 2009; Uhl-Bien et al., 2014). It was not known how DISC personality traits influenced law enforcement team members’ routine interactions (Lykourentzou et al., 2016) of communication and adapting to change. This study’s focus was to understand the influence of DISC traits of
Dominance Influence, Steadiness, and Compliance regarding routine communication and adapting to change within an existing law enforcement team.

The DISC Personality System instrument contains measurement in numerous areas: what each personality type seeks, likes/dislikes, strengths, and challenges, as well as how each type makes decisions, is motivated, evaluates and influences others, and contributes to the team (PeopleKeys, 2017; Price, 2015). The research questions emerged from Marston’s (1928) Personality Trait Theory, recommendations from Lykourentzou et al. (2016) to study an organizational team conducting routine tasks, the DISC Personality Trait profile questions and results, Wheelan’s (2013) team member effectiveness attributes, and Smith and Hoy’s (as cited in Kearney & Smith, 2008) openness to change traits. The following two research questions contain valuable information into the exploration of how DISC personality traits influenced law enforcement team members’ routine communication and adapting to change. Along with empirical research information, a panel of DISC certified experts (Appendix D) assisted in vetting the open-ended semi-structured questions (Appendix E) and focus group interview questions (Appendix F) to ensure the gathering of appropriate and applicable data, known as expert validation. Results include the phenomenon under examination of the influence of DISC traits with routine communication and adapting to change in the team environment (Lykourentzou et al., 2016; PeopleKeys, 2017; Sanglim & Sungeun, 2016).

RQ1: How do DISC personality traits influence routine team communication?

RQ2: How do DISC personality traits influence routine team adapting to change?

The descriptive study data collection came from three sources: individual and team results from the DISC Personality System profile, a focus group of 6 interview, and
13 team members’ open-ended semi-structured interviews. The answering occurred of RQ1 and RQ2 through the review of principal data sources: team member open-ended semi-structured interviews using an interview guide (Appendix E), DISC Personality System profile (Appendix G), and a focus group interview using focus group guide questions (Appendix F) data and scores.

**Advancing Scientific Knowledge**

A plethora of personality systems exist from which to choose. Numerous articles researched contained studies using personality systems other than the DISC, such as the Big 5, Meyers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI), and Cattell’s 16PF (Colbert, Barrick, & Bradley, 2014; Fang & Zhang, 2014; Thomas, 2014; Zhang, Liu, Ren, Liu, & Zhang, 2013). Few peer-reviewed and published studies found used the DISC Personality System instrument, and none measured the influence of DISC traits with law enforcement team members regarding effective communication and adaptation to change (Freeman, 2011; Lykourentzou et al., 2016; Puccio & Grivas, 2009). Lykourentzou et al. (2016) recommended further study as to (a) how DISC personality testing affects populations other than crowd sourcing, (b) how DISC personality traits influence team members performing routine tasks, and (c) examining personality with regard to the mode of interaction.

Although empirical evidence links the DISC Personality System to balancing team member personalities within teams, it was not known how DISC personality traits influenced law enforcement team members’ routine interactions (Lykourentzou et al., 2016) of communication and adapting to change. This presented a gap in the literature this study addressed. Therefore, the modeling of this qualitative descriptive study
transpired from previous research conducted that focused on identification of team
member personality, as well as team performance. However, this study included use of
the recommended DISC Personality System with a law enforcement team, while
grounding the study on Marston’s (1928) DISC Personality Trait Theory. As
recommended, the study contained extension of past research regarding personality and
team member interaction by observing for a gap identified by Lykourentzou et al. (2016),
who suggested further study of team members conducting routine communication and
adapting to change. A descriptive study answered two research questions expanding
knowledge of how a law enforcement team used DISC personality trait knowledge to
improve routine communication and adapt more easily to present and upcoming change.

The theoretical framework for this study was Marston’s (1928) DISC Personality
Trait Theory, deducing that a person’s sense of power and will greatly affects human
behavior and personality. Dulieu, Westgarth, and Westgarth (2013) summarized
Marston’s concepts in that people are different due to traits that are used to “assess a
person’s personality and predicted behavior within a selected environment” (p. 52).
Marston originally created the model in the early 1900s. However, the DISC model
evolved and expanded throughout the years as researchers made significant findings and
technology advanced, evolving a paper profile assessment to online for ease of
administration (Sugerman, Scullard, & Wilhelm, 2011). Advancement of Marston’s
DISC Personality Trait Theory occurred as discovery of team member traits and
behaviors allowed organizational leaders a greater insight as to how each team member
worked, was motivated, reacted to change, and best communicated (Dulieu et al., 2013).
This study includes additional knowledge regarding how the use and application of DISC personality traits resulted in effective team communication, performance, and adapting to change. Some published research existed regarding application of DISC personality traits to purposefully form new teams, as well as regarding creativity, but no research on an existing law enforcement team focusing on routine communication and change (Freeman, 2011; Lykourentzou et al., 2016; Puccio & Grivas, 2009). Previous studies conducted by Jeong et al. (2012), Sutalaksana et al. (2016), and Sohmen (2013) have not specifically connected DISC personality traits with law enforcement team members, and team interactions of communication and adaptation to change. Understanding how application of DISC traits within a law enforcement agency team influenced team members conducting routine communication and adapting to change assisted other researchers and organizational leaders in creating greater team cohesion, awareness, and understanding.

**Significance of the Study**

Of the current DISC studies found, none included results from a qualitative descriptive study conducted within a law enforcement agency. Pradhan, Gay, and Nepal (2015) conducted a study regarding dental care recommendations and used the DISC Personality System to identify patient personality type. Hui, Ting, See, and Chan (2015) studied a quantitative random sampling group, focusing on the relationship among personality, emotion, and pitch. The researcher conducted research based on prior studies that examined the use of the DISC Personality System and grounded in Marston’s (1928) DISC Trait Theory. The researcher extended past research by identifying the influence of DISC traits on an existing law enforcement team, specifically focusing on routine
communication and adapting to change as recommended from a gap in literature by Lykourentzou et al. (2016). In addition, Lykourentzou et al. (2016) found that teams consisting of balanced active and passive personalities performed more effectively, so the researcher has balanced the personalities in the focus group interview for potentially richer data collection.

In this study, the researcher advanced scientific knowledge by applying practical procedures organizational leaders may apply to teams. By using the DISC personality traits, stakeholders may ensure the placement of team members in such a way that performance improves when working in the correct team role (Belbin, 2010; Robinson et al., 2014). The results included the phenomenon of assisting law enforcement team members in establishing how DISC personality traits influenced routine communication and adapting to change. Additional results allowed participants to understand self first and then understand others for greater team and organizational effectiveness. By answering the two research questions, new findings added depth to existing scholarly literature regarding DISC personality traits, team roles, and team interaction, as few studies have connected team members, effective communication, and adapting to change with the DISC traits (Shih et al., 2009). As leadership and communication improved within a team, less conflict and greater productivity resulted (Lykoureftzou et al., 2015). Finally, each team member possesses unique characteristics (values) and personalities (needs) that combine to influence positive team dynamics in any church, school, or organization where leaders and teams exist (Voges & Braund, 1995).

Investigation occurred as to how a team functioned by using Marston’s (1928) DISC Trait Theory and explored the influence of DISC traits within an existing law
enforcement agency in southern North Carolina. Marston’s (1928) Trait Theory has evolved since original conception in the 1920’s. In 1940, Clark developed the first DISC System profile from Marston’s (1928) original theory, which has undergone further development, resulting in the profile system used today (PeopleKeys, 2017). Grier later adapted the DISC instrument into an online version for greater ease of administration and completion (Price, 2015). Research results contain specific knowledge of the role played by team member personality, as well as potential changes in interactions of group members before and after DISC Personality Profile Systems.

**Rationale for Methodology**

Using a qualitative approach to explore how DISC personality traits influence law enforcement team members’ communication and adapting to change was the best methodology for several reasons. When researching the qualitative and quantitative methodologies, the differences became apparent. Pettigrew (2013) posited that the qualitative researcher is personally involved with customizable and flexible data collection, while grounded in context and process versus outcomes. Further, the qualitative researcher is an integral interpreter of participants’ lived experiences throughout the study (Pettigrew, 2013). In quantitative research, the focus is primarily calibration, prevalence, and generalizability, whereas in qualitative the focus is on narration, description, explanation, and interpretation (Pettigrew, 2013). Senaratne and Gunawardane (2015) used a qualitative methodology to study leadership, team role, and team dynamics. Robinson et al. (2014) observed a group of seven cross cultural students and two tutors in a qualitative study to determine if culturally diverse people could learn different organizational communication strategies.
Utilization of a qualitative methodology occurred versus a quantitative approach because subjective interviews and life experiences captured this data from one existing team more appropriately than mathematical and statistical techniques. Due to the study of a small participant sampling of one law enforcement agency of approximately 37 team members, qualitative was the best methodology (Jeong et al., 2012). In addition, because understanding self and others is one of the greatest challenges facing organizations in the building of high-performing teams, conducting a focus group interview for application of DISC traits was possible (Dulieu et al., 2013). In qualitative studies, the researcher conducts interviews and collects more interpretative data to see perspectives, lived experiences, and perceptions of a team after using DISC. Merriam and Tisdell (2016) purported that the interest of researchers in qualitative methodology lies in uncovering how participants construct, interpret, and apply meaning to experiences. In this qualitative descriptive study, participants share personal examples providing narratives for the data set through the focus group interview and the open-ended semi-structured interviews (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016).

In this qualitative study, the researcher acted as an instrument, interacting with the participants in their natural environment, evidenced by open-ended semi-structured interviews (Appendix E), focus group interview (Appendix F), administering the DISC Personality System profile (Appendix G), and collecting demographics listed in Appendix H (Singh, 2015). Through the qualitative approach, the addressing of RQ1 and RQ2 occurred by focusing on how DISC traits influenced law enforcement team members conducting routine communication and adapting to change, versus using objective computational, statistical, or mathematical techniques. Thus, a qualitative
methodology supported all the research questions and phenomenon of the influence of DISC traits with routine communication and adapting to change in the team environment.

**Nature of the Research Design for the Study**

The research design for this study was a qualitative descriptive study design, to explore how DISC personality traits influenced law enforcement team members’ communication and adapting to change within an existing team of 37 in southern North Carolina. Maxwell (2013) recommended a descriptive study design when the researcher selects a target population, poses the questions, and justifies the phenomenon with existing theory and study goals. Yin (2014) suggested a descriptive study when the researcher has no control over the study outcome, involves asking questions of why or how, and lasts for a specific duration. Some researchers refuse to use a descriptive study approach because the process may take longer or use of a systematic approach for transferable or specific information did not occur thus resulting in biased findings (Yin, 2014). When conducting a qualitative descriptive study the goal is to simplify, transfer and enlarge theories instead of generalizing statistically (Yin, 2014), which is the emphasis of this research study.

Qualitative descriptive study use is favored for numerous reasons. In a descriptive study the researcher collects, explains, describes, and holistically interprets data (Rossman & Rallis, 2017; Yin, 2014). Rossman and Rallis (2017) suggested a descriptive study design when the borders concerning the setting and phenomenon are unclear. Human participants in a natural setting are one area of focus in a descriptive study design (Colorafi & Evans, 2016). Maxwell (2013) suggested that use of a random sampling approach occur when the researcher asks a question of a broad group and selects a small
number of participants to answer. Because this research included approximately 37 participants, a qualitative descriptive study approach with purposeful sampling was best to study a southern North Carolina law enforcement agency in a specific context.

After reviewing other approaches, phenomenology, narrative, grounded theory, ethnography, or historical would not capture this subjective description of leader and member life experiences, as does a qualitative descriptive study design (Colorafi & Evans, 2016; Maxwell, 2013). Phenomenology contains structured experiences and the appearance of things as interpreted and experienced by participant first-person views of a specific phenomenon (Lenberg, Feldt, Tengberg, Tidefors, & Graziotin, 2017). Narrative design consists of a dualistic nature of discourse and story, involving numerous events, location, and time (Lenberg et al., 2017). In the grounded theory approach, the researcher develops a self-defined purpose regarding phenomena of interest and grounds the theory in observation (Marshall, Cardon, Poddar, & Fontenot, 2013). This study contains one law enforcement team in southern North Carolina, so an ethnographic approach did not fit the criteria, as did a qualitative descriptive study. The purpose of a historical design is to analyze archived data and past events to assist with understanding of present happenings. This study included the interviewing of current team members and administering of the DISC Personality System to explore current conditions. Because exploration transpired of how DISC personality traits influenced law enforcement team members in a natural work setting over a four-week timeframe, a qualitative descriptive study was better suited to answering the research questions rather than a story narrative or the phenomena of how things appear in a first-person experience (Maxwell, 2013).
Organizations with teams may benefit from this study by learning and applying results of how DISC traits influenced team members conducting routine communication and adapting to change. Murphy, Miller, and Wrosch (2013) determined that growing evidence supports personality as an imperative determinant of life outcomes, as well as increases team performance. In contrast, other researchers focused on creativity styles and DISC traits (Puccio & Grivas, 2009), balancing for DISC personality types in crowd teams (Lykourentzou et al., 2016), and finding a relationship between emotion and DISC personality (Hui et al., 2015).

Use of three sources to collect data for this qualitative descriptive study occurred: 13 semi-structured open-ended interviews (Appendix E), a focus group interview (Appendix F) of 6, and the DISC personality profile (Appendix G). The goal was to learn if routine team interactions of communication and adapting to change during the workday, at team meetings, or with the community included DISC traits or specific roles. The study results contained new knowledge of how team members worked more proactively and effectively through this research. Research took place over a period of four weeks and the researcher had no control over the outcomes.

The target population for this qualitative descriptive study was approximately 37 team members in a law enforcement agency in southern North Carolina, while attainment occurred of a sample of 13 open-ended semi-structured interviews and a focus group interview of 6. A meeting transpired with the Chief of Police and leadership team of the southern North Carolina agency to procure organizational permission to conduct the research (Appendix A), share the study details, and discuss the potential participation of sworn and civil employees that may participate. Upon approval of the Grand Canyon
University Internal Review Board (Appendix B), contact of participants ensued to be a part of the study at a team meeting where each participant received a letter outlining the study specifics and participation requirements, then gained permission for participation (Appendix C).

The study included use of Marston’s Personality Trait Theory, the IML DISC Insights Personality System measurements (Appendix M), an expert panel of certified DISC facilitators, and recommendations from Lykourentzou et al. (2016) to determine the research questions, the open-ended semi-structured Interview Guide (Appendix E) and Focus Group Guide (Appendix F). Predicted results of research questions RQ1 and RQ2 included using strengths while applying team member results from completion of the DISC Personality System. A two hour debrief of the DISC Personality System aggregate results by this certified researcher also addressed RQ1 and RQ2 by enabling a common DISC language from which to effectively communicate (Lykourentzou et al., 2016). Each team member learned other members’ primary personality style(s) during a debrief of aggregate results session as agreed in the Informed Consent in Appendix C. As team members applied DISC traits and openly conversed how each person reacts to change during the focus group interview, the team members prepared more easily for change initiatives (O’Rourke, Higuchi, & Hogg, 2016; Sugerman et al., 2011) as discussed in RQ2. A qualitative descriptive study design allowed the facilitation of a focus group interview, open-ended semi-structured interviews, take notes, and ask questions in the exploration of (a) how DISC Personality System administration affected a law enforcement team, (b) how DISC traits influenced routine team communication, and (c) how DISC traits influenced adapting to change.
Use of a qualitative descriptive study approach resulted in success for assessing member traits, communicating effectively with team members, and identifying how best to conduct change initiatives. Seefeldt et al. (2017) conducted a qualitative descriptive study with nurses regarding behaviors that sustain a satisfying and efficient work environment and used two focus groups and individual interviews to collect data. Rod, Westby-Moen, and Struksnes (2017) conducted a qualitative inductive descriptive study researching collaboration among health professionals regarding the importance of teamwork and decision-making. Observing participants in their natural setting versus removing subjects to a different environment is an important ingredient in this qualitative descriptive study (Rossman & Rallis, 2017). By conducting a focus group interview, administering the DISC Personality profile for results, and conducting open-ended semi-structured interviews with participants, the qualitative descriptive study design best supported the research questions (Maxwell, 2013; Yin, 2014) exploring the influence that DISC personality traits have on law enforcement team members conducting routine communication and adapting to change within an existing team of 37 in southern North Carolina.

**Definition of Terms**

This section contains terms and definitions operationally used throughout this study. Providing definitions ensures terminology consistency and reader comprehension for the phenomenon of how DISC personality traits influence team members’ communication and adaptation to change:

*Active/leader type style.* The active style person is optimistic, energetic, and fast-paced (Puccio & Grivas, 2009; Rohm, 1996). Outward appearance may be more
important than inward qualities and the active style likes to lead and win in competitions (Rohm, 1996).

**Compliant dimension (C).** Compliance includes how a person systematically organizes procedures, activities, and responsibilities (Dulieu et al., 2013). The C style person is often a perfectionist, desires time to think through a situation before giving an answer, desires and gives in-depth details, and has high expectations of self and others (James, 2012; Kim & Yang, 2016; Puccio & Grivas, 2009; Rosenberg & Silvert, 2013).

**DISC personality system instrument.** PeopleKeys (2008) DISC instrument, comprised of 24 sets of word phrases, four descriptors in each section, includes a person’s selection of the phrase that is ‘most like them’ and ‘least like them’ (Dulieu et al., 2013). Answers contain information generating scores in the four DISC dimensions: Dominance, Influence, Steadiness, and Conscientiousness (Puccio & Grivas, 2009). Three graphs contain resulting information regarding the individual’s personality style: Public Self-The Mask, Private Self-The Core, and Perceived Self-The Mirror (Dulieu et al., 2013). Depending on how many traits appear above the midline, a person may have style combinations or blends, playing a strong role in how a person reacts and interprets situations and other people (Rosenberg & Silvert, 2013).

**Dominance dimension (D).** Dominance includes how a person asserts oneself, deals with problems, and controls situations (Dulieu et al., 2013). Dominant trait people exhibit competitive, results-driven behavior and are quick to make a decision, with a focus on the long-term strategic goal in mind (James, 2012). With an active and task-oriented style, D people are open to change, innovative and direct communicators who
fear failure, being taken advantage of, and frequently display little regard to the feelings of others (Freeman, 2011; James, 2012; Kim & Yang, 2016; Slowikowski, 2005)

**Fear.** For this study, a fear is synonymous with a characteristic that demotivates the four personality styles of DISC (PeopleKeys, 2017). The D style fears being taken advantage of, being micro-managed, and failure; the I style is demotivated by rejection, tight deadlines, and social exclusion; the S style fears loss of security, a harried pace, conflict, and rapid change; the C style fears criticism and having to make quick decisions versus time to analyze (James, 2012; Puccio & Grivas, 2009).

**Focus group.** A selected and defined group of individuals brought together to discuss a predetermined topic from a personal perspective in a safe, non-threatening environment (Kellmereit, 2015).

**Influencing dimension (I).** The Influencing dimension includes how a person works, relates, and communicates with people (Dulieu et al., 2013). James (2012) summarized the influencing individual as creative innovators and orators, who enjoy discussing almost anything with anyone, distract easily, over promise deliverables, and flourish when praised.

**Organizational leadership.** Leadership includes follower objectives, activities, interpretation of events, collaborative relationships, working as a team, and gaining external support (Yuki, 1994). Sohmen (2013) described organizational leadership as a combination of behaviors and abilities enabling a leader to influence people in a group.

**Passive/non-leader type style.** The Passive classification includes the C and S personality types, who are product-oriented and lend support to maintenance and stability (Rohm, 1996; Slowikowski, 2005; Voges & Braund, 1995). S and C people view the
environment as more powerful than themselves, so adapt slowly, passively, and follow
the guidelines (Puccio & Grivas, 2009). Passive personality types are cautious, good
organizers, and typically avoid confrontation Slowikowski, 2005).

**People oriented.** Marston (1928) realized that people respond to the environment
differently. Influence and Steadiness individuals view the environment as favorable and
usually place people and conversation ahead of task completion (Puccio & Grivas, 2009).

**Personality.** Enduring and organized mechanisms and traits within a person that
influence adaptation and interaction with the environment (Larson & Buss, 2006).

**Personality combination/blend.** When a person scores two or more personality
dimensions above the midline on graph three of the DISC Personality Profile, the result is
a behavior combination or blend of personality styles (PeopleKeys, 2017). With the
dominant behavior listed first and the secondary trait listed next, popular blends may
include D/I, I/D, I/S, S/C, and C/S (Slowikowski, 2005). Depending on how many traits
appear above the midline, a person may have style combinations or blends, playing a
strong role in how a person reacts and interprets situations and other people (Rosenberg
& Silvert, 2013).

**Project team.** A group of personnel and professionals who work together to fulfill
the necessary roles and functions to complete the project (Senaratne & Gunawardane,
2015).

**Routine task.** Activities considered essential to an organization that are
performance-based and performed by an employee or representative (Myers et al., 2015).

**Stable dimension (S).** The stable dimension includes a person’s temperament and
amount of persistence, patience, and thoughtfulness (Dulieu et al., 2013). Stable
personalities prefer to work on one task until completion, are good team players and listeners, seek reassurance and security, and may put others’ needs first (James, 2012; Kim & Yang, 2016). The S dimension is characterized by the passive and people orientations.

**Task oriented.** The Dominance and Compliant styles view the environment as unfavorable, resulting in the selection of completing tasks above communicating or dealing with people (Marston, 1928; Puccio & Grivas, 2009).

**Team.** West and Lyubovnikova (2012) identified a team as a group of individuals who work together in a specific organization and labeled as a team. Further, this team works collaboratively to identify, commit to, and agree on objectives while communicating regularly (West & Lyubovnikova, 2012). Lastly, team members are certain about their individual roles and possess the autonomy to fulfill team tasks.

**Team interaction.** For this study, the focus centered on how the team members develop effective communication strategies and a common language, as well as understand how team members adapt to change by using the DISC personality traits (James, 2012; Puccio & Grivas, 2009).

**Team role.** How people contribute, behave, and interact with each other in specific ways (Belbin, 2010).

**Traits.** Characteristics that describe ways in which people differ from one another (Larson & Buss, 2006).

**Assumptions, Limitations, and Delimitations**

Assumptions, limitations, and delimitations occur when researchers conduct studies. According to Ellis and Levy (2010), an assumption exists when the researcher
assumes or ascertains a perceived truth during a study. Limitations include factors over which the researcher has no control, and delimitations contain areas in which the researcher controls (Ellis & Levy, 2010). Throughout this study, efforts included the gathering of true and valid theoretical, methodological, and topic-specific information.

Assumptions. This study had assumptions affected by methodology, research, and results. An assumption is a self-evident truth and the following assumptions occurred (Ellis & Levy, 2010):

1. It was assumed that DISC instrument participants did not use deception and honestly answered to the best of their ability. The participants completed the DISC online in a private environment, allowing adequate time allotment and private personal item selection. Study confidentiality and a reminder with participants occurred that withdrawal without penalty at any time was possible.

2. A symbiotic relationship between teamwork and leadership must exist for optimal organizational effectiveness (Sohmen, 2013). It was assumed that leadership and team members interacted daily to complete routine tasks within the law enforcement agency team in southern North Carolina. The agency leadership and employees reinforced this assumption through shift change briefings and during the DISC debrief.

3. It was assumed that the 37 team members who participated in the organization sampling reflected a demographic common to southern North Carolina. It was assumed because of the 37 team members; the target of 19 participants ranged in age from 18-60 years and possessed experience of 1-21+ years, which had a common demographic for most southern North Carolina law enforcement agencies in the area.

4. It was assumed that the selected team members had not used Marston’s DISC Personality System as a team at this law enforcement agency within the past five years. The law enforcement agency leadership ensured this team had not used the DISC within the past five years.

Limitations. Limitations are effects that the researcher had no control over, such as bias (Ellis & Levy, 2010). The following limitations were present in this study:

1. One limitation of this study included the scheduling of interviews for team members. Due to numerous team members working out in the field or on four different shifts, interviews needed rescheduled several times and specifically scheduled during on-shift time and at the department location. Holding interviews
at the station created a sense of security for the participants because most were in uniform and police car parking was easy. Also, conducting interviews in a private office throughout all shift hours afforded privacy, confidentiality, and accessibility.

2. Some participants were comfortable with answering open-ended semi-structured interview and focus group interview questions, while others were not as forthcoming with answers. Thus, use of probing questions, and initial goal setting ensured quality answers from interviewees. Further defined interview questions occurred for more forthcoming answers from participants (Appendix E) and interviewed 13 participants versus the initially planned 10.

3. Due to law enforcement agency leader participation, some team members might have felt obligated to participate in the study. The Chief and other leaders assured the researcher and team members that no retaliation or negative evaluation consequences would occur if agency employees did not wish to participate in the study. Some law enforcement members were on leave or vacation and did not participate in the study. Also, interviews took place with no leadership present, so participants felt free to express openly and honestly.

4. Some questions in the open-ended semi-structured Interview Guide (Appendix E) and the Focus Group Interview Guide (Appendix F) contained yes/no close-ended and double-barreled questions. The focus group interview questions included recommendations for qualitative interviewing by Krueger and Casey (2015) to use opening, introduction, transition, key, and closing questions/statements to put participants at ease or to probe further when there was a poverty of expression.

**Delimitations.** Delimitations were situations over which the researcher had control, such as location of the study (Ellis & Levy, 2010). The following were delimitations for this study:

1. The sampling technique for this qualitative descriptive study was purposive selection to balance the focus group of 6 and 13 open-ended semi-structured interviews with different DISC personality traits and ensured a representative discussion and outcomes (Lykourentzou et al., 2016).

2. Member checking consisted of each participant reviewing the transcribed interview transcript for accuracy. The researcher purposely did not return the codes and themes for the participants to peruse due to law enforcement busy work schedules and the belief that participants would not desire to know how the researcher coded or placed into themes transcribed responses for this scholarly study.

The instrumentation used for this study consisted of the online DISC Personality System profile (Appendix G), open-ended semi-structured interviews (Appendix E), and a focus
group interview (Appendix F) over a four-week period to ask questions and observe for application of Marston’s DISC Theory.

**Summary and Organization of the Remainder of the Study**

In summary, few published studies used Marston’s (1928) Personality Trait Theory and among those published, there is scarce information connecting the DISC personality traits and their influence on law enforcement team members conducting routine (Lykourentzou et al., 2016) communication and change adaptation. Therefore, the purpose of this qualitative descriptive study was to explore research-based evidence regarding how DISC personality traits influenced routine interactions (Lykourentzou et al., 2016) of communication and adapting to change within a law enforcement team of 37 members in southern North Carolina.

Research questions emerged from Marston’s (1928) DISC Personality Trait Theory and Lykourentzou et al.’s (2016) recommendation to study an organization conducting routine tasks. Secondly expert validation from a panel of expert DISC facilitators reviewed the questions, gave input, and field tests (Bernard, Wutich, & Ryan, 2018) conducted to garner best data collection. Thirdly, the DISC Personality System instrument measures supported application of DISC personality traits within existing law enforcement team members, specifically regarding routine communication and adapting to change.

As organizations expand internationally, a positive relationship must exist for success and profitability. Jong et al. (2011) recommended that a leader’s personality is important for high team performance. Therefore, Sohmen (2013) suggested further study regarding personality and its influence on team member performance. Personality surveys
are not a new concept for organizations to use when forming work teams. Marston’s (1928) DISC Personality System is a popular profile assessment that is easy to administer and complete, while containing measurement scores as to how a person responds to the environment and interacts with others. By using the DISC behavioral instrument, leaders gained insight regarding how best to work with each personality type to achieve team compatibility and performance (Keogh, 2017; Slowikowski, 2005).

This study included five chapters. Chapter 1 contains an introduction of the problem and background information on the influence the DISC personality traits have on an existing team, needed to maintain or improve an effective organization. Also included in Chapter 1 are the problem, significance, and purpose of the qualitative descriptive study, specific research questions, assumptions, limitations, and delimitations, and concludes with a definition of terms and summary. Chapter 2 contains the theoretical framework and the literature review that form a foundation for the study. In Chapter 3, discussion of the research methodology occurred for this qualitative descriptive study, along with research design, data procedures, ethical considerations, and limitations. Next, Chapter 4 contains the synthesized information collected from participants and the compilation of results and findings. Finally, Chapter 5 contains findings, conclusions, recommended general applicability to organizations based on findings, and noted opportunities for potential future research.

In Chapter 2 discussion occurred regarding Marston’s (1928) Personality Trait Theory along with other behavioral assessments, and how the DISC traits influences teams. The literature review contains in-depth descriptions of the dominant, influencing, steady, and compliant traits, as well as trait blends, task/people orientations, and
passive/active types. Next, the discussion continues with a literature review on team composition, communication, and adapting to change. The chapter concludes with a review of methodology and instrumentation.
Chapter 2: Literature Review

Introduction to the Chapter and Background to the Problem

The purpose of this qualitative descriptive study was to explore research-based evidence regarding how DISC personality traits influenced routine interactions (Lykourentzou et al., 2016) of communication and adapting to change within a law enforcement team of 37 members in southern North Carolina. Murphy et al. (2013) determined that growing evidence includes support that personality is an imperative determinant of life outcomes. Slowikowski (2005) suggested that if a leader creates a desire to excel within team members, then the entire team experiences success. Organizations continue to design work around the high performing and semi-autonomous team concept, evidenced by the development of leaders and work teams (Morgeson, Reider, & Campion, 2005).

Prior to 2018, researchers conducted extensive studies on personality and its influence on individuals and organizations, although few studies focused on the DISC Personality System and traits in teams. Halfhill et al. (2008) explained that while work team research continues to evolve, there remains a need for more research between group member personality and team effectiveness. Rosenberg and Silvert (2013) outlined how personality style theory existed over many millennia; Hippocrates discussed four styles and Aristotle described four elements. As variations of the four traits continued to emerge over the centuries, modern versions include Jung’s four functions, Spranger’s four value attitudes, Marston’s four traits, and Fromm’s four orientations (as cited in Rosenberg & Silvert, 2013). Marston (1928) founded the four personality styles of Dominance,
Influencing, Steadiness, and Conscientious, including how the brain has four quadrants that correspond to specific behavioral patterns.

Rohm (1996) referred to personality as human nature in a person’s most relaxed state. Rohm described human nature as both an art and a science, where it is empirical and yet experiential, modifiable, and enjoyed. Marston (1928) posited that in psychology findings, use of personality traits predicted various outcomes and perceptions in the past and present. Jeong et al. (2012) declared that use of numerous personality surveys, such as the Big 5 and Meyers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI) assist with analysis of team performance in a myriad of cultures. Personality and behavioral traits significantly influence how a person views the environment, oneself, others, and affects communication and challenges (Zhang et al., 2013). Ferguson and Hull (2017) stated, “Personality is a complex latent construct represented by a combination of interconnecting qualities and characteristics” (p. 177). Cohen, Ornoy, and Keren (2013) suggested that matching a leader’s personality traits to a project was a good organizational decision and led to greater success. Shih et al. (2009) shared that leadership and personality are topics scholars pursued in the past and continue to research today.

Personality traits play an important role in leadership and team dynamics (Lykourentzou et al., 2016). Personality type and measurement are essential to organizations in creating effective leaders, individuals, and team performance (Colbert et al., 2014; Lykourentzou et al., 2016). Jeong et al. (2012) believed that knowing an individual’s personality prior to team formation increased team productivity and minimized conflict. Many personality measures exist and numerous people use
personality profiles for job placement, advancement, and the cultivation of leadership skills (Angood, 2017; Davenport, 2018; Freeman, 2011). Marston’s (1928) DISC Personality Trait Theory and System contain information to assist leaders with forming teams, establishing communication, and improving team performance. Although numerous organizations use the DISC Personality System, few published studies used this personality system (Puccio & Grivas, 2009; van den Tooren & Rutte, 2016). Fewer studies and researchers have connected DISC personality traits to the leaders, individual team members, communication, and adaptation to change (Kerr, 2009). Lykourentzou et al. (2016) recommended further study as to (a) how DISC personality testing affects populations other than crowd sourcing, (b) how DISC personality traits influence team members performing routine tasks, and (c) examining personality with regard to the mode of interaction. Because it was not known how DISC personality traits influenced law enforcement team members’ routine interactions (Lykourentzou et al., 2016) of communication and adapting to change a gap exists and the study included Marston’s Personality Trait Theory to explore how DISC trait use by team members occurred within an existing law enforcement team in southern North Carolina.

Use of a variety of sources occurred to review the research literature on this topic. These sources include books, peer-reviewed journal articles, and the Internet using Google Chrome, Safari, and Dogpile search engines. The databases and resources used in research included: Academic Search Complete, American Education Research Complete, Business Source Complete, Educational Resource Information Center (ERIC), Elton B. Stephens Company (EBSCO), Google Scholar, Grand Canyon University (GCU) library, Sage, and ProQuest: Dissertations and Theses. Key words used in the literature search
include: Belbin team role theory, change, communication, compliance, conscientious, conscientiousness, DISC and team dynamics, DISC leader personality, DISC personality System, DISC personality traits, DISC personality trait theory, dominant, dominance, focus group, followership, group theory, leader personality, influence, Marston personality trait theory, personality, personality assessments, steadiness, team communication, team formation, team performance, team role, team role theory, team theory, and leadership.

This literature review includes the Theoretical Foundations, focusing on Marston’s (1928) Personality Trait Theory, DISC styles and traits, other personality systems, and concludes with DISC and teams. The Review of Literature contains relevant themes and supporting subthemes including exhaustive research on the DISC personality factors, including the DISC personality dimensions of dominant (D), influencing (I), steady (S), compliant (C), active and passive styles, task and people-oriented styles, as well as style blends. The next section contains DISC and teams, with sub-themes of team composition, communication, and adaptation to change. Chapter 2 concludes with a preview of the methodology and instrumentation, an overall literature review summary, and an overview of information upcoming in Chapter 3.

**Theoretical Foundations**

The theoretical framework for this study is Marston’s (1928) DISC Personality Trait Theory, containing Marston’s premise that an individual’s will and sense of power effects personality and human behavior. Although numerous personality inventories exist, Pradhan et al. (2015), Xue, Yu-ling, and Kang (2015), and Puccio and Grivas (2009) recommended DISC trait measurement as an effective tool to measure a person’s
response to situations and the environment. Dulieau et al. (2013) summarized Marston’s concepts in that people are different due to traits that are used to “assess a person’s personality and predicted behavior within a selected environment” (p. 52). This study included Marston’s DISC Personality Trait Theory, exploring how DISC personality traits influence law enforcement team members’ communication and adaptation to change. The study contains answers to the following questions, influenced by Marston’s DISC Personality Trait Theory, Lykourentzou et al.’s (2016) recommendations, and other empirical studies. Data emerges through participant completion of the online DISC Personality System (Appendix G), conducting open-ended semi-structured interviews (Appendix E), and conducting a focus group interview (Appendix F):

RQ1: How do DISC personality traits influence routine team communication?

RQ2: How do DISC personality traits influence routine team adapting to change?

The Theoretical Foundations section contains Marston’s (1928) DISC Personality Trait Theory, styles and traits, and other personality systems, concluding with team concepts. Seeking to obtain how DISC personality traits influence team members conducting routine interactions may add empirical research that benefits organizations, leaders, and teams seeking to improve organizational performance by understanding unique personality traits and creating effective teams.

Participants answered 26 open-ended questions (Appendix E) validated with certified DISC experts (Appendix D) for expert validation (Yin, 2014). The open-ended semi-structured interview questions emerged from Marston’s (1928) seminal work and theory, as well as Lykourentzou et al.’s (2016) recommendations and current empirical findings. In addition, use of the four DISC Personality System characteristics and
measurements occurred of Dominance, Influence, Steadiness, Compliance, style blends, active, passive, task, and people-oriented categories from PeopleKeys (2017) and Voges and Braund (1995). Thus, the grounding of the research questions occurred in Marston’s DISC Personality Trait Theory. Furthermore, the answers to the open-ended semi-structured interview and focus group interview questions contained powerful evidence answering RQ1 and RQ2.

**Marston’s personality styles and traits.** Understanding personality types and traits includes personal habits, thought processes, and behaviors, enabling maximum effectiveness in a team (Freeman, 2009). Personality type is the entirety of a person’s emotional and behavioral individualities, or characteristics that is an instrumental and consistent variable of interactive and complimentary dynamics (Abu-Raiya, 2014; Pradhan et al., 2015). Marston’s (1928) DISC Personality System is one tool used to measure personality and James (2012) recognized that people tend to have a single pure trait or a blend of personality traits, and thus act differently in various environments. Each of the four DISC styles contains unique differences, and includes a person’s communication and change preferences, as well as which traits are most dominant (Lykourentzou et al., 2016).

In this current era of decisions and accountability, leaders using personality assessments become more effective in improving performance and team function (Freeman, 2011). Personality assessment is the evaluation and measurement of psychological traits, interests, values, worldviews, and identity with personal behavioral characteristics (Price, 2015). Personality theories evolved throughout time with numerous authors (see Figure 1). In 400 B.C., Hippocrates introduced four types of behavior,
choleric, sanguine, phlegmatic, and melancholic, which influenced the original and modern DISC Personality Trait Theory and System. Voges and Braund (1995) likened Hippocrates’ model with the DISC traits in the following manner: choleric with dominance, sanguine with influencing, phlegmatic with steadiness, and melancholic with compliance. In 1940, Clark developed the first DISC Personality System profile from Marston’s (1928) original theory, which has undergone further development, resulting in the profile assessment used today (PeopleKeys, 2017). Grier later adapted the DISC instrument into an online version for greater ease of administration and completion (Price, 2015).


Figure 1. History of Personality

Marston (1928) originally introduced in the 1928 seminal work *Emotions of Normal People*, a personality theory divided into the Dominance (D), Inducement (I), Steadiness (S), and Compliance (C) behaviors. Marston evinced that individuals relate to
situations in various ways and limited understanding results when interaction occurs (Reid & Reid, 2003). Marston suggested two concepts. First, individuals create perceptions of social environments and react differently to a friendly or hostile environment. Second, what a respondent perceives about oneself in an environment does not necessarily reveal a correct self-image. In the DISC Personality Theory, Marston described how people tend to have a blend of personality types, as each of the four styles contains unique differences. Marston labeled a person with predominantly one personality trait as a pure style, displaying high tendencies of a single evidenced by scoring towards the top of the grid on the profile. The current DISC Personality System contains insights delineating how a person prefers to communicate, interact, lead, and respond to change for optimal results (James, 2012).

The latest development of the DISC Personality System enables the written or online profiling of an individual’s personality and predicted behavior within a specific environment, such as a volunteer organization, home, or workplace (Dulieu et al., 2013). Freeman (2011) described the DISC as a behavioral model consisting of four dimensions, all equally important, with the majority of people scoring in a blend of personality styles of Direct/Driver (D), Influence/Inspire (I), Steady/Stable (S), and Correct/Compliant/Conscientious (C). When completing the DISC System, comprised of 24 sets of word phrases and 4 descriptors in each section, an individual selects the phrase that is most like them and least like them (Dulieu et al., 2013). Puccio and Grivas (2009) explained that answers contain information generating scores in the four DISC dimensions:

1. Dominance contains how a person demonstrates assertion, controls situations, and deals with conflict.
2. Influence indicates how a person interacts with and relates to people, and communication style.

3. Steadiness contains how a person demonstrates a thoughtful, patient and steady temperament.

4. Compliance indicates how a person organizes and analytically approaches procedures and activity.

Three graphs contain resulting information regarding the individual’s personality style: Public Self-The Mask, Private Self-The Core, and Perceived Self-The Mirror (Dulieu et al., 2013). When completing the DISC Personality System, the participant may experience influence by external factors such as education, life experience, maturity, and seeking advice from others (Freeman, 2011). Two styles of human personality, task and people oriented, appear on a vertical axis (Appendix J), and remain the topic of great debate according to Sugerman et al. (2011), who labeled the opposite styles as questioning/skeptical and accepting/warm. The opposing axis lines contain active and passive personality dimensions, or as Rohm (1996) labeled the two, outgoing (fast-paced) and reserved (slower-paced).

Kerr (2009) indicated that when organizational leaders used the DISC personality traits, effective merging of existing teams resulted. Leaders gained valuable information from individual DISC results regarding interaction tendencies among team members and the overall impact to the new team (Kerr, 2009). By using the DISC, a common language emerged enabling the new team to be cohesive and show each member’s strengths. Keogh (2017) conducted a study with physicians and described the DISC instrument as a tool that assesses behavior and personality to assist with work environment communication, productivity, and teamwork. Senger (2011) discussed the psychology and philosophy of using the DISC Personality System in a sales organization. Fertig and
Milewicz, (2016) conducted a study with university students and found that using the DISC personality profile in team assignments gave professors more efficient time to coach for effective teamwork outcomes. Leaders used the DISC Personality System with the corporate salesforce to effectively identify which personality style each customer used (Senger, 2011). Senger surmised that regardless of the personality style of D, I, S, or C, effective communication, people knowledge, and a focused plan are imperative for leaders and team members.

**Review of the Literature**

The review of literature contains Marston’s (1928) Personality Trait Theory, the DISC personality factors, including styles and traits of Dominant, Influencing, Steadiness, Compliance, active and passive, and task and people oriented. The review of literature section contains a comprehensive review of literature regarding personality instruments and corresponding theories, the DISC Personality System, as well as DISC and teams. The subsections include team composition, team communication, and team adaptation to change. The chapter concludes with an overall summary. Seeking to obtain how DISC personality traits influenced law enforcement team members’ communication and change adaptation added empirical research that may benefit organizations, leaders, and teams seeking to improve organizational performance by understanding unique personality traits and creating effective teams.

**Personality assessments.** The study of personality using numerous types of assessment inventories continues today. Jung (1938) generated an eight-type taxonomy based on all possible combinations in the Myers Briggs Type Inventory (MBTI) Personality Assessment, including orientations, and priorities based on Jung’s Self
Theory (Rodriguez, Mesa, Balsera, & García, 2013). Morgeson et al. (2005) used agreeableness and conscientiousness, two of Goldberg’s personality theory coined the Big Five personality traits as predictors to form teams. Kraczla (2017) used McCrae and Costa’s Five Factor Theory and model framework, showing that personality traits are innate and influence an individual to act in predictable and consistent ways. A different type of measurement, the career assessment included details of a person’s aptitude, values, interests, and personality. Freeman (2011) conducted research using two effective measures of personality, the True Colors Inventory, based on theories by Hippocrates and Plato, and the DISC Personality System. These two personality systems contained information assisting leaders in identifying individual motivators, decision-making behaviors, and limitations (Freeman, 2011). Regardless of which personality theory and assessment a leader selects for the organization, the level of education, maturity, environment, and life experiences influence a person’s style at work (Freeman, 2011).

Inside specific cultures, numerous people share common traits, just as an individual’s personality contains a myriad of central traits. McKay (2018) conducted research using Allport’s dispositional perspective theory, suggesting that various traits exist including common, central, and cardinal traits. Cardinal traits include when a person possesses a high level of dominant traits that become a trademark for every day behavior. Cattell, Eber, and Tatsuoka (1970) proposed there are 16 primary traits, and that people possess a varying amount of each trait contained within a continuum (Djapo, Kolenovic-Djapo, Djokic, & Fako, 2011; Zhang et al., 2013). Eysenck suggested three traits within the three-trait model: psychoticism, neuroticism, and extroversion (Picconi, Balsamo, Tommasi, Saggino, & Jackson, 2018). The Myers-Briggs Assessment contained 16
different personality types, each composed of four key dimensional traits (Cohen et al., 2013; Thomas, 2014; Vincent, Ward, & Denson, 2013). The Big Five Personality Dimensions is a credible and popular personality theory used today (Allik, 2014; Fang & Zhang, 2014). This theory contains information indicating that five comprehensive behavior dimensions comprise a person’s personality: neuroticism, extroversion, conscientiousness, openness, and agreeableness (Shih et al., 2009).

Marston’s (1928) DISC Personality Trait Theory and Fleeson and Jayawickreme’s (2015) Whole Trait Theory include important measurements of traits, which allow leaders and team member to discover and best use habitual patterns of thought, behavior, and emotions. Fleeson and Jayawickreme detailed the points of Whole Trait Theory, which are an integrative model of personal traits. First, density distributions contain descriptions of how people act. Second, there is an explanation of why people act differently due to possessing diverse original traits and inner mechanisms. Third, when considering the Big 5 Theory, two parts consisting of descriptive and explanatory components combine into one whole trait as one component causes the other. Fourth, Whole Trait Theory contains evidence that the social-cognitive mechanisms are imperative components of personality, thus a person is reactive to situations (Fleeson & Jayawickreme, 2015). Whole Trait Theory is one type of personality assessment containing trait dimensions; however, the contrasting of numerous other profile assessments and theories with Marston’s DISC profiling system follows in the next section.

Personality inventories and systems contain measurement of psychological traits in a reliable and valid manner (Hui et al., 2015; Pradhan et al., 2015). Psychological traits
are characteristics that describe ways in which people differ from one another (Larson & Buss, 2006). McCormick and Burch (2008) noted that by understanding a team member’s personality and psychological traits, behavior change is easier as leaders receive development to reach optimal potential, thus enabling leadership use of personality theory for work performance.

One way to attain great leaders is by using proven personality measures such as Myers-Briggs and DISC. Dulieu et al. (2013) used DISC profile results to predict a person’s motivation, response to a situation, and fit for a potential job position. Harkness (2013) intimated that after identifying employee trait preference, an effective leader then monitors team objectives, associate priorities, and work habits, resulting in organizational success. Depending on the intensity of the primary DISC personality traits in a team member, leaders found that team member success in areas of strength and weakness varied (Puccio & Grivas, 2009).

**DISC factors.** The DISC personality factors include four main dimensions of Dominance (D), Influencing (I), Steadiness (S), and Compliance (C) according to Xue et al. (2015). By focusing on measurable and observable behavior, people recognize and manage relationships and daily experiences. Marston (1928) described DISC Trait Theory as a process of ascertaining predictable personality traits and actions within human behavior. Marston introduced the DISC model of behavior and proposed that human emotions create differences in behavior among people in a group (Price, 2015). As people expressed emotions through behaviors, Marston theorized that self-perception influenced a relationship within the environment, resulting in the identification of four
predictable personality traits: Dominance (D), Inducement (I), Submission (S), and Compliance (C).

Over the years, researchers further developed the DISC theory into a personality system. This system includes measurement of a person’s behavior and personality in a specific environment, such as workplace in this research endeavor (Dulieu et al., 2013). The participant selects the phrase most and least descriptive through a questionnaire containing 24 sets of word phrases, Information detailed from these questions inform three graphs: Public self-the mask, Private self-the core, and Perceived self-the mirror (Dulieu et al., 2013; PeopleKeys, 2008). Dulieu et al. (2013) reported percentages of intensity containing information regarding four personality dimensions:

1. Dominance (how a person handles problems, demonstrates assertiveness and level of control in situations).
2. Influence (how one deals with, relates to, and communicates with people).
3. Steadiness (the temperament demonstrated by a person’s actions of persistence, patience, and thoughtfulness).
4. Compliance (the organization and approach of procedures, activity, and organization).

**Dominant (D).** Dominance is the most fundamental emotion in humans and is the first personality trait to develop (Marston, 1928). The Dominance factor includes measurement on how a person responds to challenges and solves problems. Depending on how high the intensity score towards the top of the graph (Appendix K), the high D personality works quickly at overcoming obstacles and problems while the low D tends to gather information prior to making a decision (PeopleKeys, 2008). The Dominance factor includes measurement of anger, as the high D person is quick to anger, reacting directly and aggressively when antagonized (Price, 2015). A person with a Dominant
personality style willingly accepts challenges, speaks with directness, moves into action, and is results-oriented (Sanglim & Sungeun, 2016; Voges & Braund, 1995). The D personality differs from other personality types because of natural leadership authority, extreme confidence, quick decision-making, openness to change, and a drive to solve problems (Voges & Braund, 1995). The D-style person is typically outgoing, task-oriented, and competitive while preferring evaluation of results rather than methods (James, 2012; Kim & Yang, 2016). Limitations of the dominant personality include unwillingness to discuss mistakes, anger when taken advantage of, and ignoring the human side of people because of intense focus on the task and results (Voges & Braund, 1995).

\textit{Inducement/influencing (I)}. The term Inducement was Marston’s (1928) original term for Influencing. However, as Clark further developed the DISC theory and profile assessment in the 1950’s, Influencing became the new trait label (Reid & Reid, 2003). Initially, Inducement meant to lead others more submissive in nature who desired direction (Marston, 1928). In current DISC theory, individuals with Influencing traits provide practical insight, encourage and persuade others (Sanglim & Sungeun, 2016; Voges & Braund, 1995). The Influencing trait includes measurement in persuading and influencing others, as well as the emotion of optimism (PeopleKeys, 2008). High I personalities tend to be optimistic, joyful, and verbal, attempting to persuade others to their way of thinking, versus low I intensity who demonstrate pessimism while using facts and data (PeopleKeys, 2008). When in a stressful situation, the high I personality may apologize quickly, attempt to negotiate a solution, or use humor. The Influencing leader is people-oriented, open to change, positive and desires results, while
simultaneously caring about the people who complete the goals (Puccio & Grivas, 2009). When others wish to quit, Influencing individuals project optimism, hope, and enthusiasm to rejuvenate the individual and team (James, 2012; Kim & Yang, 2016). Limitations of the Influencing personality type include the need for personal recognition, social acceptance, and a tendency for disorganization (Voges & Braund, 1995).

**Stability (S).** Submission characteristics include when a person voluntarily decreases in self and submits to a stronger personality in order to strengthen the alliance or relationship. As updates to the DISC Personality Theory progressed, Submission changed to Steadiness, characterized by people who cooperate with others and value security (Slowikowski, 2005). The Steadiness trait includes measurement of the rate at which a person responds to change and lack of emotion (PeopleKeys, 2008). The higher the S value in a person, the less emotions exhibited, the more resistant to change, and the greater the desire to complete only one project from start to finish (PeopleKeys, 2008).

As the S value lowers on the graph below midline (Appendix K), the S personality becomes open to change, emotionally expressive, and works at a faster pace while embracing change initiatives (Rosenberg & Silvert, 2013). When under stress, the S personality may respond without emotion, in a passive manner, and with sensitivity to criticism and confrontation. Team members with steadiness personalities tend to embrace teaching, prefer routine tasks, desire to please with an accommodating manner, and maintain peace in a workgroup due to a people-oriented attitude (Kim & Yang, 2016; Sanglim & Sungeun, 2016; Slowikowski, 2005). Limitations of the Steadiness personality include resistance to change, poor delegation skills, and reluctance to volunteer to lead (Slowikowski, 2005; Voges & Braund, 1995).
Compliance/conscientious (C). The Conscientious trait includes measurement of fear and how a person reacts to regulations and rules set by others (PeopleKeys, 2008). Compliant, or Conscientious behavior occurs when an environmental condition, such as a supervisor or when acting as facilitator for a meeting creates an antagonistic force greater than the compliant person (Marston, 1928). These circumstances promote a passivity and correctness for an individual to obey, follow rules, and think critically. The higher the intensity of the C personality, the more compliant the individual and becomes motivated out of a fear base (PeopleKeys, 2008). When the C intensity is lower, the person will act more fearless and operate in greater independence (Rosenberg & Silvert, 2013). When a C personality experiences stress, the reaction is withdrawal, passivity, criticism, and potentially unforgiveness. Team members with a Conscientious personality tend to place a high value on logic, order, accuracy, task-orientation, and quality (Kim & Yang, 2016; Sanglim & Sungeun, 2016; Voges & Braund, 1995). Leaders value people with this primary personality trait because completion of work is systematic, according to regulations, and correct the first time (Freeman, 2011). Limitations of the Conscientious personality include rigid detail orientation, avoidance of F2F communication, and preference of tasks instead of personal contact (Slowikowski, 2005). According to van den Tooren and Rutte (2016), these individuals may suppress negative emotions and tend to remain closed versus open to casual work relationships. Integrative compliance is inherent while compliance responses in humans are learned behaviors (Marston, 1928).

In summary, the four personality trait dimensions of DISC include Dominant, Influence, Steadiness, and Compliance. According to Institute for Motivational Living’s
(IML) Insight Personality System Profile (PeopleKeys, 2008, codebook p. 8) the following best describes an individual’s interpersonal experiences (Davenport, 2018):

- “Dominance (D): driver, determined, innovator;
- Influencing (I): inspiring, impulsive, negotiator of conflict;
- Steadiness (S): steady, supportive, loyal team worker; and
- Compliant (C): correct, cautious, and tests information”.

Challenge areas for the D personality include overstepping authority while the I may experience inattention to detail (PeopleKeys, 2008). An area that the S experiences challenges in is giving in to a persona rather than argue, while the C personality is sensitive to criticism. The next section includes DISC components.

**DISC components.** The DISC Personality System contains further components that assist in detailing how a person responds to tasks, people, fears, and may possess more than one specific trait. Six DISC categories containing further explanation into team member behavior include personality combinations/blends, active or passive, task or people orientations, transition pattern, above midline pattern, and below midline pattern. By knowing and identifying specific traits and behaviors in these six components, the leaders and team members create clear objectives and missions to foster high performing teams (Slowikowski, 2005).

**DISC trait combinations.** When a person scores two or more personality dimensions above the midline on graph three of the DISC Personality System profile (Appendix K), the result is a behavior combination or blend of personality styles (PeopleKeys, 2008, codebook, p. 4-5). With the dominant behavior listed first and the secondary trait listed next, popular blends may include D/I, I/D, I/S, S/C, and C/S (Slowikowski, 2005). Depending on how many traits appear above the midline, a person
may have style combinations or blends, playing a strong role in how a person reacts and interprets situations and other people (Rosenberg & Silvert, 2013).

Because human behavior in not one specific trait or style, Marston (1928) identified personality blends within the DISC Personality Trait Theory. It is rare that a person possesses only one personality trait of Dominance, Influence, Steadiness, or Conscientiousness (Marston, 1928). By considering the primary, secondary, and absent personality traits, a leader identifies follower preferences in situations, environments, communication interactions, conflict resolution, and organizational habits (Price, 2015). Marston surmised that by understanding the unique blend of DISC personality traits within a person, the team member experiences success when placed in a comfortable environment where leaders expect actions and reactions. Sugerman et al. (2011) conducted a study and found that four of eight DISC leadership styles contained blends of personality traits: (a) Pioneering included styles ID and DI, (b) Affirming included IS and SI, (c) Humble included SC and CS, and (d) Resolute included CD and DC (see Table 1).
Table 1.

8 Leadership Styles and DISC Dimensions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>DISC Style(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pioneering</td>
<td>DI/ID</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energizing</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affirming</td>
<td>IS/SI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclusive</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humble</td>
<td>SC/CS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deliberate</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolute</td>
<td>CD/CD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commanding</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Active/change-oriented and passive/stability-oriented type styles. People react passively actively to the surrounding environment, depending on the power an individual perceives to possess. Rohm (1996) labeled two opposite styles on a horizontal axis line as outgoing and reserved, while Sugerman et al. (2011) used the terms of fast-paced and outspoken, in contrast to cautious and reflective. This study included use of the terms of active and passive (Appendix J), as contained in the online DISC Personality System results the participants received and published by PeopleKeys (2017). One particular personality type is no better or worse than the other is, but merely different, as both styles are important (Rohm, 1996).

The active/change-oriented type classification contains the D and I personality types, and focuses on change and activity (Lykourentzou et al., 2016). Puccio and Grivas (2009) posited that D and I individuals see themselves as more powerful than the environment, thus are likely to actively strive to change and mold it. The D and I
personality types are easily adaptable to change, however do not want to be evaluated on the process used but that the end objective is met on time. These personalities possess endless energy and are fast-paced.

The passive/stability-oriented classification includes the S and C personality types, focusing on maintenance and accommodation of tasks and people (Lykourentzou et al., 2016). The S and C personalities view the environment as containing more power than self, so adaptation to and preservation of the environment is important while passively working toward the goal (Puccio & Grivas, 2009). These personality types are reserved, slower-paced, and cautious, making excellent behind the scenes workers who complete tasks, preferably one at a time.

**Task and people oriented.** Two styles of human personality, task and people oriented, appear on a vertical axis of the DISC personality profile result sheet (Appendix J), and remain the topic of great debate among DISC scholars as other researchers labeled the opposite styles as questioning/skeptical and accepting/warm. Voges and Braund (1995) categorized these styles as tasks and results, opposite from ideas and people. For this research, use of the style terms task-oriented and people-oriented was appropriate as the participants experienced these terms in the PeopleKeys (2017) online profile assessment and debrief of aggregate results.

The task-oriented style D and C individuals enjoy planning and preparation, as well as thoroughly detailing a project and seeing it through to completion. Angood (2017) referred to the DC personality as “conscientious dominators” in daily and professional interactions (p.8). This style person functions at peak performance, plans in minute detail, and is successful with large projects involving numerous steps. The D and C personalities
“perceive the environment as antagonistic to their interests… and are more likely to view the world as resistant or unwelcoming to their needs” (Sugerman et al., 2011, p. 207).

While questioning and challenging, the task-oriented style may have trouble trusting new people or ideas at the surface level. A caution for the task-focused D and C personality is to take into consideration how people feel versus completing the task or project at the expense of little empathy toward others (Rohm, 1996).

The people-oriented style includes the I and S personality types, who enjoy interacting with others, and demonstrating their depth of care and concern. This demonstrates how these two styles care more about people than merely completing a task. The I and S types trust in the environment and believe it is aligned with their personal interests (Sugerman, 2009; Sugerman et al., 2011). Reception of new ideas, people, and projects is genuine, as project acceptance occurs at face value and begins with enthusiasm. Working with a team energizes the people-oriented I and S styles as teammates share feelings, stories, ideas, and personal information (Rohm, 1996). Areas of improvement to consider for the I and S styles is to create a plan for work completion and work the plan, as this allows for less distractions and ultimate task completion.

**Transition pattern.** The Transition Pattern occurs when a person scores a tight set of points grouped around the midline (Appendix K) while moving in and out of personality styles to fulfill perceived expectations (PeopleKeys, 2017). This event, referred to as the Chameleon Pattern arises when the participant attempts to blend in with styles of others living or working in close proximity to achieve expected perceptions or expectations (Voges & Braund, 1995). After the change and stressful situation passes, the person may revert to a natural pattern reflecting an expanded set of points on the graph.
According to PeopleKeys (2017) potential causes for scoring in the Transition or Chameleon Pattern include:

- Managing change in career, health, home, or education.
- Anxiety about ambiguous expectations.
- Unclear goals and roles.
- Absence of reward and self-esteem.
- Attempting to manipulate or overanalyze the DISC instrument.

**Above midline pattern.** This pattern occurs when a respondent scores all four points above the midline (Appendix K), while reacting to the four motivational factors of the D, I, S, and C (PeopleKeys, 2017). Often referred to as the High Exertion Pattern, individuals scoring in this category attempt to become everything to everyone by rushing into projects without processing necessary details. One desire is to satiate high achievement and self-esteem needs while fast tracking a career or other goals (PeopleKeys, 2017). Individuals in this pattern risk both emotional and physical well-being and need to prioritize demands by determining what is most critical and immediate.

Potential reasons for scoring in the Above Midline Pattern include

- Undue pressure to assume too many roles and take on too many tasks.
- Transition in home life or career.
- Unclear goals or job duties.
- Attempting to manipulate or overanalyze the DISC instrument (PeopleKeys, 2017).

**Below midline pattern.** When a respondent experiences anxiety, disinterest, fear, or feel personal needs cannot manifest, the scoring of all four points below the midline occurs (PeopleKeys, 2017). When scoring in this pattern, an individual must develop a
healthy awareness of self and enlist the aid of family or co-workers to create a productive self-management system while understanding environmental influences (PeopleKeys, 2017; Sugerman et al., 2011). Potential causes for scoring in the Below Midline Pattern include

- Attempting to manipulate the answers of the DISC instrument;
- Overanalyzing the questions and answers;
- Transition in work or personal life;
- Stress produced from unclear expectations; and
- Unresponsiveness to situations and problems resulting in taking no action (PeopleKeys, 2017).

In summary, the DISC Personality System contains six categories further clarifying individual behavior: components that assist in detailing how a person responds to people, tasks, fears, and one or numerous personality trait. Personality combinations/blends includes an individual scoring more than one category above the midline on Graph 3 (PeopleKeys, 2008, codebook p. 4-5). The active or passive personality type contains description if a person reacts passively or actively to exert force or control over the surrounding environment. Task and people orientations contain how a person develops relationships and is willing and ready to shows outward emotions.

Lastly, special patterns include the all points plotting around the midline for a transition pattern, all four trait points plotting above midline, and all points plotting below the midline. The next section includes team concepts as well as DISC and team routine interactions of communication and adapting to change.

**Team concepts.** Overfield (2016) indicated due to tumultuous circumstances, rapid technology exchange and intense global competition, organizational leaders are
hard-pressed to handle workflow and problem solutions singlehandedly. As a result, teams are necessary building blocks from the front lines to the executive level (DuBois et al., 2015; Overfield, 2016). As organizations evolve into global markets, the need for virtual teams and e-leaders who communicate and adapt to new structures becomes imperative for strategic plan success (D’Urso et al., 2015). Often police squads and teams are somewhat virtual due to shifts and different days on and off, thus not seeing all leadership at any one time. This creates a “virtual” team environment, resulting in virtual and e-leaders to a degree. At times, sworn officers and civilian employees communicate via email or text messages, causing e-leadership to occur within a team. Also, upper leadership, such as chiefs, captains, and lieutenants, as well as sworn officers and civilian employees often interface with other law enforcement agencies for training and when incidents occur. Due to different shifts within law enforcement, as well as recent national and international violence, leadership and officers interfacing with government, business and other agencies is critical. Rosenberg and Silvert (2013) believed that by using the DISC dimensions, leaders and team members learned how to work together effectively through communication strategies. Marston’s (1928) Personality Trait Theory and the DISC model of behavior includes strategies to assist with maximizing team member potential, while providing a blueprint for understanding and using strengths and weaknesses (Rosenberg & Silvert, 2013).

There are numerous theoretical models for leaders and teams to work together effectively. One theoretical model includes Hallam and Campbell’s eight characteristics for effective team performance:

1. Minimal member conflict.
2. Technical skill profile assessment.
5. High performance standards.
6. Planning and organization.
7. High levels of communication.
8. Integrated performance, research, and development (Curphy & Hogan, 2012).

Team personality traits are important to group success. Halfhill et al. (2008) conducted a quantitative study involving military teams and the Big Five personality traits of conscientiousness and agreeableness. Halfhill et al. determined that team members had the interpersonal and task orientations to effectively perform and complete tasks due to possession of the personality traits of agreeableness and conscientiousness. At the conclusion of studying 47 military teams, Halfhill et al. discovered that the personality make-up of team members correlated with the performance of the team. Team cognition had a strong positive relationship to team performance, as well as team behavioral process and motivational states. Kexin et al. (2013) declared that team identification emerges from social identity theory and shows how the concept of emotion and value each team member feels directly effects their membership in the team.

Identification of a member’s specific team role assists the leader when inheriting an existing team or creating a new one. The leader is an imperative role within a team so selecting a style resulting in optimal team effectiveness is important. Some methods include enablement of a worker to identify a role in a team by establishing prior knowledge of individual resources, thus enabling the leader to maximize member expertise, satisfaction, and team performance. Team member function consists of relationship, task assignments, and role challenges.
Team role behavior changes in different situations and according to how everyone learns, as opposed to a person having a fixed personality trait. Belbin (2010) surmised that roles measure behavior, not personality and defined the team role as a propensity to interrelate, contribute, and behave with other people in certain ways. While actions people use and display are infinite, the ranges of behaviors team members use to create a high performing team are finite (Senaratne & Gunawardane, 2015). Belbin (2010) furthered team role theory by identifying nine types of team roles to which members may relate, as evidenced by descriptions in Table 2. Each type contains clusters of potential behavior characteristics in which members interact with each other (Senaratne & Gunawardane, 2015). Action-oriented roles (SH, IMP, CF), Thinking roles (PL, ME, SP), and People-oriented roles (CO, TW, RI) comprise the three categories of team role theory according to Yeh, Smith, Jennings, and Castro (2006). For a team to be balanced, Belbin believed that all nine roles be present without duplication.

**DISC and teams.** The DISC trait and style information contains important strategies for successful team composition, communication, and adaptation to change. There is a difference between teams and groups as people interact with the environment in different ways and circumstances (Johnson & Johnson, 2013). Building effective teams at strategic and crucial organizational levels represents a competitive and strategic advantage. For this research endeavor a project team is a group of personnel and professionals who work together to fulfill the necessary roles and functions to complete the project (Senaratne & Gunawardane, 2015). If an organization puts forth the extra effort to put the right people together who are emotionally committed, trusted by peers and direct reports, and willing to collaborate as a team, then any initiative has a good
chance of succeeding (Kotter, 2012). By conducting research on how DISC personality styles influence law enforcement team members conducting routine communication and change adaptation, results may contribute and further knowledge on developing effective leaders, developing team members, and creating effective team interactions.

Various definitions exist among researchers for a team. Sohmen (2013) defined a team as a group of people who sacrifice personal gain or agendas while pursuing a common goal or objective. West and Lyubovnikova (2012) identified a team as a group of individuals who work together in a specific organization and have a description of a team. Further, this team works collaboratively to identify, commit to, and agree on objectives while communicating regularly (West & Lyubovnikova, 2012). Schermerhorn, Hunt, and Osborn (1994) suggested that members achieve set objectives and goals by working together frequently. Lastly, effective leaders insure team members are certain about their individual roles and possess the autonomy to fulfill team tasks (DuBois et al., 2015).

Creating a team entails selecting the right people with the motivation, knowledge, and abilities necessary to work in a team effectively, as well as navigate regularly measured technical skills (Barrick, Stewart, Neubert, & Mount, 1998). With creating teams to complete organizational goals and assignments, Morgeson et al. (2005) revealed that scarce empirical data and research exists regarding the superlative procedures in the selection of teams-based members. Curphy and Hogan (2012) identified five questions for leaders to answer regarding people on teams: “Are the right number of people, with the right skills, in the right roles, at the right time, and for the right reasons?” (p. 58). Lykourentzou et al. (2016) conducted a study with 14 five-person teams and found that
by using DISC personality-matching strategies to balance a team, members showed
greater satisfaction and less conflict.

Before the implementation of teams, organizations sought strategies to enable
individuals to work effectively and productively together, dating back to the industrial
age and potentially to the earliest hunters. Without direction, design, and development
strategies for teams and members, organizations struggle to implement high-performing,
collaborative teams (Kyriazis, Massey, Couchman, & Johnson, 2017). Typically, during
team formation, organizational leaders assigned members to a team based on human
resource availability and technical skills rather than personality traits, resulting in
dysfunctional teams (Jeong et al., 2012).

Because teams are everywhere and organizations are constantly changing to meet
competitive demands, it is imperative for work teams to generate synergy through a
committed, collaborative determination. Team dynamics is an area of social science that
focuses on advancing current knowledge regarding life in a team (Johnson & Johnson,
2013). If a leader fully commits to complete personality assessments and put the right
people together who are trusted, committed, and willing to collaborate as a team, then
any initiative has a good chance of succeeding (Kotter, 2012; Lee, Scandura, & Sharif,
2014).

**DISC and team composition.** Team member DISC personality traits influence
team formation, effectiveness, and leadership (Dulieu et al., 2013). When leaders used
the DISC personality traits, the merging of existing teams resulted effectively (Kerr,
2009; Lykourentzou et al., 2016). Leaders continue to glean important information from
team member DISC results regarding interaction, collaboration propensities, and the
overarching impact to a newly created team (Angood, 2017; Kerr, 2009). When a leader interacts with a team comprised of individual members, knowledge of member DISC traits assists with success (Dulieu et al., 2013). Milojevic (2014) alleged that teams are an imperative social unit in the scientific field, yet there seems to be no model describing a fundamental size. Lykourentzou et al. (2016) confirmed that knowing a person’s personality type provides valuable information and is an effective strategy when forming teams.

Knowing a person’s personality prior to team formation increases team productivity and minimizes conflict (Lykourentzou et al., 2016). Sanna, Jari, and Matthias (2009) researched the commonality of entrepreneurial and management teams in small organizations then compared and identified the reasons for forming teams in small firms. Sanna et al. posited that environmental factors, growth, survival, performance, and social issues might affect team formation in small firms. Results indicated that firms using management teams showed more profit, and most firms used either a management or entrepreneurial team.

Defining personality styles is imperative in establishing a team as each style is important throughout any project or process. James (2012) reported that when members have knowledge of their counterparts’ DISC personality traits, efficient and viable solutions emerge while working together as a team. Furthermore, the understanding and embracing of differences leads to a team that delivers results, because people are predictably different and identifiable using the DISC Personality System (James, 2012). Understanding personality traits sheds light on personal habits, thought processes and behaviors, enabling maximum effectiveness in a team (Freeman, 2009). Building
effective teams at strategic and crucial organizational levels represents a competitive and strategic advantage.

The effectiveness of a team lies in its capacity to produce qualitative outcomes in four areas: the completion of the assigned task, its performance as a group, the satisfaction of members, and its ability to be an effective team. The performance of a team depends on the group’s synergy, to “create a whole greater than the sum of its parts” (Schermerhorn et al., 1994, p. 175). When stakeholders trust the team leader, members gain more confidence in personal abilities and increase team performance (Schaubroeck, Lam, & Peng, 2011). Leadership is a comprehensive social influence that highly influences organizational systems, such as teams and performance (Parris & Peachey, 2013; Senge, Hamilton, & Kania, 2015).

To achieve team success, a leader creates unity and reaches goals by selecting people with a blend of personality styles. If a leader or member’s style is a Dominant and Influencing blend, the behaviors displayed are strategic, direct, results-driven, transparent, and visionary with the end in mind (Puccio & Grivas, 2009). Opportunities for the DI team member personality style include low patience for long discussions with details, expecting results quickly, and wishing everyone involved maintained a positive attitude. If the style of a team member or leader is Conscientious and Steady, behaviors include logic, accuracy, structure, predictability, and loyalty to others (Rosenberg & Silvert, 2013). Areas of limitation for team members with the C and S personalities include dislike for sudden change, analysis paralysis, multi-tasking, perfectionism, and rapidly changing environments (Rosenberg & Silvert, 2013). Freeman (2009) purported
that leaders must work effectively by first understanding themselves, then peers and direct reports.

Measuring team performance is imperative to the organization’s bottom line, as well as discovering talent development opportunities. Organizational leaders realize the value of people working in teams to optimize human resources, motivate employees to be more involved, encourage greater creativity, and increase profitability (Johnson & Johnson, 2013). The leader benefits most by having a diverse team to plan, strategize, analyze, and execute detailed tasks. New types of teams continue to emerge and become prevalent based on 21st Century organizational needs (D’Urso et al., 2015).

Each DISC personality contributes uniquely to the team. Rosenberg and Silvert (2013) suggested that using DISC traits improves job satisfaction and success, and contributes to an impactful team by following these five keys:

1. Educate people about the styles.
2. Identify the style of each team member.
3. Consider the dynamics created by the combination of the styles.
4. Identify group strengths and blind spots.
5. Create a strategy to address style imbalances within the team (p. 184).

PeopleKeys (2008) reported that each personality type adds positive value and characteristics to a group as shown in Table 2.
### Table 2. DISC Style and Value to Team

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DISC Styles</th>
<th>Value to Team</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dominance (D)</td>
<td>Resourceful and adapts to any situation quickly, driven towards solutions, quick-paced and finds challenge in difficult tasks, takes credit or blame easily, great in crisis, likes minimum supervision, instinctive leader, accomplishes goals through practical knowledge getting people on board with goals, and getting efficient results.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Influence (I)</td>
<td>Creative problem solver, instinctive communicator, encourages and motivates others, takes positive action and negotiates conflict, quick thinker, convincing spokesman, enthusiastic, natural leader who provides direction easily, brainstorms creatively, works well with teams and management, accomplishes goals through people.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steadiness (S)</td>
<td>Reconciles conflicts, good listener, dependable, empathetic, reliable, patient, identifies with team goals, contributes specialized skills, practical and realistic viewpoint, focused and intuitive, dependable, instinctive organizer, accomplishes goals through personal relationships.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conscientious (C)</td>
<td>Detail-oriented, realistic perspective, analytical, gathers and tests information, innate organizer, desires a logical and ordered environment, asks vital questions, task-oriented, logical thinker, emphasizes quality, diplomat who strives for consensus, accomplishes goals through evaluating the team’s progress and creating a system.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Adapted from PeopleKeys (2008, p. 7). *DISC Assessment Results.*

Because personality is important in workplace team performance, identification of how personality traits assist with behavior and change enables developing leaders to experience success. Within team dynamics, the quality of the leader-member interactions, poor communication, negative organizational culture, and fear of disappointing teammates prove as significant stressors and challenges for team members (Morgan,
Fletcher, & Sarkar, 2013). The connection between team dynamics and personality is critical because forming a team with disparate personalities is like a jigsaw puzzle, where personalities must complement each other while working together.

**Team communication.** Numerous factors, such as personality style, communication style, and location of work groups are among a few areas important to team and organizational success. In this era of high technological advances and global expansion, effective communication among team members is more important than ever. Hills (2014) purported that while communication is at the heart of most organizations, numerous barriers exist that may harm efficient operations and effective interactions.

With knowledge of DISC communication styles, virtual, F2F leaders, and team members learn to filter judgment about others that are not present and glean how peer team members prefer to communicate. Due to geographical growth and team member location, conducting meetings now occurs both face-to-face (F2F) and virtually (Bartelt & Dennis, 2014). Historically, organizational meetings used to be F2F, where all parties met in the same physical room. In current organizations, approximately 60 percent of professional employees are members of virtual teams and may never meet each other F2F (Benetyte & Jatuliaviciene, 2013). Some virtual team members may feel like prisoners behind a computer or on a phone call, having no F2F communication or social contact with other team members (Benetyte & Jatuliaviciene, 2013).

People improve communication skills by understanding the needs of others and develop a common language to describe behavioral tendencies. Communication is a key factor in individual and team objectives, as well as how a team works together and achieves high performance (Pandey & Karve, 2017). A leader must develop skills to
overcome challenges in communication, thus welcoming a free exchange of communication to ensure a productive work environment and a successful project (Browne et al., 2016). Benetyte and Jatuliaviciene (2013) purported that as more business interactions continue to evolve virtually, team dynamics, communication, and trust become imperative pieces of the diverse cultural workplace puzzle.

Individuals prefer certain communication techniques due to personality traits influenced by environment. Robinson et al. (2014) conducted a qualitative study using the Rapport Management Theory, suggesting that people have three competing concerns during a communicative interaction, “face, sociality rights and obligations, and interactional goal” (p. 357). Robinson et al. (2014) purported that people prioritize communication strategies through a context and cultural filter.

Numerous communication strategies exist that are appropriate for the organizational leader to use when interacting with a team. One communication strategy entails setting up multi-cultural teams for success according to Robinson et al. (2014). Communication agreement among organizational members within one country is challenging, so communication with international stakeholders may prove more difficult (Browne et al., 2016). Robinson et al. (2014) assessed that miscommunication due to cultural differences in multi-cultural groups is not caused solely because of different nationalities. Browne et al. (2016) and Pandey and Karve (2017) that group communication is essential to team members in understanding issues and perceptions, especially in an organization with diverse and global demographics. Voges and Braund (1995) declared that when team members use DISC traits to improve interpersonal relationships and communication, processes become clearer on successfully handling change and coming to resolution.
**DISC and team communication.** Imagine how beneficial knowing DISC personality styles is to all stakeholders; communication becomes easier with a DISC perspective as team members form a roadmap picturing how to interact with each other. By discovering business partners’ DISC personality traits, leaders, team members, and external constituents, experience improved communication (Tudoran & Boglut, 2014). As organizations strategically manage factors that determine failure or success, equipping leaders and teams with strategies to communicate effectively is imperative for goal achievement (Saruhan, 2014). Because business continues to expand globally, leaders must set up diverse teams in varied global locations and communication procedures to ensure project, individual, and team success (Browne et al., 2016; Pandey & Karve, 2017). Establishing clear goals, developing plans to achieve those goals, and having commonly understood group communication techniques leads to more productive and successful teams (Bartelt & Dennis, 2014; Robinson et al., 2014).

By paying attention to people’s body language, tone, actions, and words team members easily identify others as a D, I, S, C, or a blended personality style. Knowing the various personality types of people within a team enables members to understand each other to a greater degree (Lykourentzou et al., 2016; Sugerman et al., 2011). Rohm (1996) described a strength as a natural tendency within a personality type, whereas a weakness is a strength abused or taken too far. The D individual communicates in a direct manner, prefers bulleted main points, leads with natural authority, and gets results (Rohm, 1996). The I personality is outgoing and communicates through telling stories, inspiring others, tackling new projects, and gaining public recognition (PeopleKeys, 2008; Sanglim & Sungeun, 2016). The S individual is friendly and supportive, and
communicates through active listening, clearly defined goals, and working in a group setting (James, 2012). Finally, the C team member is a perfectionist, sets high standards for self and others, and communicates in a precise fashion while preferring to work alone (Lykourentzou et al., 2016; Voges & Braund, 1995). By using each personality type’s unique strengths and weaknesses, organizations create teams that interact positively and produce more efficiently.

To ensure organizational success and performance sustainability, leaders need to establish practices that create a positive climate by communicating consistently, clearly, and authentically (Dusheng & Zhongming, 2014). For greatest success, the leader and team must set clear goals, develop plans for goal achievement, and establish comprehensible group etiquette (Bartelt & Dennis, 2014). Kyriazis et al. (2017) reported that communication positively influences team success and collaboration. Pearl (2015) confirmed that due to diverse generations of Boomers, Millennials, and Gen Xers in an organization, using DISC strategies assists with effective communication, appreciation of differences, and working together. Success during challenging times occurs by providing employees with goals and objectives for projects, including how to manage team interaction, dynamics and roles (Robinson et al., 2014). As the leaders and team members become familiar with the DISC personality traits, successful communication results due to understanding how others prefer to interact and approaching teammates in the preferred manner (Chan & Burgess, 2015; Sugerman et al., 2011).

For leaders and a team to experience success and effective communication, the establishing of trust is imperative. Curseu and Schruijer (2010) defined trust as “the extent to which team members allow themselves to be vulnerable to each other’s actions”
Benetyte and Jatuliaviciene (2013) articulated that for an organization to be successful, the leaders and team members must establish components of trust to communicate effectively. Benetyte and Jatuliaviciene (2013) conducted a study comprised of 58 participants and found that virtual teams experienced low trust at the beginning of the study. However, when participants and leaders focused on specific communication strategies, the trust level rose across all team members in various geographical locations (Benetyte & Jatuliaviciene, 2013).

Developing and understanding etiquette and operating rules as a group, assists teams with the establishment of trust while communicating. Establishment of trust among team members assists in influencing cost and speed outcomes in organizational performance. Schaubroeck et al. (2011) indicated that displayed and felt emotions by members influenced team effectiveness and successful communication. Smith, Figgins, Jewiss, & Kearney (2018) discovered when leaders communicate inspirationally and show how the team may succeed, members experience unity and pride. Valls, Gonzalez-Roma, and Tomas (2016) concluded that leaders who foster innovative team climates with members of diverse education levels experience positive performance and quality communication. Schaubroeck et al. (2011) found that both cognition and affect-based trust in the leader of the team gave the members more confidence in abilities for effective performance and communication. Pantell and Tucker (2009) purported a fourth component that a leader’s use of power affects trust development and communication in global, virtual, and F2F teams. The dynamics of a virtual team and the importance of computer-based communication influence team interactions, as well (Pantell & Tucker, 2009). By creating mutual respect and trust, employees openly and honestly
communicate with all stakeholders. When building trust and a solid foundation, the team members involved become open to hearing who, what, when, where, why, and how of a change initiative (Ace & Parker, 2010). This provides the what’s in it for me (WIIFM) for employees (Ace & Parker, 2010). Furthermore, when trusted and ethical leaders consistently involve team members and communicate throughout an entire initiative, greater employee engagement occurs because members feel like an integral part of the organization (Sharif & Scandura, 2014). Through clear communication of organizational procedures, team members learn how to conduct business ethically (Sharif & Scandura, 2014).

In most contemporary organizations, leaders interact with both face-to-face teams (F2F) and virtual teams. As a leader works and interacts with F2F team members, the communication dynamics may be quite different from those of virtual teams. When interacting and conducting business with virtual team members, the leader must take extra measures to include members in training, team meetings, and appropriate communication practices, as often times members feel isolated and omitted (Benetyte & Jatuliaviciene, 2013). Tasa, Sears and Schat (2011) espoused that groups should focus more on developing good communication and behavior as a team versus solely seeking results regardless if F2F or virtual in location. D’Urso et al. (2015) articulated that both traditional and virtual teams include people combining their expertise and capabilities to fulfill organizational goals and effective communication.

As leaders strive for optimal communication, allowing for generational differences is important. Pearl (2015) noted that due to increased generational diversity in the workplace, style flexing allows people to adjust their personality style in order to
interact appropriately with other generations. While each generation has unique characteristics, Pearl described Millennials as valuing personal relationships, disapproving bureaucracy, questioning rules, and preferring to work in a team. Sharif and Scandura (2014) declared that employees reporting to a leader displaying ethical traits and consistent communication throughout any process experienced higher performance levels.

**Change and teams.** When planning for a new change initiative, the leader and team members must assess foundational change model and theory effectiveness, while adapting them to the diverse organizational populations, systems, and culture. One of the most important steps is constructing a foundational vision (Angood, 2017; Sharif & Scandura, 2014). Sugerman et al. (2011) recommended placing team members who possess each type of DISC personality on the vision casting team to develop the initial plan. During this phase, an ethical and inspirational leader must include organizational values, the team members expected to carry out the vision, and clear procedural guidelines for the vision to be effective (Sharif & Scandura, 2014). Other key factors the leader must include are consistently keeping the vision in the forefront, making all decisions with these guidelines in mind, and being courageous and permanently committed to the initiative (Sharif & Scandura, 2014). By taking action, leaders act as change agents and lead by example, remaining conscious of subtle nuances that mandate a change in course. At this stage, using the various DISC leadership styles such as Pioneering, Energizing, or Affirming assist in keeping stakeholders motivated, while leaders remain capable of making tough decisions to adapt the plan (Sugerman et al., 2011).
There are numerous foundational theories and models upon which to draw in creating a strategic change plan. Many factors become necessary as a leader selects an appropriate model, readiness assessment instrument, and applicable interventions. While numerous change theories and models exist, combining several together with appropriate diagnostic tools, training, and understanding personality styles best serve the leaders and team members (Freytag & Hollensen, 2001). Freytag and Hollensen (2001) suggested that a vision for change, a communication plan, and a balanced scorecard, benchmarking and quantifying progress be present and used. Ace and Parker (2010) itemized three factors leading to a successful initiative implementation of preparing the organization, carefully planning and installing the change, and entrenching and continuously monitoring all that has successfully been accomplished. McKinsey’s 7S model identifies an organization’s readiness by using seven factors: staff, common company values, tactics, strategic planning, profile assessment, abilities, and stylistic flair (Singh, 2015). Another effective change theory, Kotter’s (2012) eight steps of change include the before, during, and after stages needed to launch and conduct an initiative:

1. Establish a sense of urgency.
2. Create a guiding coalition.
3. Develop a vision and change strategy.
4. Communicate the change strategy.
5. Empower employees for action.
7. Incorporate all gains.
8. Anchor the new approaches.
By combining personality assessment tools, change theories, and numerous model segments, the leaders and team members create a definitive plan to implement change from start to finish (Lee et al., 2014).

When team members are included in the planning and implementation process of the change, they are less likely to see a tyrannical imposition or experience as much stress. Tiong (2005) itemized four areas to consider during a change initiative to optimize human capital: well-being, stress level, job motivation, and organizational loyalty. Tiong declared that almost any kind of change within an organization causes stress to employees. Therefore, the leaders and team members should participate in weekly meetings, allowing for transparent, honest, fact-based, and two-way communication. This diminishes stress from the unknown and provides security for the stakeholders, which is important to the S and C personalities who view change as a process (James, 2012).

Some stress is a positive factor in employees as it activates them to achieve top performance in job duties (Tiong, 2005). Eustress is positive stress that leaders use to mobilize team members to achieve a personal best effort throughout the change initiative, allowing endurance to withstand the peaks and valleys of the implementation process (Tiong, 2005). However, Rosenberg and Silvert (2013) proposed that by understanding the DISC personality style of others, leaders communicate change in ways each person more willingly accepts and follows.

By understanding team member DISC traits, leaders plan for how people react, either actively or passively to the environment, including if there is a propensity to accept or reject change (Ferguson & Hull, 2017; Puccio & Grivas, 2009). Ace and Parker (2010) identified three steps in a successful change initiative: prepare the ground, plan and
implement, and embed and monitor. Ace and Parker (2010) specifically involved team members in the second phase of plan and implement that included: (a) “create a sense of urgency- why/when, (b) confirm roles & responsibilities- who/how, (c) develop and communicate vision and strategy- what/how, and (d) create implementation plan- how/when” (p. 2). James (2012) and Kim & Yang (2016) evinced that members with the D and I personality styles are active in leading and embracing change, transparent, and natural leaders, as well as ask numerous questions such as why the initiative is important. Whereas, people displaying the C and S styles view change as a process and potentially a threat to the environment, as well as ask how this change implementation process occurs (James, 2012).

In order to implement necessary strategic changes, contemporary leaders must comprehend their personal role, as well as add models, assessments, and intervention strategies to the leadership toolkit for successful implementation (DuBois et al., 2015). Gartner (2013) confirmed that leaders implementing mindfulness into both the collective and individual levels of the organization experienced greater change initiative success. When exploring the individual platform, mindfulness enhanced employee readiness by evidencing flexibility and changing self-efficacy (Gartner, 2013). At the organizational level, mindfulness injection showed positive results in cultural readiness, demonstrated by positive relationships, collective decision-making, education, and unfettered communication (Gartner, 2013). Although human behavior is complex, Marston (1928) suggested it is predictable as discussed in the upcoming literature review.

**DISC styles and change adaptation.** As continuous change occurs, leaders and team members must evolve to facilitate organizational success by understanding team
member DISC traits and behavioral adaptations to the environment. Creasy and Anantatmula (2013) described change as an intentional intervention to modify the operations of an organization. Leaders play a crucial role by providing team members with support and clear guidance through critical concerns and stages (Sharif & Scandura, 2014). Hammond, Clapp-Smith, and Palanski (2017) suggested that leaders progress through numerous areas, such as family, community, and work, leading to changes in self and followers. Saruhan (2014) discussed how stakeholders sometimes look at change negatively even though beneficial end-results occur for the individual team member. Creasy and Anantatmula (2013) noted that because team members play an imperative role in change implementation, leaders must coordinate and integrate human resources for ultimate effectiveness. Saruhan detailed that employees base perceptions on communication methods. Trust in the organizational leaders, employee engagement, and effective communications are critical components throughout the change process for initiative success (Saruhan, 2014).

When undergoing a change initiative, successful leaders use an on-going strategic technique of benchmarking and measuring operational and strategic performance before, during, and after change implementation. Freytag and Hollensen (2001) proposed seven ways in which benchmarking, bench learning, and bench action, prior to change constituted a total quality management system:

1. Evaluate key success factors and decide what business functions to benchmark.
2. Evaluate what is important in each area.
3. Conduct benchmarking against top leading-edge companies.
4. Gather benchmarking data.
5. Report on gaps between organization and top competitors.
6. Inspect and improve organization’s talent development from results.

7. Take action by implementing strategic changes from the findings.

Pica, Swing, & Laufgraben (2004) determined that stakeholders own and embrace the benchmarking and change process if the results are not used to rate or evaluate individual performance. Understanding of the improvement compels people to action (Pica et al., 2004). Benchmarking details that validated assessment leads to change and confirms that what the organization is currently doing actually works (Pica et al., 2004). By using these processes, S and C style leaders and team members have time to learn about and process the change.

As change continuously transpires, leadership expertise must evolve to facilitate organizational adaptation, successful change, and ensure team member commitment. Leaders play a critical role by giving employees support, a clear vision, and guidance through change initiatives and critical stages (Sharif & Scandura, 2014). Kotter (2012) suggested conveying a sense of urgency when creating a team to implement a change initiative within an organization. As organizational leaders consider the need for change, gathering and analysis of resources, data, and timing occurs as strategic plans form and come to fruition (Bhatt, 2017). Dredge, Oates, Gregory, and King (2017) reported that using a team approach enabled change management to be effective and led to customer satisfaction. In order to experience success, leaders continuously need to evaluate, monitor, and modify implemented changes with a diverse team consisting of varied DISC personalities (Ace & Parker, 2010). It is important for leadership and teams to manage change as a lack of constituent consensus often times hinders successful achievement of change initiatives (Chowthi-Williams, 2018).
Prochaska, Sampayo, and Carter (2015) determined that people must design their environment to understand self and others, communicate clearly, and be most effective throughout change processes. Among the four DISC personality types, the D and I embrace and desire change, while the S and C tend to resist change. According to Rosenberg and Silvert (2013) and PeopleKeys (2008), as a leader plans for organizational change, inclusion of the following assists diverse personalities with success:

- The D type prefers achieving results by preferring action instead of planning the details. Because the D takes risks, seeks action, and sees the big-picture quickly, change comes naturally as decisive actions ensue. D’s possess natural confidence, are assertive and competitive, and directly communicate any plans made in an organization.

- The I personality prefers constant interaction with their environment and others, while inspiring and persuading others, often through fun. Because I’s are future-focused, creative ideas and the endless realm of possibilities allow for optimistic views of organizational change as the I typically champion new initiatives.

- The S type strives for harmony, calm, and routine in situations. Involving the S in plans for change assists with understanding and acceptance due to the preference for predictable outcomes and reliable patterns. The S prefers to work behind the scenes versus in the forefront so if an S is leading a change initiative, leadership needs to support and provide close guidance.

- The C personality prefers to work independently and is a good organizer and critical thinker. This assists when planning and implementing a change initiative as the C questions processes and is highly detail-oriented. The C personality will share what may go wrong in the change process, so involving this team member in the planning will assist in careful, systematic procedures set with high standards.

In summary, the DISC trait and style information contains important strategies for successful team composition, communication, and adaptation to change. Team member DISC personality traits influence team formation, effectiveness, and leadership (Dulieu et al., 2013). Communication becomes easier with a DISC perspective as team members form a roadmap picturing how to interact with each other. Leaders and team members must evolve to facilitate organizational success by understanding team member DISC
traits and behavioral adaptations to the environment as change occurs. The next section contains the methodology of this study.

**Methodology.** Understanding self and others is one of the greatest challenges facing organizations in the building of high-performing teams. The study used a qualitative methodology versus a quantitative approach, as subjective interviews and life experiences captured this data more appropriately than mathematical and statistical techniques (Campbell-Reed & Scharen, 2013; Yin, 2014). The primary research question *how do DISC personality traits influence a law enforcement team conducting routine communication and adapting to change* was best answered through a qualitative study, with the use of *how* questions and the requirement to understand a *lived* experience through the tools of words and descriptions (Rossman & Rallis, 2017). Senaratne and Gunawardane (2015) used a qualitative methodology to study leadership, team role, and team interaction. Brodie (2016) conducted a qualitative study to research how a leader simulates a shepherd in three diverse fields (ecclesiastic, business, education) and three divergent faiths (Jewish, Christian, Islamic). Senaratne and Gunawardane (2015) used a qualitative methodology to study leadership, team role, and team dynamics. Rusk (2016) published a dissertation using a qualitative study exploring how existing classroom management practices in an Oregon private school influenced classroom disruptions. Robinson et al. (2014) observed a group of seven cross cultural students and two tutors in a qualitative study to determine if culturally diverse people could learn different organizational communication strategies.

The focus of a qualitative study centers on human experiences and phenomena versus populations (Colorafi & Evans, 2016). Because the purpose of this qualitative
descriptive study was to explore research-based evidence regarding how DISC personality traits influenced routine interactions (Lykourentzou et al., 2016) of communication and adapting to change within a law enforcement team of 37 members in southern North Carolina, the research scope emerged from identification of this theme, sampling of one existing team, and data analysis with the DISC Personality System instrumentation (de la Cuesta Benjumea, 2015). The target participants were 37 employees serving on an existing law enforcement team in southern North Carolina. This study included an open-ended semi-structured Interview Guide (Appendix E) containing open-ended and probing follow-up questions, a Focus Group Interview Guide (Appendix F), and DISC individual and team results (Appendices M and S) to explore how Marston’s (1928) DISC personality traits influenced law enforcement team members conducting routine communication and adapting to change. Because there was not a demand to analyze statistical or numerical data, a qualitative descriptive study best fit to explore how the DISC personality traits influenced law enforcement team members discussed in the theoretical framework. Fusch, Fusch, and Ness (2017) recommended selection of a design that enables the researcher to answer the research questions and reach data saturation (Fusch & Ness, 2015). Gathering team member perceptions (Yin, 2014) was the definitive route to document evidence regarding the phenomenon under examination, the influence of DISC traits with routine (Lykourentzou et al., 2016) communication and adaptation to change in the team environment.

**Instrumentation.** By employing a qualitative descriptive study design, opportunity occurred to gather data through using the DISC Personality System aggregate individual and team results (Appendices M and S), facilitating a focus group interview
(Appendix F), and conducting open-ended semi-structured individual interviews (Appendix E). The study followed an interpretive design within this qualitative descriptive study due to the need to show how DISC personality traits influenced law enforcement team members’ communication and adapting to change. In-depth information regarding validity and reliability is available in Chapter 3. When considering the assessment tool to assess individual team member personality, the instrument needed: (a) easy online administration, (b) a brief amount of questions, (c) results clearly delineating the influence of individual personality manifestation on self and team, and (d) a common language for communication and change practices. Selection of the DISC Personality System profile occurred because it met all four criteria and was the most appropriate instrument for this study. MBTI, Belbin, and the Big Five contained more traits and factors, as well as lacked complete clarity in how members interact in teams, communicate, and adapt to change in a team setting (Lykourentzou et al., 2016).

Sugerman et al. (2011) purported that the DISC Personality System contains ideologies from temperament theory, observing how dimensions of main personality trends to influence how a person acts with others individually and in a team setting. Jones and Hartley (2013) evinced that personality assessments include individual results containing assertiveness, preferred style when interacting to the environment, responsiveness, and decision-making preference.

The IML DISC Insights Personality System includes information as to how people prefer to communicate with their environment and others (PeopleKeys, 2008). Results contain findings as to how a person best communicates, as well as how team members prefer to receive feedback, motivation, and their reaction to change. The IML
DISC Insights Personality System Profile is a highly reliable tool that contains behavioral measurement factors, but does not measure performance or intelligence (Price, 2015). The IML DISC Insights Personality System currently includes scales of openness and directness for each personality style, as well as information regarding external, observable behaviors.

Classification of personality occurs in one of four theoretical frameworks: dynamic theories, behavioral, humanistic, and trait approaches. Saville (2006) suggested three categories that classify personality assessments: inductive, deductive, and validation-centric. Tests such as the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI), the Occupational Personality Questionnaire (OPQ), and Marston’s (1928) DISC are all deductive styles of assessing, where correlation of real-world application and performance with personality traits occur (Saville, 2006).

Shorter personality measures work better when gathering information from people about one subject, versus self-reporting, where a larger bank of questions works best. Crede, Harms, Niehorster, and Gaye-Valentine (2009) compared the variances between personality profile measures containing a short amount of questions, versus one with a larger amount of questions. The Big Five personality traits included the convergent validity of the loss of criterion-related variance lost when using a shorter sampling of characteristics, such as the DISC Personality System. Crede et al. reported the need for further examination of predictive validities on short personality measures to make decisions of importance. Crede et al. found that personality measurements with larger amounts of questions had a higher degree of convergence than shorter measures. In addition, the criterion validity scores on Big Five personality trait measures scored higher
due to a larger sampling of questions (Crede et al., 2009). Holtrop, Born, de Vries, and de Vries (2014) reported that newly designed and modified personality scales did not negatively affect the results, as leaders and team members responded positively to the profile assessment regardless of the amount of questions or format, thus validating the DISC Personality System with 24 sets of word phrases.

Various length profile assessments work better in differing organizations and circumstances. Allik (2014) developed a binomial Item Response Theory (IRT) model and compared a two-parameter model, identifying biases of a Likert scale questionnaire. Allik concluded that self-ratings regarding personality, as used in the DISC profile seemed to be less random than the bias showed toward social desirability. Random answering occurred when responding to questions regarding traits of conscientiousness and neuroticism, versus openness in Allik’s study using the Big Five personality traits. Although false reporting or situational specificity may occur when subjects complete the DISC Personality System, Price (2015) and Schreiner (2014) both reported success when using the DISC and validity in the profile. Crede et al. (2009) reported the need for further examination of predictive validities on short personality measures, such as the DISC that uses 24 questions to make decisions of importance.

Researchers find validity in the DISC Personality System instrument. Price (2015) conducted a validity study of the psychometric properties of the DISC Personality System Analysis in the context of the work environment. Price found construct and content validity in the profile assessment when benchmarked with standards from American Educational Research Association and American Psychological Association. Schreiner (2014) conducted a study with freshmen students from Eastman College regarding self-
awareness, and freshmen enrollment retention. Schreiner found the DISC instrument valid and results showed students using the DISC had a higher-grade point average the first year of college, as well as a higher retention rate compared to students not using the DISC. Some common problems with personality systems include false reporting when participants answer how an organization or supervisor might expect, and situational specificity by only looking at a recent event versus a larger scope of situations (Price, 2015).

The first source of data collection included the information revealed in the participant completed DISC Personality System profile. After following the coding guidelines of the participant responses, use of the participants’ printed results (Appendix M) informed a debrief of the DISC Personality System aggregate results with the participants prior to other data collection. This debrief session provided the leaders and team members the basic DISC Trait Theory and fundamentals of the current IML DISC Insights Personality System. Lykourentzou et al. (2015) purported that assessment results provide vital baseline information as to the participants’ personality style, which help inform potential compatibilities and clashes during team interactions. Jones and Hartley (2013) declared that approximately 81% of team member peers find that the DISC System results are a realistic reflection of a person’s customary behavior patterns.

A focus group interview was the second instrument and source of data collection employed in this qualitative descriptive study. Focus groups are research tools commonly used in marketing and social sciences, dating back to the early 1940’s emerging in the qualitative research group through behavioral sciences (Kellmereit, 2015). This technique has become more popular in the United States throughout the past 50 years as
approximately 250,000 plus focus groups are conducted annually. Today focus groups are conducted via social media, internet, and face-to-face as this research tool continues to evolve. Singh (2015) recommended observation during a group discussion interview because a researcher may see organizational conditions, climate, and unspoken words.

Rosenthal (2016) suggested that conducting a focus group interview includes valuable perceptions and experiences of participant understanding. Michael, O’Callaghan, and Sayers (2017) conducted a qualitative study using eight focus groups consisting of senior citizens, family members, and caregivers, resulting in discussions of how seniors transition from independence to dependence. Kaliannan, Abraham, and Ponnuasamy (2016) examined talent management practices regarding organizational commitment and job satisfaction among employees in Malaysia. Successful observation and discussion of employee values and attitudes emerged regarding communication and trust (Kaliannan et al., 2016). Advantages of using focus groups include interaction among group members, insight into views and opinions, as well as “an in-depth understanding of participants’ experiences and perceptions” (Kellmereit, 2015; Rosenthal, 2016, p. 509). Disadvantages of a focus group may include a small number of participants making the results not transferable to a larger population, participants generalizing an answer, or the potential of a person making up a response due to lack of knowledge or the question including expectation of a response containing personal information (Kellmereit, 2015).

The Focus Group Interview Guide and protocol (Appendix F) development contained protocol information from empirical research studies including Marston’s (1928) Personality Trait Theory, communication practices from Wheelan’s (2013)
effective team member attributes, adaptation to change using the DISC results (PeopleKeys, 2008), Smith and Hoy’s (as cited in Kearney & Smith, 2008) openness to change traits, Krueger and Casey’s (2015) questioning route, and expert validation with a panel of DISC certified experts. After conducting two field tests (Bernard et al., 2018) using observation of team meetings, discovery ensued that a focus group technique enabled the collection of data in a more effective way. The study included use of the Focus Group Interview Guide (Appendix F) in the forum to gather team member views and opinions as to how the DISC personality traits influenced routine communication and adaptation to change, thus gaining insights and increasing understanding (Kellmereit, 2015). Collaboration occurred with a panel of DISC experts to conduct expert validation for the Focus Group Interview Guide and protocol (Appendix F). Experts recommended using introduction questions to allow members to get comfortable with each other, and to add a question at the end of the guide allowing participants to share any information not asked by the interviewer. These practices added trustworthiness to the Focus Group Interview Guide and protocol (Appendix F). By facilitating a focus group interview the researcher collects relevant data at the workplace where the participants experience the research questions under study (Yin, 2014).

The third instrument and source of data collection included the use of open-ended semi-structured individual interviews. Development occurred of an open-ended semi-structured Interview Guide and protocol (Appendix E) containing 27 questions influenced by the initial research questions grounded in Marston’s (1928) DISC Personality Trait Theory, the DISC Personality System instrument, Lykourentzou et al. (2016) recommendations, and other empirical researcher recommendations. Lenberg et al.
recommended use of open-ended questions in a qualitative study to give participants the opportunity to reply with personal thoughts and words. According to Baxter and Jack (2008) use of an interview protocol assists researchers in providing duplicatable instructions for interviews and reliable qualitative data to compare. The open-ended semi-structured Interview Guide and protocol (Appendix E), formatted after an interview guide created by Laforest (2009) contained 27 questions with a majority of open-ended prompt and probing questions in areas indicating how the DISC personality traits influenced law enforcement team members conducting routine communication and change adaptation. These questions emerged from RQ1 and RQ2 and provided answers to these over-arching research questions. Expert validation occurred by collaborating with four certified DISC facilitator experts, identified in the Validity Statement (Appendix R). All the experts and the researcher hold certifications in the DISC model and are train-the-trainers/facilitators as well, as used and recommended by Brodie (2016) and Bernier (2017). Two of the experts hold earned doctorates, one holds a master’s degree, and one is a certified DISC master facilitator trainer while three of the experts work with the DISC instrument in their daily business careers. Conducting two field tests (Bernard et al., 2018) with local teams who were not in the actual study further provided validity and reliability to the Interview Guide and protocol (Appendix E).

Maxwell (2013) cautioned that researchers should not merely take research questions and turn them into interview questions. Instead, research questions should formulate what the researcher wished to understand, whereas the interview questions were what the researcher asked participants to gain that understanding. Yin (2014) suggested better interview results if the researcher establishes a good rapport with the
participant, putting the person at ease and remaining unbiased to the answer given. Open-ended semi-structured interviews took place in person with team members working shifts outside of the office as agency leaders allowed time for all interviewees to come into the agency for open-ended semi-structured interviews. Irvine, Drew, and Sainsbury (2013) deducted that when conducting spoken interaction during interviews, face-to-face communication garnered more completion of interview goals than did telephone interaction. Brodie (2016) cautioned that phone and online interviews might limit information, as these types of interviews do not allow the researcher to see nonverbal communication apparent in face-to-face exchanges. From this research, themes and similarities arose linking DISC personality traits to more effective team member communication, change adaptation, and performance.

**Summary**

In summary, personality is an instrumental variable and consistent dynamic in people (Ferguson & Hull, 2017; Jung, 1938; Marston, 1928). Escalating evidence includes findings that personality is a vital determinant of life consequences (Murphy et al., 2013). Larson and Buss (2006) defined personality as a set of organized and enduring mechanisms and psychological traits inside a person that impact daily adaptation and interaction with the environment. The concept of how DISC personality traits influenced team members in building effective communication and adapting to change continued to evolve through research and practical use. According to Lykourentzou et al. (2016), there is a need for further study as to team member performance in various organizations when conducting routine tasks. The study contained the furthering of knowledge through this qualitative descriptive study by providing new information and a unique opportunity to
examine DISC personality traits with team members in a law enforcement agency in southern North Carolina. Marston’s (1928) Personality Trait Theory was the basis of this research and contained the factors of four main dimensions and styles; Dominance, Influencing, Steadiness, and Compliance, active/passive and task/people oriented. Various instruments exist to measure personality, including Marston’s DISC Personality System, used in this study (James, 2012; Marston, 1928). Marston indicated that individuals react passively or actively to the surrounding environment, depending on the power an individual perceives to possess (Puccio & Grivas, 2009).

Although numerous organizations use the DISC Personality System, few published studies used this personality system. Fewer studies and researchers connected DISC personality traits to leaders and individual team members regarding communication and adaptation to change (Kerr, 2009). Uhl-Bien et al. (2014) suggested that there is a need for more empirical investigation in the area of the interaction of follower and leader traits. Lykourentzou et al. (2016) recommended further study as to (a) how DISC personality testing affects populations other than crowd sourcing, (b) how DISC personality traits influence team members performing routine tasks, and (c) examining personality with regard to the mode of interaction. Although empirical evidence links the DISC Personality System to balancing team member personalities within teams (Lykourentzou et al., 2016), it was not known how DISC personality traits influenced law enforcement team members’ routine interactions (Lykourentzou et al., 2016) of communication and adapting to change. This presented a gap in the literature this study addressed.
Due to current circumstances, rapid technology exchange, and intense global competition organizational leaders are hard-pressed to handle workflow and problem solutions singlehandedly. As a result, teams are necessary at all organizational levels (Overfield, 2016). Halfhill et al. (2008) identified that the personality make-up of team members correlated with the performance of the team. The DISC personality styles include strategies to assist with maximizing team member potential, while providing a blueprint for understanding and using strengths and weaknesses (Rosenberg & Silvert, 2013).

For instrumentation and data collection, administration occurred of the IML DISC Insights Personality System Profile (PeopleKeys, 2008) to the leaders and team members, conducted a two hour debrief of aggregate results with this DISC certified facilitator, interviewed participants, and conducted a focus group interview. This study differed from previous personality studies in that data collection occurred from one existing law enforcement team and focused primarily on the influence of DISC traits on routine communication and adapting to change. This study differed from Dulieu et al. (2013) who used DISC profile results to predict a person’s fit for a career opening, situational responses, and level of motivation. Davenport (2018) conducted a qualitative study with the DiSC Personality System to identify what DiSC personality types successful residential real estate salespeople possess, however did not address routine interactions of communication or change adaptation. Puccio and Grivas (2009) conducted a quantitative study to explore the relationship between DISC personality traits and creativity preferences, differing in research methodology and research focus.
Personality, leaders, and teams continue to be of interest to organizations and researchers. This study’s importance pertained to routine communication and change strategies recognized within a team and established by implementing the DISC personality traits. Personality types and style application developed throughout the years and Marston (1928) created the DISC Personality Trait Theory because of extensive research on the four brain quadrants (Rosenberg & Silvert, 2013). Marston founded the DISC traits and numerous researchers expanded the theory throughout the years. Participants from a law enforcement agency completed the DISC Personality System and applied the strategies to routine team functions and interactions. Extension of the concept of using DISC personality traits to existing teams and in forming new teams brought new findings to extend former studies. Leaders and team members clashed or melded depending on how the organization used personality trait implementation with existing teams and in forming new ones. The addressing of these topics transpired in the next chapter. Chapter 3 includes conduction of the study and collecting of the data, including the independent sections of the research methodology necessary to complete this valuable study, beginning with the introduction and concluding with limitations, delimitations, and the summary.
Chapter 3: Methodology

Introduction

The purpose of this qualitative descriptive study was to explore research-based evidence regarding how DISC personality traits influenced routine interactions (Lykourentzou et al., 2016) of communication and adapting to change within a law enforcement team of 37 members in southern North Carolina. Consequences from restructuring, global expansion and the necessity to remain competitive in an international economy have organizations turning to working teams for optimal performance (Johnson & Johnson, 2013). By using teams, human resources may assemble or disband quickly and facilitate employee participation (Johnson & Johnson, 2013). Often assignment of human resources to a team based on availability and technical skills occurs, versus using personality traits for team formation, resulting in teams that are ineffective (Jeong et al., 2012).

In this qualitative descriptive study, the foundation contained Marston’s (1928) Personality Trait Theory by administering the DISC Personality System profile to an existing law enforcement team in southern North Carolina. To extend the work of Lykourentzou et al. (2016), Marston (1928), and Puccio and Grivas (2009), the researcher explored how DISC personality traits influenced team members’ communication and adapting to change. The researcher extended existing knowledge as results from this study included information enabling the organization a greater insight as to how each team member works, adapts to change, and best communicates (Chowthi-Williams, 2018; Dulieu et al., 2013; Pandey & Karve, 2017). The researcher identified strategies resulting
from DISC trait application that empowered leaders and team members to communicate and work together more effectively.

Although numerous organizations use the DISC Personality System, few published studies used this personality system as frequently as other personality assessments (Lykourentzou et al., 2016; Puccio & Grivas, 2009). McKay (2018) conducted research using Allport’s dispositional perspective theory, suggesting that a person possesses a high level of dominant traits. Fewer studies and researchers have connected DISC personality traits to the leaders and individual team members conducting routine communication and adaptation to change (Kerr, 2009; Lykourentzou et al., 2016). Dulieu et al. (2013) used DISC profile results to predict a person’s motivation, response to a situation, and fit for a potential job position, and did not connect DISC personality traits with communication and change adaptation within an existing team of a law enforcement agency. Senger (2011) used the DISC Personality System in a sales organization with the corporate salesforce to identify which personality style each customer used. Davenport (2018) used the DISC Personality System to identify what DISC personality types successful residential real estate salespeople possess.

Lykourentzou et al. (2016) recommended further study as to (a) how DISC personality testing affects populations other than crowd sourcing, (b) how DISC personality traits influence team members performing routine tasks, and (c) examining personality with regard to the mode of interaction. Uhl-Bien et al. (2014) suggested that there is a need for further empirical investigation in the area of the interaction of follower and leader traits. This presented a gap in the literature this study addressed. In response to
this gap, this study focused on how a law enforcement population performed routine
communication and adapting to change.

Chapter 3 includes conduction of the study and data collection. Additionally, this
chapter further contains explanation as to the choice of research methodology and design,
participant selection, interview questions, information collection and storage, as well as
ethical considerations. The study method and design included characteristics best
completed by use of a qualitative descriptive study. Until this time, questions arose as to
how DISC personality traits influence team members’ communication and adaptation to
change in a law enforcement team in southern North Carolina. The researcher used the
DISC Personality System, a focus group interview, and open-ended semi-structured
interviews to gain participant insight regarding how DISC traits influenced team
members. Yin (2014) and Maxwell (2013) suggested that when conducting descriptive
studies, the researcher collects, explains, describes, and holistically interprets data. The
researcher garnered insight from numerous data sources, which included diverse
information. Results of this study included information that can enable others to conduct
similar research on the DISC personality traits and teams. Chapter 3 concludes with
limitations, delimitations, and a summary.

Statement of the Problem

It was not known how DISC personality traits influenced law enforcement team
members’ routine interactions (Lykourentzou et al., 2016) of communication and
adapting to change. Traditionally, researchers focused on how individuals used cognitive
processes to solve problems; however, team-based problem solving continues as a focus
by researchers (Hung, 2013). By assessing personality traits of individuals, effective
team-based problem solving evolves through improved engagement, performance, and
decision-making, thus enhancing organizational success (Fink, 2012). The optimization
of team member personality traits, communication, and leadership are areas that require
attention if teamwork is to achieve full potential (Korner et al., 2015; Lykourentzou et al.,
2015). Various instruments exist to measure personality, including Marston’s (1928)
DISC Personality System (James, 2012). Kerr (2009) surmised that when organizational
leaders used the DISC personality traits, effective merging of existing teams resulted.
Leaders gained valuable information from individual DISC results regarding interaction
tendencies among team members and the overall impact to the new team (Kerr, 2009).
Kerr found that by using the DISC, a common language emerged enabling the new team
to be cohesive and show each member’s strengths.

Existing studies have not specifically connected DISC personality traits with team
members conducting routine communication and change adaptation. For example, Shih et
al. (2009) used the Big 5 personality traits and recommended a different personality
assessment to capture personality traits and leadership styles. In addition, Sohmen (2013)
researched the relationship between effective leadership and team performance yet did
not address personality traits of team members and leaders. Exploring how DISC
personality traits influenced team members’ communication and change adaptation was
vital to this study, as the researcher endeavored to fill gaps as to how the DISC
personality traits influenced organizational team effectiveness (James, 2012; Jeong et al.,
2012).
Research Questions

Researchers identified a need to understand personality traits better in connection with leaders, direct reports, and team interactions (Browne et al., 2016; Shih et al., 2009; Uhl-Bien et al., 2014). Belbin (2010) and Marston (1928) believed that personality is a consistent behavioral variable within individuals that includes important dynamics in team member development. Advancement of Marston’s DISC Personality Trait Theory occurred as discovery of team member behaviors allowed organizational leaders a greater insight as to how each team member works, is motivated, reacts to change, and best communicates (Angood, 2017; Dulieu et al., 2013; Keogh, 2017). It was not known how DISC personality traits influenced law enforcement team members’ routine interactions (Lykourentzou et al., 2016) of communication and adapting to change; therefore, the purpose of this qualitative descriptive study was to explore research-based evidence regarding how DISC personality traits influenced routine interactions (Lykourentzou et al., 2016) of communication and adapting to change within a law enforcement team of 37 members in southern North Carolina.

Research questions in this study reflected the theoretical framework and problem statement. The researcher used areas measured by the DISC Personality instrument, Marston’s (1928) Personality Trait Theory, findings and recommendations from Lykourentzou et al. (2016), and other empirical research data to develop two research questions. The DISC instrument measurement included team and individual strengths and limitations, how best to communicate, what each personality type seeks, solving conflict, as well as motivators, contributions to the team, how each type makes decisions, evaluates and influences others (PeopleKeys, 2017; Price, 2015). Using recommendations
from Lykourentzou et al. (2016) to study an organizational team conducting routine tasks and participant responses in this validated instrument, the following two research questions contained valuable information into the exploration of how DISC personality traits influence law enforcement team members’ communication and change adaptation. These questions included guidance for the researcher in obtaining data regarding the phenomenon of how DISC personality traits influence law enforcement team members’ communication and adapting to change while implementing team instrument results.

RQ1: How do DISC personality traits influence routine team communication?

RQ2: How do DISC personality traits influence routine team adapting to change?

The researcher used a qualitative methodology and descriptive study design versus a quantitative approach, as open-ended semi-structured interviews and life experiences captured this data more appropriately than mathematical and statistical techniques (Yin, 2014). Data collection came from three principal sources: DISC Personality System profile individual and team results, a focus group interview, and open-ended semi-structured individual interviews. The researcher answered RQ1 and RQ2 through the review of principal data sources: leader and team member open-ended semi-structured interviews (Appendix E), facilitation of a focus group interview (Appendix F), and the DISC Personality System data and scores from the individual and team results (Appendices M and S).

**Research Methodology**

For this study, the researcher used a qualitative methodology to explore how DISC personality traits influenced team members’ communication and adaptation to change in an existing law enforcement team. Yin (2014) suggested using a qualitative
approach when life experiences and subjective interviews best capture data. Because a quantitative methodology entails a statistical, calibrated, and more generalizable approach, the qualitative style enabled the researcher personal involvement with participants and data collection (Pettigrew, 2013). Quantitative research contains data based on mathematical calculations and deductive prediction of phenomena used to test hypotheses. Conversely, qualitative research includes a spoken or written narrative of inductive insight gained through interviews and observations (Maxwell, 2013). In this qualitative descriptive study, the researcher purposefully selected a small team to gain in-depth knowledge, versus a much larger population typical in a quantitative study (Yin, 2014). In a quantitative study, the sample size is as large as possible in order to generalize the results to a bigger population, which may be a limitation of a qualitative study. Although use of the IML DISC Insights Personality System Profile might be used in a quantitative methodology due to the psychometrics of its nature, the researcher desired to conduct interviews to gather data through perceptions, stories, and practical application of the DISC communication tips and change adaptation strategies.

Pettigrew (2013) and Yin (2014) recommended interviewing participants in the natural environment so during this study, the researcher focused on exploring the perceptions of 37 participants at the police station and during work hours. Campbell-Reed and Scharen (2013), Senaratne and Gunawardane (2015), and Yin (2014) found that a qualitative methodology works best when the researcher seeks answers from life experiences and interviews. The researcher used a qualitative methodology instead of a quantitative approach as subjective interviews and life experiences included data to answer the two research questions more appropriately than mathematical and statistical
techniques Using a qualitative methodology was appropriate to study team interaction
and team role as the researcher used how questions to understand participant perceptions
and lived experiences. In this qualitative descriptive study, participants shared personal
examples providing narratives for the data set through the focus group interview and the
open-ended semi-structured interviews (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016).

Pettigrew (2013) purported that in qualitative research the focus is on narration,
description, explanation, and interpretation. Merriam and Tisdell (2016) purported that
the interest of researchers in qualitative methodology lies in uncovering how participants
construct, interpret, and apply meaning to experiences. The researcher selected a
qualitative methodology to explore the phenomenon of how the DISC personality traits
influenced law enforcement team members, as discussed in the theoretical framework
because there was not a need to analyze numerical or statistical data. Quantitative would
not allow focus group or semi-structured open-ended individual interviews through a
qualitative descriptive study approach to gather participant perceptions, lived
experiences, and stories after DISC administration and application. Thus, a qualitative
methodology supported the phenomenon of assisting law enforcement team members in
establishing a common DISC language for communication, understanding how team
members respond to change, facilitating effective routine interactions, assessing
understanding of the DISC personality findings, and implementing team instrument
results.

Research Design

To discover how DISC personality traits influenced law enforcement team
members’ communication and adapting to change, the qualitative descriptive study
design emerged. Colorafi and Evans (2016) recommended using a descriptive study approach when asking how or what questions. Researchers use the descriptive study approach when taking a constructivist view of allowing a participant to tell a personal viewpoint and interpreting the observed actions (Baxter & Jack, 2008). A qualitative descriptive study enabled the researcher to explore how DISC personality traits influenced team members’ communication and adapting to change.

Yin (2014) discussed various designs such as phenomenological, narrative, grounded theory, ethnography, and historical. After reviewing these designs, using one societal culture, telling a person’s story, or waiting on an event to occur would not capture this subjective description of team member life experiences with DISC traits. The best design to use to conduct this data was a qualitative descriptive study.

Phenomenology contains structured experiences and the appearance of things as interpreted and experienced by participant first-person views of a specific phenomenon (Lenberg et al., 2017). Although participants completed the DISC Personality System profile, there were no structured experiences as the researcher interviewed and discussed. The narrative design consists of a dualistic nature of discourse and story, involving numerous events, location, and time (Lenberg et al., 2017). The narrative design would not accurately answer the research questions, as does a qualitative descriptive study because a story did not unfold.

In the grounded theory approach, the researcher develops a self-defined purpose regarding phenomena of interest and grounds the theory in observation (Marshall et al., 2013). This researcher conducted a field test (Bernard et al., 2018) with a law enforcement agency during a team meeting and determined that observation did not
garner the data needed to answer the research questions for this study. In an ethnographic approach, Fusch et al. (2017) suggested that the emphasis is on studying and interpreting the geographic location and ethnicity of a social group or an entire culture. This study contained one law enforcement team in southern North Carolina, versus the entire culture of law enforcement across the United States over a longer than one-month period so an ethnographic approach does not fit the criteria, as does a qualitative descriptive study. The purpose of a historical design is to analyze archived data and past events to assist with understanding of present happenings, exemplified by Ottisova et al. (2018) who studied trafficked children over an eight-year period.

This study included the interviewing of current team members and administering of the DISC Personality System to explore current conditions within a four-week timeframe, so a historical design over numerous years was not feasible. The sharing of the DISC profile aggregate results occurred along with a focus group interview and open-ended semi-structured interviews. Because this researcher explored how DISC personality traits influenced law enforcement team members in a natural work setting over a four-week timeframe, a descriptive study was better suited to answering the research questions rather than a story narrative or the phenomena of how things appeared in a first-person experience (Maxwell, 2013). In a descriptive study the researcher collects, explains, describes, and holistically interprets data (Yin, 2014). Rossman and Rallis (2017) declared that the descriptive study design method continues to serve researchers as an effective tool when investigating modern-day phenomena in real-life contexts. Human participants in a natural setting are one area of focus in a qualitative descriptive study design, which also includes descriptive data (Colorafi & Evans, 2016).
The researcher conducted a qualitative descriptive study by (a) using the DISC Personality System individual and team results (Appendices M and S), (b) conducting semi-structured open-ended interviews (Appendix E), and (c) facilitating a focus group interview (Appendix F) with interactions and discussion captured via digital recording and observation notes (Latham, 2014; Yin, 2014). Results of research questions RQ1 and RQ2 included participant analysis, discovery, and application of personal and team member results from completion of the DISC Personality System, and focus group interview results, enabling participants to understand self and others when making decisions and allocating work assignments. A two hour debrief of the DISC Personality System aggregate results by this certified researcher supported team members in creating a common DISC language from which to effectively communicate, addressing RQ1. Each team member learned other members’ primary personality style(s) during a debrief of aggregate results session as agreed in the Informed Consent (Appendix C). As team members applied DISC traits and openly discussed how each person reacted to change, the leaders and team members prepared more easily for change initiatives as discussed in RQ2. In this qualitative descriptive study, the researcher acted as the instrument, interacting with the participants in their natural environment of the law enforcement agency. By facilitating discussion and interviewing participants using the open-ended semi-structured Interview and Focus Group Interview Guides (Appendices E and L), the researcher discovered personal stories and viewpoints as to how the team members thought, felt, and applied DISC concepts to thought processes and interactions.

In the descriptive study design, the use of three different data collection types occurred. By coding results for personality identification from the DISC Personality
System profile results (Appendices M and S), and transcriptions from the Focus Group Interview notes (Appendix F) and the semi-structured open-ended Interview Guide (Appendix E), themes emerged. The use of this qualitative descriptive study design also transpired when discussing RQ1 and RQ2 with existing team members in a law enforcement agency regarding the application of DISC personality traits. Beginning with each participant completing the DISC Personality System (Appendix G) enabled the researcher to gather critical information as to the foundational knowledge, personal perceptions, and personality type of each participant. By identifying participant styles, the researcher then purposefully selected specific personality types for inclusion in the open-ended semi-structured interviews and focus group interview. The researcher explored the influence of DISC personality traits by gathering data explaining participants’ communication, adaptation to change, and member-to-member interactions.

Numerous concerns arise regarding descriptive study research. According to Yin (2014), some researchers disdain descriptive study design because of the perception of lack of rigor. Maxwell (2013) and Yin (2014) suggested that if a researcher follows systematic procedures and does not attempt to sway the results with personal bias, the approach remains valid. Baxter and Jack (2008) determined that a qualitative study is potentially time consuming and expensive to conduct. However, numerous researchers currently use this design for outcomes of interventions, such as the DISC personality traits application in this study. Another concern is the transferability of one small qualitative descriptive study data to a larger, general population. Fusch et al. (2017) described transferability as a qualitative term left up to the reader to decide when perusing the study. Although this study included team members on a law enforcement
team, the results may apply to similar teams who use the same concept of DISC personality traits in the area of routine communication and change adaptation. Maxwell (2013) and Yin (2014) recommended maintenance of a structured framework as well as the accurate reporting of evidence for validity in a study. Therefore, the researcher reported evidence accurately and maintained a structured framework that allowed the possibility of replication, thus the validity of the descriptive study remained intact.

Few prior qualitative descriptive studies exist regarding how DISC personality traits influence team members conducting routine communication and change adaptation (Lykourentzou et al., 2016; Puccio & Grivas, 2009). Sokhanvar, Naderi, Kakemam, Arab-Zozani, and Mousazadeh (2017) conducted a descriptive study examining the relationship between leader DISC personality type and use of evidence-based practice, however did not address routine communication and adapting to change. Davenport (2018) conducted a qualitative study using DISC personality traits to discover which DISC traits top-selling real estate agents possess, however did not address routine interactions of communication or change. Sohmen (2013) conducted a qualitative study and found that because leaders are accountable for dynamic relationships with followers and production goals, coordinating and balancing leadership and teamwork assisted in achieving positive outcomes. Senaratne and Gunawardane (2015) used a qualitative case study design to investigate leadership and team role by conducting interviews to study team interaction and dynamics.

To further DISC research in these studies, selection of a descriptive study design to gather data regarding participants’ lived experiences and perceptions regarding routine communication and adapting to change ensued (Rossman & Rallis, 2017). Through the
research questions, data emerged to assist with explanation as to how DISC traits influenced a law enforcement agency team in southern North Carolina. The researcher recruited approximately 37 law enforcement team members to complete the DISC Personality System profile. This team included men, women, and diversity in age and ethnicity. From the target team of 37, the researcher interviewed 13 team member participants and 6 different participants in a focus group interview via F2F. This qualitative descriptive study approach supported the research questions and phenomenon of this study assisting law enforcement team members in establishing a common DISC language for communication, understanding how team members respond to change, facilitating effective routine interactions, assessing understanding of the DISC personality findings, and implementing team instrument results.

**Population and Sample Selection**

The study site was in a suburb of a large city in southern North Carolina. The target population included recruitment of one existing team of 37 members of a law enforcement agency. All 37 team members signed the informed consent form and took the IML DISC Insights Personality System profile (Appendix G). Inclusion requirements to participate in this study included (a) working in the capacity of sworn officer or civilian employee for the selected police department, (b) actively working shifts within the six-week period the researcher collected data, and (c) completion of the IML DISC Insights Personality System. Actively working on this law enforcement team, completing the IML DISC Insights Personality System, and attending the DISC debrief session made these members uniquely qualified to participate in this study.
The researcher took measures to procure proper written authorization in this study. The researcher met with the Chief of Police to share study details, the participant permission letter (Appendix C), and the agency site authorization (Appendix A). The Police Chief had the researcher attend a meeting with the agency leadership team to discuss the overall study and answer any questions. After document perusal with the law enforcement legal department, the Police Chief granted written permission to conduct this study with the law enforcement agency in southern North Carolina (Appendix A). There was no participant recruitment or data collection before IRB approval (Appendix B). Next, the IRB granted permission to conduct the study with this law enforcement agency (Appendix B). After gaining agency and IRB permission, participants received an email sharing the study description, a letter of consent, and a meeting invitation (Appendix C).

Selection of this team occurred by purposive sampling, also known as subjective or judgmental. This process is described as a non-probability sampling technique in which the researcher purposefully selects a small unit to intensely study, while producing large amounts of information (Lenberg et al., 2017; Yin, 2014). Watts (2014) suggested that although it is impossible to administer assessments to every leader and team member, it is important to use a representative sampling, as some researchers do not believe qualitative research includes enough participants. Therefore, the researcher administered the IML DISC Insights Personality System profile to 37 members of the law enforcement agency and used the coded individual results to purposefully select sample groups for the focus group interview and the open-ended semi-structured individual interviews.

For the open-ended semi-structured interviews inclusion criteria encompassed purposefully selected participants who scored the following varied DISC personality
types: DCS, IS, ICS, S, SD, SI, SC, SCI, SIC, C, CSI, CS, and CD. These participants all agreed to be interviewed F2F and recorded. The researcher excluded selection of participants who did not agree to be interviewed (Appendix H, question 7) and with duplicate personality type traits as Lykourentzou et al. (2016) reported successful results with purposefully balanced teams by personality type.

For the focus group, the researcher purposefully balanced participants with specific DISC personalities using the recommendations of Lykourentzou et al. (2016) who received successful results from conducting a study with balanced crowdsourcing teams versus randomly selected ones. Therefore, purposive participant selection (Lykourentzou et al., 2015; Lykourentzou et al., 2016) included the following personality types: one DI, one ISC, one SI, one CD, and one CDS personality type, as well as those who agreed to participate as denoted on the Demographic Information (Appendix H, question 7). The researcher excluded upper law enforcement officers as Carey and Asbury (2012) suggested including homogenous members in status and rank so participants feel comfortable to freely share information and not tend to defer to higher status or rank. Thus, the focus group participants included two civilian employees and four sworn officers, with no one directly reporting to any other focus group member.

North Carolina is a state that includes numerous nationalities and ethnicities, international business interests, law enforcement departments, as well as Fortune 500 corporate headquarters. With these characteristics, southern North Carolina is a melting pot for culture and business interests so participants in the study are reflective of other states in the southern United States (Suburban Stats, 2018). Because these team members typified existing work teams in other law enforcement agencies and metropolitan
geographic areas, results could benefit other leaders, teams, and organizations.

Requirements for individuals to participate in this study included that each person be an employee of the law enforcement agency, attend the informational and debrief meeting, complete the IML DISC Insights Personality Profile, and be working a shift during the data collection period. Once IRB granted permission (Appendix B), participants were contacted via email to attend an informational meeting where completion of participant informed consent forms (Appendix C) occurred. The study duration was four weeks and the plan for attrition was to include the chief, lieutenants, sergeants, corporals, sworn officers, and civilian employees which brought the participants to approximately 37. The next section includes discussion of the three sources of data used for this study.

**Sources of Data**

Validation, reliability, and trustworthiness are important aspects of qualitative research (Yin, 2014). By using the IML DISC Insights Personality System Profile participant (Davenport, 2018) results (Appendix G), open-ended semi-structured interviews (Appendix E), and a focus group interview (Appendix F) data trustworthiness (Denzin & Lincoln, 2018) occurred. When collecting information from multiple sources, data results included greater support than a single source and confirmed if similar findings occur (Yin, 2014). The researcher used a majority of open-ended questions in an open-ended semi-structured individual Interview Guide (Appendix E), a Focus Group Interview Guide (Appendix F), and administered the IML DISC Insights Personality System Profile (Appendix G) to gather data as Yin (2014) purported this practice includes success for analysis of team member perception. The next section includes a detailed review of the instruments.
**DISC instrument.** For the first source of data in this study, the researcher employed the Institute for Motivational Living (IML) DISC Insights Personality System Profile (PeopleKeys, 2008). The basis of the IML DISC Insights Personality System profile (Appendix G) is an ipsative method, or binary forced-choice system meaning that a person must select the best option from a set of 24 sets of four phrases (PeopleKeys, 2017). The participant must then select one phrase that is most descriptive and another that is least descriptive of personal behavioral traits (PeopleKeys, 2017). Price (2015) conducted a study for validity and reliability of construct on the Institute for Motivational Living (IML) DISC Insights Personality Profile and found that when participants had to make a forced selection of the most and least preferred of four words or phrases, the highest reliability coefficients criterion validity evidence was observed, and the smallest indications of response bias was observed.

From the participant response results, Freeman (2011) indicated the majority of people score in a blend of personality styles consisting of Direct/Driver (D), Influence/Inspire (I), Steady/Stable (S), and Correct/Compliant/Conscientious (C).

Participant responses contain information generating intensity scores (PeopleKeys, 2008, codebook p. 4-5) coded on three graphs (Appendix K) in the four DISC dimensions:

1. Dominance- how a person demonstrates assertion, controls situations, and deals with conflict.
2. Influence- how a person interacts with and relates to people, and communication style.
3. Steadiness- how a person demonstrates a thoughtful, patient and steady temperament.
4. Compliance- how a person organizes and analytically approaches procedures and activity (Puccio & Grivas, 2009).
Three graphs in Appendix K contain coded results regarding the individual’s personality style: Graph 1 The Public Self-The Mask coding the Most answers by the participant, Graph 2 The Private Self-The Core coding the Least answers, and Graph 3 Perceived Self-The Mirror coding the Most minus the Least responses (Dulieu et al., 2013; PeopleKeys, 2008). Ipsative assessments differ from a normative testing method where the respondent rates personal preference on a scale (PeopleKeys, 2017). Research results indicate that ipsative testing is preferred because respondents falsely identify expected answers less than in the normative method (PeopleKeys, 2017). The researcher used tallied and coded participant responses to identify the main personality trait(s) above the midline denoted on Graph 3 (PeopleKeys, 2008, Codebook p. 4-5), leading to preferred communication, change, leadership, and team interactive behaviors.

Studies by two leading DISC distributors verified reliability and validity of this behavior profile. One widely used DISC distributor, Inscape Publishing (2008), conducted a study with a sample size of 812 finding that the DISC Personality System contained good and excellent internal consistency scores of the following: Dominant: .92, Influencing: .87, Steadiness: .88, and Compliant: .85. Inscape Publishing (2008) also verified that use of Cronbach’s Alpha assisted with verification of internal validity consistency. Klassen (2006) indicated ranges of 0.64-0.80 for Cronbach’s Alpha coefficients in a validation study. Price (2015) conducted a study using the IML DISC Insights Personality System Profile with a total sample of 331 and a random subsample of 200 ethnically diverse subjects. Through the multiple analytical approaches used in the study, Price (2015) concluded that the psychometric properties of the IML DISC instrument contained multidimensional factorial reliability and validity.
When completing the IML DISC Insights Personality System, the participant may experience influence by external factors such as education, life experience, maturity, and seeking advice from others (Freeman, 2011). Some common problems with personality systems and assessments include false reporting when participants answer how an organization or supervisor might expect, and situational specificity by looking only at a recent event versus a larger scope of situations (Price, 2015). The researcher mitigated these concerns by asking participants to respond with the mindset of their work environment and to answer with individual beliefs versus how supervisors may state.

Use of the DISC first occurred as a data instrument, following the coding process according to IML PeopleKeys Codebook (2008, p. 4-5) and Davenport (2018). Next, the researcher used the individual participant personality type(s) and results as a selection tool for purposive sampling for the focus group interview and the semi-structured open-ended interviews. The individual DISC results (Appendix M) and the team DISC results (Appendix S) also informed participant responses during the focus group interview (Appendix F) and the open-ended semi-structured interviews (Appendix E) as questions referred to these results. Lykourentzou et al. (2016) found that balanced teams yielded better results so use of the individual DISC results contained identification of as many different participant traits as possible.

Open-ended semi-structured interview. The second instrument and source of data for this study included use of open ended semi-structured interviews. The researcher used Marston’s (1928) Personality Trait Theory, the IML DISC Insights Personality System profile (PeopleKeys, 2008), recommendations from Lykourentzou et al. (2016), and collaborated with four certified DISC facilitator experts, identified in the Validity
Statement (Appendix R) in expert validation to influence 27 interview questions, based on the two research questions. All the experts and the researcher hold certifications in the DISC model and are train-the-trainers/facilitators as well, as used and recommended by Brodie (2016) and Bernier (2017). Two of the experts hold earned doctorates, one holds a master’s degree, and one is a certified DISC master facilitator trainer while three of the experts work with the DISC instrument in their daily business careers.

The open-ended semi-structured Interview Guide formatted after an interview guide created by Laforest (2009) contained a majority of open-ended prompt questions in pre-determined areas (Petty, Thomson, & Stew, 2012) indicating how the DISC personality traits influenced law enforcement team members conducting routine communication and change adaptation. Lenberg et al. (2017) recommended use of open-ended questions in a qualitative study to give participants the opportunity to reply with personal thoughts and words. Krueger and Casey (2015) recommended use of a questioning route, including opening, introduction, transition, key, and ending questions to assist participants in becoming comfortable with the facilitator and other participants. According to Baxter and Jack (2008) use of an interview protocol assists researchers in providing duplicatable instructions for interviews and reliable qualitative data to compare. The researcher used this recommendation and questions were not all how questions or open-ended. The overarching research questions were as follows:

RQ1: How do DISC personality traits influence routine team communication?

RQ2: How do DISC personality traits influence routine team adapting to change?

In the open-ended semi-structured Interview Guide (Appendix E) questions 1 through 15 were subparts of RQ1 and contained questions regarding how the application of DISC
personality concepts influenced identification of new terms and concepts for influencing team communication, as well as potential communication problems. Questions 16 and 17 in the Interview Guide (Appendix E) contained an opportunity for each participant to share perceptions as to the level of the team’s adaptation to change before and after the DISC Personality System administration, along with an open-ended question section to elaborate on the stated response. Interview Guide questions 16 through 23 were subparts of RQ2 and included questions focusing on change adaptation and how DISC traits included the ideal working environment, influencing the participant and team with implementing recent changes. The final three questions were optional and contained a prompt for the participant to share any additional information regarding other potential routine interactions, and how DISC traits influenced the team, self, or others (Brodie, 2016; Rusk, 2016).

The researcher collaborated with the panel of experts to craft and influence the open-ended semi-structured individual interview questions. After the researcher constructed the interview guide first draft, it was emailed to the four DISC certified experts. Feedback from the panel experts included removing a Likert-like scale, including two a fill in the blank options, and providing a question at the end of the interview guide for participants to add any additional information. This process provided validity and reliability to the semi-structured open-ended Interview Guide (Appendix E).

After making the recommended edits, the researcher field-tested the interview questions with two local business leaders and their direct team members at two different settings to ensure interview questions yielded the best results in answering the initial research questions. Neither of these teams participated in the conducted study or were
members of the target law enforcement team. The interview guide underwent revision again, much like a study conducted by Brodie (2016) and Bernier (2017) who crafted questions, vetted them with a panel of content experts, and conducted a field test prior to gathering data. Conducting two field tests (Bernard et al., 2018) added further validity and reliability to the open-ended semi-structured Interview Guide (Appendix E). The open-ended semi-structured Interview Guide and protocol (Appendix E) contained the final questions, ensuring that all participants experienced the same questions during the individual interview (Rosenthal, 2016). Appendix E contains the Interview Guide and protocol.

**Focus group interview.** The third source of data used for this study was a focus group interview. The researcher conducted a focus group with 6 participants for approximately two hours in duration to describe “settings, behaviors, and events,” as well as draw inferences to see Marston’s (1928) DISC Personality Theory in use (Maxwell, 2013, p. 102). The focus group included 6 team members different from the 13 participants involved in the open-ended semi-structured individual interviews to garner different perspectives and points of view to a different set of discussion questions (Carey & Asbury, 2012). Krueger and Casey (2015) recommended using different questions for the focus group interview discussion so the researcher may garner a variety of perspectives, perceptions, and opinions within a select group of specific participants.

The researcher facilitated a focus group interview of purposively selected team members during a designated time to denote how team members interacted together in their natural setting, as well as gain insight from participants through the answering of the focus group questions (Appendix F). Cowton and Downs (2015) indicated that interacting
with participants in the natural setting assists with the revealing of personal expertise and insights of group members. The researcher used Krueger and Casey’s (2015) recommendation of a question route, beginning with an opening question that was factual thus enabling each participant to answer freely, contribute and begin to get comfortable. Question 1 met these criteria by asking participants to introduce themselves and share which DISC Personality trait(s) they scored above midline. The next questions introduced the research topic and transitioned to the key questions, or the focus of the group interview (Krueger & Casey, 2015). The introduction, Question 2 entailed participants answering how the DISC results were useful and to provide an example. Question 3 included transition to the beginning key questions by prompting participants to think back to the DISC debrief session and to share their first impressions. Questions 4-10 included communication and change questions from Wheelan’s (2013) effective member attributes, and Smith and Hoy’s (as cited in Kearney & Smith, 2008) openness to change traits. Finally, the ending questions 11-12 included promptings that allowed the participants to add additional information that may be individually important and not asked by the facilitator.

The purpose of the facilitated discussion among team members was to gather rich data from participant answers and group interactions to answer the research questions and the problem statement regarding how DISC personality traits influence team members’ routine communication and adapting to change (Lykourentzou et al., 2016). The focus group included two civilian employees and four sworn officers, omitting upper level leadership to enable a homogenous sample population freedom to answer questions and interact freely (Carey & Asbury, 2012; Krueger & Casey, 2015). The facilitator also
asked different questions in the focus group than in the individual open-ended semi-structured interviews (Krueger & Casey, 2015).

The focus group gave the researcher an opportunity to interact with and observe how a subpart of the overall team implemented and perceived DISC personality traits. This was impossible to do through only the individual interviews. Through omitting upper leadership, using a different question set, and interacting with and observing a subset sample, different perspectives emerges, Petty et al. (2012) described informal observation as the researcher becoming the instrument while taking part in the situation or merely silently observing. The researcher observed while facilitating the focus group interview, while recording the interview so as not to miss any of the dialog or non-verbal behavior during the interchange (Carey & Asbury, 2012).

The researcher used transcriptions to identify codes and themes containing data assisting in answering the research questions. Areas covered in the Focus Group Question Guide (Appendix F) included communication using Wheelan’s (2013) effective team member attributes, adaptation to change using the DISC results and Smith and Hoy’s (as cited in Kearney & Smith, 2008) openness to change traits, strengths, and influences of DISC traits (PeopleKeys, 2008). This Focus Group Guide underwent two field tests (Bernard et al., 2018) and examination by the DISC experts prior to actual data collection ensured validity and reliability to the Focus Group Interview Guide and protocol (Appendix F). In addition, this law enforcement agency recently experienced numerous promotions, procedural changes, and new hires so the researcher facilitated questions as to how participants implemented and responded to past and present change, as well as communication techniques.
The focus group interview, using the Focus Group Interview Guide (Appendix F) occurred F2F, including digitally recording the session to capture participant responses. The researcher noted specific items, such as DISC trait terminology, how team member communicated, and how team members adapted to change individually and with fellow teammates (PeopleKeys, 2008). These communication and change adaptation prompts contained specific data and the researcher maintained focus for verbal responses and observed behaviors (Kearney & Smith, 2008; Wheelan, 2013). Then, the researcher wrote a description of the data obtained from the focus group as additional data (Appendix W) and developed a framework to interpret and theme notes (Petty et al., 2012). The use of pseudonyms for each participant maintained confidentiality throughout the entire process. These practices added validity and reliability to the focus group interview as a data collection source. Potential issues with focus groups included immense time commitments, and that participants may not act normally when a researcher is present and recording the session (Petty et al., 2012).

The focus group interview of 6 and the 13 open-ended semi-structured interviews used different participants, different questions, and different question guides (Appendices E, F). This process included collection of diverse perspectives from 19 different participants. Carey and Asbury (2012) and Krueger and Casey (2015) recommended different participants from the same target population/team with different questions for validity and reliability of the study. The focus group did not include upper level leadership as Carey and Asbury (2012) recommended a homogeneous group for a “rankless” meeting and freer expression of participants’ opinions, perspectives, and stories.
Validity

In a qualitative study, the researcher cannot rely on statistical calculations and tests to prove validity (Singh, 2015). Pettigrew (2013) purported that validity and reliability arise when the researcher ensures appropriate context, process, and accurate recording of results. Objectivity, reliability, transferability, and validity are critical components to test honesty in the work of any researcher (Sarma, 2015). Fusch et al. (2017) posited that validity includes both external and construct and connects back to the conceptual framework. The researcher ensured construct validity by (a) using the coding process of participants’ responses in the DISC Personality Profile individual and team results for purposive sampling in the focus group interview and open-ended semi-structured interviews, (b) seeking participant review (member checking) of interview answers, (c) protecting all collected data and evidence, and (d) documenting each step of the study for replication or transferability.

The validity of the IML DISC Insights Personality System profile (Appendix G), the Interview Question Guide and protocol (Appendix E), and the Focus Group Interview Guide and protocol (Appendix F) encompassed numerous factors. First, the DISC Personality System instrument contained validation from both Inscape Publishing (2008) and PeopleKeys (2008), two of the largest distributors of the behavioral profiling instrument. Price (2015) investigated the IML DISC Insights four-factor structure in relation to Marston’s (1928) theoretical framework by using the Q-Technique for internal construct validity. The Q-Technique allows the researcher to classify participants on individual preferences within themselves. In ten random samples, results contained
evidence for a four-factor dimensional structure, as well as 70% of the total variance explained within the IML DISC model and Insights instrument (Price, 2015).

With a sample size of 812 in 1996, the IML DISC Insights Personality System contained good and excellent internal consistency scores of the following: Dominant: .92, Influencing: .87, Steadiness: .88, and Compliant: .85 (Inscape Publishing, 2008). Klassen (2006) indicated ranges of 0.64-0.80 for Cronbach’s Alpha coefficients in a validation study. According to Davenport (2018) Cronbach’s alpha includes scoring on a scale of 0.0 to 1.0, indicating that the closer the value is to 1.0, the better the correlation among questions measuring the equal traits. Acceptable values average approximately 0.70, a 0.80 value is good, while 0.90 represents an exceptional level of internal consistency (Inscape Publishing, 2008).

The basis of the DISC Personality System is an ipsative method, or binary forced-choice assessment meaning that a person must select the best option from a set of phrases (Inscape Publishing, 2008; PeopleKeys, 2008; Price, 2015). Ipsative assessments differ from a normative testing method where the respondent rates personal preference on a scale (PeopleKeys, 2017). Research results indicate that ipsative testing is preferred because respondents falsely identify expected answers less than in the normative method (PeopleKeys, 2017). According to leading distributors, Inscape Publishing (2008), use of Cronbach’s Alpha assisted with verification of internal validity consistency. With a sample size of 812 in 1996, the DISC Personality System contained good and excellent internal consistency scores of the following: Dominant-.92, Influencing-.87, Steadiness-.88, and Compliant-.85 (Inscape Publishing, 2008). Klassen (2006) indicated ranges of 0.64-0.80 for alpha coefficients in a validation study.
Second, the researcher used Marston’s (1928) DISC Personality Trait Theory, the IML DISC Insights Personality System profile (PeopleKeys, 2008), recommendations from Lykourentzou et al. (2016), feedback from two field tests (Bernard et al., 2018), and collaboration with four certified DISC facilitator experts to influence a 27-question open-ended semi-structured interview guide, based on the two research questions. Expert validation resulted as the four DISC certified facilitators had numerous years of expert certification status and are known as experts in the field of DISC facilitation and interpretation. This researcher is DISC certified and has 18 years of experience expertly administering, facilitating, and debriefing the IML DISC Insights Personality System. After expert panel members suggested revisions and two field tests (Bernard et al., 2018), the open-ended semi-structured interview guide underwent scrutiny with two different leaders and team member groups in southern North Carolina in a field test, who closely resembled the study group.

Third, the researcher conducted two field tests (Bernard et al., 2018) using two different consulting teams, one of eight people and another of twenty, none of whom participated in the actual study, to practice the open-ended semi-structured interview questions and decide if observation yielded rich data. During the first field test, the researcher administered the DISC Personality Profile, printed the individual results, and held a DISC debrief session to discuss individual and team aggregate results. After two weeks, the researcher used the open-ended semi-structured interview questions with the test team and made clarifying corrections to the interview questions as needed to improve data collection and clarify ambiguity (Bernard et al., 2018). Furthermore, after one
month, the researcher observed during a weekly team meeting to see if observation yielded applicable data to answer the research questions.

For the second field test, the researcher attended a shift change meeting of a similar law enforcement agency to the actual study population to determine if team observation provided enough information for the researcher to use observation. The researcher determined that observation did not garner enough information from either field test, so a decision to conduct a focus group interview and guide (Appendix F) resulted. By conducting two field tests (Bernard et al., 2018), the researcher added validity and trustworthiness to the study.

Fourth, after conducting two field tests, the researcher changed from observation of weekly team meetings to conducting a focus group interview, with GCU doctoral committee approval, in order to gather richer and more accurate data. Krueger and Casey (2015) and Carey and Asbury (2012) recommended a questioning route when conducting a focus group, consisting of the value, affect, and depth of personal experience, individual perspective, specific details, and a broad range of experienced participants. The Focus Interview Guide and protocol (Appendix F) contained these attributes with open-ended questions differing from the open-ended semi-structured Interview Guide and protocol and was informed by the literature of Wheelan (2013), Smith & Hoy (as cited in Kearney & Smith, 2008), PeopleKeys (2017) individualized DISC results, Marston’s (1928) Personality Trait Theory, Lykourentzou et al.’s (2016) recommendations, Krueger and Casey’s (2015) questioning route, and Carey and Asbury’s (2012) group dynamics and empirical research. Four experts reviewed and vetted the Focus Group Guide and protocol, as well as two field study tests conducted for gathering data.
Fifth, the meticulous gathering, documenting, and transcription of participant insights added validity to the study (Maxwell, 2013). Capturing demographic information also increased validity by including diverse ethnicities, genders, ages, and both home agency and shift team members, exemplifying contemporary organizational composition (Bartelt & Dennis, 2014). Finally, validity occurred when participant answers were reproducible (Brodie, 2016). By using these methods and data collection sources, the establishment of construct validity occurred (Yin, 2014). Maxwell (2013) suggested that evidence extinguishes validity threats in a study, so the researcher produced DISC results for each participant and the team, open-ended semi-structured interview notes checked by the interviewee for accuracy and focus group interview notes transcribed by rev.com and checked by the researcher and focus group participants (Petty et al., 2012).

When conducting qualitative research, consideration of numerous factors occurs such as number of interviews to conduct, participant selection, coding, and external and internal validity. Validity emerged as the researcher confirmed rich data saturation by conducting a few more open-ended semi-structured interviews as Fusch and Ness (2015) described leading to no new data, themes, or information. The study included 37 participants and the researcher interviewed 13 participants face-to-face in response to paper questions and 6 purposefully selected homogenous focus group participants, reaching rich data saturation. Yin (2014) summarized external validity as how transferable the data and findings are to other populations, while internal validity included the rigor with which the researcher conducted the study.

Even though this study included law enforcement agency members on an existing team in southern North Carolina, the findings will benefit other law enforcement agencies
and organizations in the southern United States. The IML DISC Insights Personality System (Appendix G) is widely used in organizations so data gathered assisted leaders and team members in building effective communication and apply external validity to the study. As participants completed the DISC Personality System online in a private environment, adequate time allotment and private personal item selection occurred. The researcher has practiced focus group interview facilitation and open-ended semi-structured interviewing practices for the past 20 years as a principal, professor, and human resource executive, conducting teachers’ observations and evaluations during class, as well as interviewing and hiring hundreds of new employees. The researcher conducted member checking throughout the open-ended semi-structured interviews and focus group interviews by validating meaning through probing and clarifying questions, ensuring no gaps in the phenomenon or research questions occurred. After transcription occurred, the researcher gave each participant the individual transcript to review to ensure what was originally said. The researcher purposely did not give the participants the coded or themed responses due to busy work schedules and that law enforcement would not desire to know the researcher themes or codes. This member checking process enhanced the validity of the study results.

**Reliability**

Reliability in a study is essential. According to Sarma (2015), reliability includes findings that enable a researcher to replicate consistently the study with participants in a similar context. Objectivity, reliability, transferability, and validity are critical components in the work of any researcher (Sarma, 2015). Fusch et al. (2017) described transferability as a qualitative term left up to the reader to decide when perusing the
study. By using these methods, the researcher frames and conveys new ideas and theories (Brodie, 2016).

When using validated instruments and multiple sources of data to obtain outcomes, reliability increases (Yin, 2014). Prochaska et al. (2015) reported that the DISC instrument contained reliability by validating it with the cluster factor and the exploratory factor, two multivariate statistical techniques. Lykourentzou et al. (2016) conducted a study using the DISC Personality System with 70 people and found the DISC assessment instrument to contain reliability for personality-matching strategies in balancing a team. Price (2015) described reliability as the consistency, accuracy, and stability of scores procured from a measurement instrument. When conducting reliability research on the IML DISC Insights Personality System Profile instrument, Price used the true score model and reported evidence based on internal structure and decision consistency. Price also used a structural equation modeling approach while examining the congruence between the DISC subscales of Dominance, Influence, Steadiness, and Compliance and the instrument construct validity.

On a subscale reliability of the four DISC dimensions, Price found an overall coefficient alpha of .87 and a standard error of measurement of 7.39. This sample was composed of 200 subjects randomly selected from a total sample of 331. Because the DISC Personality instrument is valid and reliable the use of the IML DISC Insights Personality System Profile instrument contributed validity and reliability to the study evidence, findings, and results.

When reviewing and analyzing the IML DISC Insights Personality System Profile individual and team results (Appendices M and S), the researcher used evidence from
participant answers to the 24 question sets to identify codes and themes in accordance with PeopleKey’s (2008) codebook (p. 4-5). These codes and themes aligned with and overlapped the open-ended semi-structured individual interview and focus group interview transcripts (Appendix Y). Additionally, peer debriefing with a DISC expert when identifying codes and confirming themes in the Codebook (Appendices T, U, X, Y). Finally, the strength and alignment of the DISC results findings aligned with Marston’s (1928) Personality Trait Theory as the law enforcement team scored similarly in areas to identified results of Marston’s original research theory and findings. One example includes the majority of participants scored in the S and C categories (78%), revealing a need for direct involvement in the change process and a significant amount of prior knowledge, while the minority trait categories included D and I (22%). The completion of these procedures contributed to the confirmability, dependability, trustworthiness, and reliability of this study.

To ensure reliability of the open-ended semi-structured Interview Guide and protocol (Appendix E) and the Focus Group Question Guide and protocol (Appendix F), the researcher used the following:

- DISC concepts from PeopleKey’s (2008) psychological instrument and participant and team results (Appendices M and S) to generate appropriate questions for the focus group interview and the open-ended semi-structured interviews.

- Marston’s (1928) DISC Personality Trait Theory for theoretical accuracy.

- Lykourentzou et al. (2015) recommendations and findings to build on empirical findings.

- Uhl-Bien et al. (2014) leader-follower research to build on empirical findings.

- Two field study tests to pilot the question guides prior to the actual study for accurate data collection (Denzin & Lincoln, 2018).
• A panel of four DISC certified experts for expert validation.

• Krueger and Casey’s (2015) focus group questioning route to ask questions in an order established on empirical research and findings.

• Wheelan’s (2013) attributes of effective team member’s communication and participation to ask questions established on empirical research and findings.

• Smith & Hoy’s (as cited in Kearney & Smith, 2008) openness to change traits to ask questions established on empirical research and findings.

The IML DISC Insights Personality System individualized participant results included specific techniques for optimal communication including evaluation and influencing of others, value to the team, reaction to pressure, motivational factors, and areas of improvement (PeopleKeys, 2008). The researcher used some of these concepts in the interview questions and placed these sections at the top of the open-ended semi-structured Interview Guide and protocol (Appendix E) for the prompting of participants: Participants were provided with and used their IML DISC Insights results (Appendix M), and the IML DISC Insights team results (Appendix S) to assist in answering the open-ended semi-structured interview and focus group questions. Some areas in participant results included evaluation and influencing of others, value to the team, reaction to pressure, motivational factors, greatest fear, strengths, challenges, dislikes, ideal environment, and decision-making style. Participants shared a specific situation or event that embodied the concept in the question (Petty et al., 2012). Maxwell (2013) recommended that researchers gain a depth of understanding with participants, so the researcher included opportunities that required both past and present tense responses regarding specific events and situations.

The researcher enlisted four expert DISC certified facilitators (expert validation) to assist with advice and the queries for both the open-ended semi-structured Interview
Guide (Appendix E) and the Focus Group Interview Guide and protocol (Appendix F) process, thus furthering reliability by adding consistency and accuracy to both guides (Price, 2015). These individuals hold earned certifications to facilitate DISC Personality System instruments and have numerous years of experience in facilitating debrief and strategy sessions with diverse international business and organizational groups. The experts work in the fields of business, religion, education, and consulting arenas. Brodie (2016) conducted a qualitative study and enlisted the assistance of experts to add consistency, stability, and accuracy to interview questions, suggesting experts lend reliability and validity in their subject matter expertise. The researcher contacted these DISC certified experts to garner advice for the most appropriate wording and questions influenced by empirical research and literature to ask participants. The researcher submitted the draft questions to the experts who suggested revisions. The researcher made suggested revisions of removing the Likert-type questions, providing fill-in-the-blank and open-ended questions, providing participants with their personal and team DISC profile results in the open-ended semi-structured interview, and share specific areas of communication. These types of questions allowed the researcher to gather descriptive data (Yin, 2014). Bernard et al. (2018) recommended conducting a field test study as one means of gaining reliability and validity for each potential item.

The researcher conducted two field tests (Bernard et al., 2018) using two different consulting teams, one of eight people and another an adjacent police department team of twenty, none of whom participated in the actual study, to practice the open-ended semi-structured interview questions and decide if observation yielded rich data. The researcher chose these teams because there were several leaders and direct reports similar to the
study team. The first team took the DISC Personality System and had a debrief of individual and aggregate results, with an emphasis on routine communication and change. The second team was observed only to see if sufficient interactions occurred during a shift change meeting to gather data to answer the research questions. Observation did not yield adequate results, therefore the researcher selected a focus group interview. Thus, establishment of reliability and validity occurred due to question content from the DISC Personality Profile instrument (Appendix G), panel DISC content expert input, conducting of two consulting field tests (Bernard et al., 2018), and extensive revision of the open-ended semi-structured Interview Question Guide in Appendix E and the Focus Group Guide in Appendix F (Krueger & Casey, 2015; PeopleKeys, 2008).

Throughout the study, the researcher preserved participants’ confidentiality by creating identifying markers for information categorization and allowing member checking after open-ended semi-structured and focus group interview transcription (Yin, 2014). By ensuring anonymity, participants felt free to speak candidly and without reprisal when answering questions (Maxwell, 2013). After interviewing participant one, there was a poverty of expression due to the personality type and potentially being a law enforcement officer, so the researcher further defined the terms communication and change to clarify for future participant interviews (Appendix E). The researcher asked the clarified open-ended semi-structured interview questions to participants 2 through 13 to ensure reliability in the study.

Data Collection and Management

In an ethical study, the researcher may begin collecting data once appropriate approval occurs. According to Yin (2014), the collection of data in a study occurs in a
variety of ways. Thus, the researcher employed the following data collection and management procedures to address the research questions.

The researcher discussed the participant recruitment process when meeting with the Chief of Police of the southern North Carolina law enforcement organization to include the entire department. Also shared at the meeting were the intent and purpose of the study, and the proposed confidential data collection procedures: (a) the IML DISC Insight Personality System (Appendix G), (b) the conducting of 13 in-depth open-ended semi-structured interviews selected by the researcher resulting from specific personality types and using the open-ended semi-structured Interview Guide and protocol (Appendix E), (c) facilitation of a focus group interview with 6 participants selected by the researcher based on DISC results guided by a Focus Group Guide and protocol in Appendix F (Krueger & Casey, 2015; Latham, 2014; Yin, 2014), and (d) member checking of provided transcripts upon all interview completion. The researcher checked with PeopleKeys, the distributor of the IML DISC Insights Personality System to seek permission to use the profile. However, since the researcher purchased the DISC Personality System, no written permission was necessary from the company. PeopleKeys granted permission to attach Appendices I, J, and K showing the participant question sets and how to code and interpret participant responses in PeopleKeys codebook (PeopleKeys, 2008, p. 5).

After the law enforcement agency granted written permission, the Dissertation Chair submitted this proposal for Institutional Review Board (IRB) approval through Grand Canyon University. Upon notification of IRB approval (Appendix B), the researcher notified the Chief of Police of the upcoming timeframes and procedures. The
researcher then met with potential participants to explain the study, share a packet of pertinent information, and gain written informed consent. The packet contained the researcher’s name and contact information, the proposed study’s description, and the affiliation with Grand Canyon University. The study description included the study name, significance, research questions, data collection procedures, and restrictions (Appendix C). The researcher answered any questions and secured written informed consent from each participant. No data collection occurred without IRB approval and participant written informed consent.

First, the researcher sought organizational permission by the Chief of Police and the law enforcement agency in southern North Carolina, who granted written consent in Appendix A for the researcher to gather data at this facility (Maxwell, 2013). At this meeting, the researcher discussed member recruitment with 37 of the 42 members of the agency, as 5 were on leave. Second, after IRB approval (Appendix B), the researcher invited each agency member and conducted a meeting with 37 of the 42 members to discuss the following components of the study:

- Review interview protocol
- Request participation and written informed consent signatures for study participation
- Review data source involvement of participation in completion of the DISC Personality System, volunteers for and recording of open-ended semi-structured interviews and focus group interview.

Third, the researcher informed team members that participation is voluntary, and ensured all employees that no consequences exist if any person chooses not to participate. The researcher received assurance by the Chief and other leaders that no retaliation or negative evaluation consequences occurred if employees choose not to participate in the
study (Rusk, 2016). Fourth, the researcher addressed study confidentiality, participant questions, and any potential apprehension during the meeting. The participants who attended the meeting received the written informed consent (Appendix C), study description, demographic sheet (Appendix H), and DISC key code information as well as an electronic copy, if desired. However, any other law enforcement employees agreeing to participate in the study received the informed consent, study description, and demographic information in an email and the researcher answered any questions. Participants could withdraw from the study at any time without penalty; however, no one withdrew from the study. The researcher told potential participants that there was no cost or compensation for participating in the study.

Fifth, after participants signed consent forms, the researcher emailed participants the administrative code to complete the online IML DISC Insights Personality System profile within one week (Appendix I). The IML DISC Insights individual (Appendix M) and team (Appendix S) profile results remain on a secure server at PeopleKeys and are not visible to anyone other than the researcher, even if the participant used a computer at work or home to complete the profile. After checking with PeopleKeys, no participant addresses are stored or used for advertisement or further marketing, thus ensuring participant privacy. During the seven-day profile assessment timeframe, the researcher consistently checked for participant completion and sent email reminders to, or called any person still needing to complete it.

Sixth, the researcher is a certified DISC master trainer and followed the coding procedures to identify the participants’ “most” and “least” individual responses (Davenport, 2018) from the IML DISC Insights Personality System Profile, resulting in
identification of specific pure or blended Dominant, Influencing, Steady, and Compliant traits as described in the codebook (PeopleKeys, 2008, p. 4-5). To prepare for the debrief session, coding occurred for the individual trait results, people or task orientation to answer communication preference (RQ1), and active or passive individual traits to answer change adaptation preference (RQ2) as listed in Appendix Y.

The researcher then conducted a two-hour debrief of aggregate profile results with the team members at the research site. Each participant received and reviewed the personal results (Appendix M) and portions of the team results (Appendix S) generated from online completion of the IML DISC Insights Personality System at the debrief session. The debrief session included a PowerPoint review of the IML DISC Insights Personality System, Dominant, Influencing, Steady, and Compliant styles, and a review of Graph 3 in the individual DISC results, which identified each person’s individual trait(s), and the group results. To ensure participant confidentiality, the researcher did not review individual results in the group setting; however, inclusion of the individual’s personality traits occurred in the team results so each team member could use this information in daily routine interactions of communication (RQ1) and adapting to change (RQ2). The researcher also reviewed personality type communication likes and dislikes, as well as preference for change to be communicated and implemented. Each participant joined the Graph 3 identified trait group and participated in a perception activity (PeopleKeys, 2008, codebook p. 4-5). All participants asked any questions, made observations, interacted with fellow team members, and departed with individual and team results (Appendices M, S). All participants completed the DISC Personality System profile and 36 attended a two-hour DISC debrief session in person at the research site.
One participant could not attend the debrief session but individual and private debrief occurred by the researcher.

Seventh, collection of data from team members using a F2F focus group interview in a private office at the police station (Appendix F) ensued. Latham (2014) and Yin (2014) recommended gathering team member perceptions assists with exploring the phenomenon, thus proving to be the definitive route to document evidence in this study of exploring the influence of DISC personality traits on law enforcement team member communication and adapting to change. The researcher facilitated a focus group interview for data collection using a questioning route proposed by Krueger and Casey (2015), including opening, introduction, transition, key, and ending questions.

The purpose of the focus group was to establish a DISC personality balanced subgroup of participants, consisting of one DI, one ISC, one SI, one SCI, one CD, and one CDS type personalities to answer proposed questions (Appendix F), discuss, and share experiences of how DISC personality traits influenced routine communication and change adaptation, as Lykourentzou et al. (2016) gained more productive results from a balanced team versus one randomly selected.

Carey and Asbury (2012) recommended to purposefully create a homogenous focus group, allowing members to freely express perceptions and experiences in a rankles setting. Therefore, the researcher excluded upper ranking leadership in the focus group and included two sworn civilian employees and four sworn officers with no direct reports in the group discussion. Focus group participants and Focus Group Guide and protocol questions (Appendix F) differed from those in the open-ended semi-structured individual interviews and Interview Guide and protocol (Appendix E) as recommended by Krueger
and Casey (2015) and Carey and Asbury (2012) in order to gather rich data from different participants. These participants came from the target 37 participants, however were 19 different individuals ensuring varied perspectives, perceptions, and opinions to inform both research questions (Carey & Asbury, 2012; Krueger & Casey, 2015). At the conclusion of the focus group interview, the researcher journaled observations regarding members and group dynamics as noted in additional data (Appendix W).

Eighth, the final stage of the data collection included 13 semi-structured open-ended individual interviews. The researcher obtained informed consent at the initial meeting and prior to each interview with participants to record the focus group interview so verbal, non-verbal, and observation may occur (Cowton & Downs, 2015). Purposeful selection of 13 members occurred due to the research of Lykourentzou et al. (2016), that balanced DISC personality trait teams produce greater results than unbalanced, randomly selected DISC personality trait members. Therefore, after coding of individual IML DISC Insights Personality System Profile responses, the researcher selected 13 team members, different from the focus group 6 members to participate in the open-ended semi-structured interviews. The personality types purposefully selected for the greatest diversity of perspective for participation included: DCS, IS, ICS, S, SD, SI, SC, SCI, SIC, C, CSI, CS, and CD. The researcher gave the interview questions to each team member at the beginning of the focus group interview session, as recommended by Rogo and Portillo (2015). The open-ended semi-structured interview questions emerged from the two over-arching research questions and consisted of several open-ended sub-questions regarding routine communication, change, how administration of the DISC influenced the team, strengths, challenges, and personal likes/dislikes. The open-ended
semi-structured Interview Guide and protocol (Appendix E) contained 27 open-ended how questions (Yin, 2014).

The researcher conducted 13 face-to-face open-ended semi-structured interviews to understand the goals and perspectives of the participants as to how the DISC personality traits influenced law enforcement team members conducting routine communication and change adaptation. However, the researcher strived to conduct face-to-face open-ended semi-structured interviews as Petty et al. (2012) reported that the researcher may gather in-depth views and experiences while observing nonverbal actions and voice inflection. As the researcher asked participants how recent changes affected the team, Maxwell (2013) and Petty et al. (2012) purported that this prompts episodic memory of a particular or specific sequence of events versus generalizations.

Due to some members working remotely or on different shifts, open-ended semi-structured interviews were available via face-to-face in person and online using Skype; however, all interviews were conducted at the police station face-to-face. Holding open-ended semi-structured and focus group interviews at the station created a sense of security for the participants because most were in uniform and police car parking was securely accessible. Also, conducting interviews in a private office throughout all shift hours afforded privacy, confidentiality, and accessibility.

The researcher conducted member checking throughout the open-ended semi-structured interviews and focus group interviews by validating meaning through probing and clarifying questions, ensuring no gaps in the phenomenon or research questions occurred. After completing one-hour open-ended semi-structured interviews in a private setting at the research site, use of member checking occurred as participants ensure
correct transcription viability and construct validity (Rosenthal, 2016; Yin, 2014). For all team members, the researcher emailed the focus group and open-ended semi-structured interview transcriptions for member checking. This member checking process enhanced the reliability of the study results.

Protection of participant rights and well-being were imperative. No participant reviewed the interview data of other participants. Maxwell (2013) posited that the researcher remains prohibited ethically from reporting any information that may violate privacy or confidentiality, or be damaging to an individual, group, or the organization. Therefore, the researcher assigned pseudonym codes for each participant to protect the actual identity. The focus group interview notes taken during the focus group interview on the Focus Group Interview Guide and protocol (Appendix F) and open-ended semi-structured Interview Guide and protocol (Appendix E) results from the 13 open-ended semi-structured interviews remained in a locked cabinet or computer throughout the ten-week data collection and interpretation study period. Only the researcher had access to all participant information and collected data, which were stored in a locked cabinet or on a password protected computer and external hard drive. A second secure hard drive was in a locked file throughout the study, and the completed study information resides in a locked file for three years after study completion. The researcher scanned all field journal notes onto a thumb drive and shredded all paper copies of information not needed after study completion. The electronic data will be deleted and the recycle bin erased at the end of the three-year period.

The investigator mitigated bias by preventing partiality or pre-judging participants and refrained from embedding personal beliefs. By establishing dependability and
credibility between the researcher and participant, enhancement of trust occurred (Rosenthal, 2016) which also mitigated bias. By using multiple sources of evidence that converged on the same findings, such as creating a descriptive study database, taking care with the chain of evidence, using a codebook (Appendix Y and PeopleKeys, 2008, p.5), and conducting a participant focus group interview, the researcher ensured meaningful results (Yin, 2014).

The researcher maintained all collected data on a password-encrypted computer and a password encrypted external hard drive during data collection. The participants’ IML DISC Insights Personality System remain in the researcher’s secure PeopleKeys account for three years, and the researcher will delete them at the end of that timeframe. The researcher used NVivo to query and store data throughout the project. After the study completion, storage of data that is password encrypted remains in a locked safety deposit box for three years, only accessible by the researcher. Destruction of the data will occur at the end of three years and the researcher will shred all extraneous papers and notes, as well as delete all data on the hard and thumb drives.

**Data Analysis Procedures**

In a qualitative study, data analysis integrates with good design as the researcher begins analysis immediately after interviews (Maxwell, 2013). Yin (2014) suggested data analysis include scrutiny, tabulation, labeling, and testing of data to yield empirical results. Fusch and Ness (2015) and Yin (2010) also recommended using the five-phase approach to prepare data for coding, consisting of compiling, disassembling, reassembling, interpretation, and narrative phases. The researcher displayed analysis across each of these five areas and three sources throughout the coding process. In this
qualitative descriptive study on how DISC personality traits influenced team members’ communication and change adaptation, the researcher sought to discern how DISC traits influenced an existing law enforcement team. The researcher proposed two questions to ascertain how the leader and team members perceived DISC trait influence in routine team communication and team adaptation to change:

RQ1: How do DISC personality traits influence routine team communication?

RQ2: How do DISC personality traits influence routine team adapting to change?

**Preparation of data for analysis.** The researcher used Yin’s (2010) five-step analysis for preparing data for coding: compiling, disassembling, reassembling, interpretation, and conclusions. Fusch and Ness (2015) described the compiling phase as organizing the data in a particular order or database. First the researcher asked each participant to complete an online IML DISC Insights Personality System within a week period (Appendix I). The researcher sent reminders or made phone calls to ensure each participant completed the profile. Next, the researcher checked for DISC Insights completion of each 24 det of adjectives, then coded the participant responses (Davenport, 2018) on the Most, Least, and Change lines (PeopleKeys, 2008, codebook p. 4-5), then identified individual results by placing the Graph 3 Change numerical value to the total garnered from participant responses. In the following step, the researcher printed the nineteen-page individualized DISC results (Appendix M) and team results (Appendix S) for use in a team debrief at the first team meeting. Participants shared their primary personality style(s) with team members but not the individualized results to ensure privacy, as specified in the letter of consent in Appendix C. Third, a debrief meeting took
place where the researcher described the DISC characteristics, individual results, and aggregate team findings.

Petty et al. (2012) recommended conducting observation during group interaction so the researcher observed behaviors while facilitating the DISC debrief session and the focus group interview. The researcher digitally recorded the focus group interview and denoted observations on a laptop using the Focus Group Interview Guide (Appendix F) and printed a copy for greater ease of reading and analysis, as recommended by Vaismoradi, Turunen, and Bondas (2013).

The next step in the compiling process (Fusch & Ness, 2015; Yin, 2010) included data from open-ended semi-structured interviews with 13 participants. The researcher transcribed, through Rev.com and printed the open-ended semi-structured interview and focus group interview notes to prepare for analysis and coding, as well as allowed for member checking of transcribed open-ended semi-structured interview notes with each participant.

**Data analysis procedures.** The researcher conducted a qualitative descriptive study to answer the following research questions:

RQ1: How do DISC personality traits influence routine team communication?

RQ2: How do DISC personality traits influence routine team adapting to change?

The researcher gathered data from three sources of data, the IML DISC Insights Personality System Profile participants’ responses, a focus group interview, and semi-structured open-ended interviews. Vaismoradi et al. (2013) defined qualitative content analysis as an approach in which large quantities of contextual data is systematically categorized and coded. The researcher used Yin’s (2010) five phases of data analysis and
specifically looked for relationships, patterns, frequencies, and trends of written and oral communications collected during data collection (Fusch & Ness, 2015; Vaismoradi et al., 2013). The researcher coded data by identifying themes, issues, and categories recurring throughout the gathered material (DeLyser & Potter, 2013; Yin, 2010). The researcher also used descriptive statistics by (a) coding and graphing participant and leader personality pure and blend types (PeopleKeys, 2008 codebook p. 4-5), people or task oriented for communication (RQ1), and passive or active change adaptation answering RQ2, (b) coding, summarizing, and counting the themes present in the focus group and open-ended semi-structured interviews in NVivo, (c) coding, analyzing, compiling, and reporting the DISC results and (d) compiling and reporting the demographic information.

**DISC.** First the researcher employed the use of IML DISC Insights Personality System Profile (PeopleKeys, 2008) as the instrument that the target population of 37 completed. The IML DISC Insights instrument included 24 forced choice questions containing optimistic adjectives while decreasing answer choices (Inscape Publishing, 2008). Evidence in previous sections includes construct reliability and validity of the IML DISC Insights Personality instrument. Items on the IML DISC Insights Personality instrument emerged from Marston’s (1928) theory and measured the dominance, influencing, steadiness, and compliant dimensions of personality (Price, 2015). These are the four latent dimensions of personality coded, graphed, and analyzed by the researcher for this study.

In the 24 question sets, IML DISC Insights established coded symbols for each set of adjectives (PeopleKeys, 2008, p. 5). For instance, question 2 “reserved” was identified compliant, “visionary” was determined dominant, “sociable” was labeled influencing,
and “peacemaker” was denoted steadiness. All participant responses converted to the appropriate personality category. Appendix G includes the 24 sets of adjectives, however the codebook instructions, codebook table, and codebook personality type identifier page are proprietary and not in the appendix in this study. These resources are available for purchase in the workbook if needed or from the researcher upon request.

Davenport (2018) conducted a study using the DISC Personality instrument and followed coding guidelines for participant responses to the forced choice sets of adjectives and found valid and reliable evidence that representative personality types emerged from the DISC. Hence, this researcher used some of Davenport’s (2018) processes to inform and analyze the personality traits of participants. First, the “most” participant responses scored one, then coded under the appropriate D-I-S or C category on Row 1 of the table on p. 4 of the codebook. This step occurred for the “least” participant responses scored 1 as well and scored on Row 2 of the table on p. 4 of the codebook (PeopleKeys, 2008, Appendix K). Any “*” responses, not representing any personality types received a score of 1 and coded in Rows 1 and 2. Next, per codebook instructions Row 2 (least) subtracted from Row 1 (most), with the exception of the “*” column (p. 4).

After analysis of the participant response scores to the IML DISC Insights 24 sets of adjectives, the researcher followed coding procedures on Row 3 (change) scores on the Graph 3 (change) per PeopleKey’s codebook (p. 4) to identify which personality trait(s) each participant scored above the midline on Graph 3. The researcher then identified each participant’s pure or blended personality traits. Finally, the researcher identified (PeopleKeys, 2008, codebook p. 8) D and C personalities as task-oriented and I and S
personalities as people-oriented informing communication preferences (Appendix J). The researcher identified the D and I personalities above the midline on Graph 3 as Active/Change-oriented and S and C personalities above the midline as Passive/Stability-oriented PeopleKeys, 2008, codebook, p. 4, 8). Thus, the researcher identified the participants accordingly, providing data for RQ1 and RQ2.

Analysis of the DISC also occurred through the focus group interview transcripts and the open-ended semi-structured interview transcripts as participants used the individual and team DISC results to answer questions. In the Focus Group Guide and protocol (Appendix F), questions 1 and 2 asked participants DISC profile results information. In the open-ended semi-structured individual Interview Guide and protocol (Appendix E), questions 1, 2, 5-10, 13, 14, 18, and 19 included referral back to the individual and team DISC results if the participant chose to reference the results.

Focus group and interviews. The second and third phases of data analysis consisted of a focus group interview of 6 participants and 13 open-ended semi-structured interviews, recorded on an audio recorder and transcribed by Rev.com, who signed a non-disclosure agreement (Appendix O). The researcher assigned an alpha-numeric symbol to ensure confidentiality for all participants (ex. FG1, INTP11). The researcher first read the focus group transcript and then the individual interview transcripts numerous times to ensure understanding of what participants said, as well as for accuracy. The researcher then began coding and discovering emergent themes in this qualitative descriptive study by understanding and interpreting the research questions and exploring how DISC personality traits influenced law enforcement team members’ communication and adapting to change.
Coding of the focus group interview and the 13 individual interviews occurred using the NVivo software program immediately upon the receipt of each transcript. Use of transcriptions through Rev.com enhanced the coding between data from the in-depth, face-to-face focus group interview, and the open-ended semi-structured interview. Different themes emerged during the coding process as common categories emerged during data analysis (Vaismoradi et al., 2013). Singh (2015) suggested that after interview and transcription, the researcher chunk relevant data for broad categories of coding, then scrutinize for emerging themes. Thus, the chunking and labeling of the themes into constructs supported the phenomenon and assisted in telling somewhat of a narrative about the qualitative descriptive study (Singh, 2015). Areas of coding included influencing of others, personal awareness, community interactions, value to the team, reaction to conflict, motivational factors, communication techniques, strengths, challenges, adaptation to change, ideal environment, and leadership style, evidenced in the codebook (Appendix T). Specific different codes identified in the focus group and individual interviews are also identified in Appendix T as coding occurred separately for both sources of data and different perspectives emerged.

Rusk (2016) suggested identifying a theme by the frequency of occurrence and then coding it according to the established system, which the researcher followed. After data collection, the researcher submitted the recordings to rev.com, who transcribed 13 interview notes and the focus group interview recording notes. Most transcriptions were returned within 12 hours, and then the researcher examined the data for differences, using NVivo for frequency of repetition and similarities during the interpretation process.
Bernard et al. (2018) indicated that a qualitative researcher use the cutting and sorting technique where identification of expressions and quotes used by participants are sorted and grouped by similarity. During the interpretation process, the researcher used cutting and sorting, as well as created common word lists that appeared frequently in the different sources of data (Rusk, 2016). The researcher conducted these techniques using NVivo and personally, when applicable. By completing these varied processes for all participant interviews and data collection, the researcher ensured that all data analysis techniques aligned with the research questions and this qualitative descriptive study design.

The researcher used NVivo to first code and analyze the focus group interview data, then to code and analyze the open-ended semi-structured interview data. The researcher did not use NVivo to code the IML DISC Insights Personality Profiles as the researcher hand-coded the results from the individual and team results. Oliveira, Bitencourt, Zanardo dos Santos, and Teixeira (2016) researched the similarities and differences between NVivo and MAXQDA software used to transcribe and code data in a qualitative study. Brodie (2016) used NVivo software to analyze open-ended semi-structured interview questions with valid results, as did this researcher in this study. Then the researcher combined the multiple data sources to identify common codes and themes in the disassembling, reassembling, and interpretation stages (Fusch & Ness, 2015; Yin, 2010).

Yin (2014) recommended analyzing data through finding and labeling categories, identifying relationships among categories, and determining the core themes. Thus, the researcher identified common codes and categories to determine themes across the data
sources. As the researcher conducted the disassembling, reassembling, interpretation, and conclusions phases (Fusch & Ness, 2015; Yin, 2010) with rigorous evaluation of the qualitative research data of DISC profile results, a focus group interview, and open-ended semi-structured interviews throughout the entire data collection process, opportunities arose to speculate on the meaning of data, reduce data, and find common themes (Maxwell, 2013; Yin, 2014). The researcher generated the initial codes, searched for themes, reviewed themes, and defined and named themes (Vaismoradi et al., 2013). Further data analysis occurred through inductive and deductive interpretation, while ensuring latent and manifest content was integrated (Vaismoradi et al., 2013).

Data analysis procedures began in this qualitative study during the first meeting with team members as themes emerged (Yin, 2014). During the disassembling, reassembling, and interpretation phases (Fusch & Ness, 2015; Yin, 2010) comparison, analysis, and coding of collected raw data began and then later grouped into thematic categories. Common themes included the following DISC Personality System result categories: evaluation and influencing of others, value to the team, reaction to pressure, motivational factors, communication strengths, challenges, likes and dislikes, personal and team adaptation to change, ideal environment, and decision-making style. Through data analysis of the three sources, many of these codes and themes overlapped.

In the conclusion phase (Fusch & Ness, 2015; Yin, 2010) the researcher answered RQ1 and RQ2 through the review of principal data sources: team member open-ended semi-structured interviews, focus group interview, and the DISC Personality System individual and team results. Predicted results of research questions RQ1 and RQ2 included participant analysis, discovery, and application of personal and team member
results from completion of the DISC Personality System, enabling participants to understand self and others when making decisions and allocating work assignments.

By using data analysis (Denzin & Lincoln, 2018) of three data sources, the DISC Personality System individual and team results, researcher facilitation of a recorded focus group interview, and 13 semi-structured open-ended interviews, the researcher provided evidence that both the quantity and quality of data was sufficient to answer the two research questions evidenced in the findings and results in Chapters 4 and 5 (Marshall et al., 2013; Yin, 2014). Marshall et al. (2013) recommended conducting approximately 15 to 30 interviews during a qualitative grounded theory study and reached 92% of identified thematic codes by interviewing the first 12 participants in one case study. By collecting data with variations of viewpoints, researcher bias mitigates (Petty et al., 2012). As the researcher collected, coded, analyzed, and interpreted data the result was quality criteria from adhering to objectivity throughout the study, confirmability through building on empirical findings and a theoretical foundation, reliability, validity, dependability, credibility with expert validation, and transferability of study findings (Petty et al., 2012). By using multiple sources of data and Yin’s (2010) five phase process for analyzing data, identification of themes, coding, and data analysis, the researcher identified the qualitative descriptive study as the best approach to conduct this research.

As team members applied DISC traits and discussed how each personality style reacts to change, the leaders and team members prepared more easily for change initiatives as discussed in RQ1 and RQ2 (Sugerman et al., 2011). Due to recent sweeping changes in the police department, participant responses during the interview and actions during the focus group interview provided rich data for RQ1 and RQ2. As the researcher
conducted an initial informational meeting and the DISC debrief session, establishment of trust and rapport built, enabling a greater depth of data collection (Yin, 2014).

**Ethical Considerations**

The researcher appraised numerous ethical issues throughout this study such as during data collection and analysis, and while sharing, reporting, and storing the data (Yin, 2014). No documents contain any actual participant or organizational names, as the researcher used pseudonyms throughout the study, ensuring no specific participant matching with data occurred through demographics, interviews, or the focus group interview. The organization and participants received no criticism for expressing views regarding DISC traits, leadership, or team communications. Securing of written permission occurred from the southern North Carolina organization to conduct the study (Appendix A) and occurred from each participant (Appendix C) to participate in the study. Participation in this study was voluntary and anyone was allowed to leave the study at any time without penalty. Prior to the study, each participant received a description, goals, and objectives of the study. The researcher followed ethical principles, beneficence, respect for all individuals, and justice throughout the study (Maxwell, 2013). The IRB approved the study and all research questions, as well as made recommended revisions prior to the study. Appendix B includes the IRB approval letter.

One ethical concern was the safety of data (Yin, 2014). Only the researcher and the dissertation committee saw the data throughout collection, transcription, and reporting. Rev.com was used to transcribe the interview and focus group interviews and signed a non-disclosure agreement prior to transcription (Appendix O). During the
study, the researcher kept the information safe and private on a password-encrypted computer and external drive, and personally completed all coding and thematic identification. The researcher placed all data in a safe deposit box for three years, at which time destruction occurs by deletion and shredding paper copies.

A second ethical consideration was bias. The researcher took precautions to mitigate bias by giving all participants equal attention and time, and conducting ethical research as contained in the Belmont Report. The researcher carefully considered each participant’s response to check for any bias that the person responded with original thoughts and not to appease the interviewer. This occurred by asking probing questions, for example if short answers resulted or personal passion exhibited when discussing the DISC, leadership, or personal convictions. No right or wrong answers occurred. Fusch et al. (2017) purported that bias is impossible for a researcher due to mere humanness, however must be mitigated as much as possible. The researcher avoided researcher bias as much as humanly possible by involving expert validation in the creation and vetting of the interview guide, included participants wishing to participate in the sample population, and accepted all participant answers during interviews with neutral verbal and nonverbal communication (Brodie, 2016; Maxwell, 2013; Yin, 2014).

A third ethical consideration regarded confidentiality. This researcher held strict participant confidentiality by honestly reporting via composite stories and using pseudonyms to protect each member’s identity in each phase of the study (Maxwell, 2013). The researcher conveyed each participant’s thoughts, ideas, and perceptions so that participant matching to personal responses did not occur. However, publishing the
dissertation through ProQuest occurred upon final approval of the IRB so anyone may read the findings.

Data management of paper and electronic material was important. The researcher maintained all collected data on a password-encrypted computer and a password-encrypted external hard drive during data collection. Because participants took the DISC Personality System profile from work or private computers, the researcher checked to ensure that PeopleKeys did not store private internet addresses. Storage of the individual results occurred on a secure and private database with PeopleKeys until the researcher stored and printed participant results from a secure and password protected personal computer. The participants’ DISC Personality Systems remain in the researcher’s secure PeopleKeys account for three years, and the researcher deleted them at the end of that timeframe. The researcher used NVivo to code and store data throughout the project, which was password protected on the computer. After the study completion, storage of data occurred in a locked safety deposit box for three years, only accessible by the researcher. Destruction of the data will occur at the end of three years by shredding all extraneous papers and notes and deleting computer information.

Recruitment came from 37 employees working for this particular southern North Carolina law enforcement team, where the researcher emailed employees for notification of the informational meeting. At the initial meeting with potential participants working in the law enforcement agency, the researcher addressed confidentiality, privacy, coercion, conflict of interest, and gained informed consent. All participant names remained confidential and pseudonyms or codes used. No participant reviewed the interview data of other participants. Interview question results
and focus group interview notes remained in a locked cabinet or computer throughout the study. The researcher told potential participants that there is no cost or compensation for participating in the study. No participant received a gift or payment in exchange for participating in the study and participation did not affect job evaluation to avoid any coercion. The researcher did not discuss how DISC personality traits influence the team members regarding communication and change adaptation with any participant prior to the study to avoid potential conflict of interest. The investigator mitigated bias by preventing partiality or pre-judging participants and refraining from embedding personal beliefs (Petty et al., 2012).

Upon notification of IRB approval (Appendix B), the researcher notified the Chief of Police of the upcoming timeframes and procedures. Recruitment came from 42 employees working for this particular southern North Carolina law enforcement team, where the researcher emailed employees for notification of the informational meeting. The researcher then met with potential participants to explain the study, share a packet of pertinent information, and gain written informed consent. The packet contained the researcher’s name and contact information, the proposed study’s description, demographic information, and the researcher’s affiliation with Grand Canyon University. The study description included the study name, significance, research questions, data collection procedures, and restrictions. The researcher answered any questions and secured written informed consent from each participant. No data collection occurred without IRB approval and participant written informed consent.
Limitations and Delimitations

Limitations and delimitations occur when researchers conduct studies. Limitations include factors over which the researcher has no control, and delimitations contain areas in which the researcher controls (Ellis & Levy, 2010). Throughout this study, the researcher encountered both limitations and delimitations as discussed next.

**Limitations.** Limitations are effects that the researcher has no control over, such as bias (Ellis & Levy, 2010). The main limitations in the study included scheduling and location of open-ended semi-structured interviews, team breakdown of percentage of DISC traits when answering questions, potential coercion of participant involvement, and open and close ended questions. The first limitation included the scheduling of the purposive sampling of team members for the individual interviews. This challenged the researcher in scheduling, holding, and recording the interviews in a timely fashion (Singh, 2015). To mitigate this, the researcher met with the team leaders and scheduled the interviews during a mutually agreed upon time, as well as sent reminder emails and texts to the selected DISC personality types to ensure attendance of 13 team members in order to gather rich data (Krueger & Casey, 2015). Leaders also assisted the researcher to schedule participants during scheduled work time, and the researcher met participants on weekends, before, or after shifts. Holding interviews at the station created a sense of security for the participants because most were in uniform and police car parking was easy. Also, conducting interviews in a private office throughout all shift hours afforded privacy, confidentiality, and accessibility. Second, limitation occurred when some participants were not comfortable with answering interview questions, while others were forthcoming with answers. Due to almost half of the department scoring a C personality
type, a poverty of expression occurred with some participants. Thus, to mitigate this, use of probing questions and initial goal setting ensured quality answers from interviewees. Also, after the first individual interview, the researcher further defined the interview questions, using Wheelan’s (2013) effective team member attributes, and Smith and Hoy’s (as cited in Kearney & Smith, 2008) openness to change traits. This enabled the participants greater clarity by the questions and researcher further defining communication and change evidenced by more discussion and longer answers by participants. In addition, establishing trust, mutual respect, and rapport between the interviewer and participant assisted with conducting quality interviews (Yin, 2014). The researcher believed that participants answered truthfully, although there was no control over this. In addition, participants asked clarifying question if any instruction or interview question was unclear in the interview guide (Appendix E). By changing participants and the North Carolina location to replicate this study, obtaining the same results may not occur (Brodie, 2016).

A third limitation occurred that due to law enforcement agency leader participation, team members might have felt obligated to participate in the study. Rusk (2016) posited that telling study participants that study participation was voluntary and not connected to performance evaluation prompted involvement. Thus, to mitigate obligatory participation, The Chief and other leaders shared that no retaliation or negative evaluation consequences occurred if employees choose not to participate in the study (Rusk, 2016). The researcher also let all employees know at the initial meeting that participation was welcome but purely voluntary. Further, the researcher told participants that no sharing of individual results occurred with leadership, thus ensuring
confidentiality. Only agreed upon primary personality traits for the team results appeared in the general results.

A final limitation included some questions in the open-ended semi-structured Interview Guide (Appendix E) and the Focus Group Interview Guide (Appendix F) contained yes/no close-ended and double-barreled questions. The researcher mitigated this by following recommendations for qualitative interviewing by Krueger and Casey (2015) to use opening, introduction, transition, key, and closing questions/statements to put participants at ease or to probe further when there was a poverty of expression.

**Delimitations.** Delimitations are situations over which the researcher has control, such as choices made or location of the study (Ellis & Levy, 2010). The following are delimitations for this study (a) purposive selection from DISC individual results for the focus group interview and the open-ended semi-structured interviews, (b) incomplete member checking as the researcher did not have participants review codes and themes, and (c) use of DISC Personality Profile. The first delimitation included the purposive selection of specific personality styles as recommended by Lykourentzou et al. (2016). The researcher mitigated this delimitation by purposefully selecting a varied sampling of personality styles after participant completion of the DISC Personality Profile and interviewed the following types: DCS, IS, ICS, S, SD, SI, SC, C, CSI, CS, CD.

Lykourentzou et al. (2016) reported successful results with purposefully balanced teams by personality type. In a team of six, 1D, 1 I, 2 S, and 2 C performed more efficiently and effectively as a team than randomly formed teams (Lykourentzou et al., 2016).

A second delimitation was the partial completion of member checking. The researcher mitigated this by ensuring member checking consisted of each participant
reviewing the transcribed interview transcript for accuracy and reporting back any changes. The researcher purposefully did not return the coded themes for the participants to peruse due to busy work schedules and the belief that participants would not desire to know how the researcher coded or placed into themes transcribed responses for this scholarly study.

The third delimitation was that the DISC Personality System was the only personality profile instrument used. Numerous other personality profiles exist; however, the researcher chose to use the DISC to assess participant personality behaviors regarding communication and change adaptation (Belbin, 2010; Marston, 1928). To mitigate the use of the DISC Personality System (Appendix G), the survey contained only 24 sets of characteristics, so participants needed only 10 minutes for completion and the researcher provided expert debrief and interpretation of the DISC results (Puccio & Grivas, 2009). Other team interactions were important to effective team performance; however, the researcher chose to focus on routine communication and change adaptation.

Minimization of this delimitation occurred because research results indicated that the DISC style of ipsative testing was preferred because respondents did not falsely identify expected answers, typically occurring less than in the normative method (PeopleKeys, 2017). With a sample size of 812 in 1996, the DISC Personality System contained good and excellent internal consistency scores (Inscape Publishing, 2008). Despite all the limitations and delimitations in this research, the researcher sought to explore how DISC personality traits influenced law enforcement team members’ communication and change adaptation.
The stated limitations and delimitations did not hinder the accuracy or
effectiveness of the research study. Participants openly and freely expressed themselves
during interviews and focus group interview as trust developed with the researcher and fellow participants. This was evidenced by use of humor, joking, and conversing with fellow participants and the researcher, as well as asking questions and elaborating answers as described by Krueger and Casey (2015). In addition, by administering and debriefing the DISC Personality System and interviewing participants, representation of how DISC personality traits influenced a law enforcement agency in southern North Carolina emerged. This qualitative descriptive study included many of the necessary components needed to justify credible, reliable, and valid qualitative research. Inclusion of law enforcement participants mitigated future research exploration into alternative contexts, selection of different sampling sizes and organizations, use of a different personality behavioral assessment, and use of more than one researcher to provide checking and another perspective during analysis. Future studies may mitigate delimitations and limitations by including a larger population of participants, selecting different demographics, and increasing the number of researchers to conduct more focus group interviews (Bernier, 2017; Rusk, 2016).

**Summary**

In summary, the purpose of this qualitative descriptive study was to explore research-based evidence regarding how DISC personality traits influenced routine interactions (Lykourentzou et al., 2016) of communication and adapting to change within a law enforcement team of 37 members in southern North Carolina. The researcher employed procedures to ensure the collected data were rich, quality, reliable, and valid.
First, participants completed PeopleKeys (2008) DISC Personality System survey instrument and demographic information. Second, the researcher conducted a two hour debrief of the aggregate results at the beginning of the study team meeting. Third, the researcher conducted a focus group interview with 6 team members using questions from the Focus Group Interview Guide in Appendix F (Maxwell, 2013). Lastly, the researcher conducted open-ended semi-structured interviews with 13 different participants (Appendix E).

Throughout data collection, the researcher assured validity by guaranteeing that sources of data contained the information needed to answer the research questions and to support the problem statement (Yin, 2014). The researcher printed the participants’ DISC Personality System individual and team results from a secured PeopleKeys website account and kept them secure until the beginning of the study aggregate debrief session. Then, the digital recording and transcription of the focus group interview was stored in a locked cabinet or password encrypted computer throughout the study. Next, the researcher conducted focus group and open-ended semi-structured interviews using a digital recording device, with transcription through Rev.com, coded the notes using NVivo and Yin’s (2010) five phases of coding approach, and enlisted purposeful member checking to ensure verbatim transcription (Maxwell, 2013; Yin, 2014). One ethical concern included maintaining participant confidentiality by honestly reporting participant responses and using pseudonyms to protect each member’s identity (Maxwell, 2013). A second ethical concern included mitigating both participant and researcher bias, addressed by preventing partiality, pre-judging participants, and refraining from embedding personal beliefs (Petty et al., 2012). Lastly, maintaining data safety
throughout the study process, addressed by keeping all data stored in a locked computer or filing cabinet (Yin, 2014).

Identification of several limitations and delimitations occurred throughout the study. Limitations included scheduling and location of open-ended semi-structured interviews, team breakdown of percentage of DISC traits when answering questions, potential coercion of participant involvement, transferability of findings, and open and close ended interview questions. Delimitations included the purposive selection from DISC individual results for the focus group interview and the open-ended semi-structured interviews, incomplete member checking as the researcher purposely did not have participants review codes and themes and use of the DISC Personality Profile instrument.

Finding out how DISC personality traits influenced law enforcement team members’ communication and adapting to change included valuable information for organizational leaders and teams to improve communication and performance. Conducting a qualitative descriptive study on the influences of DISC personality traits added empirical evidence to other DISC studies, as there are few studies with this instrument and fewer studies regarding DISC and leaders, teams, communication, and change (Lykourentzou et al., 2016). Chapter 4 contains an analysis of important information and findings reached throughout this study. Also included in Chapter 4 are participant information and a review of key data obtained during this study.
Chapter 4: Data Analysis and Results

Introduction

The purpose of this qualitative descriptive study was to explore research-based evidence regarding how DISC personality traits influenced routine interactions (Lykourentzou et al., 2016) of communication and adapting to change within a law enforcement team of 37 members in southern North Carolina. Due to global expansion, restructuring, and the necessity to remain competitive in an international economy, organizations turn to working teams for optimal performance (Johnson & Johnson, 2013). Because some leaders base assignment of human resources to a team on availability and technical skills versus using personality traits for team formation, teams are ineffective (Jeong et al., 2012).

Despite the importance of DISC personality trait identification within a team, limited empirical research existed regarding the influence of these traits on routine communication and adapting to change within a team (Lykourentzou et al., 2016). Subsequently, gathered data included evidence on how DISC personality traits influenced law enforcement team members’ communication and adapting to change. Marston (1928) purported critical aspects of communication and change in the Personality Trait Theory and created the DISC Personality Trait System to measure individual dominance, influence, steadiness, and conscientiousness trait strength. Marston (1928) posited a person’s sense of will and power greatly influences human personality and behavior while designing the environment to understand self and others and communicate clearly (Prochaska et al., 2015). People tend to resist or reject change and desire input
(PeopleKeys, 2008; Rosenberg & Silvert, 2013) because team members play an imperative role in change implementation (Creasy & Anantatmula, 2013).

In the exploration of how DISC personality traits influenced law enforcement communication and adapting to change, two research questions guided collection of data for this qualitative descriptive study. Three data sources included the DISC Personality Profile individual and team results, a focus group interview, and open-ended semi-structured interviews. Data from all three sources answered research question one and two. Data collected from the DISC results, the focus group interviews, and the open-ended semi-structured interviews were analyzed (Denzin & Lincoln, 2018) resting on a convergence of data unfolding the same phenomenon.

RQ1: How do DISC personality traits influence routine team communication?

RQ2: How do DISC personality traits influence routine team adapting to change?

Marston’s (1928) DISC Personality Trait Theory and the literature included information on which to base the research questions. To procure answers to the research questions, data were collected from the DISC Personality System profile 37 individual and 1 team results, focus group interview with 6 participants, and 13 individual interviews.

To successfully understand how DISC personality traits influenced a law enforcement agency, the researcher used a qualitative method. This method included participant answering of how questions to a relevant phenomenon within its real life, natural environment (Maxwell, 2013; Senaratne & Gunawardane, 2015). In contrast, a quantitative methodology was not appropriate as the focus was not primarily calibration, prevalence, and generalizability in a controlled setting (Pettigrew, 2013; Yin, 2014). This
study’s descriptive nature was appropriate for qualitative methods as these data results included information in examining and informing the two research questions.

The findings and data are organized in this section by the themes contained within the research questions. Included in this chapter are an overview of the problem, methodology, and research questions under investigation, as well as how data were collected, categorized, initially coded, and thematically examined. Additionally, the chapter concludes with a summarization of the study results, summary of the findings, and descriptive data containing participant demographics.

**Descriptive Data**

This section contains the characteristics of the study, sample, and setting for this study. The study occurred between July 1, 2017 and August 6, 2017 and consisted of three sources of rich data: IML DISC Insights Personality System Profile participant responses, focus group interview, and open-ended semi-structured interviews. These data sources included information as to how DISC personality traits influenced a law enforcement team in routine communication and adapting to change. Two research questions guided the researcher in this study:

RQ1: How do DISC personality traits influence routine team communication?

RQ2: How do DISC personality traits influence routine team adapting to change?

Participant criteria are defined and described through demographics and characteristics. Participant recruitment entailed a meeting with the Chief of the law enforcement for permission, then an email to everyone via the police department email system. Also covered are data source descriptions including IML DISC Insights codebook (PeopleKeys, 2008, p. 4-5), IML DISC Insights individual (Appendix M) and team
results information (Appendix S), focus group and open-ended, semi-structured interview times, number of transcribed pages, DISC Insights result pages, and disclosed demographic information.

**Participant demographics.** The target for this study consisted of a population of 37 members of a law enforcement agency in southern North Carolina. All 37 members completed the IML DISC Insights Personality System Profile (PeopleKeys, 2008) with 29 men and 8 women. The first sample was a focus group that consisted of six participants, two women and four men. The second sample was thirteen different participants for the open-ended semi-structured interviews that consisted of four women and nine men. Criteria for inclusion in this study included active employment in the selected law enforcement agency, completion of the IML DISC Insights Personality System Profile, and a signed informed consent form in Appendix C (Table 3).

Table 3.

**DISC, Focus Group Interview, and Open-ended Semi-structured Interview Inclusion Criteria**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Descriptor</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Actively Works in Target Law Agency</th>
<th>Completed DISC Personality System</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Law Agency Team</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>W (n=8) M (n=29)</td>
<td>n=37</td>
<td>n=37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law Agency Participants</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>W (n=6) M (n=13)</td>
<td>n=19</td>
<td>n=19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus Group</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>W (n=2) M (n=4)</td>
<td>n=6</td>
<td>n=6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Interviews</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>W (n=4) M (n=9)</td>
<td>n=13</td>
<td>n=13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Demographic information drawn from focus group interview and individual semi-structured interview participants.
Drawing from the demographic information reported by the 37 participants who completed the Informed Consent form (Appendix C) and the DISC Personality Profile, the age range spanned from 18 to 65 (see Table 4).

Table 4.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Level of Edu. Completed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Woman</td>
<td>18-30</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Man</td>
<td>31-40</td>
<td>Black/African American</td>
<td>High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Man</td>
<td>51-65</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Man</td>
<td>51-65</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Masters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Man</td>
<td>18-30</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Woman</td>
<td>41-50</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Man</td>
<td>18-30</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Man</td>
<td>41-50</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Woman</td>
<td>51-65</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Man</td>
<td>51-65</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Bachelors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Man</td>
<td>18-30</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Woman</td>
<td>31-40</td>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Man</td>
<td>51-65</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Bachelors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Man</td>
<td>18-30</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Associates Degree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Woman</td>
<td>41-50</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Woman</td>
<td>41-50</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Man</td>
<td>41-50</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Bachelors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Man</td>
<td>31-40</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Man</td>
<td>41-50</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Masters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Man</td>
<td>31-40</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Associates Degree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Woman</td>
<td>41-50</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Man</td>
<td>18-30</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Associates Degree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Man</td>
<td>31-40</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Bachelors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Man</td>
<td>51-65</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Bachelors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Man</td>
<td>31-40</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Bachelors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Man</td>
<td>41-50</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Man</td>
<td>31-40</td>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Woman</td>
<td>41-50</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Bachelors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Man</td>
<td>51-65</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Not HS Graduate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Man</td>
<td>18-30</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Associates Degree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Man</td>
<td>51-65</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Man</td>
<td>41-50</td>
<td>Black/African American</td>
<td>High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Man</td>
<td>41-50</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Associates Degree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Man</td>
<td>18-30</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Associates Degree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Man</td>
<td>41-50</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Man</td>
<td>18-30</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Associates Degree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Man</td>
<td>18-30</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Bachelors</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Note. Demographic information drawn from 37 target participants. All numbers in the table have been rounded in a category to protect the identity and anonymity of the participants.

The length of service in law enforcement ranged from less than 1-year experience to 31 years (see Figure 2). Demographic data contained information revealing that 12 participants worked in law enforcement from .5-5 years, 9 for 6-10 years, 9 for 11-15 years, 2 for 16-20 years, and 5 for 20+ years (see Figure 1).
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Figure 2. Years of Experience in Law Enforcement- All Population

The target participants included 8 women and 29 men, with ethnic breakdown of 32 Caucasian, 2 African American, 1 Asian, 1 Hispanic, and 1 Other. Participants in the target group numbered 19 with a high school diploma, 7 associate degree, 7 bachelor’s degrees, 2 master’s degrees, and 1 not finishing high school (see Table 4).

For the focus group interviews, the researcher assigned a pseudonym of two letters and a number exemplified by FG for focus group and P1 for focus group participant one (Table 5). The focus group contained four men and two women, five
Caucasian and one African American with five high school graduates and one holding a master’s degree (see Table 5).

Table 5.

*Demographic Profile of Focus Group Participants*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Level of Education Completed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FGP1</td>
<td>Woman</td>
<td>18-30</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FGP2</td>
<td>Man</td>
<td>31-40</td>
<td>Black/African American</td>
<td>High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FGP3</td>
<td>Man</td>
<td>51-65</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FGP4</td>
<td>Man</td>
<td>51-65</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Masters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FGP5</td>
<td>Man</td>
<td>18-30</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FGP6</td>
<td>Woman</td>
<td>41-50</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>High School</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Demographic information drawn from focus group participants. All numbers in the table have been Rounded into categories to protect the identity and anonymity of the participants.

In the focus group 2 participants reported the 18-30 age range, 1 in 31-40, 1 in 41-50, and 2 in the 51-65 range. Participants reported the length of years in law enforcement were 5, 6, 14, 30, 2, and 9 for a cumulative total of 66 years and an average of 11 years (see Figure 3).
For the open-ended semi-structured interview participants, the pseudonym of an Int P1 and a number for Interview Participant 1 (Table 6). Throughout the narrative of participant comments, the researcher used IP and the number. The interview participants included nine men and 4 women ranging in age from 18-65. Caucasian participants equaled 11, 1 other, and 1 Asian, 8 high school graduates, 1 associate degree, 3 bachelor’s degrees, and one master’s degree (see Table 6).
Table 6.

Demographic Profile of Interviewed Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Level of Education Completed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Int. P1</td>
<td>Man</td>
<td>18-30</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Int. P2</td>
<td>Man</td>
<td>41-50</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Int. P3</td>
<td>Woman</td>
<td>51-65</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Int. P4</td>
<td>Man</td>
<td>51-65</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Bachelors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Int. P5</td>
<td>Man</td>
<td>18-30</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Int. P6</td>
<td>Woman</td>
<td>31-40</td>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Int. P7</td>
<td>Man</td>
<td>51-65</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Bachelors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Int. P8</td>
<td>Man</td>
<td>18-30</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Associate Degree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Int. P9</td>
<td>Woman</td>
<td>41-50</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Int. P10</td>
<td>Woman</td>
<td>41-50</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Int. P11</td>
<td>Man</td>
<td>41-50</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Int. P12</td>
<td>Man</td>
<td>31-40</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Int. P13</td>
<td>Man</td>
<td>41-50</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Masters</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Demographic information drawn from interview participants. All numbers in the table have been rounded to protect the identity and anonymity of the participants.

Open-ended semi-structured interview participants’ length of experience varied as reported in Figure 4, where cumulative years in law enforcement equaled 161 for an average of 12.5 years. Some demographic information gathered from the participants was not reported due to confidentiality concerns.
Law enforcement agency demographics. The targeted law enforcement agency for this study had 42 employees at the time of the study, including both sworn officers and civilian workers. The target population included 37 of the 42 employees as 5 employees were not present for the meetings or on active duty at the time of the study. The southern North Carolina Police Department employed 36 sworn officers and 6 civilian employees during July 2017. Of the 30 sworn officers, 8 held leadership positions, 3 were detectives, and 3 were reserve officers. The law enforcement agency serves approximately 20,000-25,000 citizens and is located near a metropolitan city in southern North Carolina.

Description of data sources. Collection of several data sources occurred in this study including administration and completion of the IML DISC Insights Personality System profile (PeopleKeys, 2008), a digitally recorded F2F focus group interview, and digitally recorded F2F semi-structured interviews. From these sources data were collected and used to identify common codes from which themes emerged to better
understand the influence DISC personality traits have in a law enforcement agency conducting routine communication and adapting to change. The number of pages transcribed for the focus group interview was 21 and the 13 individual interviews totaled 211, resulting in a total of 232 single-spaced transcribed pages (see Table 7). The researcher also collected data from the 37 participants’ completed DISC Personality Profile individual results (Appendix M) and 1 team results (Appendix S), totaling 703 pages for individual results and 27 pages for the law enforcement team results report, for an accumulated total of 730 pages. The length of recorded time for the focus group interview was 49 minutes, and the individual interviews ranged from 22-57 minutes for a combined total of 481 minutes.

Table 7.

*Interview and Focus Group Overview*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Interview Duration (Minutes)</th>
<th>Pages of Transcripts (Single Spaced)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FG</td>
<td>7/20/2017</td>
<td>49:05</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Int P1</td>
<td>7/22/2017</td>
<td>27:14</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Int P2</td>
<td>7/24/2017</td>
<td>40:00</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Int P3</td>
<td>7/24/2017</td>
<td>37:00</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Int P4</td>
<td>7/24/2017</td>
<td>57:00</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Int P5</td>
<td>7/24/2017</td>
<td>38:00</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Int P6</td>
<td>7/25/2017</td>
<td>27:31</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Int P7</td>
<td>7/26/2017</td>
<td>26:35</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Int P8</td>
<td>7/26/2017</td>
<td>26:34</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Int P9</td>
<td>7/26/2017</td>
<td>34:00</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Int P10</td>
<td>7/26/2017</td>
<td>29:53</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Int P11</td>
<td>7/26/2017</td>
<td>22:54</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Int P12</td>
<td>7/26/2017</td>
<td>28:16</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Int P13</td>
<td>7/24/2017</td>
<td>47:00</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Interview information drawn from researcher digital recordings and rev.com completed transcripts.
**DISC data.** After each of the 37 participants completed the IML DISC Insights Personality System profile online, the researcher checked to ensure each participant completed all 24 sets of adjectives. The researcher then followed the coding process (Davenport, 2018) and graphed (PeopleKeys, 2008, codebook p. 4-6, 8) the individual personality pure or blend styles. The researcher then transferred all data category participant answers from the IML DISC Insights to the corresponding personality (Davenport, 2018). By identifying and analyzing participants’ DISC personality traits, the results informed this study by laying a foundation for individuals to first understand self and then others (Marston, 1928). Results also contained valuable information enabling participants DISC information from which to routinely communicate (RQ1) and adapt to change (RQ2) with teammates, within the department, in the community, and in personal lives, thus providing answers to the two research questions and phenomenon.

Next, the researcher compiled and printed the law enforcement agency team results, consisting of all 37 individual results. The DISC certified researcher explained individual primary traits and team aggregate results during a DISC two hour debrief session at the beginning of the study. The researcher printed and used specific aggregate result pages (Appendix S) as a reference point with participants during the DISC two hour debrief session, the focus group interviews, and the open-ended semi-structured interview. Responses from the participants in the IML DISC Insights assessment, during the focus group interview, and open-ended semi-structured interviews were used to better understand how DISC personality traits influenced routine communication and adapting to change in a law enforcement agency and answer RQ1 and RQ2.
**Interview data.** As the researcher conducted each interview, the session began with an introduction of the participant, the purpose of the study stated, printed material handouts reviewed, and protocol for the conversation explained, as well as anonymity and confidentiality discussed (Appendix E). Each participant agreed to the researcher recording the interview session and again granted consent to participate in the study (Appendix C). For interview sessions 2-13, the interviewer followed the interview guide protocol in Appendix E so that participants 2-13 experienced the same questions during each interview (Rosenthal, 2016). During interview 1, the participant was a C personality type, characterized by a logical, analytical, slow-paced style and therefore the interview resulted in short answers. The interview lasted 27 minutes and the researcher had to ask numerous probing questions to extract data from the participant. Due to the poverty of free-flowing answers, the interviewer further detailed the term of communication as listening, feedback, personal leadership strengths, and individual and team strengths in the interview guide (Appendix E) for the remaining interview sessions. These detailed concepts came from the DISC individual and team results (Appendices M and S), Wheelan’s (2013) attributes of effective team member’s communication and participation, and Smith and Hoy’s (as cited in Kearney & Smith, 2008) openness to change traits. Participant 1 was asked 18 questions; however, by asking probing questions, the researcher maintained validity in this interview session and included this interview in the data. Participants 2-13 answered a sum of 27 questions (Appendix E) regarding how DISC personality traits influenced routine communication and adapting to change in a law enforcement agency using the personal DISC results and specific handouts from the DISC team results.
The open-ended semi-structured interview questions related directly to the research questions and led by themes from the research (Maxwell, 2013). In the results, the researcher labeled each interview question with the letters IQ and the corresponding number, such as IQ1 depicted interview question one. Some specific areas covered in the interview questions included:

- Strengths and limitations.
- Communication decisions.
- How best to and not to communicate.
- Value and characteristics in a group.
- Leadership strengths in communication.
- Team strengths and opportunities.
- Solving conflicts and listening.
- Communication language.
- Planning and implementing change.
- Ideal work environment.
- Team member assignments.
- Leadership expectations with DISC results.

The researcher scheduled the open-ended semi-structured interviews for a duration of one hour. The longest interview lasted 57 minutes with IP4 and the shortest was IP11 lasting approximately 22 minutes. The average interview duration was an average of 34 minutes (see Table 7). The rich textual data from the semi-structured open-ended interview answers both RQ1 and RQ2.

*Interview setting.* The researcher coordinated the individual interview schedule with a lieutenant leader in the department, based on the time most participants would be
working on shift. All interviews took place in a quiet, private office in the police station, creating an atmosphere of comfort and security according to Kellmereit (2015). Each interview was conducted face-to-face as the majority were scheduled during the participants’ scheduled work time.

**Focus group data.** Data collection consisted of six participants, who consented to participate in the focus group interview. Participants granted permission to record the discussion. The researcher opened the meeting by sharing the focus group protocol, outlined in the beginning of the Focus Group Questions Guide in Appendix F. The focus group guide consisted of 12 questions, given to the participants at the beginning of the meeting and time allotted to review the questions. Guided by themes from the empirical research, the questions related directly to the research questions (Maxwell, 2013). In the results, the researcher labeled each focus group interview question with the letters “FGQ” and the corresponding number, such as FGQ1 depicted focus group question one.

The researcher gave participants their individual DISC personality trait summary results (Appendix M) and select handouts of the team aggregate results (Appendix S), which the researcher reviewed prior to the beginning of recording. The researcher used probing questions to elicit more information if an answer was short or needed further elaboration. The focus group recorded session was approximately 49 minutes, however the researcher provided snacks which the participants came in and ate prior to the recorded beginning of the discussion and after the group interview finished. Krueger and Casey (2015) recommended providing food prior to the actual discussion to allow participants to become comfortable with each other and dispel any potential tension among participants. This research-based approach yielded positive evidence as focus
group participants appeared comfortable with each other as trust built. The researcher observed joking among the participants, the use of individuals’ names, and stories/examples told about other participants. Thus, the actual focus group interview time lasted more than 90 minutes. The rich textual data from the focus group interview answers both RQ1 and RQ2.

**Focus group setting.** The researcher coordinated the focus group schedule with an administrative leader liaison in the department based on the time most participants would be working on shift during data collection. The focus group interview took place in an administrative board room within the police station that afforded privacy, security, and confidentiality (Kellmereit, 2015). The researcher facilitated the focus group face-to-face and during the participants’ scheduled work time. Participants agreed to the researcher digitally recording the session.

In summary, this section includes the characteristics of the target population, sample, and setting for this qualitative descriptive study. A description and definition included the participant criteria, as well as a narrative of the police department and participant demographics. In addition, data source descriptions detailed the transcribed numbers of pages and lengths of time for open-ended semi-structured interviews and the focus group interview. Certain demographic information collected was excluded to ensure confidentiality.

**Data Analysis Procedures**

The researcher used numerous steps and stages to analyze the data from the DISC Personality Profile individual profile responses, the focus group interview, and the open-ended semi-structured individual interviews. The analytical process centered around
Vaismoradi et al. (2013) and DeLyser and Potter’s (2013) suggested analysis steps of looking for relationships, patterns, frequencies, and trends of written and oral communications collected during data collection, then coding data by identifying themes, issues, and categories recurring throughout the gathered material to create the final findings. The researcher also used Yin’s (2010) five-step analysis for preparing data for coding: compiling, disassembling, reassembling, interpretation, and examination across each of Yin’s (2014) four areas of data analysis: scrutiny, tabulation, labeling, and testing of data, drawing conclusions to yield empirical results. Selection of the thematic analysis was most appropriate for this qualitative descriptive study because of alignment with RQ1 and RQ2. Vivid descriptions of the lived experiences of the participants reinforced an descriptive design, while supporting the identification of codes and major themes (Delyser & Potter, 2013; Vaismoradi et al., 2013; Yin, 2014). The three emerging themes were directly connected to the overarching research questions and Marston’s (1928) Personality Trait Theory, and critical in assisting to provide a distinct picture of how DISC personality traits influenced a law enforcement team in communication and adapting to change.

Throughout the disassembling, reassembling, interpretation, and conclusions phases (Fusch & Ness, 2015; Yin, 2010), analysis aligned to this qualitative descriptive study and assisted in addressing both research questions. First trait identification and analysis occurred with the IML DISC Insights Personality System Profile according to PeopleKeys (2008) codebook (p. 4-5), plotting identified participant results to determine the pure or blended traits, then assignment transpired of the appropriate Dominance, Influencing, Steadiness, and Compliance personality traits to each participant. After
transcription of the focus group interview and 13 open-ended semi-structured interviews (Maxwell, 2013), member checking of transcripts occurred by both participants and the interviewer. Upon verification and completion, the process of disassembling, reassembling (Fusch & Ness, 2015; Yin, 2010) and thematic analysis began, including categorizing patterns and relationships (DeLyser & Potter, 2013; Vaismoradi et al., 2013). This allowed greater understanding of potential codes and themes from the DISC Personality System individual and team results, the focus group interview, and the semi-structured open-ended interviews (Yin, 2014).

This data analysis process included inductive and deductive interpretation of codes and themes from participants’ responses, while ensuring latent and manifest content was integrated (Vaismoradi et al., 2013). Additionally, the creation occurred of a compilation of initial codes, participant examples, and definitions (Fusch & Ness, 2015; Yin, 2010; Yin, 2014) in a codebook (Appendix T). This informational matrix originated in the compiling phase (Fusch & Ness, 2015; Yin, 2010) included integral data used in the identification of numerous themes, substantiated by participant quotes exemplifying connections throughout the data analysis process (Maxwell, 2013; Vaismoradi et al., 2013). Furthermore, establishment of reliability was developed through using multiple data sources including a focus group and interview question guide, and a qualitative descriptive study protocol. In addition, by using several sources of data (IML DISC Insights Personality System individual coded results, focus group interview, and open-ended semi-structured interviews), expert validation by DISC facilitator review of DISC profile codes, interview and focus group questions, and member checking of interview and focus group transcriptions, establishment of validity occurred.
Preparing the DISC data. In Yin’s (2010) compiling stage preparation occurred of the 37 DISC Personality System individual responses for analysis and generation of DISC individual and team results. The first step included accessing each participant’s responses in the PeopleKey’s system to assess that each participant completed each of the 24 question sets and selected a “most” and “least” answer. According to Hayward, Greenwood, Nippins, and Canali (2015) it is important to review the data sources “several times to gain an overall understanding” (p. 240). Thus, review ensued of each individual’s DISC selected results and the agency team results twice to follow coding guidelines and analyze personality traits, individual and team strengths, ideal communication environments, and adapting to change preferences along with other areas. Through this compiling and assembling process, familiarization occurred with the phenomenon’s depth and breadth.

Preparing the focus group and interview data. To prepare the focus group and interview data, submission occurred immediately of all digital recordings after the conclusion of each interview to Rev.com for transcription. Rosenthal (2016) recommended that once focus group and interviews take place, it is important to quickly get audio files transcribed to written accounts for in-depth analysis. Further, Rosenthal discussed the importance for the researcher to listen to the audio recordings and compare to transcripts for accuracy. Thus, each audio recording transcription occurred between 2-18 hours by Rev.com, who did a professional job capturing almost verbatim each focus group and interview participant’s responses.

Upon completion of transcription, the member checking process ensued. Rosenthal (2016) and Yin (2014) posited that member checking is necessary for
participants to ensure correct transcription viability, transparency of recorded conversations, and allow for feedback. By using member checking via emailing transcripts to all interview and focus group participants, transcribed information was reviewed, accuracy determined, and feedback given if desired. Subsequently, the 6 focus group participants and 13 individual interview participants received, via email a copy of the transcribed interviews for each to offer corrections or feedback. Each participant received a five-day period to review the transcription and return any feedback or edits. If the participant did not send any feedback within the five-day period, the transcription remained unchanged.

Five of the participants reviewed the transcripts, with four indicating no changes were necessary. One individual interview participant responded with a correction to the supervisor’s name, which was transcribed incorrectly from the audio recording. Correction of the leader’s name occurred in the transcript as suggested by the participant. Due to busy law enforcement participant schedules, interviewees did not check codes or themes resulting in limited member checking denoted as a delimitation. As member checking occurred, participants verified correct transcription and viability of interview notes, ensuring construct and internal validity (Rosenthal, 2016; Yin, 2014).

**Coding of the data.** Upon completion of the member checking process where participants verified transcription accuracy, Yin’s (2010) five phase coding process and thematic analysis process ensued. The first source following the coding process was participant responses on the IML DISC Insights Personality System Profile. The second source of coding included the focus group interview, while the third source of data contained the 13 open-ended semi-structured interviews.
Coding occurred first in a silo by data source, then bringing all the data sources together for compilation of all codes to compare and eliminate duplicates. First, coding the interview data sources occurred individually, then together to identify common codes using Yin’s (2010) compiling phase. Generating initial codes was next in Yin’s (2010) disassembling phase in analyzing the data. Codes are labels, or tags assigned to units of data, so the researcher may gain meaning (Petty et al., 2012). By reading and continually reviewing participants’ IML DISC Insights Personality System Profile identified responses (Davenport, 2018), focus group, and semi-structured open-ended interview data, identification transpired of phrases, ideas, words, and emerging themes used. Krueger and Casey (2015) reported that “analysis is a sequential process- an evolving process of enlightenment” (p. 140). Maxwell (2013) stated that coding is an important part of categorizing by identifying differences and similarities by grouping and comparing data, thus “aid(ing) in the development of theoretical concepts” (p. 107).

**DISC.** The first source of data to follow the coding process was the participant responses on the IML DISC Insights Personality System profiles. In the overall law enforcement agency, 37 sworn officers and civilian employees completed the DISC Personality System assessment. Singh (2015) suggested the researcher categorize stories, explanations, and descriptions through deductive and inductive interpretation for greater understanding of the phenomenon. The study included use of the IML DISC Insights Personality System Profile (PeopleKeys, 2008, codebook p. 4-6, 8) individual responses to the 24 sets of forced choice adjectives for data to address the research questions and for potential codes (Davenport, 2018),
The first step in the process entailed identifying each person’s responses to the 24 sets of adjectives (Davenport, 2018) on the IML DISC Insights Personality System Profile (PeopleKeys, 2008, codebook p. 4-5). After following the coding procedures for each participant’s most, least, and change scores on the graph (PeopleKeys, 2008, codebook p. 4), the researcher plotted the Line 1 scores (most) on the corresponding Graph 1 Most at the bottom of p. 4 (Appendix K). Next the Line 2 (least) score plots occurred on Graph 2 Least, followed by the Line 3 (change) score plots on Graph 3 Change. Graph 1 represents the mask or public self, Graph 2 the core or private self, and Graph 3 the mirror or perceived self. By identifying participant responses on each graph, the researcher then identified each participant’s individual pure or blended personality traits. According to PeopleKeys (2008) codebook, the scores above midline on Graph 3 identify the individual’s innate style and intensity as Graph 3 “combines the learned responses from one’s past with the current expected behavior from the environment” (p. 6). This resulted in identification of specific pure or blended Dominant, Influencing, Steady, and Compliant traits as described in the codebook (PeopleKeys, 2008, p. 4-5). Initial identifiers for the IML DISC Insights Personality System Profile are located in Appendices T and X.

Results aligned with Marston’s (1928) DISC Trait Theory as it is rare for a person to possess only one personality trait of Dominance, Influence, Steadiness, or Conscientiousness. The 37 law enforcement team members selected the following DISC personality trait(s) and scored:

- Dominant (D)- 3= 8% of the department.
- Influencing (I)- 3= 8% of the department.
- Steadiness (S)- 15= 41% of the department.
Conscientious (C) - 16= 43% of the department.

PeopleKeys (2008) reported that the average personality norm is D-3%, I-11%, S-69%, and C-17%. Comparatively, this police team contained significantly more C personality types and less S and I types than was typical.

In alignment with Marston’s (1928) theory, the law enforcement team scored 3 pure types, 1 S and 2 C, and 34 blended personality types: 3 D blends, 3 I blends, 13 S blends, and 15 C blends. This means that 3 participants, or 8% had pure personality styles while the majority of 34, or 92% had two or three different personality types scored above midline in their individual coded DISC results. Rosenberg and Silvert (2013) posited that when a respondent has more than one trait appear above the midline, style combinations play a strong role in how a person reacts and interprets situations and other people, which is evidenced in the open-ended semi-structured interview and focus group interview statements reported in the themes below. Due to privacy and confidentiality of participants, reporting occurred of primary DISC personality traits versus specific and exact traits to protect participant identity. All agency personality types are listed in the team results (Appendix S, p. 13) with redacted names. Coded results in Table 8 contain the personality traits of all target and sample participants.

Table 8.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Focus Group n=6</th>
<th>Semi-structured Interviews n=13</th>
<th>Target Agency Team n=37</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D Primary Traits</td>
<td>1=17%</td>
<td>1=8%</td>
<td>3=8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I Primary Traits</td>
<td>1=17%</td>
<td>2=15%</td>
<td>3=8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S Primary Traits</td>
<td>2=33%</td>
<td>6=46%</td>
<td>15=41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C Primary Traits</td>
<td>2=33%</td>
<td>4=31%</td>
<td>16=43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task-oriented (D,C)</td>
<td>3=50%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People-oriented (I,S)</td>
<td>3=50%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active/Change-oriented (D,I)</td>
<td>2=33%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passive/Stability-oriented (S,C)</td>
<td>4=67%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5=38%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8=62%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3=23%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10=77%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19=51%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18=49%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6=16%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31=84%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Results taken from individual DISC personality trait results following the coding procedures in Appendix M (PeopleKeys, 2008, codebook, p. 4-5).

Two other areas measured by participant coded responses on the IML DISC Insights Personality System Profile included active/change-oriented and passive/stability-oriented, as well as task-oriented and people-oriented. Active/change-oriented personalities reveal how individuals adapt to change and include the D and I styles, while the passive/stability-oriented includes the S and C types. Of the overall law enforcement department, scores included: 3-D and 3-I totaling 16% and 15 S and 16 C, totaling 84% (see Figure 5). The second area measured in the DISC results included task-oriented and people-oriented, revealing communication preferences. Task orientation includes the D and C personality types, while the I and S are people-oriented. The department scored 19 D and C, totaling 51% and 18 I and S, for a total of 49% (see Figure 6).
Figure 5. Law Enforcement Agency Passive and Active Personality Statistics for 37 Members

Note. The percentage of passive/stability-oriented personalities was significantly higher than active/change-oriented.
Figure 6. Law Enforcement Agency Task and People-oriented Personality Statistics for 37 Members

Note. The percentage of task-oriented personalities was slightly higher than people-oriented.

During this process, identification of numerous terms occurred from the count of IML DISC Insights initial participant responses to the 24 sets of adjectives most, least, and “*” responses (Appendix X) such as:

- Active, Change-oriented
- Cautious, Compliant, Correct
- Determined, Dominant, Driver
- Impulsive, Influencing, Inspiring
- Passive, Stability-oriented
- People-oriented
- Private Self, Core
- Steady, Stable, Supportive
- Task-oriented
After identifying the participant primary pure and blended personality traits, the
task orientation or people-orientation (communication preference), and the active/change-
oriented or passive/stability-oriented (change adaptation preference) printing ensued for
individual’s DISC results, then notification to PeopleKeys (2008) of the departmental
participants’ completion to compile and run the agency results. Use of these results
occurred in the debrief meeting, the focus group interview, and the open-ended semi-
structured interviews. Coding emerged through references, examples, and stories from all
participants in the focus group interview and the open-ended semi-structured interviews.

Various DISC phrases and words discussed by participants during the focus group
interview and open-ended semi-structured interviews were also mentioned in the DISC
individual and team results, as well as the Focus Group (Appendix F) and open-ended
semi-structured Interview Question Guides (Appendix E). These words and phrases
created new codes added to the initial focus group and open-ended semi-structured
interview codes. For example, 100 plus codes (Appendix Y) emerged from the focus
group and open-ended semi-structured interview participants who applied perceptions,
opinions, stories, and insights from the personal and team DISC results including ideal
work environment, motivated by, value to the group, strengths in leadership, strengths
and challenges, detailed, etcetera. One of these areas included the DISC team results
(Appendix S, p. 24) used by the participants during the focus group interview and the
open-ended semi-structured interviews (Appendix E, IQ10). This question asked
participants’ perception and application of the team dynamics results data, detailing how
department members coded collectively in the following areas:

- Collaborating.
- Directing.
- Detailing.
- Creating.
- Influencing.
- Persisting.
- Processing.

Categories included very low, low, average, high, and very high. The target law enforcement agency rated highest in processing and detailing, in the medium range for collaborating, directing, and persisting, and lowest in creating and influencing (see Figure 7).

![Figure 7. Group Dynamics from PeopleKeys (2008) DISC Team Results](image)

Note. Processing is significantly higher than the lowest category of Influencing.

By following the coding procedure (Davenport, 2018) for the DISC participant responses through Yin’s (2010) disassembling and reassembling phases, corroborated codes and potential themes emerged by authenticating information from the IML DISC Insights.
Personality System Profile, the focus group interview, and open-ended semi-structured interviews (Maxwell, 2013).

**Focus group interview and open-ended and semi-structured interviews.** The second source of data included the focus group interview and the third source of data included the open-ended semi-structured interviews. Maxwell (2013) deduced that data analysis integrated with good design as analysis began immediately after a focus group interview and open-ended semi-structured interviews, while becoming acquainted with the data. To become completely familiar with the data, immediate review of the focus group interview and semi-structured open-ended interview digital recordings occurred immediately, as well as the reading of transcriptions line-by-line three times. DeLyser and Potter (2013) recommended coding and data analysis to “make sense of large amounts of empirical materials” as themes emerge (p. 26). By using coding schemes (DeLyser & Potter, 2013) and categories (Maxwell, 2013) chunking occurred of the focus group and interview transcripts into smaller portions. Connections emerged as common phrases appeared. By placing participant responses under each question from the Focus Group Interview Guide (Appendix F) and the open-ended semi-structured Interview Guide (Appendix E), separation ensued of the large amount of data into smaller, manageable segments.

By completing this process, an effective method emerged to identify potential codes and themes (Appendix X) throughout Yin’s (2010) disassembling and reassembling phases (Fusch & Ness, 2015). After data organization by research question and theoretical construct, the next step was identification of potential codes (Maxwell, 2013). Glaser and Laudel (2013) purported that coding, or descriptive labeling is used in
the early stages of data analysis to link data to the research questions. Identified codes for each interview data source occurred next (Appendix T) by using NVivo for both word frequency and significant statements of participants’ (Appendix V) thoughts and ideas, stated by participants in response to questions and direct quotes from focus group and individual interview transcripts. By using these coding techniques, identified occurred of relationships and categories with “subjective sense-making” (Singh, 2015, p. 140) of codes (see Tables9-10). As a result, identification of over 300 initial codes emerged (Appendix X) with over 2600 occurrences (Appendix Y) using Yin’s (2010) disassembling and reassembling phases.

Table 9.

**Interview Question Examples and Responses**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interview Questions on Communication and Change</th>
<th>Sample Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Communication (Int. Q5)</strong> Review your strengths/limitations on p. 3 of your DISC personal results. How did you apply DISC strengths to assist with communication? (RQ1)</td>
<td>“Strengths are listening, teamwork, follow through, and challenges are slow to begin, dislike change, oversensitive. I can definitely use my strengths to my advantages as far as listening, getting the group, so even if I need to get the group to help me begin because I'm a slow beginner, I can do that as well, but I definitely follow through well” (IP5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“One is over-sensitive… we're all individuals, again, but over-sensitive I think that I realize the reason I perceive things how I do sometimes is because of my personality. I try to not be so over-sensitive to what people say. Good criticism is not a bad thing” (IP3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Communication (Int. Q11)</strong> Now, after using the DISC personality traits, what do you think of your team’s routine communication? Solving conflict? (RQ1)</td>
<td>“I think that is an area that we do struggle. I think that they have to build some more confidence to solve those conflicts. I think the reason so many people are over here is because they've been beat down a lot. They have not had an opportunity, for the past several administrations, to express their opinions and their feelings and actually be heard. I think that's why a lot of them are over here. I think more of them will move to the leadership once they learn that, &quot;Hey, we can have our voices heard and we can have an opinion that matters&quot;. (IP13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“I think they can utilize it. I think it's a work in progress”. (IP10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Change (Int. Q19)</strong> What is your ideal work environment and how did learning about your ideal work environment assist you with “Being able to design and refine challenging tasks and activities. I do like that. Projects that produce tangible results, recognition for my analytical abilities. I don't agree with that. Maybe in this generation, that's fine. I need the reassurance I'm doing it right, but I don't need being put on that pedestal. I actually don't like the pedestal”. (IP12)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
“My ideal work environment, again, is in tasks and projects that can be followed through to completion, specialized or technical tasks, practical work procedures and routines, instructions and reassurance in what's expected of me. I think, probably, the fact that I've enjoyed my career as much as I do is because this is my personality, but this box of my ideal work environment incorporates everything that we do. We always have tasks that you're expected to complete. There's procedures and routines for everything. I'm a procedural guy, a routine guy, so I'm actually in my ideal work environment”. (IP2)
Table 10.

*Focus Group Question Examples and Responses*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interview Questions and Communication and Change</th>
<th>Sample Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Communication (Int. Q4)</strong>&lt;br&gt;How is innovation communicated? New ideas from the community or within? (RQ1)</td>
<td>“That's the way it used to be. Whereas, now, with the Chief, it's more involvement with everyone it seems like in the decisions. He's keeping everyone up to speed, so-to-speak, on where we're going and what we're doing, and what his reasons are. Everybody's involved, so you get everybody involved, then you've got a decent body. You're invested in it”. (FGP3) “I think they talk from the top down… Before, the top talked and we did. Now, it trails down. It's a little bit better communication. I think the chief, he gets his vision, a little bit more to the lieutenants, getting things in place… You knew something was going to happen but there was no communication on how or when. That's improved a lot. Still, nowhere near where it needs to be, but again you've got to accept some time to settle in, to bear change as well”. (FGP6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Practical Use (FGQ2)</strong>&lt;br&gt;How were your DISC results useful to you? Please give an example. (RQ1, RQ2)</td>
<td>“Well, I can say that mine are pretty spot on, but it made me realize that maybe my short attention span could be a problem sometimes. So, maybe to pay more attention, because when I don't, I end up forgetting more, when I'm not paying attention”. (FGP1) “Even though [S] was higher for me, a lot of mine fall under [I] for Influence, especially, personal life. I'm usually a pretty good – influence on people, and they seek my advice. I do, sometimes, I have a short attention span and do forget stuff. That kind of worked in, itself, as well. I do come up with spontaneous ideas to do, and random road trips, and that kind of works for me. I am accepting to new challenges”. (FGP2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Change (Int. Q4)</strong>&lt;br&gt;How are you and team members committed to change? (RQ2)</td>
<td>“I'm dead for it…I love change”. (FGP5) “I think, at first, I really want the change. Then, when it comes, it's kind of scary and I kind of want to say ... Oh, well, I kind of liked it the way it used to be ... But then, when I'm pushed to change, then I start liking it and really enjoying it. I want, and then I get scared of it, and then after it's done I'm like okay, this is good”. (FGP1) “I think it's easier if you have consistency in your leadership. So, if you kind of can see their vision and then they back their vision, then you can, or I can, my personality can just go along with whatever the change is. That's what's helpful for me, is to kind of be able to see what the plan is. And that's been easier since our newest transition”. (FGP6)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

During review of data, denotation transpired of repeated words and phrases on a computer document and on paper for potential forming of themes, patterns, and categories (Maxwell, 2013) during Yin’s (2010) disassembling and assembling phases.
The researcher also ran numerous queries in NVivo to check for word and phrase frequency. Queries were modified to omit words under four letters, such as “are”, “was”, and “is” as these were not important to study outcomes. Also, words occurring frequently but deemed not imperative to the study included works such as “okay”, “look”, and “turn”, thus were omitted. Numerous other words showing on the frequency query, such as the participants’ names were not relevant to the study so were eliminated. Some frequently used words considered as potential codes and themes and important to the study included “influence”, “personality”, “committed”, “conversation”, and “recognition”. A list of initial codes for all three data sources was included in Appendix X. To further reduce the number of initial codes, the use of categorizing and chunking (grouping initial codes that refer to similar areas/themes) occurred to begin placing minor codes into major code areas (see Table 11).
Table 11.

**Example of Codes with Corresponding Quotes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Codes</th>
<th>Corresponding Quotes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Focus Group</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-awareness</td>
<td>“I think we just all had a better understanding of why certain officers communicate the way they do, or react the way they do. Now, I understand why FGP5 goes out on scene and he handles a situation a different way than I do. Or FGP3 does. I think it just made us all understand each other a little more, really”. (FGP1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team Effectiveness</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team and Community Communication</td>
<td>“From the community standpoint, me personally, I consider myself to have the gift to be able to talk to anybody. Now, I go out and talk to an old person, and then go find some teenager, and carry on a conversation with them about something they might be interested in. It falls into listening and being able to follow through with whatever is going on in the community, or if you're out on a call with somebody. Understanding that you're out there during their worst moment. This is the reason why they called us. That's how I usually try to approach it”. FGP5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steady/Stable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Open-ended Semi-structured Interviews</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership Behaviors</td>
<td>“There's a lot of leaders or managers who are very fearful to give up control of things, whereas I bring people in and say, &quot;You need to learn how to do this because I won't be here forever. Here's all the information you need if I'm not here&quot;. That's intimidating to a lot of leaders. I'm okay with that, so I think that's pretty point on with motivating because when I sit here and tell them, &quot;I'm releasing this to you to learn how to do it,&quot; some of them look at me funny. It's a little overwhelming to them at first, but they're realizing that I'm not afraid to let them learn and to grow and develop. I think that's really good. I'm very relational and approachable”. IP13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership Expectations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved Communications</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Influence/Inspire</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humor</td>
<td>“I guess be more open. Just being more open to everybody else's opinion. I know my way is not the only way and being something for that. I've done a lot better at that coming over to the police department from the army side. That's the biggest thing for me was just listening to everybody else and accepting their feedback and their ideas and knowing that it's just not me that can't figure it out”. (IP12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adapting to Change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singh (2015) recommended analyzing codes falling under broad headings and identifying underlying themes, thus reducing large numbers of initial codes and raw data. The second review of the data yielded 72 codes (see Table 12).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 12.
Second Review – List of Codes from Focus Group Interview and Semi-structured Open-ended Individual Interviews

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Active, Change-oriented</th>
<th>Likes/dislikes routine</th>
<th>Trust</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cautious, Compliant, Correct</td>
<td>Perfectionist</td>
<td>Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Determined, Dominant, Driver</td>
<td>Accuracy</td>
<td>Strengths</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impulsive, Influencing, Inspiring</td>
<td>Critical</td>
<td>Limitations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passive, Stability-oriented</td>
<td>Field report calls</td>
<td>Motivation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People-oriented</td>
<td>Citizens &amp; community</td>
<td>Leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steady, Stable, Supportive</td>
<td>Team, family</td>
<td>Problem-solving</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task-oriented</td>
<td>Improved team effectiveness</td>
<td>Decision-making</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict</td>
<td>Building relationships</td>
<td>Listening</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Differences</td>
<td>Right fit of position/person</td>
<td>Language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self &amp; job awareness</td>
<td>Follow-through</td>
<td>Conflict resolution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conduct</td>
<td>Input</td>
<td>People-oriented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan &amp; implement change</td>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>Task-oriented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work environment</td>
<td>Chief/leaders</td>
<td>DISC personality traits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan for future change</td>
<td>Innovation</td>
<td>Dominance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changing work assignments</td>
<td>Ideas</td>
<td>Influencer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Steadiness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>Input</td>
<td>Conscientious</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership- behaviors and expectations</td>
<td>Feedback</td>
<td>Better or worse now</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desires to or not to lead</td>
<td>Communicate</td>
<td>Positive or negative impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impatient</td>
<td>Cooperation</td>
<td>Impact of my own behavior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening, change- accepts or resists</td>
<td>Humor</td>
<td>Enthusiastic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decisive/indecisive</td>
<td>Persuasive</td>
<td>Detail-oriented or lack of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cheerleader</td>
<td>Low or high follow-through</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sensitive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

However, the development of codes and themes continued to be an on-going and systematic process (Yin, 2014) throughout the disassembling and reassembling phases (Fusch & Ness, 2015; Yin, 2010). By using an iterative process for a third review, the researcher further reduced the amount of codes from 72 to 24 (see Table 13). As the researcher reviewed the focus group and interview data again for potential new codes, none were identified. Upon identification of no new codes, data saturation for coding occurred according to Fusch and Ness (2015).

Table 13.
Emerging themes from the data. As the researcher identified and established codes, themes began to develop and expand throughout the next stages of Yin’s (2010) reassembling and interpretation phases. Petty et al. (2012) described thematic analysis as grouping codes and expanding focused ideas to create “themes that distill the key issues identified by the researcher” (p. 381). After identifying initial codes, the researcher examined the DISC individual response codes and the transcriptions from the focus group and open-ended semi-structured interviews for themes. During this stage, the researcher perused all the codes to explore how major and minor themes connected and contained the codes. To distill the codes into themes and sub-themes, the researcher created a codebook (Appendix T), showing connectivity between the research questions, codes, occurrences, and participant responses (Petty et al., 2012). Bernard et al., (2018) recommended use of a codebook to identify and define examples for a researcher to analyze and revisit data throughout the iterative course. The process of placing codes into overarching themes is an iterative process where “analysis involves continual movement” and researcher review (Petty et al., 2012, p. 381).
In Yin’s (2010) reassembling and interpretation stages (Fusch & Ness, 2015), the researcher identified themes from the participant DISC Insights Personality Profile coded results, the focus group interview, and the open-ended semi-structured interviews, then justified the selected themes by relating significant statements from participants (Appendix P). Coding occurred first in silos by each data source, then all codes in data sources brought together for common codes and themes. By grouping codes, such as “personal life use”, “how my leader treats me”, “people-oriented”, and “better team effectiveness” similarities emerged enabling the categorization into the theme of “DISC trait application and practical uses”. The researcher used the same process for all open codes, as well as drawing a thematic map in NVivo to contrive meaning and connectivity between various levels of themes.

Petty et al. (2012) recommended creating a thematic map as a visual picture to assist with identifying relationships among themes. By grouping DISC and interview codes and identifying significant statements from participant open-ended semi-structured interviews and the focus group interview, the researcher identified the following themes: (a) communication implications, (b) practical uses of DISC personality trait application, and (c) change implications. Table 14 includes the major identified themes and corresponding participant quotes.
### Example of Themes from the DISC Insights, Focus Group, and Semi-structured Open-ended Interviews with Corresponding Quotes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Themes</th>
<th>Corresponding Quotes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Communication Implications</strong></td>
<td>“Well, I think you learn those strengths. I definitely learned you just have to work on listening and hopefully everybody's in the departments, I think, it's caused everybody, I'm sure to pay more attention to the situation with regard to personality or how somebody interacts. It brings more awareness to things”. (IP7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal &amp; Team Communication</td>
<td>“Prior, I'm going to say maybe low to medium and after medium to high. Helped me understand a little bit better how to communicate to people with different styles than I have”. (IP11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Practical Uses</strong></td>
<td>“Yeah. It actually helped me with the communications. Sometimes I had problems getting out to people. They think I'm being rude and all that, but now that we got this in play and all, it's actually helped me to talk to them more on a one-on-one basis and I guess not seem so much as a jerk”. (IP1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal and Team Life</td>
<td>“Probably medium to low because I didn't know a lot of people here. I haven't been here very long. But for me personally, it brought a new perspective for me, truthfully, of how I interact and what I am and how I work with things. That kind of thing”. (IP7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership Behaviors and Expectations</td>
<td>I definitely see that leadership is already starting to apply some of these things just in shift briefings and things like that the way they discuss things. They try to use different examples for different people, so everybody can kind of get a good grasp of it”. (FGP2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DISC trait Application and Use</td>
<td>“Actually, seeing it and again realizing our traits, this report amazed me, it really did. Because I looked at it and I'm like, &quot;That's me&quot;. I mean, and it was like, compared to the questions, nothing in my understanding, nothing question-wise would have made me think it would come out to this”. (IP3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change Implications - Awareness and Adapting to</td>
<td>“Well, I think from understanding who we are, but I think the results of the team would be making sure that our teams are put together with people that have, I guess, complementing or different styles… If you have C’s and S’s, you're going to have a different standard of production. If you have a C, an S, and an I, you're going to get a little bit better. It's kind of like planning a party. If all of them are Cs, you're going to have a certain type of party”. (IP2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change Implications - Awareness and Adapting to</td>
<td>“The challenges are correct. I dislike change, because I don't like to change once I'm with, once I can trust wherever I'm at. Just like a doctor office, I don't change. I'm comfortable where I'm at, trust them”. (IP6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change Implications - Awareness and Adapting to</td>
<td>“...we may be going at it in a different way. More people are open for change, and I think this will kind of help people be open for change”. (IP8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change Implications - Awareness and Adapting to</td>
<td>“I think some people here in the department are getting used to the change and all that, but I think we're starting to learn and work better as a whole with being as a team”. (IP1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change Implications - Awareness and Adapting to</td>
<td>“If the vision changes, or if they're changes ahead, if you are able to give us that information in a decent amount of time so that the people who need time to absorb that change have it. Because we do, and that's one of the main things before, is we were being led in the dark. Most of our personality traits, that wasn't okay”. (FGP6)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Enhancing and reviewing themes was a process comparable to that of code definition and refinement. To further ensure that identified themes formed a logical representation of information given by participants in the focus group interview, DISC individual results, and open-ended semi-structured interviews, the researcher reviewed all themes again for authentic patterns. Next, the researcher thoroughly reread the complete set of data to establish validity of the identified themes. Then, upon validation and connectivity to the data narrative, defined themes emerged (Appendix T).

**Connecting themes to the research questions.** Utilizing Yin’s (2010) conclusion stage, the final identified themes connected to the two research questions in this study.

**RQ1:** *How do DISC personality traits influence routine communication* aligned with the theme of *communication implications*, specifically *personal and team communication*. As participants often overlapped both RQ’s with answers pertaining to both communication and change, it was difficult for the researcher to separate and categorize the responses. For instance, the theme, *practical uses* included participant answers for communication and change and consisted of *personal and team life DISC trait use*, and *leadership behaviors and expectations*. Thus, reporting of this theme occurred in RQ1 and communication. **RQ2:** *How do DISC personality traits influence routine team adapting to change* connected to the theme of *change implications*, specifically awareness of and adapting to change. Discussion of these three themes and how alignment existed with the research questions occurs in the results section.

**Validating the data.** Yin (2014) explained that due to a novice researcher’s inexperience, the veteran researcher is likely to have more advantages during the analytic phase. To alleviate potential mistakes during this stage, this novice researcher double and
triple-checked data results throughout each phase. For confirmation of validity and correctness, data analysis of numerous data sources occurred. These included analysis (Davenport, 2018) of the validated (Price, 2015) IML DISC Insights Personality System Profile individual results (PeopleKeys, 2008, codebook p. 4-6, 8), a focus group of 6, 13 face-to-face open-ended semi-structured, expert validation by DISC certified experts, and member checking of transcriptions. In addition, the researcher conducted two field tests (Bernard et al., 2018) to confirm valid gathering of data and the second field test resulted in a change from observation to a focus group interview due to lack of collection of rich data via observation.

**Expert validation.** The first process used to strengthen validity in this study was enlisting a panel of DISC certified experts currently facilitating and using DISC concepts. These experts reviewed both the open-ended semi-structured Interview and Focus Group Question Guides (Appendices E and L) and made suggestions. Editing of the questions ensued and two field tests conducted (Bernard et al., 2018), thus increasing validity. Brodie (2016) and Bernier (2017) suggested that experts lend consistency, accuracy, and validity in their subject matter expertise to the study.

**Member checking.** The second process used for data analysis to fortify validity was member checking. The researcher conducted member checking throughout the open-ended semi-structured interviews and focus group interviews by validating meaning through probing and clarifying questions, ensuring no gaps in the phenomenon or research questions occurred. Then the researcher shared the focus group and open-ended semi-structured interview transcripts with the appropriate participants to check and confirm the accuracy of transcripts (Petty et al., 2012; Rosenthal, 2016). Maxwell (2013)
suggested that evidence extinguishes validity threats in a study, so the researcher also reviewed the audible and typed transcripts for accuracy, thus further establishing validity. The researcher purposely did not give the participants the coded or themed responses due to busy work schedules and that law enforcement would not desire to know the researcher themes or codes, resulting in a delimitation to the study of incomplete member checking.

**DISC.** The third method used to analyze data was the participant responses on the IML DISC Insights Personality System Profile (Appendices M, Y). These results were foundational to this qualitative descriptive study as the researcher gathered data on each participant’s individual personality style, how that participant best communicates and adapts to change with other styles, as well as the aggregate of the team. By learning personal personality trait style, participants first learn about self, then others. This gave DISC information to each participant in order to answer RQ1 and RQ2 as to how teammates best communicate and adapt to past, present, and future change. After following coding procedures for identification of individual personality styles (Davenport, 2018), the researcher used purposeful selection to identify which participants to include in the focus group and open-ended semi-structured interviews. The DISC individual and group results contained valuable data regarding communication style and adaptation to change, as well as informed participant answers in the focus group interview and the open-ended semi-structured interviews. Lykourentzou et al. (2016) recommended interviewing a balanced blend of personalities for best research results. Therefore, 1 DI, 1 ISC, 1 SI, 1 SCI, 1 CDS, and 1 CD personalities were selected for the focus group and 13 different personality blends were selected for the open-ended semi-structured interviews (Table 14).
The DISC results were also foundational to the open-ended semi-structured interview and focus group questions regarding communication and change, evidenced by open-ended semi-structured Interview Question Guide (Appendix E) and the Focus Group Interview Guide (Appendix F). The DISC results contained numerous categories, used in participant answers such as: “ideal work environment”, “motivated by”, “value to the group”, “how best to communicate”, “strengths and challenges”, and “influencing”. These, and numerous other areas endorsed understanding of self and others to promote effective communication and change adaptation within the law enforcement agency. The DISC individual and team results were a valuable data source and authentication between the focus group and open-ended semi-structured interview participant responses.

Focus group interview. The fourth data source in the data analysis process was the focus group interview, consisting of 6 participants and 12 questions (Appendix F). Krueger and Casey (2015) recommended using an opening, introduction, and transition question prior to moving into the key questions, which is how the focus group questions were structured (Appendix F). The researcher used 12 different questions from the open-ended semi-structured interview and vetted these questions with an expert panel of DISC experts prior to the focus group. To further validate the focus group questions, the researcher used empirical research from Carey and Asbury (2012), Krueger and Casey, (2015), PeopleKeys (2017), Smith & Hoy (as cited in Kearney & Smith, 2008), and Wheelan (2013) regarding communication, change, and focus groups to develop the questions. These questions were designed to capture participant perceptions, actions, and results to better recognize how DISC personality traits influenced routine communication and adapting to change in the law enforcement team.
**Individual interviews.** The fifth source used for data analysis included the open-ended semi-structured interviews. The researcher compiled 27 open-ended questions (Appendix E) regarding communication, change, and categories out of the DISC individual and team results (Appendices M and S). A panel of DISC certified experts assisted with the validation of the open-ended semi-structured interview questions and the researcher field-tested the questions as well, resulting in expert validation. Suggested changes were made and the researcher oft times used probing questions or prompts during the open-ended semi-structured interview sessions, such as “can you give an example” and “can you expand a little on this”. Originally, the researcher planned to interview 10 participants. However, due to some of the shortened lengths of the initial open-ended semi-structured interviews caused by a poverty of expression by some personality types and the law enforcement career style, the researcher opted to interview 13 participants to ensure saturation of data and dataset redundancy (Marshall et al., 2013). This process allowed for in-depth, comprehensive details adding to knowledge and greater understanding of the phenomenon.

By collecting, synthesizing, and analyzing data through several iterations from the DISC results, a focus group, and individual open-ended semi-structured interviews, themes emerged throughout the data analysis process. The focus group interview and individual open-ended semi-structured interviews built on the DISC participant and team results data as participants shared experiences, examples, and perceptions. By analyzing the data sources, the researcher confirmed the merging of data to support descriptive study findings. Numerous themes exhibited consistency across the sources of data analysis in the study’s results relating to how DISC personality traits influenced routine
communication and adapting to change in a law enforcement team. Findings were based
and formulated on data gathered from the DISC individual and team results, a focus
group interview, and open-ended semi-structured interviews producing constant and
reliable results that assisted in strengthening construct validity (Maxwell, 2013; Yin,
2014).

Reliability of the results. According to Sarma (2015), reliability includes
findings that enable a researcher to replicate consistently the study with participants in a
similar context. Reliability was established through using a reliable and valid instrument
in the IML DISC Insights Personality System Profile, individual open-ended semi-
structured interviews, and a focus group interview based on the following: (a) Marston’s
(1928) Trait Theory, (b) Krueger and Casey’s (2015) focus group questioning route, (c) a
panel of four DISC certified experts, (d) Wheelan’s (2013) attributes of effective team
member’s communication and participation, and (e) Smith and Hoy’s (as cited in
Kearney & Smith, 2008) openness to change traits.

At the beginning of the focus group interview and each open-ended semi-
structured interview, the researcher reviewed a scripted protocol to ensure reliability of
the open-ended semi-structured Interview Guide (Appendix E) and the Focus Group
Guide (Appendix F) as each participant received the same instructions. Reliability
increased by using the validated IML DISC Insights Personality instrument (Price, 2015)
and analyzing data to verify numerous participant perceptions and responses on the
instrument coded (Davenport, 2018) to identify personal traits to understand self and
others (Marston, 1928). These insights regarding DISC trait influences on team
communication and change assisted in answering RQ1 and RQ2. Prochaska et al. (2015)
confirmed that the DISC instrument contained reliability by validating it with the cluster factor and the exploratory factor, two multivariate statistical techniques.

To further reliability, a qualitative research system was used to load transcripts, run queries, and analyze data from transcribed open-ended semi-structured interviews and the focus group interview. Yin (2014) suggested that use of a database for descriptive study findings assisted with creating an audit trail of collected data, codes, analysis, and final conclusions. Thus, establishment of reliability and validity occurred due to coded (Davenport, 2018) participant responses on the IML DISC Insights Personality Profile instrument (Appendix G) individual and team results (Appendices M and S), panel DISC content expert validation input, conducting of two field tests (Bernard et al., 2018), use of NVivo data management system, and extensive revision of the open-ended semi-structured Interview Question Guide (Appendix E) and the Focus Group Guide in Appendix F (Krueger & Casey, 2015; PeopleKeys, 2008; Bernard et al., 2018).

In summary, numerous steps were used in the analysis of data from the coded participant responses on the IML DISC Insights Personality Profile, individual and team results, the focus group interview, and the open-ended semi-structured interviews. The researcher conducted the analytical process following theoretical practices by DeLyser and Potter (2013) and Maxwell (2013) who recommended making sense of data by categorizing, coding, chunking, and creating themes. The researcher also used and displayed analysis across each of Yin’s (2014) four areas of data analysis: scrutiny, tabulation, labeling, and testing of data to yield empirical results. By selecting thematic analysis, alignment among the research questions in a qualitative descriptive study design occurred, as well as participant experiences captured and described. These measures
solidified the selection of major themes throughout the data (Krueger & Casey, 2015). Over 300 initial codes were identified with an excess of 2600 occurrences and narrowed to 24 after the third review. The identified themes of communication implications, change implications, and practical uses linked directly to the two research questions and were critical in producing distinct detail of how DISC personality traits influenced a team in routine communication and adapting to change.

Data analysis and interpretation occurred by focus group and open-ended semi-structured interview transcripts and using data from the participant responses (Davenport, 2018) on the IML DISC Insights Personality System Profile (PeopleKeys, 2008). Throughout the various stages, analysis aligned with a qualitative descriptive study design and assisted in providing information regarding the two research questions. RQ1 included the concepts of personal and team communication, personal DISC trait use, team DISC use, and leadership behavior and expectations. RQ2 included the category of awareness and adapting to change. Validity and reliability were established through multiple sources of data, member checking of transcriptions of the focus group and open-ended semi-structured interviews, use of a validated IML DISC Insights Personality System instrument (Price, 2015), inclusion of an expert panel of DISC experts, and use of a descriptive study database and codebook (Appendices T-Y).

Results are presented and discussed in the following section. The results addressed both research questions, as RQ1 included the themes of communication implications and DISC practical uses. RQ2 contains the theme of change implications.
Results

In this qualitative descriptive study, results aligned in the context of the two research questions and subsequently followed by each theme. The participant responses on the IML DISC Insights Personality Profile (PeopleKeys, 2008), the coded focus group interview (Appendix F), and individual open-ended semi-structured interviews (Appendix E) garnered numerous results. Participants’ direct quotes strengthened study results and provided enlightenment into how DISC personality traits influenced routine communication and adapting to change in a law enforcement agency. Three major themes emerged across the three data sources: communication implications, practical uses, and change implications. Providing data results answering RQ1 How DISC personality traits influence routine team communication are themes 1 and 2. Theme 1 contained communication implications, specifically how participants used DISC personality traits in personal and team communication. Theme 2 included practical uses for DISC traits in personal and team life, as well as leadership expectations and behaviors. Theme 3 provided data results for RQ 2 How DISC personality traits influence routine team adapting to change and included change implications, participants’ awareness, and adaptation to change.

Research question 1. Using the three data sources mentioned above, the researcher answered RQ1, How do DISC personality traits influence routine team communication? Through RQ1, investigation centered on how law enforcement participants used DISC traits in personal and team communication. Data from the three sources and identified concepts within RQ1 also supported the literature of Sharif and Scandura (2014) in that employees reporting to an ethical leader using consistent
communication experience higher performance levels. Focus group questions 6, 8-10 (Appendix F), open-ended semi-structured interview questions 4-14 (Appendix E), and sections from the individual (Appendix M) and team results (Appendix S) such as strengths, limitations, how best to and not to communicate, personal leadership strengths, problem-solving, listening, and DISC terminology contributed to answering RQ1 through participant questioning. Two concepts emerged from coded data in all three data sources relating to RQ1 and included personal and team communication. These codes and themes from the data sources substantiated theme 1, *communication implications* (see Tables 15-16).

Table 15.

*Data from Open-ended Semi-structured Interviews, Focus Group Interviews, and DISC Results Materials Supporting Theme 1: Communication Implications*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data Source</th>
<th>Corresponding Evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Individual Interviews</td>
<td>“I think it just showed me how I do interact and how you learn to listen and learn to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>interact with other people here. It was interesting for this to see everybody, a lot of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>similar traits. Everybody's kind of on the same page. Half of the departments on the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>same page, but the other ones you got to try to interact there differently”. (IP7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus Group</td>
<td>“I don't think I've had enough time to categorize people as to where they were. I totally</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>see the differences in the way some of the people will group together. I think it’s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>interacting, it's been easier to understand that some other people's approach to doing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>things. I see it from like four different sergeants, and you can see how, four different</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>sergeants, I don't know how they tell their people because I'm not there when they tell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the people, but you can tell how each of their people take that information and come back.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Before, in looking at it, you can tell that not only do they have to think about how they</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>give the information to each person that they give it too. Here's the same information”. (FGP6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DISC Individual and Team</td>
<td>Strengths/limitations, Ideal Work Environment, how to/not to Communicate, Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results</td>
<td>Strengths and Opportunities, Conflict, Listening, New DISC Language, Listening,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Planning and Implementing Change, Adapting to Change, Leadership Strengths,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Personality Strengths and Team Member Assignment. “How to communicate with me would be</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>create a favorable environment that is personal and agreeable. Express a genuine interest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>in them as a person. Provide them with clarification for tasks and answers to how questions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Be patient and give them follow up support. Present ideas or departures from current practice in a nonthreatening manner. Give them time to adjust. Clearly define goals, procedures, and their role in the overall plan”. (IP6)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Two Concepts Within Communication Implications, Theme 1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal Communication</td>
<td>This pertains to how participants applied DISC personality trait personal and team results to routine communication in areas of his/her personal life. Some areas included use of strengths, limitations, value, characteristics, and leadership strengths.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team Communication</td>
<td>The relates to how and why participants applied DISC personality trait personal and team results to routine areas of communication in team or community life. Some areas included using humor, trust, listening, and value to team, conflict.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Theme 1 for RQ 1: communication implications.** The first theme was communication implications of the DISC personality trait application in a law enforcement team. After analysis of the data from the DISC individual (Appendix M) and team results (Appendix S), 13 individual open-ended semi-structured interviews, and a focus group of 6, identification of codes led to the development of this theme. Participant quotes included in-depth information on concepts within theme one, demonstrating how DISC personality traits influenced routine communication (Table 14). This theme also included answers for the research question and the literature findings of Saruhan (2014), who posited that employees base perceptions on communication methods, including personal and team communication. Communication is a key factor in individual and team objectives, as well as how a team works together and achieves high performance (Pandey & Karve, 2017). Table 15 includes a description of those concepts. Evidence from the data analysis included indication that law enforcement team members perceived that DISC personality traits influenced personal and team communication.

Personal communication. When exploring the open-ended semi-structured interviews, focus group data, and DISC results participants revealed an understanding
and application of DISC trait influence in their personal communication. IP10 shared that the DISC Personality results “helped me learn how to communicate with other people”. This aligned with Lykourentzou et al. (2016) and Sugerman et al. (2011) who found that knowing the various personality types of people within a team enables members to understand each other to a greater degree. New knowledge and strategies of communicating with others was important to IP6, who stated: “I would know how to talk to my team members from knowing what they scored and stuff”. When discussing personal communication with a supervisor and subordinates, IP11 stated:

I think it's like a two-way street, me understanding him and him understanding me. Dealing with some of the people below me as well, their communication style is somewhat confrontational, and I've got to accept that that's how they communicate, and I cannot shut down and I have to remain open to what they're saying.

Voges & Braund (1995) recommended that by using each DISC personality type’s unique strengths and weaknesses, organizations create teams that interact positively and produce more efficiently, as discussed by one participant. During discussion in the focus group and open-ended semi-structured interviews regarding individual DISC trait challenges in communication, FGP2 shared:

I guess having to accept other points of view on certain things. Everybody’s got something different to bring to the table. If everybody brought the same thing, then you only might have one thing, but you don’t. Person A brings this, Person B brings this, and C brings this. You can find some sort of common ground to meet the goal that you have set in place. To get the job done, whatever it may be. It
might be just going out there and watering that bush, but everybody's going to have a different way of doing it.

When conducting the open-ended semi-structured interviews, participants used PeopleKey’s (2017) DISC personal results (Appendix M, p. 3) to discuss individual strengths (Appendix E, Q5-6). Using the DISC personal results, IP12 stated: “Knowing your strengths and weaknesses are always invaluable. Knowing somebody else's is invaluable also. Not to be manipulative at all, but just knowing yourself and just knowing, having to communicate with somebody and how somebody can perceive something”. When discussing strengths and limitations, IP10 agreed with IP12 however, felt that most were on target:

For I it's persuading, enthusiasm, entertaining and my challenges are lack of detail, short attention span and low follow-through. And C’s strengths are planning, systems orchestration and challenges is perfectionist, critical and unresponsive… when it says challenges, lack of detail. Is that saying that it's a challenge for me to accept that, because I feel like I have that.

Marston (1928) identified that it is rare for a person to possess only one personality trait because human behavior in not one specific trait or style; therefore, personality blends exist within the DISC Personality Trait Theory. Evidencing this DISC personality blend, IP12 possessed an CI style and had a varying degree of intensity of these traits. When reading the DISC group and individual strengths and challenges, IP3 related and gave a personal example, applying Marston’s (1928) theory principles:

The strengths were listening, team-work and follow-through. Challenges: over-sensitive, slow to begin, dislikes change. One is over-sensitive. Again, I think we
all know this, we're all individuals, again, but over-sensitive I think that I realize
the reason I perceive things how I do sometimes is because of my personality. I
try to not be so over-sensitive to what people say. Good criticism is not a bad
thing.

Another section of the DISC individual results addressed personal communication
preferences. One attribute amused IP12, who reported:

When communicating with me, be brief and direct to the point. Ask what and why
questions. Focus on business. Remember, I desire results. Suggest ways for me to
achieve results. Highlight logical benefits and recognize high quality work. That's
my do's. My do not's, this is why I giggle at this. Don't ramble, repeat yourself.
Focus on only the problems. Be able to socialize, be too sociable and
conversational. Make generalizations or statements without support. That's my
don'ts.

IP12 aligned with Marston (1928) and Rohm’s (1996) characteristics of how a D
individual communicates: in a direct manner, prefers bulleted main points, leads with
natural authority, and gets results. When discussing communication in different ways
with others, IP5 used DISC profile results and stated:

Well, as far as the way to communicate, especially if I run across somebody who
is very similar to me, I can also understand how to communicate better with them
and not be pushy and things like that, because in law enforcement we can be very
pushy or aggressive when asking questions and things like that, so sometimes it's
better for us to take a step back and use a different technique because all these
techniques don't work on everybody else and things like that. As far as the way
people talk to me, I can kind of, the questions or answers that I give them can also create a communication of better environment and things like that. I think that'll be awesome.

This aligned with Marston (1928) who proposed as people express emotions through behaviors, self-perception influences a relationship within the environment.

Team communication. Throughout the open-ended semi-structured interview, focus group data, and DISC results focus group participants revealed an understanding and application of DISC trait influence in team communication. Sharif and Scandura (2014) reported that when trusted and ethical leaders consistently involve team members and communicate, greater employee engagement occurs because members feel like an integral part of the organization, exemplified by IP10’s comment: “We're learning instead of butting heads or being so isolated”. When discussing communication, IP11’s response connected to the literature as Pearl (2015) noted that due to increased generational diversity in the workplace, style flexing allows people to adjust their personality style to interact appropriately with other generations for optimal communication. While each generation has unique characteristics, Pearl described Millennials as valuing personal relationships, disapproving bureaucracy, questioning rules, and preferring to work in a team. IP11 noted:

I will use this in helping me get the Chief’s vision out there…each person has their own way of perceiving the information. It's my job to get it to them in a positive way so they understand it. And then they take that vision to the lower ones. And helping everybody just understand how to communicate if there has been a big disconnect…with the generational gap between some of these officers
and sergeants in their 30's and 40's and get the 20-something year old, you need to understand how that kid ticks.

Pearl (2015) confirmed that due to diverse generations of Boomers, Millennials, and Gen Xers in an organization, using DISC strategies assists with effective communication, appreciation of differences, and working together. Several participants agreed that communication styles were important for effective team communication, such as IP11’s comment: “Just because I know I communicate more one way may not be perceived by someone else properly. So, I have to learn to adjust who I'm talking to if that's how they communicate”. In agreement with IP11, IP10 added:

I think people hear what you have to say, but it doesn't register with them. Maybe it's because they're not interested in what you have to say, or it doesn't affect them the way that it affects you. And, giving feedback is where you really have to receive what they're saying to give them true feedback.

Similarly, IP8 stated: “Because everybody is different. Some people they have one way of talking, and they talk that way to everybody, but you can't do that. To be effective you can't do that”.

As organizations evolve into global markets, the need for teams and leaders who communicate and adapt to new structures becomes imperative for strategic plan success (D’Urso et al., 2015). In the open-ended semi-structured interview question 12 regarding communication problems (Appendix E), participants shared several responses. IP2 stated:

Not saying what's on their mind, just kind of beating around the bush. If something's on her mind, if there's an issue there, an underlying issue, just come out with it so we can work on the issue, not just beat around it and let it go for a
while. Might as well spearhead it now and get it resolved and not sit there and let it go.

Not only feedback and communication with team peers and leaders was important, also with the community concerned IP6:

Probably feedback, because when we interact with the community, they will interact with you and tell you how they feel and stuff then and there, but not to let everyone else know within the department or to see how we perform that day when we interact with them. I think the feedback is the problem that we lack with the community and ourselves.

Feedback was also a communication concern for IP10 and added listening, as well. “I think people hear what you have to say, but it doesn't register with them. Maybe it's because they're not interested in what you have to say. Or it doesn't affect them the way that it affects you”. Browne et al. (2016) and Pandey and Karve (2017) found that group communication is essential to team members in understanding issues and perceptions, especially in an organization with varied demographics. Listening was also a communication concern for IP2, who said:

I think, probably, not listening or not getting the feel that someone's heard you. In feedback from other folks, I'm probably considered one of those guys that don't listen well. I always try to make someone feel like I've heard them, but that's something I've constantly tried to work on. I am listening, but I'm doing other things.

Voges and Braund (1995) believed when team members use DISC traits to improve interpersonal relationships and communication, processes become clearer on successfully
handling change and coming to resolution. Communicating clearly and successfully concerned IP5, specifically verbally and nonverbally:

Probably verbal. I think a lot of people put up with the nonverbal stuff, but verbal is definitely a big issue when you're communicating with somebody. I think a lot of people pay more attention to what you're saying than what you're doing.

Evidence from the data analysis included indication that law enforcement team members believe that DISC personality traits influenced personal and team communication. When the researcher asked about communication before and after taking the DISC Personality System profile, a few participants said knowledge about self and teammates stayed the same (IP1, IP4, IP8, IP12), while most (IP2, IP3, IP5, IP7, IP9, IP10, IP11, IP13) reported improvement (Appendix E, Q4 and 11). Participants attributed use of DISC trait knowledge to greater understanding of self and fellow team members. This theme was consistent with the literature findings that by considering the primary, secondary, and absent personality traits, team member preferences emerged in situations, environments, communication interactions, conflict resolution, and organizational habits (Price, 2015).

**Theme 2 for RQ1: practical uses.** The second theme included a focus on practical uses and application of the DISC personality traits (Table 17). This theme addressed RQ1, *How do DISC personality traits influence routine team communication*. The analysis of data from the DISC team and individual results, 13 individual open-ended semi-structured interviews, and a focus group of 6 produced codes that reinforced this theme’s development. Participant quotes included in-depth information on two concepts within theme two, demonstrating how DISC personality traits influenced routine
communication. These themes included personal and team DISC trait use, and leadership behaviors and expectations. Table 18 includes a description of these concepts.
Table 17.

Data from Open-ended Semi-structured Interviews and Focus Group Interviews Results Supporting Theme 2: Practical Uses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data Source</th>
<th>Corresponding Evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Individual Interviews</td>
<td>“Overall, it helped put some things in perspective for me. It helped me understand some sort of why I do what I do, why I tend to lean towards the left or the right. It helps me to reaffirm some of the things I already knew. This helped me understand my leadership style a little bit better too”. (IP11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“I think it pretty much hit it on the nail. The major one being the S, just due to the fact that I’m not much of a dominant kind of a person. I’m more of a follower than leader. I can lead in some things, but I’d rather take commands from somebody else”. (IP1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus Group</td>
<td>“I’m the newbie here. I’m used to doing things one way, and now, coming here, there’s a few things that’s done different. I’m having to recognize that this is done this way versus the way I’ve done it. It’s a learning curve right there, for me, and also being able to accept it, but also have a team backing. That'll be like, hey, this is the way you do it, and we'll get you through it. Also, like the answer I hear might be slow for me to catch on at first, because I'm so used to doing it a certain way. But once I get it, then I can run with it”. (FGP2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DISC Individual and Team Results</td>
<td>Included areas of member assignment, meeting emerging demands, advice to leadership, team dynamics, DISC styles in the group, and analysis and tips for each trait subgroup.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 18.

Three Concepts Within Practical Uses, Theme 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal Life Use of DISC Traits</td>
<td>This applies to how participants applied the DISC personality traits to his/her personal life. This included DISC use or reference with family, friends, or outside of the agency.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team Life Use of DISC Traits</td>
<td>This pertains to how participants applied the DISC personality traits to the law enforcement team. This included how team effectiveness improved, use in the field, and with the community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership Behaviors and Expectations</td>
<td>This applies to how participants applied DISC personality traits to leaders in the agency and described behaviors exhibited, as well as expectations for application/use of DISC knowledge moving forward.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Evidence from the data analysis included indication that law enforcement team members perceived that DISC personality traits influenced practical use in personal and team communication and adapting to change, as well as in leadership behaviors and expectations. Participants attributed use of DISC trait knowledge to greater understanding
of self and fellow team members (Marston, 1928). This theme is consistent with the literature findings when members had knowledge of their counterparts’ DISC personality traits, efficient and viable solutions emerged while working together as a team (Ferguson & Hull, 2017; James, 2012). Through identification and application of DISC traits, relationships were built and strengthened with fellow teammates, the community, family, and friends. Through these relationships, law enforcement team members gained insight into self, leaders, constituents, and others to communicate and adapt to change more effectively.

**Personal and team DISC trait use.** Throughout the open-ended semi-structured interview, focus group interview, and DISC results discussion participants revealed an understanding and application of DISC trait influence in personal and team life. As the researcher probed using the open-ended semi-structured interview questions (Appendix E), Focus Group Interview Guide (Appendix M), and individual and team results (Appendices M and S), participants shared both personal and team applications of DISC traits. FGP2 noted:

> I guess having to accept other points of view on certain things. Everybody's got something different to bring to the table. If everybody brought the same thing, then you only might have one thing, but you don't. Person A brings this, Person B brings this, and C brings this, you can find some sort of common ground to meet the goal that you have set in place. To get the job done, whatever it may be. It might be just going out there and watering that bush, but everybody's going to have a different way of doing it.
Participant IP2 applied DISC traits, specifically strong C tendencies of a team member who tends to place a high value on logic, order, perfection, caution, accuracy, task-orientation, and quality (Kim & Yang, 2016; Sanglim & Sungeun, 2016; Sutalaksana et al., 2016; Voges & Braund, 1995) and shared an example:

My strengths would be planning systems and orchestration. Throughout my supervisory career, looking back, now knowing that these are my strengths, I've always taken that role. When things come out, "Hey, I'll take care of this. I'll do that. I'll make sure that this is done". I've always been able to be relied upon as somebody who gets things accomplished, so understanding that that is one of my strengths, that's kind of the role I take when we do have our supervisory or administrative meetings and things come up. That's kind of what I do.

Numerous participants shared personal perceptions regarding new DISC trait insight. IP13 stated: “You have to have people from every group to make it successful. If we were all alike, we'd be pretty dull. I think that using that and recognizing what personality they are”. Kexin et al. (2013) surmised that team identification emerges from social identity and the concept of emotion and value each team member feels directly effects their membership in the team. Similarly, IP9 discussed how the shift team used the DISC traits and assisted each other in different areas:

As far as my squad, my group. Yeah, I think that the funny thing is we both throw up our I's, our S's, and our C's at each other. I'll go, yep. I said don't give me no grief. You handle that. That's all you IP9, and you know, it's great that it sort of helped us understand each other a little bit more. This is great. It helps us to understand to self-reflect when we're doing something, because this has helped
bring the things that we need to work on into light, so we can sort of start adapting it into our entrepreneurial world. Try to put a little bit more strength in our weaknesses, but also using the other team members as great resources for the things that we're weak in. I think that's what's happened a lot. When I found myself doing it, and I find them doing it with me. That has been something that's been really good.

Depending on how many traits appear above the midline, a person may have style combinations or blends, that play a strong role in how a person reacts and interprets situations and other people (Rosenberg & Silvert, 2013). Referencing CS traits of preferring to work alone and conduct analytical research before making decisions, IP4 stated:

I prefer working alone in controlling my own path and my own destiny, but I can work with others and I do a lot of research for decisions, ask for advice and can sometimes go a year before I maybe implement. If I want to purchase something, I might go a year just looking for the bargain and exactly what I want.

Discussing a personal transition phase, IP12 shared D and C traits: “Administration, leadership, and determination. The challenges are I'm impatient, insensitive, and a poor listener… I agree more with the D side than I do… the C's… I'm showing a… fluctuation. I am going through a little bit of a change”. When discussing personal I traits, IP13 said: “I'm a lot more patient in some situations, but I'm not a very patient person”. During conscientious (C) trait discourse, IP2 revealed:

I've always had this about me. I never understood really what it was. But there's a lot of areas in police work that I've been that go-to guy, but at the same token, it
frustrates some people because I'm a paperwork Nazi, where your shoes better be polished, your uniform better be clean.

This aligned with Dulieu et al. (2013), who defined compliance behaviors as the organization and approach of procedures, activity, and organization. A new communication vocabulary (Prochaska et al., 2015) was used by IP7, answering IQ13 (Appendix E) and referencing the DISC personal results in Appendix M (p. 6, 9, 10):

Well, I think two things. I think you learn again, if you learn the one person that has all D and one person in the department has all C, which is interesting to me, then I think you learn to handle, if you think about it, handle a situation's approach ... The same situation is going to result the same, but I think the approach could be different and get the same result. They're both going to perceive, myself included, that person's going to, just like in communication they like to be communicated with one way. Those are bipolar as far as communication, so you try to handle those things differently if you know that.

This helps everybody understand, "Hey that's why that person's like that".

As the leaders and team members become familiar with the DISC personality traits, successful communication results due to understanding how others prefer to interact and approaching teammates in the preferred manner (Chan & Burgess, 2015; Sugerman et al., 2011).

Personality is a vital determinant of life consequences (Angood, 2017; Murphy et al., 2013), and is an instrumental variable and consistent dynamic in people (Jung, 1938; Marston, 1928). IP2 shared an observation using DISC personality terminology and insight into other team member dynamics: “You gave us the ability to look at something
and say, hey, if this person is an S, maybe I need to try to start doing this to communicate better with him”. Similarly, IP10 shared personal application in characteristics of S traits in bringing steadiness, multi-tasking, and a hard worker to the team. Discussing D traits, IP11 exemplified dominance behaviors, as defined by Dulieu et al. (2013) as how a person handles problems, demonstrates assertiveness, and level of control in situations:

I think it will help not just me but other people I work with that they know where I'm coming from, why I'm trying to set high standards, you know when he wants it done, he wants it done right the first time. It has helped me be able to get my ideas across to people and help share the vision of the Chief on down.

When conducting the open-ended semi-structured interviews, participants referenced the DISC team results (Appendix S, p. 13) to discuss use of team DISC personality traits, personal perceptions, and application. Participant IP2 said: “I appreciate that he brought you in and had this done. I think it's tremendously helped us out, and I think it's going to help in the future”. When discussing the two-hour DISC debrief and discovering the team personalities (Appendix S, p. 13) IP1 declared:

I thought it was a good learning environment, just seeing how other people are…some people actually shocked me on the list. I didn't think they would get that… it's good. Now we can come together as a department to see how each other works… and I guess make the department better than it already is.

As people express emotions through behaviors, Marston (1928) theorized that self-perception influences a relationship within the environment and the organization. Similarly, IP2 shared examples from observations during the DISC debrief activities and sharing of group results:
Well, I learned a long time ago that my way doesn't relate to everyone that works for me, so I try to meet those people on their level. I think the biggest thing for me was being able to physically see where they played out and to kind of make a plan on going forward, how I'm going to communicate with them. Because apparently, some people get kind of lost in it. You're trying your best to relate to them, but you just don't know how. And so, at least with those people, I can see what they are, and it gives me a starting point to develop a communication style with them that I hadn't had before. They're really good workers, but they have some definite conflicts in there, and it relates to their communication, their personalities, those types of things. So, really, I'm going to use what you've given me to start a better communication style with them, but, also, really expect them to start different communication styles with each other, as well, because that's what's going to make it work.

A leader must develop skills to overcome challenges in communication, thus welcoming a free exchange of communication to ensure a productive work environment and a successful project (Browne et al., 2016).

During the focus group interview and open-ended semi-structured interviews, numerous participants gave examples of DISC trait use in both personal and team areas. The application of DISC strategies by FGP6 aligned with Lykourentzou et al.’s (2016) findings that by using DISC personality strategies, members showed less conflict. FGP6 told about how personality type information assisted with co-workers and conflict resolution during communication:
For me, it opened up a line of communication to talk about some discord that's amongst us. That, it's the elephant in the room. You know that you all don't get along about certain things, and it's really about approach. I work with somebody who wants to know the name of my dog, the name of my kids, what we did this weekend, and I'm the kind of person who I don't care to give that information. But, I never thought of that prior to this, and then once I read it I was like, you've got to kind of compromise a little, and embrace that there's going to be some chit-chat and some work. It doesn't always have to be work. It just opened up communication, and to be able to look at that, the problem for what it was, because you kind of make it into a lot of things it's not.

After seeing individual and team DISC results, IP1 committed to trying to accommodate other styles and “meeting in the middle. I know some of the S’s and C’s don't get along with the D’s too much, but I guess there's always a middle that you can meet in”.

Similarly, IP9 discussed insights into personal style and interacting with others:

I think that I feel that I'm a very perceptive person, and I'm pretty good at reading people like if they're irritated, or if they're short. I can see that, and I'll just kind of like, I just bend, and flex. I do that in my personal life, I do that in my professional life. It's all one in the same. I just feel like I can read people pretty well, and know when I have to push, and when not to.

Self-reporting individual C and D traits, FGP3 revealed that oft times people may perceive his behavior as brash or harsh. This aligns with Keogh (2017) and Rohm’s (1996) description of a D individual who communicates in a direct manner, prefers bulleted main points, leads with natural authority, and gets results. While the S individual
is friendly and supportive, communicating through active listening, clearly defined goals, and working in a group setting (James, 2012). FGP2 discussed personal S and I traits:

Even though S was higher for me, a lot of mine fall under I for Influence, especially, personal life. I'm usually a pretty good influence on people, and they seek my advice. I do…have a short attention span and do forget stuff… I do come up with spontaneous ideas to do, and random road trips, and that kind of works for me. I am accepting to new challenges.

Lykourentzou et al. (2016) reported that by using DISC personality-matching strategies to balance a team, members showed greater satisfaction and less conflict. This aligned with IP2’s comment, evidencing an example of personal and team communication use of DISC traits:

With understanding and given the information that you had, there were a couple things that came up over the last couple weeks, not any major conflicts or anything, but some job descriptions or job duties that I added to some roles that ...

Well, one person I just gave them the job description changes and that worked fine. The other person, I had to sit down with, only because I knew, now, their communication style. So, both of them were extremely receptive of it. Both of them have gotten it. Both of them have taken it and ran with it. But just in knowing what I know, I knew that this one I could just give to. And then this one, I'm going to have to sit down with and go over it with them. But if I hadn't had this information, I wouldn't have known to do that.
This evidenced awareness of first self, then others as IP2 applied Marston’s (1928) Personality Trait Theory. Another open-ended semi-structured interview participant (IP13) observed that team members referenced personality styles during a meeting:

They actually throw that around and they refer back to the material when they're doing this so that's a good thing. It means they paid attention and they're listening. They were really quick to tell me my personalities, which they all knew. We were in discussion the other day and somebody brought that up, about my personality… We were saying it and they said, "But that didn't surprise me because we know that's your personality.

During the open-ended semi-structured interviews and focus group interview, participants reported that there was application of DISC trait knowledge outside of the agency setting, aligning with Price (2015) who believed that human emotions create differences in behavior among people in a group, even a community. Examples from participants included DISC trait influence in personal life, in the field, and with the community. IP10 stated: “I think it's a good thing, because I find myself not only talking about it here at work, but I share it with my friends because I think it's something they can use and learn from themselves and take to their work”. FGP3 told how people in the community and other agencies ask how things are going and about changes in the department: “Going good. It's different, and it's a learning curve, but it's one of those things that you keep working out. Nobody wanted it to happen at the time, but it did. It seems to be working itself out”. IP2 shared a new clarity into personal C personality traits, defined by Lykourentzou et al. (2016), and Voges and Braund (1995) as one who is a perfectionist, sets high standards for self and others, and communicates in a precise
fashion while preferring to work alone. IP2 gave an example of a conversation with a spouse:

When I took this home, we were talking about some of the things. And she told me, because we always have arguments when we do a project together, and she said that the reason that the arguments are is because I'm doing something, and she'll ask me a question or whatever, and she feels like I'm ignoring her. I'm hearing what she's saying, but I'm focused on what I am doing ... And she says, "Are you not listening to me? Will you answer me? I asked you three times". And I've heard it, but I'm just doing what I'm doing.

Just as IP2 shared about discussion with a spouse, FGP3 also shared the personal DISC results at home with similar results:

I said, even to my wife, I said read this, and she said, "Oh my God, this is scary". It was definitely interesting to see on paper how we act, and just from those questions. We had four to choose from for each question. Four answers, and I was looking for something in between.... You had to pick, and just doing that, to get the results that we did, it was eye opening.

Identification of personal SCI traits increased awareness, community, and team interactions, according to IP10 by stating: “I talk to anybody. I feel like when I get into a crowd, when we have functions in police, I get reserved and I stand back, and I observe more so than engage. So, I think that is a challenge for me that I need to overcome”.

According to Sugerman et al.(2011) and Ferguson and Hull (2017), the I and S personality types are people-oriented, trust in the environment, and believe it is aligned with their personal interests. Working with a team energizes the people-oriented I and S
styles as teammates share feelings, stories, ideas, and personal information (Rohm, 1996), evidenced by IP10 and IP1’s comments. IP1 discussed a people orientation with the citizens in the city: “Just relating to the community, you got to know how they feel. I personally try to get on a one-on-one basis with the community to see what I can do better as a whole and what we're doing good as a whole”. Several participants agreed that the police department reputation was important, as evidenced by IP10’s comment: “I'm people-oriented and I like to communicate with people and not just on a business level. I like for them to feel comfort and to say the police department is a good place”. Similarly, IP1 shared a recent interaction with the community where use of DISC trait knowledge occurred:

We actually, just yesterday responded to a domestic call. The guy had a knife, and I came in thinking it was going to be one thing, and it totally turned out to be an opposite, so like totally something different. I went over there, talked to the gentleman, had the other officers on scene talk to his wife because it was a domestic situation.

When discussing the DISC team results during the open-ended semi-structured interviews (Appendix E, Q10), the participants agreed that the highest score was in processing and detailing, lower scores in collaborating persisting, directing, and creating, and the lowest team score was influencing (Appendix S, p. 24). This aligned with the evidence that the majority of the department scored in the task-oriented category. The task-oriented style D and C individuals enjoy planning and preparation, as well as thoroughly detailing a project and seeing it through to completion, perceiving the environment as antagonistic and resistant to their personal needs (Sugerman et al., 2011).
During discussion, IP1 shared: “I mean just going back to the relating topic, just relating to the community, you got to know how they feel”. Similarly, IP8 remarked on the team result category of detailing: “It shows the majority of the department is in it for the details, so when communicating with them just make sure that you are presenting details to everyone and stuff like that”. When IP5 answered, notation of team results and application to personal behavior occurred:

Apparently, we had an issue with influencing, so I can help influence other people by helping them with their work and things like that and lead by example, because I'm actually wanting to go to a supervisor position, so I've got to look at this as a whole and understand what works for everybody on the shift. I think this is awesome that we're able to actually, like put this down and actually look at and decipher how everybody processes stuff as a group even.

Similarly, IP13 shared solutions for the team score in creating:

If you're going to do something, you take the material and you use it. I think it's going to really help us to become a more creative police department. I really do, because when you take a lot of different personalities and you put them all together, you get some fun stuff out of them.

Scoring comparably to IP12, IP9 scored high in one of the team’s lowest area of influencing. These participant comments evidenced Lykourentzou et al.’s (2016) findings that balanced teams using the DISC personality traits experience higher performance and better communication. After identifying the team’s highest score in detailing, an awareness was shared:
A takeaway is that I am so thankful that I've got a lot of detail-oriented people to pick up where I slack, you know? I am glad that these people are that way, because I'm just not, and it makes it easy for me, because I know that a lot of people that I do work with, if I do have questions about something, they'll be able to line item in for me, because that's what they're good at. That's what they do. I understand that's my weakness. I get it. It is no hidden secret that I don’t like the details.

Leadership behaviors and expectations. Throughout the open-ended semi-structured interview, focus group data, and DISC results discussion participants revealed an understanding and application of DISC trait influence in leadership behaviors and expectations in communication and change. Participant responses and expectations reflected literature findings of Creasy and Anantatmul (2013), who noted that because team members play an imperative role in change implementation, leaders must coordinate and integrate human resources for ultimate effectiveness. During the open-ended semi-structured interview, IP9 discussed how personality styles and traits should be taken into consideration when placing staff and during work shifts:

You got some people that are not teachers, and instructors, and they have no business. You got to be a people person. You got to be able to listen. You got to have some patience. A lot of people shouldn't be in that S spot. Community facing. That takes a certain kind of personality to do that. It takes a certain kind of personality to do a lot of stuff, but you're going to have certain people that are much stronger in those areas that maybe the agency should look at in facilitating those people, or that's just kind of how I look at it.
It is important for leadership and teams to manage change as a lack of constituent consensus hinders successful achievement of change initiatives (Chowthi-Williams, 2018). In the same vein, IP2 stated:

> When we were looking at these positions or assignments, looking at what their strengths are and see how they inherently will adapt to that role. Some may be good. Some may be bad. For me, personally, I wouldn't want to put somebody in a role that's going to be contrary to their personality trait or their communication style because you're not going to get good results from that.

Curphy and Hogan (2012) identified five questions for leaders to answer regarding people on teams: “Are the right number of people, with the right skills, in the right roles, at the right time, and for the right reasons?” (p. 58). These five questions aligned with evidenced comments of IP9, IP2, and IP13 who observed:

> Where are you at as far as where you want to be and how you want to succeed? If you're wanting to be a supervisor, you know you need to identify where your strengths and weakness are and how are you going to improve that. What training do you need, what mentorship do you need to get you there? You constantly refer back to it (DISC results). If not, then we have wasted a lot of your time and our time.

When participants and leaders focused on specific communication strategies, the trust level rose across all team members (Benetyte & Jatuliaviciene, 2013). Another perception included discussing communication strategies and expectations with a shift team, as IP10 shared protocol and personal accountability:
My small team, we talk it out. And we know that what one person likes, another person may not like and that's okay. But we can give an opinion and we can learn from that opinion, because it may be something that we don't recognize. You know, maybe we do something and it's a challenge to us and we sit back, we reflect about it and it's like, it's a good challenge. I'm going to step up my game. So, there's good communication.

When discussing leadership behaviors and expectations, IP1 melded DISC team results regarding relating, community, and leadership. Effective leaders insure team members are certain about their individual roles and possess the autonomy to fulfill team tasks (DuBois et al., 2015). This comment was one of many demonstrating the interconnectedness of DISC trait personal use, communication, leadership and community, along with leader expectation:

Just for the directing. Like to be a good leader you've got to actually be confident and lead people in the right direction, so that actually helped me with that. I guess relating as well. When you're talking to like the community on just say different scenes and stuff, you got to actually relate to their problem. You can't go in there and like totally opposite because you're not going to be able to understand them much. I think it's a good thing and it's helped me out like relating as well, just talking to the community and all that.

During the open-ended semi-structured interviews and focus group interview, the researcher probed participants through questions discussing team member assignment and placement (Appendix E, Q23). Respondents recommended that agency leadership
use DISC personality results for member assignments to match strengths and personality type. Participant IP7 contributed:

Well, I think everybody has those things that they're good at. And if we bring those together with everybody and we have very diverse personality traits, and if I was scheduling people I probably would look at that and try to balance each shift with people that are off set each other. But I think hopefully we bring different strengths to the table to match those up in place.

Participant IP7 further stated:

I think what you're going to do is you put people on places that play to their strengths. So, this probably helps if you're looking at that, what people are better suited for whatever position. Whatever that may mean, whether it be detectives or interacting with people or being foot patrol around town. It just depends. You just kind of work your way through that.

When asked about using DISC trait results with member assignments, IP13 answered:

You can place them on even different tasks, too. If there's an assignment or we need to look at this and say, "Okay, this person's personality, they would stay over here and they would help us, but they would also drive the other people's side.

When I have someone that wants to be on a team that's all about change and you're not a change agent, well then you're going to struggle there, so maybe you need to really think about that. I think it helps us to put people in the right place. I think this is a great tool to help us, not that you solely go by that, but it's a tool.

You use it.
Barrick et al. (1998) proposed that creating a team entails selecting the right people with the motivation, knowledge, and abilities necessary to work in a team effectively, as well as navigate regularly measured technical skills. Comments from IP13 and IP10 aligned with this research as IP10 shared:

I think after being through so much, through the different chiefs and personnel that we've had, I see him moving in the right direction. I see caring from him. I still don't see the whole big picture, because I'm not involved in their meetings, you know, I still do my job. But I feel like he does want to make us the best department that we can be. And I feel like he challenges us. I feel like that he has brought education where we have not had that before. I think that people really need to be heard and thanked for what they do and put in a position that makes them shine.

Participant IP7 also said that putting people in places that “play to their strengths” is important as leaders look at “what people are better suited for whatever position…whether it be detectives or interacting with people or being foot patrol around town”. By using personality, IP13 recognized that team members may complete different tasks and assignments that would help the department.

Through open-ended semi-structured interview question 26 (Appendix E) and focus group question 12 (Appendix F), participants were asked to share insights or give advice to the Chief and agency leadership regarding how DISC personality traits influenced members and the team. Sharif and Scandura (2014) purported that through clear communication of organizational procedures, team members learn how to conduct business ethically aligning with FGP4’s desire for communication:
I would sit down and tell him, to do what you're asking of everybody, so that not only is he understanding his DISC, and what it means about his layer of communication, but that he also takes that and he understands how he needs to communicate with his employees. It could be FGP3, he wants direction. He doesn’t want to play no games, he wants to do business. Tell me what I need to do, I want to get it done. Whereas somebody that wants to know, so how are you today? How's your dog doing, and that type of thing.

Discussing past and present leadership, change, and communication, FGP6 commented:

I think they talk from the top down. I think before, the top talked and we did. Now, it trails down. It's a little bit better communication. I think the chief, he gets his vision, a little bit more to the lieutenants, getting things in place. We're not really there yet to move forward. We're kind of at that settling from what has happened. We definitely had change, but it's kind of getting those things in place, and you can see that a little better now, whereas before, it was kind of muddy. You knew something was going to happen but there was no communication on how or when. That's improved a lot. Still, nowhere near where it needs to be, but again you've got to accept some time to settle in, to bear change as well.

Elaborating on communicating change with leadership, IP2’s response aligned with Puccio and Grivas (2009) findings that as leaders understand team member DISC traits, planning for active or passive reaction assists with acceptance or rejection of change:

I think meeting with the sergeants and giving the sergeants the full infinite reasons why this stuff is happening. And then that way, in their shift briefings, because the majority of our people are going to be sitting in those shift briefings,
you can have those real, transparent discussions, and then they all get it that way. It's a lot easier than just thinking that they're going to get it all from an email because it's not going to work. Just planning new ways to communicate that change to them.

When discussing current communication and the Chief, FGP3 shared:

Now with chief, it's more involvement with everyone it seems like in the decisions. He's keeping everyone up to speed, so-to-speak, on where we're going and what we're doing, and what his reasons are. Everybody's involved, so you get everybody involved, then you've got a decent body. You're invested in it.

Lastly, FGP4 verbalized expectations and an opportunity to use the DISC trait results for forward movement:

But just making sure that he uses this tool to attend to his department, and to the benefit of the employees here. They go through leadership training. He has a time here where he can use this and his other skills to really move this department forward. That's what I would tell him.

The consensus among the focus group and open-ended semi-structured interview participants was that team members used the DISC personality traits in personal and practical ways with team members, outside the agency with family, friends, and the community, as well as with leadership. By understanding team member DISC traits, leaders planned for how people react, either actively or passively to the environment, including if there was a propensity to accept or reject change (Puccio & Grivas, 2009). Team members requested that agency leaders use the DISC traits and team results (Appendix S) to not only better understand direct reports, but to assign personnel into
positions matching individual personality styles. This aligns with James (2012), who reported that when members have knowledge of their counterparts’ DISC personality traits, efficient and viable solutions emerge while working together as a team.

**Research question 2.** To answer RQ2, *How do DISC personality traits influence adapting to change*, the researcher used three sources of data (DISC individual and team results, a focus group interview, and open-ended semi-structured interviews). Through RQ2, the researcher investigated how law enforcement participants used DISC personality traits in change awareness and adaptation through activities, examples, perceptions, and strategies. Open-ended semi-structured interview questions (Appendix E) 5, 16-22 and focus group questions (Appendix F) 4, 5, 7, 9, and DISC individual and team result sections ideal work environment, response to change, and team dynamics were instrumental in probing participants and answering the research question. Data from the IML DISC Insights Personality System Profile coded individual results (Davenport, 2018) and team results, focus group interview, and semi-structured interviews contributed to the development of the theme of change implications (see Table 19). From these three data sources, one theme emerged, *change implications* and related to RQ2. All data coded from these three sources authenticated the formation of the theme (see Tables 19-20).

**Table 19.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data from Open-ended Semi-structured Interviews, Focus Group Interviews, and DISC Results Supporting Theme 3: Change Implications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Data Source</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Focus Group
“...still some people that are here now because I've talked to them, that still don't accept change. There's some people in leadership that still do not accept change, and don't understand change, and don't understand how to accept a vision, and follow a vision. Especially, when that's leading to change. I still think there's some embracing of change, at the level in this room. There's probably more embracing of change in here, than some people that aren't in this room”. (FGP4)

DISC Individual and Team Results
Included areas of personality style to accept change, planning and implementing change (p. 4), ideal work environment, personal and team change, team dynamics, group DISC styles and change, and team work assignments for changing demands.

With the change that we've just undergone, prior to, I was not looked at as someone who was used for anything. I was just a guy out there doing what I do, so I was very frustrated. So now, with the new changes that we've put in place, I'm able to meet these things and get satisfaction out of what I do. But now I get it”. (IP2 applying DISC results during the interview)

**Theme 3 for RQ 2: change implications.** The third theme included a focus on change implications, specifically how DISC personality traits influenced change adaptation and awareness. The analysis of data from the DISC team and individual results, 13 individual open-ended semi-structured interviews, and a focus group of 6 reinforced this theme’s development. Participant quotes included in-depth information within theme three, demonstrating how DISC personality traits influenced change adaptation and awareness in a team. Study results coincided with literature findings of Saruhan’s (2014), denoting that stakeholders sometimes look at change negatively even though beneficial end-results occur for the individual team member. Table 20 includes a description of these concepts. Law enforcement participants supported this theme as well as Sharif and Scandura’s (2014) findings that leaders play a crucial role by providing team members with support and clear guidance through critical concerns and stages. In alignment with this research, FGP3 described the current Chief’s communication through a change initiative:

Now with Chief, it's more involvement with everyone it seems like in the decisions. He's keeping everyone up to speed, so-to-speak, on where we're going
and what we're doing, and what his reasons are. Everybody's involved, so you get everybody involved, then you've got a decent body. You're invested in it.

Table 20.

*Concept Within Change Implications, Theme 3*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Awareness and Adapting to</td>
<td>This pertains to how participants used DISC personality trait knowledge to become aware of and adapt to change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Change adaptation and awareness. Evidence from the data analysis process indicated that law enforcement team members used DISC personality traits when discussing change in the department. When the researcher asked about change before and after taking the DISC Personality System profile, all participants (IP1-IP13) reported improvement regarding knowledge about self and teammates (Appendix E, IQ16-17).

During planning and implementation of change, most participants in both the open-ended semi-structured interviews and focus group interview agreed that notice prior to the change and communication about the change was desired. This aligned with the literature and data results as Larson and Buss (2006) found that personality impacts daily adaptation and interaction with the environment, as different styles are change-oriented or stability-oriented. Expressing appreciation for continuous communication from leadership during the change initiative, FGP6 expressed:

> Just continuing including us in communication, letting us know what the vision is. Keep us on track, it helps, or knowing the vision helps keep us on track. If the vision changes, or if they're changes ahead, if you are able to give us that information in a decent amount of time so that the people who need time to absorb that change have it. Because we do, and that's one of the main things
before, is we were being led in the dark. Most of our personality traits, that wasn't okay.

When discussing how use of DISC trait knowledge to adapt to or plan for change in IQ21, IP3 remarked: “I'm going to try to not have that fear of change because I have the confidence that any change we make now is for the good not just somebody wanted it done because they wanted it done”. As IP3 scored highest as a S personality type, according to Rosenberg and Silvert (2013) the S personality strives for harmony, calm, and routine in situations. Involving the S in plans for change assists with understanding and acceptance due to the preference for predictable outcomes and reliable patterns. FGP4 evidenced alignment with Sharif and Scandura’s (2014) belief that leaders play a crucial role by providing team members with support and clear guidance through critical concerns and stages. FGP4 described awareness of change:

There's still some people that are here now because I've talked to them, that still don't accept change. There's some people in leadership that still do not accept change, and don't understand change, and don't understand how to accept a vision, and follow a vision. Especially, when that's leading to change. I still think there's some embracing of change, at the level in this room. There's probably more embracing of change in here, than some people that aren't in this room.

Along the same line, IP2 stated that people react differently to changes in procedures and communication about that change should now occur according to individual personality styles:
There'll be certain people that we need to go and just kind of spark up a conversation, then relay that change. Even though they get an email, you kind of reinforce that with them. Some people, email's good enough. They're cool with it.

The comment of IP2 reflects evidence that understanding personality traits sheds light on personal habits, thought processes and behaviors, enabling maximum effectiveness in a team (Angood, 2017; Freeman, 2009). Also evidencing Freeman’s (2009) findings in a discussion regarding the recent changes in the department, IP11 suggested assessing the department a year after taking the DISC profile:

Lot of new officers, let them get settled into the role, like we were talking about earlier, and see if this does vary after we have all the pieces together here at the department. Everyone's in the position where they need to be. And what we have we're just rolling on. And just see how the result would be in a year's time, and compare it to what happened now, and see if there is any fluctuation. New job, new Chief, lot of new, new, new, new.

Another comment by IP7 showed enthusiasm regarding the team’s motivation and morale regarding current change awareness and adaptation, aligning with Saruhan (2014), purporting that employees base perceptions on communication methods, trust in the organizational leaders, employee engagement, and effective communication:

I'm not in tune with that as much, but I think the Chief is doing an excellent, excellent job of bringing positive change and positive influences to everybody here. The morale is exceptionally high. Where before it was not as high. It's just a little bit of time I've been here, I could tell everybody seemed very positive. And I
think that's a huge deal. You want everybody to be motivated and excited about what they're doing.

Similarly, IP5 showed new DISC trait awareness through change by sharing new communication with leadership before and during proposed change:

Well, with the understanding what I like and need, that allows me to ask the questions that I need to ask from administration. If they do make a change, of why they're making that change as opposed to before I probably would have just let it ride and just been frustrated, but now I'll ask why so that I can get an answer and understand why, and that'll help me deal with change a whole lot better than just sitting there going, "I don't understand why they're doing this". But it's also we're dealing with a different administration, too. When you ask why, you're going to get an answer and not just, "Because I said so". It's a different atmosphere as well, so I completely think that they'll answer our question.

When responding to planning for and implementing change, IP13 shared that use of a story of prior implementation proved successful in past experiences. By relating to fellow team members, IP13 gave assurance that certain change procedures worked before and can work again, using examples and personal credibility. This evidenced alignment with Prochaska et al. (2015) proposing that people must design their environment to understand self and others while communicating clearly throughout change processes.

When sharing personal DISC individual results findings on adapting to change, IP10 shared:

You tend to forget that a great process with no results is not effective.

Occasionally shift to the goal rather than the steps that have you bogged down.
Make a spontaneous decision and carry through with it. You tend to always be operating under the ready, aim, ready, aim method, but you do have a tough time pulling the trigger. Fire do not be so afraid of change.

Another discussing personal traits in the C style was IP8, who discussed an attitude of stability-orientation and reactions to change:

Probably the one thing on here where it says, "Be willing to accept change and understand it," that's probably my weakness in this I guess, because I'll accept it all day long, but I look for the most practical explanation for things or ways of doing things. If somebody is changing it for what I think is the bad, then I'll argue it all day long, but, no, we don't need to change this. But if it's something where obviously it needs to be changed, I'll be the first one to tell you, "Yeah, let's change it. If you want me to do it, I'll do it.

Still another example of how a CS personality responded to change. This evidenced alignment with Rosenberg and Silvert (2013), positing the C personality is a good organizer and critical thinker, while preferring to work independently. These traits assist when planning and implementing a change initiative to question processes, shown by IP4, who told how a preference to work alone and being in control was most preferable:

If you leave me alone, I do my best work. It's when people start coming in to my world that it doesn't go as smoothly. I guess I like control and I think my way is the right way until I'm proven otherwise, and then I'll change it from that way, because I always want to be on the right way. If you show me there's a better way, I'll think it over to your way, but if you just come to me and say, "You need to do that differently" I'm like, "You're out of your mind, and get out of my face". Give
me some reasons and then I'm cool with it. I try not to be too proud to take those facts and it's like, "Man, you know what? I was wrong. I need to change my path". I'll do that but as far as my comfort, just leave me alone.

Law enforcement team members perceived that the identification and application of DISC personality traits influenced their awareness and adapting to change in the department. By identifying personal change preferences, sworn officers and civilian employees gained awareness of how agency change affected them and others. Then, after learning how the team scored, departmental members saw a larger picture of teammates and the agency unit. Some participants described concern regarding numerous change initiatives within the department in leadership and procedures. Others shared situations regarding changing personal behaviors and perceptions with co-workers as conflict existed within the team, aligning with Price (2015) who believed that human emotions create differences in behavior among people in a group. Participants reported using the new DISC knowledge to change behaviors, procedures, member assignments, and personal behaviors. Individual and team DISC result results included insights into change awareness and adaptation, communicating about and through change, and leadership and team member expectations.

Sources of error and outliers. As a qualitative researcher acts as an instrument during data collection (Lenberg et al., 2017), potential errors or outliers may occur in a study. Errors on the part of the participants or the researcher may inadvertently create errors in the collection or analysis of the data. Using a purposive sampling approach versus a random sampling may not be as transferable to a greater population. Not having law enforcement interview participants check how the researcher coded transcripts may
have resulted in different codes. In addition, participant responses from the focus group interview and semi-structured open-ended interviews may be biased due to subjective responses during the interview. While identification of none of these conditions occurred, it is possible that any of these factors could have caused an error in collected and analyzed data.

Krueger and Casey (2015) recommended using a questioning guide to assist participants in becoming comfortable with peers and building trust with the facilitator. The researcher used a Focus Group Interview Guide (Appendix F) and a semi-structured open-ended Interview Guide (Appendix E) to build rapport and trust with participants. Participants received instructions to answer questions honestly and to the best of their ability. In addition, participants received a copy of the interview transcription to review and submit comments or corrections. While identification of no distrust, dishonesty, or reticence to answer questions occurred, it is possible that any of these factors could have caused an error in collected and analyzed data.

During Yin’s (2014) five phases of data analysis for coding preparation, one outlier result occurred from participants as the 37 law enforcement target team members selected the following IML DISC Insights personality trait(s) and scored:

- Dominant (D)- 3= 8% of the department.
- Influencing (I)- 3= 8% of the department.
- Steadiness (S)- 15= 41% of the department.
- Conscientious (C)- 16= 43% of the department.

PeopleKeys (2008) reported that the average personality norm is D-3%, I-11%, S-69%, and C-17%. This police team contained significantly more C personality types and less S and I types than was typical. Due to police officers enforcing laws and rules daily, this
may draw a higher amount of C personality types than an average team environment. As the researcher compared and checked the three data sources for consistency and accuracy throughout each of the five phases (Yin, 2014), the coding and themes became refined and established. The following section contains a summary of data analysis and results.

**Summary**

Thirty-seven sworn officers and civilian employees on a law enforcement department in southern North Carolina participated in this qualitative descriptive study. The researcher purposively selected team members from the coded (Davenport, 2018) IML DISC Insights Personality System Profile (PeopleKeys, 2008, codebook p. 4-5) with specific personality types for a 6-person focus group interview and 13 open-ended semi-structured interviews. Data analysis occurred through multiple sources of data including the IML DISC Insights Personality System Profile (PeopleKeys, 2008) individual coded results (Davenport, 2018), the focus group interview transcription, and the open-ended semi-structured interview transcriptions. The researcher used Yin’s (2010) five-step analysis for preparing data for coding: compiling, disassembling, reassembling, interpretation, and conclusions to yield empirical results. Analysis of data occurred through coding using Yin’s (2010) four phases of coding, chunking, categorizing, and establishment of themes. The analytical process also centered around Vaismoradi et al. (2013) and DeLyser and Potter’s (2013) suggested analysis steps of looking for relationships, patterns, frequencies, and trends of written and oral communications collected during data collection.

Three thematic categories emerged from the sources of data and answered the two research questions. Use of the first and second theme, *communication implications* and
practical uses answered RQ1. The third thematic category of change implications answered RQ2. After the identification of three themes, key concepts emerged and contributed to understanding the phenomenon (see Figure 8).

Figure 8. Phenomenon of how DISC personality traits influenced team routine communication and adapting to change.

Note. Information taken from open-ended semi-structured interviews, focus group interview, and DISC individual coded results and team results.

The study results included identification of how DISC personality traits influenced routine communication and adapting to change in a law enforcement team. The results revealed that DISC personality traits influenced team members in (a) personal and team communication, (b) personal and team practical uses, (c) expectations of leadership, and (d) awareness and adapting to change. Additionally, the results from the study further included identification of perceived elements that impacted how DISC personality traits influenced law enforcement communication and adapting to change. The findings indicated that the majority of the department are stability-oriented versus change-oriented and are almost evenly distributed between task and people-oriented. Lastly, the team communication and change adaptation strengths are processing and
detailing, while the challenges are influencing and creating. Participants’ quotes contained insight into the two research questions and framed the study results. Direct quotes from the focus group and open-ended semi-structured interview participants strengthened this study and provided insight into how DISC personality traits influenced routine communication and adapting to change within a law enforcement team.

**Limitations.** Several limitations emerged during this qualitative descriptive study, potentially affecting the interpretation of the analysis of data. The main limitations in the study included scheduling and location of open-ended semi-structured interviews, team breakdown of percentage of DISC traits when answering questions, potential coercion of participant involvement, and open and close ended questions. One limitation of this study included the scheduling and location of open-ended semi-structured interviews for team members. Due to numerous team members working out in the field or on four different shifts, interviews needed rescheduled several times and specifically scheduled during on-shift time. This was mitigated by the researcher working with leaders and participants to schedule interviews during weekends, early mornings, or evenings. Holding interviews at the station created a sense of security for the participants because most were in uniform and police car parking was easy. Also, conducting interviews in a private office at the police station throughout all shift hours afforded privacy, confidentiality, and accessibility.

A second limitation involved the comfortability of some participants with being recorded and answering open-ended semi-structured interview and focus group questions. Due to almost half of the department scoring a C personality type, a poverty of expression occurred with some participants. Thus, use of probing questions and initial
goal setting ensured quality answers from interviewees, and all agreed to the recording of open-ended semi-structured interviews and the focus group interview. The researcher further defined open-ended semi-structured interview questions for more forthcoming answers from participants (Appendix E) and interviewed 13 participants versus the initially planned 10 to ensure rich data saturation.

The third limitation included that due to law enforcement agency leader participation, some team members might have felt obligated to participate in the study. The Chief, other leaders, and the researcher assured team members that no retaliation or negative evaluation consequences would occur if agency employees did not wish to participate in the study. Some law enforcement members were on vacation or on leave and did not participate. Also, interviews took place with no upper leadership present, so participants felt free to express openly and honestly.

A final limitation included some questions in the open-ended semi-structured Interview Guide (Appendix E) and the Focus Group Interview Guide (Appendix F) containing yes/no close-ended and double-barreled questions. The researcher mitigated this by following recommendations for qualitative interviewing by Krueger and Casey (2015) to use opening, introduction, transition, key, and closing questions/statements to put participants at ease or to probe further when there was a poverty of expression.

The researcher presents an introduction and a comprehensive summary of the study findings in Chapter 5. Also included is a summary of the study and findings. The balance of the chapter contains a conclusion of implications and recommendations for future study.
Chapter 5: Summary, Conclusions, and Recommendations

Introduction

The purpose of this qualitative descriptive study was to explore research-based evidence regarding how DISC personality traits influenced routine interactions (Lykourentzou et al., 2016) of communication and adapting to change within a law enforcement team of 37 members in southern North Carolina. The unit of analysis for this study included a law enforcement team of 37, with sample sub-groups of 13 and 6 different participants for a focus group interview and 13 open-ended semi structured interviews. As organizations continue to expand globally and remain competitive, a symbiotic relationship between teamwork and leadership must exist for optimal organizational effectiveness; therefore, studying personality and the influence it has on leadership and team performance was imperative (Sohmen, 2013). In order for teamwork to achieve full potential, it was important to explore the role of DISC personality traits within a team (Korner et al., 2015; Lykourentzou et al., 2015). The optimization of team member personality traits, communication, and leadership are areas that require attention if teamwork is to achieve full potential (Korner et al., 2015; Lykourentzou et al., 2015).

Although numerous personality instruments exist today, the researcher used Marston’s (1928) Personality Trait Theory of Dominance Influence, Steadiness, and Conscientious to explore the influence on routine communication and adapting to change within a police department team.

This qualitative descriptive study centered on previous research on teams and member personality and the problem statement, it was not known how DISC personality traits influenced law enforcement team members’ routine interactions (Lykourentzou et
al., 2016) of communication and adapting to change. The problem statement led to the selection of the IML DISC Insights Personality System Profile use with a law enforcement team, as well as the development of the two research questions:

RQ1: How do DISC personality traits influence routine team communication?

RQ2: How do DISC personality traits influence routine team adapting to change?

The qualitative method and descriptive study design set the foundation for the researcher to collect data through the IML DISC Insights Personality System Profile coded results, a focus group interview, and open-ended semi-structured interviews. Coding and thematic analysis enabled the researcher to explore and increase a wide-ranging understanding of DISC personality trait influence on law enforcement communication and change.

The study’s sample was based on the literature findings of Kerr (2009), Kim and Yang (2016), and Lykourentzou et al. (2016) whose findings suggested that use of the DISC Personality System assisted individuals in building effective communication by understanding others’ traits and characteristics in a team. Therefore, this research included the targeting of a law enforcement team of 37 to complete PeopleKeys (2008) IML DISC Insights Personality System Profile and then debrief results in a two-hour meeting to discuss individual and aggregate personality styles and results. This approach was in alignment with James (2012) and Kerr (2009) findings indicating that use of the DISC traits assisted teams in establishing a common language, as members understand others’ personality characteristics. Therefore, an in-depth description from the law enforcement team member perspective was imperative of how DISC personality traits influenced routine communication and adapting to change.
Instrumental to this qualitative descriptive study were the informational analysis of the IML DISC Insights Personality System Profile individual results, the focus group interview, and the open-ended semi-structured interviews. This research was necessary and designed to further advance the understanding and knowledge of DISC personality traits by law enforcement team members that influence successful communication and change adaptation, thus contributing to the field of research. Study findings advanced the cognizance and understanding of the importance of using DISC personality traits within an existing team to enhance routine communication, change adaptation, and human resource placement to increase team effectiveness.

Chapter 5 contains an in-depth summary of the complete study results. Also included is a dialogue on the importance of this research, as well as how the qualitative descriptive study design subsidized the understanding of the research and results. A succinct summary of the findings, conclusions, and theoretical, practical, and future implications are also included in this chapter, concluding with future research recommendations.

**Summary of the Study**

This study aimed to address how DISC personality traits influenced routine communication and adapting to change in a law enforcement team. Findings from prior research included information that DISC personality traits results indicated that use of DISC personality traits assisted individuals in building effective communication by understanding personal and team member traits (Kerr, 2009; Kim & Yang, 2016; Lykourentzou et al., 2016). Results from other studies included findings that supported an effective team-based problem-solving approach (DuBois et al., 2015; Hung, 2013).
Additionally, by assessing personality traits of individuals, results showed improved engagement, performance, and decision-making, thus enhancing organizational success (Fink, 2012).

This qualitative study was constructed upon Lykourentzou et al.’s (2016) qualitative findings that found use of the DISC Personality System to identify individual and team personality types resulted in greater team performance. Although Lykourentzou et al.’s (2016) study contained findings that balanced crowdsourcing teams formed by using DISC personality traits had higher performance than randomly selected team members, the study prevented the analysis of how DISC traits influence a regular team conducting routine interactions. These research findings led to the gap in the literature and the overarching research question of how DISC personality traits influenced routine communication and adapting to change in a team.

By examining the two research questions, an opportunity to further investigate the phenomenon and conduct a comprehensive study emerged. Consequently, this qualitative descriptive study contributed to the current body of knowledge by presenting an in-depth depiction of DISC trait perceptions, results, actions, and strategies used by law enforcement team members to enhance communication and change adaptation. The data gathered and analyzed created new results, exposing new perceptions to advance the body of knowledge in the field of law enforcement teams as they consider the administration and application of DISC Personality System profile traits. Additionally, new insights gathered in this study may be beneficial in assisting individually talented people to come together, thus creating a high-performing team through DISC trait use (PeopleKeys, 2017).
Chapter 1 of this study included the literature gap and identification of the problem statement which was it was not known how DISC personality traits influenced law enforcement team members’ routine interactions (Lykourentzou et al., 2016) of communication and adapting to change in a law enforcement team of 37 in southern North Carolina. This study further delved into scholarly research, including Belbin’s (2010) summation that organizations rely on teamwork to improve productivity and empower stakeholders, as well as Gilley et al.’s (2010) findings regarding successful team integration results of a positive work culture, effective communication, and better performance. Additional topics covered in Chapter 1 included the study gap that led to the purpose of the study, the problem statement, and the two research questions, resulting from the qualitative methodology. Within the qualitative method, a descriptive study design emerged and led to the theory and theoretical models. The research questions explored how DISC personality traits influenced routine communication and adapting to change within a law enforcement team. Chapter 1 concluded with how the study advanced scientific knowledge, assumptions, limitations, and delimitations.

Chapter 2 included a comprehensive review of Marston’s (1928) Personality Trait Theory, the DISC Personality System assessment, and literature on the phenomenon. Numerous topics that pertained to DISC personality traits were discussed in the literature review, including DISC factors, components, and patterns as well as DISC and teams, communication, and change adaptation. Previous study instruments and methodologies were also discussed in Chapter 2, thus further supporting the use of a qualitative descriptive study approach.
Chapter 3 contained an in-depth description of the research methodology and qualitative descriptive study design, the target population and sample size, as well as the approach to data collection and analysis procedures. In exploration of the phenomenon, the researcher used a qualitative method and descriptive study design to purposefully sample 6 participants for a focus group interview and 13 individual interviews of the 37 law agency team members. Data collection occurred through 3 sources, IML DISC Insights Personality System Profile individual coded (Davenport, 2018) results (PeopleKeys, 2008, codebook p. 4-6, 8), a focus group interview, and open-ended semi-structured interviews. Thematic analysis included use of Yin’s (2010) five phase analysis for coding and chunking of data in the development of central themes throughout the analytical approach in this study. The researcher also used a qualitative software tool, NVivo to assist with analysis and coding, as well as Rev.com for participant transcription of recorded interviews.

Chapters 4 and 5 include comprehensive details on the study results and delivers a summary of the complete research. Chapter 4 included demographics of team members and the law enforcement agency, including gender, years of law enforcement service, and a detailed description of the 19 purposefully selected sample participants. Next, the coded (Davenport, 2018) participant responses on the IML DISC Insights Personality System Profile provided integral data regarding identification of Dominant, Influencing, Steadiness, and Compliant personality traits, as well as task/people orientation (communication preference, RQ1), and active/change-oriented and passive/stability-oriented (change adaptation, RQ2). The next two sources of data included transcription and coding of the focus group interview and the open-ended semi-structured interviews.
After data coding and analysis, three main themes emerged, (a) communication implications, (b) practical uses, and (c) change implications. The chapter concluded with the study limitations and delimitations. Chapter 5 concludes with a summary of findings, conclusion, implications, and recommendations for future research.

**Summary of Findings and Conclusion**

In this study, the two research questions included exploration of how DISC personality traits influenced routine communication and adapting to change within a law enforcement team. Results from the DISC individual and team results, a focus group interview, and open-ended semi-structured interviews contained the comprehensive activities, perceptions, and strategies law enforcement team members used to routinely communicate and adapt to change in personal and team environments.

Two research questions guided the study.

**RQ1:** How do DISC personality traits influence routine team communication?

**RQ2:** How do DISC personality traits influence routine team adapting to change?

Three themes emerged throughout data examination and were pertinent in answering the two research questions, (a) communication implications, (b) practical uses, and (c) change implications. Through the data convergence of the three data sources, IML DISC Insights Personality System Profile individual coded results, the focus group interview, and the open-ended semi-structured interviews, validation of the three themes occurred.

**Research question 1.** The first research question included exploration of how DISC personality traits influenced routine communication. Researchers reported when trusted leaders consistently involve team members and communicate, greater employee engagement occurs because members feel like an integral part of the organization (Sharif
By discovering stakeholders’ DISC personality traits, leaders, team members, and external constituents, experienced improved communication (Tudoran & Boglut, 2014). When members learn counterparts’ DISC personality traits, improved collaboration results (Stephens, 2017). Although several studies recently published reference effective communication in teams (Benetyte & Jatuliaviciene, 2013; D’Urso et al., 2015; Smith et al., 2018; Sutalaksana et al., 2016), few studies used DISC personality traits and how they influence routine communication within a team (Lykourentzou et al., 2016). Therefore, there was a need for this study.

**Theme 1 for RQ1: communication implications.** Theme one included a focus on how DISC personality traits influenced communication and the implications to the law enforcement team and individual members. This theme answered the research question and the literature findings that employees base perceptions on communication methods, including personal and team communication (Saruhan, 2014). Further findings included that communication becomes easier with a DISC perspective as team members form a roadmap picturing how to interact with each other (James, 2012; Keogh, 2017; PeopleKeys, 2008).

A police department operates in shifts; thus, the leaders do not have the opportunity to interact and conduct business with each team member, resulting in somewhat of a virtual team dynamic. Hence, the leader must take extra measures to include members in training, team meetings, and appropriate communication practices, as members may feel isolated and omitted (Benetyte & Jatuliaviciene, 2013). However, due to shift change meetings with sergeant leaders and the inclusion of every departmental employee, team members feel a combining of their expertise and capabilities assisted
with fulfillment of organizational goals and effective communication (D’Urso et al., 2015). Groups need to focus more on developing good communication and behavior as a team versus solely seeking results (Tasa et al., 2011).

Results indicated that law enforcement team members believed that DISC personality traits influenced personal and team communication. Several participants agreed that communication styles, particularly how best to and not to communicate were important for effective overall team communication. When leaders communicate inspirationally and show how the team may succeed, members experience unity and pride (Smith et al., 2018). By using different DISC styles, participants used strengths and limitations in solving conflict with fellow team members, as well as during calls in the community. As leadership and communication improves within a team, less conflict and greater productivity results (Lykourentzou et al., 2015). Participants attributed use of DISC trait knowledge for greater understanding of self and fellow team members. This resulted in creation of a new communication language among team members, resulting in enhanced listening, sharing of information, and the discussing of communication problems. These results and conclusions aligned with former findings of Price (2015) and Lykourentzou et al. (2016).

**Theme 2 for RQ1: practical uses.** Due to participant answers in the focus group interview and individual interviews including both communication and change perceptions, stories, and opinions, theme two contained both routine interactions. However, the theme summary report fell under RQ1. Thus, the second theme answered RQ1, including a focus on the practical uses of DISC traits, specifically in personal and team life, as well as with leader behaviors and expectations. This theme is consistent with
the Chapter 2 findings in the literature that using DISC traits improves job satisfaction and success, while contributing to an impactful team by DISC style education, identification, dynamics, strategies for imbalances, and strengths and challenges (Rosenberg & Silvert, 2013). Each DISC personality type adds positive value and characteristics to a group (Lykourentzou et al., 2016; PeopleKeys, 2008). Due to increased generational diversity in the workplace, flexing personality styles allows people to adjust their personality traits to interact appropriately with other generations for optimal communication (Pearl, 2015). When leaders involve team members and effectively communicate, greater employee engagement occurs because members feel like a valued part of the team (Sharif & Scandura, 2014).

Based on the IML DISC Insights Personality System Profile coded (Davenport, 2018) individual results, the focus group interview, and the open-ended semi-structured interviews the consensus among participants was team members use the DISC personality traits in personal and practical ways with fellow teammates and department leaders, as well as outside the agency with the community, friends, and family. By understanding team member DISC traits, leadership may plan more appropriately how team members will respond to the environment, with a change-oriented attitude of embracing change, or with a stability-oriented viewpoint of rejecting change (Davenport, 2018; Puccio & Grivas, 2009). Giving organizational members DISC trait knowledge improves solutions and team efficiency (James, 2012; Keogh, 2017)). These Chapter 2 findings aligned with study results in that participants requested agency leaders to use the DISC traits and team results to better understand fellow team members, as well as make human resource decisions considering individual DISC personality styles. Leadership is a
comprehensive social influence that highly influences organizational systems, such as teams and performance (Parris & Peachey, 2013; Senge et al., 2015).

**RQ1 conclusions.** The qualitative descriptive study approach was the best design (Maxwell, 2013; Yin, 2014) for exploration of how DISC personality traits influenced routine team communication and adapting to change in a law enforcement team. The overall findings supported research and contained results that answered RQ1. Results included that approximately half of the law enforcement team scored as people-oriented, while the other half were task-oriented. Further results indicated most of the police team scoring in the S or C category, as the average personality norm is D-3%, I-11%, S-69%, and C-17%. Comparatively, this police team contained significantly more C personality types and less S and I types than was typical (PeopleKeys, 2008). In alignment with Marston’s (1928) Personality Trait Theory, the law enforcement team scored 3 pure types and 34 blended personality types. When a respondent has more than one trait appear above the midline, style combinations play a strong role in how a person reacts and interprets situations and other people (Rosenberg & Silvert, 2013).

This study also contained results of personal and team strengths and limitations, how best to and not to communicate, concerns in communication, and a new DISC language. Results indicated the team scored highest in processing and detailing and lowest in creating and influencing. Results also included participant concerns in communication, such as feedback, listening, body language, and using new knowledge about teammates when communicating. This result was supported by findings that knowing the various personality types of people within a team enables members to understand each other to a greater degree (Keogh, 2017; Lykourentzou et al., 2016;
Sugerman et al., 2011). A final result included participant discussion during the open-ended semi-structured interviews and focus group interview regarding how personality styles and traits should be taken into consideration when placing staff into positions and during work shifts. Organizational leaders realize the value of people working in teams to optimize human resources, motivate employees to be more involved, encourage greater creativity, and increase profitability (Johnson & Johnson, 2013).

These results aligned with research that member DISC personality traits influence team formation, effectiveness, and leadership while knowledge of member DISC traits assists with success (Angood, 2017; Dulieu et al., 2013). By using the DISC personality traits, stakeholders ensure the placement of team members so that performance improves when working in the correct team role (Belbin, 2010; Robinson et al., 2014). Researchers have identified a need to understand personality traits better in connection with leaders, direct reports, and team interactions (Angood, 2017; Shih et al., 2009; Uhl-Bien et al., 2014). The contributions of these findings are noteworthy because they advance the understanding of how DISC personality traits influenced routine communication in a law enforcement team.

**Research question 2.** The second research question included exploration of how DISC personality traits influenced adapting to change in a law enforcement team. Researchers identified that stakeholders sometimes look at change negatively even though beneficial end-results occur for the individual team member (Saruhan, 2014). As leaders learn how and why team members actively participate in change initiatives, planning events and involving stakeholders becomes easier (O'Rourke et al., 2016). Further findings showed that leaders play a crucial role by providing team members with
support and clear guidance through critical concerns and stages of change (Sharif & Scandura, 2014). Identification of one theme, change implications emerged to answer RQ2.

**Theme 3: change implications.** The third theme included a focus on change implications, specifically on how DISC personality traits influenced change awareness and adaptation. Validation of this theme emerges from literature, indicating a change process depends on employee engagement, trust in the organizational leaders, and effective communication (Chowthi-Williams, 2018; Saruhan, 2014). Change is defined as an intentional intervention to modify organizational operations and noted that team members play an imperative role in change implementation, so leaders must coordinate human resources for success (Creasy & Anantatmula, 2013).

Based on the data, the researcher found that the use of IML DISC Insights personality traits had a positive influence on awareness and adapting to change in team members’ personal and team environments. Findings included the DISC individual and team results, revealing that 84% of the law enforcement team are the C and S personality type, producing stability-oriented team members. Conversely, with only 16% of the department in the change-oriented category, employees desire direct communication and a long lead time prior to a new initiative and may reject change. Among the four DISC personality types, the D and I embraced and desired change, while the S and C tended to resist change (PeopleKeys, 2008; Rosenberg & Silvert, 2013). Participant responses and expectations reflected literature findings that because team members play an imperative role in change implementation, leaders must coordinate and integrate human resources for ultimate effectiveness (Creasy & Anantatmula, 2013).
When asked about change prior to and after the DISC administration, all interview participants expressed an improvement and heightened awareness of change initiatives. This is a significant finding for all participants to express improvement after DISC and has seldom been mentioned in former research. A further finding included DISC individual and team result area strategies for adapting to change in the personal and work environments, how to respond to change, and planning change with personal and team DISC dynamics for better results. This theme’s conclusions and findings are significant and aligned with prior research.

**RQ2 conclusions.** This qualitative descriptive study contained a comprehensive study of how DISC personality traits influenced adapting to change in a law enforcement team. These findings contributed to answering RQ2. One finding was that law enforcement team members perceived that the identification and application of DISC personality traits influenced their awareness and adapting to change in the department. Another finding showed that the law enforcement agency was comprised of approximately 84% of C and S personality type, producing stability-oriented team members who may resist or reject change. This was supported in that the D and I embrace and desire change, while the S and C tend to resist change (Rosenberg & Silvert, 2013). People must design their environment to understand self and others, communicate clearly, and be most effective throughout change processes (Prochaska et al., 2015). This aligned with a significant finding that participants reported using the new DISC knowledge to change personal and team behaviors, interactions with the community, and when considering new assignments.
Implications

Based on findings, numerous theoretical, practical, and future implications emerged. This qualitative descriptive study addressed the gap in the literature on how DISC personality traits influence routine communication and adapting to change in a law enforcement team. The unit of analysis for this descriptive study was a law enforcement team. Even though this study entailed explicitly working with one law enforcement agency team in southern North Carolina, the research contained recognition of IML DISC Insights personality trait application and strategies to improve team communication and adapting to change.

First, the overall DISC personality trait composition of a team influenced routine communication and adapting to change. When a team’s composition is high in stability-oriented members versus change-oriented, change adaptation and awareness is a slower process and may be rejected. Second, DISC personality traits appear to influence individual and team communication by using strengths and limitations, how best and not to communicate, as well as knowing self and teammates’ styles. Third, DISC trait application assisted team members in identifying and solving problems in communication, such as conflict, listening, giving input, and feedback. Fourth, law enforcement team members used DISC personality trait terminology and concepts in practical application with the department, community, in the field on calls, and in personal life. Fifth, team members believed that DISC personality traits revealed individual and team characteristics that departmental leaders should use in making human resource placement in the present and future. Sixth, law enforcement team members unanimously agreed that use of DISC personality trait knowledge improved awareness of
and adaptation to change in the department through team scores of detailing and processing, as well as identifying an ideal work environment. Using the DISC personality results allows team members to learn signals from others as to how completion of tasks occurs, such as who desires to complete the task efficiently, socialize first, come into agreement with other team members, or merely accomplish the task quickly (Fertig & Milewicz, 2016). This study contained imperative information that may be used in law enforcement agencies in southern North Carolina, as well as in police departments across the United States.

**Theoretical implications.** The basis of this qualitative descriptive study was built on Marston’s (1928) Personality Trait Theory and the IML DISC Insights Personality System Profile and numerous theoretical implications emerged through findings. Marston’s DISC Personality Trait Theory contained concepts that enabled the researcher to understand how DISC personality traits influenced routine communication and adapting to change on a law enforcement team, as well as address RQ1 and RQ2. The information gleaned from the DISC model also assisted the researcher in answering RQ1 and RQ2 by highlighting differences in people due to traits that are used to “assess a person’s personality and predicted behavior within a selected environment” (Dulieu et al., 2013, p. 52). By fully comprehending the theoretical implications of Marston’s Personality Trait Theory and the DISC model, the researcher interpreted the results through the lens of the research questions.

The first research question included examination of how DISC personality traits influenced routine communication in a law enforcement team. Study data included results of the first theoretical implication that DISC personality traits influenced personal and...
team communication, findings that employees base perceptions on communication methods, including personal and team communication (Browne et al., 2016; Saruhan, 2014). A second theoretical implication from results revealed that almost half of the law enforcement team scored as people-oriented, while the other half were task-oriented. Most of the police team scored in the S or C category, which was significantly more C personality types and less S and I types than was typical (Marston, 1928).

A third theoretical implication from results contained application of DISC traits from personal and team strengths and limitations, how best to communicate, and concerns in communication, enabling the use of a new DISC language. Researchers identified a need to understand personality traits better in connection with leaders, direct reports, and team interactions (Angood, 2017; Shih et al., 2009; Uhl-Bien et al., 2014). Member DISC personality traits influence team formation, effectiveness, and leadership, leading to team success (Dulieu et al., 2013; Keogh, 2017). Therefore, due to the method used, collected data, and offered study findings the conclusions are credible and aligned with Marston’s (1928) Personality Trait Theory.

The second research question contained investigation into how DISC personality traits influenced adapting to change. Data from this study included a fourth theoretical implication through results that the use of DISC personality traits had a positive influence on awareness and adapting to change in team members’ personal and team environments (Saruhan, 2014; Sutalaksana et al., 2016). A fifth theoretical implication evidenced by results indicated that the majority of participants scored in the stability-oriented category, revealing a need for direct involvement in the change process and a significant amount of prior knowledge, indicating an agreement with Marston’s (1928) Personality Trait
Theory that people have a tendency to resist or reject change (Chowthi-Williams, 2018; PeopleKeys, 2008; Rosenberg & Silvert, 2013). People must design their environment (Sutalaksana et al., 2016) to understand self and others, communicate clearly, and be most effective throughout change processes (Prochaska et al., 2015).

A sixth theoretical implication from results indicated that after DISC administration, all interview participants expressed an improvement and heightened awareness of change adaptation. The sixth theoretical implication indicated participants believed that leaders must use DISC trait styles when communicating change because team members play an imperative role in change implementation (Browne et al., 2016; Creasy & Anantatmula, 2013; Marston, 1928). Therefore, due to the method used, collected data, and offered study results the conclusions are credible and align with the research method, data and further Marston’s (1928) personality trait theory.

**Practical implications.** Numerous practical implications developed as a result of this study. If systematically applied in organizational teams, the practical implications could assist law enforcement leaders and team members in using DISC personality traits in personal and team communication, change adaptation and awareness, as well as in practical uses with the community and family. Additionally, application of these implications may assist with higher performing and communicative teams as human resources assignment is based on DISC personality type within law enforcement teams of any size and location.

One result from the study indicated that team members desired departmental leadership to use the team and individual DISC trait results for human resource assignments. As a result of these findings, a practical implication is to consider using
DISC individual and team styles to place members in a position. For instance, when filling the position of school resource officer, a team member who is people-oriented, likes to multi-task, is a good listener, and strategizes to solve conflict should be considered. This would potentially include a person with an IS or ID personality type. This approach could improve performance when each team member works in the correct team role (Belbin, 2010; Robinson et al., 2014).

A second practical implication from study data and findings included that DISC personality trait composition of a team influenced routine communication and adapting to change. Law enforcement employees acknowledged that DISC personality traits influenced both individual and team interactions by understanding communication problems, strengths, challenges, and knowing self and teammates’ styles. A practical implication for this finding is to balance shift team composition by DISC personality style to ensure greater performance and effective communication. When leaders purposefully select specific personalities for a team, such as 1 D, 1 I, 2 S, and 2 C styles, teams perform and communicate more effectively (Lykourentzou et al., 2016).

A third practical implication from data and study findings indicated that DISC personality traits influenced awareness and adapting to change. Each interview participant agreed that awareness of change and planning for new initiatives improved after DISC team and individual results. Because most of the officers and civilian employees were stability-oriented, change was either resisted or rejected. A practical implication for this finding is to involve all team members in the planning of a change initiative, provide as much lead time as possible prior to the proposed change, and communicate the process, benchmarks, and desired goals frequently (O’Rourke et al.,
Also, communication should include face-to-face meetings, electronic notifications (emails, texts, etc.), and written to ensure all personality styles are reached via desired communication venue (Browne et al., 2016). Because team members play an imperative role in change implementation, leaders must coordinate and integrate human resources for ultimate effectiveness (Chowthi-Williams, 2018; Creasy & Anantatmula, 2013).

**Future implications.** As organizations and law enforcement agencies consider ways to improve communication and adapting to change, leaders should consider using the DISC personality profile to best identify the individual styles and needs of their sworn officers and civilian employees. While numerous research studies exist that draw attention to using the DISC personality profile, this study may assist in creating a dialogue within law enforcement teams.

Based on the previously stated practical implication, results indicate a future implication for law enforcement team members to use DISC personality traits in routine communication and adapting to change. Given the international focus on high-performing teams (Browne et al., 2016), and particularly the scrutiny of police officers in America, a second future implication is that departments should set aside funds to administer the DISC Personality System to every employee. A third future implication is that once individual and team styles are identified, results may be used to enhance relationships within the police force, as well as with the community and in personal lives.

**Strengths and weaknesses.** In this study, purposive selection criteria, potential coercion to participate, and incomplete member checking presented weaknesses in this study. The first potential weakness included that the sampling technique for this
A qualitative descriptive study was purposive selection from the researcher to balance the focus group of 6 and 13 open-ended semi-structured interviews with different IML DISC Insights personality traits to ensure a representative discussion and outcomes (Lykourentzou et al., 2016). Out of the 37 completed IML DISC Insights Personality System Profiles, only 19 employees were selected for the focus group interview and open-ended semi-structured interviews, thus presenting a potential weakness. Mitigation of this risk occurred by following Lykourentzou et al.’s (2016) findings that DISC personality balanced teams performed greater and with less conflict than randomly selected and unbalanced DISC personality teams. The gathering of rich data took place due to purposively balanced DISC personality interviews.

The second potential weakness was that due to law enforcement agency leader participation, some team members might have felt obligated to participate in the study. The Chief, other leaders, and the researcher assured team members that no retaliation or negative evaluation consequences would occur if agency employees did not wish to participate in the study. Some law enforcement members were on vacation or on leave and did not participate. Also, interviews took place with no upper leadership present, so participants felt free to express perceptions, thoughts, and stories openly and honestly.

Lastly, member checking consisted of each participant reviewing the transcribed interview transcript for accuracy. The coded themes were purposefully not returned for the participants to peruse due to law enforcement busy work schedules and the belief that participants would not desire to know how the researcher coded or placed into themes transcribed responses. This was mitigated by participants reviewing the transcripts and
giving feedback if desired, as well as collaboration with the content expert regarding descriptive study coding and the coding process.

Identified study strengths included the use of a qualitative method, descriptive study design, and three primary data sources. These strengthened the study in that the qualitative descriptive study approach included opportunities to gather data from a smaller sampling where individuals shared perceptions and lived experiences (Maxwell, 2013; Yin, 2014). Use of a qualitative method included the opportunity to gather data and explore how DISC personality traits influenced law enforcement team member routine communication and adapting to change. The perceptions, activities, and applications of the sworn officers and civilian employees, gathered through DISC individual results (Davenport, 2018) and team results, a focus group interview, and open-ended semi-structured interviews appeared honest and were reported without intentional bias, thus validating the findings of this study as credible.

**Recommendations**

Through a comprehensive literature review, the researcher identified a need to explore how DISC personality traits influenced a law enforcement team in routine communication and adapting to change. Literature findings indicated that the optimization of team member personality traits, communication, and leadership are important components if teamwork is to achieve full potential (Angood, 2017; Korner et al., 2015; Lykourentzou et al., 2015). Due to this it was important to explore the role of DISC personality traits within a law enforcement team in order for teamwork to achieve full potential (Korner et al., 2015; Lykourentzou et al., 2015). In this study, the researcher sought to heighten understanding and increase awareness of how law enforcement teams
may improve communication and change adaptation through the lens of DISC personality traits. Additionally, study results indicated that law enforcement team members used DISC personality traits in team and personal communication, in practical applications with the community, leadership, and in personal lives. Furthermore, this study contained identification of recommendations for future research regarding DISC personality trait influence on law enforcement team members, leaders, and community members.

**Recommendations for future research.** Due to study results, several recommendations emerged:

- This study included one law enforcement agency team, comprised of 37 members. A recommendation for future study would be to administer the DISC Personality System Profile to larger, metropolitan police departments to discover the individual and team composition. Also, other organizations such as fire department teams, military branch teams, non-profit, and corporate teams may yield different personality styles and overall team composition.

- As this study furthered Marston’s (1928) Personality Trait Theory, further research may include other personality trait theories, such as Belbin’s (2010) Role Theory or Jung’s (1938) eight-type taxonomy based on all possible combinations in the Myers Briggs Type Inventory (MBTI) Personality Assessment (Rodriguez et al., 2013).

- In this study, the DISC Personality System assessment was used due to the 24-question format and the timeframe of 10 minutes for completion online. Future researchers may wish to use a different personality assessment tool to measure routine communication and adapting to change in a law enforcement agency.

- Because this study focused on routine communication and adapting to change, future studies may focus on other routine interactions, as recommended by Lykourentzou et al. (2016).

- Future research should include the perspectives of the community and possibly family members as to how DISC traits influenced the sworn officers and civilian employees. This could create a common DISC language for improved communication and change adaptation.

- As this study was conducted over a four-week period, future research should consider extending the timeframe to more than one month. This would allow for greater in-depth use of the DISC personality traits, as well as allow time for the C and S personalities to analyze the model, individual and team results, and apply
concepts in personal and team behavior. Among the four DISC personality types, the D and I embrace and desire change, while the S and C tend to resist or reject change (PeopleKeys, 2008; Rosenberg & Silvert, 2013).

**Recommendations for future practice.** The results from this qualitative descriptive study indicate support for the use of DISC personality traits in law enforcement teams to improve communication. To address the rise and use of the working team, use of personality identification assists with greater cohesiveness and effective communication, allowing for optimal performance (Browne et al., 2016; Johnson & Johnson, 2013). Organizations rely on teamwork to improve productivity and empower stakeholders, while integrating results of a positive work culture through effective communication and better performance (Belbin, 2010; Gilley et al., 2010). As each team member identifies unique characteristics (values) and DISC personalities (needs), this new knowledge combines to influence positive team dynamics (Voges & Braund, 1995). This practice is recommended to benefit law enforcement working teams as leadership and communication improves within a team, less conflict and greater productivity results (Lykourentzou et al., 2016).

A second recommendation for practice is to use the DISC personality traits to assist with identifying individual and team styles for human resource placement. Research findings indicated that leaders assign human resources to a team based on availability and technical skills, versus using personality traits for team formation, resulting in teams that break down and fall apart (Jeong et al., 2012). Law enforcement team members responded that departmental leaders should use the IML DISC Insights individual and team results to fill human resource positions in the present and future. Participant responses and expectations reflected literature findings that because team members play a critical role in initiatives, leaders must coordinate and integrate human
resources for ultimate effectiveness (Creasy & Anantatmula, 2013). The optimization of team member personality traits, communication, and leadership are areas that require attention if teamwork is to achieve full potential (Davenport, 2018; Korner et al., 2015; Lykourentzou et al., 2016). This practice could place the right employee in the right position for optimal communication, change adaptation, and team performance.
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Appendix A.

Site Authorization

Sheila J. Hunt, a doctoral student under the direction of Dr. Erich Randall, Ph.D., in the School of Doctoral Studies at Grand Canyon University, is conducting research in the Charlotte North Carolina area, and is inviting you to participate. The title of the study is Law Enforcement Team Personality: DISC Trait Influence on Routine Communication and Change. The study’s purpose includes exploring how DISC personality traits influence a law enforcement team in routine interactions such as communication and adaptation to change, discovering solutions for organizations who want to advance team effectiveness. The purpose of this letter is to seek permission from your organization to conduct this research with the Belmont Police Department and to provide you with information that could affect your decision to take part in this research project. I am requesting permission to contact and recruit potential participants, as well as collect data as described below. If you choose to participate, please place this content on your organizational letterhead sign in the space at the end of this form to record your consent, and return it to me via email as soon as possible.

Your organization was selected to participate and assist professional organizational leaders in learning more about daily utilization of DISC personality traits.
leadership, and team practices. If your organization chooses to participate in this study, the following applies:

1. Each participant will attend a short briefing on the study and sign an informed consent form to participate if s/he so chooses.

2. Each participant will complete the DISC Personality System profile online within one week of receiving the administrative code.

3. Each participant will attend a 1.5 - 2 hour DISC debrief to discuss individual and team profile and team results.

4. Ten to twelve individuals will participate in an interview with the researcher in person or online Week 4 of the study.

5. If in person, the researcher will interview the participant in your organization’s respective building in a private location (i.e. office).

6. The interview will take approximately 30-60 minutes.

7. Six to eight individuals will participate in a focus group discussion with the researcher in person during Week 3 of the study.

8. The interview and focus group discussion will be recorded if the participant gives permission, or notes taken to ensure all information is recorded and transcribed accurately.

9. Each interview and focus group participant will be given a transcript to review after the interview is complete and transcribed to ensure accuracy.

I do not anticipate any risk to any participant during this study. However, while participating in this study, if any participant becomes uncomfortable in any way, s/he will be able to (a) stop the interview and continue when able, (b) reschedule the interview, and/or (c) leave the study at any time without penalty. There will be no adverse effects from Belmont PD or the researcher if a participant chooses not to participate or to withdraw.

All possible provisions will be upheld to maintain privacy should a participant choose to email any information to the researcher after the interview or focus group discussion; however, there is no guarantee that electronic communications will not be
accessed by a third party. All emails will have a disclaimer noting information that is privileged, confidential, and exempt from disclosure under the law and how to handle such should an email be intercepted.

There is no cost to participate and there is no loss of legal right if your organization chooses to take part. As the objectives of this study are to observe team meetings and conduct on-site or Skype online interviews, there is no expectation of injury to a participant. However, no funds are available to pay anyone in the event of injury. If harm is suffered due to participation in this study, a participant may contact the Grand Canyon University Office of Academics 602-639-7804.

From your sharing, organizational leaders and employees may utilize DISC personality traits with teams to promote greater communication, trust, performance, and team interaction. The researcher will publish study results, ensuring that privacy is maintained by not using actual names or identifiers, and storing all information in a secure storage area. Only the researcher will see or access study information. All participation is voluntary and if a participant chooses to depart from the study at any time, there is no penalty.

By signing this form, your organization states (1) that you have read this form or have had it read to you, and (2) that you understand this form, the research study, and its risks and benefits. The researcher will be happy to answer any questions you have about the research, so feel free to contact Sheila Hunt, 479.264.0075, sheilahunt7@gmail.com or you may contact the Office of Academic Research at 602-639-7804. You may also contact Dr. Erich Randall, research supervisor at 703-581-5129, Grand Canyon University, 3300 West Camelback Road, Phoenix, Arizona 85017. If you have any
questions about your rights as a participant, concerns about the research process, or would like to discuss an unforeseen problem related to the research, please contact the Office of Academic Research at 602-639-7804. Your identity, questions, and concerns will be kept confidential.

Note: By signing below, you are telling the researcher “Yes,” and your organization will participate in this study. Please keep one copy of this form for your records.

I confirm that this form includes all information concerning the study that is important to the security of the rights of the participants; this includes the purpose of this research, benefits, risks, costs, and any procedures. I have described the rights and protections to the organization’s representative and have done nothing to pressure, coerce, or falsely entice this person to participate. I am available to answer the participant’s questions and have encouraged him or her to ask additional questions at any time during the course of the study.

Investigator’s Name: Sheila J. Hunt    Date: May 30, 2017

Investigator’s Signature: [Signature]

The following organization has granted Sheila J. Hunt access to their participants and facilities:

Name: Chad E. Hawkins    Approval Date: 6/2/2017

1) Chad Hawkins, Chief of Police, Belmont, NC

Your Name (please print): Chad E. Hawkins

Your Name (signature): Chad E. Hawkins
This research has been approved by Grand Canyon University's Institutional Review Board.

Approval number: ________________

Effective dates: From: ________________ to ________________. (This information will be supplied by Grand Canyon University's IRB Office upon the approval of the IRB application.)
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Participant Letter of Consent

CONSENT FORM
Communication and Change: A Qualitative Study of Law Enforcement Team DISC Personalities Traits
Sheila Hunt

INTRODUCTION

The purposes of this form are to provide you (as a prospective research study participant) information that may affect your decision as to whether or not to participate in this research and to record the consent of those who agree to be involved in the study.

RESEARCH

Sheila J. Hunt, a doctoral student under the direction of Erich Randall, Ph.D., in the School of Doctoral Studies at Grand Canyon University, is conducting research in the southern North Carolina area, and is inviting you to participate. The title of the study is Law Enforcement Team Personality: DISC Trait Influence on Routine Communication and Change.

STUDY PURPOSE

The study's purpose includes exploring how DISC personality traits influence law enforcement team members’ communication and adapting to change, discovering solutions for organizations who want to advance team effectiveness. Sheila Hunt, a doctoral student at Grand Canyon University has invited your participation in this research study.

DESCRIPTION OF RESEARCH STUDY

Your participation will assist professional organizational leaders to learn more about daily use of DISC personality traits, communication, and team practices. The study will last for approximately 4-6 weeks at the Named Police Department location and all departmental employees are eligible to participate. If you choose to participate in this study, the following applies:
1. You will attend a short briefing on the study and sign an informed consent form to participate if you choose.

2. You will complete the DISC Personality System profile online within one week of receiving the administrative code.

3. You will attend a 1.5 - 2 hour team DISC debrief to share and discuss your profile, your primary personality traits, and aggregate team results.

4. You may participate in an interview (13 employees) or focus group (6 employees) interview with the researcher in person or online during Week 3 and Week 4 of the study.

5. If in person, the researcher will interview you in your respective building in a private location (i.e. office).

6. The interview will take approximately 30-60 minutes.

7. The interview will be recorded if you give permission, or notes taken to ensure all information is recorded and transcribed accurately.

8. You may skip or return to any question asked during the structured interview or focus group session.

9. You will be given a transcript to review after the interview is complete and transcribed to ensure accuracy. This is called Member Checking and may take up to 30 minutes if you participate in the focus group or open-ended semi-structured interviews.

10. All findings will be reported anonymously, i.e.: Participant 1, Participant 2, etc., as well as the location kept confidential.

**RISKS**

There are no known risks from taking part in this study, but in any research, there is some possibility that you may be subject to risks that have not yet been identified. I do not anticipate any risk to you during this study. However, while participating in this study, if you become uncomfortable in any way, you will be able to (a) stop the interview and continue when you are able, (b) reschedule your interview, and/or (c) leave the study at any time without penalty. A list of free services will be provided by the researcher upon request for any participant who may experience any emotional distress due to participation in the research study.

As the objectives of this study are to conduct a focus group during Week 3 and on-site or Skype online interviews during Week 4, there is no expectation of injury to a participant. However, no funds are available to pay you in the event of injury.

**BENEFITS**

Although there may be no direct benefits to you, the possible benefits of your participation in the research are organizational leaders and employees may use DISC personality traits with teams to promote greater communication, adaptation to change, performance, and team interaction.

**NEW INFORMATION**

1. You will attend a short briefing on the study and sign an informed consent form to participate if you choose.

2. You will complete the DISC Personality System profile online within one week of receiving the administrative code.

3. You will attend a 1.5 - 2 hour team DISC debrief to share and discuss your profile, your primary personality traits, and aggregate team results.

4. You may participate in an interview (13 employees) or focus group (6 employees) interview with the researcher in person or online during Week 3 and Week 4 of the study.

5. If in person, the researcher will interview you in your respective building in a private location (i.e. office).

6. The interview will take approximately 30-60 minutes.

7. The interview will be recorded if you give permission, or notes taken to ensure all information is recorded and transcribed accurately.

8. You may skip or return to any question asked during the structured interview or focus group session.

9. You will be given a transcript to review after the interview is complete and transcribed to ensure accuracy. This is called Member Checking and may take up to 30 minutes if you participate in the focus group or open-ended semi-structured interviews.

10. All findings will be reported anonymously, i.e.: Participant 1, Participant 2, etc., as well as the location kept confidential.
If the researchers find new information during the study that would reasonably change your decision about participating, then they will provide this information to you.

CONFIDENTIALITY

All information obtained in this study is strictly confidential. The results of this research study may be used in reports, presentations, and publications, but the researchers will not identify you. The researcher will publish study results, ensuring that privacy is maintained by not using actual names or identifiers, and storing all information in a secure storage area. Only the researcher will see or access study information.

WITHDRAWL PRIVILEGE

Participation in this study is completely voluntary. It is ok for you to say no. Even if you say yes now, you are free to say no later, and withdraw from the study at any time. All participation is voluntary and if you choose to depart from the study at any time, there is no penalty. Your decision to not participate or withdraw will not affect your relationship or employment status with the Named Police Department or the researcher. If you withdraw from the study early, all data collected from you will be immediately destroyed by the researcher.

COSTS AND PAYMENTS

The researchers want your decision about participating in the study to be absolutely voluntary. Yet they recognize that your participation may pose some minor inconveniences. There is no payment for your participation in the study. There is no cost to participate and there is no loss of legal right if you choose to take part.

VOLUNTARY CONSENT
Any questions you have concerning the research study or your participation in the study, before or after your consent, will be answered by Sheila Hunt, 479.264.0075 and email sheilahunt7@gmail.com or shunt5@my.gcu.edu.

If you have questions about your rights as a subject/participant in this research, or if you feel you have been placed at risk, you can contact the Chair of the Institutional Review Board, through the College of Doctoral Studies at (602) 639-7804. If you feel like you need additional support, the researcher will provide you with local numbers (Appendix Z).

This form explains the nature, demands, benefits and any risk of the project. By signing this form, you agree knowingly to assume any risks involved. Remember, your participation is voluntary. You may choose not to participate or to withdraw your consent and discontinue participation at any time without penalty or loss of benefit. In signing this consent form, you are not waiving any legal claims, rights, or remedies. A copy of this consent form will be given (offered) to you.

Your signature below indicates that you consent to participate in the above study. By signing below, you are granting to the researchers the right to use your likeness, image, appearance and performance - whether recorded or transferred to videotape, film, slides and photographs with eyes blacked out - for presenting or publishing this research by maintaining utmost anonymity and confidentiality.

___________________________  ___________________________  ____________
Subject's Signature  Printed Name  Date

Other Signature  (if appropriate)  ___________________________  ____________
Printed Name  Date

INVESTIGATOR’S STATEMENT

“I certify that I have explained to the above individual the nature and purpose, the potential benefits and possible risks associated with participation in this research study, have answered any questions that have been raised, and have witnessed the above signature. These elements of Informed Consent conform to the Assurance given by Grand Canyon University to the Office for Human Research Protections to protect the rights of human subjects. I have provided (offered) the subject/participant a copy of this signed consent document”.

___________________________  ___________________________  ____________
Signature of Investigator  Date
Sheila J. Hunt, doctoral learner, Grand Canyon University
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Letter to DISC Experts for Expert Validation

June 27, 2016

Hello Coleen, Dr. Stanko, Bonnie, Dr. Randall and Jim,

Thank you so much for agreeing to be a part of my doctoral journey by assisting as a Certified DISC Expert. Collaboration is essential to ensuring collection of the best data possible. You are a life saver!

Attached are the draft questions I have at this time.

1. Do they make sense to you?

2. Would they garner results after giving the DISC assessment to a team, and specifically looking for communication and change results/interactions?

3. What would you change/add/delete?

I welcome any and all feedback. I have also included the Introduction and the four research questions for your reference so you will understand what my over-arching objective is in this qualitative case study of one existing team and the direct report team members.

My timeline for your perusal is feedback by July 15, 2016 if possible. I will begin data collection by August 1st. Please let me know if you have any questions and I look forward to hearing from you soon.

All the best,

Sheila Hunt
479.264.0075
Sheilahunt7@gmail.com
How Do DISC Personality Traits Influence the Leader, Team Members, Communication, and Change Adaptation?

A Qualitative Case Study Dissertation by Sheila Hunt, Grand Canyon University

479.264.0075  sheilahunt7@gmail.com

Draft Interview Questions with Participants

1- Ineffective  2- Somewhat ineffective  3- Somewhat effective  4- Effective  5- Highly effective

1. Prior to taking the DISC profile, I rate my team’s communication as

1  2  3  4  5  because…

2. After utilizing the DISC personality traits, I rate my team’s communication as

1  2  3  4  5  because…

3. Prior to taking the DISC profile, I rate my knowledge about teammates and my personality style to accept and conduct change as

1  2  3  4  5  because…

4. After utilizing the DISC personality traits, I rate my knowledge about teammates and my personality style to accept and conduct change as

1  2  3  4  5  because…

5. How did application of DISC personality concepts influence team relationships?

6. How did application of the DISC personality concepts assist you and your team in implementing change?

7. How did DISC personality concepts and terminology produce new communication within my team? What are the new terms?

8. (For team members only)- How did utilization of DISC personality traits influence your interactions with the leader? With other team members?

9. How did utilization of DISC personality traits influence you as a team member?
10. (For the team leader only) - How did utilization of DISC traits influence your interactions with the team members?

11. How did utilization of DISC personality traits influence you as a leader and your leadership style?

12. Other information you would like to add regarding how DISC personality traits influenced you, your team, and interactions…(optional)

**Chapter 1: Introduction to the Study**

**Introduction**

As organizations continue to expand globally and remain competitive in an ever-changing economic environment, a symbiotic relationship between teamwork and leadership must exist for optimal organizational effectiveness (Sohmen, 2013). Further, as business becomes technologically dependent and knowledge-intensive, the importance for researchers to study personality and the influence it has on leadership and team performance intensifies (Sohmen, 2013). The optimization of team member personality traits, communication, and leadership are a few areas that require attention if interprofessional teamwork is to achieve full potential (Korner et al., 2015; Lykourentzou et al., 2015). Jong, Song, and Song (2011) reported that there is a connection between performance and leader personality; therefore, establishing team norms through interpersonal processes assists in member and organizational success.

Various instruments exist to measure personality, including Marston’s (2013) Dominance (D), Influencing (I), Steadiness (S), and Conscientious (C) (DISC) personality assessment system. The purpose of this qualitative case study is to explore how DISC personality traits influence the leader, team members, communication, and change adaptation within an existing team. Marston’s (2013) DISC Personality Trait Theory will include valuable information for the leader and team members and assist
with providing a common language for communication. Whereas James (2012) and Kerr (2009) suggested that utilization of the DISC assessment assists individuals in building effective communication by understanding others’ traits and characteristics, the literature is sparse regarding the connection of DISC personality traits to leadership, and team member interactions of communication and change (Puccio & Grivas, 2009). Although numerous organizations utilize the DISC personality assessment, a gap exists because few published studies utilized this personality assessment (Puccio & Grivas, 2009). Fewer studies and researchers have connected DISC personality traits to the leader, individual team members, communication, and adaptation to change (Kerr, 2009). Lykourentzou et al. (2016) recommended further study as to (a) how personality influences team members performing routine tasks, (b) members who have predefined roles, (c) personality compatibility or clashes among the team, and (c) member performance resulting from leadership. Uhl-Bien et al. (2014) suggested that there is a need for more empirical investigation in the area of the interaction of follower and leader traits. This presents a gap in the existing literature.

The following research questions contain the phenomenon of exploring how DISC personality traits influence the leader, team member role, and team interactions within an existing team:

R1: How do DISC personality traits influence the leader?
R2: How do DISC personality traits influence individual team members?
R3: How do DISC personality traits influence team member communication?
R4: How do DISC personality traits influence team member adaptation to change?
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Interview Guide Questions and Protocol with Participants

Introduction of Interviewer 7.17

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main Question</th>
<th>Additional Questions</th>
<th>Clarifying Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Introduce yourself and share your primary traits above midline on your DISC Results Graph 3.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Review your general characteristics, motivated by, and ideal environment in the boxes on p. 4 of your results.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. How were your DISC results useful to you? Please give an example.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4. Tell me about your team’s communication prior to taking the DISC profile…</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Did you know how you or fellow team members preferred to communicate?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Is there a specific example? • In what ways?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Can you expand a little on this?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Can you tell me anything else?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Review your strengths/limitations on p. 3. How did you apply DISC strengths to assist with communication? Change?

6. How did your strengths influence any decisions you made in how to or how not to interact during meetings (p. 3 in your personal results)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7. On p. 6, let’s review how best to communicate and not communicate with you. How can you use this information to better communicate with your team members? Leader? Community?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• In what ways?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• When you look at your personal results on p. 3, what findings describe you?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• How did you use DISC concepts to identify team member communication strengths?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Can you expand a little on this?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Can you tell me anything else?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Can you give me some examples?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. How did DISC personality concepts influence or assist you in communicating your value and characteristics in a group/team (p. 7 in your personal results)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>9. How did DISC personality concepts assist you in using your leadership strengths in communication (p. 12 in your personal results)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• How did use of DISC personality traits influence your communication with team members and/or the community?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Can you expand a little on this?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Can you tell me anything else?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Can you give me some examples?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. After learning about your team’s strengths and opportunities, what are your perceptions? How may you use this new knowledge to communicate with and as a team for

<p>| • Have you noticed any changes? If so, what are they? |
| • Can you expand a little on this? |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feedback? Problem solving? Decision making (Team result p. 24)?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>11.</strong> Now, after using the DISC personality traits, what do you think of your team’s routine communication? Solving conflict?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>12.</strong> In your experience, which communication problems bother/affect people the most? In PD? The community?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>13.</strong> How did DISC personality concepts and terminology produce new communication within your team (p. 6, 9-12 in your personal results)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>14.</strong> How did you or team members use DISC traits to improve listening- being listened to and listening to others (p. 6, 9-12 in your personal results)? Examples?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>15.</strong> How might you use the graph of all your team members’ individual DISC personality styles? How might so many similar personality styles influence your departmental team? (Single sheet handout)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

`**RQ2: How do DISC personality traits influence routine team adapting to change?**`

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main Questions</th>
<th>Additional Questions</th>
<th>Clarifying Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>16.</strong> Prior to taking the DISC profile, my knowledge about teammates’ and my personality style to accept and conduct change was _______ because…</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>17.</strong> After using the DISC personality traits, my knowledge about teammates’ and my personality style to accept and conduct change is _______ because….</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>18.</strong> How did application of the DISC personality concepts assist you and your team in planning &amp; implementing change (p. 4 in your personal results)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>19.</strong> What is your ideal work environment and how did learning about your ideal working environment assist you with adapting to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Why?
- How?
- Can you give some examples?
- What new communication terms/vocabulary emerged?
- Why?
- How?
- Can you give some examples?
- Can you tell me anything else?
- Can you give me some examples?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Follow-up Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20. What understanding do you have of what will happen next in PD? How</td>
<td>• What recent change initiatives occurred and how did using DISC concepts assist with</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>may you use DISC to assist in understanding?</td>
<td>implementation or processes?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. How will you use your new DISC personality trait knowledge to adapt</td>
<td>• Can you expand a little on this?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to or plan for change moving forward? As a team member/for your team?</td>
<td>• Can you tell me anything else?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. How can we get better results as individuals and as a team by using</td>
<td>• Can you give me some examples?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>our new DISC knowledge?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. How can member assignments match their personality strengths? Change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to meet emerging demands?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Conclusion of the Interview**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Follow-up Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24. Are there any other routine interactions where you used DISC results?</td>
<td>• What were they and what was the outcome?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. We want to discover how DISC personality traits influenced you and</td>
<td>• Anything else you wish to add?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>team members and made a difference during the past few weeks and value</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>your input. What did we miss?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. If you had a chance to give advice to leadership regarding how DISC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>personality traits influenced your law enforcement agency team members,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>what advice would you give?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Do you want to add anything on how DISC traits influenced your law</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>enforcement team or anything else regarding the study?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appendix F.

Focus Group Interview Guide

Introduction of Focus Group Interview 7.1.17

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focus Group Interview Protocol</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Contact participant after receipt of consent form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Introduce self as the researcher and facilitator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Verify participants are still willing to participate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Verify participants are willing for the interview to be recorded and start recording</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Inform participants that the interview will be confidential and names replaced w/ coded pseudonyms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Inform participants that the focus group interview will take approximately 30-60 minutes to complete, and to speak one at a time for ease of transcription</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Inform participants that researcher will email transcribed focus group discussion within 24 hours, to please check for accuracy, and return any comments to the researcher.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Have participants introduce self and spell name for transcription purposes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Begin interview and read script</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hello, my name is Sheila Hunt and I will facilitate a focus group interview regarding **How DISC personality traits influence law enforcement team regarding members’ in your law enforcement agency.**

Participants are encouraged to bring and utilize their DISC personality results to assist in focus group interaction. Our goal of this focus group is to interact and engage each other, hear from everyone, stay on topic, and be conversational. I will timeframe questions to ensure adequate time and coverage of all questions. Some areas we will discuss are influencing of others, value to the team, reaction to pressure, motivational factors, communication strengths and challenges, ideal environment, response to change, and decision-making style.

I will facilitate points of discussion as well as record the meeting to ensure that no dialog is missed. Only you will see the transcript and the notes will be summarized, coded, and each participant given a pseudonym for anonymity. Please let me know if you have any questions or concerns. Also, you will have an opportunity to add anything you wish regarding the DISC personality profile/traits that was not asked/covered from the questions. As a participant, you may skip or not answer any question(s) you may like or do not feel comfortable answering.

Overarching main research questions:

RQ1: How do DISC personality traits influence routine team communication?

RQ2: How do DISC personality traits influence routine team adapting to change?

**A Questioning Route**
<p>| Opening- (stating factual information, easy) | 1. Introduce yourself and share your primary traits above midline on your DISC Results (Carey &amp; Asbury, 2012; Krueger &amp; Casey, 2015). |
| Introduction- (relates to topic and restates info to get participants talking) | 2. How were your DISC results useful to you (Krueger &amp; Casey, 2015; PeopleKeys, 2017)? Please give an example. |
| Transition- (gives an opinion to build trust and include each participant) | 3. Think back to the end of the DISC debrief session and share your first impressions (Krueger &amp; Casey, 2015). |
| Key- (begins the actual questions for the research data) Answers RQ 2 | 4. How are you and team members committed to change (Smith &amp; Hoy as cited in Kearney &amp; Smith, 2008)? |
| Key- (begins the actual questions for the research data) Answers RQ 2 | 5. How do you and team members embrace change initiatives? New rules, procedures, ideas (Smith &amp; Hoy as cited in Kearney &amp; Smith, 2008)? Can you give an example? |
| Key- (begins the actual questions for the research data) Answers RQ 1 &amp; 2 | 6. How is innovation communicated? New ideas from the community or within (Smith &amp; Hoy as cited in Kearney &amp; Smith, 2008)? |
| Key- (begins the actual questions for the research data) Answers RQ 2 | 7. How is change embraced or rejected (Smith &amp; Hoy as cited in Kearney &amp; Smith, 2008)? |
| Key- (begins the actual questions for the research data) Answers RQ 1 | 8. How did you use DISC traits to ensure that all members’ input and feedback was heard (Wheelan, 2013)? |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key- (begins the actual questions for the research data) Answers RQ 1 &amp; 2</th>
<th>9. How did you use DISC traits/strategies to demonstrate competence, skills, and cooperation during communication and change initiatives (Wheelan, 2013)?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Key- (begins the actual questions for the research data) Answers RQ 1</td>
<td>10. How did you use DISC traits/strategies to communicate your views during conflict or competition (Wheelan, 2013)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ending- (allows for summaries and additional information if warranted by participant) Answers RQ 1 &amp; RQ 2</td>
<td>11. I want to discover how DISC personality traits influenced you and team members and made a difference during the past few weeks and value your input. What did I miss? Is there anything I should have talked about but didn’t (Krueger &amp; Casey, 2015)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ending- (allows for summaries and additional information if warranted by participant) Answers RQ 1 &amp; RQ 2</td>
<td>12. If you had a chance to give advice to the Chief regarding how DISC personality traits influenced your law enforcement agency team members, what advice would you give (Krueger &amp; Casey, 2015)?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appendix G.

IML DISC Insights Personality System Profile

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Encourage others</th>
<th>Friendly, Easy to be with</th>
<th>Not easily detoured</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strive for perfection</td>
<td>Unique, Bored by routine</td>
<td>Will do as told, follows leader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Be part of the team</td>
<td>Actively change things</td>
<td>Excitable, Cheerful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Want to establish goals</td>
<td>Want things exact</td>
<td>Want things orderly, neat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Become frustrated</td>
<td>Non-confrontational, Giving in</td>
<td>I will lead them</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keep my feelings inside</td>
<td>Overloaded with details</td>
<td>I will follow through</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tell my side of the story</td>
<td>Changes at the last minute</td>
<td>I will persuade them</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stand up to opposition</td>
<td>Demanding, Abrupt</td>
<td>I will get the facts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likely, Talkative</td>
<td>Want advancement</td>
<td>Think of others first</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fast paced, Determined</td>
<td>Satisfied with things, Content</td>
<td>Competitive, Like a challenge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Try to maintain balance</td>
<td>Openly display feelings</td>
<td>Optimistic, Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Try to follow the rules</td>
<td>Humble, Modest</td>
<td>Logical thinker, Systematic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manage time efficiently</td>
<td>Cool, Reserved</td>
<td>Please others, Agreeable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Often rushed, Feel pressured</td>
<td>Happy, Carefree</td>
<td>Laugh out loud, Animated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social things are important</td>
<td>Pleasing, Kind</td>
<td>Courageous, Bold</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Like to finish what I start</td>
<td>Bold, Daring</td>
<td>Quiet, Reserved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resist sudden change</td>
<td>Spend quality time with others</td>
<td>Want more authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tend to over promise</td>
<td>Plan for the future, Be prepared</td>
<td>Want new opportunities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Withdraw under pressure</td>
<td>Travel to new adventures</td>
<td>Avoid any conflict</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not afraid to fight</td>
<td>Receive rewards for goals met</td>
<td>Want clear directions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A good encourager</td>
<td>Rules need to be challenged</td>
<td>Reliable, Dependable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A good listener</td>
<td>Rules make it fair</td>
<td>Creative, Unique</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A good analyzer</td>
<td>Rules make it boring</td>
<td>Bottom line, Results oriented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A good delegator</td>
<td>Rules make it safe</td>
<td>Hold high standards, Accurate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix H.

Background Information Form (Demographics)

Please provide the following information.

(This information will be used for research purposes only. If using a computer, you may highlight the selection.)

1. **Gender:** Male Female

2. **Approximate Age:**
   - 18-30
   - 31-40
   - 41-50
   - 51-65
   - Over 65

3. **Ethnicity:**
   - American Indian/Alaskan Native
   - Black/African American
   - Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander
   - White
   - Hispanic/Latino
   - Asian
   - Other

4. **Years of experience in leadership:**

5. **Years of experience in law enforcement:**

6. **Level of education completed (Choose one)**
   - High School
   - Associate Degree
   - Bachelors
   - Masters
   - Doctorate

7. **I would like to participate in:**
   - Focus Group
   - Interview
   - Open-ended semi-structured Interview
   - Neither

8. **I have taken the DISC Personality Profile before working at Named PD.**
   - Yes
   - No

9. **I am in leadership and responsible for evaluating others/have direct reports in Named PD.**
   - Yes
   - No
Appendix I.

Participant Letter for DISC Personality Profile Key

Hello Participant,

Because personality is important in workplace leadership and performance, identification of how personality traits influence behavior enables leaders to experience success. Understanding personality traits sheds light on personal habits, thought processes, and behaviors, enabling maximum effectiveness in a team. The effectiveness of a team lies in its capacity to produce outcomes in four areas: the completion of the assigned task, its performance as a group, the satisfaction of members, and its ability to be an effective team. The performance of a team depends on the group’s synergy to “create a whole greater than the sum of its parts.

You have been invited to complete the DISC Personality System by Monday, July 10, 2017 at 11:59 pm. Your certified DISC facilitator, Sheila Hunt will then print your results and bring it to your team’s DISC debrief on Tuesday, July 18 at Named Police Department. The online instructions are as follows:

2. Fill in the personal data such as name, and a valid email address. You will create a password for future use.
3. Agree to the “Terms of Use” and click “Next”.
4. Follow the instructions from there.

If you should need to quit, you can always re-enter the DISC Personality System where you left off by following these steps:

2. Click on the black bar that says, “Continue an Incomplete DISC Personality System”
3. Enter the login (e-mail) and password you created in Step 2 above
4. Enter keycode: [REDACTED] (Please do not share this code with anyone as it is for your individual use only)

If you have any questions, please contact me at the information below. Thank you and I look forward to our DISC discussion on Tuesday, July 18, 2017 at the Police Station.

Leading, facilitating, and empowering,
Sheila Hunt
479.264.0075
Sheilahunt7@gmail.com
Appendix J.

DISC Personality System Overview

The Personality System Overview

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>D</th>
<th>Influencing • Inspiring Impulsive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Likes to Take on Active Roles and is Task-Oriented</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Characteristics: Good problem solver, risk taker, strong ego, self-starter, goal-oriented</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value To Team: Bottom-line organizer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenges the status quo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenge Areas: Oversteps authority</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argumentative attitude</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dislikes routine</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attempts too much at once</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greatest Fear: Being taken advantage of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I</th>
<th>Likes to Take on Active Roles and is People-Oriented</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Characteristics: Enthusiastic, trusting, optimistic, persuasive, talkative, impulsive, emotional</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value To Team: Creative problem solver</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great encourager</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivates others to achieve</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive sense of humor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negotiates conflicts; peace maker</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenge Areas: Inattentive to detail</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More concerned with popularity than tangible results</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overuses gestures and facial expressions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tends to listen only when it’s convenient</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greatest Fear: Rejection</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>C</th>
<th>Stable • Steady Supportive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Likes to Take on Passive Roles and is Task-Oriented</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Characteristics: Accurate, analytical, conscientious, careful, fact-finder, precise, high standards, systematic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value To Team: Perspective: “The anchor of reality”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conscientious and even tempered, thorough in all activities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defines situations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gathers, criticizes and tests information</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenge Areas: Gets bogged down in details</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Needs clear-cut boundaries for actions/relationships</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bound by procedures and methods</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefers not to verbalize feelings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sensitive to criticism</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greatest Fear: Criticism</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S</th>
<th>Compliant • Correct Cautious</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Likes to Take on Passive Roles and is Task-Oriented</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Characteristics: Good Listener, team player, possessive, steady, predictable, understanding, friendly</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value To Team: Reliable and dependable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loyal team worker</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compliant towards authority</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good listener; Patient and empathetic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good at reconciling conflicts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenge Areas: Resists change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Takes a long time to adjust to change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holds a grudge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will give in rather than argue</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficulty establishing priorities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greatest Fear: Loss of security</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: People Key’s Description of Personality Styles and Traits. PeopleKeys (2008).
Appendix K.

DISC 3 Graphs

Graphing Instructions:
1. Graph 1: Plot Row 1 “Most” numbers onto Graph 1.
2. Graph 2: Plot Row 2 “Least” numbers onto Graph 2.
3. Graph 3: Plot Row 3 “Change” numbers onto Graph 3. Pay attention to positive and negative numbers.
4. Connect the D - I - S - C dots on each of the three graphs. See example below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Graph 1</th>
<th>Graph 2</th>
<th>Graph 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MOST</td>
<td>LEAST</td>
<td>CHANGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DISC</td>
<td>DISC</td>
<td>DISC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Example:

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note:
If you cannot find the exact number for your score on a graph, estimate between the two closest numbers on any given line.
Appendix L.

Permission from People Keys

January 13, 2016

Greetings Coleen Kulkin,

Thank you for taking my call today and visiting with me regarding my dissertation topic of *Communication and Change: A Qualitative Study of DISC Personality Traits on Law Enforcement*. I am specifically studying interactions of communication and change adaptation. I am currently a doctoral student at Grand Canyon University, located in Phoenix, AZ and my dissertation chair is Dr. Erich Randall.

I am writing this email to you to receive written permission to use the DISC Personality System Overview from p. 8 of the DISC Personality System booklet in my dissertation. Thank you for granting me verbal permission, but I need written permission on your letterhead or w/ your signature stating your company information in order to place it in an Appendix in my dissertation document.

Thank you very much for your permission and figure as this will definitely be value-added in my study and dissertation. I will share the results and findings as soon as the dissertation is completed and approved. Please let me know if you need further information or have any questions.

All the best,

Sheila Hunt

479.264.0075

Sheilahunt7@gmail.com
June 13, 2017

Between:  
Client: Sheila Hunt  
And: Publisher: PeopleKeys

RE: Permission to use copyrighted material

The Publisher and copyright holder, The Institute for Motivational Living, Inc. (IML)/PeopleKeys, grants permission to Client, Sheila Hunt, to use only the content (or portions of content) on the below pages for the purpose of inclusion in Client’s doctoral dissertation. See details below.

Publication: The Personality System Profile

Pages: Note: Pages must appear as shown on pg. 2-3

Pg. 3 – DISCinsights Personality System Questionnaire  
Pg. 4 – DISCinsights Personality System Tally Sheet  
Pg. 8 – The Personality System Overview

Purpose: Dissertation Publication: Law Enforcerent Team Personality: DISC Trait Influence on Routine Communication and Adapting to Change

Time frame: One-time use for the purpose above

Other considerations: The Client shall cite PeopleKeys/IML in the dissertation. PeopleKeys appreciates if Client can share Client study findings that were generated using PeopleKeys assessment tools.

The copyrighted content, in written form or copied in its entirety, can only be used one time and for the purpose stated above. The Client does not have permission to make copies outside of the purpose stated above and can not sell or resell the copyrighted material.

Sincerely,

Cathleen Kulik
Director of Product Development, PeopleKeys | IML
Page 3 – just the bottom portion of the assessment page to show the assessment. But do not include the entire assessment.

Page 4 – just the bottom portion of the scoring page to show the graphs. But do not include the entire scoring page.
Appendix M.

DISC Individualized Results

Style: Concluder

DISC Assessment

Monday, January 30, 2017
Introduction

Your results report uses the DISC Personality System. The DISC Personality System is the universal language of behavior. Research has shown that behavioral characteristics can be grouped together in four major groups. People with similar styles tend to exhibit specific behavioral characteristics common to that style. All people share these four styles in varying degrees of intensity. The acronym DISC stands for the four personality styles represented by the letters:

- D = Dominant, Driver
- I = Influencing, Inspiring
- S = Steady, Stable
- C = Correct, Compliant

Knowledge of the DISC System empowers you to understand yourself, family members, co-workers, and friends, in a profound way. Understanding behavioral styles helps you become a better communicator, minimize or prevent conflicts, appreciate the differences in others and positively influence those around you.

In the course of daily life, you can observe behavioral styles in action because you interact with each style, to varying degrees, everyday. As you think about your family members, friends and co-workers, you will discover different personalities unfold before your eyes.

Name

**This is the D Style**

- Do you know someone who is assertive, to the point, and wants the bottom line? Some people are forceful, direct, and strong-willed.

**This is the I Style**

- Do you have any friends who are great communicators and friendly to everyone they meet? Some people are optimistic, friendly, and talkative.

**This is the S Style**

- Have you ever worked with someone who enjoys gathering facts and details and is thorough in all activities? Some people are precise, sensitive, and analytical.

**This is the C Style**

Because human personality is comprised of varying intensities of the four behavioral styles, the DISC graph helps make the personality style more visual. The DISC graph plots the intensity of each of the four styles. All points above the midline are stronger intensities, while points below the midline are lesser intensities of DISC characteristics. It is possible to look at a DISC graph and instantly know the personality and behavioral characteristics of an individual.

**The chart below helps put the four dimensions of behavior into perspective.**
Below are your three DISC graphs, and a brief explanation of the differences between the graphs. (Results of codes from participant answers according to PeopleKeys (2008) codebook p. 4-5.

**DISC graph 1** represents your "public self" (the mask) Participant MOST answers

This graph displays the "you" others see. It reflects how you perceive the demands of your environment, and your perception of how you believe others expect you to behave.

**DISC graph 2** represents your "private self" (the core) Participant LEAST answers

This graph displays your instinctive response to pressure and identifies how you are most likely to respond when stress or tension are present. This would be your instinctive reaction.

**DISC graph 3** represents your "perceived self" CHANGE (the mirror) Participant MOST minus LEAST answers

This graph displays the manner in which you perceive your typical behavior. It could be referred to as
your self-perception. Although at times you may be unaware of the behavior you use with other people, this graph shows your typical approach.
Understanding your style

Style is identified by the keyword "Concluder".

Name, as a Concluder style, tends to be a strong individualist. Name is forward-looking, progressive and competitive. They can also be direct and even forceful at times. Concluders are curious and have a wide range of interests. They are logical, incisive and critical in their problem solving. Many times a Concluder will come up with the imaginative and unusual. Name has good leadership abilities. A Concluder may appear to be cold or blunt because their task-orientation tends to overtake their people-orientation. Concluders have high standards and can appear to be critical when these standards are not met. Concluders may also place high standards on surrounding people and expect perfection from them as well. Name seeks authority and challenging assignments.

Concluders can have a very strong impact on people and can motivate others to achieve goals. Because of these characteristics, they need to be sensitive to the people around them. Their high-risk, adventurous spirit moves them through life at a fast pace while making things happen in the lives of the people. Others may see concluders as opinionated and they will challenge others' opinions.

Concluders tend to be short tempered, especially when they feel someone is taking advantage of them. They thrive on activity and a consistently forward moving environment. Patience does not come easily. A Concluder may put themselves in the position of being affected by other peoples’ actions because they want to be involved in everything going on around them. Concluders may want to take charge of problems that are out of their area of responsibility and may be irritated when others do not share their sense of urgency. Name is constantly thinking about what to move on to next that is new and exciting.

Often perceived as a very strong-willed individual, Name is one who others may tend to view as overly direct, perhaps even demanding. This individual goes by the rule that "whatever works" to obtain goals is ok. When challenged, Name tends to become extremely competitive and unrelenting in their quest for the win.

Name is an optimistic individual. They are the type of person who loves exploring new places or things and a wide variety of experiences. A natural charisma is displayed that draws and charms others. Name is a very encouraging person; others find them inspirational and lively.

Appreciating change and challenges, Name tends to become bored with routines; often searching for new acquaintances or a change in lifestyle. This person may have a hard time conforming to "the norm" because they simply prefer to do things in their own way. Although viewed as an individualist, Name truly has the overall good of the group at heart.

Not afraid to take a bold approach, Name is willing to challenge the status quo. Original and creative, this individual acts with confidence when implementing new solutions. Name will tend to use a balance of intuition and facts when making decisions. Once they have made a decision, they will not be afraid to act upon it.

**General Characteristics:**
- Natural leader and spokesperson
- High ego strength
- Influential and motivating
- High energy, extroverted, and optimistic

**Motivated by:**
- Being able to direct and pioneer
- Power and authority to take risks and make decisions
- Freedom from routine and mundane tasks
- Changing environments in which to work

**My Ideal Environment:**
- A competitive environment with rewards
- Being able to delegate details to others
- Freedom from controls, supervision, and details
- Evaluation based on results, not methods

**Famous people who share your personality**
Benjamin Franklin
1706-1790

U.S. Statesman, Publisher and Inventor

Born the fifteenth child in his family, he went to work at age ten. The drive and determination of the Concluder are seen in his early success in business. At age seventeen Franklin left his Boston home for Philadelphia. Within 10 years he had a successful printing and publishing business and was the sole owner of the Pennsylvania Gazette. The wide range of interests of the Concluder are easily observed in any of his biographies. During his lifetime Franklin compiled almanacs, formed philosophical discussion groups, established the nation’s first lending library, established a university, served in the Pennsylvania Assembly, was a postmaster, conducted scientific experiments, developed a fuel-efficient stove and served as a diplomat.

"Content makes poor men rich; discontentment makes rich men poor. If passion drives you, let reason hold the reins."

Napoleon Bonaparte
1769-1821

French Emperor (1799-1815)

Called a titanic figure in European history, Napoleon personified the visionary nature and forceful drive of the Concluder. He became a successful army officer as a young man, and lost only one battle during ten years of war as he led the French revolutionaries against the Austrians and the British in the 1790s. Concluders like to lead, and they can have a strong impact on others. Napoleons goal was to make France the center of a huge European empire modeled after ancient Rome and to see himself lead it as emperor. As an army commander, Napoleons genius was incredible. He conquered the Austrian empire, and ruled Italy, Germany and Switzerland. However, he was unable to hold on to his command. He finished his last days in exile. "Nothing is more difficult, and therefore more precious, than to be able to decide."
With the Concluder style

Remember, a Concluder may want:

- Authority, varied activities, prestige, freedom, assignments promoting growth, opportunity for advancement

Greatest fear:

- Being taken advantage of, being talked about

When communicating with Name, a Concluder, DO:

- Talk about results, not processes
- Talk about solutions, not problems
- Focus on business; remember they desire results
- Suggest ways for him/her to achieve results, be in charge, and solve problems Let them in on the "big picture" because they are visionary
- Agree with facts and ideas rather than the person when in agreement

When communicating with Name, a Concluder, DO NOT:

- Ramble, repeat yourself, or do all the talking Focus on problems
- Be pessimistic or challenge them directly Focus on the process and details

While analyzing information, Name, a Concluder may:

- Ignore potential risks
- Not weigh the pros and cons Not consider others' opinions
- Offer innovative and progressive systems and ideas

Motivational Characteristics

- **Motivating Goals:** Dominance and independence
- **Evaluates Others by:** Ability to complete a task quickly **Influences Others by:** Force of character, persistence
- **Value to Team:** Determination; striving to overcome obstacles
- **Overuses:** Impatience, competition
- **Reaction to Pressure:** Analytical, belligerent, logical
- **Greatest Fears:** Slowness or being seen as too jovial
- **Areas for Improvement:** Increase patience, concern for people, humility

Knowledge comes, but wisdom lingers.
- Alfred Lord Tennyson
With the Concluder style

Value to the group:

- Bottom-line organizer
- High energy, spurs activity
- Can multi-task easily
- Decisive and great in a crisis

Concluders possess these positive characteristics in groups:

- Instinctive leaders
- Direct and decisive
- Innovative in getting results
- Maintain focus on goals
- Great communicators, willing to give opinions
- Overcome obstacles,
- They see silver lining
- Provide direction and leadership
- Push group toward their goals
- Generally optimistic
- Welcome challenges without fear
- Accept risks
- Sees the big picture
- Can handle multiple projects
- Function well with heavy workloads

Personal growth areas for Concluders:

- Strive to be an "active" listener
- Be attentive to other team members' ideas until everyone reaches a consensus. Be less controlling, be more patient
- Develop a greater appreciation for the opinions, feelings and desires of others. Put more energy into the details and process
- Take time to explain the "whys" of your statements and proposals

You can have brilliant ideas, but if you can't get them across, your ideas won't get you anywhere.
- Lee Iacocca
Relating to others

Your D and I plotted above the midline, your style is identified by the keyword “Concluder”.

This next section uses adjectives to describe where your DISC styles are approximately plotted on your graph. These descriptive words correlate as a rough approximation to the values of your graph.

D -- Measures how decisive, authoritative and direct you typically are. Words that may describe the intensity of your “D” are:

- **FORCEFUL** Full of force; powerful; vigorous
- **RISK TAKER** Willing to take chances **ADVENTURESOME** Exciting or dangerous undertaking **DECISIVE** Settles a dispute, question, etc.
- **INQUISITIVE** Inclined to ask many questions; curious

I - Measures how talkative, persuasive, and interactive you typically are. Words that may describe the intensity of your “I” are:

- **GENEROUS** Willing to give or share; unselfish; bountiful **POISED**
- Balanced; stable; having ease and dignity of manner **CHARMING**
- Attractive; fascinating; delightful
- **CONFIDENT** Sure of oneself; feeling certain; bold

S -- Measures your desire for security, peace and your ability to be a team player. Words that may describe the intensity of your “S” are:

- **RESTLESS** Inability to rest or relax; uneasy; not quiet
- **CHANGE-ORIENTED** Desire to alter; likes variety
- **SPONTANEOUS** Acting in accordance with a natural feeling without constraint
- **ACTIVE** Characterized by much action or emotion; busy; quick

C -- Measures your desire for structure, organization and details. Words that may describe the intensity of your “C” are:

- **OWN PERSON** Not easily affected by the opinions of others **PERSISTENT** Continuing, especially in the face of opposition; persevere **INDEPENDENT** Free from the influence or control of others; self-confident

The only way to change is by changing your understanding.
- Anthony De Mello
How you communicate with others

How You Communicate with Others

Please return to the "Communicating" section of this report and review the communicating "DO" and "DO NOT" sections for your specific style. Reviewing your own communication preferences can be an eye-opening experience or simply confirmation for what you already know to be true. Either way, you have your communication characteristics in writing. This information is powerful when shared between colleagues, friends, and family. Others may now realize that some approaches do not work for your style, while other ones are received well by you. Equally important is that you now see that THE WAY YOU SAY SOMETHING can be as important as WHAT IS SAID. Unfortunately, we all have a tendency to communicate in the manner that we like to hear something, instead of the method another person prefers.

Your style is predominately a "D" style, which means that you prefer receiving information telling you RESULTS. But, when transferring that same information to a client or co-worker, you may need to translate that into giving them precise facts, or just the end result, or how they are a part of the solution and we need to work as a team.

This next section of the report deals with how your style communicates with the other three dominant styles. Certain styles have a natural tendency to communicate well, while certain other styles seem to be speaking different languages all together. Since you are already adept at speaking your "native" language, we will examine how to best communicate and relate to the other three dominant languages people will be using.

This next section is particularly useful for a dominant "D" style as you may have the tendency to be more aggressive in your communication than what others would like.

The Compatibility of Your Behavioral Style

Two "D" styles will get along well only if they respect each other and desire to work as a team to accomplish a set goal. Care must be taken not to become overly competitive or overly domineering with each other.

A "D" likes the "I" style, because an "I" is a natural encourager to the "D". Sometimes an "I" will not be task oriented enough for the "D" in a work situation, unless the "D" sees the value of how the "I" can be influential to achieve ultimate results.

A "D" and an "S" normally work well together because the "S" does not threaten the "D" and will normally work hard to achieve the desired goal. Sometimes personal relations can be strained because the "D" sometimes comes across as too task oriented and driven.

A "D" and a "C" must be careful not to become too pushy and too detail oriented, respectively. However, a "D" needs the detail attention of the "C" style, but sometimes has a hard time of effectively communicating this need.

Speech is the mirror of the soul; as a man speaks, so is he.
- Publillius Syros
Compatibility of your behavioral style

How the "D" Can Enhance Interaction with Each Style

D with D
If there is mutual respect, you will tend to see each other as driving, visionary, aggressive, competitive and optimistic. So long as they agree on the goal to be accomplished, they can focus on the task at hand and be extremely efficient. If mutual respect does not exist, you will tend to see the other D as argumentative, dictatorial, arrogant, domineering, nervous and hasty.

Relationship Tip: Each of you must strive to achieve mutual respect, and communication, setting this as a goal to be accomplished will help immensely. You must also work to understand the realms and boundaries of each other's authority, and to respect those boundaries.

D with I
You will tend to view I's as egocentric, superficial, overly optimistic, showing little thought, too self-assured and inattentive. You'll dislike being "sold" by the I. Your task orientation will tend to lead you to become upset by the high I's noncommittal generalizations.

Relationship Tip: You should try to be friendly, since the I appreciates personal relationships. Be complimentary, when possible. Listen to their ideas and recognize their accomplishments.

D with S
You will tend to view the S as passive, nonchalant, apathetic, possessive, complacent and non-demonstrative. D's tend to perceive S's as slow moving. They will tend to see your approach as confrontational, and it may tend to be overwhelming to the high S. Your quick pace of action and thinking may cause a passive-aggressive response.

Relationship Tip: Avoid pushing; recognize the sincerity of the high S's good work. Be friendly to them, they appreciate relationships. Make every effort to be more easy going when possible, adapting a steady pace will reduce unnecessary friction in the relationship.

D with C
Your tendency will be to view the C as overly dependent, evasive, defensive, too focused on details and too cautious and worrisome. D's often feel that high C's overanalyze and get bogged down in details.

Relationship Tip: Slow down the pace; give them information in a clear and detailed form, providing as many facts as you can. In discussions, expect the C to voice doubts, concerns and questions about the details. Remove potential threats. Whenever possible, allow time for the C to consider issues and details before asking them to make any decisions.

Communication

Communication Tips Worksheet

Changes in your graphs indicate your coping methods. The human personality is profoundly influenced by changes in our environment. Typically, people change significantly from graph one to graph two as a result of stressors or environmental changes. Recognizing the differences or changes between these two graphs helps us understand our instinctive coping mechanism and indicates how to better adapt in the future.

Instructions: Each of your graphs illuminates different aspects of your personality. A closer look at those changes reveals valuable insights. Please refer to both graphs (if necessary, reference data throughout your profile). Compare the D, I, S, and C points on graphs one and two. Finally, read the analysis of your answers, and consider how your environment affects your decisions, motivations, actions and verbal messages.

Communication works for those who work at it.
- John Powell
D Changes:

Compare graphs 1 and 2. When you look at graph 2, is your "D" higher or lower than the "D" in graph 1? Consider how high or low the letter moves. A higher value indicates someone who desires more control in stressful situations. If the D goes up considerably, you can become very controlling when you become stressed. A lower value indicates someone who desires less control in stressful situations. If the D goes down considerably, you may want someone else to lead you and you will follow.

I Changes:

Compare graphs 1 and 2. When you look at graph 2, is your "I" higher or lower than the "I" in graph 1? Consider how high or low the letter moves. A higher value indicates someone who desires more social influence in stressful situations. If the I goes up considerably, you may try to use your communication skills to smooth things out. A lower value indicates someone who desires less social influence in stressful situations. If the I goes down considerably, you rely less on verbal means to come to a resolution.

S Changes:

Compare graphs 1 and 2. When you look at graph 2, is your "S" higher or lower than the "S" in graph 1? Consider how high or low the letter moves. A higher value indicates someone who desires a more secure environment in stressful situations. If the S goes up considerably, you may tend to avoid any conflict and wait until a more favorable environment is available before making any changes. A lower value indicates someone who desires a less secure environment in stressful situations. If the S goes down considerably, you become more impulsive in your decision-making.

C Changes:

Compare graphs 1 and 2. When you look at graph 2, is your "C" higher or lower than the "C" in graph 1? Consider how high or low the letter moves. A higher value indicates someone who desires more information before making a decision in stressful situations. If the C goes up considerably, you will probably not want to make a decision until you have significantly more information. A lower value indicates someone who desires less information before making decisions in stressful situations. If the C goes down considerably, you may make decisions based more on gut feelings.

Which one of your points makes the most dramatic move up or down? What does that tell you about how you react to pressure?

How could your coping method help or hinder you in making decisions? How can you use this information to help you see possible blind spots in your reaction to pressure?
Your strengths in leadership

INFLUENCING - Extreme Focus
You prefer to be in control and in the limelight at all times. You tend to get involved, make a decision, delegate, and then find the next major challenge in life. You would be more effective occasionally stepping back and evaluating the situation instead of always operating under the "Ready, Fire, Aim!" approach. Don't be afraid to relax, you deserve it!

DIRECTING - Well Developed
You were probably just selected to oversee yet another project, especially one that has a tight deadline. Your team values your work ethic. You may appear a bit distant at times, but your attention to detail and your inner drive causes others to respect you and to see the great value you add to the team. Learn to take time to get to know other team members; time invested in relationships is not time wasted.

PROCESSING - Limited Use
You let someone else come up with the process, but will gladly critique it and make necessary changes. You prefer new challenges and adventures to routine tasks.

DETAILING - Limited Use
You rely more on your "gut feeling" than on the facts. Sometimes, it would help to slow down the process and proceed with more caution. You are likely to use your influence to get others to help in the areas in which you prefer not to be involved.

CREATING - Good
You are more comfortable moving ahead in areas in which you have experience and proven results. Sometimes you prefer to have the pace slowed down a bit so that one project can be completed before another venture is begun.

PERSISTING - Above Average
Others like working together with you because you typically do more than your share of whatever is required and this makes the entire team look good. You will maintain a hands-on approach and let others visibly see that you are a team player.

RELATING - Good
You tend to be task oriented, but know that people and relationships cannot be ignored. You may get caught up in getting things done, but you make up for that by taking time to nurture close relationships.

Developing excellent communication skills is absolutely essential to effective leadership. The leader must be able to share knowledge and ideas to transmit a sense of urgency and enthusiasm to others. If a leader can't get a message across clearly and motivate others to act on it, then having a message doesn't even matter.
- Gilbert Amelio
Personal Image

When completing your profile, you answered the questions according to a particular setting, for example ‘Home’ or ‘Work’. This is because people tend to display different aspects of their personality in different settings. You are typically not the same at work as you are at home or in a social setting. A significant benefit of this report is its ability to measure how others will tend to perceive you and your behavior in various settings.

In the setting for which you answered the questions, others will tend to perceive you as having certain characteristics. Their perception of these characteristics will change depending on the amount of pressure you experience in any given situation. This is an area where each individual tends to have significant “blind spots”. We often don’t realize how we’re perceived by others when we are under pressure.

The following keywords describe specific values of your DISC scores for two of the three graphs. An analysis has been generated for Graph 2 (personality under stress) and graph 3 (personality in general). The following keywords represent characteristics typically displayed by similar graphs.

The DISC descriptive keywords generated from an analysis of each graph have been divided into two lists. The first list, generated from Graph 2, is under the heading “How I Respond to Pressure”. It shows your typical response to pressure. The second list, generated from Graph 3, is under the heading “How I See Myself”. Unless your two graphs are completely different, you should expect to see some repetition of items in each list. However, you should be aware that the dominant traits are listed first; therefore the placement of each keyword demonstrates its significance. You should particularly note keywords that are repeated in both lists. Notice whether repeated keywords moved higher or lower from list to list.

Keyword Exercise Part 1 HOW I RESPOND TO PRESSURE

The following descriptive keywords were generated from an analysis of Graph 2. These keywords describe the specific value of your DISC scores providing a representation of the characteristics you tend to display when you are responding to pressure.

Instructions: Please ask someone to help you complete this exercise. It should be someone who knows you well in the particular setting for which you answered the questions on your profile. Ask him/her to check the boxes next to the keywords that he/she perceives describe you during a time when you were under significant pressure. Please ask him/her to leave blank keywords that do not describe you during a pressure-filled time. Consider the impact these characteristics may have on your relationships. These may be areas for you to consider as being significant to your self-image.

DARING Possessing courage for some act; to venture out
DIRECT Straightforward; not vague; frank
EGOCENTRIC Viewing everything in relationship to oneself

ENTHUSIASTIC Inspirational; visionary; intense
GREGARIOUS Fond of the company of others;
PERSUASIVE Having the power to persuade; influencing
"OWN PERSON" Not easily affected by the opinions of others PERSISTENT Continuing, especially in the face of opposition; persevering SUPERIOR Concerned with having the best quality, high-class, expert

CHANGE-ORIENTED Desire to alter; likes variety QUALITY CONSCIOUS Calling attention to defects RESTLESS Nervous; uneasy
Keyword Exercise Part 2  HOW I TEND TO SEE MYSELF

The following descriptive keywords were generated from an analysis of Graph 3. These keywords describe the specific value of your DISC scores providing a representation of the characteristics you tend to see yourself displaying (your self-image).

Instructions: Please check the boxes next to the keywords that you perceive describe you in general. Please leave blank keywords that do not describe your everyday characteristics. Consider the impact these characteristics may have on your relationships. Are there any keywords that come up in both part one and part two of this exercise? If so, these may be areas for you to consider as being significant to your self-image.

DARING Possessing courage for some act; to venture out
DIRECT Straightforward; not vague; frank
EGOCENTRIC Viewing everything in relationship to oneself

AFFABLE Easy to approach and talk to; pleasant & polite
SOCIALE Enjoying the company of others; friendly; agreeable; informal
TRUSTING Firm belief in honesty, integrity, faith

FIRM Solid; hard; not moved easily; fixed; not fluctuating; steady
INDEPENDENT Free from the influence or control of others; self-confident RIGID
Not bending or flexible; still

ACTIVE Characterized by much action or emotion; busy; quick
FRUSTRATED BY STATUS QUO Negative emotional reaction to lack of change
SPONTANEOUS Acting in accordance with a natural feeling without constraint
Graph page

Personality Style Graphs

Public Perception

Stress Perception

Mirror
Each of the three graphs reveals a different snapshot of behavior, depending on the conditions of the environment. Within a given environment, Graph 1 reveals the “Public Self;” Graph 2 displays the “Private Self;” and Graph 3 portrays the “Perceived Self.”

**These three graphs or snapshots are defined in detail below.**

**Graph 1 -
Mask, Public Self**

*Behavior Expected By Others*

Everyone acts according to how they think other people expect them to act. This behavior is the public self, the person projected to others. Sometimes, there is no difference between the true person and their public self. However, the public self can be very different from the “real” person; it is a mask. Graph 1 is generated by the “Most” choices on The Personality System, and has the greatest potential for change.

**Graph 2 -
Core, Private Self**

*Instinctive Response To Pressure*

Everyone has learned responses from the past: consequently, these are behaviors which the person accepts about him/herself. Under pressure or tension, these learned behaviors become prominent. This is the graph which is the least likely to change because these are natural and ingrained responses. A person’s behavior under pressure may be drastically different than his/her behavior in Graphs 1 and 3. Graph 2 is generated by the “Least” choices on The Personality System, and has the lowest potential for change.

**Graph 3 -
Mirror, Perceived Self**

*Self Image, Self Identity*

Everyone envisions him/her self in a particular way. Graph 3 displays the mental picture that one has of him/her self, the sel-image or self-identity. Graph 3 combines the learned responses from one’s past with the current expected behavior from the environment. Change in one’s perception can occur, but it is usually gradual and based on the changing demands of one’s environment. Graph 3 is generated by the difference between Graph 1 and Graph 2.

**Different Graphs Indicate Change or Transition**

- If Graph 1 is different than Graph 2, the demands of the environment are forcing behavior that is not congruent with the core, or instinctive behavior. In such a situation, a person trying to modify his/her behavior to meet the demands of the environment will most likely experience stress.
If Graph 1 is different than Graph 2, but similar to Graph 3, the individual has been able to successfully alter his/her behavior to meet the demands of the environment without altering his/her core. This individual is probably fairly comfortable with the behavior shown in Graph 3 (Perceived Self), and is probably not experiencing stress.

If Graph 1 is different than Graph 3, an individual may be in a period of growth (and some discomfort) while he/she attempts to alter behavior to meet the demands of a new environment. A person’s behavior may fluctuate during this period of adjustment.

**Similar Graphs Indicate Few Demands For Change**
An individual who perceives the current demands of the environment (Graph 1) to be similar to his/her past (Graph 2) will have little need to change his/her self-perception (Graph 3). This may be due to any of the following factors:

- The behavior demanded by the present environment is similar to demands in the past. This individual controls what others demand of him/her.
- The behavior demanded by the present environment is different than demands in the past. However, instead of altering behavior, this person has chosen to augment style. To accomplish augmentation, this individual has surrounded him/herself with people of complimentary styles, thus creating a team with combined strengths.

**Your keyword style of Concluder (DI) and the contents of this report are derived from Graph 3**
Name's Action Plan

This worksheet is a tool to enable effective communication between you and others with whom you interact on a regular basis. The goal is to help you maximize your strengths and minimize the effects of potential limitations. It addresses work-related and general characteristics that are common to your style as a whole, and is not derived directly from your graphs.

This section gives you an opportunity to sit down with a co-worker, employer, friend, spouse, etc., and assess your personality style, getting feedback from someone who knows you well. Although doing so is beneficial, it is not required to have anyone else present while completing this section. If you choose to get feedback from another, you may print the report and do so that way.

Instructions:

**Step 1**: The items listed below are areas to reflect upon between you and your closest contacts. After printing out this report, give this page to another person who knows you well (associate, team member, teacher, family member, friend) and ask them to read each item. They should consider whether or not they perceive the item to describe your traits. Then, check either Yes or No beside each item. Open dialogue is encouraged and any blind spots (areas of your personality that you are blind to) should be discussed. Since communication is a two way street, it is recommended that two people complete one another's worksheets.
### Action Plan

**Answer Yes or No to the following**

*Improving Your Interpersonal Skills - Mahatma Gandhi*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YN Yes</th>
<th>YN No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Delegates work well</td>
<td>Low tolerance for error</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sees the big picture</td>
<td>Goal/results oriented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can’t be bothered with details</td>
<td>Organizes well</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seeks practical solutions</td>
<td>Rash decision maker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moves quickly to action</td>
<td>Tends to be abrupt/overly direct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overly demanding of others</td>
<td>Thrives</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

on opposition Volunteers for jobs/shows initiative YN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YN Yes</th>
<th>YN No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Would rather talk than work</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presents well/polished</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequently lacks follow through</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outgoing and personable</td>
<td>Priorities often get out of order</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overly dependant upon feelings</td>
<td>Easily distracted</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Step 2:** Now, select the three items that would benefit the most from focused attention. Discuss and determine specific outcomes and a reasonable time frame for their achievement. Write the details in the spaces provided, along with notes helpful to achieving specific outcomes. Set a date 60-90 days from now for a discussion with your contact to review your progress. The person who works with you on this is important to your growth and should help you stay accountable to your plan.

1. The first item upon which I will focus:
   - Review Date:

   **Action Plan**

   *Improving Your Interpersonal Skills*

   - Specific actions I will take on this item in the next 60 to 90 days:
   - Specifics to address

2. The second item upon which I will focus: Review Date:
   - We continue to shape our personality all our life. If we know our self perfectly, we should die.
   - Albert Ca
Appendix N.

Participant Recruitment Letter

June 19, 2017

Named Police Department Employees,

As our frontline law enforcement leaders, we are invested in your professional development and will be presenting a new opportunity for department talent development. You were nominated by Chief and leadership to participate in this event through the next four weeks.

Our goal is for each Named PD employee to participate by attending the informational meeting on Tuesday, June 20, 2017 at 5am or 5pm to accommodate both day and night shift officers and employees. This meeting will last for approximately 20 minutes and discuss how DISC personality traits influence law enforcement team members’ routine communication and adapting to change.

If you are interested please select a meeting, sign up by emailing me back, and attend one of the information sessions.

Please feel free to reach out to me, Sheila Hunt or PD Lt. [Redacted], administrative liaison with any questions.

Thank You,

Sheila J. Hunt

Sheila Hunt, MA

DISC Consultant/GCU Doctoral Student
479.264.0075
Sheilahunt7@gmail.com
Shunt5@my.gcu.edu
Appendix O.

NDA Rev.com

CLIENT NON-DISCLOSURE AGREEMENT

This CLIENT NON-DISCLOSURE AGREEMENT, effective as of the date last set forth below (this “Agreement”), between the undersigned actual or potential client (“Client”) and Rev.com, Inc. (“Rev.com”) is made to provide for understanding and agreement of the parties hereto with respect to certain proprietary information being provided to Rev.com for the purpose of performing translation, transcription and other document related services (the “Rev.com Services”). In consideration for the mutual agreements contained herein and the other provisions of this Agreement, the parties hereto agree as follows:

1. Scope of Confidential Information

1.1. “Confidential Information” means, subject to the exceptions set forth in Section 1.2 hereof, any documents, video files or other related media or text supplied by Client to Rev.com for the purpose of performing the Rev.com Services.

1.2. Confidential Information does not include information that: (i) was available to Rev.com prior to disclosure of such information by Client and free of any confidentiality obligation in favor of Client known to Rev.com at the time of disclosure; (ii) is made available to Rev.com from a third party known to Rev.com at the time of such availability to be subject to a confidentiality obligation in favor of Client; (iii) is made available to third parties by Client without restriction on the disclosure of such information; or (iv) becomes available to the public other than as a result of disclosure by Rev.com prohibited by this Agreement; or (v) is developed independently by Rev.com or Rev.com’s directors, officers, members, partners, employees, consultants, contractors, agents, representatives or affiliated entities (collectively, “Associated Persons”).

2. Use and Disclosure of Confidential Information

2.1. Rev.com will keep secret and will not disclose to anyone any of the Confidential Information, other than furnishing the Confidential Information to Associated Persons; provided that such Associated Persons are bound by agreements respecting confidentiality. Rev.com will not use any of the Confidential Information for any purpose other than performing the Rev.com Services on Client’s behalf. Rev.com will use reasonable care and adequate measures to protect the security of the Confidential Information and to attempt to prevent any Confidential Information from being disclosed or otherwise made available to unauthorized persons or used in violation of the foregoing.

2.2. Notwithstanding anything to the contrary herein, Rev.com is free to make, and this Agreement does not restrict, disclosure of any Confidential Information in a judicial, legislative or administrative investigation or proceeding or to a government or other regulatory agency; provided that, if permitted by law, Rev.com provides to Client prior notice of the intended disclosure and permits Client to intervene therein to protect its interests in the Confidential Information, and cooperate and assist Client in seeking to obtain such protection.

3. Certain Rights and Limitations

3.1. All Confidential Information will remain the property of Client.

3.2. This Agreement imposes no obligations on either party to purchase, sell, license, transfer or otherwise transact in any products, services or technology.

4. Termination

4.1. Upon Client’s written request, Rev.com agrees to use good faith efforts to return promptly to Client any Confidential Information that is in writing and in the possession of Rev.com and to certify the return or destruction of all Confidential Information; provided that Rev.com may retain a summary description of Confidential Information for archival purposes.

4.2. The rights and obligations of the parties hereto contained in Sections 2 (Use and Disclosure of Confidential Information) (subject to Section 2.1), 3 (Certain Rights and Limitations), 4 (Termination), and 5 (Miscellaneous) will survive the return of any tangible embodiments of Confidential Information and any termination of this Agreement.

5. Miscellaneous

5.1. Client and Rev.com are independent contractors and will so represent themselves in all regards. Nothing in this Agreement will be construed to make either party the agent or legal representative of the other or to make the parties partners or joint venturers, and neither party may bind the other in any way. This Agreement will be governed by and construed in accordance with the laws of the State of California governing such agreements, without regard to conflicts-of-law principles. The sole and exclusive jurisdiction and venue for any litigation arising out of this Agreement shall be an appropriate federal or state court located in the State of California, and the parties agree not to raise, and waive, any objections or defenses based upon venue or forum non
convenes. This Agreement (together with any agreement for the Rev.com Services) contains the complete and exclusive agreement of the parties with respect to the subject matter hereof and supersedes all prior agreements and understandings with respect thereto, whether written or oral, express or implied. If any provision of this Agreement is held invalid, illegal or unenforceable by a court of competent jurisdiction, such will not affect any other provision of this Agreement, which will remain in full force and effect. No amendment or alteration of the terms of this Agreement will be effective unless made in writing and executed by both parties hereto. A failure or delay in exercising any right in respect to this Agreement will not be presumed to operate as a waiver, and a single or partial exercise of any right will not be presumed to preclude any subsequent or further exercise of that right or the exercise of any other right. Any modification or waiver of any provision of this Agreement will not be effective unless made in writing. Any such waiver will be effective only in the specific instance and for the purpose given.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the parties have caused this Agreement to be executed below by their duly authorized signatories.

CLIENT

Print Name: Sheila Hunt

By: Sheila Hunt

Name: Sheila Hunt
Title: Account Manager
Date: 4/17/17

Address for notices to Client:
5722 Kildare Ct
San Diego, CA 92115

REV.COM, INC.

By: Cheryl Brown

Name: Cheryl Brown
Title: Account Manager
Date: April 7, 2017

Address for notices to Rev.com, Inc.
251 Kearny St, Fl 8
San Francisco, CA 94108
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Letter for Transcript Review for Focus Group and Interview Participants

July 20, 2017

Police Department DISC Study Participant ______________________,

Thank you for participating in the DISC Personality Study being conducted with the Police Department. You recently participated in a focus group interview and semi-structured interview where your responses were recorded and transcribed. Please take a few minutes to check the attached transcription, make any edits you deem necessary if the typed transcription differs from what you originally responded, and return it to me within 3 days.

Don’t hesitate to let me know if you have any questions or need assistance returning any edits to me. Thank you again for your participation and assistance.

Thank You,

Sheila J. Hunt

Sheila Hunt, MA
DISC Consultant/GCU Doctoral Student
479.264.0075
Sheilahunt7@gmail.com
Shunt5@my.gcu.edu
Appendix Q.

Researcher Conflict of Interest

### CONFLICT OF INTEREST

**CONFLICT OF INTEREST PROCEDURE**

Researchers are required by GCU IRB to disclose any potential conflicts involved in the conduct of the research with human subjects. Conflict of interest is not just when financial interests are involved, but rather any situation that could result in perception of undue influence or coercion would constitute a potential conflict of interest.

For example, if a researcher wishes to recruit a subject who is also an employee, student, a colleague or a subordinate of the researcher, the probability for coercion exists. Though the researcher may be very careful to avoid potentially coercive behavior, the very nature of the relationship with the subject can create the appearance of coercion. For this reason, researchers should avoid using their own students or employees as subjects. Researchers who wish to recruit these groups as subjects must make special considerations due to this innate conflict.

It is necessary at all times to assure the continued confidence in the judgment of scholars and in the dedication of academic research institutions to the integrity of the research originality. The strength of this declaration is based on the assumption that scholars are honest and conduct their research with the highest standards and integrity according to Grand Canyon University’s IRB policy.

This procedure is intended to serve subjects of human research. This procedure is not intended to eliminate all situations of conflict of interest, but rather to enable individuals to recognize situations that may be subject to question and resolve conflicts without compromising the integrity of research.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name and Degree(s):</th>
<th>Department/Center</th>
<th>University Affiliation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sheila Hunt BS, MA, Proposed EID</td>
<td>Dept. of Doctoral Studies</td>
<td>Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Instructor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Student Researcher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Principal Investigator:</td>
<td>Title of Project Proposal</td>
<td>Other: Please specify. (<em>Other categories may require prior approval</em>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheila Hunt</td>
<td>Law Enforcement Team Personality: DISC Trust Influence on Routine Communication and Adapting to Change.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Is this participating investigator being added to a pending or existing project?  Yes  No

Anticipated Sponsor(s) or Funding Source: NA for dissertation purposes only

Is this an update to an existing Conflict of Interest (COI)?  Yes  No

V3_2.12.15
Vendors of services, supplies, or equipment with an aggregate value in excess of $10K (name supplier(s)) even if goods or services are being provided at no cost.

Sheila Hunt, a doctoral student at GCU will provide to the Belmont Police Dept. free administrative support to take the DISC Assessment free of charge for potentially participating in the above named research study. Individual and aggregate results will be given at a 2 hour DISC debrief free of charge for both the report and the debrief presentation. No participant will be charged anything or paid for participation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) Do you, your spouse or dependent child(ren) hold a position such as board member, director, officer, partner, trustee, employee or consultant with a sponsor, a vendor or (sub)contractor related to the proposed activity?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Do you, your spouse or dependent child(ren) have a Significant Financial Interest in a sponsor, a vendor or (sub)contractor related to the proposed activity?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Have you, your spouse or dependent child(ren) assigned to a sponsor, a vendor or (sub)contractor related to the proposed activity rights to a disclosed intellectual property, pending patent application or an issued patent in an invention(s), or copyright for software?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Do you, your spouse or dependent child(ren) have a Significant Financial Interest in a for-profit entity that will manufacture or commercialize any drug, vaccine, device, product, procedure, or process that is associated with or that will predictably result from the proposed activity?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) Do you, your spouse or dependent child(ren) have a Significant Financial Interest in a for-profit entity that can reasonably be expected to benefit directly and significantly from the design, conduct, or reporting of the proposed activity?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) Is it reasonable to anticipate that you, your spouse’s or dependent child(ren)’s financial interest could be directly and significantly affected by the design, conduct, or reporting of the proposed activity?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7) Do you, your spouse or dependent child(ren) have a Significant Financial Interest in any entity that can reasonably be expected to compete with the product or procedure that will predictably result from the work described in the application?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

INVESTIGATION CERTIFICATION

I certify that the answers to the declaration are accurate and truthful to the best of my knowledge.

Signature: Sheila Hunt
Date: June 13, 2017

V3_2_12_15
In making the application, I certify that I have read and understand the IRBH Handbook and that I intend to comply with the letter and spirit of the University Policy. Changes in to the study will be submitted to the IRB for written approval prior to these changes being put into practice. I also agree and understand that informed consent/assent records of the participants will be kept for at least three (3) years after the completion of the research. Upload a copy of the PI’s CV (if external to GCU) unless one is already on file with the College of Doctoral Studies.

All forms and documents are signed through IRBNet's electronic signature by completing Sign this Package step in www.IRBNet.org.

Authorized Signatures:

Please upload all required forms along with the IRB Application into IRBNet. All forms and documents were signed through IRBNet's electronic signature by completing Sign this Package step. Your electronic signature is accepted as a legal signature.
Appendix R.

Validity Statement

The researcher had an expert panel review items on the focus group and interview questions for clarity and validity of the instruments prior to beginning the data collection. The panel members confirmed to the researcher in discussions that each instrument was clear and aligned with the research questions.

Expert Panel:

Dr. John Stanko  
Dr. Erich Randall, GCU Chair  
James Hunt, MBA  
Bonnie Burns, Master DISC Certification Trainer  
Dr. Russ Watson, GCU Content Expert also read through them with no changes recommended

In order to determine the clarity and validity of the interview protocol and guide, the researcher conducted two field tests with two local business teams; neither participated in the actual study.

The researcher conducted member checking of open-ended semi-structured interview transcripts with all 19 participants to verify the accuracy of their responses. The researcher read over the transcripts as well for verification of accuracy for all interviews. Members verified their transcript responses were accurate or submitted edits to the researcher for immediate correction. The researcher made suggested edits by two respondents which were names incorrectly transcribed.

Sheila Hunt, Researcher
Group Name : Redacted

Number of people in team: 37

From account : Hunt

7/5/2017

What are your Group Dynamics?

High-performing companies have high-performing teams. Outstanding teams are created and cultivated, so it is no accident that some groups perform better than others.

This team-building tool uses DISC to explore the traits that make independently talented people come together to form a team culture.

Work groups are as unique as individuals. When different people work together, they form their own culture.

"Culture" can be described as "shared ways, shared values, and shared goals"
This group report is designed to allow you to examine the behavioral strengths and characteristics of each team member independently as well as collectively. Used as a springboard for enhanced collaboration, this report will shed light upon leadership impact, communication/task flow and increase awareness of individual strengths and diversity.

Another goal is to show how each team member has tremendous impact upon the team and how each team affects the organization as a whole. Organizations who use DISC can create a neutral language regarding the core styles, making discussions about personal traits less "personal", and more based on style awareness. Teams and organizations that embrace DISC can experience improved communication, stronger relationships, higher levels of productivity and creativity, reduced stress, and greater results.

For more information about each team member’s TEAMS Thinking Style and what role they best accomplish and fulfill within the team, take the PeopleKeys TEAMS Report.

For more information about each team member’s work Values Style and internal motivations, take the PeopleKeys Values Style Report.

Overview of Group Dynamic Styles

Analyzing Group Dynamics with The DISC Personality System

Your report uses the DISC Personality System as the lens to view your Team’s current culture. The DISC Personality System is the universal language of behavior. Research has shown that behavioral characteristics
can be grouped together in four major groups. People with similar styles tend to exhibit specific behavioral characteristics common to that style.

All people share these four styles in varying degrees of intensity. The acronym DISC stands for the four personality styles represented by the letters: D (Dominant, Driven), I (Influencing, Inspiring), S (Steady, Stable), and C (Conscientious, Correct).

Knowledge of DISC empowers you to understand yourself, family members, co-workers, and friends in a profound way. Understanding behavioral styles helps you become a better communicator, minimize or prevent conflicts, appreciate the differences in others and positively influence those around you.

D Groups: Groups led by or comprised of mostly "D" Personality Styles may exhibit these characteristics. How many of these characteristics describe your team? Circle all that apply

- Fast Paced
- Decisive
- Thinks Big
- Impatient
- Seeks Change
- Competitive
- Seeks Recognition
- Sets Goals
- Individual Results Focused
- Wants Tangible Results
- Direct Communication
- Good Under Pressure

I Groups: Groups led by or comprised of mostly "I" Personality Styles may exhibit these characteristics. How many of these characteristics describe your team? Circle all that apply
**Talkative**  **Outgoing/Social**  **Sensitive/Emotional**  **Flexible**  **Disorganized**  **People Oriented**  **Informal**  **Seeks Adventure**  **Seeks**  **Fast Paced**  **Lively**  **Acceptance**  **Seeks Change**

**S Groups:** Groups led by or comprised of mostly "S" Personality Styles may exhibit these characteristics.  
How many of these characteristics describe your team? Circle all that apply

- Thoughtful
- Steady/Stable
- Peacemaker
- Sympathetic

- Supportive
- Active Listeners
- Loyal
- Avoids Conflict

- Creates Personal Bonds
- Resistant To Change
- Consistent/Reliable
- Good Follow Through

**C Groups:** Groups led by or comprised of mostly "C" Personality Styles may exhibit these characteristics.  
How many of these characteristics describe your team? Circle all that apply

- Perfectionist
- Logical/Analytical
- High Quality Work
- Researchers

- Conscientious
- Slow Paced
- Organized
- Detail Oriented

- Resistant To Change
- Slow To Make Decisions
- Focused On Processes
- Seeks Tangible Results

**Group Expressed Styles**

Expressed Styles are each person’s primary, secondary or tertiary styles (any style above the midline on the individual graphs).
Your individual team members will be listed under their respective style.
The "D" Styles in your Group:

Appreciate them for:

- Quick and confident decision making
- Moving projects forward, creating a sense of urgency
- Making decisions, taking risks
- Seeing goals and working to achieve them
- Wanting to beat the competition
- Being confident about their goals and progress

Limitations for them:
• They can be quick to react or "see red"
• Can become easily frustrated with non-producers May not listen well or accept opinions of others
• Can be stubborn or unwilling to back down
• Can think of things as either black or white May be intense in tone and body language

They become frustrated with others for:
• Over-analyzing information
• Thinking about the steps and not the end goal
• Being overly sensitive or showing weakness
• Moving slowly, not showing results
• Not being decisive or being indirect

Tips for improving communication with them:
• Focus on solutions instead of why things won’t work
• Don’t ramble or use hints—be direct
• Don’t overly focus on details
• Have information ready and being able to solve problems

The "I" Styles in your Group:

Appreciate them for:
• Being optimistic, charisma c and passionate
• Their ease with engaging and being talkative with everyone
• Creative thinking, brainstorming, originality
• Motivating and inspiring others
• Creating a positive and fun work environment
• Their ability for presentation, articulation and demonstration

Limitations for them:
• They may be bored or distracted with repetitive or detail-oriented tasks
• Can over promise and lack follow through because of their people-pleasing nature
• Their verbal, talkative or outgoing nature can be uncomfortable for some
• They may become highly emotional, animated and unstructured
• Can be overly sensitive to rejection
• They can change direction or be impulsive
They become frustrated with others who:

- Are disinterested in them, they view as rejection
- Are overly cautious or bound by rules or structure
- Take away their personal freedom, flexibility or fun
- Appear to be introverted, shy, or non-communicative Operate in set systems that don't change or evolve

Tips for improving communication with them:

- Be positive, engaging and show interest in them and their ideas
- Surround them with others who can manage their details
- Be enthusiastic and show friendly body language
- Provide opportunities for them to use their people and presentation skills

The "S" Styles in your Group:

Appreciate them for:

- Their ability to create a harmonious environment and make peace
- Their strong follow-through, consistency and practical nature
- Being reliable, responsible, and loyal to the team
- How they can be empathetic, understanding, humble and supportive
- How they can create consensus and be diplomatic with sensitive issues
- Loyal co-workers, managers, and leaders

Limitations for them:

- They don't want changes, prefer to know well in advance
- Would prefer to avoid conflict or controversy at all costs
- May act out in passive aggressive ways
- May manipulate rather than being direct or risking stability of relationships
- They would rather not speak up or speak out, and prefers the background
- Can become possessive if feeling threatened
- May give up if too difficult or if it requires too much independence or instability

They become frustrated with others who:

- Are aggressive, pushy or demanding
- Take advantage of their good nature
- Don't show appreciation for all they do
- Change goals or environments
- Take risks or who are impractical or impulsive
Tips for improving communication with them:

- Talk about meaningful things concerning their life, family, things they care about
- Surround with others who they can identify with and build relationships
- Be open, supportive and appreciative of them
- Establish trust and honesty

The "C" Styles in your Group:

Appreciate them for:

- How they can be thorough, thoughtful and accurate
- Their ability to work hard, be disciplined and diligent
- Being practical, loyal, and dependable
- Their knack for being highly skilled, to achieve mastery and expertise in their field
- Their ability to work independently and stay on task

Limitations for them:

- Slow decision makers because they want to gather all information first
- Would prefer to avoid conflict or controversy at all costs
- They crave recognition and appreciation for their hard work
- Their need to complete a task before moving on
- Their high standards of quality can hold them back from completion Criticism of their work is taken personally

They become frustrated with others who:

- Overlook details or are vague
- Make decisions without research or all information
- Have unrealistic me frames and expectations
- Are critical of their work
- Think that something is simpler than it actually is. Don't allow them to finish what they started

Tips for improving communication with them:

- Be as specific as possible
- Allow them to work independently
- Allow them to establish their own process
- Let them finish a task with quality
- Compliment their high-quality work
- Be patient with them
Your Group's Combined Style is: SC

By averaging all the points on all team member’s third graphs, you can see the combined style of your entire team. The higher the point on your graph, the more energy your group devotes to the dimensions of that personality style. Conversely, the lower the point on your graph, the less energy your group devotes to that behavioral dimension.

The middle of the graph "0" is the midline or "average" energy. This group is focused both on tasks and on people. Because your team represents an S and a C above the midline, there will be a focus on teamwork, people, and processes. Both Styles are passive, which means that this team will move at a slower pace, and may struggle with confrontation.

This group is kind, steady, agreeable and has members who are skilled at managing detailed processes. They show sincere concern for others and desire a peaceful and passive environment that is free from conflict or aggressiveness. This group is cautious when it comes to decisions; they like to evaluate situations carefully weighing the pros and cons, comparing and contrasting elements, or thinking about how the outcome will affect people. If they feel someone is taking advantage of a situation, they will slow down processes so that they can watch and evaluate what is going on around them.

This group can be counted on to carry out tasks correctly. They have the ability to observe detailed procedures, guidelines and schema. With the right amount of aptitude and self-discipline, the members of this group can achieve high levels of competency; they may then develop an expertise in a highly specialized occupation. A lot of members of this group place a high importance on accuracy and precision and desire to have quality be their hallmark. This group prefers to have exact facts and figures when making a decision. It excels when given specific feedback, guidelines and deadlines. The more they know in advance, the more effective they can be. To this group, information is power.
Your Group's Emphasis

This Group will place emphasis on:

S Style:

Accomplishing goals and individual roles in collaboration with one another
Checking in with one another to ensure that everyone is onboard with a plan
Finding easier ways to accomplish tasks
Working on one project (or aspect of a project) at a time

C Style:

Accomplishing tasks the correct way using research-validated processes, creating systems
Researching options, making sure the data supports the group’s choices
Having enough time to think a project through, doing tasks the right way, creating high-quality work

This Group will place less emphasis on:

I Style and D Style:

The least represented Styles on this team are I and D. These are both active Styles, so this team may be lacking an emphasis on progress, change, and swift results. The D Style personality is very results driven and decisive. Without it, there may not be a sufficient amount of time spent considering the bottom line or progress, and this team could struggle with making decisions and dealing with confrontation. There is also a lack of I Styles on this team. The lack of I Style personalities on this team means that there may not be any active and people-oriented individuals making it their mission to be optimistic when things get tense and to keep things positive and fun, and morale may suffer as a result.

Tips for the SC Group:

Tip 1: Create Systems to Help You Stay Organized

The S Style personalities enjoy routine and security, and will desire the creation of systems to solidify expectations. If this team can find a way to systematically double check their work to ensure that they haven’t neglected any important information, they can be more effective. The C Styles tend to be perfectionists. They excel at creating accurate, high-quality, detail-oriented work. Because of this, the C is excellent at organizing and analyzing. Set up systems like notifications on the calendar,
making lists, etc. Collaborate on which systems should be put in place to assist with organization. These can include project management systems, ticketing systems, shared calendars, organizing folders on your computer, and more. Decide together what will work best for you. Both S and C Styles prefer systematic approaches to projects, and the S Styles will enjoy the sense of security they will feel once their roles and goals are clearly defined. The better the team is organized as a whole, the better communication will be and the more clearly information will be transferred. S Styles like to move at a slow, steady, and consistent pace. But sometimes this slow pace may mean that the team doesn’t accomplish as much as it could. Try to gently encourage the S Styles to be a little more self-reliant and to move a little bit quicker to achieve goals by deadlines. And if there isn’t an organizational system in place to establish and enforce deadlines, create an impersonal system to enforce this. That way, when the deadline approaches, it isn’t an individual that is pressuring them to hurry up, but the deadline itself.

Tip 2: Recognize Each Other for Work Well Done

Everyone on this team wants recognition, appreciation for hard work, and approval from others. S Style personalities respond favorably to personal recognition for their accomplishments, and may feel rejected or disappointed when their efforts go unnoticed. C Styles hold themselves to very high standards, and appreciate the recognition of their unparalleled work. Acknowledging progress, contribution, good ideas, and the hard work of individuals will go a long way toward keeping people motivated and keeping productivity at the desired pace.

Tip 3: Try to Pick Up the Pace a Little

The S Style personalities on this team are people oriented and prefer to collaborate and work in a group environment where they have clear expectations lined out for them. This entails a lot of discussion, and since S Styles don’t want to disrupt the harmony of the group by stepping on anyone’s toes, they probably don’t want to make many firm decisions. The C Styles are also hesitant to make decisions, they prefer to do an exhaustive, comprehensive search for relevant data before they decide. They don’t fear the disapproval of the team so much as they fear making the incorrect choice because they made an incorrect analysis of the data. These aspects of the S Style, while they create a positive work environment, can impede upon people’s abilities to accomplish their goals and complete their tasks. S Styles like to move at a slow, steady, and consistent pace. C Styles like to move at a slow pace because they tend toward perfectionism. But sometimes this slow pace may mean that the team doesn’t accomplish as much as it could. Try to gently encourage the S Styles to be a little more self-reliant and to move a little more quickly to achieve goals by deadlines. And try to encourage the C Styles to understand when it is important to do work that is perfect, and when it is more of a priority to finish projects quickly.
Tip 4: Use Your Strengths

Make sure to use the strengths of all of the styles wisely. If new projects require a systematic approach, consider asking an S Style personality to engage in this task, as they excel at executing discrete tasks. Avoid being too critical when explaining why a plan or idea will not work with the S Styles. Offer solutions and feedback that will help the team reach their goals. The C Styles strengths include their ability to be accurate analysts who create unparalleled work. When given sufficient me to meet their own extremely high standards, the C can produce excellent results. Avoid giving the C a rushed deadline and insufficient alone me to accomplish their tasks.

Tip 5: Work on Communication

Be sure to work on listening to one another. The S’s can sometimes misinterpret the C’s coolness as personal rejection and may push to build a relationship too soon. The C’s can be concerned that the S isn’t precise enough, and may ignore the S’s need to develop a relationship. The S’s should attempt to present facts clearly when speaking with a C Style, and be well prepared for discussion, remove any potential threats, expect the C’s to express doubts and give them me to evaluate data before making a decision. When communicating with each other, remember that the differences between the personalities can be complementary. You can use the strengths of each style to buffer the potential weaknesses of another.

Group Dynamics - Under Stress

Your Group’s Combined Style Under Stress: SC

Normal style is SC  Stress style is SC
Another unique phenomenon to explore is how your team changes under pressure. Different groups respond to pressure differently, and knowing how your team handles inevitable stress will help team leaders and members know where to develop better "coping" mechanisms.

For example, the collective "mood" of a group can become more aggressive or passive under stress. Where one group tends to react to adversity by choosing to be more self-reliant, another will react to the same situation by reaching out to others for help or support.

Knowing the tendencies of your group and how they react to pressure is vital to effective planning and decision making. Identifying the group dynamics under stress can provide an objective view of your group's tendencies.

Note the graphs above. Which behavioral dimensions intensify under pressure? Which dimensions does your team devote even less energy towards?

**How Your Group Responds to Stress**

Take a look at your group's combined stress graph. Compare the graph points on the stress graph to the points on the normal graph:
If your Group’s D Goes Up:
Group results & timelines will become more
Individual results will gain emphasis
Decisions will be made more quickly Pressure will increase on the group in general

If your Group’s I Goes Up:
Collaboration will increase
Group discussion will increase
Verbal problem solving will take place
Group energy & optimism may improve

If your Group’s S Goes Up:
Group consensus will be more important Focus will increase on tried and true methods
A stronger emphasis on group’s well-being Routine and stability will increase

If your Group’s C Goes Up:
Attention to detail & organization will increase Conflicts will be avoided Research will increase, in hopes of basing decisions on information
Sensitivity to criticism will increase

If your Group’s D Goes Down:
Group results & timelines may become more flexible
Decision making may slow and more reflection will take place
Decisions will be made more based on information
May take less risks, becoming more cautious

If your Group’s I Goes Down:
The group will become quieter
Increase in individual work
Energy & optimism may decrease
More tasks may get accomplished

If your Group’s S Goes Down:
More openness to change and risk taking
Consensus will be less important
Work will become more individualized More “out of the box” thinking will take place

If your Group’s C Goes Down:
Attention to detail & organization will decrease The pace may increase Decisions may be made more quickly, without the need for as much information
More likely to take risks
Group Dynamics

Groups are dynamic and effective when they move towards a common goal. Like individuals, groups can become specialized around the requirements to achieve their objective. Think about your group's goals and check the chart below. Does your group have the dynamics necessary to achieve its goals?

**COLLABORATING (MEDIUM) -**

Your team values relationships and will work to preserve and nurture team relationships. Equally important is your group's focus on task accomplishment. Your group wants to please others and so will want to move tasks ahead and accomplish project goals. This team is in a good position to collaborate and relate well, yet not to get caught up in social aspects of group work.

**CREATING (MEDIUM).**

Your team is more comfortable moving ahead in areas in which you have experience and proven results. Sometimes you prefer to have the pace slowed down a bit so that one project can be completed before another venture is begun. Your creativity can sometimes give way to safety, but don't be afraid to take risks and be original.

**DETAILING (MEDIUM) -**

Others appreciate it when this group takes the me to make sure the little things get done. This group has a tendency to start at a quick pace but not complete the task. Remember the necessity of paperwork and details so that you can add value to your other stronger traits. This group has the ability to logically look at a situation and rearrange things for a more efficient operation. The members of this group pay attention to even the smallest details and put the finishing touches on projects. This group likes to operate in surroundings that are neat and efficient and they appreciate it when others follow suit.
DIRECTING (MEDIUM) -

Your team has a good combination of task and people orientation; realizing that both are critical to a healthy team. Your group's ability to direct others and hold others accountable is good overall, however you may work on your group's leadership and their ability to hold member's feet to the fire. Your group may not always have the tenacity to plow through your task list quickly, but you get the job done and with quality.

INFLUENCING (MEDIUM) -

Leading and influencing as a group is not something that comes naturally to your team. However, you are able to set goals and accomplish tasks and step up to the plate as necessary. Your group has a balance between leading and following, which is great because you should be able to both plan and execute your plan. Your team can probably harmonize well in most capacities, but don’t be afraid to show your assertiveness when necessary.

PERSISTING (MEDIUM) -

Your group consists of strong, steady workers who want to do quality work. Sometimes they may begin to look at other alternatives to completing a project when the going starts getting rough. Encourage your group not to quit nor lose focus on what they have started. Others like working together with your group because they typically do more than their share of whatever is required, and this makes the entire project look good. This group likes to maintain a hands-on approach and will let others visibly see that they are team players.

PROCESSING (HIGH) -

Your group likes to be "hands on" and are great at following through and finishing strong. Others rely on your team to make systems work like a well-oiled machine. Your group may have a hard time delegating, but you are willing to delegate tasks when a project is larger than you can handle. Your group is comprised of team players who genuinely care about each other and can be loyal to the objectives and tasks at hand. Your group’s value is in your ability to take ideas, create a system and execute the plan.

Group Dynamics Worksheet

Does this team have a leader? If so, determine the personality style of the leader(s) on this team by looking at their individual graphs. Does the leader’s style guide the culture of the team?

Look at your team's individual graphs. Of the expressed styles (over the midline) which team members have the most intense styles? How does the intensity of those behavioral styles impact your team?

Do you see any dimensions of the "Group Dynamics" graph that your team would benefit by working on?
Strategies for Success

1) What are some of the traits of that culture that you view as positive for your team?

2) What are some of the traits of that culture that you view as negative for your team?

3) What strategies can you set in place to turn the negatives into positives?

4) Are the members of your team each placed within their areas of strength? Who is the most organized? Who is the best at multi-tasking? Who produces the fastest results? Are there any ways that the team could better place people in their areas of strengths?

5) Are there any strategies put into place that would get that person the resources they need (realistic deadlines, more information, more team work, more quiet me, etc.?)
Appendix T.

Initial Codes

Concepts from the literature were used to define the codes or coding concepts.

**Initial Codes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Question</th>
<th>Initial Codes</th>
<th>Code Definition</th>
<th>Number of Occurrences of Code</th>
<th>Direct Quotes that Illustrate the Code (Source)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RQ1: How do DISC personality traits influence routine team communication?</td>
<td>Using humor, creating trust, conflict resolution</td>
<td>Building team relationships through honest communication</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>“I've done that with my husband. I'm trying to figure him out”. FGP6  “Didn’t he tell you not to do that?” FGP3 “I guess having to accept other points of view on certain things. Everybody's got something different to bring to the table”. FGP2 “...you could tell that people that you kind of have ... I won't say conflict with ... But, differences of opinion with, would be in the other groups”. FGP6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Codes that participants discussed both communication and change Reported in RQ1 results</td>
<td>Dominant (D), Influencing (I), Steadiness (S), Conscientious (C)</td>
<td>Application of DISC traits to self and others</td>
<td>1204</td>
<td>“Well my general characteristics are enthusiastic, fun, loving, trusting, optimistic, persuasive, talkative, relational, and people oriented”. IP9 “Overall, it helped put some things in perspective for me. It helped me understand some sort of why I do what I do, why I tend to lean...” IP9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expectations and behaviors of the Chief and leaders</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Practical uses of DISC traits and assessment results in personal, department, team and community application</td>
<td></td>
<td>224</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Increased: Personal life Team awareness/effectiveness Field/Community awareness</td>
<td></td>
<td>142</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RQ2: How do DISC personality traits influence routine team's adapting to change?

| Job awareness and readiness/receptivity to change w/ positive or negative impact | Participants’ use of DISC trait information to assess personal/team readiness for current processes or upcoming change initiatives. | 146 | “…I lay out very clear, defined goals and some of it, I say, you tell me how it's going to work. I think that generates a lot of discussion and fear sometimes, but then when they see it succeed. I think that there's a good mix there of letting people know what is expected, clearly define the goals, but also give them some wiggle room to come up with their own ideas”. IP13  
“Now, with the Chief, it's more involvement with everyone it seems like in the decisions. He's keeping everyone up to speed, so-to-speak, on where we're going and what we're doing, and what his reasons are. Everybody's involved, so you get everybody involved, then you've got a decent body. You're invested in it”. FGP6 |
Appendix U.

Themes Defined

After the DISC participant profile was coded, the focus group interview transcript coded, then the 13 individual interviews were coded. The three different data source codes are reported together as common themes and overlapping codes emerged.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relationship to research questions</th>
<th>Interview or Focus Group Question #</th>
<th>Words or Phrases</th>
<th>Emerging Themes Defined</th>
<th>Theme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RQ1</td>
<td>Int. 1-15, 25-27 FG 6, 8, 10</td>
<td>Innovation, ideas, community, input, feedback, communicate, cooperation, humor, trust, team, strengths, limitations, motivation, leadership, problem-solving, decision-making, listening, language, conflict, resolution</td>
<td>This thematic category related to how participants applied DISC trait knowledge for personal and team communication.</td>
<td>Communication Implications: Personal and team communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RQ1</td>
<td>FG 1, 2, 3, 9, 10, 11, 12 Int. 1-27</td>
<td>Control, administration, leadership- natural or grudging, desires to or not to lead, impatient, listening, change-accepts or resists, decisive/indecisive, persuasive, cheerleader, enthusiastic, detail-oriented or lack of, low or high follow-through, sensitive, likes/dislikes routine, perfectionist, accuracy, critical, field report calls, citizens &amp; community, team, family, improved team effectiveness, building relationships, right fit of position/person, follow-through, input, communication, chief, leaders. FGP1-FGP6, IP1-IP13</td>
<td>This thematic category included how participants identified &amp; applied the traits of Dominance (D), Influencing (I), Steadiness (S), &amp; Conscientiousness (C) to various aspects (personal, field, community, team, relationships, leadership expectations) of daily communication</td>
<td>DISC Trait Application &amp; Practical Uses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RQ2</td>
<td>FG 4, 5, 7 Int. 16-27</td>
<td>Self &amp; job awareness, accept, conduct, plan &amp; implement change,</td>
<td>This thematic category related to the increase of self &amp; job awareness of</td>
<td>Change implications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work environment, plan for future change, changing work assignments.</td>
<td>FGP1, RGP3, FGP6, IP2, IP7, IP9, IP12, IP13</td>
<td>adapting to &amp; planning for change in daily routines &amp; initiatives.</td>
<td>Awareness in self and team to accept change and others</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix V.

Significant Responses

To Research Question 1 - How do DISC personality traits influence routine communication?

“I think they talk from the top down. I think before, the top talked and we did. Now, it trails down. It's a little bit better communication. I think the chief, he gets his vision, a little bit more to the lieutenants, getting things in place. We're not really there yet to move forward. We're kind of at that settling from what has happened. We definitely had change, but it's kind of getting those things in place, and you can see that a little better now, whereas before, it was kind of muddy. You knew something was going to happen but there was no communication on how or when. That's improved a lot. Still, nowhere near where it needs to be, but again you've got to accept some time to settle in, to bear change as well”. (FGP6)

“I thought it was a good learning environment, just seeing how other people are, because like I said, some people actually shocked me on the list. I didn't think they would get that. But yeah, it's good. Now we can come together as a department to see how each other works and all that, and I guess make the department better than it already is”. (IP1)

“We actually just yesterday responded to a domestic call. The guy had a knife, and I came in thinking it was going to be one thing, and it totally turned out to be an opposite, so like totally something different. I went over there, talked to the gentleman, had the other officers on scene talk to his wife because it was a domestic situation”. (IP1)

“Yeah. It actually helped me with the communications. Sometimes I had problems getting out to people. They think I'm being rude and all that, but now that we got this in play and all, it's actually helped me to talk to them more on a one-on-one basis and I guess not seem so much as a jerk”. (IP1)

“I mean just going back to the relating topic, just relating to the community, you got to know how they feel. I personally try to get on a one-on-one basis with the community to see what I can do better as a whole and what we're doing good as a whole”. (IP1)

“Just for the directing. Like to be a good leader you've got to actually be confident and lead people in the right direction, so that actually helped me with that. I guess relating as well. When you're talking to like the community on just say different scenes and stuff, you got to actually relate to their problem. You can't go in there and like totally opposite, because you're not going to be able to understand them much. I think it's a good thing and it's helped me out like relating as well, just talking to the community and all that”. (IP1)

“I see where it says listening under the S for me. I tend to listen a lot more than I do giving orders out and all that, so I think that's helping me out a lot with the department. I see that being a good thing as well, because in order to be a good department you've got to listen to the command staff and follow what they're going through, and they've got to listen to their bosses in order to make the department whole”. (IP1)
“I think it did cover everything; communication, personality traits they have, it basically covered everything that helps people understand why they do things a certain way, what makes them tick, and probably help them understand why the person next to them, what makes them tick”. (IP11)

“Yeah actually I shared this information with my wife back at home. So she gained a little bit better understanding why I do things in a certain manner, so she stops yelling at me for it”. (IP11)

“Use this in helping me get the Chief’s vision out there. Like I said, each person has their own way of perceiving the information it's my job to get it to them in a positive way so they understand it. And then they take that vision to the lower ones. And helping everybody just understand how to communicate if there has been a big disconnect, like I said before with the generational gap between some of these officers and sergeants in their 30’s and 40's and get the 20-something year old, you need to understand how that kid ticks”. (IP11)

“Push them out of comfort zone, over promise without following through, question their motives and their integrity, be overly aggressive or confrontational”. (IP11)

“I think it's like a two-way street, me understanding him and him understanding me. Dealing with some of the people below me as well, their communication style is somewhat confrontational, and I've got to accept that that's how they communicate and I cannot shut down and I have to remain open to what they're saying”. (IP11)

“I think it will help not just me but other people I work with that they know where I'm coming from, why I'm trying to set high standards, you know when he wants it done, he wants it done right the first time. It has helped me be able to get my ideas across to people and help share the vision of the Chief on down”. (IP11)

“Again it falls under their listening style, and when sometime people don't want to talk or are more confrontational, or other people, you need to speak more than they do, because you know they need that direction”. (IP11)

“I'm hoping they would open them up and see how other people communicate, so they learn other people communication styles, and understand like if you go at somebody a certain way, they won't be perceived well, and they may shut down and not get the message. I'm hoping that will help people understand different communication styles as a whole”. (IP11)

“I would know how to talk to my team members from knowing what they scored and stuff”. (IP6)

“Build a favorable, friendly environment, give opportunity to share their vision, share testimonies from others relating to proposed ideas, allow time for independent work, develop participative relationship, create extensions for quality and results of work”. (IP11)

“Being patient, I have learned to before, if something bothers me before I react, get up, walk away, take a drive around the block, come back. Calm down before I do something. The poor listening tends to show, in my opinion that I'm trying to multi-task instead of focusing on that
person... so I've been trying to be more conscious if I'm communicating with somebody I give them my full attention”. (IP11)

“Probably feedback, because when we interact with the community, they will interact with you and tell you how they feel and stuff then and there, but not to let everyone else know within the department or to see how we perform that day when we interact with them. I think the feedback is the problem that we lack with the community and our self”. (IP6)

“Explain to them that if we have a task from ... That we are assigned to that we can start and we can finish it. It won't be left up in the air, not knowing if it's finished or not. I'm a good listener, so that's the good key talking to people, having their trust and their understanding”. (IP6)

“How to communicate with me would be create a favorable environment that is personal and agreeable. Express a genuine interest in them as a person. Provide them with clarification for tasks and answers to how questions. Be patient and give them follow up support. Present ideas or departures from current practice in a nontreating manner. Give them time to adjust. Clearly define goals, procedures, and their role in the overall plan”. (IP6)

“She was crying at one point. She was laughing. She was talking at another point, but depending on how her personality was doing, it literally varied the way I needed to talk to her. In every instance, she was able to calm down again and we were able to do our interview. I got all the answers I needed from her, and it was simple, but before I would have just been pushing and not kind of [inaudible 00:29:48] my characteristics around when I talked to her and things like that as far as just the way I handled her because before I was just like, "Bang, bang, bang, let's get it over and done with. You're drunk. Don't care. Let's go. I got a lot of paperwork to do". But with this I'm able to sit there and talk, and then with other people as well. My big thing is if I do have to take you to jail, why am I taking you to jail for, and how can I stop it from never happening again? With young kids, I like to sit down and talk to them when I'm up at the jail and go, "Look, this is why you're here. This is what you could do not to get here anymore. These are ways that you can establish your time and do something else other than doing dope". It's definitely gave me a better understanding of how to talk to them depending on their personality to get a better result. I think that's going to be awesome”. (IP5)

“Just talking to people. Talking to people and understanding what makes them tick, because you're able to get ... I mean, our goal is when we go out on a call is to get compliance. Some people if you're very pushy, you're going to end up putting them in handcuffs. Other times you're like, "Sir, I just need you to please sit down for a second. I'll explain everything to you in a second". That's a whole lot more ... You're going to get a better reaction out of that sometimes, but it allows you to make these decisions really, really quickly in talking to them, because in a few minutes you understand kind of how they are and how the way you need to talk to them. I just had a lady who I just arrested for DWI, and she had every mood swing that you could feel". (IP5)

“It is. It's always been. Personally, on my shift everybody has more or less always been a pretty good listener, so I haven't really had to deal with a lot of people who weren't good listeners on my shift. But with that being said, since we've gone through this, I think they've become better
listeners all the way around, and everybody is wanting to be more personable with each other. Like I said before, our work environment has completely changed on the way people communicate with each other. So, it's definitely been a beneficial thing to go through”. (IP5)

“Probably verbal. I think a lot of people put up with the nonverbal stuff, but verbal is definitely a big issue when you're communicating with somebody. I think a lot of people pay more attention to what you're saying than what you're doing”. (IP5)

“This has been extremely exciting to be able to get together, take some time, discuss things together, talk about each other in a very positive manner, because all this was done in a very positive manner. Nobody has been beaten down about it. Everybody is like, "Oh, that's what you are? Okay, that's awesome. Cool, man". Nobody is like, "Aww, man. I can't believe you're ... " Everybody is just super ecstatic about what everybody is, so, I mean, I think it's been awesome going through this and being able to better understand your fellow employees and your employers and things like that”. (IP5)

“I mean, we can definitely communicate better with each other, I mean, because I understand what makes other people tick now as far as just because being a little pushy on me doesn't mean that I'm being a little pushy on somebody else. Doesn't work. And then also just in general personalities and what makes them want to do better work and things like that, so I think that's pretty cool, and vice versa. I mean, they're kind of able to understand that, "Okay, don't be pushy with him, because he's going to push back". That's not going to get you anywhere, but what will get you where is if we have a good environment, things like that, and good stability. That's going to make him give you and produce the best work. That's awesome. I mean, I definitely see that leadership is already starting to apply some of these things just in shift briefings and things like that the way they discuss things. They try to use different examples for different people so that everybody can kind of get a good grasp of it”. (IP5)

“Yes, yes. Just because I know I communicate more one way may not be perceived by someone else properly. So, I have to learn to adjust who I'm talking to if that's how they communicate”. (IP11)

“Prior, I'm going to say maybe low to medium and after medium to high. Helped me understand a little bit better how to communicate to people with different styles than I have”. (IP11)

“Well, as far as the way to communicate, especially if I run across somebody who is very similar to me, I can also understand how to communicate better with them and not be pushy and things like that, because in law enforcement we can be very pushy or aggressive when asking questions and things like that, so sometimes it's better for us to take a step back and use a different technique because all these techniques don't work on everybody else and things like that. As far as the way people talk to me, I can kind of, the questions or answers that I give them can also create a communication of better environment and things like that. I think that'll be awesome”. (IP5)

“… it definitely opens your eyes and allows you to ... With going through this, you understand now, "Okay, this is how they are, so if I want to get compliance from them or something like that
or if I need them to help me, this is how I need to discuss it with them so that I can get what I want from them”. So, it's definitely awesome to understand how that works”. (IP5)

“Before you kind of got a general idea of how people function, but this definitely gives you a better understanding of why they are the way they are. Some people have a very dry sense of humor, and now I can kind of see why they're like that. Before it was just kind of like, "Okay, you're weird". (IP5)

“Probably medium to low because I didn't know a lot of people here. I haven't been here very long. But for me personally, it brought a new perspective for me, truthfully, of how I interact and what I am and how I work with things. That kind of thing”. (IP7)

“Well, I think two things. I think you learn again, if you learn the one person that has all D and one person in the department has all C, which is interesting to me, then I think you learn to handle, if you think about it, handle a situation's approach ... The same situation is going to result the same, but I think the approach could be different and get the same result. They're both going to perceive, myself included, that person's going to, just like in communication they like to be communicated one way. Those are bipolar as far as communication, so you try to handle those things differently if you know that. This helps everybody understand, "Hey that's why that person's like that". (IP7)

“Well, I think you learn those strengths. I definitely learned you just have to work on listening and hopefully everybody's in the departments, I think, it's caused everybody, I'm sure to pay more attention to the situation with regard to personality or how somebody interacts. It brings more awareness to things”. (IP7)

“I think it's going to make things more open would be my guess. People now know what other people's thought processes are or how they act to some degree. They already knew that because you interact with them every day, but it gives you a better understanding of why maybe or how to act that way”. (IP7)

“I think I would say, especially in the police department too, but people tend to withhold stuff or hold it inside. They hold what's going on for whatever reason. And outside the police department, for sure. We're normally not dealing with somebody about, "Hey, have a nice day". We're normally dealing with a situation, we get called to a situation, there's a situation that's something…” (IP7)

“I think these characteristics help me interact with that and help share that experience that I've had over my stuff going on at my other division. I can share those experiences with people that are here”. (IP7)

“Because everybody is different. Some people don't do that. Some people they have one way of talking, and they talk that way to everybody, but you can't do that. To be effective you can't do that”. (IP8)

“I think it's challenged me to understand myself better and to understand how I interact in relationships”. (IP7)
“I have to learn to on the strength side when communicating to just develop those relationships and allow them. It's definitely true. I don't do well with being questioned or being confronted”.

(IP7)

“Build a friendly environment, give opportunity for them to share their vision, share testimonials from other referring to proposed ideas, allow time for independent work, develop a relationship, create incentives for quality and results in work”. (IP7)

“I think it just showed me how I do interact and how you learn to listen and learn to interact with other people here. It was interesting for this to see everybody, a lot of similar traits. Everybody's kind of on the same page. Half of the department's on the same page, but the other ones you got to try to interact there differently type of thing”. (IP7)

“I think it's like anything else. It's who you are dealing with. We all have different, as we know now, personalities. If you're dealing with a D, they're going to handle a situation different than a C does. That's just how it's going to be. Or maybe not different, but they're going to perceive it differently. And as we've learned, communicate with them in a different level or a different format or level. Maybe format”. (IP7)

“People like being a part of something. I think they really do, and more than just lip service for the main part. So skin in the game. I think that's how you get your best performance and your best satisfaction from your people. If you have a satisfied employee, you're gonna get better performance out of them. I found that after 25 years of working people, and it was a hard lesson learned. It didn't take me too long to figure out that my pocketbook was definitely influenced by my employees. But now when it was a different arena. It's a different arena, but I understood ... it's still the same principle. People like to be valued, like to feel like their two cents counts and like to participate in some fashion and have some say-so”. (IP4)

“Let's see. For example, like here where it says, "Do not do all the talking", me, I'd rather somebody else do the talking. I guess I just like, I'll work off action. Like, if somebody tells me to go do something, I go do it. I'm more for if we're sitting here in a meeting discussing something, I'd rather you tell me what you need me to do and I'll take care of it versus me come up with something and then you take care of it. Does that make sense?” (IP8)

“Yeah. As far as that, if I'm talking or if I'm giving instructions, yeah, I try to listen and take down everything. But at the same time though, I try to take too much in at one time, and I find myself when I get home at five, "I was supposed to do this". I have to write down notes or I will forget stuff. I try to take too much in I think sometimes than what I'm actually capable of keeping on that one wavelength if that makes sense”. (IP8)

“And it helped me learn how to communicate with other people”. (IP10)

“Okay. How I communicate is build a favorable friendly environment, allow for social activities, give opportunity for them to verbalize about ideas, people and their intuition. Give adequate information for informed decisions. Share testimonials from others relating to proposed ideas. Develop a team atmosphere and participate ... or ... yeah, relationship. Create incentives for their quality of work”. (IP10)
“Right, right. I mean, obviously it shows that the majority of the department is in it for the details, so when communicating with them just make sure that you are presenting details to everyone and stuff like that”. (IP8)

“I mean, we're learning instead of butting heads or being so isolated”. (IP10)

“My small team, we talk it out. And we know that what one person likes, another person may not like and that's okay. But we can give an opinion and we can learn from that opinion, because it may be something that we don't recognize. You know, maybe we do something and it's a challenge to us and we sit back, we reflect about it and it's like, it's a good challenge. I'm going to step up my game. So, there's good communication”. (IP10)

“I think it gave them understanding of where they stand and it teaches them their own strengths and dislikes so that they can communicate with each other”. (IP10)

“I'm people-oriented and I like to communicate with people and not just on a business level. I like for them to feel comfort and to say the police department is a good place”. (IP10)

“I don't think you missed anything. With understanding and given the information that you had, there were a couple things that came up over the last couple weeks, not any major conflicts or anything, but some job descriptions or job duties that I added to some roles that ... Well, one person I just gave them the job description changes and that worked fine. The other person, I had to sit down with, only because I knew, now, their communication style. So, both of them were extremely receptive of it. Both of them have gotten it. Both of them have taken it and ran with it. But just in knowing what I know, I knew that this one I could just give to. And then this one, I'm going to have to sit down with and go over it with them. But if I hadn't had this information, I wouldn't have known to do that”. (IP2)

“For me, thinking the way that I do, if you choose to communicate with someone outside of their communication style and it fails, then you should have known better”. (IP2)

“I would advise them to take an assessment. Even paid for, it's going to be worth it to your agency. Communication in every agency… it's always what people complain about. I've learned that it's not that the information's not going out, but a lot of times, we're not putting out the information in a way that people get it. So, I would say whatever it is that you have to do to find out what makes your people tick, it's worth it because it's going to benefit you down the road”. (IP2)

“Yes. But once you bring all those other personality traits and communicators in, man, all those minds are thinking and they're bringing up different things, so you get better results”. (IP2)

“Well, it influences the way we accomplish our tasks. It would, in my opinion, it would be nice to have as many people from across the board as we can, but with having the Ss and the Cs, you're inherently ... Most of these people are, what we call, the boots on the ground workers, so whatever our goals are, our expectations are, we need to understand that this is how their ... with this communication style and then their personalities, this is how we're going to go about accomplishing these things because, inherently, that's the way we do things”. (IP2)
“Well, when I took this home, we were talking about some of the things. And she told me, because we always have arguments when we do a project together, and she said that the reason that the arguments are is because I'm doing something and she'll ask me a question or whatever, and she feels like I'm ignoring her. I'm hearing what she's saying, but I'm focused on what I am doing ... And she says, "Are you not listening to me? Will you answer me? I asked you three times". And I've heard it, but I'm just doing what I'm doing”.

“Knowing your strengths and weaknesses are always invaluable. Knowing somebody else's is invaluable also. Not to be manipulative at all, but just knowing yourself and just knowing, having to communicate with somebody and how somebody can perceive something that you're doing that you're not seeing in a negative way is nice”.

“I think we're all going to be able to, with having this knowledge, understand what people are with a plan. You get to see how you need to try to relate to people who are different, so you're going to be able to form those communication styles with them. It's not just as simple as saying, "Oh, he's a D". Now you've got something to sit down and look at and go, "Okay. Well, Ds do this. So maybe if I approach him in this way, he's going to hear it completely different". And I've noticed that working with Chief. If I go in, if I tell him a story”.

“Well, I think the great thing is ... I don't know that everybody knows what I am. I know we discussed it. But, say, when we were doing our practical exercises in the thing and I'm in that group with C’s. People get to see me and then they get to write about me, what they agree with, what they don't. So just as I'm looking at different ways to approach them, I think they get to see different ways to approach me, but also understand I may be difficult sometimes, but this is what I bring to the table”.

“Okay. When communicating with me, a logical thinker, prepare your case in advance. Delineate pros and cons of proposed ideas. Support ideas and statements with accurate data. Reassure them that no surprises will occur. Submit an exact job description with a precise explanation of how that task fits into the big picture. Review recommendations with them in a systematic and comprehensive manner. Be specific when agreeing. Disagree with the facts rather than the person when disagreeing. Be patient, persistent, and diplomatic while providing explanations”.

“Right. I don't care how you feel. But the biggest thing for me is, now that I see this and understand that certain people are going to communicate that way, I have to be more open to it, and I have to realize, "Hey. It's not my way". I've got to see how their emotion plays into this, and it's going to help me communicate with them better. I'm not good without the data and the facts. Once I see that, then I can make a decision that it's good or it's going to work or whatever, but just because you think it is or just because you like it that way, it's never been enough for me. I need something to reassure me that this is going to work”.

“She (spouse) read through it. I gave her the document. She's very much, she'll read the entire thing. I get to the meat of it. She giggles. She's like, "This is so you".”
“It kind of shows you who you are as a person and who everybody else is and how that communicates with them. If you want to get something done or if you want to communicate with to someone else within the team, and knowing what their strengths are, how to speak with them is invaluable”. (IP12)

“Okay, on communicating with me, an advisor do: build a favorable, friendly, participative environment. Give opportunity for them to verbalize about ideas, people, and their intuition. Assist them in transferring talk into action. Allow time for stimulating sociable activities. Submit details in writing, but don't dwell on them. Create incentives to follow through on task”. (IP3)

“The only way I know how to answer that is just to be myself. I'm just me. I don't try to push my ideas on anyone else. If you ask my opinion, I'm going to tell you, but I can agree to disagree with just anybody”. (IP3)

“I think it's like I said earlier. This is almost dangerous. Because you could kind of understand how a person works. You can manipulate it. Especially on the road or while working, knowing how somebody is and being able to see that is going to be invaluable. If you put yourself in a situation where you can get a result other than finding yourself in a fight so to speak”. (IP12)

“The ramble and repeat yourself. It's funny because I've had it here too. People started to ramble and I just float away. I see them almost walk away. Not in a bad way. I'm like, just get to the point. What do you want?” (IP12)

“I think we just all had a better understanding of why certain officers communicate the way they do, or react the way they do. It was a complete ... Now, I understand why FGP5 goes out on scene and he handles a situation a different way than I do. Or FGP3 does. I think it just made us all understand each other a little more, really. I'm not sure as far as the community, though”. (FGP1)

“Yeah. Before this, it wasn't an issue. It was just more of a, why am I not getting it? What is it that about I'm saying that they're not picking up? Now I kind of understand”. (IP12)

“It's very self-reflective. I mean it really ... It's almost transparent, but the one thing that I kind of hoped to get out of it was that the agency was going to actually kind of look at some of this stuff, and utilize some of ... Like me for instance in a situation within the agency, that would be beneficial to the agency, and to myself, and how to interact, and talk to one another. So that thing I found very influential, because there are people that I talk to that I was like, man, lighten up, or why are you like this? Now when I was going over all this--... I was like oh, that's why, you know? So it's been great on being able to communicate with people, and not take things maybe so personally”. (IP9)

“Yeah. I think people don't put a lot of thought about when they're communicating, how it may be projecting to somebody else, and it comes across very crass. Do you know what I'm saying? I don't know whether ... I mean, I get that it's their personality, but I think that a lot of people either are afraid to communicate what they're really thinking, and saying to go along with the collective. I think there's a lot of stuff that is ... Or if they're unclear. A lot of people don't say, well what exactly did you mean by that? ... cause if there was 10 people here in a room, and you
told them all the same darn thing, everybody's going to interpret it differently. So, if I'm telling you something, and you take it this way, I would prefer somebody to say, "Hey IP9, what did you mean by that?" To get clarity. Not for less for misinterpretation, and I think people misinterpret a lot, because everybody I just said that they interpret it how they want”. (IP9)

“The direct approach that I take to a lot of things, the people that aren't CD or SI, it can come across as being rude, or harsh, because they're sensitive, I guess. I don't know”. (FGP3)

“I felt like it was dead on. It was helpful to see that. It was kind of hard at the same time, but we have some conflict in my close co-workers, sometimes, so it was helpful to see how different we were on paper, because you don't really look that different as workers”. (FGP6)

“For me, it opened up a line of communication to talk about some discord that's amongst us. That, it's the elephant in the room. You know that you all don't get along about certain things, and it's really about approach. I work with somebody who wants to know the name of my dog, the name of my kids, what we did this weekend, and I'm the kind of person who I don't care to give that information. But, I never thought of that prior to this, and then once I read it I was like, you've got to kind of compromise a little, and embrace that there's going to be some chit-chat and some work. It don't always have to be work. It just opened up communication, and to be able to look at that, the problem for what it was, because you kind of make it into a lot of things it's not”. (FGP6)

“I think that I feel that I'm a very perceptive person, and I'm pretty good at reading people like if they're irritated, or if they're short. I can see that, and I'll just kind of like, I just bend, and flex. I do that in my personal life, I do that in my professional life. It's all one in the same. I just feel like I can read people pretty well, and know when I have to push, and when not to”. (IP9)

“I guess having to accept other points of view on certain things. Everybody's got something different to bring to the table. If everybody brought the same thing, then you only might have one thing, but you don't. Person A brings this, Person B brings this, and C brings this, you can find some sort of common ground to meet the goal that you have set in place. To get the job done, whatever it may be. It might be just going out there and watering that bush, but everybody's going to have a different way of doing it”. (FGP2)

“I would just advise. I would sit down and tell him, to do what you're asking of everybody, so that not only is he understanding his DISC, and what it means about his layer of communication, but that he also takes that and he understands how he needs to communicate with his employees. It could be FGP3, he wants direction. He don't want to play no games, he want to do business. Tell me what I need to do, I want to get it done. Whereas somebody that wants to know, so how are you today? How's your dog doing, and that type of thing”. (FGP4)

“I think it's (communication) got to start somewhere and you started the dialogue. You started the wheels in motion”. (IP13)

“Well, I learned a long time ago that my way doesn't relate to everyone that works for me, so I try to meet those people on their level. I think the biggest thing for me was being able to physically see where they played out and to kind of make a plan on, going forward, how I'm
going to communicate with them. Because apparently, some people get kind of lost in it. You're trying your best to relate to them, but you just don't know how. And so, at least with those people, I can see what they are and it gives me a starting point to develop a communication style with them that I hadn't had before. One of the most challenging areas that I've had is in our … They're really good workers, but they have some definite conflicts in there, and it relates to their communication, their personalities, those types of things. So, really, I'm going to use what you've given me to start a better communication style with them, but, also, really expect them to start different communication styles with each other, as well, because that's what's going to make it work”. (IP2)

“I have no problems at all communicating with the community. That is probably the only area that I've been very, very effective in. I think the self-awareness, just the fact of taking the time to look at it, brings it to the forefront of your mind so that you can try to be aware, just like when you are aware of interactions that I have with other folks and the leadership”. (IP4)

“Sure. My strengths would be planning systems and orchestration. Throughout my supervisory career, looking back, now knowing that these are my strengths, I've always taken that role. When things come out, "Hey, I'll take care of this. I'll do that. I'll make sure that this is done". I've always been able to be relied upon as somebody who gets things accomplished, so understanding that that is one of my strengths, that's kind of the role I take when we do have our supervisory or administrative meetings and things come up. That's kind of what I do”. (IP2)

“Like I say, they knew I took it seriously, because of the email that I sent out recently that said, "This is a great program; it's great to know yourself; thank you for all your participation in it". It shows them that I'm in. Of all the things I could have talked about, of all the training, I didn't mention any other training. I put this list out ... These things that are going great, what we're doing and some things and that was in there to say, "Hey, thank you for this and this is important to us as an organization". (IP13)

“Yeah. He wanted to ... At first he kind of wanted to be tucked away and not tell me the full details of what was going on, but after realizing what he was going through, some personal issues, I kind of got on his level and kind of talked to him and ended up working things out”. (IP1)

“Yeah. I've noticed like just looking back at the report, like what people have, you can pretty much spot the people's section or what they are. There are some people in here, I'm not going to mention their names, that shocked me in some sections as well. For a good part though it's not anything bad. Yeah, just looking back at it, you can see how the department gets along as a whole and all that”. (IP1)

“I think it pretty much hit it on the nail. The major one being the S, just due to the fact that I'm not much of a dominant kind of a person. I'm more of a follower than leader. I can lead in some things, but I'd rather take commands from somebody else”. (IP1)

“And I think that this will help them understand that, and help get the vision out there, help this department run more smoothly”. (IP11)
“Impatient, absolutely. Insensitive, poor listener. That was for D. For "S": over sensitive, slow to begin, dislikes change. For "C": perfectionist, critical, unresponsive. The acronym sums it up”. (IP11)

“Overall, it helped put some things in perspective for me. It helped me understand some sort of why I do what I do, why I tend to lean towards the left or the right. It helps me to reaffirm some of the things I already knew. This helped me understand my leadership style a little bit better too”. (IP11)

“Steady and persistent, driven to complete goals, loyal to vision, builds tried and tested methods. Team goals being reached, being able to lead with strong supporters, being able to rely on driven methods, loyalty and help from others to achieve their vision”. (IP11)

“This is really good, knowing what team members, what kind of traits they have so you know how to talk to them and what sets them off and how to move forward”. (IP6)

“It makes me think more of what kind of person I am, because you don't stop and think how you are. You don't look from the outside seeing yourself, so it's really nice to see this kind of person you are to other people”. (IP6)

“It's definitely had a lightning effect as far as it's kind of made everybody a little more mellow around each other and not so amped up, but that could also be because of the change that we've kind of gone through as well. Since we've gone through this process, everybody has really liked it, enjoyed it. Everybody has been excited for it, so it's definitely also helped cheer a lot of people up doing this. I mean, a lot of people have been extremely excited about this. I've enjoyed it”. (IP5)

“Yes, and before I start it I want to know how to do it. I got to have everything in order and do it. I don't like to start, stop, start, stop, so that's always been an issue for me”. (IP5)

“Well, it definitely has me down to a T as far as being a good listener and things like that. It's amazing how you can break things down as a bracket like this and actually fall into categories like this, so it definitely helps you learn a lot about yourself, which you didn't understand”. (IP5)

“As I said earlier, I think what you're going to do is you put people on places that play to their strengths. So this probably helps, if you're looking at that, what people are better suited for whatever position. Whatever that may mean, whether it be detectives or interacting with people or being foot patrol around town. It just depends. You just kind of work your way through that”. (IP7)

“Well, I think everybody has those things that they're good at. And if we bring those together with everybody and we have very diverse personality traits, and if I was scheduling people I probably would look at that and try to balance each shift with people that are off set each other. But I think hopefully we bring different strengths to the table to match those up in place”. (IP7)

“I prefer working alone in controlling my own path and my own destiny, but I can work with others and I do a lot of research for decisions, ask for advice and can sometimes go a year before
I maybe implement. If I wanna purchase something, I might go a year just looking for the bargain in exact what I want”. (IP4)

“Yeah, those ... I came out of an engineering background prior field. So, methodical, process, planning’s very critical to my previous job. I'm more of a starter than a finisher. So it's easy for me to start a project and be excited and enthusiastic, but then about midway through, I'm ready for the next project. So, I have to really kind of force myself to complete the project”. (IP4)

“Yeah. To me, yeah, I know what the visions are and I know what the plan is a year from now, six months, and I'm even more into it just in the position I'm in now, but as far as that overall vision, I don't look at it every day because I have right now probably 40 little projects that are going on. In order to obtain that vision, I've got to get my stuff done. I don't really look at the whole grand scheme. I mean, I see it. At the end of the day when I go home, yeah, we're headed in the right direction. I have no doubt about that, but to me there's a lot that's got to be done… But me, in order for the vision to be accomplished, I've got to get my stuff done”. (IP8)

“I think after being through so much, through the different chiefs and personnel that we've had, I see him moving in the right direction. I see caring from him. I still don't see the whole big picture, because I'm not involved in their meetings, you know, I still do my job. But I feel like he does want to make us the best department that we can be. And I feel like he challenges us. I feel like that he has brought education where we have not had that before”. (IP10)

“I was very surprised because at first I didn't know, I guess I was a skeptic of everything, but then it kind of hit the nail on the head on a lot of them for me. But, yeah, it explained me very well”. (IP8)

“I am a steady hard worker, analytical. Motivates others to achieve by aiding and assisting. Good leader if parameters are clearly defined and very relational and approachable”. (IP10)

“Okay, for I it's persuading, enthusiasm, entertaining and my challenges is lack of detail, short attention span and low follow-through”. (IP10)

“Yeah, we just are able to just go sit in there. I get excited telling my friends about it because they never heard of it either and they're like, "Wow". So, I went to the website, I found it, some different things, and I sent it to them and they're like, "Oh, gosh. I'm going to see if this police department ..." because they work for different agencies, if they utilize it or have heard of it”. (IP10)

“It was very amazing. It just brought light and attention to some things I knew and some things I didn't know”. (IP10)

“I was like, "How can you answer a few questions and get all this about yourself?" (IP10)

“Okay, my general characteristics is steady, reliable, loyal, relational, team and family oriented, does things right the first time, enthusiastic, optimistic and practical. And I'm motivated by sincere appreciation and acceptance, a family environment, ability to have a balance between work and play and clear definition of the role and expectations”. (IP10)
“... your car better be clean, those types of things. They've always been my expectations upon others because I've set that for myself. And understanding inherently, it's harder for some people. Some people would say, "Hey, I do a really good job, but, yeah, my car's not clean". (IP2)

“Well, I accept change, slow and deliberate change. With Chief, there is nothing slow. Everything is deliberate, but there is nothing slow. So we've had numerous conversations, where he's like, "Get out of your OCD box. Just go with me. Just go with me". I've had to step out on a leap of faith and do those things, so it's becoming easier. But, for me, it's hard. I want to know, or at least have a good idea, that it's going to work before I go through all the steps, and so I'm learning”. (IP2)

“Well, yeah. I've been through some other personality surveys through police supervision and leadership institutes, and there's various things that I took from each one. But what I took from this one, specifically, was that I went back ... and I'm in a fairly new role now, but I was patrol sergeant for 11 years. And when I look back at some of these things that I've read, I saw how I am really influenced the way I ran my shift and the difference between my shift and the three other shifts. An example of that would be when we take reports, say it's a fraud investigation or a larceny or whatever, I've always been the type of person that expected all of my officers to work it through to completion. So every other supervisor would just mark a box, send it up to detectives, but I pushed my guys to follow this thing through, so we could either close it out or we could arrest the bad guy”. (IP2)

“Well, I'll be completely honest. The way I view using this in my role is when we're putting together structure, and we're assigning people for specific tasks, whether it be a community relations position or being community officer for that shift or traffics, narcotic, whatever it is. I'm going to utilize this to see what their communication styles are because, inherently, you're going to need people that, especially in the community role, that are not going to be closed in, that are going to be willing to ... good listeners because those people want to be heard. I'm going to use it, as far as putting together specialty positions and tasks and that type of thing”. (IP2)

“No, not really. I think from the start to now, it's been pretty outlined. It's pretty obvious what's happening. Yeah, I honestly wouldn't change anything or add anything to it. It's nice”. (IP12)

“I don't mind being involved; I just don't want to be the leader”. (IP3)

“I think if everybody, including myself, take the time to really look at it and work on our insecurities or our low points, that, in doing that, we'll all be a better team”. (IP3)

“Actually seeing it and again realizing our traits, this report amazed me, it really did. 'Cause I looked at it and I'm like, "That's me". I mean, and it was like, compared to the questions, nothing in my understanding, nothing question-wise would have made me think it would come out to this”. (IP3)

“Well, I think from understanding who we are, but I think the results of the team would be making sure that our teams are put together with people that have, I guess, complementing or different styles. If everybody on the team is a C, you're going to get a certain standard of production. If you have Cs and Ss, you're going to have a different standard of production. If you
have a C, an S, and an I, you're going to get a little bit better. It's kind of like planning a party. If all of them are Cs, you're going to have a certain type of party”. (IP2)

“What I have learned ... I think this is what you're asking me. What I have learned. The main thing I have learned is to pay attention to other people's personalities and try to coincide with their personalities. You know, everybody's not going to have my personality, and I'm not going to have everybody's personality, but to work with people, try to think about more how they would take what I say to them. Or, how I would do something for them”. (IP3)

“I think it makes sense. I think you have some natural leaders and you have some people who are just natural followers. The detailing side is great. We should be. I think that it makes sense to see where people are in positions where they're in versus where they rate on this scale. It's not to say that some people here shouldn't be in leadership. It's just, I can see what's, you can see the flow of the police department just based on this. It's kind of nice. (IP12)

“It's kind of low before. Now, I would say medium now. Because all we have is two letters based on the person. You don't really have a good, I haven't really been through everything. I think it's nice to see. I think it's nice to know who you're working with. Honestly, how to come together as a general team. It's nice”. (IP12)

“Not saying what's on their mind, just kind of beating around the bush. If something's on her mind, if there's an issue there, an underlying issue or if there's, just come out with it so we can work on the issue, not just beat around it and let it go for a while. Might as well spearhead it now and get it resolved and sit there and let it ...” (IP12)

“You got some people that are not teachers, and instructors, and they have no business. You got to be a people person. You got to be able to listen. You got to have some patience. A lot of people shouldn't be in that S spot. Community pleasing. That takes a certain kind of personality to do that. It takes a certain kind of personality to do a lot of stuff, but you're going to have certain people that are much stronger in those areas that maybe the agency should look at in facilitating those people, or that's just kind of how I look at it”. (IP9)

“You're probably most likely to oversee another project. Sometimes I like to skip to somebody else. Especially when it's tight, the deadline. I do work well. I actually feel like I thrive in what needs to happen now and that tight deadline so to speak. Your team's values, your team values your work ethic. You may appear a bit distant at times, but your attention to detail and your inner drive causes others to respect what they see of you, is pretty much what it says”. (IP12)

“Yeah. We actually do get along pretty well. I don't think there's a, I mean, I value what he's saying and I know he knows what he's talking about. I think it's vice versa. As far as my do's and don'ts, I looked at that and I got to the meat of it. That whole ramble and me floating off, I'm getting better at that”. (IP12)

“I've done these before, and I've never had nothing like this detailed. This was really nice to see”. (IP12)
“Administration and leadership and determination. The challenges are I'm impatient, I'm insensitive, and I'm a poor listener. Yeah, I can you very, I agree more with the D side than I do in some of the C's. I know that perhaps I'm showing a different kind of a fluctuation. I am going through a little bit of a change”. (IP12)

“As far as my squad, my group. Yeah, I think that the funny thing is we both throw up our I's, our S's, and our C's at each other. I'll go, yep. I said don't give me no grief. You handle that. That's all you IP9, and you know, it's great that it sort of helped us understand each other a little bit more. This is great. It helps us to understand to self-reflect when we're doing something, because this has helped bring the things that we need to work on into light so we can sort of start adapting it into our entrepreneurial world. Try to put a little bit more strength in our weaknesses, but also utilizing the other team members as great resources for the things that we're weak in. I think that's what's happened a lot. When I found myself doing it, and I find them doing it with me. That has been something that's been really good”. (IP9)

“I thought it was spot on. Whenever I realized what category I was in, I thought it was spot on, and it was just like me. Other than a little few things, I believe. I felt mine was accurate. I couldn't believe how close to it being accurate it was. Whenever we were doing the test online, and the result came in”. (FGP1)

“I said, even to my wife, I said read this, and she said, "Oh my God, this is scary". It was definitely interesting to see on paper how we act, and just from those questions. We had four to choose from for each question. Four answers, and I was looking for something in between.... You had to pick, and just doing that, to get the results that we did, it was eye opening”. (FGP3)

“It was hard to look at your strengths and your opportunities, because sometimes your strengths are really not, are negatives. You make them be negative, or I make them be negative, because being a perfectionist, it's not always the best thing to do, especially in this environment. You really can't, it can't be perfect. That interferes sometimes with expecting someone else to do something the way that you would do it”. (FGP6)

“We get each other. We do, but I just think that I again, I know I've said this several times. I think just really utilizing. If there is something that comes up with the agency I think that I would like the agency to go through, and say hey, whether it's you, him, her, or me, hey let's really talk to that person about this, because they would be better suited. They would flourish more for themselves in the department. In the agency. That's what I kind of hope that his plans are, and I don't know what they are”. (IP9)

“But just making sure that he uses this tool to attend to his department, and to the benefit of the employees here. They go through leadership training. He has a time here where he can use this and his other skills to really move this department forward. That's what I would tell him”. (FGP4)

“I think it was, for the most part, spot on”. (IP13)

“One is you lead by example. People here know that I am a steady, hard worker…They want to see that you're capable of doing what you ask them to do. I really instill the training and
education aspect because I want my people to succeed. When I come in, I tell people, "Pay attention, because you're going to have to do my job one day". I'm an open door; I'm a true open door. I've heard that open door before, but I have a true open door. There's a lot of days, you can come into my office and there's 4 or 5 people standing around". (IP13)

“They do. They actually throw that around and they refer back to the material when they're doing this so that's a good thing. It means they paid attention and they're listening. They were really quick to tell me my personalities, which they all knew ... I can't remember the detail ... We were in discussion the other day and somebody brought that up, about my personality, and it was like, "But that didn't surprise me". We were saying it and they said, "But that didn't surprise me because we know that's your personality". (IP13)

“You have to have people from every group to make it successful. If we were all alike, we'd be pretty dull. I think that utilizing that and recognizing what personality they are ... Then you can place them on even different tasks, too. If there's an assignment or we need to look at this and say, "Okay, this person's personality, they would stay over here and they would help us, but they would also drive the other people's side". I think we utilize it. If you're going to do something, you take the material and you utilize it. I think it's going to really help us to become a more creative police department. I really do, because when you take a lot of different personalities and you put them all together, you get some fun stuff out of them”. (IP13)

“I think if you want people to get on board and to follow and to lead, you have to be a good follower before you can be a good leader, if you're following the right people. I think by knowing what's expected. You have to set the expectations. People want those parameters and I'm okay with giving those. This is where we're operating. I'm not going to tell you exactly how to do it, but this is where I want to be. This is where I need to go. You figure out how we get there. That puts some people out of their box, but there's certain pieces of that I lay out very clear, defined goals and some of it, I say, you tell me how it's going to work. I think that generates a lot of discussion and fear sometimes, but then when they see it succeed. I think that there's a good mix there of letting people know what is expected, clearly define the goals, but also give them some wiggle room to come up with their own ideas how it might work". (IP13)

“Right now, our goal has been to put the right person in the right seat on the bus. This helps me greatly, and those people, because they know ... What I've told them to do is figure out where you want to be. Figure out what you want. I don't expect everyone to write a bunch of tickets or to arrest a bunch of drunk drivers. We have to have a good mix; that's what makes us a good team. I think this helps us”. (IP13)

“By applying it. When you walk out the door, not forget about it. You can believe that, when I do training, I always tell people, "We refer back to our training. Go back to this. Don't just forget about it". I'll ask them questions about their training. When I see them and when we're having conversations, some of it's fun stuff, but I'll say, "In that training the other day, what did you pick up?" I will constantly refer back to it, especially about their personalities and where are you strongest so it makes them constantly think about it. I think that's a way that we can utilize to help us is to constantly refer back to where are we at... With your emotions, where are you at ...
Where are you at as far as where you want to be and how you want to succeed? If you're wanting to be a supervisor, you know you need to identify where your strengths and weaknesses are and how you're going to improve that. What training do you need, what mentorship do you need to get you there? You constantly refer back to it. If not, then we have wasted a lot of your time and our time”. (IP13)

“No, I am very thankful that we have been able to do this. It was not the perfect timing with everything that happened, but we had to stay on track with it... I'm very thankful that we did it and I think it's going to be a great tool for us. You can believe that it will be utilized”. (IP13)

“Like I say, they knew I took it serious, because of the email that I sent out recently that said, "This is a great program; it's great to know yourself; thank you for all your participation in it". It shows them that I'm in. Of all the things I could have talked about, of all the training, I didn't mention any other training. I put this list out ... These things that are going great, what we're doing and some things and that was in there to say, "Hey, thank you for this and this is important to us as an organization". (IP13)

“I'll say that you guys know that I lack attention to detail. I'll say stuff like, okay sir, I'll get that, you know? That's the one thing that's been kind of great about this is I'll kind of use this like, you guys know how I am”. (IP9)

“Yeah. Can't lie about it. It's black, and white. The one thing from myself I found that I'm trying to be a little bit more detailed in some of the things that I do. It's kind of brought some of those weaknesses to light that even though you know were there, because it's just part of who you are. You're not really focusing on that, you're just like, okay. That's not that important”. (IP9)

“Yeah. I'm not very receptive of that aggression and confrontation. I get very defensive, and horns come out, all kinds of stuff... 'Cause I talk to people the way I want to be spoken to. Ignore my ideas, and accomplishments. Yes. I like to be acknowledged. I like to get the verbal praise, like you're doing a good job, which we don't get very much around here. And make them work alone. Yeah. I like people”. (IP9)

“I think when I do things, and things happen I think that yeah, you can reflect on this, and sit there, and you know, but it's who I am. It's who we are as a collective. The one thing that this has done is it changed my personality in a way, but this is a very people-oriented business. You're dealing with different personalities all day long. I think that my personality's great. Now, the one thing that it does do is a lot of times I'm so friendly that people kind of can try to utilize that. They think that I'm a push over, but I'm not, and I have to try to pull that out of myself, and a lot of times my team members that are not so I, like they make sure that I'm not a push over, but I'm more wanting to know why are you like this, or why is this happening. Finding that solution to a problem”. (IP9)

“We had a recent call and you don't have time to be their social worker, or their counselor. You got a job to do, so a lot of times they'll help me move it along. It's great... A lot of times people out in the field, they'll be like, hey thank you so much for talking to me like a person, not like a criminal, because not a lot of police officers do that. They don't want to talk to you. They're this
way, or that way so they thank me. It's good, but it just doesn't allow my team members knowing how I am, does not allow my personality to kind of get in the way”. (IP9)

To Research Question 2- How do DISC personality traits influence adapting to change?

“I'm going to use what you've given me to start a better communication style with them, but, also, really expect them to start different communication styles with each other, as well, because that's what's going to make it work”. (IP2)

“I'd still say that it was high, but we may be going at it in a different way. More people are open for change, and I think this will kind of help people be open for change”. (IP8)

“I think mine was high just due to the fact that being in the military we see change all the time. Every two years we have a new change of command. It takes time to get used to. I think some people here in the department are getting use to the change and all that too, but I think we're starting to learn and work better as a whole with being as a team”. (IP1)

“Yeah. I guess with human beings in general though you can't please everybody. Some people just want to be happy and some people not, so I guess you just got to get used to working around both people, so I guess kind of meet in the middle kind of thing”. (IP1)

“Like I said, I've seen what other people, their results are, so I'm going to try my best to accommodate them and meet in the middle with them. I know some of the Ss and Cs don't get along with the Ds too much, but I guess there's always a middle that you can meet in”. IP1)

“I see in the section where it says the applicants do not like conflict. I think being in a team and all that and working as a department, you got to get along with each other so that way you can make the job fun and try to prevent less conflict in the department as much as possible, because the more conflict that's in the department, the more people are going to hate coming to the job and enjoying the job. Then that actually affects the job capabilities itself, like if you come into working hating your job, you're more likely to show the anger and aggression towards another individual than coming into work happy and all that, and actually being able to handle the call appropriately”. (IP1)

“Lot of new officers, let them get settled into the role, like we were talking about earlier, and see if this does vary after we have all the pieces together here at the department. Everyone's in the position where they need to be. And what we have we're just rolling on. And just see how the result would be in year time, and compare it to what happened now, and see if there is any fluctuation. New job, new Chief, lot of new, new, new, new”. (IP1)

“Yes, I do know. That's my strength. The challenges are correct. I dislike change, because I don't like to change once I'm with, once I can trust wherever I'm at. Just like a doctor office, I don't change. I'm comfortable where I'm at, trust them. (IP6)

“Well, with the understanding what I like and need, that allows me to ask the questions that I need to ask from administration. If they do make a change, of why they're making that change as opposed to before I probably would have just let it ride and just been frustrated, but now I'll ask why so that I can get an answer and understand why, and that'll help me deal with change a
whole lot better than just sitting there going, "I don't understand why they're doing this". But it's also we're dealing with a different administration, too. When you ask why, you're going to get an answer and not just, "Because I said so". It's a different atmosphere as well, so I completely think that they'll answer our question”. (IP5)

“And this a job where we're always changing so it’s ironic that they fight the change. But like we're always changing; new laws, new procedures, everything. I think it helps open their eyes a little bit that change is not always bad”. (IP11)

“I, like I did more hands on, working close with them, letting them know change is good, it's not going to hurt. And just make sure it’s over in a positive way”. (IP11)

“Police officers do not like change”. (IP11)

“I can't stand change. It takes me a while to actually get with the program when something has changed and get used to it and understand why it has to be changed. Is it being changed for the better? And things like that. I definitely like the security”. (IP5)

“I'm not in tune with that as much, but I think the Chief is doing an excellent, excellent job of bringing positive change and positive influences to everybody here. The morale is exceptionally high. Where before it was not as high. It's just a little bit of time I've been here, I could tell everybody seemed very positive. And I think that's a huge deal. You want everybody to be motivated and excited about what they're doing”. (IP7)

“If you leave me alone, I do my best work. It's when people start coming in to my world that it doesn't go as smoothly. I guess I like control and I think my way is the right way until I'm proven otherwise, and then I'll change it from that way, 'cause I always wanna be on the right way. If you show me there's a better way, I'll think it over to your way, but if you just come to me and say, "You need to do that differently", I'm like, "You're out of your mind, and get out of my face". Give me some reasons and then I'm cool with it. I try not to be too proud to take those facts and it's like, "Man, you know what? I was wrong. I need to change my path". I'll do that but as far as my comfort, just leave me alone”. (IP4)

“One good thing about that, and that goes back a little bit too, since Chief has been here; it's not that we're never going to make mistakes; it's that we're going to stop, fix the mistake and go on. You don't feel like well if I make a mistake I'm going to be fired”. (IP3)

“I thrive in that mindset that we have now because I expect people to go out and make those decisions. I don't want to have to tell you what to do. I want you to do it. But a lot of people aren't comfortable with doing that”. (IP2)

So now, with the new changes that we've put in place, I'm able to meet these things and get satisfaction out of what I do. But now I get it”. (IP2)

“Well, being a part of administration, we have planning talks about everything. So whatever changes are coming up, the chief is not one of those people that keeps those parts to themself. He discusses it fully with his command staff. So anything that's changing going forward, I'm a part of. Understanding the way that people are going to hear it, and accept it, and take it is huge. So
having the information that we have now, we can implement that change a lot better, or communicate that change coming up a lot better, than the way we did it. The old way was just put out a blanket email, and you get what you get”. (IP2)

“There's still some people that are here now, because I've talked to them, that still don't accept change. There's some people in leadership that still do not accept change, and don't understand change, and don't understand how to accept a vision, and follow a vision. Especially, when that's leading to change. I still think there's some embracing of change, at the level in this room. There's probably more embracing of change in here, than some people that aren't in this room”. (FPG4)

“That you're probably overloaded with work because you hate to delegate. You tend to do most things yourself. You believe that for something to be done right you need to do it. That's what I just said, wasn't it? Train others around you to work to your own high standards and delegate to them. Although it may take longer initially, you will be helping others to achieve and grow more. Be willing to accept change and understand it may be necessary for growth and security. Yes, that's for sure. Yeah, I think for it to be done right I have to do it in a lot of cases, but I guess just my standards are higher than a lot of people's. But probably the one thing on here where it says, "Be willing to accept change and understand it", that's probably my weakness in this I guess, because I'll accept it all day long, but I look for the most practical explanation for things or ways of doing things. If somebody is changing it for what I think is the bad, then I'll argue it all day long, but, no, we don't need to change this. But if it's something where obviously it needs to be changed, I'll be the first one to tell you, "Yeah, let's change it. If you want me to do it, I'll do it". (IP8)

“I would say medium, only because I'd had those other types of assessments, and I'm still constantly working on it and trying to change it. That would be the only reason. There has been nothing in my law enforcement career that ever addressed any part of this at all. We're a paramilitary type organization. You do what you're told. When I first started, you don't ask questions. You just, "Thank you, sir. Can I have another?", that type of thing. But that's evolved. It's evolved, so now we've gotten into an era where, not only do we set expectations, but we also give a reason why, and we show a path to get that accomplished. And that path is extremely important because we're held liable as an organization, if I don't give you the tools and show you the way. So it's completely changed”. (IP2)

“Well, sure. Just understanding that influencing, directing, being our lowest two, those are where we're going to need to work on. I think with the influence and the directing, for so long, people have been being held back in that area. People don't feel comfortable with making those decisions themselves. Part of that is putting that responsibility on them. Because they're not used to it, the mentality has been, "If I always call somebody and they tell me what to do, then there's no liability in that", which is completely different from our mindset now. I thrive in that mindset that we have now because I expect people to go out and make those decisions. I don't want to have to tell you what to do. I want you to do it. But a lot of people aren't comfortable with doing that, so”. (IP2)
“When I have someone that wants to be on a team that's all about change and you're not a change agent, well then you're going to struggle there, so maybe you need to really think about that. I think it helps us to put people in the right place. I think this is a great tool to help us, not that you solely go by that, but it's a tool. You use it”. (IP13)

“Well, I don't know that we've had many conflicts to solve, just in the last couple of weeks. I think with a lot of the peacemakers that we have, that there's conflicts there. They just don't bring them to the forefront. It's not dealt with, I guess, which, in my opinion, it is inherently dangerous because once it does blow up, it's a lot worse than just walking through it at the time, because it's a lot easier to deal with it then”. (IP2)

“Just enjoy hanging out with your friends. I think this will ... I think we're going to grow. I think we're going to be strong. I think we're going to have some problems; it's no Santa Claus so to speak, but I only see good things”. (IP3)

“I would prefer things stay the same, than to risk new adventures, unless it is proven and true. This person is typically peaceful and low-key and she's usually seen by associates as a good friend and listener. I tend to adopt a wait-and-see attitude rather than taking charge of a situation, usually preferring to let others take the lead”. (IP3)

“For one, I'll be more conscientious of other people. I'm going to try to not have that fear of change because I have the confidence that any change we make now is for the good not just somebody wanted it done because they wanted it done”. (IP3)

“There's some things I'm really in my box about. It's got to operate exactly this way. I've really pushed him to get out of that box, because that's where you grow. You don't grow in the box”. (IP13)

“Just continuing including us in communication, letting us know what the vision is. Keep us on track, it helps, or knowing the vision helps keep us on track. If the vision changes, or if they're changes ahead, if you are able to give us that information in a decent amount of time so that the people who need time to absorb that change have it. Because we do, and that's one of the main things before, is we were being led in the dark. Most of our personality traits, that wasn't okay”. (FGP6)

“There's a lot of leaders or managers who are very fearful to give up control of things, whereas I bring people in and say, "You need to learn how to do this because I won't be here forever. Here's all the information you need if I'm not here". That's intimidating to a lot of leaders. I'm okay with that, so I think that's pretty point on with motivating because when I sit here and tell them, "I'm releasing this to you to learn how to do it," some of them look at me funny. It's a little overwhelming to them at first, but they're realizing that I'm not afraid to let them learn and to grow and develop. I think that's really good. I'm very relational and approachable”. IP13

“Yeah. I don't know anything but change. I love it because change is what keeps us on our toes. It's what keeps us creative and responsive to the community, because our community constantly changes. Our environment constantly changes; our world constantly changes and I think we have to be fluent with that. I'm very open to change and I try to create a change. I'm regularly referred
to as a change agent by a lot of people, so that's the environment I want to encourage. I'm very open to it”. (IP13)

“I think there's still some resistance to change because I hear a lot of, "We've always done it this way". I say, "Well, that's why we're changing, because obviously, it hasn't worked". I think it's probably medium and I think that the more people see that they're trusted and valued, they're willing to change more. I've seen that through history, which goes back to one of my personality traits: I do things based on my prior experience, and I've seen the more people trust you, the more they trust the environment, the more they're willing to change”. (IP13)

“I implement change by ... I think I come in with a little credibility because most of these people have seen the things I've done in the past that works, so I relate a story to them, "This is how it works. I've seen this". I think that's how, showing them that change is okay because it's happened before and it really benefited the people and they've talked to people from other agencies I've worked. I think that I do try to go back and say, "This will work; this is good; I've seen it". I can share and relate to them. I think that's the piece that's really helped me with a lot of people here ... With a story, and say, "Let me tell you how this worked before," and they can see it”.

Some employees who are not willing to move forward, they can see me as that other person that's like ... Once you get to that point, "Just do it. We're not even discussing it; this is what needs to be done". I think, for the most part, if you are a cooperative person, you will get that side of me: I want to teach you; I want to help you. I'm very hands-on.... I have a lot of employees and a lot of things going on, but I will take that personal time with people and say, "This is how we do it". I think those are spot on”. (IP13)

“With the change that we've just undergone, prior to, I was not looked at as someone who was utilized for anything. I was just a guy out there doing what I do, so I was very frustrated. So now, with the new changes that we've put in place, I'm able to meet these things and get satisfaction out of what I do. But now I get it”. (IP2)

“I guess be more open. Just being more open to everybody else's opinion. I know my way is not the only way, and being something for that. I've done a lot better of that coming over to the police department from the army side. That's the biggest thing for me was just listening to everybody else and accepting their feedback and their ideas and knowing that it's just not me that can't figure it out”. (IP12)

“When communicating with me, be brief and direct to the point. Ask what and why questions. Focus on business. Remember, I desire results. Suggest ways for me to achieve results. Highlight logical benefits and recognize high quality work. That's my do’s. My do not's, this is why I giggle at this. Don't ramble, repeat yourself. Focus on only the problems. Be able to socialize, be too sociable and conversational. Make generalizations or statements without support. That's my don'ts””. (IP12)
Appendix W.

Focus Group Additional Data

Researcher observations after Focus Group Interview

Focus Group held in quiet conference room by the administrative offices. Food and beverages served by facilitator (Krueger & Casey, 2015). Provided each participant with his/her personal DISC repost, some of the Team report pages for reference, and the FG questions for each participant.

Participant FGP4 came from another location to participate, while the other five participants were on shift during this Focus Group.

Started Focus Group with five participants. Participant FGP6 arrived a few minutes after the Focus Group started. Introduced oneself and easily joined in the discussion. Other participants continued discussion, not seeming to mind the lateness or interruption of the late arrival.

Participants were participative and built trust with each other as the Focus Group progressed as evidenced by utilizing humor with each other or using another participant in an example. Utilized the DISC trait language to joke with each other.

Participant FGP5 was more quiet than other participants, but gave valuable input when s/he desired to interact.

Participant FGP1 was eager to answer questions and provide examples.

Participant FGP3 was reserved at first until trust was built but then joined in the discussion with a varied team member perspective. Asked good questions and had self-discovery.

Participant FGP6 was concerned about peer conflict and perceptions of co-workers in respect to Question 3, regarding thoughts and utilization after the DISC debrief results.

FG participants utilized their DISC personal reports and team report as a reference to illustrate some points of communication and change.

After the FG questions were completed, some participants stayed to visit with each other and this facilitator, as well as eat more snacks provided while others left immediately.
Appendix X.

Examples of Focus Group Interview and Open-ended Semi-structured Initial Codes

IML DISC Insights Personality System Profile Participant Responses

Action-oriented
Active
Cautious
Change
Communication
Compliant
Core
Correct
Determined
Dominant
Driver
Impulsive
Influencing
Inspiring
Least
Mask
Mirror
Most
Passive
People-oriented
Perceived Self
Private Self
Public Self
Steady
Stable
Supportive
Task-oriented

Co-workers
Decisions
Differences
Difficult for people
Dominant
Driving
Embrace change
Environment
Get along
Harsh
Helpful
Humor
Influencing (people)
Leader (ship)
Mixture
Morale
People like me
Personality
Plan
Reflection
Results
Right
Routine
Rude
Sensitive
Steady
Spontaneous
Team (backing)
Tension
Working

Agree/agreement
Aggressive
Analytical
Apply/application
Appreciate
Articulate
Assert/assertive
Assist/help
Attention to detail
Attention Span
Best placement
Camaraderie
Cautious
Challenges
Change- slow or quick
to
Cheerleader
Collaborating
Comfort
level/comfortable
Committed/commitment
level
Communication
Community
Compatible
Competitive
Complexity
Conferring
Conflict Resolution
Confrontational
Conscientious
Consideration
Control
Conversations
Cooperation
Creative
Critical
Decision-making
Decisive
Department

Focus Group

Accepting (new challenges)
Attention (short, span, pay more)
Change
Compliant
Conflict
Communicate
Conscientious
Correct

Semi-structured Interviews

Accepting
Accuracy
Adapting
Administration
Advice to leadership
Advocate
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Detail-oriented</th>
<th>Job Placement</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Determination</td>
<td>Leader</td>
<td>Right position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Differences</td>
<td>Leadership- Chief, Sgt., Capt., Lt.</td>
<td>Routine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diplomatic</td>
<td>Limitations</td>
<td>Self-awareness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DISC</td>
<td>Listening</td>
<td>Self-starter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominant</td>
<td>Methodical</td>
<td>Sensitivity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficiency</td>
<td>Motivating factors</td>
<td>Strengths</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empathetic</td>
<td>Orchestration</td>
<td>Systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourage</td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Task-oriented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entertaining</td>
<td>Patience</td>
<td>Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enthusiasm</td>
<td>People-oriented</td>
<td>Team Effectiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment</td>
<td>Perfectionist</td>
<td>Teammates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence</td>
<td>Personality</td>
<td>Teamwork</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience</td>
<td>Persuasion</td>
<td>Together</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fluctuation</td>
<td>Planning and</td>
<td>Traits/attributes/characteristics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follow-through</td>
<td>Implementing Change</td>
<td>Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friendship</td>
<td>Questions</td>
<td>Understand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frustration</td>
<td>Recognition</td>
<td>Utilize</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Relating</td>
<td>Value to team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humor</td>
<td>Reports</td>
<td>Weaknesses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideal work environment</td>
<td>Responsive</td>
<td>Work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Awareness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix Y.

Final Codebook- Code and Theme Tallies Totals for Focus Group and Open-Ended Semi-Structured Interviews. Coded Focus Group Transcription and One Coded Individual Interview Transcription.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FOCUS GROUP INTERVIEW CODING</th>
<th>D-references</th>
<th>I-references</th>
<th>S-references</th>
<th>C-references</th>
<th>RQ2 Change Implications: Awareness and adapting to change (CI)</th>
<th>RQ1 Practical Uses: Personal life (PUP) Team- (PUT) Put PUB and PUF into PUT Leaderships Behaviors &amp; expectations of what leadership should do w/ DISC info… (LDR)</th>
<th>RQ1 Communication Implications: Personal Comm. (PC) Team Comm.(TC)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Control, administration, leadership, determination, impatient, insensitive, poor listener, decisive, accepts change, inefficiency &amp; indecision (p. 3 of personal results)</td>
<td>Recognition, persuasion, entertaining, enthusiasm, lack of detail, short attn. span, low follow-through, spontaneous, accepts change, routine &amp; complexity</td>
<td>Acceptance, listening, team work, follow-through, over sensitive, slow to start, likes routine, conferring, insensitivity, change</td>
<td>Accuracy, systems, orchestration, planning, critical, unresponsive, perfectionist, methodical, slow to change</td>
<td>Change orientation codes Active oriented // 2 Passive oriented ///// 4</td>
<td>Change orientation codes Active oriented // 2 Passive oriented ///// 4</td>
<td>Change orientation codes Active oriented // 2 Passive oriented ///// 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DISC Pure &amp; Blend Codes FG Participants N=6 DI, ISC, SI, SCI, CD, CDS</td>
<td>// 1 /// 4 /// 4 /// 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DISC Total Codes for FG 1 4 4 4 6 6 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus Group Coding FG P1 // 4 /// 1 /// 1 /// CI 4 /// PUT // PUBN PUT / LDR 10 /// CIHT TC /// 9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FG P2 // 1 /// 5 /// 3 /// 1 /// CI 1 /// PUT // PUBN PUT 9 /// CIHT /// DIJA 8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<p>| FG P4 | ///// | 5 | // | 1 | // | 1 | // CI | 1 | // // // LDR 7 | // // CIHT // TC 9 |
| FG P5 | // | 2 | // | 2 | // | 1 | // CI | 1 | // PUP // PUFC PUT // PUT 11 | // // CIHT // TC 6 |
| FG P6 | // | 1 | // | 2 | ///// | 6 | ///// CI | 6 | ///// // PUP ///// PUT // PUBN PUT ///// //LDR 24 | // // CIHT ///// // TC // CRA 14 |
| Focus Group Totals | 9 | 13 | 10 | 18 | 17 | 86 | 61 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DISC Trait Codes</th>
<th>INT</th>
<th>Participating N=13 DCS, IS, ICS, S, SD, SI, SC, SCI, SIC, C, DSI, CS, CD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11 9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Change orientation codes: Active oriented 3 Passive oriented 10 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DISC Total Codes for Open-ended Semi-Structured Interview s</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3 6 11 9 13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Communication orientation codes: People oriented 8 Task oriented 5 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Open-ended Semi Structured Interview s</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INT</th>
<th>Participating N=13 DCS, IS, ICS, S, SD, SI, SC, SCI, SIC, C, DSI, CS, CD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3 6 11 9 13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Communication orientation codes: People oriented 8 Task oriented 5 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DISC Trait Codes</th>
<th>INT</th>
<th>Participating N=13 DCS, IS, ICS, S, SD, SI, SC, SCI, SIC, C, DSI, CS, CD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11 9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Change orientation codes: Active oriented 3 Passive oriented 10 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DISC Total Codes for Open-ended Semi-Structured Interview s</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3 6 11 9 13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Communication orientation codes: People oriented 8 Task oriented 5 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Open-ended Semi Structured Interview s</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INT</th>
<th>Participating N=13 DCS, IS, ICS, S, SD, SI, SC, SCI, SIC, C, DSI, CS, CD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3 6 11 9 13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Communication orientation codes: People oriented 8 Task oriented 5 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Open-ended Semi Structured Interview s</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INT</th>
<th>Participating N=13 DCS, IS, ICS, S, SD, SI, SC, SCI, SIC, C, DSI, CS, CD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3 6 11 9 13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Communication orientation codes: People oriented 8 Task oriented 5 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Open-ended Semi Structured Interview s</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INT</th>
<th>Participating N=13 DCS, IS, ICS, S, SD, SI, SC, SCI, SIC, C, DSI, CS, CD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3 6 11 9 13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Communication orientation codes: People oriented 8 Task oriented 5 |

| Open-ended Semi Structured Interview s |
| IP1 | 7 | 4 | 14 | 6 | CI, CIP, CP, CIJS/CA, CIJS | PUP 2 | PUT 10 | PUB 4 | PUB 10 | LDR 4 30 | PC 10 | TC 22 | CR 3 41 |
| IP2 | 4 | 5 | 7 | 59 | CI, CIP, CP, CIJS/CA, CIJS 11 | PUP 13 | PUT 6 | PUB 5 | PUB 2 | LDR 51 77 | PC 24 | TC 33 | CR 6 63 |
| IP3 | 1 | 17 | 59 | 1 | CI, CIP, CP, CIJS/CA, CIJS 12 | PUP 10 | PUT 8 | PUB 2 | PUB 3 | LDR 8 31 | PC 17 | TC 13 | CR 1 31 |
| IP4 | 2 | 2 | 37 | 90 | CI, CIP, CP, CIJS/CA, CIJS 2 | PUP 17 | PUT 8 | PUB 4 | PUB 3 | LDR 17 49 | PC 14 | TC 4 |
| IP5 | 9 | 5 | 47 | 3 | CI, CIP, CP, CIJS/CA, CIJS 9 | PUP 27 | PUT 6 | PUB 8 | PUB 0 | LDR 17 58 | PC 33 | TC 21 |
| IP6 | 0 | 1 | 27 | 25 | CI, CIP, CP, CIJS/CA, CIJS 3 | PUP 1 | PUT 5 | PUB 1 | PUB 2 | LDR 12 21 | PC 29 | TC 11 |
| IP7 | 28 | 4 | 31 | 4 | CI, CIP, CP, CIJS/CA, CIJS 0 | PUP 16 | PUT 8 | PUB 3 | PUB 0 | LDR 9 36 | PC 21 | TC 25 |
| IP8 | 3 | 29 | 35 | 44 | CI, CIP, CP, CIJS/CA, CIJS 7 | PUP 4 | PUP 2 | PUB | PUB | LDR 5 11 | PC 5 | TC 15 |
| IP9 | 3 | 65 | 25 | 7 | CI, CIP, CP, CIJS/CA, CIJS 7 | PUP, PUB, PUB, PUF, LDR 84 | PC/TC 26 |
| IP10 | 0 | 17 | 42 | 23 | CI, CIP, CP, CIJS/CA, CIJS 4 | PUP 2 | PUP 9 | PUB 4 | PUB 3 | LDR 6 25 | PC 4 | TC 22 | 26 |
| IP11 | 37 | 0 | 20 | 22 | CI, CIP, CP, CIJS/CA, CIJS | 8 | PUT 5 | PUP 4 | PUB 3 | PUF 0 | LDR 21 | 33 | PC 6 | TC 29 | 35 |
| IP12 | 53 | 1 | 1 | 40 | CI, CIP, CP, CIJS/CA, CIJS | 6 | PUT 15 | PUP 15 | PUB 5 | PUF 10 | LDR 10 | 54 | PC 3 | TC 18 | 21 |
| IP13 | 18 | 88 | 46 | 36 | CI, CIP, CP, CIJS/CA, CIJS | 47 | PUT, PUP, PUB, PUF, LDR | 185 | | | | | |
| Totals for Interviews | 165 | 238 | 391 | 360 | 129 | 704 | 448 |
| Totals for INT., FG, & DISC | 165(INT)+ 9(FG)+ 4(DISC)= 178 | 238(INT)+ 13(FG)+ 10(DISC)= 261 | 391(INT)+ 10(FG)+ 15(DISC)= 416 | 360(INT)+ 18(FG)+ 13(DISC)= 391 | 129(INT)+ 17(FG)+ 19(DISC)= 165 | 704(INT)+ 86(FG)+ 00(DISC)= 790 | 448(INT)+ 61(FG)+ 19(DISC)= 528 |
| Grand total of all codes w/ themes | | | | | | | | 2729 |
Appendix Z.

Free Resources for Emotional Distress

Crisis Text Line, text **741741**

National Suicide Hotline, call **800-273-8255**