

DIFFERENT BY DESIGN · STRONGER TOGETHER

ZONE TYPING™

Premium Couples Report

SAMPLE REPORT

This sample uses placeholder labels (Person A and Person B) to show what a Zone Typing™ couples report looks like. It is not based on any real couple.

PREPARED FOR

Person A & Person B

DATE TAKEN

Shown for illustration

Understanding yourself. Understanding others. Building greater flexibility.

Dr. Dale R. Goodman · EdenToday.org

© 2026 Dr. Dale R. Goodman · Zone Typing™ / Zone Compatibility · All rights reserved.

Table of Contents

A Personal Introduction

Understanding the Zone Framework

Zone Reference

Your Relationship at a Glance

1 — Thinking & Processing

2 — Communication & Social Processing

3 — Decisions & Relationships

4 — Time, Structure & Task Management

Adaptability

When Your Zones Collide

What You Bring Out in Each Other

Worksheet: Your Collaboration Strategy

Your Practical Growth Plan

Reflection, Faith & Next Steps

About Dr. Dale R. Goodman

A Personal Introduction

Why this report matters — and how to use it together

THE PURPOSE OF THIS REPORT

This report is designed to do more than show where each of you falls on a scale. Its purpose is to help you recognize the meaning behind your differences, appreciate what each person naturally contributes, and develop practical ways to communicate, decide, and live together with greater understanding.

Over the years, I have worked with many couples who genuinely love one another, yet become frustrated by differences they do not fully understand. Often, the problem is not a lack of love or commitment. Two people may simply process, communicate, decide, relate, and approach everyday responsibilities in very different ways.

That is one reason I developed Zone Typing™. My hope is that this report helps you see those differences from a new perspective. Instead of asking, “Why does my spouse do that?” try asking, “What preference might be shaping how they are seeing this?” That shift can lower defensiveness and make room for curiosity.

Your results are not meant to put either of you into a box, and no Zone is better than another. The goal is to understand your natural starting points, value what each brings, and grow greater flexibility when the relationship needs something outside your usual preference.

Read this report slowly and together. Pause when something feels especially accurate. Use the Reflection & Application Questions as conversation guides to turn insight into practical understanding and meaningful change.

My hope is simple: that greater understanding leads to greater appreciation, clearer communication, less unnecessary conflict, and a stronger relationship.

— Dr. Dale R. Goodman

Understanding the Zone Framework

Zone Typing™ grew from Dr. Dale Goodman's study and clinical application of ideas associated with cerebral lateralization and hemispheric specialization. Contemporary neuroscience also shows that complex thinking, emotion, and personality depend on integrated networks across the brain.

Zone Typing™ uses Left Zone and Right Zone as a processing framework. It does not claim that a person is globally “left-brained” or “right-brained,” and it does not measure hemisphere dominance. It describes patterns of preference in thinking, communication, decisions, relationships, and daily life.

Zone Types

The three directions a preference can lean

LEFT ZONE (LZ)

Often favors sequence, precision, structure, predictability, facts, and closure. Common strengths include organization, reliability, analysis, and follow-through.

MIDDLE ZONE (MZ)

Common strengths are the ability to access both Left and Right Zone.

RIGHT ZONE (RZ)

Often favors big-picture thinking, connection, possibility, flexibility, intuition, and relational impact. Common strengths include creativity, adaptability, empathy, and vision.

Zone Reference

A side-by-side look at how each Zone tends to show up in daily life

ZONE REFERENCE	LEFT ZONE	MIDDLE ZONE	RIGHT ZONE
Pace	Structured and steady	Flexible, situational	Spontaneous and adaptive
Priority	Accuracy and structure	Balance, as the moment calls for it	Connection and possibility
Strengths	Organization, reliability, analysis, follow-through	Access to both sides as the situation requires	Creativity, adaptability, empathy, vision
Struggles	Can be rigid, slow to adapt	May lack a strong natural lean either way	Can be scattered, miss important details
Often Fears	Losing control, being unprepared	Being forced to commit to one side permanently	Losing connection, being boxed in
Under Stress	Becomes more rigid or controlling	Can lean either direction depending on the stressor	Becomes more scattered or avoidant
Communication	Measured, deliberate	Adjusts to fit the conversation	Open, expressive, in the moment

ZONE CATEGORIES, TYPES & SUBTYPES

The more opposite you are in your Zone Types will require more intentionality to understand and to appreciate the opposite trait of your partner. This will help minimize some of the conflict that can arise out of the difference.

Four Categories	Person A	Person B
1. PROCESSING	RZ: Dominant	LZ: Dominant
2. COMMUNICATION	RZ: Moderate	RZ: Slight
3. DECISION MAKING	RZ: Moderate	LZ: Dominant
4. TIME MANAGEMENT	RZ: Dominant	LZ: Dominant

Your Relationship at a Glance

The most important patterns to understand first

Person A — Dominant Right Zone

Clear, consistent preference pattern

Person B — Dominant Left Zone

Clear, consistent preference pattern

YOUR COUPLE SIGNATURE

- **Person A:** Naturally brings openness to possibility, relationship impact, and adaptation.
- **Person B:** Naturally brings structure, clarity, and dependable follow-through.
- **Together:** Your strongest growth comes from learning when your marriage needs expansion and when it needs definition — without treating either preference as the standard the other must become.

GREATEST CONTRAST — TIME, STRUCTURE & TASK MANAGEMENT

- Person A: Dominant Right Zone — every comparison favored flexibility.
- Person B: Dominant Left Zone — every comparison favored structure.

CLOSEST CATEGORY — COMMUNICATION & SOCIAL PROCESSING

- Person A: Moderate Right Zone.
- Person B: Slight Right Zone — nearly matching Person A's, the smallest gap of any category, and the one place you're actually alike rather than opposite.

WHAT YOU SHARE — CONSISTENCY OF PREFERENCE

- Person A leans Right across all four categories, consistently.
- Person B leans Left in three categories — Thinking & Processing, Decisions & Relationships, and Time, Structure & Task Management — and Right in one, Communication & Social Processing.
- Together: three categories show a clear opposite pattern; Communication is the exception, where you're actually aligned rather than opposite.

WHAT SUCCESS LOOKS LIKE FOR YOU

1. Use Person B's structure where reliability matters and Person A's flexibility where flexibility matters.
2. Protect both predictability and freedom instead of requiring one style to win every situation.
3. Notice the Zone difference early enough that it does not turn into a judgment about character.

1 PROCESSING

How you take in information, organize it, and make sense of the whole picture

PERSON A DOMINANT RIGHT ZONE PREFERENCE

You naturally tend to begin with the larger picture, make connections quickly, and allow ideas to develop as you go. You may see possibilities before all the details are settled, and you often gain clarity through exploration.

PERSON B DOMINANT LEFT ZONE PREFERENCE

You naturally tend to organize information through detail, sequence, precision, and a clear process. You may feel more comfortable moving forward once the important pieces are defined and the order is established.

RELATIONSHIP STRENGTH

- **Person A:** Broadens the picture, notices possibilities, and helps keep new options visible.
- **Person B:** Brings ideas into focus through sequence, questions, details, and practical requirements.
- **Together:** One opens up more possibilities while the other brings shape and structure to them.

POTENTIAL CHALLENGE

- **Person A:** May experience requests for more detail as slowing the process or narrowing possibilities too soon.
- **Person B:** May experience rapid movement among ideas as incomplete or insufficiently thought through.
- **Together:** The tension is often about processing sequence, not whose thinking is better.

WHEN THIS STRENGTH GETS OVERUSED

Person A: Big-picture thinking taken too far can mean never landing on a concrete plan, leaving important details unaddressed. Person B: A love of structure taken too far can mean rejecting a good idea simply because it didn't follow the expected process.

Teambuilding

Turning big-picture ideas and careful detail into shared understanding

COMMUNICATING WITH PERSON A

DO

- Let the idea develop before asking for a finished plan.
- Engage with the big picture before drilling into details.
- Expect the process to evolve as new information comes in.

DON'T

- Don't demand a fully mapped-out plan before any work begins.
- Don't dismiss an idea just because it isn't fully formed yet.
- Don't rush to details before the concept is clear.

COMMUNICATING WITH PERSON B

DO

- Give a clear starting point and sequence.
- Allow time to work through details before deciding.
- Respect the value of a proven process.

DON'T

- Don't expect excitement for an idea with no structure yet.
- Don't skip steps to save time.
- Don't treat the need for a plan as inflexibility.

WHAT HELPS PERSON A

Treat Person B's questions as an effort to make the idea workable, not automatic rejection. Give enough time for sequence, evidence, and practical details before expecting commitment. When the discussion narrows, ask which details are essential and which can wait.

WHAT HELPS PERSON B

Consider more dialogue before narrowing down to a decision. Ask whether Person A is brainstorming, recommending, or asking for a decision. Avoid requiring every detail before a possibility can be discussed.

WHEN YOU ARE TALKING PAST EACH OTHER

Person A may still be exploring while Person B has already started evaluating. Be curious. Ask: "Are we brainstorming, evaluating, or deciding?" That one question can lower a surprising amount of tension.

A FAMILIAR CONFLICT SCRIPT TO WATCH FOR

"You're overthinking this." / "You haven't thought this through." When this script appears, stop arguing about who is thinking correctly. Ask: "What does this issue need next — more possibility, more detail, or a decision?"

QUESTIONS TO TALK THROUGH TOGETHER

Which stage do we rush? Which stage do we skip? Where has Person A's broader thinking helped us see an option we might have missed, and where has Person B's detail helped turn an idea into something dependable?

A FOUR-STEP SHARED THINKING SEQUENCE

1	Explore Start by generating possibilities freely, without yet deciding whether each one will work.
2	Define Identify the facts, constraints, details, costs, and questions that must be settled before moving forward.
3	Test Ask together: What is realistic? What could work? What would make this stronger, safer, or more complete?
4	Conclude Name what is still only an idea, what has become a real option, and what the next concrete step will be.

Reflection Questions

1. When we face a new idea or problem, what does Person A tend to see first, and what does Person B tend to look for before feeling ready to move forward?
2. Where has Person A's big-picture thinking opened a useful possibility, and where has Person B's attention to detail helped turn an idea into a workable plan?
3. What upcoming decision would benefit from deliberately giving both exploration and detail a place before we decide?

2 COMMUNICATION

How your thoughts, self-expression, and contact needs may differ

PERSON A MODERATE RIGHT ZONE PREFERENCE

You tend to be open and spontaneous in conversation and may discover what you think by talking it through. Interaction can create energy and clarity, especially when the relationship feels emotionally connected.

PERSON B SLIGHT RIGHT ZONE PREFERENCE

You also lean toward openness in conversation — discovering what you think as you talk it through — though this preference is softer and less set than Person A's. Depending on the moment, you may move between spontaneous sharing and a more measured, reflective response.

RELATIONSHIP STRENGTH

- **Person A:** Brings thoughts and feelings into the open readily and can create momentum through conversation.
- **Person B:** Shares that same openness, and brings a touch more flexibility to slow down and reflect when a conversation calls for it.
- **Together:** You largely speak the same communication language — conversations can move quickly without one of you needing to translate for the other.

POTENTIAL CHALLENGE

- **Person A:** May move quickly into talking something through before either of you has had a moment to think it over first.
- **Person B:** May follow Person A's lead into an open, fast-moving conversation even in moments that would benefit from more reflection first.
- **Together:** With neither of you naturally the one who slows things down, an important conversation can move faster than it should — the risk here isn't misunderstanding each other, it's rushing.

WHEN THIS STRENGTH GETS OVERUSED

Person A: Openness taken too far can mean talking through every thought out loud, without leaving room for either person to actually land somewhere. Person B: Matching Person A's pace too consistently can mean a real need for reflection goes unspoken until it becomes a bigger issue.

Teambuilding

Making the most of a shared strength, without losing the value of slowing down

COMMUNICATING WITH PERSON A

DO

- Give Person B a moment to finish a thought before responding.
- Say what you're thinking, even half-formed — it helps both of you think out loud.
- Circle back and summarize what was decided.

DON'T

- Don't assume silence means agreement.
- Don't fill every pause — some are just someone finishing a thought.
- Don't treat a slower response as disinterest.

COMMUNICATING WITH PERSON B

DO

- Say directly when you want a moment to think, rather than matching the pace by default.
- Trust your instinct to speak up — it's real, not just going along.
- Name when a conversation has actually reached a decision.

DON'T

- Don't stay quiet about wanting reflection time and raise it only later.
- Don't assume Person A will notice you need a pause.
- Don't let a fast conversation stand in for a real decision.

WHAT HELPS PERSON A

Check in before assuming Person B wants to talk something through right away. This preference is real but lighter than Person A's, so Person B may sometimes want a beat to think first, even though open conversation usually works well for both of you.

WHAT HELPS PERSON B

Trust your instinct to speak up in the moment — it's a genuine part of how you communicate, not just something you do to match Person A. When you do want space to think first, say so directly rather than defaulting to going along with the pace.

WHEN MOVING FAST ISN'T ACTUALLY HELPING

Because you both lean toward talking things through, it's easy to keep a conversation moving even when it would benefit from a pause. Try: "We're both ready to keep going — should we, or would 30 minutes to think first make this easier?"

A FAMILIAR CONFLICT SCRIPT TO WATCH FOR

"We already talked this through." / "I don't think we actually landed anywhere." When this script appears, it's often a sign the conversation moved fast but skipped a real decision point. Go back and name what was actually agreed, not just discussed.

A SMALL SHIFT CAN CHANGE THE TONE

Person A: pause and ask before assuming Person B's ready to keep talking. Person B: say it out loud when you want a moment, rather than matching Person A's pace by default. Both shifts protect the reflection time your shared openness can otherwise skip.

A FOUR-STEP CONVERSATION CHECK-IN

1	Connect One sentence that signals, “We are on the same team.”
2	Name the pace Either of you can ask: “Are we thinking out loud, or do we need a minute first?” — since you both lean toward talking it through, this has to be asked on purpose.
3	Make room If either person wants reflection time, that request gets the same weight as a request to keep talking.
4	Agree Choose one concrete next step, who owns it, and when you will revisit it if needed.

Reflection Questions

1. Where has our shared, open communication style served us well — made things faster, warmer, or easier to work through together?
2. Are there moments where we'd both benefit from slowing down, even though neither of us naturally pumps the brakes?
3. Since Person B's lean here is softer than Person A's, when does Person B actually want more space to reflect, and how would Person B signal that in the moment?

3 DECISION MAKING

How facts, people, consistency, and relational impact enter the decision process

PERSON A MODERATE RIGHT ZONE PREFERENCE

You tend to give meaningful weight to relationship impact, intuition, and how a decision may affect the people involved. You may also remain open to reconsidering as new information or relational dynamics emerge.

PERSON B DOMINANT LEFT ZONE PREFERENCE

You tend to give greater weight to facts, analysis, task requirements, and having enough information before reaching a conclusion. Once the reasoning feels sound, consistency may be important to you.

RELATIONSHIP STRENGTH

- **Person A:** Keeps human impact, relational consequences, intuition, and less-obvious possibilities in view.
- **Person B:** Grounds decisions in facts, practical requirements, consistency, and clear reasoning.
- **Together:** Strong decisions often need both lenses.

POTENTIAL CHALLENGE

- **Person A:** May experience a strong focus on facts as though relationship impact is being minimized.
- **Person B:** May experience continued attention to feelings, intuition, or changing circumstances as though the decision keeps moving.
- **Together:** Each may be protecting something important that the other is not attending to first.

WHEN THIS STRENGTH GETS OVERUSED

Person A: Weighing relational impact too heavily can mean a decision never quite closes, since there's always another person's feelings left to consider. Person B: Weighing facts too heavily can mean a technically correct decision that overlooks real cost to the people it affects.

Teambuilding

Giving facts, people, values, and consequences a place at the table

COMMUNICATING WITH PERSON A

DO

- Bring the facts and timeline Person B needs to feel confident.
- Say explicitly when you're ready to decide, not just exploring.
- Acknowledge the practical requirements Person B has already weighed.

DON'T

- Don't treat a request for details as distrust.
- Don't keep a decision open after agreeing it's settled.
- Don't dismiss practical concerns as missing the bigger picture.

COMMUNICATING WITH PERSON B

DO

- Ask how a decision affects the people involved, not just the facts.
- Name what new information would actually change your mind.
- Acknowledge the relational concern before presenting the data.

DON'T

- Don't treat relational concerns as a distraction from the real issue.
- Don't reopen a settled decision without something genuinely new.
- Don't let "the facts say so" be the whole answer to a people question.

WHAT HELPS PERSON A

Make room for relational impact before closing the issue. Explain why a decision is needed now rather than treating closure itself as the goal. If the answer is no, acknowledge the people, feelings, or possibilities involved before moving to the practical conclusion.

WHAT HELPS PERSON B

State the bottom line and the practical reasoning clearly. Distinguish genuinely new information from simply wanting to keep exploring. Once an agreement is reached, avoid reopening it unless something material has changed.

WHEN ONE WANTS CLOSURE AND THE OTHER WANTS MORE TIME

Ask one concrete question: "What information is still missing?" If the missing information could materially change the decision, name how you will get it and by when. If nothing material is missing, recognize that the remaining discomfort may be the Zone difference itself.

A FAMILIAR CONFLICT SCRIPT TO WATCH FOR

"We already decided this." / "But something has changed." Before escalating, ask whether the new issue is truly new information or whether the same preference difference is resurfacing in a new form.

QUESTIONS TO TALK THROUGH TOGETHER

Which decisions tend to get reopened? Where has Person B's careful reasoning protected us from a mistake? Where has Person A's attention to people or changing circumstances protected us from a different kind of mistake?

A FOUR-STEP SHARED DECISION PROCESS

1	Name it Define the actual decision and whether there is a real deadline. Do not solve five related issues at once.
2	Hear both lenses List facts, requirements, costs, and consequences; then list relational impact, values, intuition, and people affected.
3	Set the rule Before closing, agree on what kind of new information would be important enough to reopen the decision later.
4	Close & own State the decision, who owns the next action, and when you will review it if a review is truly needed.

Reflection Questions

1. When making a decision, what does Person A tend to weigh first, and what does Person B tend to weigh first? Where can each perspective add something the other may miss?
2. When has one person's preferred decision style protected us from a mistake, blind spot, or unintended consequence?
3. For a current decision, how can we deliberately hear both the practical facts and the relational impact before reaching closure?

4 TIME MANAGEMENT

How you relate to schedules, deadlines, follow-through, and changing priorities

PERSON A DOMINANT RIGHT ZONE PREFERENCE

You tend to work with greater flexibility around schedules, timing, and changing priorities. You may adapt quickly when new information appears and can function well when there is room to adjust the plan.

PERSON B DOMINANT LEFT ZONE PREFERENCE

You tend to prefer clearer structure, time awareness, early preparation, and dependable follow-through. Plans and agreed expectations can create a sense of order, competence, and trust.

RELATIONSHIP STRENGTH

- **Person A:** Brings adaptability, spontaneity, and an ability to adjust when plans change.
- **Person B:** Brings predictability, organization, preparation, and follow-through.
- **Together:** Person B can help keep responsibilities from drifting; Person A can help keep structure from becoming too fixed for real life.

POTENTIAL CHALLENGE

- **Person A:** May hear strong structure as controlling or unnecessarily rigid.
- **Person B:** May hear flexibility as disorganization, lack of urgency, or unreliability.
- **Together:** One may be protecting predictability while the other is protecting room to adapt.

WHEN THIS STRENGTH GETS OVERUSED

Person A: Flexibility taken too far can mean commitments quietly slip, and Person B stops trusting that a plan will hold. Person B: Structure taken too far can mean every small change feels like a crisis, even when nothing that actually matters is at risk.

Teambuilding

Creating dependable agreements without making life feel rigid

COMMUNICATING WITH PERSON A

DO

- Put real commitments in a shared, visible place.
- Give early notice when a plan needs to change, and why.
- Protect the deadlines and promises that affect Person B.

DON'T

- Don't treat every deadline as negotiable.
- Don't change a plan without saying so.
- Don't let "we'll figure it out" replace an actual commitment.

COMMUNICATING WITH PERSON B

DO

- Separate true commitments from personal preference.
- Allow flexibility in method once the deadline and outcome are protected.
- Ask whether a change actually threatens something, or just feels less orderly.

DON'T

- Don't treat every change as a broken promise.
- Don't require the same process for every task regardless of stakes.
- Don't mistake Person A's flexibility for unreliability.

WHAT HELPS PERSON A

Put shared commitments in one visible system and be clear about which deadlines affect Person B or other people. When a plan needs to change, communicate early: what changed, why it changed, who is affected, and what the new plan is.

WHAT HELPS PERSON B

Separate true commitments from preferences. When the outcome and deadline are protected, allow more freedom in method, sequence, or low-impact timing. Before correcting a difference, ask whether it affects a shared responsibility or simply feels less orderly.

WHEN A PLAN CHANGES

Person A: explain the change before defending the flexibility. Person B: decide whether the issue is truly fixed or simply preferred before reacting. Both: protect the agreement first, then negotiate the details.

A FAMILIAR CONFLICT SCRIPT TO WATCH FOR

"Why can't we just stick to the plan?" / "Why does everything have to be so exact?" Treat this as a signal to identify the category: Is this a broken commitment, a reasonable adjustment, or merely two different preferences for structure?

A SIMPLE WEEKLY CONVERSATION

Ask: What absolutely needs to be fixed this week? What can remain flexible? Who owns each shared responsibility? Where might one of us be treating a preference as though it were a commitment?

THE FIXED / FLEX FRAMEWORK

1	Fixed Appointments, commitments to others, financial obligations, essential deadlines, and agreements that affect both people.
2	Flexible Method, sequence, optional timing, recreation, low-impact details, and choices that do not jeopardize a shared commitment.
3	Owner Name who owns the task. Ownership includes communicating if the task or plan is at risk.
4	Update If a fixed item must change, communicate before it becomes a surprise and replace the old plan with a clear new one.

Reflection Questions

1. Which shared responsibilities genuinely require clear structure, deadlines, or ownership — and which can remain more flexible?
2. Where does Person B's structure help us most, and where does Person A's flexibility help us most?
3. What one recurring scheduling, task, or follow-through issue can we redesign this week so both reliability and flexibility are protected?

Adaptability

Why you may seem easier to get along with at work than at home

Adaptability is the willingness and ability to adjust your natural Zone preference to fit a particular moment or relationship. It is not pretending to be someone else — it is choosing, on purpose, to meet a situation where it actually is.

One pattern shows up often enough that it is worth naming directly: people are frequently more adaptable at work, or with people they do not know well, than they are at home, with the person they love most. A colleague who seems endlessly easygoing may be far less flexible with a spouse. This is not hypocrisy. With strangers and coworkers, there is usually more social pressure to adapt, and less history to fall back on. At home, old patterns are familiar, the relationship feels safe enough to stop adapting, and both of you may simply be more fully, unguardedly yourselves.

WORTH ASKING EACH OTHER

Where do I already adapt easily for other people — and what would it look like to bring a little of that same effort home? This is not about becoming less yourself. It is about choosing flexibility on purpose, in the relationship that matters most.

A FEW HONEST NOTES ON ADAPTABILITY

- No Zone is naturally more adaptable than another — adaptability is a choice available to everyone, not a trait only some people have.
- You can be more adaptable with one person today and less tomorrow. It is a moment-by-moment choice, not a fixed setting.
- Total adaptability has its own cost — a person who is endlessly flexible in every situation can lose their own footing, or build quiet resentment. The goal is not constant accommodation; it is choosing well when it counts.
- Raising your adaptability tends to raise trust. Lowering it tends to lower trust — not because either of you is wrong, but because the other person has to work harder to meet you.

When Your Zones Collide

Recognizing the predictable cycle before a small difference becomes a larger conflict

Opposite-Zone couples can get into trouble when stress causes each person to lean harder on the very preference that is most difficult for the other spouse.

1	Person B seeks clarity Person B looks for order or a firm answer. The goal is usually to reduce uncertainty and make the situation manageable.
2	Person A feels constrained Person A experiences the pressure as constraining or emotionally disconnected, and may broaden the discussion, explain more, delay closure, or seek reassurance the relationship is still safe.
3	Person B feels more uncertain Person B experiences the added explanation or flexibility as more uncertainty, and may become more direct, corrective, or specific to restore order.
4	Person A feels managed Person A experiences the increased structure as being managed or unseen, and may soften the hard truth, over-promise, withdraw, or lower the emotional temperature.
5	Both feel misunderstood The original issue is now joined by what each person believes the other's behavior means about care, respect, or reliability.

HOW TO INTERRUPT THE CYCLE

- Pause the meaning-making. Ask: "What preference is showing up here before I decide what this behavior means about me?"
- Name the category: thinking pace, communication pace, decision criteria, or structure/task expectations.
- Use one cross-Zone bridge move instead of demanding that the other person switch completely to your style.
- Repair the relationship before returning to logistics if either of you feels dismissed, controlled, pressured, or unreliable.

THE GOAL IS NOT "MEETING IN THE MIDDLE" EVERY TIME

Sometimes the situation calls for Person B's structure; sometimes it calls for Person A's flexibility. Mature flexibility means choosing what best serves the moment rather than automatically defending what feels most natural.

What You Bring Out in Each Other

The relationship value hidden inside the difference

At your best, your differences are complementary resources. The same contrast that can create conflict can also make your shared life wider, stronger, and more resilient.

PERSON A OFTEN CONTRIBUTES

Big-picture perspective; relational awareness; emotional openness; adaptability when plans change; creative alternatives; energy, warmth, and possibility.

Person A's strongest Right preferences are Thinking & Processing and Time, Structure & Task Management — both Dominant, and where this pattern is most consistent.

PERSON B OFTEN CONTRIBUTES

Structure and clear expectations; careful analysis; consistency and follow-through; reliability around time and commitments; practical reality-testing; steadiness when order is needed.

Person B's strongest Left preferences are Thinking & Processing, Decisions & Relationships, and Time, Structure & Task Management — bringing definition and dependable follow-through. Communication is the one exception, leaning Right instead.

TOGETHER, YOU CAN CREATE...

- Vision with execution — an idea can be both inspiring and workable.
- Warmth with reliability — people can be valued without letting important responsibilities drift.
- Flexibility with anchors — life can adapt without becoming chaotic, and structure can guide without becoming rigid.
- Better decisions — facts, people, practical realities, and relational consequences can all have a seat at the table.

WATCH FOR ROLE POLARIZATION

Opposite-Zone couples can accidentally exaggerate each other: one becomes “the flexible one” and the other becomes “the structured one.” Growth means keeping your strengths while not making your spouse permanently responsible for the skills you find less natural. Ask regularly: “What strength in my spouse have I started treating as an annoyance simply because it is different from mine?”

Worksheet: Your Collaboration Strategy

A page to fill in together, not just read

Differences in Zone preference are normal, and every relationship experiences both easy stretches and stressful ones. Having strong love or respect for someone does not mean collaboration always feels effortless. When tension is Zone-related, it often helps to name each of your patterns plainly, then decide together how you will work with them.

Fill in the worksheet below in your own words, using what this report has shown you. Then write a short, real collaboration strategy together.

Name: Person A

My Zone pattern:

What I bring to this relationship:

Where I may struggle:

What helps me communicate well:

Name: Person B

My Zone pattern:

What I bring to this relationship:

Where I may struggle:

What helps me communicate well:

OUR COLLABORATION STRATEGY

What will we do differently, starting this week, knowing what we now know about each other?

Your Practical Growth Plan

Small repeated practices that build greater flexibility over time

THE 60-SECOND ZONE CHECK

Before a difficult conversation, each person silently asks: What Zone preference am I using right now? What preference is my spouse likely using? What is one small step I can take toward their side before I speak?

FOUR PRACTICES FOR THE NEXT 30 DAYS

1	One shared logistical system Choose one calendar, task list, or weekly planning rhythm for commitments that affect both of you. Keep it simple enough that Person A will use it and clear enough that Person B can trust it.
2	One weekly Zone Stretch Person A chooses one small structure/follow-through action. Person B chooses one small flexibility/connection action. Keep the stretch specific, small, and repeatable.
3	One 15-minute relationship check-in No logistics for the first five minutes. Each person answers: “How are we doing?” and “Is there anything I have been misreading about you this week?” Then move to practical matters.
4	One two-perspective decision For one meaningful choice each week, list practical facts and relationship impact separately. Make the decision only after both lists have been heard.

INDIVIDUAL STRETCH FOR PERSON A

After making a commitment that affects Person B, create one external checkpoint — calendar reminder, shared list, or follow-up time. Practice naming one hard truth early and briefly instead of softening it until the issue becomes larger.

Your clearest growth edge is not less creativity; it is making good intentions dependable enough for Person B to organize around.

INDIVIDUAL STRETCH FOR PERSON B

Before solving a relational problem, give one sentence of acknowledgment: “I can see why that mattered to you.” Choose one low-risk situation each week in which you deliberately allow an open loop or a less-structured approach.

Your clearest growth edge is not less responsibility; it is allowing relational or situational flexibility without losing clarity.

MEASURE PROGRESS BY CLIMATE, NOT PERFECTION

Ask whether conversations recover faster, fewer differences become personal, and each of you feels more accurately understood. Those changes matter more than eliminating every disagreement.

Reflection, Faith & Next Steps

Turning insight into a stronger shared life

SHARED REFLECTION QUESTIONS

1. Where do our two Zones already complement each other in ways we may have stopped noticing?
2. Which category most often becomes personal for us — and what would it sound like to name the category instead of judging the character?
3. What is one strength in my spouse's Zone that I genuinely need and do not naturally supply as well myself?
4. What would it look like for each of us to take one intentional step toward the other Zone this week?
5. If we were handling conflict with greater flexibility six months from now, what would be noticeably different in our home?

FAITH ANCHORS FOR GROWTH

- **Person A:** Proverbs 21:5 and Luke 14:28 invite thoughtful planning and follow-through.
- **Person B:** James 1:19 and Proverbs 4:23 invite patient listening and care for the heart.
- **Together:** Romans 12:4–5, Ephesians 4:2–3, and Colossians 3:12–14 remind us that unity does not require sameness and that humility, patience, and love shape how differences are carried.

A CLOSING WORD

- **Person B:** Your clarity and steadiness can protect what matters and help the relationship build dependable structure.
- **Person A:** Your warmth, possibility-thinking, and flexibility can keep the relationship open to connection, adaptation, and new options.
- **Together:** Your differences are substantial, but difference is not defect. The goal is not sameness; it is a stronger shared life in which both strengths are respected and both of you continue growing.

Zone Typing™ is an educational and developmental processing-preference framework informed by concepts associated with lateralization and hemispheric specialization. It is not a neurological test,

psychological diagnosis, compatibility percentage, or prediction of relationship outcome. This premium report is designed to support conversation, self-understanding, and relational growth and should be interpreted alongside real-life observation, conversation, and professional judgment when appropriate.

About Dr. Dale R. Goodman

Author | Speaker | Counselor

For more than three decades, Dr. Dale R. Goodman has helped individuals, couples, parents, and families better understand the patterns behind conflict, communication, decision-making, and personal growth. His work combines practical counseling insight, relationship education, brain-health principles, and faith-informed development.

Dr. Goodman is a Licensed Clinical Pastoral Counselor (Advanced Certification) and a Licensed Brain Health Trainer & Coach with Amen Clinics. He is the founder/director of Eden Ministries International (Eden Today) and also serves clients through Fresh Start for the Mind. His approach is designed to help people understand themselves more clearly and turn insight into practical change.

AUTHOR & SPEAKER

Dr. Goodman has authored several books on marriage, parenting, and life. His books are available on Amazon by searching Dr. Dale R. Goodman. He is also available for workshops, classes, church events, and speaking engagements focused on relationships, parenting, personal growth, and practical brain-health principles.

LEARN MORE

EdenToday.org

CONTACT DR. DALE

- Counseling & client inquiries: drgoodman@freshstartmind.com
- Author, speaking & ministry: drdale@edentoday.org
- Website: EdenToday.org