



GOLDEN

STUDENT
PROFILER™

John P Golden Ed.D.

Technical Manual

Table of Content

Overview	1
Introduction	2
History of Psychological Measurement	3
Underlying Assumptions	7
Data Analysis	12
References	23

Figures & Tables

Figure 1. Big Five Dimensions in Popular Personality Assessments	7
Figure 2. Items Samples	10
Table 1. Descriptive Statistics	12
Table 2. Global Scale Correlations	12
Table 3. Alpha Reliability Coefficients	13
Table 4. Alpha Coefficients By Gender	13
Table 5. Alpha Coefficients By Age	13
Table 6. Item & Global Scale Correlations	13
Table 7. Type Percentages By Gender	17
Table 8. Global Scale By Gender	18
Table 9. Percentages by of Type By Age	18
Table 10. Estimated Adult vs Student Global Scale Population	19
Table 11. Estimated Adult vs Student Type Population	19
Table 12. Percentages by of Type By Age	20
Table 13. Global Scales Adults and Students by Gender	20

The Golden Student Profiler is a Trademark of Golden LLC.

Overview

The Golden Student Profiler is a powerful approach to assisting teenage students understand their behavior, actions, choices and career directions personality. Personality is the essence of who each person is and each person is unique. It is reflected in things people say, what they feel, what they do, and how they choose to live their lives. Having a better understanding of oneself is the first step toward self-enlightenment and ultimately self-improvement. Knowing about one's own personality helps people to understand their actions, feelings, and relationships and can help individuals to adapt to their environment. There are no wrong or right, better or worse personality. Each personality has its own strengths and resources.

The Golden Student Profiler breaks new ground in the assessment of personality for middle and high school age children. The assessment also honors the past by building its theoretical base on respected theoretical foundations forged over the past 2500 years. It is a reliable and valid instrument that has both a strong theoretical basis and statistical basis. It provides an invaluable profile measuring an personality in a useful and practical manner.

The Golden Student Profiler's theoretical roots are grounded in philosophical and psychological theories shaped over the past 2500 years, but primarily uses the theoretical framework elaborated on by Carl Jung in his book *Psychological Types* (1921), The Golden Student Profiler explores the three global personality scales attributed to Jung's theory of psychological type, Extraverting/Introverting, Sensing/Intuitive and Thinking/Feeling and a fourth dimension Organizing/Adapting which some believe is inferred in Jung's theory of Type, but which is nonetheless considered to be an essential construct of normal healthy personality.

Sample

The Golden Student Profiler version was administered to 1900 students, 968 males and 1022 females. The number of students in each age group is: 11=220, 12=84, 13=27, 14=67, 15=703, 16=120, 17=23, and 18=17. No other demographic information was collected.

Reliability

Cronbach's alpha reliability coefficients for the four Global Scales range from .64 to .84 for the Global Scales. Reliabilities have also been calculated by gender and age, which indicate similar results.

Validity

Correlations are reported on Item/Global Scales. Correlations of items assigned to the Extraverting/Introverting Global Scale ranged from .23 to .61; for the Sensing/Intuiting, .30 to .65; for Thinking/Feeling, .29 to .69; and for Organizing/ Adapting, -.08 to .63. All correlations were significant at the $p < .01$ level. Three of the one-hundred items had a higher correlation with a Global Scale other than the one to which it was assigned.

Factor analysis showed that, unlike The Golden Personality Profiler, which confirmed the assignment items to Facet Scales and Facet Scales to Global Scales with factor coefficients ranging from .44 to .96, The Golden Student Profiler items structure reveals three clear factors related including Organizing/Adapting, Extraversion/Introversion and Thinking Feeling. These results suggest that sufficiently strong relationships to regard the three of the four Global Scales as distinct and robust constructs. The lack of significant coefficients related to the anticipated fourth factor Sensing/Intuiting suggested that further study of the item content related to

Perceiving Global Scales was warranted. A secondary factor analysis of only the sensing/intuiting items supported that the author's conceptualization of these items do comprise a distinct fourth factor and support the authors conclusion that the sensing and intuiting perceiving function as captured using the continues to be developed into early adulthood.

Introduction

The Golden Student Profiler is a powerful approach to assisting teenage students understand their behavior, actions, choices and career directions personality. Personality is the essence of who each person is and each person is unique. Personality is reflected in the things people say, what they feel, what they do, and how they choose to live their lives. Having a better understanding of oneself is the first step toward self-enlightenment and ultimately self-improvement. Knowing about one's own personality helps people to understand their actions, feelings, and relationships and can help individuals to adapt to their environment. There are no wrong or right, better or worse personality. Each personality has its own strengths and resources. The value of this fact cannot be minimized as effectiveness and success in life can only be achieved through interaction within a social context. With the Golden Student Profiler there are no wrong or right, better or worse personality types. Each personality, and therefore each person, has their own strengths, weaknesses and natural gifts.

The Golden Student Profiler breaks new ground in the assessment of personality. It is among only a few self-assessments designed specifically for middle and high-school students. It is a reliable and valid instrument that has both a strong theoretical basis, as well a strong statistical underpinning. It provides an invaluable means for measuring, exploring and discussing the role of personality and self-understanding among young people.

The Golden Student Profiler can be used to:

- contribute to an overall self-understanding
- improve school based relationships
- build relationships in social settings
- strengthen personal and family relationships
- navigate planning career, educational and life choices
- increase student self-confidence and esteem

The Golden Student Profiler also helps to introduce students to the idea of self-exploration and assessment as they transition into adulthood. The origin of the Golden Student Profiler emerged from the authors own experience. In the 1970s personality assessment was becoming a more common among experience among adults, but teenagers were rarely assessed and instructed in the topic of self-exploration. and personality When they were they only had adult based surveys to work with. The special contextual elements reflecting their lives and experiences were missing in both the construction of the surveys themselves and the reports they obtained. Today, almost 50 years later, this has changed. Teenagers are increasingly being introduced to the concept of self-exploration and personality. Even so, few surveys have been developed to fit the unique context and lives lived by younger members of our society. Using assessments designed for adults should never be an option. The Golden Student Profiler was and is designed to meet the specific needs of the teenagers in their lives as students. As a first experience, getting it right is critical. They will be exposed to assessment many times as adults in their personal, educational and work lives. How they experience their first personality assessment will have consequences in how they expense those in the future lives.

In the hands of teachers, guidance counselors, administrators and parents the Golden Student Profiler represents a helpful tool for enhancing communication, building motivation and strengthening personal character, and encouraging strong and healthy relationships in the school environment. A more in-depth description of the Golden Student Profiler can be found in Chapter 3. Teachers, faculty, support staff and administrators should complete the Golden Personality Profiler and read their reports before assessing their students with the Golden Student Profiler

History of Psychological Measurement

While the school of Psychology is just over 100 years old the desire to describe and measure personality is likely as old as the human species. Psychology is said to have a short history but along past. As early as 1711, Christian Thomasius, a German lawyer and philosopher, proposed measuring personality. He believed that the inclinations of the human mind were divided into four sources, which he called passions: love, hedonism, ambition, and voluptuousness. He believed that individuals possessed the qualities of all four, but one was dominant at any given time. He set up a 60-point scale, in which the dominant passion was awarded 60 points, and the weakest passion was given a 5. He analyzed past behavior of individuals in order to obtain these numbers. According to Ramul (1963), Thomasius' style of thinking was stimulated by the quantitative approach and is very similar to measures used today. It was very much the beginning of personality measurement.

One of the first to develop a personality questionnaire was Robert Woodworth, who was tasked with measuring emotional stability of soldiers in World War I. In doing so, he developed what was at the time called the Personal Data Questionary, which is the lineal ancestor to all personality questionnaires, surveys, and inventories of today. After the development of his Questionary, Woodworth sampled thousands of healthy recruits and compared them to small groups of abnormal patients (1919). Although Woodworth did not greatly affect the war effort, he left a legacy that is still part of the culture today: self-report questionnaires used to measure psychological predispositions.

Since the time of Thomasius and Woodworth, there have been numerous measures of personality developed. Some of these measures have been unstructured and others structured; some were designed to be used with healthy individuals and others with individuals with psychological illness. Some have been designed to measure at a global or dimensional aspect of personality; whereas others have been designed to measure personality at a more specific level, such as types of personality. Others have been designed to look at personality in an even more specific way by focusing on traits.

Dimensions

There have been a wide variety of scales designed to measure dimensions of personality and almost as many theories about how many dimensions exist. Eysenck believed that there were 3 dimensions, whereas Cattell believed there were at least 20. As early as 1934, Louis Thurstone noted that a list of adjectives could be reduced to five factors or dimensions of personality. However, Thurstone did not follow-up on his findings. In 1949, Fiske used factor analysis to determine how many dimensions made up the personality and also came up with 5 dimensions. The relatively consistent finding of five factors over the decades prompted Goldberg (1981) to coin the phrase the "Big Five." The most popular assessment for measuring the five factor

model among adults is the NEO-PI, developed by Costa and McCrae (1991). The Golden Student Profiler (OPP, 2002) also measures five global factors.

Traits

The concept of traits has an intuitive appeal for most people. People like to think that they behave in a consistent manner. Also, it is easy for individuals to imagine that other people behave the same across similar situations. People use traits to summarize behavior efficiently (what has happened in the past and the present), and then they use them to predict future behavior. Using a sophisticated measurement technology, such as Eysenck's, trait theory can be extremely useful in the study and understanding of personality.

Mischel (1968) condemned the use of traits in the description of personality. He believed that the internal consistency of items and test-retest reliability did not matter if there was no consistency of human behavior. In other words, what good was reliability if there was no predictive accuracy? If one were to buy into Mischel's view, the measurement of personality through the use of traits would no longer be in practice. However, there are a number of reasons why the measurement of traits is important. First, traits appear to be an integral part of how people understand themselves and their world. Understanding how traits work and what their limitations are is very important. Second, individuals very often do not end up in situations randomly. Most of the time, they put themselves there. Therefore, it is important to know and understand why individuals put themselves in certain situations. Third, a number of trait-like terms have social meaning, and are therefore important. Most of these traits are associated with abnormal characteristics, such as depression and character disorder (Rogers, 1995). Thus, the measurement of traits has not disappeared since Mischel's (1968) criticisms. There are still a large number of measures that have taken the trait approach. These measures are stronger and more diverse because of Mischel.

Carl Gustav Jung

Jung's contributions to psychological theory are broad and varied. Jung believed that an individual's core tendency was the attainment of selfhood. "Selfhood represents a balance between opposing forces of personality, and includes both conscious and unconscious material" (Maddi, 1980, p. 717). One of the most important concepts that Jung developed is the idea of character typology, which was not just important to theory building, but to the measurement of personality as well. Jung attributed individual differences to two processes: (1) the characteristic direction (inward or outward) of the movement of the libido, and (2) the typical way in which individuals apprehend internal and external stimuli (Jung, 1937, 1976)

The first construct refers to how people approach their world, what Jung referred to as Extraversion versus Introversion. Extraversion he described as the outward turning of the *libido* or life energy. Characteristics shown by individuals who are extraverts include outgoingness, going forth with ease and confidence into the unknown, adapting easily to any given situation, and being heavily influenced by the external objective environment. Introversion, on the other hand, is shown through an interest in one's inwardly focused life energy which can be described by shyness around unfamiliar others, and inscrutability (Jung, 1917/1972). There is an innate tendency for one attitude to predominate over the other. For example, an individual may feel more comfortable being with just one friend, rather than being at a party with hundreds of people. Extraversion and Introversion are integral parts of the Golden Student Profiler.

The second construct elaborated on by Jung involves how individuals react to and interpret stimuli and consists of what he described as the four *functions*, sensing or intuitive perception,

and thinking and feeling judgment. The first, sensation, is establishing the fact that there is something to perceive. The second, intuition, enables an individual to form hunches or conclusions without relying on the other functions. The third thinking is interpreting and understanding the meaning of what is perceived. The fourth, feeling, is the evaluating the pleasantness and desirability of the perception. According to Jung, "Sensation tells you that something exists; thinking tells you what it is; feeling tells you whether it is agreeable or not; and intuition tells you whence it comes and where it is going (Jung, 1964, p. 49). Thinking and feeling are opposites and are called the rational functions because they involve purposive acts of cognition (Ewen, 1993). Sensation and intuition oppose each other and are considered the irrational (non-rational) not because they are contrary to reason, but because they are outside the province of reason and therefore not established by it (Maduro & Wheelwright, 1977). Everyone has the capacity described by all functions; however, there is an innate tendency for one to predominate over the opposite. For example, an individual may make decisions based on how those decisions affect others, rather than thinking about the decision that would earn an organization more money.

Personality Types

Personality instruments designed to measure types categorize a person "in a range of" from four to sixteen types. Typically these measures ask individuals to make judgments about themselves in an "all or none" format. Individuals usually have to select one response over another, even if both are equally applicable or equally disagreeable. The Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI) (Myers & McCaulley, 1985) is one of the earliest of these kinds of tests. Once an individual is categorized, these approaches assume that people of the same type are similar in many ways, including interests, aptitudes for particular careers, as well as basic ways of relating to other people. Critics contend that such type-oriented approaches to personality are simplistic (and often incorrect). For example, if there are only 16 types measured. How is it possible that everyone in the world can be put into a box or a label? What if an individual is equally an extravert and an introvert?

However, placing individuals into one of four or sixteen types and creating larger generalizations about personalities has its usefulness. When dealing with groups of people, whether in school or at home, it is much more helpful to paint broad-brush strokes when describing different personalities. The idea of types holds universal appeal to individuals and many businesses use the idea of types in training to help individuals work together in harmony. The Golden Student Profiler uses its positive foundation of personality type to help introduce students to their general personality and character.

Although the previously mentioned assessment models have some usefulness, they also have manifest some problems. Most importantly, few surveys have been designed for use with middle and high school student populations. The Golden Student Profiler was developed to meet this important need. In Table 1., the Golden Student Profiler measures four of the five dimensions associated with the Five Factor Model. The fifth scale commonly called Neuroticism in assessments like the NEO-PI or Tense/Calm in the Golden Personality Profiler was determined to be inappropriate for measurement and reporting of a middle and high-school aged population. While it is a very important construct, feedback from educators, specifically that of guidance counselors showed that the Tense/Calm scale, i.e., how a student responds to typical everyday stress in their life, requires more specialized training and individualized attention to interpret. Guidance professionals reported the concern of not having sufficient time to interpret and monitor the impact of this concept among their student populations. As a result, the Golden Student

Profiler was developed without that concept or scale included. As an introductory model, the authors believe that this was satisfactory conclusion and suggest that older teens, those above 16 years of age can be introduced to the concept of Tense/Calm through the secondary step of taking the Golden Personality Profiler when they reach their junior and senior year of high school.

The Golden Student Profiler's last Global Scale is called OrganiZing and Adapting. Experience has shown that regardless of age, the use of Judging and Perceiving (J or P) as a scale title or label is confusing and problematic for teaching, learning and retention. These labels are used in other, Jungian based surveys, such as the Personality Assessment Inventory (PAI), The Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI), The Keirsey Temperament Sorter (KTS) and the Student Styles Questionnaire (SSQ). Judging (J) or Perceiving (P) has proved themselves to be challenging and problematic to explain and interpret. For example, people often think J means Judgmental, and most have no relevant life experience to help them understand and remember what Perceiving means. The origin of these scales are traced back to Carl Jung's use of these labels to generally define the constructs Sensing and Intuition, which he called the Perceiving dimensions and the Thinking and Feeling, which he called the Judging dimensions. In 1942, Isabel Myers, inferred deeper theoretical meaning behind Jung's use of these ideas and developed a separate scale she called Judging and Perceiving. Thurstone's Five Factor Model, and subsequent assessments designed to measure it, confirmed the importance of measuring the same ideas and referred to Conscientiousness. The authors of the Golden Student Profiler determined that the scale labels for this dimensions should reflect the item content and behaviors they measure needed refinement. In the end, labeling a personality assessment scale proves to be a combination of more art and science and concluded that Organizing and Adapting (Z/A) made the most practical and scientific sense. Z/A was selected because they best symbolized the overall intent of the dimension and content of the items used in creating it, and they improve recall and learning retention by teenagers and adults. These scale labels make immediate sense to students and they retain the conceptual idea well after introduction to the concept.

Unlike the Golden Personality Profiler (GPP), the Golden Student Profiler does not report out results at the Facet Scale level. While sub-facets likely exist within the item content, their reporting would not necessarily translate into beneficial understandings and applications among the target 11 to 16 year old student population. As the teenage personality is still emerging and evolving, the most benefit is achieved through an understanding of their personality at the Global Dimension and personality type level. When a deeper and more accurate self-understanding and awareness occurs, and a mature and stable personality evolves, these deeper levels of understanding can be introduced. It is recommended that the GPP be used with mature students ages 16 and older, or those younger teenagers showing the maturity and higher reading level.

FIGURE 1. BIG FIVE DIMENSIONS IN POPULAR PERSONALITY ASSESSMENTS

Golden Student Profiler	Golden Personality Profiler	NEO-PI	PAI/MBTI/KTS/SSQ
Extraverting/Introverting	Extraverting/Introverting	Extraversion	Extraverting/Introverting
Sensing/Intuiting	Sensing/Intuiting	Openness	Sensing/Intuiting
Thinking/Feeling	Thinking/Feeling	Agreeableness	Thinking/Feeling
Organizing/Adapting	Organizing/Adapting	Conscientiousness	Judging/Perceiving
	Tense/Calm	Neuroticism	

Item Format

The Golden Student Profiler survey contains 100 items. “Slang” or trendy phrases and terms were not used and each item was written with the qualitative voice and an understanding of the world of the young person in mind. Also, like the Golden Personality Profiler, the item format used is not typical of those found in other Jungian personality measures. Among the unique features of this survey, the item format allows students to select a strength of response for each question. This unique item format is called “modified dichotomous Likert scale” and containing seven possible choices. Students can state the degree to which one characteristic is descriptive of their personality. Most Jungian type surveys utilize a forced choice, such as either/or, A/B or True False item format. Students can also select a neutral response when they cannot choose a one behavioral response over another. This item format characteristic is not found in any other Jungian based system. Students can also identify questions they don’t understand at all. This feature helps to identify items appropriateness based on age. Finally, survey items are framed within unique environmental settings encountered by students, such as common school, work, social and recreational activities. This context allows students to answer from their own experiential perspectives, rather than having to interpret vague and ambiguous questions that can be highly influenced by circumstances and mood.

Underlying Assumptions

Anchored in Normality and Optimism:

This system of personality is based on an understanding of normal healthy adult behavior. While the Golden Student Profiler for adults does explore the nature and impact of stress on the normal healthy personality, stress in this sense is not defined as abnormal, such as in the case of neurotic, psychotic or other forms of dysfunctional human behavior. The ideas expressed and constructs measured can each be viewed as common, typical and positive. Any behavior or trait can be used in an appropriate setting or in an inappropriate manner. Helping people gain a deeper sense of self-consciousness, personal choice and control over their own behavior is one of the most important outcomes gained from the use of this assessment.

Innately Derived

Few psychologists today would support the idea that we are born completely “tabula rasa” or blank tablet. Jung concluded that personality must have a hereditary component what today we would refer to as a genetically or biologically derived base of origin. On this topic he wrote (1921, pg 516) “type differentiation often begins so early that in some cases one must speak of it as innate”. To this he added (1921, pg 322) “the fact that children often exhibit a typical attitude quite unmistakably even in the earliest years forces us to assume that it cannot be the struggle for existence in the ordinary sense that determines a particular personality”. In support of a hereditary origin of personality Hall and Lindsey (1957) wrote that Allport conceptualized that “at birth the infant is innately endowed with certain physique and temperament potentialities, although fulfillment of these must wait upon growth and maturation. Theories based on both “nature”, the role of heredity and genetics and “nurture” the role of our social environment and life experiences are needed to explain the full range of dynamics and complexity for healthy functioning personality. The Golden Student Profiler is grounded in these very ideas.

Developmentally Driven

If we conceive of personality as genetically based and environmentally influenced then it makes sense to believe that it is developmentally capable as well. To believe otherwise would mean that we are all slaves to our own biological predispositions, without the will to alter our futures in a desirable fashion. Learning and education would in such a case, require a set of principles and definitions different than those that exist. Fortunately this is not the case. While change or total metamorphosis is not likely in its truest sense, personality is capable being developed. Over the natural course of life a healthy personality can grow and develop significantly. With accurate and meaningful self-knowledge, personality growth that would otherwise be slow and misdirected is capable of being controlled, directed and accelerated. The goal of development through the lens point of the Golden Student Profiler is the development of a wider range of behavioral abilities and skills than that provided by heredity or gained through one’s life experiences.

Why should we begin a more earnest attempt to developing self-awareness among our future adults? While occurring at all ages, significant personality development occurs during the adolescent or teen age years. Left to the nature alone, psychologist John Gardner writes that children develop *“a choking underbrush of customs and precedent” that prevent their positive personal development. By adolescence the willingness of young people to risk failure has diminished greatly. That is self-knowledge, learning and self development cease. We pay a heavy price for our fear of failure. It is a powerful obstacle to growth. It assures the progressive narrowing of the personality and prevents exploration and experimentation*”. In developing the theory of Psychological Type Jung was greatly influenced by the writings of American philosopher William James who wrote in his classic *The Principles of Psychology*: (1890, pg 123). “if the period between twenty and thirty is the critical one in the formation of intellectual and professional habits, the period below twenty is more important for fixing of personal habits.” And after twenty years of age an invisible law, as strong as gravitation, keeps him within his orbit arrayed this year as he was the last.” To this James remarked “the great thing in all education is to make our nervous system our ally instead of our enemy.” As Gardner puts it is well worth developing our selves before we are adults when he wrote, “we can keep ourselves so busy, fill our lives with so many diversions, stuff our heads with so many people and cover so much ground that we never have time to probe the fearful and wonderful world within. By middle life most of us are accomplished fugitives from ourselves”, *Self-Renewal* (1963, pg 13)

Commonalities and Uniqueness

Logical Opposites

The dimensions identified and measured are expressed as logical opposites not necessarily because they are in fact opposites, but because this means of categorization is commonly used and understood within our framework of cognition and understanding. Unlike other personality theories the conception of the Global Dimensions Extraverting vs Introverting, Sensing vs iNtuiting, Thinking vs Feeling, organiZing vs Adapting and Tense vs Calm, as well as their associated Facet Scales creates in the lay person self- understanding at a useful and practical level. As a common sense and accurate system of profiling personality, it helps to extend one's self-insight to an understanding of other people. The Golden Student Profiler system makes it possible for anyone to develop a typological map of their important relationships.

Online Administration

The Golden Student Profiler is administered as a survey online at goldenllc.com through a private administration account system available for qualified professionals. For more information on how the online account system works, survey pricing or to apply for an account login to www.goldenllc.com and follow the well marked links. Survey data and reports are archived online and available to download as soon as they are completed and whenever needed thereafter. Students can complete the Golden Student Profiler from any computer connected to the Internet. These sessions may take place in a group or class based setting and or independently on their own time and schedule.

Who Can Administer the Golden Student Profiler?

Professionals who administers the Golden Student Profiler, at a minimum, should have a college degree in a related educational or psychological discipline, as well as a background in psychological theory and test and measurement. Administrators should also have training in how to administer psychological surveys and should have some idea about the environment in which the surveys are going to be used. Golden LLC can provide this training. For more information about administration qualifications and certification training, log onto www.goldenllc.com.

Who Should Take the Golden Student Profiler?

The Profiler is designed to be administered to students in grades 6 through 10, ages 11 to 16. Those over the age of 16 should consider taking the Golden Personality Profiler. The Golden Student Profiler takes on average 30 minutes to complete. Both surveys are available online at www.goldenllc.com.

The Global Scales

The Golden Student Profiler identifies behaviors that comprise individuals' personality with five Global Scales. Three of these scales were identified by Jung (Extraverting- Introverting, Sensing-Intuiting, and Thinking-Feeling). The Profiler has one other Global Scale (Organizing-Adapting).

The Four Global Scales

The Golden Student Profiler measures preferences along four Global Scales:

Extraverting (E) / Introverting (I) - how individuals direct their attention and energy.

Sensing (S) / Intuiting (N) - ways that individuals gather information.

Thinking (T) / Feeling (F) - ways that individuals make decisions.

Organizing (Z) / Adapting (A) - how an individual functions in the world.

Global Scales determine an individual's personality type. For example, a person could be identified as Extraverting, Sensing, Feeling, Adapting (ESFA) or Introverting, Intuiting, Thinking, Organizing (INTZ). There are sixteen possible Type combinations.

Item Format and Content

At the most basic level it is the individual items or questions that are used to create the Global Scales. These items are the backbone and stability of the Golden Student Profiler. The items tap into not only general behaviors and habits, but behaviors in the types of situations teenagers typically find themselves in. For example, a general question like Section II, item number 89 asks the student to choose which phrase accurately describes them. In the process of making their response the student is actually making two choices. First, the student decides which of the two descriptions are most like them and second the student chooses how strongly the description fits them (strongly, mostly, or somewhat)? When they cannot decide they may choose a neutral response (~). In version 3.0 students who do not understand the question may select the item response ???. Other items, particularly those contained in Section I, assess the students situationally relevant behaviors. An example of this is Item 46. Again, in the act of making a response two levels of decision making occur, behavioral choice and strength of fit. Neutral and do not understand the question options are also found in Section I. Section I items are designed to address a wide range of behaviors in a variety of settings including those with friends and family members and in activities like sports and when studying.

FIGURE 2. ITEMS SAMPLES

Section I			
I always complete my homework assignments			
a head of their due date	3 2 1 ~ 1 2 3	??	at the last minute
Section II			
easy to approach	3 2 1 ~ 1 2 3	??	hard to approach

One of the best methods for determining how individual personalities differ is by examining the strength of response comments on the Global Scales. Everyone prefers to write with one hand. Most people do not think about which hand to use; they just do it. They have a preference for one hand over the other when writing. When individuals are forced to use the non-preferred hand, the result is a lack of comfort and frustration. However, the non-preferred hand is sometimes used as the hand of choice. For instance, researchers have found that right-handed individuals use their left hand to scratch a bug bite and vice versa for left-handed people. The same is true for personality. Individuals have a mode of operation that they prefer, feel

comfortable with, and do not think about most of the time. However, individuals will use their non-preferred traits at different times and in different situations.

Some researchers have believed that a forced choice demonstrated an individual's preference. However, the Golden Student Profiler is different because individuals are able to choose how strongly they view themselves regarding a particular characteristic of their personality. The degree to which someone chooses a preference is the *Strength of Response*. For example, few people have a sole preference for Extraverting. People are usually a combination of Extraverting and Introverting.

All the graphs are based on a scale of 1 to 100%. When a student chooses "Strongly" to all of the Extraverting/Introverting questions, then the graphs would add up to 100%. If, however, they chose "Mostly" or "Somewhat" for some of the items then the scores would not add up to 100%.
verbal comments

In addition, the Strength of Response scores on the interpretive feedback report provides Global Scale Verbal Comments related to the Global Scale. These comments are found on the report in the sentence placed immediately above the paired Global Scales bar graph. They are intended to help the student's interpret the magnitude of the Strength of Response scores.

- for scores between 0 and 5% = no clear preference
- for scores between 6% to 19% = slight preference
- for scores between 20% to 49% = clear preference
- for scores between 50% to 69% = strong preference
- for scores between 70% plus = very strong preference

Report Format and Distribution Considerations

The report is designed to make it easy to read and interpret. The report contains Introductory background information, Global Scales bar graphs and definitions, a personality profile, a personality profiler map with brief descriptions of the 16 Types, frequently asked questions and answers and a summary page.

Each of the 16 personality profiles contained in the report were developed to depict the quality, characteristics and behaviors associated with respective four-letter type. These profiles were written with the theoretically pure type as a reference point. In reality people are not one sided in the behavioral capabilities. With an accurate picture, based on the portraits provided students are then able to identify how their specific behavior or personality differs from the profile

Depending on the unique circumstances surrounding the surveys use, Administrators can determine how they are going to distribute the report back to students. This choice is usually determined by the amount of time devoted to the topic and/or the number of sessions available for interpretation. Administrators should use their best judgment and rely on their own experiences when making these decisions.

Summary Page & Raw Scores

The survey administrator also has access to all Global Scale Strength of Response scores and bar graphs for each respondent. This information is contained on the one page Summary Report. In addition, Raw Scores for the Global Scales can be found on the Summary Page. The

Summary report is intended for the survey Administrator or faculty member, but it can also be a useful as an “at a glance” tool by the student.

Data Analysis

Sample

The Golden Student Profiler version 2.0 was administered to 1900 students ranging in age from 11 to 18 covering wide demographic and socioeconomic levels. The sample consisted of 968 males and 1022 females. The numbers of students in each age group is: 11 (220), 12 (84), 13 (27), 14 (767), 15 (703), 16 (120), 17 (23), 18 (17). No other demographic information was collected. The sample was not randomly selected and therefore generalization of these findings to the broader young adult population at large is cautioned against.

Descriptive Statistics for Golden Student Profiler

Personality measures, such as the Golden Student Profiler, are effective because different people respond to the individual items uniquely. Table 1 provides the descriptive statistics including minimum and maximum scores, mean and standard deviation for the four Global Scales with scale scores means ranging from 3.91 for organiZing/Adapting to 24.10 for Extraverting/Adapting.

Table 2. scale correlations ranged from -.14 for Thinking/Feeling and organiZing/Adapting, to .37 for organiZing/Adapting and Sensing/intuiting. Global Scale Cronbach’s Alpha reliability coefficients were calculated for the Global Scales as shown in Table 3. with correlations ranging from .64 to .84. The scale correlations for the sample are also provided for by gender and age in Tables 4. and 5.

TABLE 1. DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS

Scale	Mean	Standard Deviation	Minimum	Maximum
Extraverting/ Introverting	24.10	21.54	-71.00	78.00
Sensing/INtuition	5.68	13.08	-37.00	52.00
Thinking/Feeling	7.99	16.86	-56.00	57.00
organiZing/ Adapting	3.91	20.60	-62.00	65.00

(n = 1990)

TABLE 2. GLOBAL SCALE CORRELATIONS

	Extraverting/ Introverting	Sensing/INtuition	Thinking/Feeling
Sensing/INtuition	.20**		
Thinking/Feeling	.19**	.24**	
organiZing/Adapting	.18**	.37**	-0.14

(n=1990) (**p>.001 Significance)

TABLE 3. ALPHA RELIABILITY COEFFICIENTS

Extraverting/Introverting	0.84
Sensing/INtuition	0.64
Thinking/Feeling	0.77
organiZing/Adapting	0.82

(n = 1990)

TABLE 4. ALPHA COEFFICIENTS BY GENDER

	Total n = 1990	Male n = 998	Female n = 1022
Extraverting/Introverting	0.84	0.83	0.85
Sensing/INtuition	0.64	0.61	0.66
Thinking/Feeling	0.77	0.64	0.71
organiZing/Adapting	0.82	0.81	0.83

TABLE 5. ALPHA COEFFICIENTS BY AGE

	Total Sample n=1990	Age 11 n=220	Age 12 n=84	Age 13 n=27	Age 14 n=767	Age 15 n=703	Age 16 n=120	Age 17 n=23	Age 18 n=17
E/I	0.84	0.80	0.70	0.87	0.86	0.83	0.84	0.88	0.87
S/N	0.64	0.58	0.61	0.65	0.66	0.66	0.58	0.66	0.27
T/F	0.77	0.73	0.73	0.81	0.79	0.77	0.70	0.85	0.75
ZA	0.82	0.79	0.83	0.79	0.83	0.83	0.80	0.85	0.78

TABLE 6. ITEM & GLOBAL SCALE CORRELATIONS

	Extraverting/Introverting	Sensing/INtuition	Thinking/Feeling	organiZing/Adapting
1	.13**	.39**	0.04	.16**
2	0.02	0.00	.44**	-.15**
3	.10**	..24**	-.11**	.27**
4	.06**	.37**	0.04	.11**
5	.06**	.46**	.16**	.09**
6	.11**	.07**	.30**	-0.03
7	.14**	.20**	-0.02	.33**

8	.43**	0.02	.10**	.12**
9	.20**	.18**	0.02	.24**
10	.09**	.20**	.34**	.09**
11	.38**	.11**	-0.01	.14**
12	.24**	-.06**	.14**	-.09**
13	.17**	.42**	0.01	.29**
14	.44**	.10**	.12**	.07**
15	.04*	.18**	0.04	.36**
16	.40**	-.05*	.10**	-.07**
17	.04*	.09**	.31*	0.00
18	.28**	.11**	.06**	-.06**
19	0.02	.12**	-.17**	.53**
20	.46**	.15*	.07**	.17**
21	.06**	.48**	-.08**	.18**
22	.54**	.07**	0.02	-0.03
23	.18**	.16**	.08**	0.02
24	.34**	.10**	-.10**	.38**
25	.50**	.08**	.33**	0.04
26	.11**	.37**	.05*	.17**
27	0.04	0.22	.09**	.66**
28	.07**	.11**	.33**	0.03
29	.04*	.32**	.05*	0.04
30	.55**	.11**	.09**	.05*
31	.08**	.11**	-0.01	.24**
32	0.03	0.02	.55**	-.17**
33	.09**	.22**	-0.04	.36**
34	-.06**	.29**	-0.03	.08**
35	0.01	.10**	.42**	-.12**
36	-0.48	-.13**	-.16**	-.08**

37	0.05	.06*	-.08**	.33**
38	.20**	.38**	.20**	.15**
39	.16**	.22**	.53**	.07**
40	.08**	.15**	-0.06	.55**
41	.48**	.08**	.07**	0.04
42	.09**	.44**	.06**	.18**
43	.06**	0.04	.56**	-.26**
44	0.02	.14**	-.11**	.59**
45	.39**	-0.02	.10**	-0.01
46	0.02	.09**	-.11**	.59**
47	.09**	.04**	.41**	-.12**
48	0.01	.06**	-.13**	.44**
49	.60**	.08**	.09**	0.01
50	.10**	.07**	-.11**	.44**
51	0.01	.38**	.08**	.19**
52	.12**	.09**	.33**	-.04**
53	.61**	.11**	.19**	.04**
54	.06**	-.01**	.40**	-.20**
55	0.04	0.33**	.31**	0.02
56	0.04	0.17**	-0.05	.59**
57	.25**	.10**	-0.04	.36**
58	.22**	.10**	.38**	-.08**
59	.11**	.13**	-.07**	.49**
60	.42**	.08**	-0.05	.08**
61	.07**	.14**	-.11**	.46**
62	.04*	-.06**	.09**	-.23**
63	.08**	.14**	-.08**	.42**
64	.49**	.08**	.25**	-0.03
65	.55**	.15**	.11**	.08**

66	0.03	.43**	.12**	.15**
67	.24**	.09**	.46**	-.07**
68	.55**	.13**	.17**	.08**
69	.06**	.27**	-.08**	.60**
70	.14**	.15**	.62**	-.11**
71	.14**	.15**	.62**	-.11**
72	.18**	.20**	.07**	.38**
73	.10**	.16**	-.07**	.38**
74	.42**	.16**	.12**	.11**
75	.06**	.41**	.08**	.14**
76	-0.04	.08**	.48**	-.18**
77	.22**	.22**	.10**	.29**
78	.25**	-.11**	-0.48**	.14**
79	-.08**	-0.02	-0.03	-0.10
80	.05*	.17**	.37**	0.03
81	.11**	.27**	0.03	-.10**
82	.09**	.38**	.09**	.18**
83	.25**	.37**	.09**	.16**
84	.55**	.14**	-0.03	.12**
85	-.16**	0.01	.18**	-0.02
86	.17**	.20**	0.01	.40**
87	.55**	.09**	.20**	-0.02
88	-.24**	-.08**	-.29**	0.02
89	.46**	.13**	.22**	0.00
90	0.02	.17**	-.10**	.15**
91	.59**	.15**	.15**	.10**
92	.11**	.14**	.45**	0.01
93	.14**	.29**	0.01	.41**
94	.04**	.23**	-.08**	.63**

95	0.03	.30**	.27**	-.08**
96	0.03	.20**	-.11**	.63**
97	.01	.16**	-.09**	.39**
98	.17**	.22**	.25**	.18**
99	.50**	.23**	.15**	.13**
100	-.12**	0.02	-.17**	.12**

(**p>.001 Significance)

Items were submitted to a factor analysis with a varimax rotation which indicated loadings ranging from .36 to .61 for Extraverting/Introverting, .32 to .60 for Thinking/Feeling and .32 to .64 for organizing/Adapting. Factor analysis did not reveal loadings above .30 for the Sensing/iNtuiting items, however a follow-up two factor analysis of the S/N items showed that the items do hold together as a factor with all but five of the items showing factor loadings above .33.

Table 7, shows the distributions among the sixteen personality types represented in the sample and by gender. For the overall sample, the highest percentages of students reported themselves to be ENFA (26.5%), ENFZ (15.8%), and ENTA (14.3%). The lowest percentages were ISFA (.9%), INTZ (1.0%), and ISTA (1.2%). There were gender differences in the percentages of boys and girls falling into each personality type. The highest percentages of girls fell into the ENFA (33.4%), ENFZ (24.2%), and the ESFZ (13.8%) categories; whereas the highest percentages of males fell into the ENTA (15.3%), ENFA (19.2%), and ESTA (8.8%) categories. As can be seen in Table 7. the sample tested strongly in the Extraverted domain 86.7%. Table 8. also shows a gender difference on the Thinking/Feeling and Sensing/iNtuiting Dimensions. On the Thinking/Feeling dimension 86.5% of girls scored Feeling compared to 43% of boys. Boys tested out more Sensing 68% whereas girls reported more iNtuiting 72%.

TABLE 7. TYPE PERCENTAGES BY GENDER

	Total n = 1990	Male n = 998	Female n=1022
ENFA	26.5	19.2	33.4
ENFZ	15.8	7.0	24.2
ENTA	14.3	24.6	4.5
ENTZ	5.5	8.5	2.7
ESFA	6.1	5.2	6.9
ESFZ	9.5	5.1	13.8
ESTA	5.1	8.8	1.7
ESTZ	3.9	6.4	1.5
INFA	2.0	2.2	1.8

INFZ	2.6	1.5	3.6
INTA	2.7	4.2	1.3
INTZ	1.0	1.2	0.8
ISFA	0.9	0.9	0.8
ISFZ	1.5	1.0	2.0
ISTA	1.2	2.1	0.4
ISTZ	1.4	2.1	0.8

TABLE 8. GLOBAL SCALE BY GENDER

	Total n = 1990	Male n = 998	Female n=1022
Extraverting	86.7	84.8	89.5
Introverting	13.3	15.2	27.7
Sensing	70.0	68.0	27.7
iNtuiting	30.0	31.6	72.3
Feeling	35.1	57.0	13.5
Thinking	64.9	43.0	86.5
organiZIng	41.2	50.6	49.4
Adapting	58.8	49.4	50.6

TABLE 9. PERCENTAGES BY OF TYPE BY AGE

	Age 11 n=220	Age 12 n=84	Age 13 n=27	Age 14 n=767	Age 15 n=703	Age 16 n=120	Age 17 n=23	Age 18 n=17
ENFA	29.5	21.4	25.9	26.5	27.7	24.2	21.7	5.9
ENFZ	24.1	21.4	-	17.1	12.8	8.3	17.4	11.8
ENTA	13.6	19.0	22.2	13.2	15.4	14.2	13.0	5.9
ENTZ	9.5	9.5	3.7	4.7	4.3	7.5	8.7	-
ESFA	2.3	8.3	11.1	6.1	6.1	9.2	-	23.5
ESFZ	7.7	8.3	3.7	11.6	8.4	5.8	8.7	17.6
ESTA	3.2	7.1	3.7	5.5	4.7	7.5	4.3	5.9
ESTZ	4.1	1.3	7.4	3.4	4.7	0.8	4.3	11.8
INFA	0.5	-	3.7	1.7	2.6	4.2	4.3	-

INFZ	0.5	2.4	7.4	2.3	3.0	5.0	4.3	5.9
INTA	2.3	-	3.7	2.7	2.8	5.0	4.3	-
INTZ	0.9	1.2	-	0.5	1.7	0.8	-	-
ISFA	-	-	-	0.7	1.1	0.8	4.3	5.9
ISFZ	0.9	-	7.4	1.3	1.8	0.8	4.3	-
ISTA	0.5	-	-	1.0	1.4	4.2	-	-
ISTZ	0.5	-	-	1.7	1.4	1.7	-	5.9

TABLE 10. ESTIMATED ADULT VS STUDENT GLOBAL SCALE POPULATION

	Student Total n = 1990	Adult Estimated
Extraverting	86.7	75%
Introverting	13.3	25%
Sensing	70.0	75%
iNtuiting	30.0	25%
Feeling	35.1	50%
Thinking	64.9	50%
organiZIng	41.2	60%
Adapting	58.8	40%

TABLE 11. ESTIMATED ADULT VS STUDENT TYPE POPULATION

	Predicted Adult %	Students %
ENFA	5%	27%
ENFZ	5%	16%
ENTA	5%	14%
ENTZ	5%	6%
ESFA	13%	6%
ESFZ	13%	10%
ESTA	13%	5%
ESTZ	13%	4%
INFA	1%	2%

INFZ	1%	3%
INTA	1%	3%
INTZ	1%	1%
ISFA	6%	1%
ISFZ	6%	1%
ISTA	6%	1%
ISTZ	6%	1%

TABLE 12. PERCENTAGES BY OF TYPE BY AGE

	Students (n=1990)	Adults (n=4927)	Boys (n=998)	Men (n=1445)	Girls (n=1022)	Women (n=1390)
ENFA	26.5	12.7	19.2	7.4	27.7	15.9
ENFZ	15.8	12.7	7.0	9.0	12.8	20.3
ENTA	14.3	6.8	24.6	9.8	15.4	3.9
ENTZ	5.5	9.9	8.5	13.8	4.3	4.8
ESFA	6.1	1.6	5.2	2.7	6.1	2.6
ESFZ	9.5	9.4	5.1	6.5	8.4	16.2
ESTA	5.1	1.9	8.8	4.4	4.7	1.3
ESTZ	3.9	7.5	6.4	15.3	4.7	4.1
INFA	2.0	2.2	2.2	2.2	2.6	2.8
INFZ	2.6	4.4	1.5	1.7	3.0	5.0
INTA	2.7	2.5	4.2	3.3	2.8	1.0
INTZ	1.0	3.9	1.2	14.0	1.7	2.1
ISFA	0.9	1.0	0.9	1.1	1.1	1.7
ISFZ	1.5	8.7	1.0	4.5	1.8	13.1
ISTA	1.2	0.8	2.1	2.9	1.4	1.1
ISTZ	1.4	9.1	2.1	11.6	1.4	4.4

TABLE 13. GLOBAL SCALES ADULTS AND STUDENTS BY GENDER

	Students (n=1990)	Adults (n=2861)	Boys (n=998)	Men 1390	Girls (n=1022)	Women (n=1390)
Extraverting	86.7	68.7	84.8	68.7	89.5	65.0
Introverting	13.3	31.3	15.2	31.3	11.5	35.0
Sensing	70.0	46.5	68.0	49.0	27.5	49.0
iNtuiting	30.0	53.5	31.6	51.0	72.3	51.0
Feeling	35.1	43.4	57.0	42.5	13.5	22.6
Thinking	64.9	56.6	43.0	57.5	86.5	77.4
organiZIng	41.2	68.0	50.6	49.2	49.4	69.8
Adapting	58.8	32.0	49.4	50.8	50.6	30.2

Table 14. Alpha Coefficients Students vs Adults

	Golden Student Profiler	Golden Personality Profiler
	n = 1990	n = 2861
Extraverting/Introverting	0.84	0.92
Sensing/iNtuiting	0.64	0.87
Thinking/Feeling	0.77	0.89
organiZIng/Adapting	0.82	0.90

Items were submitted to a factor analysis with a varimax rotation which indicated loadings ranging from .36 to .61 for Extraverting/Introverting, .32 to .60 for Thinking/Feeling and .32 to .64 for organiZIng/Adapting. Factor analysis did not reveal loadings above .30 for the Sensing/iNtuiting items, however a follow-up two factor analysis of the S/N items showed that the items do hold together as a factor with all but five of the items showing factor loadings above .33.

Table 7, shows the distributions among the sixteen personality types represented in the sample and by gender. For the overall sample, the highest percentages of students reported themselves to be ENFA (26.5%), ENFZ (15.8%), and ENTA (14.3%). The lowest percentages were ISFA (.9%), INTZ (1.0%), and ISTA (1.2%). There were gender differences in the percentages of boys and girls falling into each personality type. The highest percentages of girls fell into the ENFA (33.4%), ENFZ (24.2%), and the ESFZ (13.8%) categories; whereas the highest percentages of males fell into the ENTA (15.3%), ENFA (19.2%), and ESTA (8.8%) categories. As can be seen in Table 7. the sample tested strongly in the Extraverted domain 86.7%. Table 8. also shows a gender difference on the Thinking/Feeling and Sensing/iNtuiting Dimensions. On the Thinking/Feeling dimension 86.5% of girls scored Feeling compared to 43% of boys. Boys tested out more Sensing 68% whereas girls reported more iNtuiting 72%.

Table 10. shows the comparison of Golden Student Profiler and Golden Personality Type Profiler Global Scales distributions (Golden, 2005). Type distributions differed between the adult

and student most significantly on the Extraverting/Introverting scales and organiZing/Adapting Global Scales. This difference is thought to be due to the nature in which the adult estimates are derived. These estimates are based on qualitative and quantitative meta-analyses of studies based on Jungian assessments like the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator and KeirseY Temperament Sorter. These assessments have been reported to mischaracterize type results. The distribution of Types of Students and Adults shown in Table 11. shows a closer relationship between the two groups. The larger Extraverting population among students is also thought to be a reflection of the greater attractiveness of Extraversion over Introversion in the teenage group who has yet to develop a greater self-awareness and appreciation for the traits associated with Introversion.

Summary and Conclusions

Overall, the Golden Student Profiler performed as anticipated and identified where further study and refinement might take place. E/I and Z/A attitudes are among the first to develop as the young personality is formed and self-awareness is still developing

The purpose of the tool is not only to predict and identify, but to help the student accelerate and take amore conscious role and the precise development of sense of self. The Golden Student Profiler is a positive early step in that process.

References

- Adler, A. (1929). *The science of living*. New York: Greenberg.
- Allport, G.W. (1937). *Personality: A psychological interpretation*. New York: Holt.
- Allport, G.W. (1961). *Pattern and growth in personality*. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.
- Block, J. (1961). The Q-sort methodology in personality assessment. *Springfield, IL: Thomas*. Borgatta, E.F. (1964). The structure of personality characteristics. *Behavioral Science*, 9, 8-17.
- Cattell, R.B. (1947). Confirmation and clarification of the primary personality factors. *Psychometrika*, 12, 197-220.
- Cattell, R.B. (1948). The primary personality factors in women compared with those in men. *British Journal of Psychology*, 1, 114-130.
- Costa, P.T., Jr. (1991). Clinical use of the Five Factor Model: An introduction. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 57, 857-872.
- Costa, P.T., Jr. & McCrae, R.R. (1976). Age differences in personality structure: A cluster analysis approach. *Journal of Gerontology*, 31, 564-570.
- Costa, P.T., Jr. & McCrae, R.R. (1985). *The NEO personality inventory manual*. Odessa, FL: Psychological Assessment Resources.
- Costa, P.T., Jr. & McCrae, R.R. (1988a). From catalog to classification: Murray's needs and the five-factor model. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 55, 258- 265.
- Costa, P.T., Jr. & McCrae, R.R. (1988b). Personality in adulthood: A six-year longitudinal study of self-reports and spouse ratings on the NEO Personality Inventory. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 54, 853-863.
- Costa, P.T., Jr. & McCrae, R.R. (1992). Four ways five factors are basic. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 13, 653-665.
- Costa, P.T., Jr., McCrae, R.R., & Dye, D.A. (1991). Facet scales for Agreeableness and Conscientiousness: A revision of the NEO Personality Inventory. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 12, 887-898.
- Digman, J.M. (1996). The curious history of the five factor model. In J.S. Wiggins (Ed.) *The Five-Factor Model of Personality*. New York: The Guilford Press.
- Digman, J.M. & Takemoto-Chock, N.K. (1981). Factors in the natural language of personality: reanalysis, comparison, and interpretation of six major studies. *Multivariate Behavioral Research*, 16, 149-160.
- Ewen, R.B. (1993). *An introduction to theories of personality* (4th edition). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc., Publishers.
- Eysenck, H.J. (1967). *The biological basis of personality*. Springfield, IL: Thomas. Eysenck, H.J. (1970-1971). (Ed.) *Readings in extraversion-introversion* (vols. 1-3).
- Eysenck, H.J., & Eysenck, M.W. (1975). *Manual of the Eysenck personality questionnaire*. San Diego: Educational and Industrial Testing Service.
- Fiske, D.W. (1949). Consistency of the factorial structures of personality ratings from different sources. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 44, 329-344. Goldberg, L.R. (1993). The structure of phenotypic personality traits. *American Psychologist*, 48, 26-34.
- Goldberg, L.R. (1981). Language and individual differences: The search for universals in personality lexicons. In L. Wheeler (Ed.), *Review of Personality and Social Psychology*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Golden, J.P. (2005) *Golden Personality Type Profiler Technical Manual*, Pearson, Talent Lens, San Antonio, TX.

- Hess, A.K. (1992). The NEO personality inventory. In J.J. Kramer & J.C. Conoley (Eds.) *The Eleventh Mental Measurements Yearbook*. Lincoln, NB: Buros Institute of Mental Measurements.
- Hogan, R. (1989). The NEO personality inventory. In J.C. Conoley & J.J. Kramer (Eds.), *The Tenth Mental Measurements Yearbook*. Lincoln, NB: Buros Institute of Mental Measurements, University of Nebraska.
- Jackson, D.N. (1984). *Personality Research Form manual*. Port Huron, MI: Research Psychologists Press.
- Johnson, D.A. & Saunders, D.R. (1990) *Confirmatory Factor Analysis of the Myers- Briggs Type Indicator Expanded Analysis Report*. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 50, 561-571.
- Jung, C.G. (1917). *On the psychology of the unconscious*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, Vol. 7.
- Jung, C.G. (1937). *Psychological factors determining human behavior*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Jung, C.G. (1964). (Ed.) *Man and his symbols*. London: Aldus Books.
- Jung, C.G. (1972). *Two essays on analytical psychology*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Jung, C.G. (1976). *Psychological types*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Maddi, S.R. (1980). *Personality theories: A comparative analysis*. Homewood, IL: The Dorsey Press.
- McCrae, R.R. & Costa, R.R. (1985). Updating Norman's "adequate taxonomy": Intelligence and personality dimensions in natural language and questionnaires. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 49, 710-721.
- Maduro, R.J. & Wheelwright, J.B. (1977) Chapter 4 *Analytical Psychology*. In Corsini, R.J. *Current Personality Theories*. F.E. Peacock Publishers, Inc. Itasca, ILL.
- Myers, I.B., & McCaulley, M.H. (1985). *Manual: A guide to the development and use of the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator*. Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.
- Norman, W.T. (1963). Toward an adequate taxonomy of personality attributes: Replicated factor structure in peer nomination personality ratings. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 66, 574-583.
- Norman, W.T. (1967). *2800 personality trait descriptors: Normative operating characteristics for a university population*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan, Department of Psychology.
- Ramul, K. (1963). Some early measurements and ratings in psychology. *American Psychologist*, 18, 653-659.
- Rogers, T.B. (1995). *The psychological testing enterprise: An introduction*. Pacific Grove, CA: Brooks/Cole Publishing Company.
- Thurstone, L.L. (1934). The vectors of the mind. *Psychological Review*, 41, 1-32.
- Tupes, E.C. & Christal, R.E. (1961). *Recurrent personality factors based on trait ratings (USAF ASD Tech. Rep. No. 61-97)*. Lackland Air Force Base, TX: U.S. Air Force.
- Tupes, E.C. & Christal, R.E. (1992). Recurrent personality factors based on trait ratings. *Journal of Personality*, 60, 225-261.
- Woodworth, R. (1919). Examination of emotional fitness for warfare. *Psychological Bulletin*, 16, 59-60.