

Comparison of C-me to other tools:



MBTI.

Similarities:

- Jungian underpinning - the top and bottom of the C-me wheel roughly align to the thinking and feeling rational functions used in MBTI, while LHS and RHS align with introversion and extroversion attitudes
- Jung's 8 primary types can be aligned with the first and second colours of people's behavioural preferences in the C-me system
- Both systems share a non-judgemental approach – wanting to honour the gifts and natural strengths of all people, whilst increasing our understanding of those different to ourselves
- C-me shares the desire to reduce conflict brought about by the misunderstanding of difference. This was a key driver for Myers and Briggs
- Both systems are preference indicators

Differences:

- C-me generates a more behavioural description so, for example, we replace the description of introversion with reflective
- C-me statements in the report also carry through this more behavioural emphasis. What we read there is shaped by application – it should be applicable and coachable
- The N and S preferences used by MBTI have a looser alignment with the RHS and LHS of the wheel respectively. Where someone is borderline on two colours at the top or bottom of the wheel, these may be the preference drivers that draw the wheel position assigned to one side or the other – acting a bit like a magnet on either side
- The 4th preference scale (judging-perceiving) which was added by Myers and Briggs cannot meaningfully be mapped onto all colour combinations - although some alignment can be drawn in parts, for example in practice blue often has high J and yellow high P
- Those who have used both systems report C-me as more memorable, and therefore more durable in application

- C-me's more intuitive and simple approach makes it easier to understand others preference and what that looks like in practice
- Colours blend where letters do not. C-me is therefore a less binary system. MBTIs typology is essentially prescriptive – it does not take account of shades or intensities of preference
- Individual's preferences are reported in C-me graphs unique to them rather than assigned one of 16 types
- The scale of preference, as well as its overall assignment is readily readable through the graph scales with C-me
- C-me reports also include a less conscious measure for comparison
- The visuals in the C-me report, and the team wheels, make it easier to understand quickly how individual's differ in their preferences. We can also read at a glance the overall balance and dynamic of a team
- C-me is quicker to complete: The evaluator is a quick online process (10 mins) and the reports are instantly generated

Strengths Finders (Gallup)

Similarities:

- Both share a desire to affirm people's strengths. There is a recognition that our strengths are different but equally important
- Both systems aspire to align people with their strengths in what they do and build awareness of that

Differences:

- C-me is more of a behavioural profile, not a personality tool
- C-me is easy and fast to complete online, whereas Gallop is word based
- Gallop includes unusual words which people report as hard to recall after any time and to know how to put into practice, C-me always keep the language simple, accessible and memorable
- C-me reports include action points and are a highly visual tool
- C-me reports include team dimensions and application, encouraging corporate reading
- Gallop has no organizational (cultural) element for company growth

Insights:

Similarities:

- Both include the application of colours to Jungian quadrants
- Each system makes use of Preference indicators
- They are both underpinned by Jungian thinking
- Reports include both a conscious and unconscious measure
- A position on a wheel is given as a summary and can be then grouped to give a take on team dynamics

Differences:

- C-me does not use boxes on the wheel into which people are placed – it is a more blended wheel design
- The C-me algorithm used to calculate the natural graph is more accurate
- The C-me accreditation is more cost-effective and offers a more coaching/ bite sized approach to learning
- There is no minimum credit block required with C-me Accreditation
- C-me currently charges No license fee
- C-me hosts free community events
- C-me Accreditation can be transferred with the individual if they move context/ company.
- C-me statements have been written in the last 5 years so the language is fresher and jargon free
- C-me has a more behavioural focus – more applied, less about ‘personality’
- C-me offers a workbook format to many of the reports which easily encourages and guides application
- C-me offers far greater freedom to Accredited Practitioners to position and present the reports within their own offering
- C-me has invested in a more flexible and up to date tech system (receiving reports is very easy)

Enneagram

Similarities:

- Both endorse a belief that people grow and change over time
- Each system recognises that people's behavioural preferences shift under stress
- They both include a celebration of diversity in strengths and recognition of different development needs

Differences:

- C-me does not box people by a single number/ label but gives each person an individualised read out
- Diagnosis for C-me is through a quick online evaluator that has been tested by thousands of users
- Diagnosis for C-me is not simply self/ other identification but through a tried and tested evaluator and algorithm
- C-me allows teams to be plotted quickly and easily to reveal trends and gaps

Belbin

Similarities:

- Both recognise the need for diversity of preferences and natural/ resilient strengths for a healthy team
- Each introduce a language to help measure the above in a team

Differences:

- C-me Individuals reports are not dependent on the context of team to be useful
- C-me is not an archetypes model
- C-me do not associate certain preferences with fixed roles
- C-me completion is quick and completed online

DISC

Similarities:

- Jungian underpinning (but developed further by William Moulton Marston in early 20th Century)
- A recognition that individuals are a combination of behaviour preferences, present in differing degrees
- Both have a desire to align people with their strengths in what they do and build awareness of that
- Both systems increase an understanding an individual's values to a team/organisation, communication preferences

Differences:

- There is some correlation between C-me's four colour quadrants and DISC's Dominance, Influence, Steadiness and Compliant descriptors, however DISC reports and C-me reports differ in how they present their relative intensities for each individual; some DISC providers use a colour wheel similar to C-me's team wheel (although colours don't always directly correlate), others use a line graph with points above or below the y-axis for D,I,S and C. In comparison, through the nomenclature of colour, C-me can describe an individual's profile as a blend of colours
- DISC language focuses on Personality, rather than Behaviours
- In the absence of colour wheels with DISC, it is difficult to review more than one profile at the same time – it is especially hard when comparing line graphs
- DISC tends to be sold as a recruitment tool, where graphs/profiles can be benchmarked against certain roles in a business.

Clarity 4D

Similarities

- Also based on Bonstetter's work.

Differences

- Reports are drawn from fewer statements
- No unconscious graph, which is key for those who are heavily adapting and for recruitment.

True Colours

Similarities

- Use colour as their reference point
- Drawn from similar initial historical research

Differences

- Talks about personality rather than behaviours.
- Registration renewal is mandatory every five years

