

RADAR 360

THE RIGHT ALTITUDE · RADAR SERIES

Your 360 Political Calibration Report

Jordan Hale

June 1, 2026

Access code: JXRDRS · Valid through June 1, 2027

YOUR COMPOUND PATTERN

The Invisible

Self-Interest: 14/100 · Ego: 11/100 · Competition: 19/100

You scored yourself as nearly invisible across all three dimensions, Jordan — Self-Interest at 14, Ego at 11, Competition at 19. That's The Invisible pattern: someone who shows up to do the work, not to be seen doing it. In your own telling, you don't position, you don't protect, you don't compete. You just deliver.

Here's what the 360 says. Your raters don't see an invisible person at all. They see someone who is calibrated on Self-Interest (43), present on Competition (34), and human on Ego (31). Every single dimension scored higher from the outside than from the inside — three hidden strengths, not one. That's the headline.

When all three gaps point the same direction, it's rarely about behavior. It's about self-perception. You've built an identity around being the person who doesn't play the game, and that story is so strong it's editing out evidence to the contrary. The raters watch you advocate, hold ground, and stake claims — and you log none of it as 'self-interest' because in your mind that word belongs to other people.

The environment context matters here. Everything sits at a moderate 3 out of 5 — competitiveness, visibility, political complexity, stability. This isn't a shark tank, and it isn't a monastery. A moderately political room rewards calibrated presence, which is exactly what your raters say you already have. The good news: the room you're in doesn't require you to become someone else. It requires you to recognize who you already are.

The level breakdown adds one more layer. Your above-level rater scores you highest across the board (Self-Interest 48, Ego 35, Competition 38), and your below-level rater scores you lowest (38, 28, 30). That's a meaningful pattern — the people above you see more presence, drive, and self-advocacy than the people who report to you do. Your leadership sees a player. Your team sees a protector. Neither is wrong; they're watching different versions of you in different moments.

So the work isn't to amplify. It's to close the gap between what you believe about yourself and what's already visible to everyone else. You're not under-calibrated in the room. You're under-calibrated in your own self-image — and that's a more fixable problem than it sounds.

THE THREE DIMENSIONS

Your three political dimensions, scored 1–100. The range label reflects where you sit on each spectrum.



SELF-INTEREST

14/100 — SUPPRESSED

You rated your Self-Interest at 14 — a number that says you don't position, don't claim, don't protect what's yours. Your raters put it at 43, squarely calibrated for a moderately political environment. That 29-point gap is the largest dimensional gap in your profile, and it's the central story of this report.

The subcategory data sharpens it. Career Positioning shows a 44-point gap (self 6, raters 50) and Resource Protection a 40-point gap (self 6, raters 46). These are the two places where you see almost nothing and others see a fully functioning operator. You are advocating for your work and guarding your team's resources — you're just not counting it as such.

The one place the gap nearly closes is Decision Framing (self 25, raters 29, gap of only 4). That tells me when you make decisions, you do frame them around your own priorities more than you frame anything else — and you know it. So the self-awareness exists; it's just confined to one narrow lane.

The level split confirms the dynamic. Above-level scores you at 48, below-level at 38. Your leadership watches you stake claims and hold ground; your team watches you give more than you take. Both are seeing real behavior — and the gap between them is worth your attention, because it shapes how each group decides whether to trust you with more.

SUBCATEGORY SCORES

Subcategory	Self	Raters	Gap
Career Positioning	6	50	-44
Credit & Narrative	13	50	-37
Resource Protection	6	46	-40
Relationship Investment	19	38	-19
Decision Framing	25	29	-4

At self 6 versus raters 50, this is the widest gap in your entire profile. You believe you don't position yourself at all, while everyone around you watches you make the case for your work. The behavior is there — you've just decided it isn't 'positioning' when you do it.

A 37-point gap (self 13, raters 50) says you take far less credit in your own mind than others see you take in practice. You're likely sharing credit so reflexively that you don't register the moments you do claim it. Others notice those moments and read them as healthy ownership.

Self 6, raters 46 — you see yourself as someone who never guards turf, but your raters watch you protect what your team needs to deliver. That protection is part of why people trust you with resources. You're doing the job without giving yourself any credit for it.

The gap here (self 19, raters 38) is narrower but still real. You undercount the relational capital you build, treating connection as just part of the work rather than something you invest in deliberately. Others see the investment clearly.

This is your tightest Self-Interest gap (self 25, raters 29). When you frame decisions around your own priorities, you know you're doing it — which means the self-awareness exists in at least one corner. The work is extending that same honesty to the other four subcategories.

EGO

11/100 — SUPPRESSED

Your self-score of 11 is the lowest number in your profile — the most suppressed dimension you have. You see yourself as someone with almost no ego in the room: you take feedback flat, own errors instantly, never defend your turf of ideas. Your raters scored you at 31, still under-calibrated but markedly more present than you believe.

The two largest gaps both land on resilience. Feedback Reception (self 19, raters 46) and Error Response (self 6, raters 33) each show 27-point gaps. You think you absorb criticism and mistakes with no friction at all — but your raters see something healthier: a person who responds to feedback and owns errors like a capable adult, not a doormat. The complete self-erasure you imagine isn't what they witness.

The smaller gaps — Knowledge Position, Idea Ownership, both at 12 points — suggest you're closer to accurate on how you hold your expertise and your ideas. You don't oversell what you know, and the data backs that up.

The level pattern is consistent: above-level 35, below-level 28. Even your highest rater puts you in under-calibrated territory, so this isn't a blind spot about being too much. It's a hidden strength about being more grounded and present than you give yourself credit for. A little healthy ego — owning your ideas out loud — wouldn't cost you anything here.

SUBCATEGORY SCORES

Subcategory	Self	Raters	Gap
Feedback Reception	19	46	-27
Error Response	6	33	-27
Knowledge Position	13	25	-12
Credit Sensitivity	6	25	-19
Idea Ownership	13	25	-12

At self 19 versus raters 46, you believe you take feedback far more passively than others observe. They see someone who engages with input thoughtfully rather than absorbing it without response. That engagement reads as confidence, not defensiveness.

Self 6, raters 33 — a 27-point gap. You think you own mistakes with zero friction, but your raters see a measured, accountable response that doesn't erase you in the process. Owning an error while still standing your ground is a strength; you're doing it without naming it.

A narrower gap (self 13, raters 25) means you're fairly accurate about how you hold your expertise. You don't position yourself as the smartest in the room, and others confirm that. There's room to claim what you know a bit more openly.

Self 6, raters 25 — you believe you're entirely indifferent to credit, while others see a normal, healthy awareness of it. Caring a little when your contribution gets recognized isn't ego run amok; it's how people know to value your work.

At self 13 versus raters 25, you undercount how much you stand behind your ideas. The gap is modest, which suggests this is one place you can lean in safely. Owning an idea out loud, by name, would cost you nothing and would help your team know where you stand.

COMPETITION

19/100 — SUPPRESSED

Competition is your most amplified dimension at a self-score of 19 — which tells you how suppressed the whole profile is, since 19 is still low. Your raters put it at 34, a 15-point gap. You see almost no competitive instinct in yourself; they see a measured amount that fits the room.

The story lives almost entirely in one subcategory. Peer Framing shows a 37-point gap (self 13, raters 50) — your single largest gap in this dimension and one of the largest in the whole profile. You think you don't frame yourself against peers at all, but your raters watch you hold your own among colleagues clearly. That's not aggression; it's presence.

Win/Lose Orientation adds another 17-point gap (self 25, raters 42). You drive toward outcomes more than you realize. The remaining three — Information Flow, Alliance Building, Threat Response — all show single-digit or low gaps, meaning your self-read is fairly accurate there. You share information openly and don't treat colleagues as threats, and the data agrees.

The level split runs the same direction as everywhere else: above-level 38, below-level 30. Your leadership sees more competitive drive than your team does. That's worth sitting with — the people who decide your next move see a player, while the people you lead see someone who plays it safe with them.

SUBCATEGORY SCORES

Subcategory	Self	Raters	Gap
Peer Framing	13	50	-37
Win/Lose Orientation	25	42	-17
Information Flow	25	29	-4
Alliance Building	13	25	-12
Threat Response	19	25	-6

Self 13, raters 50 — a 37-point gap that says you hold your own among peers far more visibly than you believe. You don't think you frame yourself competitively at all, but others see you stand confidently alongside colleagues. That presence is an asset you're not claiming.

At self 25 versus raters 42, you drive toward winning outcomes more than you give yourself credit for. You read your own competitiveness as low; others see a healthy outcome focus. Naming that drive openly would help your team understand what you're pushing toward.

A near-perfect match (self 25, raters 29). You share information openly and you know it, and your raters confirm it. This is calibrated self-awareness — no gap to close.

Self 13, raters 25 — a modest gap. You build fewer alliances in your own mind than others observe, but neither number is high. There's room to be more deliberate about who you align with in a moderately political room.

At self 19 versus raters 25, this is your tightest Competition gap. You don't treat colleagues as threats, and others agree. Your read of yourself here is accurate — keep it.

SELF VS. RATER COMPARISON

Your self-assessment scores compared to how your raters see you. Gaps of 15 or more points flag blind spots (self > raters) or hidden strengths (raters > self).

Dimension	Self	Raters	Gap	Signal
Self-Interest	14	43	-29	Hidden Strength
Ego	11	31	-20	Hidden Strength
Competition	19	34	-15	Hidden Strength

SUBCATEGORY COMPARISON

Self-Interest

Career Positioning	6	50	-44
Credit & Narrative	13	50	-37
Resource Protection	6	46	-40
Relationship Investment	19	38	-19
Decision Framing	25	29	-4

Ego

Feedback Reception	19	46	-27
Error Response	6	33	-27
Knowledge Position	13	25	-12
Credit Sensitivity	6	25	-19
Idea Ownership	13	25	-12

Competition

Peer Framing	13	50	-37
Win/Lose Orientation	25	42	-17
Information Flow	25	29	-4
Alliance Building	13	25	-12
Threat Response	19	25	-6

BY RATER LEVEL

Dimension	Self	Above (1)	Peer (1)	Below (1)
Self-Interest	14	48	43	38
Ego	11	35	30	28
Competition	19	38	35	30

GAP ANALYSIS

Jordan, the story here is consistent — and that consistency is the finding. Across all three dimensions, you rated yourself lower than every rater group did. Self-Interest at 14 against their 43. Ego at 11 against their 31. Competition at 19 against their 34. There is no dimension where you saw more in yourself than others saw in you. That kind of uniform under-rating tells me something specific: this isn't a measurement error in one area. It's a way you've learned to see yourself.

The most consequential gaps sit inside Self-Interest. Career Positioning shows a 44-point split — you scored a 6, your raters landed at 50. Resource Protection runs the same way, 6 to 46. These aren't small calibration adjustments. The people around you watch you advocate, protect what your team needs, and position your work — and you don't register any of it as self-interested. You experience it as just doing the job.

What makes this a hidden-strength story rather than a blind-spot story is the direction. Blind spots are when you think you're doing something others can't see. Yours is the reverse — others see capacities you've talked yourself out of owning. That's gentler to hear and harder to fix, because the work isn't behavioral. It's about belief.

The one place you and your raters nearly agree is Decision Framing (25 vs 29) and Information Flow (25 vs 29). Where the gaps shrink, you're describing yourself accurately. Where they widen — Career Positioning, Credit & Narrative, Peer Framing — you've built a self-image that runs well below your actual presence in the room.

BLIND SPOTS & HIDDEN STRENGTHS

Let's name them, because every gap here points the same direction. Career Positioning (self 6, raters 50) is the loudest. You see yourself as someone who doesn't angle for advancement. Your raters see someone who clearly understands where they sit and where their work lands. Credit & Narrative tells the same story (13 vs 50) — you think your contributions go unspoken, and the people around you watch you name your work more than you realize. Resource Protection (6 vs 46) — you defend what your team needs, and you've decided that doesn't count as anything.

Peer Framing is the standout inside Competition — a 37-point gap, 13 against 50. You don't experience yourself as comparing or jockeying with peers. Your raters see someone who holds their own position clearly relative to others. That's not aggression. It's presence, and you're discounting it entirely.

The ones I'd sit with longest are Feedback Reception (19 vs 46) and Error Response (6 vs 33). You believe you receive feedback and own mistakes with very little ego — a 6 on Error Response is nearly bottom of the scale. Your raters see someone considerably more solid and self-possessed than that. When you score your own error response at a 6, you may be over-apologizing, over-absorbing blame, taking on more than is yours. Others read your handling of mistakes as steady. The gap suggests you punish yourself for things the room has already moved past.

LEVEL PATTERNS

Here's what's notable about your level data, Jordan — there's almost no split. Your above-level rater, your peer, and your direct report all see you the same way, with a clean gradient. Self-Interest runs 48 from above, 43 at peer level, 38 from below. Ego: 35, 30, 28. Competition: 38, 35, 30. The same descending staircase in every dimension.

That consistency means you're not code-switching. You're not performing one version of yourself for your boss and another for your team. The same Jordan shows up at every level — which is rare and worth naming as a strength on its own.

The one pattern in the gradient: people above you see slightly more Self-Interest and Competition than people below you do. That's not a problem — it's natural. Those above you watch you in rooms where positioning happens; your reports watch you support and steady them. But every level still scores you higher than you score yourself. The undervaluation isn't level-specific. It's whole-cloth. You carry it everywhere.

ENVIRONMENT CONTEXT

Your environment reads as moderate across the board — competitiveness, visibility, complexity, and stability all at 3 out of 5, overall intensity low. That matters for how we read these scores. You're not in a shark tank where suppressed Self-Interest gets you eaten alive. You have room to operate.

In this kind of setting, your raters' view of you — Calibrated Self-Interest, Under-Calibrated Ego and Competition — is close to ideal. You're not over-playing politics in a place that doesn't demand it. The mild Under-Calibration on Ego and Competition isn't a liability at intensity this low. It reads as steadiness, not weakness.

So the environment doesn't pressure you to change behavior. It pressures the story you tell yourself. In a calmer environment, the cost of feeling invisible isn't being out-maneuvered — it's slowly undervaluing your own contribution until you believe the low numbers you gave yourself. The recalibration here is internal alignment, not external armor. A coach or therapist can help you get to what the data alone cannot.

THE POLITICAL LANDSCAPE AUDIT

PRIMARY RECALIBRATION

Jordan, the most consequential gap in this report isn't a flaw — it's a story you're telling about yourself that your raters don't recognize. You rated Career Positioning at 6. Your raters put it at 50. That's a 44-point gap, the widest in the entire profile, and it tells me you've built a self-image around not playing the political game while the people around you watch you do it competently every day.

This matters because of what self-suppression costs in a moderately competitive, moderately visible environment like yours. When you believe you have no interest in positioning yourself, you stop doing it on purpose. You let it happen by accident. That means the credit you've earned gets attributed unevenly, the resources you need get claimed by someone who asks more directly, and the work you do quietly gets remembered as someone else's.

The adjustment isn't to become more political. Your raters already see you as calibrated there. The adjustment is to own it — to make conscious the moves you're already making unconsciously, so you can direct them instead of letting them drift.

Staying where you are costs you the next opportunity. When a high-visibility project opens up, the person who gets it is the one who's been visibly connected to outcomes — not the one who did equal work but described themselves as uninterested in being seen. You're handing that advantage to a peer who's no more capable than you, just less allergic to being noticed.

SECONDARY ADJUSTMENT

The second adjustment is about Ego — your most suppressed dimension at 11, with raters at 31. This is a hidden strength wearing the costume of a weakness. Error Response especially: you scored yourself a 6, your raters a 33. You think you collapse and absorb blame. They see someone who owns mistakes cleanly without making them a crisis.

That gap is a gift you're not using. The capacity to take feedback without defensiveness and own an error without drama is rare, and your raters clearly notice it. But you're so convinced it's a deficiency that you over-apologize and under-claim — which can read as a lack of confidence rather than the steadiness it actually is.

The move here is small but real: stop treating your low ego as something to hide. Let people see that your willingness to be wrong is a strength of judgment, not an absence of conviction. Said plainly once, it builds the kind of credibility that defensiveness never will.

WHAT NEEDS PERMISSION

Here's what this 360 gives you permission to do, Jordan: stop performing humility. Three raters across every level — above, beside, and below — independently scored you higher than you scored yourself on nearly everything. They're not seeing a self-promoter. They're seeing someone competent who keeps insisting they're not in the game.

That consistency is your permission slip. You don't have to manufacture political instinct you don't have. You already have more than you give yourself credit for. The data says so.

What you're allowed to do now is direct it. Name your contributions without flinching. Claim the resources you need without apologizing. Let the room know what you're working on. None of that makes you the apex predator you're afraid of becoming — it makes you visible at the level you're already operating.

THE STRATEGIC RADAR PRACTICE

Before any meeting with political stakes, run the triple check. First, rate the room: how competitive, how ego-driven, how self-interested are the people walking in? Most of your rooms sit around a 3 — moderate, not cutthroat. Second, rate yourself going in: where will your instinct land you on each dimension?

Then add the third question this 360 makes possible: what would my raters say I'm actually doing? You now have data on the gap between your self-read and reality. That third lens catches you in the moment you're about to under-claim, under-position, or shrink — because you'll know that what feels like appropriate restraint to you reads as invisibility to everyone else.

Do this for two weeks and the gap starts to close on its own. You stop calibrating to your imagined modesty and start calibrating to what the room actually requires.

WHAT'S GOING TO RESIST

What fights back is the identity. You've spent years believing that not wanting credit makes you trustworthy, that staying small makes you safe. Every time you go to claim something, that belief will whisper that you're becoming someone you don't respect.

It's lying. The raters already gave you the evidence — they see calibration, not greed. The resistance is old programming, not present reality.

Before every meeting with political stakes: rate the room on all three dimensions, then rate yourself. The gap is the adjustment.

THE CALIBRATION LOG

Keep a Calibration Log with four columns: the situation, what you did, how it felt to you, and a new column — what a rater would likely say you did. The fourth column is the whole point. Your felt experience has been running 20 to 40 points below reality, so logging the rater-check trains you to trust the external read over the internal flinch.

Log one political moment a day. A meeting where you spoke or stayed quiet, a moment you claimed credit or let it pass, a resource you asked for or didn't.

WHAT YOU'LL SEE

Within two weeks you'll see that the moments that felt like self-promotion looked like normal participation to everyone else. The gap between felt and real will become visible on the page. That's when you can start adjusting on purpose.

WHAT FIGHTS THE DATA

The discomfort spikes when you log a moment you claimed something. Your instinct will label it as showing off and want to delete the entry. Leave it — that entry is the data proving the instinct wrong.

THE OPPONENT MAP

This is the section you fill out. Not later. Now. Three exercises that change how you read the political landscape.

The Opponent Map isn't about enemies — for you it's about reading the field you keep refusing to admit you're standing on. Map the three or four people whose work intersects yours: where their interests align with yours, where they diverge, and where you've been ceding ground without noticing. Then add the 360 lens: for each person, ask whether they see you as a player or as background.

Your raters see you more clearly than you see yourself. Use that. The map works because the people around you are already keeping one — you've just opted out of having your own.

RECALIBRATE ONE DIMENSION

Pick Career Positioning — your widest gap. For one month, do one visible, intentional positioning move a week: name a contribution in a meeting, send a brief update to someone above you, claim a project you want. Your raters already see you at 50 here, so this isn't a leap — it's catching your conscious mind up to what you're already doing.

The dimension I need to adjust:

The specific behavior I'm changing:

What I expect to feel when I adjust:

READ ONE OPPONENT

Choose one peer whose work overlaps yours and read them on all three dimensions. Where are they positioning while you stay quiet? Your below-level raters scored you lowest on Self-Interest — meaning your team sees you ceding ground. Reading one peer closely teaches you what claiming space looks like when it's done without apology.

The person I'm analyzing:

Their loudest dimension (self-interest / ego / competition):

What they want that they're not getting:

BUILD ONE ALLIANCE

Pick one person above your level and invest in the relationship on purpose — not transactionally, but consistently. Your above-level rater gave you the widest gaps, which means the people with the most influence over your next move are most likely to underestimate your interest. One real alliance there shifts how your contributions get remembered.

The relationship I'm investing in:

What I'm offering:

What I need in return:

THE FIRST 30 DAYS

WEEK 1

Your raters see more in you than you see in yourself — across all three dimensions. That gap is the story of this whole report. Start by letting their view in before you try to change anything.

1. Reread your subcategory scores beside the rater numbers. On Career Positioning you scored 6; your raters scored 50. Sit with that 44-point gap. Write one sentence on what they might be seeing that you discount.
2. Pick one project you led recently and write down, plainly, what you contributed. No hedging, no team-credit reflex. Just the facts of your work. This is data collection, not bragging.
3. Ask your manager one question: when have you seen me underplay my own contribution? Listen without correcting. Their above-level view scored you highest — they notice.

You undervalue your own footprint by a wide margin. The raters aren't being polite — they're describing someone with more presence than you'll admit.

Did you finish the week able to name one thing you do well without softening it? If not, that's the work, not a failure.

WEEK 2

Visibility and credit aren't self-promotion — they're accuracy. Your Credit & Narrative score was 13; raters said 50. The people around you already know your value. The problem is you keep it quiet.

1. In one meeting this week, state a contribution in the first person. I built this, I recommended that. No deflecting to the team. Notice how it lands — it will land fine.
2. Send one email to your manager summarizing a result you delivered, framed around impact, not activity. Your raters value your work; give them the language to repeat it.
3. Identify one decision where you instinctively framed it around others' needs and ignored your own. Name what you wanted. You don't have to act on it yet — just see it.

Suppressing your own narrative doesn't make you generous. It makes you invisible to people who'd advocate for you if they could quote you.

Track how many times you deflected credit this week versus claimed it. Aim for one clean claim. One is a real shift from zero.

WEEK 3

Ego scored your lowest — 11 to the raters' 31. Your Error Response sat at 6 while raters saw 33. You may be so quick to absorb blame that you erase your own judgment from the room.

1. When you make a small mistake this week, name it once and stop. Don't over-apologize or rebuild the whole narrative around your fault. Raters see steadiness here you don't credit yourself for.
2. In a disagreement, hold your position for one more exchange than feels comfortable. Your Win/Lose score was 25; raters said 42. You can advocate without it being a war.
3. Name one idea as yours and don't immediately give it away. Idea Ownership at 13 means you're handing off thinking that should carry your name.

Holding your ground isn't ego. It's letting your judgment count. The room loses something every time you defer reflexively.

Did you defend one idea or position fully this week? Notice whether the relationship survived. It did.

WEEK 4

The pattern across all three levels is consistent — above, peer, and below all see more self-interest, ego, and competition in you than you grant yourself. That consistency is reliable data. Use it to recalibrate, not to perform.

1. Revisit the level breakdown: your above-level rater scored you highest on every dimension. Ask them directly what makes you effective. Their answer is the calibration target you've been missing.
2. Choose one peer relationship and make it less transactional. Relationship Investment was 19 to raters' 38 — invest in one alliance with no immediate ask attached.
3. Write your own three-sentence summary of what you bring. Compare it to the rater scores. Where you're still underselling, that's next month's work.

You came into this expecting to find too much ambition and ego. You found the opposite — a leader who consistently shrinks. The recalibration here is upward.

Can you now describe yourself in terms closer to what your raters see? That alignment is the whole point.

CLOSING

Your access code is valid for 365 days. You can retake up to 3 times within that window — give the practice at least 60–90 days before your first retake. Each retake builds a comparison against everything in this document.

If the data says the practice isn't reaching the pattern, that's not failure. It's information. A coach can help you get to what the plan can't.

— Don