

# AN EFFICACY STUDY ON “INTELLIGENCE OF SELF”: *Voice Dialogue and Personality Types*

by Pierre Cauvin  
and Geneviève Cailloux

In 2005, the book *Livre noir de la psychanalyse* [Black Book of Psychoanalysis] appeared and caused a great stir in the psychological community. Among the questions raised on this occasion, there was one that particularly attracted our attention: should and can the efficacy of a coaching or personal development approach be measured?

*Should it be?*

After all, in one of his works, James Hillmann states that any method is good from the moment when it provides enough support to permit someone to understand his or her life. This is, in the main, true, but it is not enough to convince our clients that what we offer them is useful. Let us therefore keep to the middle ground between the absence of measurement and quantification at any cost.

We have therefore decided to try to evaluate our approach: “**Intelligence of Self**,” which combines Voice Dialogue and Personality Types.

*Can it be?*

Yes, undoubtedly, provided that we show a healthy humility and clearly indicate the evaluation procedure before presenting its results.

## THE EVALUATION PROCEDURE

### THE POPULATION STUDIED

For practical reasons and rapidity, we chose to focus this first study on human resources professionals registered in the “coaching” training course, **Intelligence of Self**. Strictly speaking, it is therefore more a question of evaluating the training than the approach itself. As the training program, however, consists for the most part in applying the approach to the participants, it is not rash to consider that an evaluation of one is also that of the other. This training program lasts 28 days, spread out over two years, with a thesis required for qualification; a third year of nine days permits advanced training.

This study concerns 24 people, divided among three classes. For certain questions, due to a lack of precision in their formulation, only 13 answers could be taken into account. It is therefore a very small sample and the conclusions must be taken with caution. Let us note, however, that all the distributions, with only one exception, are Gaussian, which places us in a statistically reliable environment.

### THE EVALUATION METHOD

Overall, there are two ways:

- An “objective” evaluation, through application of external criteria. CBT practitioners compare, for example, the suicide rate of patients suffering from depression who have had therapy to that of those who haven’t. We did not use this method, as much for lack of time and means as for the difficulty in finding appropriate criteria.
- A “subjective” evaluation through self-evaluation. Although subjective, this evaluation is not arbitrary. We know, for example, that the patients know how to place themselves on a pain scale precisely from 1 to 10, without exaggerating in one direction or the other. So we applied this principle.

## THE QUESTIONNAIRE AND ITS ADMINISTRATION

### *At the beginning of the training program*

The participants were asked on the first day of the training program to:

- Determine their professional (Question 1) and personal (Question 2) goals, as well as the main difficulties they were encountering (Questions 31, 32, 33)
- Rank these different elements on a scale from 1 (everything is going badly) to 10 (things are going well)
- Estimate in the same way, the degree of global satisfaction with their life (Question 4)

The ambiguous formulation of questions 31, 32 and 33 in the first version made their analysis impossible for 11 cases – which explains the difference in size of the population according to the questions concerned.

Osiris kept the filled-out questionnaires.

### *At the end of the second year of the training program*

The participants:

- Received the list of goals and difficulties that they had established, *without the initial ranking*
- Ranked on a scale of 1 to 10 their current degree of satisfaction

This approach makes it possible to limit to the maximum the influence of one ranking on the other or the more or less conscious desire to show progress because no participant could recall the rank used two years earlier. Some of them were even surprised to find goals or difficulties that they had forgotten.

## RAW DATA

### *Establishment*

- Attribution of a number to each respondent from 1 to 24
- Establishment of a synthesis sheet for each respondent including the before/after ranking for each question designated simply by their abbreviation (Q1, Q2, Q31, Q32, Q33, Q4) or their heading (professional project, etc.) without mentioning the content specific to each question

### *Comments*

This way of working allows:

- Total anonymity of the answers
- Complete disconnection of the evaluation from the specific content of the individual goals/difficulties

## PROCESSING OF THE DATA AND RESULTS

The data processing and analysis of the results were carried out by a specialist, Victor Troyano, a lecturer in psychology at the University of Lyon 2. We are presenting the main results, including the tables, adding our comments to his.

## DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS

The idea here is the “raw” results, without any correlation calculation. We are presenting, below, the table of the complete results, for the curious. For those who are put off by figures, turn to the next table!

	Pop.	Min.	Max.	Mode	Median	Average	Stand. dev.	Variance
Professional project evaluation 1	24	1	8	3	3.5	3.79	1.98	3.91
Personal project evaluation 1	24	1	8	3	3	3.92	1.89	3.56
Difficulty 1 evaluation 1	13	2	7	2	3	3.31	1.38	1.90
Difficulty 2 evaluation 1	13	2	6	3	3	3.54	1.33	1.77
Difficulty 3 evaluation 1	13	1	6	2	3	3.46	1.56	2.44
Global satisfaction evaluation 1	24	3	9	6	6	6.13	1.42	2.03
Personal project evaluation 2	24	4	10	8	8	7.75	1.48	2.20
Professional project evaluation 2	24	6	10	9	8	8.21	1.18	1.39
Difficulty 1 evaluation 2	13	5	9	6	7	6.77	1.24	1.53
Difficulty 2 evaluation 2	13	4	8	8	7	6.54	1.45	2.10
Difficulty 3 evaluation 2	13	2	10	6	6	6.15	2.38	5.64
Global satisfaction evaluation 2	24	3	10	8	8	7.50	1.56	2.43

Chart 1: Descriptive Statistics

The second table is more revealing. It presents the difference in averages between the first evaluation and the second evaluation; in other words, it directly answers the initial question "Is there a significant improvement between the beginning and the end of the training program?"

## Differences in averages: evaluation 2 - evaluation 1

Professional goal	3.96
Personal goal	4.29
First difficulty	3.46
Second difficulty	3.00
Third difficulty	2.69
General satisfaction with one's own life	1.37

Chart 2: Differences in Averages

As can be easily observed, there is clear progress for all the questions. The dimensions follow a normal law (Kolmogorov-Smirnov test) with the exception of the professional project dimension. Considering the small sample size, a nonparametric test (Wilcoxon test) was used. What emerges from these two tests is that all the deviations in average are meaningful ( $p < .02$ )

This was the hoped-for result and it was largely reached. In this general framework, a few specific observations:

- The highest progression concerns the personal goal. This is coherent with the fact that
  - Learning the approach is done through personal discovery
  - A large part of the participants came as much for their own development as for professional training
- The progression on the three difficulties decreases in importance: the first has the strongest progression, the third the weakest. Here too, the result seems logical. The first difficulty is probably the one that seems the most important, although the participants were not asked to rank the difficulties in order of importance. It is therefore on this first difficulty that the main effort had to be made.
- The weakest progression, but statistically significant, concerns general satisfaction (about one's own life and not about the training). The weakness of the progression results from the fact that the first evaluation on this question is particularly high; the margin of progress is therefore reduced. The question can then be asked: why is the first assessment higher than the others? Hypotheses:
  - Social desirability: not seeming to be doing badly
  - Relativizing: compared to the others, I don't have anything to complain about
  - Putting things in perspective: in spite of my problems, things aren't so bad
  - People who attend the training have objective reasons to be on the whole satisfied with their life
  - ...

## DESCRIPTION OF THE CORRELATIONS

For their fans, we are providing, in the annex, the table of correlations (simplified). Relationships are notably observed:

### *On the level of the first evaluation*

- Between the professional project and personal project evaluations
- Between the evaluation of the professional project and the evaluation of difficulties 2 and 3
- Between the evaluation of the personal project and difficulties 1, 2 and 3. Difficulty 1 is therefore apparently more linked to the personal project
- Between general satisfaction and difficulties 1 and 2

There seem to be strong links between the professional, personal projects and the difficulties. This can seem obvious – but it is not verified on the level of the second evaluation.

### *On the level of the second evaluation*

In fact, only a single correlation is observed between the evaluation of the professional project and the evaluation of the personal project.

Notably, the improvement in personal and professional projects is not correlated with the improvement in difficulties. This is very interesting.

During the first evaluation, it seems that each participant draws up a table whose elements are coherent. During the second evaluation, reality is

disconnected from the initial vision.

The hypothesis that can be formulated — with all proper reserves — is that the accomplishment of projects was not as linked to the difficulties as the participants thought; the improvement in difficulties is moreover less than that of the projects. Along the way, the participants found something other than what they were expecting, in their best interests. This will undoubtedly not surprise Voice Dialogue and Intelligence of Self practitioners who know that many things happen during sessions other than what the client was expecting!

## CONCLUSIONS

- ① In the framework of the experimentation conditions, the efficacy of the Intelligence of Self approach on the professional as well as the personal level is statistically demonstrated.
- ② The study opens reflection tracks, for example:
  - Can a “general satisfaction” criterion be used?
  - To what extent is the progression of the projects linked to the improvement in difficulties?
- ③ The next phase should consist of an efficacy study with direct users (the clients of the people trained).
- ④ Any remarks and suggestions are welcome!

	Pro project eval. 1	Pro project eval. 2	Per project eval. 1	Per project eval. 2	Difficulty 1 eval. 1	Difficulty 1 eval. 2	Difficulty 2 eval. 1	Difficulty 2 eval. 2	Difficulty 3 eval. 1	Difficulty 3 eval. 2	Satisfaction eval. 1	Satisfaction eval. 2
Pro project eval 1	1	.234	.753	.206	.500	-.006	.595	.709	.556	.135	.272	.444
Pro project eval 2	.234	1	.179	.604	.435	-.211	.505	.334	.214	.073	.407	.338
Perso proj. eval 1	.753	.179	1	.243	.554	.144	.788	.436	.690	.054	.263	.236
Perso proj. eval 2	.206	.604	.243	1	.851	.014	.475	.436	.361	.310	.554	.390
Difficulty 1 eval 1	.500	.435	.554	.851	1	.045	.630	.327	.549	.010	.688	.505
Difficulty 1 eval 2	-.006	-.211	.144	.014	.045	1	-.172	.168	.060	.326	.178	-.052
Difficulty 2 eval 1	.595	.505	.788	.475	.630	-.172	1	.312	.593	.051	.584	.613
Difficulty 2 eval 2	.709	.334	.436	.436	.327	.168	.312	1	.102	.216	.536	.486
Difficulty 3 eval 1	.556	.214	.690	.361	.549	.060	.593	.102	1	-.111	.183	.260
Difficulty 3 eval 2	.135	.073	.054	.310	.010	.326	.051	.216	-.111	1	.088	.252
Satisfaction eval 1	.272	.407	.263	.554	.688	.178	.584	.536	.183	.088	1	.440
Satisfaction eval 2	.444	.338	.236	.390	.505	-.052	.613	.486	.260	.252	.440	1
Number	24	24	24	24	13	13	13	13	13	13	24	24

Chart 3: Correlations Matrix (Pearson)

- The correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (bilateral)
- The correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (bilateral)

For any additional information, please write to us at:  
 Osiris Conseil - 33 rue du Montoir—F 77670 Vernou sur Seine  
 Tel.: 33 (0)1 64 23 03 07 | e-mail: [contact@osiris-conseil.com](mailto:contact@osiris-conseil.com)  
 URL: [www.osiris-conseil.com](http://www.osiris-conseil.com)