

COACHED RADAR 360

THE RIGHT ALTITUDE · RADAR SERIES

Your Coached 360 Calibration Report

Jordan Hale

June 1, 2026

Access code: JXCRDR · Valid through June 1, 2027

The Invisible

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

You scored yourself as nearly absent across all three dimensions — Self-Interest at 14, Ego at 11, Competition at 19. On paper, that reads as The Invisible: someone who has all but removed self-advocacy, ego, and competitive instinct from how they operate. It's the profile of a person who works for the mission and trusts the work to speak for itself.

But here's where the 360 changes the story. Your raters — above you, beside you, below you — see someone far more present than you do. They put Self-Interest at 43, Ego at 31, Competition at 34. That's not a small adjustment. On every dimension, the people around you see more deliberate, more politically aware behavior than you give yourself credit for.

This is the rarest and most encouraging kind of gap. You're not over-claiming anything. You're under-claiming everything. Where most leaders need to be talked down from a story about themselves, you need to be shown a fuller one — because the people in the rooms with you are watching someone more capable, more positioned, and more competitive than you believe yourself to be.

There's a pattern in how the levels see you. Your manager scores you highest across the board — Self-Interest at 48, Ego at 35, Competition at 38. Your reports score you lowest — 38, 28, 30. That split matters. The people above you see more strategic positioning than the people below you do, which usually means you show up sharper in rooms where it counts and softer with the team you lead. That's not a flaw. But it's worth knowing which version of you each audience receives.

The environment here is moderate on every axis — competitiveness, visibility, political complexity, stability all sit at a 3. This isn't a shark tank. You don't need to armor up. But a calibrated environment still rewards being seen, and right now you're underestimating how much you already are. The cost of The Invisible self-image isn't that you're failing to compete — your raters tell us you are. It's that you're not claiming the ground you've already taken.

Read the dimensions below with that frame. The work for you isn't to manufacture self-interest or ego from nothing. It's to recognize what others already see, name it, and decide on purpose what you've been doing by instinct.

COACH'S ANALYSIS

WHAT I SEE IN YOUR DATA

Three low self-scores and three raters who all see you higher than you see yourself. That's the whole story in one line. You walked in reading yourself as The Invisible — low on self-interest, low on ego, low on competition. Your raters don't see invisible. They see someone doing real work who hasn't decided to claim it. The gap isn't a flaw in how you operate. It's a gap between what you do and what you'll say you do.

YOUR COMPOUND PATTERN

The Invisible is the pattern where competence outruns visibility. You're not avoiding the political dimension because you can't read it — your environment scores say you read it fine. You're avoiding it because claiming feels like self-promotion, and self-promotion feels like a violation of how you want to be seen. So you do the work and let the room decide what to make of it. The trouble is the room decides without you in it.

THE THREE DIMENSIONS

Self-Interest at 28 is the one to start with — it's where your raters split hardest from you (+15). They watch you protect the work and assume you're protecting your stake in it. You're not, and that's the problem. Ego at 19 reads as someone who truly doesn't need the credit — admirable, costly. Competition at 20 says you don't frame the room as a contest, which is fine until the contest happens anyway and you're the only one who didn't show up to it.

RECALIBRATION STRATEGY

We're not raising your numbers. We're closing the gap between your read and theirs. Start with one room, one quarter: name your own contribution once, out loud, before someone else frames it for you. Not a campaign — a sentence. The above-level raters already see your positioning; the work is making your direct reports see it too, because right now your downward signal is weaker than your upward one and that costs you a team that knows what you stand for.

COACHING PRIORITIES

First: separate claiming from self-promotion in your own head — they are not the same act, and conflating them is what keeps you quiet. Second: pick the lowest-risk room to practice the one-sentence claim. Third: watch what happens to the discomfort — it won't go to zero, and it doesn't need to. We're building tolerance, not comfort.

WHAT I'D WATCH FOR

Two things. One — you'll be tempted to treat this data as a verdict on your character instead of a map of a gap. It isn't. The work is real; the signal is the problem. Two — when the discomfort of claiming shows up, you'll reach for the old move: do more, say less, let the work speak. Notice that reach. That's the pattern asking to stay invisible. The whole point is to not take the bait.

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 scored Self-Interest at 14 — near the floor. In your own mind, you don't position, you don't protect resources, you don't claim credit. You do the work and let it land where it lands.

Your raters disagree, and not by a little. They put you at 43 — squarely calibrated. That 29-point gap is the largest of the three dimensions, and it's a hidden strength, not a liability. The people around you see someone who positions their team's work appropriately, who advocates when it matters, who reads a room and frames decisions with awareness.

The subcategories sharpen this. Career Positioning shows the widest gap of your entire profile — you scored 6, raters scored 50. They see you positioning effectively while you believe you're doing none of it. Same with Resource Protection: you scored 6, they scored 46. You think you're giving everything away; they see someone who guards what the team needs.

Notice the level split too. Your manager scores Self-Interest at 48, your reports at 38. The people above you see more strategic advocacy than the people below you — which suggests you advocate upward more visibly than you do for or with your team. The closest gap is Decision Framing, where self and raters nearly agree at 25 and 29. That's the one place your self-image and reality line up.

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

You scored this at 6, your raters at 50 — a 44-point gap, the widest in your entire profile. You're convinced you do nothing to position yourself, but the people around you watch you do it effectively and consistently. The lesson isn't to start positioning — it's to recognize that you already are, and to do it on purpose.

Self 13, raters 50. You believe you don't shape the story of your work; others see you doing it well. The gap suggests your instinct for narrative is sound — you've just disowned it.

Self 6, raters 46. You think you give everything away, but your raters see someone who guards the time, people, and tools the work requires. That protective instinct is real and serving you — you simply don't count it as self-interest.

Self 19, raters 38. You undervalue how much relational capital you build, though the gap here is narrower than elsewhere. Others see investment you treat as just being decent.

Self 25, raters 29 — almost a match. This is the one corner where how you see yourself and how others see you align. Trust this as your baseline for what calibrated self-awareness feels like.

EGO

11/100 — SUPPRESSED

Ego is your lowest self-score at 11 and your most suppressed dimension. You see yourself as someone who absorbs feedback without defense, owns errors fully, holds no territory over ideas or knowledge.

Your raters put you at 31 — still under-calibrated, but 20 points higher than your self-view. They see a healthy amount of self-regard that you've written out of your own story. This isn't a warning that your ego runs hot. It's a signal that the modest, appropriate sense of self that others perceive is invisible to you.

Two subcategories carry the weight. Feedback Reception: you scored 19, raters 46. You think you take feedback flatly; they see someone who engages with it actively — which reads as healthy confidence, not ego defense. Error Response: you scored 6, raters 33. You believe you take total ownership of mistakes; others see a more balanced response that doesn't collapse into self-blame. That's healthier than you give yourself credit for.

The level pattern holds steady — manager at 35, reports at 28. Even your most generous raters keep Ego in the under-calibrated band, so there's no risk being flagged here. The opening is the opposite: you may be so allergic to appearing self-important that you've erased the ordinary, useful confidence others can plainly see.

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

Self 19, raters 46 — a 27-point gap. You think you receive feedback without much of a stance; others see active, confident engagement. What you read as neutrality, they read as self-assurance.

Self 6, raters 33. You believe you take full blame for every error; raters see a more measured response that doesn't over-absorb fault. That balance is healthier than the punishing standard you hold yourself to.

Self 13, raters 25. A smaller gap, but the same direction — you hold and offer expertise more visibly than you think. You're not claiming territory; you're simply being seen as knowledgeable.

Self 6, raters 25. You score yourself as indifferent to credit, but others detect a normal, appropriate awareness of it. Caring a little is not a flaw — it's human.

Self 13, raters 25. You don't think you claim your ideas; others see you stand behind them modestly. That ownership is part of why your ideas land.

COMPETITION

19/100 — SUPPRESSED

Competition is your highest self-score at 19 — which still places you in the suppressed band. You see yourself as someone who doesn't frame peers as rivals, doesn't play to win, doesn't build alliances strategically.

Your raters put you at 34. The 15-point gap is your smallest, which means your self-view is closest to reality here. But it's still a hidden strength — others see more competitive awareness than you claim.

The one subcategory that breaks the pattern is Peer Framing: you scored 13, raters scored 50 — a 37-point gap. You don't think about peers in competitive terms at all, but the people around you see you reading the landscape of who does what and where you stand. Win/Lose Orientation shows a similar split — self 25, raters 42. You play to win more than you admit. Meanwhile Information Flow, Alliance Building, and Threat Response stay close to your self-view, so the competitive awareness others see is concentrated in how you frame peers and outcomes, not in maneuvering or guarding information.

The level read is consistent — manager 38, reports 30. As with the other dimensions, your boss sees a sharper competitive edge than your team does. In a moderately competitive environment, the small gap here is the least urgent of the three. But the Peer Framing gap is worth sitting with: you're more aware of where you stand than you let yourself believe.

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, the widest in this dimension. You don't think you size up peers, but others see you reading the field clearly. That awareness is an asset you've disowned.

Self 25, raters 42. You play to win more than you admit to yourself. Others see drive toward outcomes that you frame internally as just caring about the work.

Self 25, raters 29 — nearly aligned. How you share and hold information matches how others perceive it. No recalibration needed here.

Self 13, raters 25. A modest gap. You build working coalitions a bit more deliberately than you think, but this stays in the under-calibrated range for both views.

Self 19, raters 25 — the closest match in this dimension. You and your raters agree you don't react defensively to threats. This is settled ground.

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 across all three dimensions points in one direction — you see far less of yourself than the people around you do. Every single gap is negative, and several of them are wide. You rated Self-Interest at 14, Ego at 11, Competition at 19. Your raters saw 43, 31, and 34.

That consistency is itself the finding. This isn't a case of being accurate in some places and blind in others — it's a person who systematically discounts their own presence in the room. When someone under-rates themselves across the board, it usually means they've built an identity around being modest, low-maintenance, and out of the way.

The most consequential gaps sit inside Self-Interest. Career Positioning shows a 44-point gap, Resource Protection 40, Credit & Narrative 37. These aren't small. The people you work with watch you advocate, protect what your team needs, and shape how your work gets understood — and you don't register any of it as something you do.

What makes your profile striking is that there is no blind spot in the usual sense. You don't overestimate yourself anywhere. The entire calibration error runs one way: you are more visible, more effective, and more present than you believe. That's a quieter problem than arrogance, but it costs just as much.

BLIND SPOTS & HIDDEN STRENGTHS

Every flagged item here is a hidden strength, not a blind spot — and that distinction matters for how we work on it. A blind spot is something you think you're doing that others don't see. You have none of those. What you have is a long list of things others see clearly that you've decided don't count.

Start with Career Positioning at self=6, raters=50. Your raters watch you position your work and your team with real skill. You experience it as just doing the job. Resource Protection tells the same story — self=6, raters=46. You fight for what your people need and then forget you fought. Credit & Narrative, 13 to 50, says you shape how things get understood far more than you'll admit. Peer Framing, 13 to 50, says your colleagues see someone who holds their own among equals while you picture yourself in the corner.

The Ego items deserve a gentler hand. Feedback Reception at self=19, raters=46 means people experience you as open and steady when they bring you hard things — you'd score yourself as merely adequate. Error Response, 6 to 33, says when something goes wrong you handle it with more composure than you give yourself credit for. Credit Sensitivity at 6 to 25 is the cleanest signal of all: you truly don't grab for credit, and others notice. The coaching here isn't to fix a flaw. It's to let you stop discounting the influence you already carry.

LEVEL PATTERNS

The level data is unusually clean, Jordan, and it tells a clear story. Your above-level rater scored you highest — Self-Interest 48, Ego 35, Competition 38. Your peer rater landed just below that. Your direct report scored you lowest across all three — Self-Interest 38, Ego 28, Competition 30.

This is the inverse of strategic code-switching. People who manage up well show high Self-Interest to the boss and low to the team — a performance. You show the opposite gradient. The higher someone sits, the more presence and self-advocacy they see in you. The people below you see the most modest version.

That pattern has a cost. Your manager and peers see someone substantial. Your direct report sees someone so self-effacing that your advocacy on their behalf may not be visible to them. When you fight for your team's resources and don't narrate it, the people who benefit can't see the protection happening — which means they can't learn it, and they can't trust that it's there.

ENVIRONMENT CONTEXT

Your environment reads as moderate across the board — competitiveness, visibility, complexity, and stability all at 3, overall intensity low. This matters, because it removes the most common excuse for under-calibration. You're not in a cutthroat place where staying small is survival. You're in a balanced setting where a bit more visible self-advocacy would cost you nothing and gain you something.

In this context, your raters' scores read as healthy. A Self-Interest of 43 in a moderately competitive org is right where it should be — aware, adjusting, not aggressive. Your raters are telling you that you're already calibrated for your environment. You just don't believe them.

That's the gift of a low-intensity setting: it's a safe place to practice taking up the space others already see you holding. There's no penalty here for letting people watch you advocate, claim a result, or name what your team accomplished. The room can handle more of you than you're currently offering it.

THE POLITICAL LANDSCAPE AUDIT

PRIMARY RECALIBRATION

You scored yourself an 11 on Ego and a 14 on Self-Interest — almost as low as the scale allows. Your raters, across every level, see something different. They put your Self-Interest at 43 and your Ego at 31. That's not flattery. It's evidence that the things you think you're not doing, you're already doing — and doing well enough that others notice.

The most consequential gap is Career Positioning: you rated it a 6, your raters a 50. A 44-point split. You believe you don't position yourself at all, while the people above, beside, and below you watch you advocate, frame, and place yourself in ways that register clearly. The cost of believing your own low number is that you keep apologizing for, or hiding from, a skill you actually have. You leave the room thinking you overstepped when everyone else thinks you showed up appropriately.

What to do differently: stop managing a problem that isn't there. When you feel the urge to shrink after speaking up for your work or your team's resources, check it against the data. Your raters are telling you the volume is fine — calibrated, even. The drift you need to catch isn't self-promotion. It's the reflex to undo it the moment it happens.

Staying where you are costs you visibility you've already earned. When the next opening comes, the person who names their contribution plainly gets considered. You'll have done the work and then quietly stepped back from it, and someone with half your judgment and twice your comfort claiming it will be in the room you should have been in.

SECONDARY ADJUSTMENT

The second adjustment is about a hidden strength your raters keep flagging: Feedback Reception. You scored it a 19. They scored it a 46. People at every level experience you as someone who takes input well — and you don't see it in yourself.

This matters because you're likely bracing for criticism that the people around you aren't delivering. You treat feedback as a threat to absorb rather than a strength to use. The 27-point gap suggests you've built a reputation for openness without realizing you have it.

Use it on purpose. Ask one person above you directly: what would you want to see more of from me? You already handle the answer better than you think. The data says so three times over.

WHAT NEEDS PERMISSION

This 360 is your permission slip. You've been operating as though showing any self-interest, any ego, any competitive instinct would mark you as the kind of person you don't want to be. Your raters — boss, peer, and report alike — are telling you that you're nowhere near that line. You have room to move toward it.

The Invisible pattern usually comes from a belief that being seen is the same as being self-serving. Your data breaks that link. People already see you as appropriately self-interested and reasonably composed under feedback. They're not asking you to dial it down. If anything, the above-level rater scored you highest — a quiet signal there's appetite for more.

So here's the permission: you can name your contribution without it being a character flaw. You can protect your team's resources without becoming territorial. You can let your work be associated with you. The version of you the raters describe is already doing this. You just haven't given yourself credit for it.

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 is the table you're about to sit at? Second, rate yourself: where will your Self-Interest, Ego, and Competition land in that room? Third — and this is the new step — ask: what would my raters say I'm actually doing?

That third question is the correction for someone who consistently underestimates their own presence. You'll predict you'll be invisible. Your rater data says you won't be. The gap between your prediction and their observation is exactly the drift to watch.

Over a few weeks, this becomes automatic. You'll start the meeting expecting to disappear and catch yourself, mid-thought, remembering that the people in the room already register you at a 43, not a 14. That recalibration in real time is the whole point.

WHAT'S GOING TO RESIST

What fights back is the old story that taking up space is taking something from someone else. Every time you position yourself, a voice will tell you you've gone too far — and the data says you almost never have.

The resistance won't feel like fear. It'll feel like virtue — like you're being humble, generous, easy to work with. That's why it's hard to catch. Humility that erases your contribution isn't generosity. It's a tax you pay that no one asked you to.

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 actually did, how invisible you felt afterward, and a rater-check column — what would my boss, peer, or report have observed? The fourth column is where the learning lives. You'll see your felt-invisibility and your observed-presence diverge again and again.

Log every meeting where you spoke up for your work, your team, or your resources. Note the urge to retract afterward. Over a month, the pattern will be unmistakable: you registered as present and appropriate while feeling like you'd overstepped.

WHAT YOU'LL SEE

You'll see that your internal alarm fires constantly while the external consequence almost never arrives. The felt-cost and the actual-cost rarely match. The raters were right and the alarm was wrong.

WHAT FIGHTS THE DATA

The instinct to skip the rater-check column when you're sure you went too far. That's precisely the entry worth making. The certainty that you overstepped is the symptom, not the truth.

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 someone running the Invisible pattern, it's about noticing who in your environment plays the political game openly — and learning to read them rather than recoil from them. Add a 360 lens to it: for each person, note not just how they operate, but how they likely perceive you. Your raters already told you that perception is higher than you assume.

Map three people: one above, one beside, one below. For each, ask what they want, how they pursue it, and where your interests overlap. You'll find more shared ground than you expect, because you've been treating their normal political behavior as something foreign to you.

RECALIBRATE ONE DIMENSION

Pick Career Positioning — your widest gap at 44 points. For one week, name your contribution in one meeting without retracting it afterward, and assume your raters will read it as a 50, not the 6 you fear. Then check the actual reaction against your prediction.

The dimension I need to adjust:

The specific behavior I'm changing:

What I expect to feel when I adjust:

READ ONE OPPONENT

Choose the above-level rater, the one who scored you highest. Watch how they position themselves and ask what they'd want to see more of from you. Their higher scores suggest they're already inviting more from you — read the invitation instead of bracing against it.

The person I'm analyzing:

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

What they want that they're not getting:

BUILD ONE ALLIANCE

Find the peer who rated you. Your raters see your Relationship Investment at 38 against your own 19 — you're more connected than you credit. Use that existing trust to build one deliberate alliance, naming a shared goal out loud rather than assuming the connection speaks for itself.

The relationship I'm investing in:

What I'm offering:

What I need in return:

THE FIRST 30 DAYS

WEEK 1

You scored yourself a 14 on Self-Interest. Your raters — at every level — put you nearly 30 points higher. The first week isn't about changing behavior. It's about seeing what others already see in you.

1. List three moments this week where you advanced your own work, named your contribution, or held a resource. Your raters scored Career Positioning at 50 to your 6 — you do this more than you admit.
2. Write down one decision you made primarily for yourself this week. Decision Framing was your tightest gap. Notice you're not as self-erasing as you believe.
3. Tell one person what you actually accomplished — without crediting the team in the same breath. Just the fact. Then watch what happens.

The hidden strength here is real. People above, beside, and below you all see capability you're discounting. The gap between your 14 and their 43 is not modesty — it's a costly blind spot.

By Friday, ask yourself: did naming my own work feel like a violation or just unfamiliar? That distinction tells you whether this is values or fear.

WEEK 2

Ego scored lowest of all — your 11 against their 31. Your Error Response self-score was a 6; raters saw 33. You absorb fault faster than you defend yourself. This week, slow that reflex.

1. The next time something goes wrong, wait before claiming the blame. Ask whether it was actually yours. Your Error Response gap of 27 says you take on more than belongs to you.
2. When you receive feedback this week, say thank you and then say what you actually think. Feedback Reception scored 46 from raters — they see you engaging more than you credit.
3. Hold one idea as yours for a full meeting. Don't hand it off, don't dilute it. Idea Ownership is suppressed for a reason worth examining.

Suppressed ego isn't humility — it's invisibility with a virtuous label. When you take blame that isn't yours, you train people to let you carry it.

Notice whether defending an idea felt arrogant or just honest. If it felt arrogant, that's the calibration that needs adjusting, not the behavior.

WEEK 3

Competition was your most amplified dimension at 19 — and still suppressed. Peer Framing scored 50 from raters against your 13. You're more competitive than you let yourself believe, and that's not a flaw.

1. Identify one peer whose work overlaps yours. Name, privately, where you'd want to be the one who delivered it. Peer Framing's 37-point gap says this instinct already exists in you.
2. Build one alliance this week with intention — not friendship, partnership. Alliance Building scored 25 from raters, your lowest competition subcategory. Pick someone whose goals align with yours.
3. When you have information others need, decide deliberately what to share and when. Information Flow was nearly even — use that awareness on purpose.

Win/Lose Orientation scored 42 from raters to your 25 — they see you wanting to win more than you admit to wanting it. Wanting to win is not the same as wanting others to lose.

Ask yourself whether competing felt dishonest or simply uncomfortable. Discomfort fades with practice. Dishonesty doesn't — so be sure which one it is.

WEEK 4

This week, integrate. Across all three dimensions, every rater group placed you 15 to 34 points above your own scoring. Above-level raters saw it most — Self-Interest at 48. That's the room where being seen matters.

1. Revisit the level breakdown: your manager scored you highest across all three dimensions. Schedule a conversation where you name one piece of work you own. They already see you — let your words match their view.
2. Pick the single subcategory with the widest gap — Career Positioning at 44 points — and choose one concrete habit to keep past 30 days.
3. Write the version of yourself your raters described and read it back. The person they see is more present, more capable, and more substantial than the one you scored.

The Invisible pattern protects you from exposure but costs you the room. Your raters are telling you the cost is unnecessary — you're already more visible than you fear.

Look at the four weeks together. The work was never to become someone else. It was to let your self-assessment catch up to who you already are to everyone watching.

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