

Running head: AFFECTIVE TYPING

Testing Respondent Sense of Correctness of Affective Typing Report

Gretchen Light

Western Kentucky University

### Abstract

Often counselors and mental health professionals will use tests to get an idea of what their client's personality type is or the problems that they face. While the One Wheel model does not give specific, diagnostic results, it does outline personality types. Following the work of Cari Bourette, this study examines the use of the One Wheel model in personality assessment via archetypes. A report was generated from responses to a Likert scaled 32 word ranking survey. The participants and a familiar person then ranked the accuracy of the actual report generated and a control report. Significant results for self and other recognition of key report sections, as well as significant results for self recognition in the overall report show promise for the One Wheel system.

### Testing Respondent Sense of Correctness of Affective Typing Report

From the beginning, people have had the urge to categorize things: natural phenomena, literature, even types of people. Often counselors and mental health professionals will use tests to get an idea of what their client's personality type is or the problems that they face. While the One Wheel model does not give specific, diagnostic results, it does outline personality types.

Jung explored the development of archetypes at length throughout his career. Enns explains Jungian archetypes as “primordial images, myths, and evolutionary symbols that represent inborn and universal ways of perceiving and comprehending the world” (1994). The One Wheel model, according to Bourette (2006a), is based largely on archetypes; it, too, applies universally. As Bourette claims that this model is applicable to all things, it should theoretically apply to personalities as well. The four basic personality types, as developed by Bourette, are derivative from four of the eight “elements,” or categories. Using a short assessment, the Quick Assessment Survey (QAS), data is collected and a report is generated from the respondent's answers. Each report shows the four areas of a person's outlined type. These are Base, Persona, Affect and Stress. Base represents the combination of elemental qualities that make up a person's foundation, their base configuration. Persona is the combination of archetypes that the participant has learned either to enhance or to balance the qualities of their foundation. This is their creative adaptation, how they see themselves, and may assume this is how others see them as well. Affect is the result of the Persona overlaid on the Base. Theoretically, this is how others will most likely see the participant and how the world may seem to respond to them, but not necessarily how they see themselves. Response to Stress is the difference others perceive when the participant is under stress as their creative ways of coping (Persona) give way.

### *Statement of the Problem*

The purpose of this study was to investigate the reliability of the wheel model as applied to personality. This was done using a Likert scale survey filled out by the initial respondent and a familiar other on the degree to which the report resembles the respondent.

### *Review of Literature*

The One Wheel model itself has been based on archetypes found in indigenous cultures, ancient Greek proto-cultures, Eastern thought, and the work of Carl Jung. The Greeks were one of the early cultures to present such types. Claudius Galen outlined the four types to be sanguine, phlegmatic, choleric, and melancholic (Jung, 1923). While these types are not commonly the basis for psychological types, Galen's work served as an inspiration from which to work.

Jung took from the example of the Greeks and continued to study archetypes as shown in the human psyche. The pervading theme of his work in "Contribution to the Study of Psychological Types" (1913) is showing opposites on spectrums of personalities. It establishes a way of identifying and developing archetypes as he perceives them. His later work on the collective unconscious drew heavily on his understanding of archetypes as universal ways of connecting with and categorizing the world (Enns, 1994). These archetypes can be used for a wide variety of applications, from gifted youth to gay development (Reynolds, 2005; McFarland, 1999), due to their universal qualities.

These archetypes continue to find new application in the One Wheel system. In step with Jung, from whom much influence was drawn, Bourette and Reader draw from multiple sources to develop the One Wheel system and continually mold Ekacakra into a working model as a worldview. Reader developed the Ekacakra model drawing from his background in philosophy and religion. Bourette is a doctor of psychology; she drew from her background in mental health to apply the Ekacakra model to personalities (Bourette, 2006a). Ekacakra is not purely for use as

a personality typing system. However, it can be utilized as one possible means of understanding one's clients. "With the introduction of a few key words, more complex images, or archetypes, may be accessed in the participant such that a composite model, many orders more complex than the original search terms, may be arrived at" (D. Reader, personal communication, May 15, 2007). Essentially, these terms are trigger terms for the larger archetypes already present in people's psyches.

This application of the One Wheel model is similar to the Meyers-Briggs system. While the One Wheel system encompasses more than personality testing, it could be used by counselors, couples, and groups to help the participants work on relationships (Bourette, 2006a). Much like the Meyers-Briggs, the One Wheel model allows individuals to understand their own personality type and that of others to best learn how to interact together. This can also be used for counselors who need to better understand their clients' communication styles. It shows in general what is valued by a person and how they see their world; in essence, it gives a basic outline of their worldview.

Further, also in line with Jungian archetypes, is the idea that there is a part of everyone's mind "that deals with change, or transformation"; further still, to change the dominant archetype is to change the person's "surface personality" (Masters, 1980). In other words, to change the dominant archetype is to change a central tenet of the person's worldview and therefore expression towards the world around him or her. This could be paralleled to the currently more commonly practiced Cognitive-Behavioral therapy in which changing one's thoughts changes one's feelings and therefore, one's behavior (Corey, 2005). Even staying within one's dominant archetype, there seems to be room for change. By identifying the archetypal qualities, one can don the cloak of another "goddess" or "god" within the same archetypal category (Burt, 1988).

In essence, one can reframe the god/goddess imagery to a more positive or productive “manifestation,” changing one’s outlook and therefore, again, feelings and behaviors.

The Quick Assessment Survey has been developed as a quick tool based on the One Wheel model intended to be used with minimal time spent, but accurate, general results. Although not developed for use as a clinical test, it could possibly allow professionals to use the test to get a quick read of a client with minimal interference with session time. “In developing the QAS, having the image in mind of these 8 complexes, or archetypes, the task was to come up with four words for each archetype that meant precisely that, and not any of the others” (C.G. Bourette, personal communication, May 15, 2007). The Jungian archetypes were not used wholesale as they have potential, possibly stemming from the time period in which he wrote, to be considered sexist for the anima/animus as Enns has criticized (1999). Instead, these have been changed to represent male/female in general rather than the masculine side of a woman or vice versa (Bourette, 2006b), and are blended with the more elemental archetypes of indigenous religions, looking at other such models such as Combs (2004), who developed an elemental model of understanding personalities and how they interact individually and in groups. These combined give the resulting archetypes used for the general, but accurate results that Bourette claims.

In an interview regarding her work, C.G. Bourette stated, “The reason why it appears that this survey gives out more information than goes into it is because knowing a person’s dominant archetypes gives us pages of information about them,” based on these archetypes (personal communication, May 15, 2007). This sounds like a fantastic claim, as Bourette said, and warranted exploration as to the accuracy of this system. If counselors can gain this much information on a client based on this system, this worldview, it makes it a potential—possibly

invaluable—counseling tool. While this is only one facet, a single applied use, of the much larger Ekacakra lens, it may prove with further study to be vital to the counseling profession.

## Method

### *Participants*

Participants in this study will be selected from the population of college-educated or higher individuals at Western Kentucky University in Bowling Green, Kentucky and a partner who knows them well. They have been drawn primarily from the Counseling department for their higher potential for self-awareness, as well as the Philosophy and English Departments. The student population in the counseling department is 85% female; therefore, I will try to find male participants to balance the genders as close to 50%-50% as possible.

### *Instrument*

The purpose of this study was to investigate the reliability of the wheel model as applied to personality. This was done using a Likert scale survey, called the Affective Typing System, filled out by the initial respondent and a familiar other on the degree to which the report resembles the respondent. There are 8 scores required for the Affective Typing System. Bourette designed A 32 word ranking questionnaire as an instrument to obtain these scores quickly and easily from a moderately educated, middle class population. The 8 categories these scores represent and the corresponding qualities and attributes are listed in the table below:

<b>Category</b>	<b>Qualities and Attributes</b>
A1	Stillness, Materiality, Home & family, Security, Stability, Savings, Quiet, Identity, Groundedness
A2	Activity, Work & achievement, Spending, Energetic, Restless
B1	Digital or Component View, Thinking, Symbolic/Verbal Communication, Rationality, Objectivity, Analytical, Detail-Oriented
B2	Feeling, Image/Emotional Communication, Intuition, Subjectivity, Music/Poetry, Big Picture-Oriented, System View
C1	Receptive, Hospitality, Helpfulness, Relationship-oriented, Facilitating communication, Enabling development of potential in others.

- C2 Directive, Leadership, Giving direction, Team sports or physical competition, Enjoys life drives such as food and sex, Doing the right thing.
- D1 Challenging, Symbol Manipulation, Words for competition or debate, “random” actions to keep others guessing, surprises, analytic sports (golf, billiards), mania, practical jokes.
- D2 Limiting, Control, Squelching unexpected activity or communication, religious mysticism, melancholy, of caves and spaces that are dark & quiet, of graveyards and “ghosts”, slow & steady.

From these scores, a report is generated.

### *Design*

There will be two groups of 15-25 college students and graduates each. Participants in both groups will be found through the Counseling Department and classmates. They will be contacted via e-mail and telephone. All participants will be given a copy of the report with graphics as a reward for participation in the study.

### *Procedure*

The following procedure is proposed to test the reliability of the report from this instrument.

1. It is proposed that there be two groups. There will be a minimum of 15 in each group, and a maximum of 25.
2. Participants will be asked to fill out the 32 word ranked questionnaire. Location will be a classroom at Tate Page Hall. Time to complete is less than 10 minutes. Arrangements will be made for a follow up to present the report to them.
3. In the follow-up session, both groups will be informed that the information in the report is under development, and that their input will help in any adjustments that need to be made prior to its official release.
4. Both groups will be asked to rank each statement in the report using a 5 point Likert scale



from Strongly Disagree to Strongly Agree. The first group will be given the correct report first, and then a control report produced from random scores (see sample). The second group will be given the control report first, and then the correct report. This should take no more than 10 minutes for each report, or a total of 20 minutes. The person administering the report ranking will not know which group the person is in or therefore which test is labeled “correct.”

5. Each participant will be given a copy of the “correct” report that was produced for them to take with them. It will be explained that this is the report that was expected to be most right.

Another Person’s Perspective: since a portion of the report claims to give the Affect—how the person appears to other people—the participants, at their option, are invited to bring a friend with them to the follow up appointment to rank the report statements under Affect and Stressed using the same 5 point Likert scale.

Calculations are made by an Excel spreadsheet after entering answers to the 32 word survey. The report is manually compiled from a list of statements that correspond to various scores generated by the Excel spreadsheet calculations. The person generating the report and the person in contact with the respondents will be two different people.

## Results

Although the experimental design called for a minimum of 15 in each group, it was more difficult to find respondents who would complete the study in full than originally anticipated. Out of 34 respondents, 18 completed surveys on both reports; 10 from group one and 8 from group two. Out of the 18 who completed surveys, 9 male and 9 female, only 6 from group one and 4 from group two returned surveys from a familiar person. Responses that could not be used

at all: 3 only turned in responses to one report. 1 survey by a familiar person was turned in with a name that did not match any primary respondents.

The survey asked 4 Likert-scale questions on how well each section of the report described them, and 1 question on the overall report. To each statement of “X describes me very well” the Likert-scale response ranged from 1 – strongly disagree to 5 – strongly agree. Tables 1 – 4 below show the responses for each group of respondents.

**Table 1. Crosstab by Respondent Group 1, Survey 1 (actual report)**

Respondent#	Overall	Base	Persona	Affect	Stressed
1	4	5	5	4	2
2	4	4	4	4	5
3	5	5	5	5	2
4	4	5	5	4	4
5	4	5	5	5	4
6	4	5	5	4	1
7	4	3	4	4	4
8	4	4	5	4	5
9	5	5	5	4	5
10	4	5	5	4	2
median	4.2	4.6	4.8	4.2	3.4
mode	4	5	5	4	4.5

**Table 2. Crosstab by Respondent Group 1, Survey 2 (control report)**

Respondent#	Overall	Base	Persona	Affect	Stressed
1	4	2	5	3	5
2	4	4	4	4	5
3	3	5	5	2	2
4	4	3	4	2	4
5	3	2	5	3	2
6	3	2	3	1	2
7	3	3	3	2	2
8	3	3	3	3	3
9	4	4	5	4	5
10	4	2	5	3	5
median	3.5	3.0	4.2	2.7	3.5
mode	3.5	2.5	5	3	3.5

**Table 3. Crosstab Group 2, Survey 1 (control report)**

Respondent#	Overall	Base	Persona	Affect	Stressed
-------------	---------	------	---------	--------	----------

	11	2	3	4	3	3
	12	3	4	4	2	3
	13	4	4	5	4	3
	14	4	4	4	3	4
	15	3	3	4	3	4
	16	5	4	5	4	5
	17	3	4	3	3	2
	18	4	3	4	5	4
median		3.5	3.6	4.1	3.4	3.5
mode		3.5	4	4	3	3.5

**Table 4. Crosstab Group 2, Survey 2 (actual report)**

Respondent#	Overall	Base	Persona	Affect	Stressed
11	4	4	4	5	3
12	3	3	1	4	2
13	4	5	4	3	4
14	4	1	4	4	2
15	5	5	5	4	4
16	3	4	3	3	5
17	4	3	4	4	2
18	4	5	4	3	4
median	3.9	3.8	3.6	3.8	3.3
mode	4	5	4	4	3

Tables 5 -8 below show the responses of the familiar persons that completed surveys.

**Table 5. Crosstab by Familiar Person Group 1, Survey 1 (actual report)**

Familiar #	Respondent#	Time known (months)	Overall	Base	Persona	Affect	Stressed
1	5	4	5	5	5	4	4
2	6	1	4	4	4	4	3
3	7	2.5	4	5	4	5	4
4	8	2.5	3	4	3	3	3
5	9	384	4	5	4	4	3
6	10	456	4	5	4	4	2
		median	4	4.7	4	4	3.2
		mode	4	5	4	4	3

**Table 6. Crosstab by Familiar Person Group 1, Survey 2 (control report)**

Familiar #	Respondent#	Time known (monthss)	Overall	Base	Persona	Affect	Stressed
1	5	4	1	2	3	2	1

2	6	1	3	3	3	2	2
3	7	2.5	5	4	5	4	5
4	8	2.5	3	3	3	3	3
5	9	384	3	5	3	2	3
6	10	456	2	2	4	4	4
		median	2.8	3.2	3.5	2.8	3
		mode	3	3	3	2	3

**Table 7. Crosstab by Familiar Person Group 2, Survey 1 (control report)**

Familiar #	Respondent #	Time known (months)	Overall	Base	Persona	Affect	Stressed
7	15	60	3	4	3	4	4
8	16	228	4	5	4	4	5
9	17	1	3	3	4	5	2
10	18	384	3	3	3	3	5
		median	3.3	3.8	3.5	4	4
		mode	3	3	3.5	4	5

**Table 8. Crosstab by Familiar Person Group 2, Survey 2 (actual report)**

Familiar #	Respondent #	Time known (months)	Overall	Base	Persona	Affect	Stressed
7	15	60	4	5	3	5	4
8	16	228	3	4	3	3	3
9	17	1	4	4	5	5	2
10	18	384	4	5	3	5	5
		median	3.8	4.5	3.5	4.5	3.5
		mode	4	4.5	3	5	3.5

Tables 9-12 below show the results of a paired t-test of the two surveys to test for significant difference between the responses for the actual and the controlled reports. The t-tests were calculated using the Graphpad Software (2005) t-test calculator. For the respondents in Group 1 (Table 9), the difference was significant for the Base and Affect sections at  $p \leq .005$ . For the Overall section it was significant at  $p = .010$ . There was no significant difference for the Persona or Stressed sections.

**Table 9. Paired t-test Results Group 1 Respondents**

Group 1 Respondents		n=10			df =9	
Section	Overall	Base	Persona	Affect	Stressed	
t	3.280	3.748	2.25	4.392	0.171	
S.E. of diff.	0.213	0.427	0.267	0.342	0.586	
P value	0.010	0.005	0.051	0.002	0.868	

For the familiar persons in Group 1 (Table 10), the difference was significant for the Base and Affect sections at  $p \leq .03$ . There was no significant difference for the Overall, Persona, or Stressed sections.

**Table 10. Paired t-test Results Group 1 Familiar Persons**

Group 1 Familiar Persons		n=6			df =5	
Section	Overall	Base	Persona	Affect	Stressed	
t	1.659	3.00	1.168	2.907	0.237	
S.E. of diff.	0.703	0.50	0.428	0.401	0.703	
P value	0.158	0.03	0.296	0.034	0.822	

For the respondents in Group 2 (Table 11), there was no significant difference in the responses to the two reports.

**Table 11. Paired t-test Results Group 2 Respondents**

Group 2 Respondents		n=8			df=7	
Section	Overall	Base	Persona	Affect	Stressed	
t	0.814	0.205	1.000	0.704	0.798	
S.E. of diff.	0.460	0.611	0.500	0.532	0.313	
P value	0.442	0.844	0.351	0.504	0.451	

For the familiar persons in Group 2 (Table 12), there was no significant difference in the responses to the two reports.

**Table 12. Paired t-test Results Group 2 Familiar Persons**

Group 2 Familiar Persons			n=4	df=3	
Section	Overall	Base	Persona	Affect	Stressed
t	1.000	1.192	0.000	0.775	1.000
S.E. of diff.	0.500	0.629	0.408	0.645	0.500
P value	0.391	0.319	1.000	0.495	0.391

Three unpaired t-tests were done between groups. Table 13 below shows the results of a test to see if there was a significant difference between the responses for the first survey filled out by each group. The mean was higher in each case for Group 1 (the actual report) except for Stressed. The difference was significant in each category except for Stressed at  $p \leq .05$ .

**Table 13. Unpaired t-test Group 1 vs. Group 2 Respondents, Survey 1**

Group 1 and 2 Respondents, 1st Survey			n=18	df=16	
Section	Overall	Base	Persona	Affect	Stressed
t	2.141	3.282	2.691	2.545	0.164
S.E. of diff	0.327	0.297	0.251	0.324	0.609
P value	0.048	0.005	0.016	0.022	0.872

The unpaired t-test in Table 14 below shows the results of a test to see if the difference between responses by Group 1 and Group 2 respondents for the actual report is significant. The only significant difference ( $p = .01$ ) is for the category Persona.

**Table 14. Unpaired t-test Group 1 vs. Group 2 Respondents, Actual Report**

Group 1 and 2 Respondents, Actual Report			n=18	df=16	
Section	Overall	Base	Persona	Affect	Stressed
t	1.364	1.694	2.925	1.680	0.231
S.E. of diff	0.275	0.502	0.402	0.268	0.648
P value	0.192	0.110	0.010	0.112	0.820

The unpaired t-test in Table 15 below shows the results of a test to see if the difference between responses by Group 1 and Group 2 responses for the control report is significant. No significant difference was found between the two groups for the Control Report.

**Table 15. Unpaired t-test Group 1 vs. Group 2 Respondents, Control Report**

Group 1 and 2 Respondents, Control Report					
Section	Overall	Base	Persona	Affect	Stressed
t	0.000	1.529	0.195	1.523	0.164
S.E. of diff	0.346	0.409	0.384	0.443	0.609
P value	1.000	0.146	0.848	0.147	0.872

### *Discussion*

There was a statistically significant difference ( $p \leq .005$ ) between how respondents in Group 1 rated the statements in the report in the Base and Affect sections for the actual and control report. Persons familiar with these respondents also showed a significant difference ( $p = .03$ ) in the rating of the actual versus control reports. There was also a significant difference ( $p = .01$ ) in responses for the Overall category of respondents in Group 1 vs. Group 2.

While there was no significant indication of self or other recognition in the Persona section, this does not indicate that the report is necessarily invalid here. Because Persona is theoretically what someone unconsciously adds to their Base configuration to arrive at the total expressed Affect, it is supportive that the respondents did not recognize the Persona section as themselves. Also, since theoretically Persona is not directly observable, and is a “function of how someone shifts themselves, and thus manipulates others, to arrive at a desired outward and observable affect” it may be part of a “mutually agreed upon unconscious process” (C. G. Bourette, personal communication, May 15, 2007). Further, the scores which determine the report contents for Base and Persona come directly from the QAS. The score, and therefore

report content, for Affect is calculated from the Base and Persona scores. If “Persona” is invalid, then how is the highly significant self and other recognition of the derived Affect section explained?

There were no significant findings for the Stressed section. While from this study there is no indication of validity to this section of the report contents, it still may be worth further study. It would require a certain degree of self knowledge for someone to be aware of how they change the way they express themselves under stress. As for other recognition of how someone behaves under stress, this would best be tested with persons currently living together for a minimum period of time. The familiar persons in this study were acquaintances, friends, and parents, with highly varying degrees of length of time known and various levels of intimacy and currency.

There was nothing of significance found in Group Two which saw the control report first. It is noteworthy that this group did not duplicate Group One’s significantly higher ranking of the first report seen. In other words, it can not be concluded that the significance in Group One was based simply on it being the first report seen and ranked. However, the lack of difference in the ranking of the Group Two reports may be due to the control report being seen first. There is a longstanding ethical consideration in testing to use care in presenting psychological reports as people tend to accept them as authoritative pronouncements on “who they are.” It is possible that this effect could have skewed the ranking of survey one in both groups. Further research would be required to determine the extent of such skewing.

To the extent that the difference between these two groups could be examined with the available data from this study, unpaired t-tests showed that the higher means on the first report seen in Group One (actual report) and the first report seen in Group Two (control report) were significantly different ( $p \leq .05$ ). Also, unpaired t-tests showed that there was no significant



difference in responses between groups for responses to the control report, and little to no significant difference in responses between groups for responses to the actual report.

### Conclusion

Using the QAS and a resulting report it was possible to perform a preliminary investigation of the One Wheel model as applied to personality. Significant results for self and other recognition of the report sections on Base and Affect, as well as significant results for self recognition in the overall report show promise for the One Wheel system. Responses for the Persona section did not show self or other recognition. Yet Affect, which was significant, is calculated from the Persona and Base scores, and since theoretically Persona should be an unconscious process, this finding is consistent with the model and does not invalidate the Persona section of the report as invalid. Obtaining two pages of recognizable information from a 1-4 ranking of 8 sets of 4 words may seem unusual, but apparently the One Wheel model can deliver as promised to a significant degree. There is no indication from this study that there is any validity to the Stressed section of the report, and until further research is done, that section should be used with caution, if at all. As the sample size of this study was relatively small, it can not be considered conclusive, but instead suggestive that further study and attention to this model as a means of understanding oneself and others is warranted.

Since the One Wheel model gives categories, a wheel from which one can discern personality type “qualities,” it can be used like a personality typing system, though it is far from limited to this capacity alone. While the system is more complicated than a typing system, the continuous “wheel” on which these qualities occur has the possibility for this application. This study does not prove the model; however, it shows if further research is warranted. Enns (1994) suggests that using archetypal models in counseling can be useful to help the client develop a more concrete projected self-image, hopefully to the end of enhancing their self-image and self-

esteem. Perhaps one day a clinician will develop a personality type model from these categories.

It may have the potential for gaining a quick understanding people via these eight personality categories.

## References

- Bourette, C. G. (2006a). *Affective Typing of People, Groups, and Places: A Common Mapping System*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Western Kentucky University.
- Bourette, C. G. (2006b). *Elements of One Wheel (Ekacakra)*. Retrieved May 20, 2007, from A New Story Foundation Web Site: <http://anewstory.org/documents/onewheel.doc>.
- Burt, K. (1988). *Archetypes of the Zodiac*. St. Paul, MN: Llewellyn Publications.
- Corey, G. (2005). *Theory and Practice of Counseling and Psychotherapy* (7<sup>th</sup> Edition). Monterey, CA: Brooks/Cole.
- Enns, C. (1994, November). Archetypes and Gender: Goddesses, Warriors, and Psychological Health. *Journal of Counseling & Development*, 73(2), 127-133. Retrieved August 9, 2007, from MasterFILE Premier database.
- Graphpad Software. (2005). *QuickCalc t-test Calculator*. Retrieved September 27, 2007, from <http://www.graphpad.com/quickcalcs/ttest1.cfm?Format=C>.
- Masters, Paul L. (1980). Part III: The Collective Unconscious. *The Metaphysical Psychology of Consciousness*. Los Angeles: University of Metaphysics.
- McFarland, W., & McMahon, T. (1999, September). Male Archetypes as Resources for Homosexual Identity Development in Gay Men. *Journal of Humanistic Counseling, Education & Development*, 38(1), 47. Retrieved August 9, 2007, from MasterFILE Premier database.
- Reynolds, F., & Piirto, J. (2005, Spring). Depth Psychology and Giftedness: Bringing Soul to the Field of Talent Development and Giftedness. *Roeper Review*, 27(3), 164-171. Retrieved August 9, 2007, from MasterFILE Premier database.

Author Note

Gretchen E. Light, Department of Counseling and Student Affairs, Western Kentucky University.

A warm thanks to Dr. Cari Bourette for assistance with the results and discussion sections, as well as for her overall guidance.

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Gretchen Light, Department of Counseling and Student Affairs, Western Kentucky University, 1906 College Heights Boulevard #51031, Bowling Green, KY 42101. E-mail: [gretchen.light@wku.edu](mailto:gretchen.light@wku.edu).

*Appendix A*

## 32 Word Ranking Survey

Name \_\_\_\_\_

Male \_\_\_\_\_ Female \_\_\_\_\_ Age \_\_\_\_\_

For each of the following 8 sets of words, please fill in numbers from 1-4. Note that 1 means the word is MOST descriptive of you, 4 means it is LEAST descriptive of you. Please don't use the same number twice in any row.

- |    |                  |                   |                    |                |
|----|------------------|-------------------|--------------------|----------------|
| 1. | ___ Active       | ___ Talkative     | ___ Intuitive      | ___ Peaceful   |
| 2. | ___ Organizer    | ___ Leader        | ___ Jokester       | ___ Scheduler  |
| 3. | ___ Energetic    | ___ Intellectual  | ___ Emotional      | ___ Stable     |
| 4. | ___ Nurturing    | ___ Passionate    | ___ Thrill-seeking | ___ Controlled |
| 5. | ___ Dynamic      | ___ Communicative | ___ Deep           | ___ Steady     |
| 6. | ___ Inviting     | ___ Goal-directed | ___ Unsystematic   | ___ Structured |
| 7. | ___ Busy         | ___ Rational      | ___ Dreamy         | ___ Solid      |
| 8. | ___ Facilitating | ___ Forceful      | ___ Entertaining   | ___ Mysterious |

Appendix B

Form filled out by respondent in follow-up session (a similar one filled out by familiar person).

Name \_\_\_\_\_

strongly agree      agree      not sure      disagree      strongly disagree

1. As a whole, this report describes me very well.

\_\_\_\_\_

2. The section "Base" describes me very well.

\_\_\_\_\_

3. The section "Persona" describes me very well.

\_\_\_\_\_

4. The section "Affect" describes me very well.

\_\_\_\_\_

5. The section "Stressed" describes me very well.

\_\_\_\_\_

Optional:

When reading the report, I especially liked or agreed with:

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

When reading the report, I especially disliked or disagreed with:

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

Group 1 2      Report \_\_\_\_ (to be filled in by researcher)

*Appendix C*

WESTERN KENTUCKY UNIVERSITY  
Human Subjects Review Board  
Office of Sponsored Programs  
301 Potter Hall  
270-745-4652; Fax 270-745-4211  
E-mail: Sean.Rubino@wku.edu

In future correspondence please refer to HS07-195, May 17, 2007

Gretchen Light  
c/o Dr. Jianliang Wang  
Counseling & Student Affairs  
WKU

Dear Gretchen:

Your revision to your research project, "Testing Respondent Sense of Correctness of Affective Typing Report," was reviewed by the HSRB and it has been determined that risks to subjects are: (1) minimized and reasonable; and that (2) research procedures are consistent with a sound research design and do not expose the subjects to unnecessary risk.

Reviewers determined that: (1) benefits to subjects are considered along with the importance of the topic and that outcomes are reasonable; (2) selection of subjects is equitable; and (3) the purposes of the research and the research setting is amenable to subjects' welfare and producing desired outcomes; that indications of coercion or prejudice are absent, and that participation is clearly voluntary.

1. In addition, the IRB found that you need to orient participants as follows: (1) signed informed consent is required; (2) Provision is made for collecting, using and storing data in a manner that protects the safety and privacy of the subjects and the confidentiality of the data. (3) Appropriate safeguards are included to protect the rights and welfare of the subjects.

This project is therefore approved at the Expedited Review Level until August 31, 2007.

2. Please note that the institution is not responsible for any actions regarding this protocol before approval. If you expand the project at a later date to use other instruments please re-apply. Copies of your request for human subjects review, your application, and this approval, are maintained in the Office of Sponsored Programs at the above address. Please report any changes to this approved protocol to this office. Also, please use the stamped Informed Consent documents that are included with this letter. A Continuing Review protocol will be sent to you in the future to determine the status of the project.

Sincerely,

Sean Rubino, M.P.A.  
Compliance Manager  
Office of Sponsored Programs  
Western Kentucky University