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Introduction

Social psychologists have been considering the dimensions of personality for many years using various approaches and styles. In fact, Humans have been trying to understand personality for thousands of years, dating back to Greek philosophers (Riso & Hudson, 1996 & Hudson, p. 431). Originally Greeks and Romans thought that personality could be understood in the context of the four cosmic elements: earth, air, fire, and water. Four personological temperaments coincide with each element including melancholic, sanguine, choleric, and phlegmatic (Crider, Kavanaugh, Goethals, Solomon, 1993, p. 490).

Each model sheds light on the mystery of personalities and often challenges and adds to the previous literature. In search for the all-encompassing model that breaks down and describes every element of human personality social psychologists continue to avidly pursue the meaning of personality. The Enneagram Model of Personality is one of the many approaches to understanding personality and this study will assess its value in comparison with other established and recognized models of personality, and in addition, the study will also address the Enneagram in the context of leadership. More specifically, Study 1 will explore the typology sorority members with a distinction between leaders and non-leaders. Study 2 will explore the relationship between Enneagram types and presidential leadership and more specifically presidential success. The Enneagram is an approach derived from ancient wisdoms that date back at least 2,000 years ago to Asia and the Middle East, yet it clearly reflects many qualities found in contemporary psychological theory. The Enneagram seeks to understand personality by classifying people into one of nine different types that emerges during childhood and is thought to be an in-born quality (Riso & Hudson, 1996, p. 31). A person can only be a member of just
one of the Enneagram types. Though we develop and grow, our basic personality type never changes throughout our life.

The model’s name comes from its nine-pointed symbol; each point represents one of the nine numbers of the Enneagram system. Enneagram expert, Ginger Lapid-Bogda says that, “This ancient system offers profound insights into the different ways in which people think, feel, and behave, since the nine different Enneagram styles represent distinct worldviews, with related patterns of thinking feeling, and taking action” (Lapid-Bogda, 2007, p. 1). According to Enneagram theorists, each person has a basic personality type that emerges from childhood, though every person may identify in some way or another with all nine types. “Inborn temperament and other pre-natal factors [are] the main determinants of our type. This is the one area where most all of the major Enneagram authors agree—we are born with a dominant type” (Riso & Hudson, 2011).

The Enneagram is a fascinating personality model that I believe deserves attention and recognition when discussing the relationship between personality and leadership. In order to understand the model and understand where it belongs in personality theory, we must first review the literature surrounding personality, leadership, and presidential personality as well as the relationships among all three. This review will begin with an assessment and historical recount of the general terms of personality theory with a focus on trait theory. Following that review, I will discuss the origins and basic concepts of the Enneagram and identify the similarities and parallels that it shares with other personality theories. Next, I will assess the current literature on personality and leadership including the relationship between the Enneagram and leadership. Finally I will mention several relevant theories regarding personality and presidential leadership. By completing a thorough review of these topics I hope to build a
foundation on which I will begin my personal research on the **Relationship between The Enneagram and Leadership** focusing on sorority women and presidential greatness.

**General Terms of Personality Theory**

*I will rely heavily on the work of Crider et al. (1993) in the following section.*

First, it is necessary to examine the different terms of personality theory and the four primary perspectives: psychodynamic, behavioral, humanistic and trait. The Enneagram is a unique combination of the trait and type perspectives with some influence from the other approaches, so in order to understand the model more fully we will discuss the trait perspective in more depth.

*Psychodynamic Perspective*

Sigmund Freud coined the term psychoanalysis in 1896 as a result of his extensive clinical experiences. He delved into the world of the unconscious and though many of his findings and theories drew significant criticism, he set the stage for other psychologists to challenge him and build on his theory.

Freud was a pioneer in the field of studying unconscious motives and conflicts, which he did through the analysis and interpretation of dreams and psychological symptoms of his patients. Through clinical work, Freud developed his main idea that personality characteristics develop out of unconscious conflicts about sexual and aggressive drives, positing that a person’s personality is defined during the first five years of existence. As his followers developed and expanded on Freud’s analyses, their work became known as the psychodynamic perspective of personality.
Freud's theory of personality identifies three mental structures: *id, ego, and superego*. The interaction and combination of these mental structures, which all develop at different stages of life, suggest how a person is going to think, feel, and act. Freud describes the *id* as the mental structure at birth that is entirely consumed by an unconscious and instinctual drives for both pleasure and destruction. The *ego* acts as the conscious portion of the psyche by planning and reasoning to remain reality-oriented. The *ego* serves to help the *id* achieve real satisfaction. The *superego* is the mental structure that accounts for moral principles and reason, which is learned from parental guidance and societal environment. Freud proposed that the three mental structures developed through four stages of tension reduction: oral stage, anal stage, phallic stage, and genital. It is during these stages of development that Freud says personality develops.

Ego-defense mechanisms are the unconscious strategies the *ego* uses to reduce anxiety and to keep other emotional threats from overwhelming the *ego*. These mechanisms in turn affect the way a person sees the world and suggests that they will behave using the behavior-channeling defense mechanisms, the primary reality-distorting mechanisms, and the secondary reality-distorting mechanisms. Behavior channeling consists of three defenses, which are identification, displacement, and sublimination. Each of these defenses works to protect the person from conflict, anxiety, and harm. The primary reality-distorting defenses use repression and denial to avoid feeling or even perceiving anxiety by removing all awareness of these threats. The secondary reality-distorting defenses work in conjunction with repression and denial in order to facilitate these defenses further. The three defenses within this mechanism are projection, reaction formation, and rationalization.

Though many aspects of Freud's theories and ideas regarding sex and aggression have been challenged and sometimes discredited, the psychoanalytic theory has been revisited and
expounded upon in regards to both normal personality and psychological disorders. One important psychoanalyst, Heinz Kohut, expanded on Freud’s theory developing a concept of self that he felt Freud’s theory lacked. The self, according to Kohut, is a person’s sense of individuality and worth and can be explained in terms of the autonomous self and the nuclear self. Other psychoanalysts have continued to build on Freud’s theory and added to the psychodynamic literature. Freud established foundational ideas that will continue to be used and discussed in further research of personality and psychological disorders.

Karen Horney

Karen Horney was brought up in the Freudian school of thought, but did not agree with many of Freud’s psychosocial approaches. Her theory is grounded in the concept of neurosis believing that there are varying degrees of neuroticism that facilitate both healthy and unhealthy forces. Horney (1942) first distinguished ten neurotic needs that later developed into three different orientations of social interaction. People can be classified as “moving toward people”, “moving against people”, or “moving away from people” (DiCaprio, 1974, p. 312). The social orientations eventually manifested into more general orientations: (1) self-effacing solution (striving for love), (2) expansive solution (striving for mastery), and (3) resignation (striving for freedom) (DiCaprio, 1974, p. 313). The following chart distinguishes between the ten needs and their manifestations as well as their social and general orientations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Horney’s Ten Neurotic Needs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Neurotic Need</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affection and approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominant partner in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exploitation of others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prestige</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal admiration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambition in personal achievement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narrowly confined limits of life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-sufficiency and independence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perfection and unassailability</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table taken from Personality Theories written by Nicolas DiCaprio*

Horney makes the claim that though we each may possess all or some of these needs, one of the needs will be particularly powerful for every person. We develop these needs in reaction to uncomfortable social situations we faced in our youth. Young children seek solutions and coping strategies to deal with the anxieties and disturbances that affect their wellbeing. These ten needs are the irrational solutions, “for the problem of disturbed human relationships” (Horney, 1942).

*The Trait and Type Perspectives*

The four distinct approaches to personality in psychology including, the psychodynamic perspective, the trait perspective, the behavioral perspective, and the humanistic perspective are all important to gaining a complete understanding of personality. Each different approach has
had important ramifications on the modern study of personality and each adds unique and meaningful pieces to an ever-expanding puzzle. However, in order to understand the Enneagram it is important that I explain fully the trait approach more so than the other approaches. The trait and type approach are the foundations for the Enneagram Model.

“Traits are relatively stable characteristics of a person that can be measured” (Crider et al, 1993, p. 502). The trait perspective says that a person’s internal traits, as opposed to external or situational factors, will affect the way he or she behaves as individual. This perspective suggests that a person can vary in the strength of a particular trait. The trait perspective was developed out of type theory, which asserted that a person falls into a certain category or type according to their personality. Individual’s can be grouped into one aspect of a category or another, such as introvert or extrovert. Though closely related, there are important distinctions between type and trait theory. I will more thoroughly explore the dynamics and differences between these theories because as you will see later, they have fascinating implications on the Enneagram model.

We will begin by discussing the type theory brought to light by Carl Jung. Jung was in close relationship with Freud during his formative years, but eventually broke away from Freud’s psychosexual approach and developed his own theory of psychoanalysis and psychotherapy, which became known as analytical psychology. His theory of personality incorporates both past experiences with future aspirations to form a holistic analysis of personality.

Jung, unlike Freud, looks at the ancestry of individuals to understand their present personality. He believed that as humans we have a predisposition to particular personological qualities because of our evolutionary origins. In order to understand personality, Jung believed that psychologists must explore human history. Jung studied and analyzed concepts such as
mythology, religion, symbols, and rituals in order to form a complete understanding of how personality has developed and evolved (Hall & Lindzey, 1978, p. 117).

Jung developed a complex structure of personality that includes the ego, personal unconscious, the collective unconscious and its archetypes, the persona, the anima and animus and the shadow, and the self. Additionally, there are the two attitude types and four different functions. The self is what Jung describes at the center of the whole personality.

The ego is the conscious mind, or the perceptions, memories, thoughts, and feelings that are available to the conscious at any given moment. This part of our personality is responsible for our personal identity and continuity (Hall & Lindzey, 1978, p. 118). Adjoining the ego is the personal unconscious, which are those experiences that were at one point conscious, but now are in the unconscious because they were suppressed, repressed, forgotten, or ignored. The ego and the personal unconscious consist of experiences that are interchangeable depending on the relevance to the conscious mind at a given time. Within the construct of the personal unconscious there are complexes. Complexes are organized groups of feelings, thoughts, and perceptions and memories categorized by topic or relevance (Hall & Lindzey, 1978, p. 118).

The collective unconscious is where seemingly universal latent memory traces from a person’s ancestry are stored. It consists of many different archetypes, which are potential universal ideas that contain a large element of emotion (Hall & Lindzey, 1978, p. 120). Several archetypes are highly developed and more understood so they have become systems in and of themselves: persona, anima and animus, and the shadow.

The persona is a “mask adopted by the person in response to the demands of social convention and tradition and to his or her own inner archetypal needs” (Hall & Lindzey, 1978, p. 122). The persona is essentially the role that society has assigned you and will determine your
public personality. The more that the ego identifies with the *persona*, the more likely it is that the person will become out of touch with their genuine feelings and simply become a reflection of society (Hall & Lindzey, 1978, p. 122).

The *anima* and the *animus(133,561),(254,577) represent the archetypes that are a result of male and female interaction and interdependence over the course of time. The *anima* is the feminine archetype in a man and the *animus* is the masculine archetype in a woman. Jung suggests that it is rather obvious that men and women both demonstrate some qualities of the opposite sex in their personality and this can be explained by discussing the *anima* and the *animus*. The *shadow* is another archetype that represents our animal instincts that we have inherited from when we were lower life forms. Jung believes that it is this animal instinct archetype that gives humans a more full personality with a three-dimensional quality.

Jung describes the *self* as the midpoint of personality that acts as the center for all the different systems. The *self* controls these systems and gives them meaning. Acting as the glue that holds the systems together the *self* provides personality with unity, equilibrium, and stability (Hall & Lindzey, 1978, p. 124). Achieving a holistic sense of self is every person’s deepest inner goal; we are constantly striving for it, but can never seem to reach it.

Another hugely important aspect of Jung’s theory for this thesis is that people can also be categorized by their attitude or orientation toward an experience. Based on someone’s attitude, a person is either introverted (inward looking) or extroverted (outward looking). Extroversion means that a person will be oriented towards the external and have an objective view of the world and introversion means that a person will orient towards the inner self and view the world more subjectively. According to Jung, both introversion and extroversion will be present in everyone’s personality, but one type tends to be more dominant and therefore in the conscious
mind (ego), while the other tends to be subordinate and remain within the personal unconscious. The self acts to pull all of these contradictory aspects of the personality together in order to achieve complete unity and wholeness.

In addition to attitude, a person’s reaction to experience places them into a group or type that will rely on one of four functions: thinking, feeling, intuiting, and sensing. These four functions can be understood by looking at them as two different pairings. Thinking and feeling are categorized as judgment functions; they make judgments about the world as opposed to just perceiving it. The second pair is the perception function that views the world through unconscious processes and subliminal contents. Within each pair, the two functions are opposite in the way they either judge or perceive. First, thinking consists of using reason to make judgments. It is ideational, intellectual and suggests that a person will try to comprehend the nature of the world and themselves. Second, feeling involves using emotions and values to make judgments, as opposed to rational judgments. It is an evaluation function that focuses on the value of something whether it is positive or negative. This type views experiences as subjective and evaluates them based on pleasure, joy, pain, anger, fear, sorrow, and love. The third function is intuition, which strives to go beyond the facts and searches for the essence of reality. This type tries to understand the meaning of the world and the meaning of each of their experiences by placing them all in perspective. The final function is sensing, which suggests that a person will see the world in terms of facts and clear representations, opposite the intuition function. Using the five senses, this type will perceive the world and develop obvious and understandable mental images of their environment.

Similar to the two types of attitudes, each person will demonstrate a dominant function in the conscious, which is called the superior function, while the other three functions reside in the
unconscious. The least acted out function is called the *inferior function*. Jung proposes that if a person were to exude all four functions in harmony he or she would experience full actualization of the self (Hall & Lindzey, 1978, p. 126). Just as the *self* tries to pull together introversion and extroversion, the *self* will try to exude all four functions in harmony. In order to demonstrate this more clearly, we will imagine how a person acting in each function would react to standing on the edge of the Grand Canyon. If the feeling function is dominant, the person will experience a sense of “awe, grandeur, and breath-taking beauty.” If the sensing function predominates, the person “will see the Canyon merely as it is or as a photograph might represent it.” If the thinking function is in control of the ego then the person “will try to understand the Canyon in terms of geological principles and theory.” Finally, if the intuitive function is in primary control, the person will “tend to see the Grand Canyon as a mystery of nature possessing deep significance whose meaning is partially revealed or felt as a mystical experience” (Hall & Lindzey, 1978, p. 125).

Jung’s theory consisted of eight types determined by introversion-extroversion and primary reliance on one of the four functions. The eight types are as follows: introverted-thinking, introverted-feeling, introverted-intuitive, introverted-sensing, extroverted-thinking, extroverted-feeling, extroverted-intuitive, and extroverted-sensing (Crider et al., 1993, p. 503). In an effort to make the theory of personality types more useful and applicable, Isabel Briggs Myers and her mother Katharine Briggs developed an instrument to address the different ways that people use perception and judgment. Her instrument sought to determine whether a person was introverted or extroverted, whether they see the world in terms of judgment or perception, and which function they maintain (thinking, feeling, intuition, sensing).

Perception involves all the ways of becoming aware of things, people, happenings, or ideas. Judgment involves all the ways of coming to conclusions about what has been
perceived. If people differ systematically in what they perceive and in how they reach conclusions, then it is only reasonable for them to differ correspondingly in their interests, reactions, values, motivations, and skills (Myers Briggs website).

The Myers Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI) categorizes people into one of sixteen different personality types based on these four pairings: Extroversion (E)-Introversion (I), Sensing (S)-Intuition (N), Thinking (T) –Feeling (F), and Judging (J)-Perceiving (P). A person’s type is denoted by four letters that each represent one aspect of each of these four pairs. No one type is better than another and each one brings something unique and meaningful to the world. For example, President Jimmy Carter might be an INTJ(Introverted, Intuiting, Thinking, Judging) type. Michael Lyons studied the MBTI and its relation to the presidential office and found Bill Clinton to be a clear example of an ENJP(Extroverted, Intuiting, Judging, Perceiving) type (1997). ENJP types tend to seek close attachments to people, and are often warm-spirited and optimistic. They can also be undisciplined and disorganized, but at the same time, work relentlessly to accomplish a task. The following table explains what each paring of qualities is measuring:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Orientation Pair</th>
<th>Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extroversion (E) or Introversion (I)</td>
<td>Do you prefer to focus on the outer world or on your own inner world?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sensing (S) or Intuition (N)</td>
<td>Do you prefer to focus on the basic information you take in or do you prefer to interpret and add meaning?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thinking (T) or Feeling (F)</td>
<td>When making decisions, do you prefer to first look at logic and consistency or first look at people and special circumstances?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judging (J) or Perceiving (P)</td>
<td>In dealing with the outside world, do you prefer to get things decided or do you prefer to stay open to new information and options?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Information found on The Myers Briggs Foundation website.
Carl G. Jung developed his theory of personality types in the 1920s and Isabel Briggs Myers developed the MBTI in the 1940s and since then, the assessment has been mostly accepted as externally valid, but its construct validity is still more highly debated (Lyons, 1997; McCrae & Costa, 1989). The MBTI is used for individual therapy as well as corporate management. By understanding the ways in which different people think and see the world, we can better understand each other and therefore have greater team cooperation. Since Isabel Briggs Myers developed the MBTI other psychologists have developed type indicators and type theories to try to understand the human personality in new and different ways. One of the typologies that has been built upon over the years is the Enneagram Model of Personality and scholars collaborated to create the RHETI (Riso Hudson Enneagram Type Indicator) much in the same way Briggs Myers created the MBTI.

Typology as presented by Jung was not well suited for many theorists believing that a person cannot be confined to a specific type. Some psychologists believed that there was more fluidity to personality and that people needed to be able to be defined on a strength-of-trait basis. Type theories assert that individuals can be assigned to one of a small (relatively) number of types and that all members of this group will share certain similarities. Typology and the trait approach, though similar in some respects, also greatly differ.

Gordon Allport, a leading trait theorist, believed that assessing personality with types failed to address the inherent individuality of humans. “Types are idealized constructions of the observer, and the individual can be fitted to them, but only at the loss of his or her distinctive identity” (Hall & Lindzey, 1978, p. 446). According to Allport, traits are more encompassing and though many people may share the same trait there is room for individuality in a person’s disposition. A person’s behavior is motivated by his traits (Hall & Lindzey, 1978, p. 446).
When we meet new people we evaluate their behavior and define them in terms of their traits. There is an extensive vocabulary of words that we use to describe the personality of another person and this is one of the most fundamental ways in which we can understand and relate to others. Allport does not discredit type theory though; rather he suggests that analyzing and creating types can fuel further research and understanding of complex traits (Hall & Lindzey, 1978, p. 446).

Allport’s trait theory can be understood by discussing how he distinguishes different kinds of traits. The first level of distinction is between common traits and unique traits. Common traits are those that are prevalent among most people and act as good sources of comparison. Measuring common traits involves determining the extent to which a person displays the quality. Unique traits are those that truly make a person an individual, distinct from all other individuals. These traits are more rare or can be a combination of several traits allowing for individuality and true personality to be revealed (Crider et al., 1993, p. 504).

Each person will display certain traits more strongly than others when they are interacting with others. Allport suggested that every person has a unique combination of what he calls cardinal, central, and secondary traits. These distinctions allowed for distinction of strong or weak manifestation of a particular trait within an individual’s personality. A person’s behavior is largely influenced by their cardinal trait or that characteristic that seems to be the most all-encompassing of the individual. Though a person tends to have just one cardinal trait, it is possible to have several central and secondary traits. Central traits, though similar to the cardinal trait, are not manifested as consistently as the cardinal trait. Finally, the secondary traits are those that are activated only in particular situations or environments. These are less critical when attempting to understand the core of someone’s personality, but can be useful when
attempting to get a more global picture of personality (Crider et al., 1993, p. 504). Trait theory has been a common method of analyzing the relationship between personality and leadership and more specifically presidential leadership. Later in this paper I will discuss how modern psychologists have used the trait approach to determine the qualities that they believe are most important when assessing personality, leadership, and presidential personality.

Hans Eysenck continued the research on the basic dimensions of personality. Using factor analysis he determined that there are two basic dimensions of personality: introversion and extroversion (as Jung posited) and stability versus instability. Eysenck suggests that introversion is “composed of reserve, lack of sociability, caution, and emotional control” and extroversion is “composed of sociability, activity, daring, and expressiveness” (Crider et al., 1993, p. 504). Dissimilar from typology, Eysenck believes that a person will fall somewhere on a continuum of introversion and extroversion. The second dimension, stability versus instability (which can also be called neuroticism) asserts whether a person is “well adjusted, calm, relaxed, and easygoing” or “moody, anxious, restless, and temperamental” (Crider et al., 1993, p. 505). The following image shows the different characteristics that can be found within each trait category.
Since Eysenck’s research on these two dimensions of personality, psychologists have been building on his theory and have been attempting to narrow down and identify the most basic trait dimensions of personality. The question remained whether extroversion and stability were the only two dimensions to measure personality. Tupes and Cristal (1961) and Norman (1963) identified the five qualities that have become known as the Big Five: extroversion, agreeableness, conscientiousness, emotional stability, and cultural interest (now more commonly referred to as openness). The research done by Norman especially was not accepted for some time, but more recent studies done by McCrae and Costa (1987) have supported the five factors. These researchers helped refine his theory to develop the more common traits associated with the Big Five, which are Surgency (or Extroversion), Agreeableness, Conscientiousness (Dependability), Emotional Control (Neuroticism), and Culture (Openness). It seems to me that the Big Five model may draw from other personality measures such as Leary’s Interpersonal Behavior Circle, R.F. Bales’ three-dimensional analysis, and the previously discussed Myers Briggs Type Indicator.
Leary’s Interpersonal Behavior Circle (Lorr & McNair, 1963) which falls into the trait approach, is described as "a two-dimensional representation of personality organized around two major axis." Dominant-Submissive and Hostile-Friendly. An individual’s personality will be a blend of traits that represent these two primary dimensions. Leary’s dominant-submissive dimension can be compared with the Big Five’s extroversion factor and the hostile-friendly dimension can be compared with the Briggs Myers’ agreeableness factor.

R.F. Bales developed a similar multi-dimension interpersonal model that sought to understand group behavior and interaction. According to Bales group members fall within a three-dimensional group space (upward-downward, positive-negative, forward-backward). The upward-downward dimension is closely related to power and dominance and therefore closely relates to Leary’s dominant-submissive dimension and the Big Five’s extroversion factor. The positive-negative dimension addresses the individual’s nature of affiliation and attraction and the forward-backward dimension assesses a group member’s task style whether it be task-oriented or relationship-oriented. Bales’ forward-backward dimension is closely related to the Big Five’s conscientiousness trait. In the following charts the first one demonstrates the similarities among the three approaches to personality. The chart following it lists several scales that are associated with each Big Five Factor. Neuroticism is the only category that is thought to have no direct correlating quality with the other trait models (McCrae & Costa, 1979a).

### The Big Five and Other Models

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Big Five</th>
<th>Leary</th>
<th>Bales</th>
<th>MBTI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extroversion</td>
<td>Dominant-Submissive</td>
<td>Introverted-Extroverted(I-E)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreeableness</td>
<td>Hostile-Friendly</td>
<td>Thinking-Feeling(T-F)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Conscientiousness   Forward-Backward   Judging-Perception(J-P)
Openness
Neuroticism

*Information for MBTI column in the table was gathered from McCrae and Costa, 1979

**The Big Five and Associated Scales**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Scales Associated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Factor 1: Extroversion</td>
<td>Talkative-Silent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sociable-Reclusive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adventurous-Cautious</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 2: Agreeableness</td>
<td>Good-natured-Irritable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mild, Gentle-Headstrong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cooperative-Negativistic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not Jealous-Jealous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 3: Conscientiousness</td>
<td>Responsible-Undependable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Persevering-Quitting, Fickle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fussy, Tidy-Careless</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scrupulous-Unscrupulous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 4: Stability</td>
<td>Calm-Anxious</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Composed-Excitable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non-hypochondrical-Hypochondriacal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Poised-Nervous-Tense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 5: Openness</td>
<td>Imaginative-Simple, Direct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Artistically sensitive-Insensitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Intellectual-Non-reflective, Narrow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Polished, Refined-Boorish</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adapted from Digman & Inouye (1986)
Behavioral Perspective

The behavioral perspective developed as a reaction to the claim that personality was stable and consistent because some psychologists proposed that personality is much more fluid and dynamic. It is developed over time and through various experiences and external events such as reinforcement. A person’s overall personality is a reflection of the many learned behaviors that have been maintained over time (Crider et al., 1997, p. 512). From the basic idea that behavior and external factors are important aspects to consider when evaluating personality, theorists took the behavioral perspective in very different directions, namely: radical behaviorism, social learning theory, and locus of control.

B.F. Skinner is an important name when discussing the radical behaviorism perspective of personality. He posited that behavior is completely determined by its consequences. Skinner developed the concepts of reinforcement, generalization, and distinction to show how behavior is in fact shaped by consequences. Reinforcement refers to the outcome that someone receives in reaction to a certain behavior or action. As children especially, we learn to generalize the things we learn through reinforcement to larger topics. If a child is reinforced for sharing his toys he will learn to share in a more general sense. Even when a behavior is not reinforced every time, a person can still learn the behavior through what is called partial reinforcement. Maintaining behavior is a function of reinforcement in some way or another. Through what Skinner calls functional analysis researchers can determine what the situation entails (i.e. what’s the reinforcement and who is doing the reinforcing) and what the behavior looks like. Through this analysis researchers can achieve behavior modification by discovering what behaviors are maintained and how to either continue to maintain them or change the behavior by disrupting the
reinforcement. Skinner’s research on radical behaviorism has become an important tool for explaining how we can change social behaviors that are perhaps unwanted.

Skinner’s theory is easily observable when assessing human development, but several psychologists still were not satisfied with explaining personality solely on the basis of behavior. Social learning theorists expounded upon Skinner’s work by adding additional cognitive factors to the theory. The inclusion of observational learning is a fundamental addition to the radical approach. Observational learning suggests that not only do we learn from having our own behaviors reinforced, but we also gain insight from watching the reinforcement of others’ behaviors. Vicarious reinforcement is the concept that through observing a person being reinforced for a certain action or behavior, we form expectations about similar reinforcement if we were to act in this way.

Another social learning concept is that of reciprocal interaction, which asserts that not only is a person affected by his environment, but the person affects the environment. Our behavior and therefore personality sets the tone for the environment through reinforcement and the observational learning of others.

Walter Mischel (1973, 1984) built his “cognitive social learning theory” on these basic behavioral principles of social learning positing that people’s interaction with the environment can be understood in terms of five “person variables”. The five person variables are competencies, encoding strategies, expectancies, values, and self-regulatory systems and plans. These cognitive processes help to explain and determine how people will behave and what actions they will take in different situations. Mischel’s person variables slightly resemble the trait approach in that all five are considered factors that drive a person’s behavior. Social learning theorists have centered their research and theories around the idea that behavior is a
function of the reciprocal interaction between person and environment, but some theorists such as Julian Rotter (1966), Jerry Phares (1984), and Herbert Lefcourt (1982) have furthered the literature by researching the extent to which a person perceives they have control over their environment (Crider et al., 1997, p. 514).

Rotter’s concept of the *locus of control* proposed that based on the development of an individual’s “generalized expectancies,” the reinforcement they experience can be categorized in terms of internal or external control. Internal control refers to a person’s belief that they are personally in control and his or her behavior actually affects this environment, while external control refers to a person’s perception that the environment is what controls his or her behavior. Rotter developed a test to measure a person’s perceptions of locus of control (Crider et al., 1997, p. 515). His test sought to measure the degree to which a person felt that either he was in control of the situation or whether external factors controlled his behavior in a situation. An important qualification of Rotter’s theory is that people can attribute control differently in different situations. Similarly, we all differ in our desire for control and our belief that we can control a situation. A person will most certainly rank poorly on a scale of internal control if he believes that he has no control over the situation. Self-efficacy is, “…defined as people’s judgments of how well they can organize and bring to bear their cognitive, social, and behavioral skills in particular activities, is a major determinant of how fearful they are in threatening situations” (Crider et al., 1993, pp. 513-514). Self-efficacy also acts as a component of reciprocal interaction because it determines whether an individual is going to take effective action within his or her environment. "If a person has low self-efficacy they will also likely have an external locus of control (Kassin, 1998, p. 582)."
Social Learning Theory

Not all theorists were convinced that the trait perspective was the most effective way to discuss and evaluate personality. Social learning theorists criticized the trait perspective claiming that external and situational factors played a much greater role than trait theorists were willing to accept. These critics wanted to know if individual’s behaved according to their personality traits consistently across time and across situations. Studies were done in order to answer the question of consistency across time and findings showed that people did in fact act consistently according to their assigned traits over a period of 25 years (Block, 1971). The findings regarding the second question of consistency across different situations showed that a person’s personal trait might not be constant across all types of situations. There is some degree of trait variability depending on environment and context. Social learning theorists and other critics of the trait perspective sought to explain personality on a more situational basis and so developed the behavioral perspective.

Humanistic Perspective

Several theorists were still were not satisfied with the accepted approaches to personality. Some thought that determining personality and behavior by unconscious dynamics of childhood (Freud) and predicting and controlling behavior was not the most ideal way to analyze personality. Humanists believe that the psychology of the individual is emphasized by the workings of the inner self. People behave according to their individual perceptions and understandings of the world around them. Humanist psychologists think that people have the capacity for good and enormous potential for growth and development (Crider et al., 1993, p. 522). The Association of Humanistic Psychology stated four basic principles: (1) The
experiencing person is of primary interest; (2) human choice, creativity, and self actualization are preferred topics of investigation; (3) meaningfulness must precede objectivity in the selection of research problems; (4) ultimate value is placed on the dignity of a person (Goethals, 583).

Carl Rogers, a leading humanist psychologist, suggested that an organism constantly works toward maintaining, enhancing, and actualizing itself (Rogers, 1951). Through analyzing and conceptualizing the research he gathered from treating his patients, Rogers became intrigued by the notion of self-concept and the strong inclination towards self-improvement. He found that when patients were given a safe, warm, kind, and encouraging environment to process their emotions they were able to solve their own problems through a process of self-actualization. Rogers proposed the idea that in each of us there is an innate inner wisdom that allows us to develop and expand our sense of self (Crider et al., 1993, p. 584).

Rogers defines self-concept as “…an image of the self or the way one thinks about one’s self” (Crider et al., 1993, p. 522). The concept is developed in childhood by processing the values one learns from his parents. If parents or highly influential people in a child’s life provide unconditional positive regard, meaning they love the child and accept him in spite of failures, the child will develop a good sense of self-concept and will be able to move on to the process of self-actualization. If, however, a child experiences conditional positive regard, meaning the love and acceptance they receive is conditional on certain actions and behaviors, then a child’s sense of self-actualization may be blocked and he is left trying to balance his true self with others’ expectations (Kassin, 1998, p. 584).

Rogers differentiates between the “self” and the “organism” by saying that the organism is the “locus of all experience”, essentially that everything that is available to a person’s awareness at a given moment defines the organism. The organism is at the center of the
phenomenal field, which is a continually changing world of experience that each individual in turn perceives and reacts to; these reactions constitute the perceptual field of reality. “The phenomenal field is the individual’s frame of reference that can only be known to the person” (Hall & Lindzey, 1978, p. 284) and will subsequently determine how a person will behave. Essentially the organism represents the totality of a person’s experience. The self, however, is “…composed of the characteristics of the ‘I’ or ‘me’ and the perceptions of the relationships of the ‘I’ or ‘me’ to others and to various aspects of life, together with the values attached to these perceptions” (Rogers, 1959, p. 200). It is the structure that is purely focused on internal perceptions of one’s self and one’s experiences. When the perceptions of the self and the actual experience of the organism are incongruent a person is said to be maladjusted and will experience threat and anxiety. Congruence is when the self and the organism are perfectly aligned and this person is thought to be “adjusted,” “mature” and “fully functioning” (Hall & Lindzey, 1978, p. 286).

Throughout a person’s life there is more and more incongruence between self and organism as certain experiences and relationships unfold, but if a person were to achieve complete congruence then he would be to open to all experiences, have accurate awareness, unconditional self-regard, harmonious relations with others and an absence of defensiveness (Hall & Lindzey, 281).

Abraham Maslow was another leading theorist in the Humanistic Approach to psychology and personality. He added to the literature his motivational theory of personality focusing on people’s need to fulfill their highest potential (Kassin, 1998, p. 586). Maslow built on this idea of self-actualization suggesting that there is a hierarchy of needs that each person
strives to achieve. Achieving all of the needs and becoming everything we are capable of becoming is the core of Maslow’s theory of self-actualization (Kassin, 1998, p. 586).

Maslow’s hierarchy of needs proposes that as humans we need to satisfy our lower needs before we can be motivated to satisfy our higher needs. The lowest and most primitive of our needs are physiological (hunger, thirst, etc.), then safety needs (to feel secure and out of danger), then belongingness (to affiliate with others, to be accepted, and belong), then esteem needs (to achieve, be competent, and gain approval and recognition), then cognitive needs (to know, understand, and explore), then aesthetic needs (symmetry, order, and beauty), and finally, self-actualization needs (to find self-fulfillment and realize one’s potential) (Crider et al., 1997, 156).

The Humanistic approach is highly praised for its research and findings on the self and all that the self can achieve and do. Rogers and Maslow added concepts to the literature on personality that are still considered as important and fundamental to personality. Their research and theories are compelling to me and have clear ties to the concept of self-discovery within the Enneagram Model, though I believe there are limitations to the humanistic approach including a lack of clear personological distinctions between individuals. With a better understanding of the history of personality theory and more specifically the trait approach we will now examine the components of the Enneagram.

**Enneagram Model of Personality**

**Symbol and Structure**

The ancient geometric Enneagram symbol consists of a circle with nine equidistant points on the circumference. The nine points represent the nine different
personality types. The types are interrelated as can be seen by the inner lines. For example, the Nine, Six, and Three, form an equilateral triangle. Also, the six other numbers connect as follows: One connects with Four, Four with Two, Two with Eight, Eight with Five, Five with Seven, and Seven with One. The meaning of these connections will be further discussed in the section about Direction of Integration and Disintegration (Riso & Hudson, 1996, p. 28).

Origins

The exact origins of the Enneagram symbol are not known, but it is thought that the it surfaced some time during the orders of the Sufi, an ancient Islamic sect from the tenth and eleventh century. Some scholars believe that the symbol has origins long before even the Sufi, dating back to 2500 B.C. in Babylon. There is still debate surrounding the exact beginnings of the unique symbol described as, “a circle with the circumference divided into nine points which are joined to give a triangle and an irregular six-sided figure” (Riso & Hudson, 1996, p. 15). The word Enneagram translates in Greek to “a nine diagram” and therefore it makes sense that the origin of the diagram is rooted in ancient mathematical theory, whether that be Pythagorean, Neo-Platonic, or even earlier (Riso & Hudson, 1996, p. 12).

While it is thought that the Enneagram has some roots in the Sufi tradition, it is also possible to trace it back to the Judeo-Christian tradition. The mathematical symbol certainly suggests Greek influence. The nine-pointed diagram has been in existence for a significantly long time, but the origins of the personality model and the nine types are more recent and more understood.

George Ivanovich Gurdjieff, an elusive and secretive spiritual teacher, discovered a version of the Enneagram somewhere along his quest for knowledge and is the sole reason the
Enneagram made its way into Europe in the 1910s and 1920s. Gurdjieff’s teachings of the Enneagram are similar, but not identical to the modern understandings of the theory. His ideas do not directly discuss the nine types, but rather nine types that he calls “Man Number One, Man Number Two, and Man Number Three” (Riso & Hudson, 1996, p. 16). These three categories correspond with the modern Enneagram’s three Centers (this will be discussed in further detail later) but not the nine different types. Though his model does not directly match up with the Enneagram, it shares many of the underlying fundamental psychological ideas upon which the Enneagram was built. For example, Gurdjieff elaborates on “the relationship between the personality, the learned or acquired part of a person’s behavior and identity, and the essence, the innate part of human nature which needs to be addressed for real transformation to occur” (Riso & Hudson, 1996, p. 17). Gurdjieff also never linked the notion of types to the Enneagram symbol as we know it today. He transmitted his ideas through movement and more specifically dance calling the Enneagram a “living symbol” (Riso & Hudson, 1996, p. 17).

Though important to the origins of the several aspects and the foundations of the model, experts do not look to Gurdjieff to learn more about the modern Enneagram. Instead, scholars explore the work of Oscar Ichazo. According modern Enneagram experts Don Riso and Russ Hudson, Ichazo is the originator of the nine personality types as they are known today (1996). Believing the Enneagram is rooted in Neo-Platonic philosophy and the Hebrew Kabbala, Ichazo claims that it has no Sufi origins. “The modern Enneagram, therefore, seems to be the result of Ichazo’s brilliant synthesis of a number of related systems of thought about the nature and structure of human consciousness, brought together in the enigmatic Enneagram symbol” (Riso & Hudson, 1996, p. 18).
Ichazo first taught the Enneagram at the Institute for Applied Psychology in La Paz, Bolivia, then in the 1960s brought his teachings to Chile. Finally he came to the United States in 1971 where he founded the Arica Institute in order to further his teachings. His work primarily focused on the “ego fixations” and the “passions” which were derived from the seven deadly sins plus two additional passions with Deceit and Fear. His more psycho spiritual approach, though closer to the modern Enneagram, still lacked comprehensive and clear descriptions of the nine personality types (Riso & Hudson, 1996, p. 19).

Claudio Naranjo, a Chilean psychiatrist, brought his understanding of the Enneagram, learned by Ichazo, to Berkeley, California so as to continue teaching the personality model. He is credited for expanding the descriptions of the nine types and interviewing participants to develop even more distinct and concrete ideas about each type. The transmission continued as American Jesuits learned the theory and Reverend Robert Oschs, S.J. taught the Enneagram at Loyola University in Chicago. Eventually, through Jesuit teaching, Don Richard Riso and Russ Hudson encountered the Enneagram theory.

Don Riso, though skeptical at first, quickly came to believe the wisdom of the Enneagram, as he perceived it having truth and beauty. He recognized himself in the descriptions of one type and was able to analyze the personalities of his family and friends using the nine descriptions. His fascination was paired with frustration that the Enneagram was not well documented and tended to focus primarily on the unhealthy qualities of human personality. Riso set out to expand the descriptions even further and attribute average and healthy qualities to the nine types. Riso states, “I have retained the essence of the Enneagram—its delineation of the nine personality types—while remaining skeptical of the many garbled interpretations and misattributions which have accumulated around it” (Riso & Hudson, 1996, p. 25). He states that
though the model of personality currently lacks scientific proof, many people have found
tremendous personal psychological value using the model (Riso & Hudson, 1996, p. 25).
According to Riso, “You will experience a shock of recognition when you discover your own
personality type—the most important proof there is of the Enneagram’s accuracy” (p. 25). Don
Riso and Russ Hudson have greatly advanced the literature on the Enneagram and have
continued clarify the different components and enhance comprehensiveness (Riso & Hudson,
1996, p. 24). Riso and Hudson are the leading experts of the Enneagram and for the purpose of
this study; their material will be used in order to discuss the Enneagram.

**Triads**

Fundamental to the Enneagram discussion is the concept of the three Triads (sometimes
referred to as Centers). In each different Triad there are three personality types that have similar
assets and liabilities involving thinking, feeling, or instinct therefore the three Triads are the
Thinking Triad, the Feeling Triad, and the Instinctive Triad. Within each, one type tends to over
express the common characteristic (thinking, feeling, or instinct), one under expresses it, and one
is out of touch with it. The Nine, Six, and Three are the primary types within their respective
Triads and form an equilateral triangle on the Enneagram symbol (the meaning of this triangle
will be explained later). These are the primary types because these three are all the most “out of
touch” with the instinctual energy or characteristic of their Triad. The lack of identification with
their Triad’s energy allows them to relate more profoundly with the types in other Triads. In
essence, they can “get outside themselves” in order to see the world from another’s (someone
outside their own Triad) perspective.
This concept will become clearer as we look at an example of the dialectical relationship among the types within any given Triad. In addition the expression of the unifying characteristic within each Triad, there is also a dominant human need that will elicit different emotional responses when that need is not being met. Types in the Instinctive Triad have a need for balance and control and each type will respond emotionally (in some way) with anger or rage, those in the Feeling Triad have a need for a sense of value and identity and will respond with shame, and those in the Thinking Triad have a need for guidance and support and often respond with anxiety (Riso & Hudson, 2000, p. 23).

In the Instinctive Triad, the One under expresses instinct, while the Eight over expresses it, and the Nine is the most out of touch with it. The deep human need for this Triad is to experience a sense of balance and control. The Ones under express their instinctual energy by trying to control it. “Ones try to resist acting on their instincts, believing that they need to feel justified by being right before they act”(Riso & Hudson, 2000, p. 25). The Eights over expresses their instinctual energy by constantly asserting their vitality and independence. “Their desire to assert themselves can also lead them to attempt to challenge and dominate everything and
everyone around them” (Riso & Hudson, 2000, p. 24). The Nine is the primary type within the Instinctive Triad and is the most out of touch with its instinctual energy—“its passion, anger, and zest for life”. “Nines would like to transcend this energy or ‘mellow it’ in order to maintain their peace of mind and ease in life. This lack of identification with their own instinctive energy can lead Nines to identify more strongly with others, living through someone else” (Riso & Hudson, 2000, p. 25). Healthy types in the Instinctive Triad utilize the deep wisdom that comes from within to relate well to the environment and the people around them and frequently becoming leaders, but if they are unhealthy they become out of balance with how they relate. The Eight, Nine, and One all have problems with repression and aggression. These types set boundaries for themselves and will often limit or resist their experiences in order to maintain them. These types often try to ward off the influence of others (Riso & Hudson, 1996, 40).

In the Feeling Triad, the Four under expresses feeling, the Two over expresses it, and the Three is the most out of touch with it. In the Feeling Triad, all three types share similar assets and liabilities involving their feelings. The Four under expresses its feeling energy because they are “painfully self-conscious” and will withhold direct expression of their feelings. The Twos tend to over express their feelings in order to gain approval and sense of appreciation. “Twos become effusive and overly friendly, expressing only their positive feelings for others while repressing awareness of their own needs and ulterior motives” (Riso & Hudson, 2000, p. 23). The Threes are the most out of touch with their feelings and are therefore the primary type in this Triad. Threes are able to focus on tasks and performance while being unconsciously motivated by their feelings. When they are healthy, types in this center their interpersonal qualities are admirable, but when they are unhealthy their emotions become out of balance. The Two, Three and Four types all struggle with identity and hostility, though each type manifests these problems
in different ways. More so than any other types, the Two, Three, and Four are highly concerned with self-esteem, personal value, appreciation, and shame. They work to maintain a "false self-image", which they want others to validate (Riso & Hudson, 1996, p. 35). The types in this Triad are driven by the desire for pride and the need for recognition.

In the Thinking Triad, the Seven under expresses thinking, the Five over expresses it, and the Six is the most out of touch with it (Riso & Hudson, 1996, p. 30). In the Thinking Triad, each type shares similar assets and liabilities related to thinking. Sevens under express thinking by jumping quickly from one thought to another and move quickly from thought to action without much contemplation. "This can lead them to do too many things at once, becoming hyperactive and addicted to staying in motion" (Riso & Hudson, 2000, p. 24). Fives over expresses thinking and tend to be the most cerebral and intense type in the Enneagram. "They live for their ideas, their concepts, and their imagination while neglecting many of the practical aspects of life" (Riso & Hudson, 2000, p. 24). The Six is the primary type in this Triad and is most out of touch with thinking. It is not that Sixes do not think, in fact, Sixes overthink—becoming anxious and second-guessing everything they do. They overthink to the point where they become out of touch with their own inner guidance and wisdom. "Sixes look to beliefs or to trusted others to reassure them and to give them the confidence to act decisively" (Riso & Hudson, 2000, p. 24). When these types are healthy, they demonstrate impressive thoughts, ideas, and comprehension. When they are unhealthy, their thinking can become disturbed or out of balance. Each of these types share common problems of insecurity and anxiety, though they cope with these problems very differently. These types are driven by fear and have a common feeling of lack of support. They will seek security in order to alleviate feelings of anxiety.
Basic Personality Type

As previously mentioned, the Enneagram consists of nine distinct Types that are denoted by the numbers One through Nine. No one number is better than another and each person maintains just one Type from childhood through the rest of their life. “Each basic personality type of the Enneagram represents the overall way in which the child has unconsciously adapted itself to its family and the world. In short, which basic personality type a person has represents the total outcome of all childhood factors that have gone into the formation of the child’s personality, including genetics (Riso & Hudson, 1996, p. 31). Though people change dramatically throughout their lives and their environment shapes who they are and what they believe, each person has one basic personality type that never changes. Not every aspect of each type will apply to all people within that type at all times. As humans, we fluctuate between the healthy, average, and unhealthy traits of each type. Depending on our environment and our current state we may exhibit different qualities of our type. Even though all types have both positive and negative qualities associated with it, different types are better suited for different roles in a society, culture, or group (Riso & Hudson, 1996, p. 33).

Each of the nine types can be simply categorized by one word, a few sentences, or by an entire book. The One can be referred to as the Reformer, the Two as the Helper, the Three as the Achiever, the Four as the Individualist, the Five as the Investigator, the Six as the Loyalist, the Seven as the Enthusiast, the Eight as the Challenger, the Nine as the Peacemaker (Enneagram Institute). The following chart shows both the one-word description and how each type can be described in four words. The four word descriptions include both positive and negative traits that are associated with each type. At different levels of development more positive or negative...
qualities will be more apparent (Levels of Development will be discussed more in depth later in the paper).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>One Word Description</th>
<th>Four Word Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One</td>
<td>The Reformer</td>
<td>Principled, orderly, perfectionist, and self-righteous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two</td>
<td>The Helper</td>
<td>Caring, generous, possessive, and manipulative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three</td>
<td>The Achiever</td>
<td>Adaptable, ambitious, image-conscious, and hostile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four</td>
<td>The Individualist</td>
<td>Intuitive, expressive, self-absorbed, and depressive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five</td>
<td>The Investigator</td>
<td>Perceptive, original, detached, and eccentric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Six</td>
<td>The Loyalist</td>
<td>Engaging, committed, defensive, and paranoid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seven</td>
<td>The Enthusiast</td>
<td>Enthusiastic, accomplished, uninhibited, and manic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eight</td>
<td>The Challenger</td>
<td>Self-confident, decisive, dominating, and combative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nine</td>
<td>The Peacemaker</td>
<td>Peaceful, reassuring, complacent, and neglectful</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In order to better understand the Enneagram, it is important to understand the basics of each type. We will now examine the qualities of each type within each Triad focusing primarily on how people in each type behave when they are functioning “at their best” or “at a more average level”. Any type when functioning “at their worst” display psychotic tendencies so for the purpose of this paper we will not discuss the state of psychosis.

The Feeling Triad: Types Two, Three, and Four

Twos (Helpers) at their best are unselfish, humble, altruistic, joyful and gracious. They live to serve the people in their lives and do a very good job at it. At a more average or typical level, twos become “people pleasers.” As a means of connecting with others and feeling needed,
Twos will become over friendly and overly emotional. They care for others so that they can feel depended on and important in others lives. Twos, as part of the Feeling Triad, are very driven by their feelings and the need to demonstrate and convey their “positive” feelings (Riso & Hudson, 1996, p. 61). “A central thing to understand about Twos is that although on the surface they seem to be offering love, on a deeper level they are really searching for it. Twos believe that if they love others enough, surely others will love them in return” (Riso & Hudson, 1996, p. 61).

Threes (Achievers) at their best are charitable, benevolent, and authentic. They are motivated, yet know their limitations. More average Threes become obsessed with performance, and being the best at everything, and coming out on top. They are very comparative and are driven by the need to be better than others. Others perceptions of them become a primary concern. Highly motivated by desire to feel valued and distinguished, “Threes frequently become successful in the eyes of their society because they make it their business to achieve those things which their peers find valuable” (Riso & Hudson, 1996, p. 97).

Fours (Individualists) at their best are incredibly creative and are able to find the value in all experiences. They are “inspired, self-renewing, and regenerating…” (Riso & Hudson, 1996, 134). More average Fours have an artistic outlook on life and become very absorbed in their personal feelings sometimes becoming temperamental and moody. They believe they are highly unique and therefore they are excused from living in the same way as others. With high emotional needs, Fours can be envious and self-pitying. “The constant conflict we see in Fours is between their need to be aware of themselves, so they can find themselves, and, at the same time, their need to move beyond self-awareness, so they will not be trapped in self-consciousness” (Riso & Hudson, 1996, p. 136).
The Thinking Triad: Personality Types Five, Six, and Seven

Fives (Investigators), at their best, are visionary and understand the world in a profound and meaningful way. They are open-minded and become incredible innovators. More average Fives tend to focus on the conceptualization and work hard to acquire quality techniques. Becoming obsessed with their inner thoughts and interpretations, Fives can become preoccupied and detached. "In the Five, we see the genius and the madman, the innovator and the intellectual, the mildly eccentric crackpot and the deeply disturbed delusional schizoid" (Riso & Hudson, 1996, p. 174).

Sixes (Loyalists), at their best, are trusting individuals that demonstrate “courage, positive thinking, leadership, and rich self-expression” (Riso & Hudson, 1996, p. 216). More average Sixes seek stability and safety and will look to others to form a support system that offers structure and guidance in their life. They are loyal to their relationships and expect a similar commitment from others. “For Sixes, security comes from a rock-of-ages allegiance and an investment of themselves in something outside themselves which they believe will give them stability and safety” (Riso & Hudson, 1996, p. 218).

Sevens (Enthusiasts), at their best, are free-spirited and joyous, appreciating the small wonders in life and seeing the good in all things. More average Sevens become materialistic and keeping up with the trends is important. They become uninhibited and will do anything in order to feel fulfilled and satisfied in that moment. They become preoccupied with everything that will keep them entertained and realize their immediate needs and desires. “All the personality types are faced with the issue of how to ‘use’ the world to its best advantage, although the Seven is the type which most exemplifies this universal problem” (Riso & Hudson, 1996, p. 261).
The Instinctive Triad: Personality Types Eight, Nine, and One

Eights (Challengers), at their best, are courageous and self-sacrificing. They have a strong sense of vision and are willing to put themselves in harms way in order to accomplish their goals. They, “May achieve true heroism and historical greatness” (Riso & Hudson, 1996, p. 297). More average Eights are pragmatic risk takers. They are concerned with the more practical issues in life such as money and self-sufficiency. They can be domineering and seek to be in control of situations and have people supporting them. Highly competitive, they treat every situation like a confrontation that can be won. “In the personality type Eight, we see courage, will, self-reliance, leadership, authority, self-assertion—and the dark side of power, the ability to destroy what power has created” (Riso & Hudson, 1996, p. 299).

Nines (Peacemakers), at their best, are very content with themselves and are able to help others sort through difficult times. They form solid relationships that have great meaning and are fulfilling for both people. They are aware of the world around them and in touch with themselves and those around them. More average Nines avoid conflict and become complacent in order to do this. They disengage and become unresponsive and inattentive. They lose touch with reality in order to maintain the harmonious fantasy they have created in their mind. “In this personality type, we will see the personal cost of the philosophy of peace at any price” (Riso & Hudson, 1996, p. 340).

Ones (Reformers), at their best, have a strong sense of what is right and are able to discern what is right and truthful. They are realistic and inspiring. More average Ones become high-minded idealists. They take on the responsibility to fix the things that they see wrong with the world. Ones can be highly critical of both themselves and those around them. They are
orderly and organized, but intensely fear making a mistake or disrupting their ideals. “What Ones typically do not see is that, given their fundamental premise, they are locked in conflicts between opposing forces that cannot be reconciled either in themselves or in the universe” (Riso & Hudson, 1996, p. 378).

Wing

The Enneagram is a complex model of personality and takes into account the unique aspects of different personalities. Though we all have a basic dominant personality type, no person can be purely one type. Everyone displays some qualities from all nine types, but even more so, everyone is mixture of two types. This second most influential type is called the wing. Each person must have at least a 51% make-up of his or her basic personality type, but beyond that the proportion of basic type to wing can vary tremendously. The wing for any given type will be one of the adjacent numbers on the Enneagram symbol. For example, a type Nine will have either an Eight or a One wing, while a One will have either a Nine or a Two wing. While it is possible to have strong tendencies for both wings, each type actually only has one wing. Since there is no such thing as a pure type (everyone must have a wing) we can understand the Enneagram to actually be a model of eighteen subtypes rather than just nine basic types. The number of subtypes increases dramatically when we consider all the possibilities of the different proportions of basic type to wing. In order to fully understand a person’s personality it is important to recognize his or her wing and the proportion of the wing to the basic personality type (Riso & Hudson, 1996, p. 420).

Levels of Development
Every type demonstrates different qualities at different times. Don Riso, Enneagram expert, sought a way to explain the different and sometimes contradictory traits that humans show throughout their experiences and daily lives. In 1977, Don Riso hypothesized the Levels of Development and has been expanding on them and drawing out implications ever since. The Levels of Development, though not part of the original interpretations of the Enneagram, is seen as fundamental to understanding human personality and growth (Riso & Hudson, 2000, p. 138). The Levels of Development assert that even people within the same type may seem like entirely different types if they are functioning at different levels.

"The Levels of Development are a representation of the inner structure of each type, the conceptual skeleton that is fleshed out with traits, defenses, attitudes, and many other complex features" (Riso & Hudson, 2000, p. 137). Throughout our lives we change, grow, develop, and struggle. The Levels of Development give us a continuum of different levels of personal development and growth that we may find ourselves in at any give moment. When discussing the different traits of each type, we discussed healthy and average traits, which can be explained by the Levels of Development. Every person can operate at nine different levels of development ranging from highly integrated and "healthy" to highly disintegrated and "unhealthy". Levels one through three are considered healthy, levels four through six are average, and levels seven through nine are unhealthy. The idea is that as we move up the continuum we become healthier displaying the positive attributes of our personality and as we move down the continuum we become more neurotic displaying our more negative qualities. The nine different levels put together form the most holistic understanding of the type. The Levels of Development act as the internal structure of each type and shed light on the differences between people that are of the
same type (Riso & Hudson, 2000, p. 141). Here is what each type looks like at its healthiest, most average, and most unhealthy:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Characteristics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Healthiest (Level 1)</td>
<td>The type at its very healthiest, a state of psychological balance, freedom, and the emergence of special spiritual capacities or virtues. The ideal state for the type, reflecting the essential qualities of the type.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most Average (Level 5)</td>
<td>The ego inflates as the type tries to control the environment in characteristic ways. Defense mechanisms become more serious. A marked turning point in the deterioration of the type; traits noticeably less healthy, more negative. Conflicts with others increase.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Least Healthy (Level 9)</td>
<td>A fully pathological state. Person out of touch with reality, willing to destroy self and/or others to save illusions and to spare self from the anxiety of realizing what he or she has done. Different forms of immediate or remote self-destructiveness manifest themselves, resulting in serious violence, breakdown, or death.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table taken from *Personality Types: Using the Enneagram for Self-Discovery* by Don Riso and Russ Hudson

There is constant movement both upwards and downwards on the continuum of development, though we strive to move upwards and achieve a highly integrated and healthy state. As our ego inflates we spiral downwards on the continuum of development and lose personal freedom within our type. As our ego inflates we lose sight of our essential state, but as we move up the continuum the door to discovering our essential self opens. Our essential state is the core of our personality without the influence of the ego. In our essential state, “We come fully in contact with reality because we are not perceiving it through the distorting lens of ego. We feel
intimately and compassionately connected with ourselves, others, and the environment, experiencing live with an exhilarating immediacy” (Riso & Hudson, 2000, p. 156).

The Enneagram and Other Typologies

According to Riso and Hudson, the Enneagram has distinct ties with the research and findings of Karen Horney, Sigmund Freud, and Carl Jung. In comparing these approaches with the Enneagram, they supposedly found impressive correlations and made appropriate adaptations (in their opinion) in order to positively expand the theories. For the purpose of this study, I will discuss the proposed similarities between the Enneagram and Horney and the Enneagram and Jung.

As previously discussed, Karen Horney asserted that there were three general neurotic “solutions”: moving away from people (withdrawn), moving against people (aggressive), and moving toward people (compliant). Riso and Hudson found these three “solutions” to be very applicable to the three Triads. Though the three types in a Triad all share similar liabilities and assets, they are also unique and different from each other. Riso and Hudson describe this as a “mixed Triad” and believe that Horney’s three solutions can contribute to the understanding of these Triadic differences. Before explaining which “solution” correlates with which numbers, it is important to discuss the expansions and adaptations that Riso and Hudson make regarding Horney’s theory. First, they suggest that people do not just move away, against, or towards other people; instead, they believe that people respond to the total environment, both inner and outer. Second, they suggest that the aggressive solution (moving against) means that a person will move against nature as well as their own fears. Third, the withdrawn solution (moving away), in addition to withdrawing from people, also withdraws from activities. The final expansion they
suggest is that the compliant type (moving toward) is not only compliant towards others, but also, compliant, “to the dictates of their superego, which had its genesis in other people, mainly their parents” (Riso, 1996, p. 433). This means that the person will be compliant to what their subconscious tells them is the “ideal self”: the way they should be as a person. Riso and Hudson assert that within each Triad one type will correspond with Horney’s compliant “solution, one will correspond with her aggressive “solution”, and one will correspond with her withdrawn “solution”. The combination of the three different solutions within each Triad explains the concept of a “mixed Triad” (Riso & Hudson, 1996, p. 433). The following charts will demonstrate which type in each Triad corresponds with each of Horney’s “solutions” as well as the explanations of these correlations.

**Instinctive Triad:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Enneagram Type</th>
<th>Horney’s “Solution”</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eight</td>
<td>Aggressive</td>
<td>Aggressive in asserting themselves against others and the environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nine</td>
<td>Withdrawn</td>
<td>Withdrawn so that others will not disturb their inner peacefulness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One</td>
<td>Compliant</td>
<td>Compliant to the ideals after which they strive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Thinking Triad:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Enneagram Type</th>
<th>Horney’s “Solution”</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Five</td>
<td>Withdrawn</td>
<td>Withdrawn, away from action, into the world of thought</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Six</td>
<td>Compliant</td>
<td>Compliant to the superego’s dictate to do what it expected of them</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seven</td>
<td>Aggressive</td>
<td>Aggressive about engaging the environment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Feeling Triad:**
Karen Horney began to discuss and differentiate between types and subtypes, but never formally addressed them. While Riso and Hudson saw other slight correlations between Horney’s somewhat developed types and subtypes and the Enneagram’s nine types, they found Horney’s “solutions” to be the most relevant to their model.

Riso and Hudson also acknowledge the similarities between Carl Jung’s theory of types and the Enneagram. As already mentioned, Jung suggested that there are eight “psychological types” according to a two dimensional analysis of personality: introversion-extroversion and four functions (thinking, sensing, feeling, intuiting). Riso and Hudson found that all eight types correlated with all of their posited nine types except for the Three (Achiever). Though it seems as though there is no direct correlation between Jung’s types and the Enneagram, Riso and Hudson suggest that because the Three personality is the most malleable and changeable type, Jung overlooked it as being its own type, however they believe that in reading Jung’s work you can notice the descriptions of the Three within descriptions of his other types. The following chart shows which of Jung’s “psychological types” match up with the Enneagram’s nine types.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Enneagram Type</th>
<th>Horney’s “Solution”</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Two</td>
<td>Compliant</td>
<td>Compliant to the superego’s dictate to be always selfless and loving</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three</td>
<td>Aggressive</td>
<td>Aggressive in the pursuit of their goals in their competition with others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four</td>
<td>Withdrawn</td>
<td>Withdrawn to protect their feelings and their fragile self-image</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Information for these charts was taken from Riso & Hudson (1996), pp. 433-434*
Personality and Leadership

There are many different ways in which people study the dynamics of leadership including the skills approach, style approach, and the situational approach, to name just a few. As with many concepts of psychology, it is relevant to begin with the Freudian influence on the topic of personality and leadership. Freud’s concept of group psychology is important to the study of leadership in that he claims people, “place themselves instinctively under the authority of a chief... [A group] has such a thirst for obedience it submits itself instinctively to anyone who appoints himself its master” (Freud, 1921, p. 81). Freud proposes that people will blindly follow a leader in response to an instinct to submit.

An interesting approach when considering my proposed research is the trait approach to leadership. The question driving this approach is; what is it about certain people that make them great leaders? Leadership traits were studied and theories developed about the innate characteristics and qualities a person must have in order to be considered a great leader. These theories were called “great man” theories because they addressed the characteristics of great social, political, and military leaders (Northouse, 2001, p. 15).

Research challenged the notion that there was such a thing as universal leadership traits and that only leaders possessed these particular traits. Ralph Stogdill completed a major review
of the literature and suggested that there are no differentiated traits between leaders and non-leaders. While certain traits might be useful in a leadership position, it does not mean that if someone demonstrates a certain trait they must therefore be a leader. Through multiple survey studies and literature reviews, researchers have found many different traits that are related to leadership in some way or another. The list of traits associated with effective leadership is long and extensive but several of the important recurring traits include intelligence, self-confidence, determination, integrity, and sociability (Northouse, 2001, p. 21). The unique aspect of the trait approach to leadership is that it focuses solely on the characteristics of the leader and largely disregards the followers and the situation. This is considered a strength in that it is an approach that is simple and easy to understand, but is also a limitation because it does not acknowledge the fact that the situation could potentially play a large role in determining whether a person is able to be an effective leader. The trait approach is just one of the many ways to examine and critically think about leadership and personality. Additionally, it is an important method to consider when looking at the Enneagram’s role in personality and leadership.

The Enneagram is being used extensively in today’s society and has made its way into all kinds of professions including, government, business, psychology, religion, and life coaching. In an article from the Financial Mail magazine, Fontyn (2010), a life coach, states that the Enneagram is “a personality typology for deeper understanding of one’s personality type, path of personal growth and understanding of self and others; and emotional freedom techniques - used for deep-seated fears, blocks or habits”. An article in Newsweek shared that, “The U.S. Postal Service recently turned to the Enneagram to help employees resolve conflicts. Clergy from the
Vatican signed up for an Enneagram seminar last year" (Seligmann, 1994). Use of the Enneagram is spreading fast and it is working its way into the literature surrounding effective leadership.

It is important to note that, “some types are often more desirable than others in any given culture or group” (Riso & Hudson, 2011). The question then is, which type(s) are more desirable for leadership positions? Ginger Lapid-Bogda, a leader in the field of the Enneagram and business, (2007) discusses each type’s unique leadership paradigm as well as their areas of strengths and areas for development in regards to leadership.

Leadership Paradigms refer to the set of assumptions and beliefs, often unconscious, about what leadership is that influence how we behave and what we tend to overlook. These paradigms affect our leadership strengths because we tend to pay attention to these areas. They also influence our potential derailers—attributes and behaviors that can hinder our success—because we place less emphasis on these areas. (Lapid-Bogda, 2006, p. 58)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Paradigm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One</td>
<td>A leader’s job is to set clear goals and inspire others to achieve the highest quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two</td>
<td>A leader’s job to assess the strengths and weaknesses of team members and to motivate and facilitate people toward the achievement of organizational goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three</td>
<td>A leader’s job is to create environments that achieve results because people understand the organization’s goals and structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four</td>
<td>A leader’s job is to create organizations that give people meaning and purpose so that they are</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
inspired to do excellent work

Five
A leader’s job is to develop an effective organization through research, deliberation, and planning so that all systems fit together and people are working on a common mission

Six
A leader’s job is to solve organizational problems by developing a creative problem-solving environment in which each person feels that he or she is part of the solution

Seven
A leader’s job is to get people excited and to create new ventures so that the organization can take advantage of important business opportunities

Eight
A leader’s job is to move the organization forward by leading decisively, getting capable and reliable people in the right jobs, and empowering competent people to take action

Nine
A leader’s job is to help achieve the collective mission by creating a clearly structured and harmonious work environment

*Information retrieved from Lapid-Bogda, 2007 pp 4-28

All types bring unique and useful qualities and ambitions to leadership positions, but Lapid-Bogda (2007) makes no claims as to which types are more likely to desire and hold positions of leadership. Is it possible that there is a dominant type in regards to leadership aspirations and desires? Type Threes are often referred to as “The Achiever”. They can be described as being the success-oriented and pragmatic type that is adaptive, excelling, driven, and image-conscious. Riso and Hudson suggest that leaders such as Bill Clinton, Oprah Winfrey, and Barack Obama are all Ennea-type Threes. There is a strong need for achievement, success, and recognition for the Threes, and obtaining a leadership position would be an ideal way for a Three to demonstrate their skills and abilities (2011).
Type Eight (Challenger) is also sometimes referred to as the Leader. Perhaps, this powerful, dominant, assertive, decisive, willful, self-confident, and confrontational type is more likely to desire and hold leadership positions in today's society. Martin Luther King Jr., Franklin Roosevelt, Lyndon Johnson, and Mikhail Gorbachev are all regarded as prominent leading Eights (Riso & Hudson, 2011). Going beyond the question of which type is most likely to aspire to leadership, it is also interesting to consider which types, if they are to hold a leadership position, will be the most successful and highly rated. Perhaps an Eight will be highly effective, but less liked. This study will seek to answer these probing questions.

The Enneagram and the paradigms discussed by Ginger Lapid-Bogda seek to identify new leadership styles. Now the question is, is one style more suited for leadership in today's society, and more specifically for presidential leadership?

**Presidential Leadership and Personality**

As previously mentioned the psychology of leadership is a prominent field of research that seeks to understand the ways in which leaders control and influence their followers and the relationship that ensues between leaders and followers. The office of the President of the United States is a fascinating facet of leadership because it is widely known and there is a distinct role that the person who holds this office must carry out. Attempting to understand the psychology of this role and how a person becomes qualified or is deemed worthy of the position has merited substantial research.

Though leadership has been discussed generally in terms of psychology and personality, there has also been significant research done on personality and presidential leadership. This section will review the work done by James David Barber, David Winter, and Dean Keith
Simonton. Barber’s (1992) theory of presidential personality is highly focused on the self-esteem of the president and how his decisions are made based on his self-concept and understanding of his emotions and rationality. Barber identifies three components to presidential personality: character, worldview, and style. Character can be further broken down into four types, which are based on two separate dimensions: active versus passive and positive versus negative. Active-positives demonstrate high self-esteem and there is a congruence between working hard and being active, and enjoying that activity. The active-negatives are compulsive, and often petty and aggressive. They have a very poor self-image and they lack the enjoyment that active-positives feel. The passive-positives also experience low self-esteem, but they display an artificial optimism (Barber, 1992). “They [are] fragile and dependent, and [are] easily pushed around by powerful advisers” (Goethals, 558). Finally, the passive-negatives engage infrequently and are often considered to be withdrawn.

The second aspect of presidential personality, worldview, is the concept of how the person’s orients themselves toward the world. This aspect is developed during adolescence and is comprised of a person’s general orientation towards life including how they perceive and process experiences and their assumptions about human nature (Barber, 1992). The final aspect is style, which develops in early adulthood and represents the way a person will handle certain situations and deal with successes and challenges as they come (Barber, 1992).

David Winter had a different, very unique approach to analyzing presidential personality and effectiveness. Through the analysis of presidential inaugural addresses, Winter (1987) explored three different motive profiles: achievement, affiliation, and power. Winter was primarily interested in what predicted presidential appeal and what predicted performance. His theory has close ties with the trait approach to leadership considering he focused on the
individual and examined something as specific as an inaugural address to make assertions about the qualities of one’s personality. The situation, as well as the followers, play an important role in Winter’s method of analysis. His theory differs from the trait approach in that Winter’s when a president’s motives and goals are matched with his potential followers, he experiences a high level of appeal. Contrarily, performance was not predicted by this congruence of needs and motives, but rather by power motivation. This means that presidents that demonstrate a high level of assertiveness, control, and confrontational motives exhibit higher presidential performance (Winter, 1987).

Finally, Dean Keith Simonton (1986) analyzed presidential personality in terms of specific traits and qualities that a president maintains. He used scores from the Gough Adjective Check List and based scores on information about each president that was gathered from biographical works. He created short, descriptive, yet anonymous excerpts for many Presidents and had participants score the Presidents using the Check List. Simonton found that he could narrow the large list of adjectives down into 14 clear personality dimensions: Moderation, Friendliness, Intellectual Brilliance, Machiavellianism, Poise and Polish, Achievement Drive, Forcefulness, Wit, Physical Attractiveness, Pettiness, Tidiness, Conservatism, Inflexibility, and Pacifism.

His analysis shows that Presidents can be grouped into categories according to their personal traits. For example, John Adams, John Quincy Adams, Tyler, Cleveland, and Wilson were all found to be, ‘highly idealistic, even self-righteous, and eminently stubborn’ (Simonton, 1986, p. 153). Simonton discovered various clusters that can be organized by several characteristic traits and can also be categorized into Barber’s four categories of presidential leadership. Though the groupings revealed interesting results about the similarities of certain
presidents, Simonton found that the only true and consistent determinant of presidential success is intellectual brilliance. Simonton’s research is especially important to this research because I will be using several of his disguised excerpts about U.S. Presidents.

Many researchers and psychologists have sought to understand presidential leadership by examining both the personal and situational factors that contribute to the personality of the person who assumes office. In his book *The Politics President’s Make*, Stephen Skowronek (1997) went into more depth regarding the interaction of personal and situational factors. He posited that there are four categories to describe the situation a president faces based on two dimensions: whether the President is affiliated or opposed to the “established regime” and whether the regime is resilient or stable. The approaches have ranged from purely situational or personal to a combination of both.

Barber also addressed situational factors in his assessment of presidential personality. He suggested that in addition to the three aspects of internal attributions, there are also the external factors of influence including the *power of the situation* and the *climate of expectations*. The power of the situation includes, “the popular mandate with which the president is elected, and the degree of support he has for his program in the congress” (Crider et al., 1993, p. 559). The climate of expectations is a cyclical rotation of expectations. The rotation goes as follows: desire for action, need for legitimacy, craving for reassurance, and back to a desire for action. Barber suggests that as each new president is elected and attempts to use their capabilities to address the current need or desire, he will either fulfill the need or not, but once the desire is fulfilled, the next desire is put into effect.
By using the Enneagram to better understand presidential leadership we will be attempting to assess presidential personality as well as effective leadership with a trait driven approach that will emphasize the predictive possibilities of using typology.

**Proposed Research**

With a thorough understanding of the origins of the Enneagram, an in depth review of the literature regarding the Enneagram and Leadership, Personality and Leadership, and Personality and Presidential Leadership, one question still remains. How does the Enneagram model of Personality relate to effective leadership, and more specifically presidential leadership? This study will attempt to answer this fundamental driving question through the study of sorority women and presidential men.

Don Riso and Russ Hudson have used the Enneagram Model of Personality to type several U.S. Presidents, but not all of them have been discussed and there has been no correlation made between presidential success and Enneagram type. This research seeks to (1) place the Enneagram among the literature surrounding personality and presidential leadership and (2) identify any possible connections between presidential greatness/success and particular Enneagram types.

Study 1 will recruit approximately 60 sorority women to complete a survey that will have them (1) complete a 72-item RHETI and (2) read short descriptions of all nine Enneagram types and then decide to what degree each Type describes themselves using a Likert Scale (1-7). For Study 2, 11 different participants (Junior Jepson students) will be asked to read about 13 presidents (the top eight most highly ranked presidents and the bottom five most negatively ranked presidents in terms of success) using Keith Simonton’s disguised excerpts. They will
also read 750-word descriptions (approximately) of the nine types and then be asked to rate each
disguised President on every Type using a Likert Scale (1-7).

In order to gain an even deeper understanding of the relationship between The
Enneagram and presidential leadership, I spoke with Enneagram expert Dr. Joel M. Rothaizer, an
experienced executive coach and organizational consultant, and asked him to share his insight on
the Enneagram and leadership. More specifically, I wanted to ask him about the different
motivations each Type may have that might lead a person to desire a presidential leadership
position. In his experience as an executive coach, he tends to see Type Eights at the very top of
companies because this Type is driven to break new ground and be in a powerful position,
whereas Type Threes are often second in command because they prefer to create plans and
strategies to reach success. After describing highly developed Type Eights as strong,
resourceful, direct, heroic, inspiring, and faithful and lower developed Eights as dominating,
blunt, willful, and self-important, Joel suggested that Eights are one of the Types that would be
most likely to strive for the highest leadership positions along with Type Threes. On the other
hand, Types Four, Five, and Nine are the types that are least likely to strive for leadership
positions, though that is not to say there have not been Presidents of these Types. Every Type
can be viewed in terms of its relation to the others and in terms of what they share in common.
For example, if we take Type One we can see that Types One, Two, and Three all have a strong
sense of service while Types One, Three, and Five are categorized as being able to put feelings
aside in order to get the job done, and Ones, Fours, and Sevens are often chronically frustrated
that things are not as they should be. Intertype correlations are possible and plausible, but they
could be different for every person according to which traits are strongest in that person. The
implications of these considerations for this study are that it is likely that there will be a strong
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variance among Enneagram Type across the 13 presidents, but there will also likely be strong
trend of Types Three and Eight among the Presidents. Additionally, it is possible that these
types will lend themselves to more quality presidential leadership and therefore Highly ranked
presidents will score higher on Types Three and Eight.

Joel also discussed his experience with common mistyping issues based on gender
stereotypes. Though he was sure to emphasize that no Type is deemed either purely male or
female, the descriptions of the types are often presented as such. For example, Types Two and
Four are usually described in a very feminine way, while Type Eight is often described with a
masculine tone. Female Type Eights often do not identify strongly with the descriptions of the
Type Eight, though they learn over time through self-discovery that they are in fact Eights.
Similarly, male Fours are often mistyped as Type Fives because the Four description often
appears too feminine.

With a conceptual grasp on the relationship between the Enneagram and Leadership we
began our research, hypothesizing for Study 1, that Type Eight will be among the lowest scoring
Types on both the Likert and RHETI because all of the participants in the study are females.
Additionally, we expect to see a trend in Enneagram type for women in the leader group that will
distinguish them from the non-leader group. For Study 2, we hypothesize that participants will
rate Presidents most highly on Types 3 and Type 8. Enneagram Type Threes are highly
motivated and driven go-getters that set goals for themselves and pursue them passionately, and
Type Eights are self-confident, strong, assertive leaders that desire control of their environment.
We expect that these assertive Types will show up the most in the ratings of U.S. Presidents.
Methods and Results

Study 1

Participants

Sixty women affiliated with a Greek Sorority at the University of Richmond in Richmond Virginia participated in Study 1. There are five sororities at the University of Richmond including, Kappa Kappa Gama, Delta Delta Delta, Pi Beta Phi, Kappa Alpha Theta, and Delta Gama. In order to research the characteristics of sorority leadership with regards to the Enneagram Model of Personality, Study 1 considered two groups, Leader and Non-Leader. The Leader condition consisted of senior women from all five sororities who hold an executive leadership position in the organization. The Non-Leader condition consisted of senior women who did not hold an executive position. In order to recruit women for the Leader condition, an email was sent to the women in top executive positions in all five sororities (approximately 10 women per sorority) soliciting their participation in an online survey about personality. They were blind to the fact that they were being surveyed according to their leadership status. Similarly, a separate email was sent to 9 randomly selected senior non-leader women in each sorority asking for their participation in an online survey. Thirty participants for both conditions chose to complete the survey and completed the consent form (Appendix A). As an incentive, both groups of women were told that the sorority with the highest participation would win $100.00 to be given to their designated philanthropy.

Materials
The survey given to participants in both conditions had three parts. The first section was a 72-item RHETI (Appendix B). The RHETI, as previously discussed in the Introduction, is the Riso Hudson Enneagram Type Indicator and is used to determine possible Enneagram types. For the second and third part of the survey, participants were given very brief descriptions of each type (approximately 120 words) that included key characteristics or traits, including the type’s basic fear, basic desire, and key motivations (Appendix C).

Procedure

Two separate emails were sent to participants, one being sent to participants in the Leader condition and one being sent to the participants in the Non-Leader condition. The emails linked to two different surveys so that results for leaders and non-leaders would be collected separately and anonymously. Participants were blind to the fact that the study was also looking at leadership.

The survey began with the 72-item RHETI, and then participants were asked to rate themselves using a Likert scale (1-7) on each of the nine Enneagram types, based on the short descriptions. The final part of the survey asked the participant to choose just one type that they believed described herself best based on the descriptions they read. We chose not to address these results because the self-chosen type correlated nearly perfectly with the highest Likert score.

Results

I began this study in hopes of learning more about the Enneagram Model of Personality and how it can be related to leadership in general as well as presidential leadership. Throughout
my studies in Psychology and Leadership I have been exposed to various personality models, but had never been exposed to the Enneagram. Only after discovering the Enneagram outside of the classroom did I decide that I wanted to understand its usefulness in the academic arena. In Study 1, we were expecting to see some trends in Type for Leaders and Non-Leaders of sorority women. More specifically, we expected to see low scores on Type Eight given what we know about gender roles and Type Eight.

In order to determine if we could draw any conclusions about sorority leadership and the Enneagram, we ran two separate ANOVAs, one for the RHETI results and one for the self-reported Likert scores. The ANOVAs were 2-factor mixed ANOVAs that analyzed the Leader/Non-Leader between subjects factor and the Type 1-Type 9 within subjects factor. The results for the RHETI ANOVA gave us a main effect for Enneagram Type ($F=28.45$, $p=0.00$). Essentially, scores on some types are higher than scores on others when we look at both leader and non-leaders together. The results for the interaction between Type and Leader were marginally significant, though not statistically so ($F=1.97$, $p=0.07$). This tells us that there is a strong trend in the data that suggests that the scores on the nine types differ somewhat between sorority Leaders and Non-Leaders.

In addition, we calculated mean scores on each Type for all participants as well as mean scores on the Types for the Leader group and the Non-Leader group. The means are presented in Table 1.
Table 1
Includes RHETI means on each type for all participants as well as mean scores on the types for the Leader and Non-Leader groups.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Type 1</th>
<th>Type 2</th>
<th>Type 3</th>
<th>Type 4</th>
<th>Type 5</th>
<th>Type 6</th>
<th>Type 7</th>
<th>Type 8</th>
<th>Type 9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall Means</td>
<td>6.75</td>
<td>10.90</td>
<td>8.95</td>
<td>6.42</td>
<td>6.82</td>
<td>10.40</td>
<td>7.07</td>
<td>6.33</td>
<td>8.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leader Means</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>11.83</td>
<td>8.67</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>6.60</td>
<td>11.00</td>
<td>6.80</td>
<td>6.23</td>
<td>8.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Leader Means</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9.93</td>
<td>9.23</td>
<td>6.83</td>
<td>7.03</td>
<td>9.90</td>
<td>7.33</td>
<td>6.43</td>
<td>8.30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We found that overall the highest mean scores were for Type Two [the empathetic, sincere, servant Type] and Type Six [the committed, security-oriented Type] and the lowest scores were on Type Four [the self-aware, sensitive, and reserved Type] and Type Eight [the dominating and commanding leaders]. This was true for both the Leader and the Non-Leader groups.

Comparing Leaders and Non-Leaders, we notice that the Leader scores for Type Two and Type Six are noticeably higher than the scores for the Non-Leaders despite the lack of statistical significance. For Type Two, Leaders have a score of 11.80 and Non-Leaders have a score of only 9.93. For Type Six, Leaders have a score of 11.00 while Non-Leaders have a score of only 9.90. Additionally, the Non-Leader score for Type Four (\( \bar{x} = 6.83 \)) is higher than the Leader score for Type Four (\( \bar{x} = 6.00 \)).

We ran the same 2-factor ANOVA with the Likert scores and found many similar results as with RHETI analysis. There was a main effect for Enneagram Type (\( F= 7.12, p =0.00 \)). Again, this shows that scores on some types are higher than scores on others overall regardless of leadership status. As with the RHETI analysis, there was no significant interaction between Type and Leader (\( F= 1.47, p= 0.19 \)) for the Likert scores meaning there were no statistical trends.
in the data that showed that the scores on any one of the types were higher or lower than other types.

After calculating the means for the Likert scores (as can be seen in Table 2), we noticed that there are high overall scores on Types Two and Six, as well as low overall scores on Types Four and Eight. The most striking data in this analysis is the difference in Type Four scores; Non-Leaders have a score of 3.89 while Leaders only scored 3.07.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Includes Likert means on each type for all participants as well as mean scores on the types for the Leader and Non-Leader groups.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Means</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leader Means</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Leader Means</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results for both the Likert scores and the RHETI scores show that the scores on Types Two and Six are high overall and are also somewhat higher for Leaders than Non-Leaders, while scores on Types Four and Eight are low overall yet notably higher for Non-Leaders than Leaders.

**Study 2**

*Participants*

Study 2 consisted of 11 Junior women in the Jepson School of Leadership Studies at the University of Richmond. I recruited participants by speaking to three separate Jepson classes including two sections of Theories and Models of Leadership and the Honors Tutorial class.
asking for participation in a 3-hour study for $50.00. They were told that the participants would be asked to familiarize themselves with a certain personality model and would then be asked to classify 13 different leaders based on the model. The study would require them to come into the lab for three separate 1-hour sessions to complete the study.

Materials

For Study 2, I used Dean Keith Simonton’s descriptions of the following U.S. Presidents, George Washington, Abraham Lincoln, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, Thomas Jefferson, Harry S. Truman, Theodore Roosevelt, Andrew Jackson, Woodrow Wilson, James Buchanan, Warren Harding, Andrew Johnson, Millard Fillmore, and Franklin Pierce. These 13 presidents consist of the eight most highly ranked presidents (Washington, Lincoln, F. Roosevelt, Jefferson, Truman, Jackson, T. Roosevelt, and Wilson) and five most poorly ranked presidents (Buchanan, Harding, A. Johnson, Fillmore, and Pierce) regarding presidential success. These presidents were selected as the most highly ranked and the most poorly ranked based on consensus among accepted rankings including C-SPAN and Murray-Blessing according to their overall successfulness as the chief executive of the United States. In order to study presidential personality, Simonton created roughly 750-word personality descriptions of 39 presidents from Washington to Reagan (the article was published in 1986) using various biographical reference works and fact books. The descriptions are a compilation of quotes, facts, and statements about each of the presidents with all identifying material removed (Simonton, 1986, p. 150).

Enneagram Type descriptions were also used for Study 2. For each of the nine Enneagram types, an approximately 750-word description was used (Appendix E). The descriptions were obtained from several Enneagram information sources written by experts Don
Riso and Russ Hudson. In addition, the short descriptions of each type that were used in Study 1 were also used for Study 2 (Appendix F).

In order for participants to record their Enneagram classifications for each president they were given a chart to fill in that had a place for each president to be rated on a Likert scale according to how much each type description described the person (Appendices H, I)

Procedure

Participants were asked to schedule three separate sessions that they could come into the lab for approximately one hour. During the first session, participants were asked to read through two separate packets. The first packet contained the long descriptions of each of the types and the second was a compilation of the shorter descriptions. Participants were asked to read through them and familiarize themselves with the nine Types. They were told they could use a pen, pencil, and/or highlighter because they would be able to refer back to both packets when they were classifying the leaders during sessions 2 and 3. During the second session, participants read descriptions for a grouping of either six (A) or seven leaders (B) that were completely anonymous (no identifying information about presidential status). Grouping A contained four highly ranked presidents and two poorly ranked presidents in a random order (Appendix G), whereas grouping B contained the other four highly ranked presidents and three poorly ranked presidents (Appendix H). In order to control for possible confounding variables, six of the participants were randomly selected to work through grouping A first, while the other five were chosen to work through grouping B first. Participants were told to read through one description at a time feeling free to refer back to the Enneagram Type descriptions at any time, and then rate the leader on each of the nine Enneagram types on a scale of 1 to 7. They were again told that
they could use a pen/pencil/highlighter to highlight any important information about the person. During the third session, the participants followed the same procedure as during their second session in order to complete the second grouping of leaders.

Results

Previous experience with the Enneagram led me to think that Presidents may tend towards Type Three (the willful, driven, achievers) and Eight (the dominating and commanding leaders). Though learning more about the Enneagram and presidential leadership in general was interesting to me I also wanted to discover more about the Enneagram's relationship to quality leadership compared with less effective leadership. Is there a difference in Enneagram type(s) between highly rated presidents compared to poorly ranked presidents? The results seem to say there definitely is a difference.

In order to analyze our data for Study 2 we ran a 2x9 2-way within subjects ANOVA of the Likert ratings, with one factor being the historical ranking of the presidents (high/low) and the other factor being the Enneagram Type (One-Nine). In order to do this, we calculated a mean score of all 11 participants for each Type across presidents in the highly ranked group and we calculated a mean score of all 11 participants for each type across presidents in the poorly ranked group. For example we calculated just one mean score for Fillmore, Pierce, Buchanan, Harding, and A. Johnson on Types One through Nine. As expected there was no main effect for Ranking (F= 1.58, p= 0.24), meaning that neither highly ranked nor poorly ranked presidents were more or less likely to get high or low overall scores. However, there was a huge main effect for Type: F = 4.26, p = 0.00. This finding indicates that there are in fact differences among the presidents on each of the nine Types, as can be seen in Table 3. Finally, as we
hypothesized, there was a highly significant interaction between Ranking and Type (F = 3.07, p = 0.01). This tells us that there is a difference in Types between highly ranked presidents and poorly ranked presidents and furthermore, that the Enneagram may be useful in determining what types of personality will lend itself to quality presidential leadership.

Table 3
Differences in means among Highly Ranked Presidents and Poorly Ranked Presidents.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>All Presidents</th>
<th>Type 1</th>
<th>Type 2</th>
<th>Type 3</th>
<th>Type 4</th>
<th>Type 5</th>
<th>Type 6</th>
<th>Type 7</th>
<th>Type 8</th>
<th>Type 9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>3.99</td>
<td>3.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highly Ranked Presidents</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>4.37</td>
<td>2.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poorly Ranked Presidents</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>3.53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Among all Presidents, we see that the highest scores are on Type Three [the willful, driven, achievers] and Type Eight [the dominating and commanding leaders] and the lowest score is on Type Five [independent, innovative, and preoccupied type] (\( \bar{x} = 3.10 \)). When looking at the means within each group we see that the highly ranked presidents score the highest on Type Eight (\( \bar{x} = 4.37 \)), Type Three (\( \bar{x} = 4.01 \)), and Type One [the conscientious and ethical moralist] (\( \bar{x} = 3.75 \)), and the lowest on Type Two (\( \bar{x} = 3.10 \)). For the poorly ranked group the highest scores are on Type Two [the empathetic, sincere, servant] (\( \bar{x} = 4.00 \)), Type Three (\( \bar{x} = 3.90 \)), and Type Six [the committed, security-oriented type] (\( \bar{x} = 3.76 \)) and the lowest scores were on Type 1 (\( \bar{x} = 3.00 \)) and Type 5 (\( \bar{x} = 2.67 \)). Interestingly, when we compare the results for highly and poorly ranked Presidents directly we see that Type One and Type Eight ratings are high for the highly ranked group and are among the lowest scoring types for the poorly ranked presidents.
group. Similarly, the poorly ranked presidents rate highly on Types Two, Six, and Nine, which are among the lowest scores for the highly ranked Presidents.

After seeing such remarkable differences between the highly and poorly ranked groups, we thought it would be interesting to look more closely at individual presidents and see how they compared to every other president, even within their own high or low ranking group. We ran a second ANOVA ignoring the high/low rating classification and thereby identifying the variance among all 13 presidents and all 9 types. In order to run this ANOVA, we calculated mean scores of the participants for each of the 13 presidents. For example, we averaged the scores that all 11 participants gave Abraham Lincoln on Type One to get an overall Type One score for Abraham Lincoln. We repeated this procedure until we had a mean score on each Type for every President. The mean scores can be seen in Table 4.

Table 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>President</th>
<th>Type 1</th>
<th>Type 2</th>
<th>Type 3</th>
<th>Type 4</th>
<th>Type 5</th>
<th>Type 6</th>
<th>Type 7</th>
<th>Type 8</th>
<th>Type 9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln</td>
<td>4.73</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>4.73</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>2.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>5.55</td>
<td>3.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackson</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>4.59</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>5.55</td>
<td>2.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Truman</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>4.59</td>
<td>2.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. Roosevelt</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>5.55</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>5.27</td>
<td>2.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilson</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td>4.73</td>
<td>4.45</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>2.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FDR</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>3.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jefferson</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>5.18</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buchanan</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>4.68</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>5.09</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>4.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harding</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>5.09</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>3.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Johnson</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>4.86</td>
<td>2.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fillmore</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>4.45</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>3.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pierce</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>4.41</td>
<td>4.45</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Presidents</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>3.99</td>
<td>3.17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The results for this ANOVA were very similar to those of the first analysis. There was no significant main effect for President, meaning there was no overall difference in how high or low the 13 presidents were rated ($F = 0.97, p = 0.48$). There was however a huge main effect for Type: $F = 5.11, p = 0.00$. This indicates that there are enormous differences in scores among the 13 presidents on the various types. For example, Types Three and Eight had particularly high scores compared with the other seven types. Finally, the analysis showed an interaction between President and Type: $F = 2.75, p = 0.00$, telling us that different presidents have different scores on the nine Enneagram types. These results are implicit in the first analysis, but go beyond it to show the individual differences in Type among presidents. It also shows us that there is variance among all 13 presidents and therefore all eight highly ranked presidents are not all alike and all five poorly ranked presidents are not all alike.

Looking at the means in Table 4, we see that Washington, Jackson, Truman, and Theodore Roosevelt all score very high on Type Eight and Type Three and they all scored relatively low on Type Nine. Washington and Theodore Roosevelt both score low on Types Two and Five and Jackson scores especially low on Type Four. Presidents Buchanan and Harding scored highest on Type Two and Type Six (among the lowest scores for the previous highly ranked presidents).

Theodore Roosevelt, Wilson, and Franklin Roosevelt all have high scores on Type Three, but low scores on Type Five, the highly introverted and independent type. Theodore Roosevelt and Wilson both have strikingly low scores on Types Two and Nine and Franklin Roosevelt scores lowest on Type Four.

If we look at the highest scores for each of the types among all of the Presidents we can see that Lincoln scores the highest on Type One, Harding scores the highest for Type Two, and
T. Roosevelt is by far the highest on Type Three, while Washington and Jackson score highest on Type Eight. When looking at low scores we see that Pierce has the lowest scores for Types One, Five (along with FDR), and Six (along with Truman), Wilson is rated lowest for Type Two, Harding is lowest on Type Three, Jackson is lowest on Type Four, Buchanan is lowest on Types Seven and Eight, and Jackson is lowest on Type Nine. By glancing at the means in Table 4 we can see the strong trends in high and low scores on types for certain presidents and we can get a clear sense of the differences in Type between successful and unsuccessful presidents. The implications of these trends as well as further analysis will be discussed in the follow section.

Discussion

Study 1

*Any information regarding Enneagram Type was obtained from Riso, D. R., & Hudson, R. (1996)

The chapters above report that in Study 1 we sought to compare Enneagram Types among sorority Leaders and Non-Leaders. The results generally supported our hypotheses about sorority profiles. As you will recall, in the results for both ANOVAs (RHETI and LIKERT) we found that overall, regardless of leader classification, sorority women rated high on Types Two and Six and low on Types Four and Eight. Though there was no statistical interaction between Type and Leader on the Likert measure, the interaction results for the RHETI were nearly significant and through close examination comparing the two groups, we found that Leaders scored noticeably higher on Types Two and Six.

Based on our understanding of the Enneagram, leadership, and my conversation with Dr. Joel M. Rothaizer, we hypothesized that mean scores for Study 1 would be considerably low on Type Eight (personal communication, March 4, 2011). As previously mentioned, the Type Eight descriptions tend to be highly masculine in tone and often, female Eights are mistyped as other
numbers. Type Eight women that have not yet typed themselves as such will often shy away from the descriptions of the Type Eight and try to identify with another type. The data shows that on both measures, Type Eight has the lowest scores. Sorority members not only shy away from Type Eight when self-reporting on the Likert, but also answer questions on the RHETI that lead them away from being categorized as Type Eight. The short description of Type Eight that participants were asked to read before self-reporting, used words such as strong, assertive, straight talking, egocentric, self-reliant, confrontational, intimidating, and domineering.

Research has shown that there is a strong tendency to describe oneself in accordance with the sex-typed standards of typical and often socially desirable behavior for men and women (Bem, 1974, p. 155). In the Bem Sex Role Inventory (BSRI), the words aggressive, dominant, and self-reliant appear on the Masculine items list suggesting that in American society these traits are more desirable in a man. Therefore, women in Study 1 may have acted in accordance with sex role norms by avoiding the stereotypically masculine Type Eight description. Further discussion of role incongruity theory will be discussed during the comparison of Study 1 and Study 2.

Interestingly, we found that participants, Leader and Non-Leader alike, scored highly on Types Two and Six. The short description of Type Two used words such as warm-hearted, empathetic, sincere, flattering, and sentimental. Sure enough listed as feminine items in the BSRI are the words warm and flatterable. As we consider the possible influence of the gender roles and sex typed traits, it is also reasonable to consider that women participating in Study 1 might have been acting in accordance with their perceived understanding of their role as a sorority member. The women participating in the study were made aware that this survey was being distributed to only sorority women, which may have primed them to answer questions with consideration to their sorority membership role. In my personal experience with sorority
membership as well as having a leadership role on the Panhellenic council, sorority culture often emphasizes ideals such as community, loyalty, dedication, and service, which are qualities that are much more akin to the descriptions of Type Two and Six than to that of Type Eight. Twos basic desire is to be loved and their key motivations are to express their feelings for others, to be needed and appreciated. Type Six, sometimes referred to as the loyalist, is described as the committed, reliable, trust-worthy, security-oriented type. Sixes basic desire is to have security and feel supported by others. It is worthwhile to consider two plausible explanations for the Study 1 results, (1) that women participating in the study were acting in congruence with gender roles and possibly perceived sorority membership roles, or (2) the types of women who join sororities tend to be Twos and Sixes more so than any other type(s).

Further analysis led to the comparison of Leader Types and Non Leader Types, which led to several interesting observations regarding sorority leadership. Though Types Two and Six were high scoring among all participants in the RHETI results, mean scores on these Types for Leaders were noticeably higher than the scores for Non-Leaders. That is to say that the Leaders, more so than the Non-Leaders, are characterized as Twos and Sixes. Historically, there has been a clear incongruence between prototypic female behavior and prototypic leadership behavior, which has made it difficult for women to succeed in leadership positions. “Women who are effective leaders tend to violate standards for their gender because they manifest male-stereotypic, agentic attributes and can fail to sufficiently manifest female-stereotypic, communal attributes” (Knippenberg & Hogg, 2003, p. 85). Leaders in Study 1, may have responded in a socially desirable manner so as to emphasize their femininity and communality in an effort not to appear as a prototypical dominating male leader, therefore rating highly on Two and Six and low on Type Eight. However, consistent with stereotypic differences between male and female
leadership styles, women tend to employ a more democratic and participatory style than a more direct stereotypic male style (Eagly and Johnson, 1990, p.236). Perhaps, in an all-female organization, more communal and participatory leadership is desired, accepted, and effective and therefore Type Twos and Sixes are likely to attain a leadership role. If Type Twos and Type Sixes encompass the qualities of a sorority member, then it is reasonable to assert that leaders of the organization may score even higher on Type Two and Type Six because they are especially prototypical, thereby exemplifying even more the prescribed qualities and injunctive norms for sorority women. Alternatively or in addition, sorority leaders may score highly on Type Two and Six because they think it is important to appear norm-consistent of the prototypical sorority member. In addition to drawing conclusions regarding sorority leadership from Study 1, we also gained insight into the utility of the RHETI and Likert measures. Finding strong consistency in the results between RHETI and the Likert, we were confident that we would find compelling results using the Likert in Study 2 especially since there would be no self-presentational concerns (participants were rating presidents as opposed to themselves) in Study 2.

**Study 2**

As previously discussed, the goal of Study 2 was to explore the relationship between the Enneagram and presidential leadership as well as presidential success. Enneagram literature has suggested that no Type is better than another, though society may hold certain types in higher regard when considering specific roles (Riso & Hudson, 2011). This study sought to determine which type or types are considered desirable for presidential leadership and even more so, for successful presidential leadership. Though Ginger-Lapid Bogda highlighted the leadership qualities of all Types, we speculated that the qualities of Type Eight and Type Three might
exemplify the qualities that are most valued in the president. Furthermore, our understanding of the Enneagram as well as presidential leadership led us to hypothesize that Types Five, Nine, and Four, the more introverted and passive types, would be least likely to desire the role of president and therefore less likely to have high scores in our study. Through various ANOVAs, mean score analyses and comparisons, our results supported our hypotheses and greatly expanded our knowledge on the Enneagram and Presidential Leadership.

In our first 2 x 9 ANOVA, we found a huge main effect for Type and it was clear looking at the calculated means for each Type, that as expected, Type Three and Type Eight had the highest scores across both high and poor ranking groups, while Types Five and Nine scored lowest. Similarly, the results showed a significant interaction between Type and Presidential Ranking. In comparing the means for highly ranked and poorly ranked presidents, we see that the highly ranked presidents score highest overall on Type Eight (\( \bar{x} = 4.37 \)) and Type Three (\( \bar{x} = 4.01 \)) and lowest on Type Nine (\( \bar{x} = 2.99 \)) and Type Two (\( \bar{x} = 3.10 \)), while poorly ranked presidents conversely score highest on Type Two (\( \bar{x} = 4.00 \)) and Type Three (\( \bar{x} = 3.90 \)) lowest on Type Five (\( \bar{x} = 2.67 \)). There are several noticeable differences of scores between highly and poorly ranked Presidents that also deserve some discussion. Highly ranked presidents score much higher than poorly ranked presidents on Type Eight by a margin of 1.03. Poorly ranked presidents were rated higher on Type Two by a margin of 0.90. As we explore the meaning of these results in more depth, it will become evident that there are significant trends in presidential personality especially among successful and unsuccessful presidents, which leads us to conclude that the Enneagram model may be a useful tool for evaluating and predicting quality presidential leadership.
We will begin by discussing the general results showing that Type Eight and Type Three are the highest scoring Types among presidents regardless of ranking and Type Five, Type Nine, and Type Four are among the lowest scoring Types. The results showed that Type Eight has the highest mean score across all 13 presidents. Eights are often referred to as “The Challengers” because of their self-confidence, decisiveness, and assertive nature. People of this type can be protective, resourceful, and strong, but their need to control their environment as well as other people can lead them to be domineering and intimidating. Dominating their environment is a key motivation for Eights and is what often drives them into powerful leadership positions. Persuasive and charismatic, Eights are adept at persuading others to follow them passionately. Eights’ vitality and resolve is strengthened as they are given the opportunity to exercise their power and influence over others, which in turn can instill confidence in their followers. As President of the United States, Eights have the opportunity to exercise an enormous amount of power and are able to make monumental changes to their environment. After, simply reading Type descriptions, it is no surprise that the results of this study showed that presidents score highly on Type Eight.

Threes have often been referred to as “The Achievers” because of the tenacity and energy they bring to everything they do. They are incredibly ambitious and work hard to achieve their goals, though their idea of success is often contingent upon recognition of their accomplishments. Threes love the spotlight and being noticed for their accomplishments and greatest endeavors. Success driven, Threes will go to great lengths to distinguish themselves and achieve something that others will deem noteworthy. Again, it is no surprise that this relentless drive leads Threes to desire the highest possible leadership role. As President of the United States, Threes are in the position to do great things and be noticed for them.
The lowest mean score across all 13 presidents was on Type Five, which is sometimes referred to as “The Investigator” and is described as alert, insightful, and curious. Highly independent, Fives can be preoccupied with their own thoughts and musings and become detached from the world around them. Driven by their desire to possess knowledge and figure the world out, Fives spend considerable time observing and contemplating the things they find most fascinating. Lapid-Bogda (2006) suggests that all Types can be leaders and that each will bring unique and useful skills to the job, but this does not suggest that all Types will share a similar desire for leadership roles or even that the unique skills a certain Type offers will be regarded as valuable by society. The Five’s leadership paradigm as described by Lapid-Bogda notes that a leader’s job is to develop an effective organization through research, deliberation, and planning. Though there are areas in society that may benefit tremendously from a Five’s leadership style, it may not lend itself to presidential leadership. It makes perfect sense that a highly introverted, introspective, and potentially isolated person would not likely desire presidency, thereby lowering the prevalence of this Type among Presidents, both highly and poorly ranked.

Results showed that Type Nine was the second lowest mean score for all 13 presidents, though the margin of difference between Type Nine and Type Five was only a matter of 0.07. Type Nines, sometimes called “The Peacemakers” are accepting, trusting, and stable. Their optimism and supportive nature make them good at bringing people together and creating harmony in their environment. Avoiding all conflict is a key motivation for Nines and they will work very hard to evade any kind tension in their life. Though Nines are often very supportive and can be intensely connected with the people around them, they can also become complacent and unwilling to address issues in an attempt to keep the peace. Lapid-Boda writes that a Nine’s
leadership paradigm suggests that a leader's job is to create a structured and harmonious work environment. As with Type Five, there are many areas of society in which this kind of leadership style might be especially effective, but when considering the demands and responsibilities of the President, it is not difficult to see why the Nine's passivity and complacency may keep them from seeking election to the Presidential Office.

Type Four was also among the lowest scores for all 13 Presidents and deserves discussion in regards to its relationship to presidential leadership. Fours, also called "The Individualists" tend to be incredibly self-aware and sensitive people. They are possibly the most creative and expressive Type and often inspire people with their creations. Highly introspective and intuitive, Fours often demonstrate a gentle compassion that is appreciated by those around them. Their vulnerability can lead them to withhold themselves from others becoming moody and self-conscious. They have an intense desire to freely express themselves and surround themselves with beauty. Though their artistic ability and eye for natural beauty are often appreciated, it seems as though their personality may not be best suited for presidential leadership. Lapid-Bogda’s leadership paradigm for the Four is that a leader’s job is to create an organization that gives people meaning and purpose. It is said that Fours have a key motivation of attracting a "rescuer". It is reasonable to suggest that Fours lack the assertiveness and forthrightness that seems critical to presidential leadership.

Regarding the significant interaction between Type and Ranking, Type Eight, as hypothesized, has the highest mean score for the highly ranked group implying that successful presidents score highest on Type Eight, more so than any other type. Type Eight is a high scoring type regardless of Ranking, but the interaction tells us that there are notable differences between the Highly and Poorly ranked groups. It does not take much more than a glance at the
means to see that Type Eight scores much higher than any other Type within the highly ranked group in addition to being significantly higher than the Type Eight mean score for the poorly ranked group. The question that remains to be answered is what is it about Type Eight that causes it to not only have the highest mean score for all 13 presidents, but an especially high score for the successful ones? In the review of presidential leadership and personality, we discussed David Winter’s (1987) approach to personality and presidential effectiveness. In his exploration of three different motive profiles (achievement, affiliation, and power) he found that presidential performance was predicted by power motivation. Presidents demonstrating high levels of assertiveness, control, and confrontational motives exhibit higher presidential performance. “Several characteristics that are important to leader appeal and leader performance in the theories of Freud and Weber, such as energy, impact, prestige, and even narcissism, are closely related to the known action characteristics of the power motive” (Winter, 1987, p. 198).

The Enneagram Type Eight description very clearly corresponds to Winter’s definition of power motivation. Eight is the Enneagram personality type that most exemplifies power. “They possess a powerful connection with their instinctive drives which gives them tremendous energy, self-confidence, and the desire to impact their world in some significant way” (Riso & Hudson, 1996, p. 300).

Corresponding closely with the extroverted intuitive type in Jungian typology, an Eight’s “capacity to inspire courage or to kindle enthusiasm for anything new is unrivalled...He brings his vision to life, he presents it convincingly and with dramatic fire, he embodies it, so to speak. But this is not play-acting, it is a kind of fate” (C.G. Jung, Psychological Types, 368-369).

Energy, confidence, embodiment, and fate are terms that are strikingly relevant to a discussion.
The dialogue on the correlation of charisma and effective leadership has continued since Weber first introduced the intriguing concept to sociology and society. Furthermore, researchers have often suggested that presidential greatness correlates with charisma (e.g., Emrich, Brower, Feldman, & Garland, 2001; Simonton, 1988). It is a compelling then, to suggest that Eights may possess some degree of charismatic authority that allows them to be powerfully successful presidents.

As we continue to determine the Enneagram’s place among the literature on personality and effective leadership, we find compelling theories about presidential leadership that appear highly consistent with the qualities exemplified in the Enneagram Types. The concept of active versus passive leadership has been a part of discussions regarding quality leadership for quite some time now. As previously discussed, Barber (1992) identifies three components of presidential personality: character, worldview, and style. Regarding character, he differentiates between four types along on two dimensions: Active-Passive and Positive-Negative. The active-passive dimension indicates the level of energy a president brings to his position and his overall
investment in the political agenda. Barber describes Active-Positive presidents as positively motivated individuals having high self-esteem and self-confidence. Active-Negatives are driven by their desire to obtain and sustain power, but they find little enjoyment in their distinguished role. Passive-Positives seek power because of their desire for love and admiration and enjoy the attention and popularity that comes along with power. Passive-Negatives are driven purely by their sense of duty and often do not get personal enjoyment from their job (p. 8).

It appears that the active-passive dimension may be particularly relevant to this study in that several Enneagram Types seem to fit nicely into Barber’s four categories of typology. It seems as though the positive-negative dimension of character and the Enneagram Levels of Development may address similar elements of leadership, but further discussion of this possibility is beyond the scope of this study. Instinctively, it seems that Type One, Three, and Eight are highly active types that display immense energy and motivation in various ways. Additionally, it seems fitting to suggest that Type Two, Six, and Nine can be categorized as passive by their non-confrontational nature and desire for peacefulness, security, and appreciation. As we consider possible correlations, it is interesting to examine more closely the categorizations and typology of several of the presidents that were studied in this research. Harry Truman, Theodore Roosevelt, and Woodrow Wilson were all rated very high on Type Eight and furthermore Theodore Roosevelt also scored highly on Type Three along with Franklin Roosevelt. Barber classifies Franklin Roosevelt, Harry Truman, and Theodore Roosevelt as Active-Positive types and Woodrow Wilson as an Active-Negative. Ignoring the positive-negative dimension for a moment, we see that all of these presidents are categorized as active and interestingly they are all highly ranked presidents. Conversely, Warren Harding, who scores highest on Type Two, is classified as a Passive-Positive type and is one of the Poorly
ranked presidents. After piecing this all together, there is convincing evidence that suggests that there is a powerful relationship between Barber’s active-passive dimension and Enneagram Types Three, Eight, and Two: Type Three and Eight are Active and Type Two is Passive.

To take it one step further, we might draw conclusions about the predictive value of the Enneagram in regards to presidential success by acknowledging its possible relationship to Barber’s active-passive dimension. According to Barber, Active-Positive types make the best presidents, and Active-Negative types, though potentially dangerous, are hard working power seekers. We might venture to say that Active presidents will be more successful than Passive ones and thereby Type Threes and Eights will be more successful as presidents than Type Twos. Evidence for this claim is solidified further when we recall that Type Three and Eight are in fact the highest scoring types for Highly ranked (successful) presidents while Type Two is the highest scoring type for Poorly ranked (unsuccessful) presidents. Though we are unable to show correlations for the other types since not all of the presidents discussed in this study are also discussed in Barber’s literature, we speculate that there are similar correlations between Enneagram Type One and Barber’s active classification as well as Enneagram Types Six and Nine and Barber’s passive dimension. Consistent with the trend, Type One has a considerably high score for highly ranked presidents, yet a low score for poorly ranked and Type Nine has a fairly high score for Poorly ranked and the lowest score for the Highly ranked group.

The results for this first ANOVA allowed us to make compelling assertions about the relationship between Enneagram Type and highly/poorly ranked presidents as a whole. But as we have already mentioned, we wanted to look more closely at individual presidents and see how they compare to other presidents in their own ranking group as well as in the other ranking group. Similar to the first analysis, the 13 x 9 ANOVA showed a huge main effect for Type
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suggesting that there are differences in scores among all 13 individual presidents. Likewise, there was a significant interaction between Type and President telling us that presidents vary greatly in their scores on the nine Types. By looking at the means we were able to expand our understanding of the Enneagram and presidential leadership in that we noticed variance not only between the high and poor ranking groups but also within them. It may go without saying, but essentially the results tell us that there is an element of individuality and uniqueness in regards to the personality of these 13 presidents. By the same token, there is also a degree of similarity between them.

In order to get a better grasp on the similarities and differences of pairs of presidents, we created a differences chart that numerically describes the similarity of each pair of presidents (within their own ranking group). For example, Lincoln has a mean score of 4.73 on Type One and George Washington has a mean score of 3.55 on Type One so the difference between these two presidents on Type One is 1.18. We continued this process for each of the Nine Types and then found the sum of all the difference scores on each type to get an overall difference score (d) of 9.14 for Lincoln and George Washington. The lower the difference score the stronger the similarities between Enneagram Type scores (See Tables 5 & 6).
Table 5
Difference Scores for each pairing of Highly Ranked Presidents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AL/GW</th>
<th>AL/TJ</th>
<th>AL/HST</th>
<th>AL/TR</th>
<th>AL/FDR</th>
<th>AL/AJa</th>
<th>AL/WW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9.14</td>
<td>6.05</td>
<td>5.61</td>
<td>9.65</td>
<td>9.64</td>
<td>11.77</td>
<td>6.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GW/TJ</td>
<td>GW/HST</td>
<td>GW/TR</td>
<td>GW/FDR</td>
<td>GW/AJa</td>
<td>GW/WW</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.63</td>
<td>4.81</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>6.32</td>
<td>5.07</td>
<td>6.32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TJ/HST</td>
<td>TJ/TR</td>
<td>TJ/FDR</td>
<td>TJ/AJa</td>
<td>TJ/WW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.92</td>
<td>11.22</td>
<td>10.87</td>
<td>12.46</td>
<td>8.95</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HST/TR</td>
<td>HST/FDR</td>
<td>HST/AJa</td>
<td>HST/WW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>7.39</td>
<td>7.46</td>
<td>5.77</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR/FDR</td>
<td>TR/AJa</td>
<td>TR/WW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.45</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>5.27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FDR/AJa</td>
<td>FDR/WW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.39</td>
<td>8.90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AJa/WW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Initials Key**: Abraham Lincoln (AL), Thomas Jefferson (TJ), Harry S. Truman (HST), Theodore Roosevelt (TR), Franklin D. Roosevelt (FDR), Andrew Jackson (AJa), Woodrow Wilson (WW)

Table 6
Difference Scores for each pairing of Poorly Ranked Presidents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JB/WH</th>
<th>JB/AJo</th>
<th>JB/MF</th>
<th>JB/FP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.41</td>
<td>10.86</td>
<td>8.56</td>
<td>8.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WH/AJo</td>
<td>WH/MF</td>
<td>WH/FP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.63</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>6.24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AJo/MF</td>
<td>AJo/FP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>7.75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MF/FP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Initials Key:** James Buchanan (JB), Warren Harding (WH), Andrew Johnson (AJ), Millard Fillmore (MF), Franklin Pierce (FP)

Taking this one step further, we calculated a uniqueness rating ($u$) for each individual president (within his own ranking group). For the highly ranked presidents we found the sum of the seven difference scores for each of the seven presidents within the group. For example, to find Lincoln’s uniqueness rating, we averaged the seven difference scores for Lincoln/Washington, Lincoln/Jefferson, Lincoln/Truman, Lincoln/T. Roosevelt, Lincoln/F. Roosevelt, Lincoln/Jackson, and Lincoln/Wilson. We used the same calculation process for the poorly ranked presidents, with the only difference being that there are five presidents in this grouping and therefore fewer pairings (See Table 7).

Table 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>High Ranked</th>
<th>Uniqueness rating</th>
<th>Poorly Ranked</th>
<th>Uniqueness rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jefferson</td>
<td>9.16</td>
<td>A. Johnson</td>
<td>7.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackson</td>
<td>8.75</td>
<td>Pierce</td>
<td>7.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FDR</td>
<td>8.42</td>
<td>Harding</td>
<td>6.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln</td>
<td>8.35</td>
<td>Fillmore</td>
<td>6.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilson</td>
<td>7.34</td>
<td>Buchanan</td>
<td>5.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T.Roosevelt</td>
<td>7.20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>6.41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Truman</td>
<td>6.35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Closely examining the chart of similarity scores for each of the presidents allowed us to see groupings among the presidents beyond just similar pairs. The lowest difference scores for the highly ranked group were found for the following pairs: Washington/T. Roosevelt ($d=3.58$), Washington/Truman ($d=4.81$), Washington/Jackson ($d=5.07$), Truman/T. Roosevelt ($d=5.5$), T. Roosevelt/Jackson ($d=6.5$), and Truman/Jackson ($d=7.46$). Let it be noted that the average difference score for all 28 pairs is 7.78; therefore all of the difference scores in the
aforementioned pairings are below the average meaning there is a high level of similarity between the pairs. Moreover, we can conclude that Washington, Truman, T. Roosevelt, and Jackson form some kind of a similarity grouping that merits discussion. Likewise, it appears that there is another grouping among the poorly ranked presidents between Harding, Fillmore, and Pierce with the following difference scores: Harding/Pierce (d=6.24), Fillmore/Pierce (d=6.51), and Harding/Fillmore (d=6.69). Let it be noted that the average difference score for the Poorly ranked presidential pairings is 7.33, therefore all of these presidents are below the average and have a high level of similarity.

Let us first discuss the similarity grouping among the highly ranked presidents. By just glancing at the means table (Table 4), the Type similarities of these four men become quite obvious. Washington, Jackson, Truman, and T. Roosevelt all score very high on Type Eight. In fact, Washington and Jackson tie for the highest overall score on Type Eight (\( \bar{x} = 5.55 \)). T. Roosevelt is not far behind with a mean score of 5.27 and Truman scores a high 4.59. Looking further we see that Truman and T. Roosevelt both score low on Type Nine and T. Roosevelt and Washington both score lowest on Type Two. Additionally, Washington also scores low on Type Five and Jackson scores lower than any other president on Type Four. If we treat these four Highly ranked presidents as a group we conclude that they score high on Type Eight and low on Two, Four, Five, and Nine. Let us recall our hypotheses that (1) the traits of Enneagram Type Eight exemplify the qualities that are most valued in a president and therefore will have the highest scores among the Highly ranked presidents and (2) the more passive Type Five, Type Nine, and Type Four will be less motivated to desire presidency and therefore will have low scores among Highly ranked presidents. This remarkable finding supports our hypotheses and
suggests that this similarity grouping can be seen as a possible prototypic group of successful presidents as described in Enneagram Typology.

The similarity grouping for the poorly ranked presidents does not show as strong a trend as that of the highly ranked group. Harding, Pierce, and Fillmore, despite having similarly low difference scores among the pairings, actually have somewhat different and conflicting individual high and low mean scores. Harding scores highest on highest on Type Two and lowest on Type Four and Type Five, while Fillmore scores highest on Type Three, but lowest on Type Two. Pierce, like Fillmore scores highest on Type Three, but lowest on Type Five. It is much harder to draw conclusions about the similarities of this grouping, which leads me to the possible explanation that there are more striking similarities among successful presidents than there are among unsuccessful ones. Perhaps this suggests that we are more likely to identify a prototype for presidential greatness than we are to identify a prototype for presidential failure.

After thorough exploration of similarities between and among presidents, we thought it would be interesting to look more closely at each of the presidents on an individual basis. Though there were distinct trends and similarities among the highly and poorly ranked presidents, no president is exactly like another. In fact, even several of the high ranking presidents broke the trend of high scores on Type Three and/or Type Eight. Looking at the uniqueness ratings that we calculated using the difference scores we noticed that Jefferson is the most unique president among the 13 (u=9.16), while Truman is the least unique (u=6.35). Other unique presidents include Jackson (u=8.75), Lincoln (u=8.35), and FDR (u=8.42). We will further discuss this element of individuality by looking more closely at the most unique presidents beginning with Jefferson.
Thomas Jefferson, the most unique president out of all 13, scores very high on Type Five, which is interestingly the lowest scoring type across all presidents. This is especially noteworthy because, as we previously speculated, Type Five does not seem to be the kind of type that would desire a leadership role. However, it is perfectly fitting that Jefferson scored high on the alert, insightful, curious, independent type. Merill Peterson (1998), speaking about Jefferson says, “As his character was somewhat labyrinthian, so his mind was bewildering in its range and complexity” (p. 9). Jefferson’s investigative nature was evident in his political skill and agenda. He certainly sought to develop and expand the nation through research, planning, and deliberation. Joseph Ellis notes that, “In 1803, Jefferson took personal charge of interpreting the ill-defined borders of the Louisiana Territory in the most expansive fashion possible” (Ellis, 2004, p. 32). His leading style was highly removed and his decision-making was as Ellis describes it, “nearly invisible” (p. 29). Jefferson was detached and he often isolated himself, retiring to Monticello, his safe haven. Unlike many successful presidents, Jefferson was not driven by his desire for power, but rather his dedication to his beliefs in a limited federal government. At a time when our country was still in its formative stage it made sense that a man scoring high on Type Five would assume the role of presidency as a means of influencing the nation through his extensive knowledge of government and legislation. While at first it may seem unfitting for a Type Five to be President of the United States, greater understanding of the situational factors and political environment at the time reveals that this kind of personality may have been just what our country needed.

Abraham Lincoln is also one of the most unique presidents among the 13 studied and he is another one of the highly ranked presidents that break the trend of high scores on Type Three and Eight. Lincoln scores highest on Types One [the moral, high-minded idealist, that is driven
by the desire to be considered good] and Five and is the overall highest scoring president on Type One and the overall second highest scoring president on Type Five (after Jefferson). Lincoln most certainly left a lasting legacy on the United States, one that forever changed our nation. Lincoln also was driven to assume the role of presidency not because he had strong power motivation, but rather because he had an intense moral obligation. As he left his hometown of Springfield, Illinois in 1861 to begin his presidential life in Washington he said:

My friends, no one, not in my situation, can appreciate my feeling of sadness at this parting. To this place, and the kindness of these people, I owe everything...Here my children have been born, and one is buried. I now leave, not knowing when, or whether ever, I may return, with a task before me greater than that which rested on Washington. (qtd. in McPherson, 2004, p. 118).

Unlike many great presidents who would show innate leadership abilities and diplomatic charm at very young ages, “Lincoln’s origins gave little promise of greatness”(McPherson, p. 118). However, his strong moral compass would be a leading factor for his greatness. Our country was facing a tremendous crisis that had the potential to lead to the destruction and demise of the united nation that had been built thus far. While Type Eights and Threes seem to possess the qualities that are most attractive to followers and especially appropriate for positions of power, a president scoring high of those Types may not have been able to lead our country through the moral crisis of slavery with the same poise and skill as Lincoln. According to Riso and Hudson (1996), “By accepting what is, [Ones] become transcendentally realistic, knowing the best action to take in each moment. Humane, inspiring, and hopeful: the truth will be heard”(p. 376). Lincoln’s sense of mission, moral heroism, and his ability to overcome moral adversity are the qualities that suggest that he was a highly developed Type One.
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It is not surprising to see that Lincoln also scores highly on Type Five. Historian Allan Nevins wrote that the quintessential quality of Lincoln’s mind, “…was a dogged desire to learn the exact truth about everything and anything, and a delight in the reasoning process as a means of apprehending truth” (qtd. in Arnold, 1994, p. 81). His intellectual drive and curiosity coupled with his conscientiousness and ethicality rendered Lincoln the ideal leader to guide our country through the darkest of times. Once again, the situational factors and the political needs of the day called for a president that possessed more than just power motivation and/or achievement drive.

Next we will consider the uniqueness of Franklin Delano Roosevelt and the qualities that set him apart from the others, yet still rendered him a highly successful president. FDR scored highest on both Type Three and Type Seven and lowest on Type Four and Five. High scores on Three and low scores on Type Four and Five are consistent with the presidential greatness trend, but FDR’s high score on Seven, the extroverted, optimistic, spontaneous Type, is what is particularly interesting. Roosevelt is the highest scoring president on Type Seven among all of the 13 presidents, thereby amplifying his uniqueness. Sevens, sometimes referred to as “The Enthusiasts”, are characterized by versatility, high-spirits, and a playful nature. Roosevelt’s enthusiasm was contagious and his cheerful determination gave our country the hope that it desperately needed. Like Jefferson, he faced a country in crisis during his time as president, but this time the crisis was economic. Devastated by the Great Depression and in turmoil over the state of war, the people of the United States were downtrodden and in need of a resilient leader that would forge ahead even in times of trouble.

The country got just what it needed, Franklin Delano Roosevelt. Embodying the optimism of the Type Seven, Roosevelt rallied the nation through his motivational speeches and
intimate fireside chats. Winston Churchill says that encountering Franklin Roosevelt “was like opening one’s first bottle of champagne: a heady experience” (Ware, 2000, p. 224). Citizens felt as though Roosevelt not only understood them, but also cared for them. “FDR’s ebullient personality not only charmed the heads of state but American voters as well” (Ware, p. 224). In a time when our country needed someone to raise moral and instill hope and faith, Franklin Roosevelt fittingly brought the exuberance of a Type Seven. Despite their positive effect on the moral of those around them, Sevens can become over-extended, scattered and undisciplined. Led by his impulsivity and excitement, “The New Deal over which Franklin Roosevelt presided was not a carefully though out plan but rather a series of sometimes contradictory responses to the ongoing economic contraction” (Ware, 2000, p. 227).

Eights and Threes certainly posses the recognized qualities of presidential greatness, but there have been times in history when our nation has needed more than power motivation. At a time when political precedents were being set, Thomas Jefferson was as an intellectually brilliant visionary who served as the nation’s expert on forming political policy and legislation. In a time when civil war wreaked havoc on our nation, Lincoln served as a grounded and discerning moralist. When the country was facing a devastating economic crisis, Franklin Roosevelt brought energy, vivacity, and hopefulness to his role as president and served to rejuvenate the spirit and confidence of our great nation. While the evidence clearly suggests that Enneagram Typology correlates nicely with several theories regarding effective presidential leadership, it would be foolish not to acknowledge that situational factors, such as those mentioned, play a crucial part in determining greatness.

Dean Keith Simonton (2008) gives evidence to suggest that both situational factors as well as individual factors are contributors to presidential greatness, but to make a statement
about the degree to which one predicts greatness more than the other would be challenging (p. 144). In accordance with Simonton, we suggest that the Enneagram Typology may be especially useful in assessing and predicting presidential greatness when situational factors are considered in conjunction with the Type assessment.

Before concluding the discussion on uniqueness ratings we want to discuss the particularly intriguing uniqueness of President Andrew Jackson. Jackson happens to have the second highest uniqueness score, but after looking at the mean table we see that he scores highest on Type Eight and lowest on Type Four. These scores fit perfectly with the Highly ranked group’s trend of high scores on Eight and/or Three. Additionally, we suggested that highly power motivated presidents would likely score low on Type Four in addition to scoring high on Type Eight. So what makes Jackson so unique? Examining the difference scores table we see that Jackson is incredibly different from both Lincoln and Jefferson. Jackson, along with Washington, ties for the highest score on Type Eight among all 13 presidents with a huge mean of 5.55. Additionally, Jackson’s score on Type Four is the lowest score (\( \bar{X} = 1.82 \)) on this Type among all 13 presidents. Jackson’s uniqueness comes from the combination of his noticeably higher score on Type Eight and noticeably lower score on Type Four, which may make him a highly prototypical highly ranked power seeker.

**A Comparison of Study 1 and Study 2**

From the outset, we took a multi-faceted approach to explore the relationship between the Enneagram Model of Personality and Leadership by assessing University of Richmond sorority leadership as well as U.S. presidential leadership. While the results for both Study 1 and Study 2 are compelling when considered separately, they are also fascinating to explore in conjunction...
with one another. The results from Study 1 show that there is a slight (though not significant), but noticeable trend that suggests that sorority leadership correlates with Enneagram Type Two and Type Six. Study 2 results give evidence for a strong positive correlation between presidential leadership and Type Eight and also Type Three. Types Two and Six are both people-oriented types, highly motivated by their need for support and love. In contrast, Types Three and Eight are driven, assertive, and action-oriented. The differences are stark, but not all together surprising when we consider that Study 1 evaluated all female leadership while Study 2 examined all male leadership. Eagly has written several papers regarding individuals’ perceptions and assumptions about leadership and gender. Eagly’s social role theory says that often people’s leadership prototypes are more congruent with their understanding of the roles that men occupy (Eagly & Karau, 2002). Because women have traditionally lacked representation in leadership roles, people have become accustomed to seeing men occupy these roles. Group members may see women “as lacking the stereotypical directive and assertive qualities of good leaders—that is, as not being tough enough or not taking charge” (Eagly, 2007, p.4). In a meta-analysis of more than 160 sex-related differences in leadership style, there was only difference in leadership style between men and women and that is that women use a more participative and a less autocratic and directive style than men did. Interestingly, the tendency for women to lead in this way decreases when they are in a highly male dominated setting (Eagly & Johnson, 1990). Perhaps then, in a highly female dominated setting such as sorority, the tendency for women to use a more democratic and participative style would increases. If this were true, then it would make sense that sorority leaders might tend more towards Types Two and Six, and presidential men would embody the qualities of the more directive, assertive, and powerful Type Eight.
Utility of the Enneagram Model

One of the major goals of this research was to evaluate the Enneagram as a tool that could be used to predict and assess leadership in general as well as effective presidential leadership. Though there are researchers that criticize a purely trait driven typology approach in regard to assessing presidential performance (George & George, 1998, p. 24), the results of this research offer compelling evidence for the use of the Enneagram as means of a presidential leadership assessment. Through various analyses including mean comparisons, difference scores, uniqueness ratings, and correlational connections to other theories of presidential personality and success, we found the Enneagram to have high utility. There is great potential for the Enneagram to be used as a means of discussing the similarities and differences of presidential personality as well as the differences in personality between successful and unsuccessful presidents.

Limitations and Further Directions

For Study 1, a possible limitation is that the self-reporting Likert results may have self-presentational effects. Participants may have scored themselves higher on a Type they found to be more likeable or socially desirable and/or scored themselves lower on a Type they did not like or felt was not socially desirable. Similarly, as for the RHETI, it is possible that participants answered according to what they preferred as opposed to what really described them. Another limitation is that all participants completed the 72-item RHETI before reading the short descriptions and self-reporting with the Likert. In hindsight, I would have liked to have asked half of the participants complete the RHETI first and the other half to complete the Likert first.
As mentioned in the discussion, another possible limitation is that since participants knew the study was being distributed to only other sorority women they may have been primed to answer in accordance to their beliefs and assumptions about sorority norms or gender norms. Though the results compared nicely with those from Study 2, it would be interesting to expand Study 1 further to include fraternity groups or even other campus groups.

For Study 2, it would have been interesting to study more presidents using more participants, but that would have required more time and money. Additionally, it would have been nice to ask participants further questions about the leaders they had read about. It would have been interesting to have results that showed how likeable, assertive, charismatic, etc., each of the Presidents seemed to the participants. Another limitation regarding the participants is that they were all female Jepson students and therefore may have perceived the leaders differently or rated them differently than male students would have.

One large limitation for this study is the lack of attention given to the Levels of Development within the Enneagram. Experts at the Enneagram Institute as well as Dr. Joel Rothaizer, mentioned that understanding a person’s Level of Development is very important to a discussion on presidential effectiveness (K. Taylor, Personal Communication, November 8, 2010). Incorporating a measure to assess the Level of Development was beyond the scope of this research, but this could be an interesting direction to take this research in the future. Dr. Rothaizer suggested a method that we had considered in the early stages of research but for various reasons chose not to pursue. It would involve asking experts on presidential personality to complete the RHETI on behalf of a president and then determine at which Level of Development the president was functioning.
As with many things, if there was only more time, we could have explored much greater depths of analysis. If time permitted we would have liked to continue exploring the statistical relationships between various presidents on certain types as well as made individual comparisons between highly ranked presidents and poorly ranked presidents.
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APPENDIX A
Study 1 _Consent Form

Informed Consent Form

Study Purpose:
The purpose of this study is to learn more about personality as it pertains to a particular model that is being disguised in order to control the experiment.

Benefits and Risks to Subjects:
There are no risks for subjects in completing this survey though there is the possible benefit of becoming more self-aware and interested in personality testing.

Information on the Principal Investigator (including contact information).
Carly Cameron
Email: carly.cameron@richmond.edu
Cell: 978-501-0831

Voluntary Participation.
Participation in the study is voluntary and you can withdraw at any time without penalty.

How the Data will be Used?
The Data gathered in this study will be used to assist in the defense of a Senior Honors Thesis in the Jepson School of Leadership Studies.

a. Confidentiality. Results from the survey are completely confidential and anonymous. Your name will not be linked to the results in the survey in any way.

b. Participants’ Rights Information. Participants can contact the Chair of the University of Richmond IRB at rjomas@richmond.edu or (804) 484-1565 in the event that they have any questions regarding their role as a research subject.

c. Participant’s Consent.
The study has been described to me and I understand that my participation is voluntary and that I may discontinue my participation at any time without penalty. I understand that my responses will be treated confidentially and used only for the purpose of thesis research. I understand that if I have any questions, I can pose them to the Carly Cameron. I have read and understand the above information and by clicking on ‘Submit’ and taking this online survey I am providing my consent to participate and I attest that I am over 18 years of age.
Instructions to complete survey for Study 1:

The following survey is a forced-choice psychological test, which requires you to choose one statement in each pair of statements that describes you best. For each pair of statements, select the statement that applies to you MOST OF YOUR LIFE. Do not over-analyze the questions, or try to think of "exceptions to the rule." Be spontaneous and choose the statement that comes closest to the way you have been most of the time, most of your life.

Occasionally there will be questions that ask you to make a close call between two choices. This is because the test is trying to discriminate areas where you have similar behaviors or attitudes.

If a question is very close and you can't decide which statement applies to you best, you can come back to it after you have completed the other questions, but before you hit the SCORE button.

It usually takes about 20 minutes to complete this personality test.

1. I've been
   ○ I've been romantic and imaginative  *
   ○ pragmatic and down to earth

2. I have tended to
   ○ I have tended to take on confrontations  *
   ○ avoid confrontations

3. I have typically been
   ○ I have typically been diplomatic, charming, and ambitious.
   ○ direct, formal, and idealistic

4. I have tended to be
   ○ I have tended to be focused and intense.
   ○ spontaneous and fun loving

5. I have been a
   ○ I have been a hospitable person and have enjoyed welcoming new friends into my life.
   ○ private person and have not mixed much with others
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6. It's been
   - It's been difficult for me to relax and stop worrying about potential problems.
   - difficult for me to get myself worked up about potential problems.

7. I've been more of a
   - I've been more of a "street-smart" survivor.
   - "high-minded" idealist.

8. I've have
   - I've have needed to show affection to people.
   - preferred to maintain a certain distance with people.

9. When presented with a new experience, I've usually asked myself if it would be
   - When presented with a new experience, I've usually asked myself if it would be useful to me.
   - enjoyable.

10. I have tended to focus too much on
    - I have tended to focus too much on myself.
    - others.

11. Others have depended on my
    - Others have depended on my insight and knowledge.
    - strength and decisiveness.

12. I have come across as being too
    - I have come across as being too unsure of myself.
    - sure of myself.

13. I have been more
    - I have been more relationship-oriented than goal-oriented.
    - goal-oriented than relationship-oriented.

14. I have
    - I have not been able to speak up for myself very well.
    - been outspoken—I've said what others wished they had the nerve to say.
15. It's been difficult for me to
○ It's been difficult for me to stop considering alternatives and do something definite.
○ take it easy and be more flexible.

16. I have tended to be
○ I have tended to be hesitant and procrastinating.
○ bold and domineering.

17. My
○ My reluctance to get too involved has gotten me into trouble with people.
○ eagerness to have people depend on me has gotten me into trouble with them.

18. Usually, I have
○ Usually, I have been able to put my feelings aside to get the job done.
○ needed to work through my feelings before I could act.

19. Generally, I have been
○ Generally, I have been methodical and cautious.
○ adventurous and taken risks.

20. I have tended to be a
○ I have tended to be a supportive, giving person who enjoys the company of others.
○ serious, reserved person who likes discussing issues.

21. I've often felt the need to
○ I've often felt the need to be a "pillar of strength."
○ perform perfectly.

22. I've typically been interested in
○ I've typically been interested in asking tough questions and maintaining my independence.
○ maintaining my stability and peace of mind.

23. I've been
○ I've been a bit cynical and skeptical.
○ mushy and sentimental.
24. I've often worried that
   - I've often worried that I'm missing out on something better.
   - if I let down my guard, someone will take advantage of me.

25. My habit of
   - My habit of being "stand-offish" has annoyed people.
   - telling people what to do has annoyed people.

26. I have tended
   - I have tended to get anxious if there was too much excitement and stimulation.
   - to get anxious if there wasn't enough excitement and stimulation.

27. I have
   - I have depended upon my friends and they have known that they can depend on me.
   - not depended on people; I have done things on my own.

28. I have tended to be
   - I have tended to be detached and preoccupied.
   - moody and self-absorbed.

29. I have liked to
   - I have liked to challenge people and "shake them up."
   - comfort people and calm them down.

30. I have generally been an
   - I have generally been an outgoing, sociable person.
   - earnest, self-disciplined person.

31. I've wanted to
   - I've wanted to "fit in" with others—I get uncomfortable when I stand out too much.
   - stand out from others—I get uncomfortable when I don't distinguish myself.

32. Choose the most fitting description
   - Choose the most fitting description Pursuing my personal interests has been more important to me than having comfort and security.
   - Having comfort and security has been more important to me than pursuing my personal interests.
33. When I've had conflict with others, I've
   ○ When I've had conflict with others, I've tended to withdraw.
   ○ rarely backed down.
   *
34. I have
   ○ I have given in too easily and let others push me around.
   ○ been too uncompromising and demanding with others.
   *
35. I've been appreciated for my
   ○ I've been appreciated for my unsinkable spirit and resourcefulness.
   ○ deep caring and personal warmth.
   *
36. I have
   ○ I have wanted to make a favorable impression on others.
   ○ cared little about making a favorable impression on others.
   *
37. I've depended on my
   ○ I've depended on my perseverance and common sense
   ○ imagination and moments of inspiration.
   *
38. Basically, I have been
   ○ Basically, I have been easy-going and agreeable.
   ○ hard-driving and assertive.
   *
39. Choose the most fitting description.
   ○ Choose the most fitting description. I have worked hard to be accepted and well-liked.
   ○ Being accepted and well-liked has not been a high priority for me.
   *
40. In reaction to pressure from others, I have become more
   ○ In reaction to pressure from others, I have become more withdrawn.
   ○ assertive.
   *
41. People have been interested in me because I've been
   ○ People have been interested in me because I've been outgoing, engaging and interested in them.
   ○ quiet, unusual, and deep.
   *
42. Choose the most fitting description.
- Choose the most fitting description. Duty and responsibility have been important values for me.
- Harmony and acceptance have been important values for me.

43. I've tried to motivate people by
- I've tried to motivate people by making big plans and big promises.
- pointing out the consequences of not following my advice.

44. I have
- I have seldom been emotionally demonstrative.
- often been emotionally demonstrative.

45. Choose the most fitting description.
- Choose the most fitting description. Dealing with details has not been one of my strong suits.
- I have excelled at dealing with details.

46. I have often emphasized how
- I have often emphasized how different I am from most people, especially my family.
- much I have in common with most people, especially my family.

47. When situations have gotten heated, I have tended to
- When situations have gotten heated, I have tended to stay on the sidelines.
- get right into the middle of things.

48. I have
- I have stood by my friend, even when they have been wrong.
- not wanted to compromise what is right even for friendship.

49. I've been
- I've been a well-meaning supporter.
- a highly motivated go-getter.

50. When troubled, I have tended to
- When troubled, I have tended to brood about my problems.
- find distractions for myself.
51. Generally, I've had
- strong convictions and a sense of how things should be.
- serious doubts and have questioned how things seemed to be.

52. I've created problems with others by being
- pessimistic and complaining.
- bossy and controlling.

53. I have tended
- to act on my feelings and let the "chips fall where they may".
- not to act on my feelings lets they stir up more problems.

54. Being the center of attention has usually felt
- natural to me.
- strange to me.

55. I've been
- careful, and have tried to prepare for unforeseen problems.
- spontaneous, and have preferred to improvise as problems come up.

56. I have gotten angry when others
- have not shown enough appreciation for what I have done for them.
- have not listened to what I have told them.

57. Being
- independent and self-reliant has been important to me.
- valued and admired has been important to me.

58. When I've debated with friends, I've tended to
- press my arguments forcefully.
- let things go to prevent hard feelings.

59. I've often
- been possessive of loved ones--I have troubled letting them be.
- "tested" loved ones to see if they were really there for me.
60. Choose the most fitting description.
   ○ Choose the most fitting description. Organizing resources and making things happen has been one of my major strengths.
   ○ Coming up with new ideas and getting people excited about them has been one of my major strengths.
   *

61. I've tended
   ○ I've tended to be driven and very hard on myself.
   ○ to be too emotional and rather undisciplined.
   *

62. I have tried to keep my life
   ○ I have tried to keep my life fast-paced, intense, and exciting.
   ○ regular, stable, and peaceful.
   *

63. Even though I've had
   ○ Even though I've had successes, I've tended to doubt my abilities.
   ○ setbacks, I've had a lot of confidence in my abilities.
   *

64. I generally have tended
   ○ I generally have tended to dwell on my feelings and to hold onto them for a long time.
   ○ to minimize my feelings and not pay very much attention to them.
   *

65. I have provided many people
   ○ I have provided many people with attention and nurturance.
   ○ direction and motivation.
   *

66. I've been a bit
   ○ I've been a bit serious and strict with myself
   ○ free-wheeling and permissive with myself.
   *

67. I've been
   ○ I've been self-assertive and driven to excel.
   ○ modest and have been happy to go at my own pace.
   *

68. I have been proud of my
   ○ I have been proud of my clarity and objectivity.
   ○ reliability and commitment.
   *
69. I have
- I have spent a lot of time looking inward—understanding my feelings has been important to me.
- not spent much time looking inward—getting things done has been important to me.

70. Generally, I have thought of myself
- Generally, I have thought of myself as a sunny, casual person.
- serious, dignified person.

71. I've had
- I've had an agile mind and boundless energy
- a caring heart and deep dedication.

72. I have
- I have pursued activities that had a substantial potential for reward and personal recognition.
- been willing to give up reward and personal recognition if it meant doing work I was really interested in.

Done

Powered by SurveyMonkey
Create your own free online survey now!
Please read through all of the following descriptions and rate yourself according to each Type on a scale of 1 to 7 with 1 meaning it does not describe you at all and 7 meaning it describes you extremely well. For example, after you read Type One, if you feel it describes you perfectly you will write the number 7 in the box provided.

* 1. Type "Ones" are conscientious and ethical, with a strong sense of right and wrong. They are teachers, crusaders, and advocates for change: always striving to improve things, but afraid of making a mistake. Well-organized, orderly, and fastidious, they try to maintain high standards, but can slip into being critical and perfectionist. They typically have problems with resentment and impatience. At their Best: wise, discerning, realistic, and noble. Can be morally heroic.

- Basic Fear: Of being corrupt/evil, defective
- Basic Desire: To be good, to have integrity, to be balanced

Key Motivations: Want to be right, to strive higher and improve everything, to be consistent with their ideals, to justify themselves, to be beyond criticism so as not to be condemned by anyone.

* 2. Type "Twos" are empathetic, sincere, and warm-hearted. They are friendly, generous, and self-sacrificing, but can also be sentimental, flattering, and people-pleasing. They are well-meaning and driven to be close to others, but can slip into doing things for others in order to be needed. They typically have problems with possessiveness and with acknowledging their own needs. At their Best: unselfish and altruistic, they have unconditional love for others.

- Basic Fear: Of being unwanted, unworthy of being loved
- Basic Desire: To feel loved
Key Motivations: Want to be loved, to express their feelings for others, to be needed and appreciated, to get others to respond to them, to vindicate their claims about themselves.

* 3. Type "Threes" are self-assured, attractive, and charming. Ambitious, competent, and energetic, they can also be status-conscious and highly driven for advancement. They are diplomatic and poised, but can also be overly concerned with their image and what others think of them. They typically have problems with workaholism and competitiveness. At their Best: self-accepting, authentic, everything they seem to be—role models who inspire others.

• Basic Fear: Of being worthless
• Basic Desire: To feel valuable and worthwhile

Key Motivations: Want to be affirmed, to distinguish themselves from others, to have attention, to be admired, and to impress others.

* 4. Type "Fours" are self-aware, sensitive, and reserved. They are emotionally honest, creative, and personal, but can also be moody and self-conscious. Withholding themselves from others due to feeling vulnerable and defective, they can also feel disdainful and exempt from ordinary ways of living. They typically have problems with melancholy, self-indulgence, and self-pity. At their Best: inspired and highly creative, they are able to renew themselves and transform their experiences.

• Basic Fear: That they have no identity or personal significance
• Basic Desire: To find themselves and their significance (to create an identity)

Key Motivations: Want to express themselves and their individuality, to create and surround themselves with beauty, to maintain certain moods and feelings, to withdraw to protect their self-image, to take care of emotional needs before attending to anything else, to attract a "rescuer."
5. Type "Fives" are alert, insightful, and curious. They are able to concentrate and focus on developing complex ideas and skills. Independent, innovative, and inventive, they can also become preoccupied with their thoughts and imaginary constructs. They become detached, yet high-strung and intense. They typically have problems with eccentricity, nihilism, and isolation. At their Best: visionary pioneers, often ahead of their time, and able to see the world in an entirely new way.

- Basic Fear: Being useless, helpless, or incapable
- Basic Desire: To be capable and competent

Key Motivations: Want to possess knowledge, to understand the environment, to have everything figured out as a way of defending the self from threats from the environment.

6. The committed, security-oriented type. Type "Sixes" are reliable, hard-working, responsible, and trustworthy. Excellent "troubleshooters," they foresee problems and foster cooperation, but can also become defensive, evasive, and anxious—running on stress while complaining about it. They can be cautious and indecisive, but also reactive, defiant and rebellious. They typically have problems with self-doubt and suspicion. At their Best: internally stable and self-reliant, courageously championing themselves and others.

- Basic Fear: Of being without support and guidance
- Basic Desire: To have security and support

Key Motivations: Want to have security, to feel supported by others, to have certitude and reassurance, to test the attitudes of others toward them, to fight against anxiety and insecurity.
7. Sevens are extroverted, optimistic, versatile, and spontaneous. Playful, high-spirited, and practical, they can also misapply their many talents, becoming overextended, scattered, and undisciplined. They constantly seek new and exciting experiences, but can become distracted and exhausted by staying on the go. They typically have problems with impatience and impulsiveness. At their Best: they focus their talents on worthwhile goals, becoming appreciative, joyous, and satisfied.

- Basic Fear: Of being deprived and in pain
- Basic Desire: To be satisfied and content—to have their needs fulfilled

Key Motivations: Want to maintain their freedom and happiness, to avoid missing out on worthwhile experiences, to keep themselves excited and occupied, to avoid and discharge pain.

8. Type "Eights" are self-confident, strong, and assertive. Protective, resourceful, straight-talking, and decisive, but can also be ego-centric and domineering. Eights feel they must control their environment, especially people, sometimes becoming confrontational and intimidating. Eights typically have problems with their tempers and with allowing themselves to be vulnerable. At their Best: self-mastering, they use their strength to improve others' lives, becoming heroic, magnanimous, and inspiring.

- Basic Fear: Of being harmed or controlled by others
- Basic Desire: To protect themselves (to be in control of their own life and destiny)

Key Motivations: Want to be self-reliant, to prove their strength and resist weakness, to be important in their world, to dominate the environment, and to stay in control of their situation.
9. Type "Nines" are accepting, trusting, and stable. They are usually creative, optimistic, and supportive, but can also be too willing to go along with others to keep the peace. They want everything to go smoothly and be without conflict, but they can also tend to be complacent, simplifying problems and minimizing anything upsetting. They typically have problems with inertia and stubbornness. At their Best: indomitable and all-embracing, they are able to bring people together and heal conflicts.

- Basic Fear: Of loss and separation
- Basic Desire: To have inner stability "peace of mind"

- Key Motivations: Want to create harmony in their environment, to avoid conflicts and tension, to preserve things as they are, to resist whatever would upset or disturb them.

10. Please choose just one of the Nine Personality Types that you feel describes you best overall.
APPENDIX D
Study 2 _ Consent Form

Informed Consent Form

Study Purpose:
The purpose of this study is to learn more about the relationship between leadership and a particular personality model that is being disguised in order to control the experiment.

Benefits and Risks to Subjects:
There are no risks for subjects in completing this survey though there is the possible benefit of becoming more interested in personality testing.

Information on the Principal Investigator (including contact information).
Carly Cameron
Email: carly.cameron@richmond.edu
Cell: 978-501-0831

Voluntary Participation.
Participation in the study is voluntary and you can withdraw at any time without penalty.

How the Data will be Used?
The Data gathered in this study will be used to assist in the defense of a Senior Honors Thesis in the Jepson School of Leadership Studies.

a. Confidentiality. Results from the study are completely confidential and anonymous. Your name will not be linked to the results for the study in any way.

b. Participants’ Rights Information. Participants can contact the Chair of the University of Richmond IRB at rjonas@richmond.edu or (804) 484-1565 in the event that they have any questions regarding their role as a research subject.

c. Participant’s Consent.
The study has been described to me and I understand that my participation is voluntary and that I may discontinue my participation at any time without penalty. I understand that my responses will be treated confidentially and used only for the purpose of thesis research. I understand that if I have any questions, I can pose them to the Carly Cameron. I have read and understand the above information and by signing below I am providing my consent to participate and I attest that I am over 18 years of age.

X
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APPENDIX E
Study 2_Enneagram Long Descriptions

TYPE 1

Ones have a “sense of mission” that leads them to want to improve the world in various ways, using whatever degree of influence they have. They strive to overcome adversity—particularly moral adversity—so that the human spirit can shine through and make a difference. They strive after “higher values,” even at the cost of great personal sacrifice.

History is full of Ones who have left comfortable lives to do something extraordinary because they felt that something higher was calling them. The idealism of each of Ones has inspired millions.

Ones are people of practical action—they wish to be useful in the best sense of the word. On some level of consciousness, they feel that they “have a mission” to fulfill in life, if only to try their best to reduce the disorder they see in their environment.

Although Ones have a strong sense of purpose, they also typically feel that they have to justify their actions to themselves, and often to others as well. This orientation causes Ones to spend a lot of time thinking about the consequences of their actions, as well as about how to keep from acting contrary to their convictions. Because of this, Ones often persuade themselves that they are “head” types, rationalists who proceed only on logic and objective truth. But, the real picture is somewhat different: Ones are actually activists who are searching for an acceptable rationale for what they feel they must do. They are people of instinct and passion who use convictions and judgments to control and direct themselves and their actions.

In the effort to stay true to their principles, Ones resist being affected by their instinctual drives, consciously not giving in to them or expressing them too freely. The result is a personality type that has problems with repression, resistance, and aggression. They are usually seen by others as highly self-controlled, even rigid, although this is not how Ones experience themselves. It seems to them that they are sitting on a cauldron of passions and desires, and they had better “keep the lid on” lest they and everyone else around them regret it.

Ones believe that being strict with themselves (and eventually becoming “perfect”) will justify them in their own eyes and in the eyes of others. But by attempting to create their own brand of perfection, they often create their own personal hell. It is difficult for Ones to trust their inner guidance—indeed, to trust life—so Ones come to rely heavily on their superego, a learned voice from their childhood, to guide them toward “the greater good” which they so passionately seek. When Ones have gotten completely entranced in their personality, there is little distinction between them and this severe, unforgiving voice. Separating from it and seeing its genuine strengths and limitations is what growth for Ones is about.
TYPE 2

People of this type are either the most genuinely helpful to other people or, when they are less healthy, they are the most highly invested in seeing themselves as helpful. Being generous and going out of their way for others makes Twos feel that theirs is the richest, most meaningful way to live. The love and concern they feel—and the genuine good they do—warms their hearts and makes them feel worthwhile. Twos are most interested in what they feel to be the “really, really good” things in life—love, closeness, sharing, family, and friendship.

When Twos are healthy and in balance, they really are loving, helpful, generous, and considerate. People are drawn to them like bees to honey. Healthy Twos warm others in the glow of their hearts. They enliven others with their appreciation and attention, helping people to see positive qualities in themselves that they had not previously recognized. In short, healthy Twos are the embodiment of “the good parent” that everyone wishes they had: someone who sees them as they are, understands them with immense compassion, helps and encourages with infinite patience, and is always willing to lend a hand—while knowing precisely how and when to let go. Healthy Twos open our hearts because theirs are already so open and they show us the way to be more deeply and richly human.

However, Twos’ inner development may be limited by their “shadow side”—pride, self-deception, the tendency to become over-involved in the lives of others, and the tendency to manipulate others to get their own emotional needs met. Transformational work entails going into dark places in ourselves, and this very much goes against the grain of the Two’s personality structure, which prefers to see itself in only the most positive, glowing terms.

Perhaps the biggest obstacle facing Twos, Threes, and Fours in their inner work is having to face their underlying Center fear of worthlessness. Beneath the surface, all three types fear that they are without value in themselves, and so they must be or do something extraordinary in order to win love and acceptance from others. In the average to unhealthy Levels, Twos present a false image of being completely generous and unselfish and of not wanting any kind of pay-off for themselves, when in fact, they can have enormous expectations and unacknowledged emotional needs.

Average to unhealthy Twos seek validation of their worth by obeying their superego’s demands to sacrifice themselves for others. They believe they must always put others first and be loving and unselfish if they want to get love. The problem is that “putting others first” makes Twos secretly angry and resentful, feelings they work hard to repress or deny. Nevertheless, they eventually erupt in various ways, disrupting Twos’ relationships and revealing the inauthenticity of many of the average to unhealthy Two’s claims about themselves and the depth of their “love.”

TYPE 3

When they are healthy, Threes really can and do achieve great things in the world. They are the "stars" of human nature, and people often look up to them because of their graciousness and personal accomplishments. Healthy Threes know how good it feels to develop themselves and contribute their abilities to the world, and also enjoy motivating others to greater personal achievements than others thought they were capable of. They are usually well regarded and popular among their peers, the type of person who is frequently voted “class president” or “home coming queen” because people feel they want to be associated with this kind of person who acts as a stand-in for them. Healthy Threes embody the best in a culture, and others are able to see their hopes and dreams mirrored in them.

Threes are often successful and well liked because, of all the types, they most believe in themselves and in developing their talents and capacities. Threes act as living “role models” and paragons because of their extraordinary embodiment of socially valued qualities. Healthy Threes know that they are worth the
effort it takes to be “the best that they can be.” Their success at doing so inspires others to invest in their own self-development.

Threes want to make sure their lives are a success, however that is defined by their family, their culture and their social sphere. In some families, success means having a lot of money, a grand house, a new, expensive car, and other status symbols. Others value ideas, and success to them means distinguishing oneself in academic or scientific worlds. Success in other circles might mean becoming famous as an actor, or model, or writer, or as a public figure of some kind, perhaps as a politician. Threes will try to become somebody noteworthy in their family and their community. They will not be a “nobody.”

To this end, Threes learn to perform in ways that will garner them praise and positive attention. As children, they learned to recognize the activities that were valued by their parents or peers, and put their energies into excelling in those activities. Threes also learned how to cultivate and develop whatever about them is attractive or potentially impressive.

Threes want success not so much for the things that success will buy (like Sevens), or for the power and feeling of independence that it will bring (like Eights). They want success because they are afraid of disappearing into a chasm of emptiness and worthlessness: without the increased attention and feeling of accomplishment which success usually brings, Threes fear that they are nobody and have no value.

Threes can become alienated from themselves and no longer know what they truly want, or what their real feelings or interests are. In this state, they are easy prey to self-deception, deceit, and falseness of all kinds. Thus, the deeper problem is that their search for a way to be value increasingly takes them further away from their own Essential Self with its core of real value. It is as if they “put their feelings in a box” so that they can get ahead with what they want to achieve. Threes have come to believe that emotions get in the way of their performance, so they substitute thinking and practical action for feelings.

TYPE 4

Fours maintain their identity by seeing themselves as fundamentally different from others. Fours feel that they are unlike other human beings, and consequently, that no one can understand them or love them adequately. They often see themselves as uniquely talented, possessing special, one-of-a-kind gifts, but also as uniquely disadvantaged or flawed. More than any other type, Fours are acutely aware of and focused on their personal differences and deficiencies.

Healthy Fours are honest with themselves: they own all of their feelings and can look at their motives, contradictions, and emotional conflicts without denying or whitewashing them. They may not necessarily like what they discover, but they do not try to rationalize their states, nor do they try to hide them from themselves or others. They are not afraid to see themselves “warts and all.” Healthy Fours are willing to reveal highly personal and potentially shameful things about themselves because they are determined to understand the truth of their experience—so that they can discover who they are and come to terms with their emotional history. This ability also enables Fours to endure suffering with a quiet strength. Their familiarity with their own darker nature makes it easier for them to process painful experiences that might overwhelm other types.

Nevertheless, Fours often report that they feel they are missing something in themselves, although they may have difficulty identifying exactly what that “something” is. Is it will power? Social ease? Self-confidence? Emotional tranquility?—all of which they see in others, seemingly in abundance. Given time and sufficient perspective, Fours generally recognize that they are unsure about aspects of their self-image—their personality or ego-structure itself. They feel that they lack a clear and stable identity, particularly a social persona that they feel comfortable with.
While it is true that Fours often feel different from others, they do not really want to be alone. They may feel socially awkward or self-conscious, but they deeply wish to connect with people who understand them and their feelings. The “romantics” of the Enneagram, they long for someone to come into their lives and appreciate the secret self that they have privately nurtured and hidden from the world. If, over time, such validation remains out of reach, Fours begin to build their identity around how unlike everyone else they are. The outsider therefore comforts herself by becoming an insistent individualist: everything must be done on her own, in her own way, on her own terms. Fours’ mantra becomes “I am myself. Nobody understands me. I am different and special,” while they secretly wish they could enjoy the easiness and confidence that others seem to enjoy.

Fours typically have problems with a negative self-image and chronically low self-esteem. They attempt to compensate for this by cultivating a Fantasy Self—an idealized self-image that is built up primarily in their imaginations.

In the course of their lives, Fours may try several different identities on for size, basing them on styles, preferences, or qualities they find attractive in others. But underneath the surface, they still feel uncertain about who they really are. The problem is that they base their identity largely on their feelings. When Fours look inward they see a kaleidoscopic, ever-shifting pattern of emotional reactions. Indeed, Fours accurately perceive a truth about human nature—that it is dynamic and ever changing. But because they want to create a stable, reliable identity from their emotions, they attempt to cultivate only certain feelings while rejecting others. Some feelings are seen as “me,” while others are “not me.” By attempting to hold on to specific moods and express others, Fours believe that they are being true to themselves.

One of the biggest challenges Fours face is learning to let go of feelings from the past; they tend to nurse wounds and hold onto negative feelings about those who have hurt them. Indeed, Fours can become so attached to longing and disappointment that they are unable to recognize the many treasures in their lives. As long as they believe that there is something fundamentally wrong with them, they cannot allow themselves to experience or enjoy their many good qualities. To acknowledge their good qualities would be to lose their sense of identity (as a suffering victim) and to be without a relatively consistent personal identity (their Basic Fear). Fours grow by learning to see that much of their story is not true—or at least it is not true any more. The old feelings begin to fall away once they stop telling themselves their old tale: it is irrelevant to who they are right now.

**TYPE 5**

Fives want to find out why things are the way they are. They want to understand how the world works, whether it is the cosmos, the microscopic world, the animal, vegetable, or mineral kingdoms—or the inner world of their imaginations. They are always searching, asking questions, and delving into things in depth. They do not accept received opinions and doctrines, feeling a strong need to test the truth of most assumptions for themselves.

Behind Fives’ relentless pursuit of knowledge are deep insecurities about their ability to function successfully in the world. *Fives feel that they do not have an ability to do things as well as others.* But rather than engage directly with activities that might bolster their confidence, Fives “take a step back” into their minds where they feel more capable. Their belief is that from the safety of their minds they will eventually figure out how to do things—and one day rejoin the world.
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Fives spend a lot of time observing and contemplating—listening to the sounds of wind or of a synthesizer, or taking notes on the activities in an anthill in their back yard. As they immerse themselves in their observations, they begin to internalize their knowledge and gain a feeling of self-confidence. They can then go out and play a piece on the synthesizer or tell people what they know about ants. They may also stumble across exciting new information or make new creative combinations (playing a piece of music based on recordings of wind and water). When they get verification of their observations and hypotheses, or see that others understand their work, it is a confirmation of their competency, and this fulfills their Basic Desire. ("You know what you are talking about.")

Knowledge, understanding, and insight are thus highly valued by Fives, because their identity is built around “having ideas” and being someone who has something unusual and insightful to say. For this reason, Fives are not interested in exploring what is already familiar and well-established; rather, their attention is drawn to the unusual, the overlooked, the secret, the occult, the bizarre, the fantastic, the “unthinkable.” Investigating "unknown territory”—knowing something that others do not know, or creating something that no one has ever experienced—allows Fives to have a niche for themselves that no one else occupies. They believe that developing this niche is the best way that they can attain independence and confidence.

Thus, for their own security and self-esteem, Fives need to have at least one area in which they have a degree of expertise that will allow them to feel capable and connected with the world. Fives think, “I am going to find something that I can do really well, and then I will be able to meet the challenges of life. But I can’t have other things distracting me or getting in the way.” They therefore develop an intense focus on whatever they can master and feel secure about. It may be the world of mathematics, or the world of rock and roll, or classical music, or car mechanics, or horror and science fiction, or a world entirely created in their imagination. Not all Fives are scholars or Ph.Ds. But, depending on their intelligence and the resources available to them, they focus intensely on mastering something that has captured their interest.

For better or worse, the areas that Fives explore do not depend on social validation; indeed, if others agree with their ideas too readily, Fives tend to fear that their ideas might be too conventional. History is full of famous Fives who overturned accepted ways of understanding or doing things (Darwin, Einstein, Nietzsche). Many more Fives, however, have become lost in the Byzantine complexities of their own thought processes, becoming merely eccentric and socially isolated.

The intense focus of Fives can thus lead to remarkable discoveries and innovations, but when the personality is more fixated, it can also create self-defeating problems. This is because their focus of attention unwittingly serves to distract them from their most pressing practical problems. Whatever the sources of their anxieties may be—relationships, lack of physical strength, inability to gain employment, and so forth—average Fives tend not to deal with these issues. Rather, they find something else to do that will make them feel more competent. The irony is that no matter what degree of mastery they develop in their area of expertise, this cannot solve their more basic insecurities about functioning in the world. For example, as a marine biologist, a Five could learn everything there is to know about a type of shellfish, but if her fear is that she is never going to be able to run her own household adequately, she will not have solved her underlying anxiety.

Thus, much of their time gets spent "collecting" and developing ideas and skills they believe will make them feel confident and prepared. They want to retain everything that they have learned and “carry it around in their heads.” The problem is that while they are engrossed in this process, they are not interacting with others or even increasing many other practical and social skills. They devote more and more time to collecting and attending to their collections, less to anything related to their real needs.
Thus, the challenge to Fives is to understand that they can pursue whatever questions or problems spark their imaginations and maintain relationships, take proper care of themselves, and do all of the things that are the hallmarks of a healthy life.

**TYPE 6**

Sixes are the most loyal to their friends and to their beliefs. They will “go down with the ship” and hang on to relationships of all kinds far longer than most other types. Sixes are also loyal to ideas, systems, and beliefs—even to the belief that all ideas or authorities should be questioned or defied. Indeed, not all Sixes go along with the “status quo”: their beliefs may be rebellious and anti-authoritarian, even revolutionary. In any case, they will typically fight for their beliefs more fiercely than they will fight for themselves, and they will defend their community or family more tenaciously than they will defend themselves.

The reason Sixes are so loyal to others is that they do not want to be abandoned and left without support—their Basic Fear. Thus, the central issue for type Six is a failure of self-confidence. Sixes come to believe that they do not possess the internal resources to handle life’s challenges and vagaries alone, and so increasingly rely on structures, allies, beliefs, and supports outside themselves for guidance to survive. If suitable structures do not exist, they will help create and maintain them.

Sixes have the most trouble contacting their own inner guidance. As a result, they do not have confidence in their own minds and judgments. This does not mean that they do not think. On the contrary, they think—and worry—a lot! They also tend to fear making important decisions, although at the same time, they resist having anyone else make decisions for them. They want to avoid being controlled, but are also afraid of taking responsibility in a way that might put them “in the line of fire.” (The old Japanese adage that says, “The blade of grass that grows too high gets chopped off” relates to this idea.)

Sixes are always aware of their anxieties and are always looking for ways to construct “social security” bulwarks against them. If Sixes feel that they have sufficient back up, they can move forward with some degree of confidence. But if that crumbles, they become anxious and self-doubting, reawakening their Basic Fear. (“I’m on my own! What am I going to do now?”) A good question for Sixes might therefore be: “When will I know that I have enough security?” Or, to get right to the heart of it, “What is security?” Without Essential inner guidance and the deep sense of support that it brings, Sixes are constantly struggling to find firm ground.

Sixes attempt to build a network of trust over a background of unsteadiness and fear. They are often filled with a nameless anxiety and then try to find or create reasons why. Wanting to feel that there is something solid and clear-cut in their lives, they can become attached to explanations or positions that seem to explain their situation. Because “belief” (trust, faith, convictions, positions) is difficult for Sixes to achieve, and because it is so important to their sense of stability, once they establish a trustworthy belief, they do not easily question it, nor do they want others to do so. The same is true for individuals in a Six’s life: once Sixes feel they can trust someone, they go to great lengths to maintain connections with the person who acts as a sounding board, a mentor, or a regulator for the Six’s emotional reactions and behavior. They therefore do everything in their power to keep their affiliations going. (“If I don’t trust myself, then I have to find something in this world I can trust.”)

Until they can get in touch with their own inner guidance, Sixes are like a ping-pong ball that is constantly shuttling back and forth between whatever influence is hitting the hardest in any given moment. Because of this reactivity, no matter what we say about Sixes, the opposite is often also as true. They are both strong and weak, fearful and courageous, trusting and distrusting, defenders and provokers,
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sweet and sour, aggressive and passive, bullies and weaklings, on the defensive and on the offensive, thinkers and doers, group people and soloists, believers and doubters, cooperative and obstructionistic, tender and mean, generous and petty—and on and on. It is the contradictory picture that is the characteristic "fingerprint" of Sixes, the fact that they are a bundle of opposites. The biggest problem for Sixes is that they try to build safety in the environment without resolving their own emotional insecurities. When they learn to face their anxieties, however, Sixes understand that although the world is always changing and is, by nature uncertain, they can be serene and courageous in any circumstance. And they can attain the greatest gift of all, a sense of peace with themselves despite the uncertainties of life.

**TYPE 7**

Sevens are enthusiastic about almost everything that catches their attention. They approach life with curiosity, optimism, and a sense of adventure, like "kids in a candy store" who look at the world in wide-eyed, rapt anticipation of all the good things they are about to experience. They are bold and vivacious, pursuing what they want in life with a cheerful determination. They have a quality best described by the Yiddish word "chutzpah"—a kind of brash "nerviness."

Sevens tend to be extremely practical and engaged in a multitude of projects at any given time. Their thinking is *anticipatory*; they foresee events and generate ideas "on the fly," favoring activities that stimulate their minds—which in turn generate more things to do and think about. Sevens are not necessarily intellectual or studious by any standard definition, although they are often intelligent and can be widely read and highly verbal. Their minds move rapidly from one idea to the next, making Sevens gifted at brainstorming and synthesizing information. Sevens are exhilarated by the rush of ideas and by the pleasure of being spontaneous, preferring broad overviews and the excitement of the initial stages of the creative process to probing a single topic in depth.

Sevens are frequently endowed with quick, agile minds, and can be exceptionally fast learners. This is true both of their ability to absorb information (language, facts, and procedures) and their ability to learn new manual skills—they tend to have excellent mind-body coordination, and manual dexterity (typewriting, piano playing, tennis). All of this can combine to make a Seven into the quintessential "Renaissance person."

Ironically, Sevens' wide-ranging curiosity and ability to learn quickly can also create problems for them. Because they are able to pick up many different skills with relative ease, it becomes more difficult for them to decide what to do with themselves. As a result, they also do not always value their abilities as they would if they had to struggle to gain them. When Sevens are more balanced however, their versatility, curiosity, and ability to learn can lead them to extraordinary achievement.

The root of their problem is they are out of touch with the inner guidance and support of their Essential nature. As with Fives and Sixes, this creates a deep anxiety in Sevens. They do not feel that they know what to do or how to make choices that will be beneficial to themselves and others. Sevens cope with this anxiety in two ways. First, they try to keep their minds busy all of the time. As long as Sevens can keep their minds occupied, especially with projects and positive ideas for the future, they can, to some extent, keep anxiety and negative feelings out of conscious awareness. Likewise, since their thinking is stimulated by activity, Sevens are compelled to stay on the go, moving from one experience to the next, searching for more stimulation. This is not to say that Sevens are "spinning their wheels." They generally enjoy being practical and getting things done.

Second, Sevens cope with the loss of Essential guidance by using the "trial and error" method: they try everything to make sure they know what is best. On a very deep level, *Sevens do not feel that they can*
find what they really want in life. They therefore tend to try everything—and ultimately may even resort to anything as a substitute for what they are really looking for. (“If I can’t have what will really satisfy me, I’ll enjoy myself anyway. I’ll have all kinds of experiences—that way I will not feel bad about not getting what I really want.”)

We can see this in action even in the most trivial areas of their daily lives. Unable to decide whether he wants vanilla, chocolate, or strawberry ice cream, a Seven will want all three flavors—just to be sure that he does not miss out on the “right” choice. Having two weeks for a vacation and a desire to visit Europe brings a similar quandary. Which countries and cities to visit? Which sites to see? The Seven’s way of dealing with this will be to cram as many different countries, cities, and attractions into his vacation as possible. While they are scrambling after exciting experiences, the real object of their heart’s desire (their personal Rosebud, as it were) may be so deeply buried in their unconscious that they are never really aware of precisely what it is.

Furthermore, as Sevens speed up their pursuit of whatever seems to offer freedom and satisfaction, they tend to make worse choices, and they are less able to be satisfied because everything is experienced indirectly, through the dense filter of their fast-paced mental activity. The result is that Sevens end up anxious, frustrated, and enraged, with fewer resources available to them physically, emotionally, or financially. They may end up ruining their health, their relationships, and their finances in their search for happiness.

On the positive side, however, Sevens are extremely optimistic people—exuberant and upbeat. They are endowed with abundant vitality and a desire to fully participate in their lives each day. They are naturally cheerful and good humored, not taking themselves too seriously, or anything else for that matter. As we have seen, the Basic Desire of Sevens is to be satisfied, happy, and fulfilled, and when they are balanced within themselves, their joy and enthusiasm for life naturally affect everyone around them. They remind us of the pure pleasure of existence—the greatest gift of all.

**TYPE 8**

Eights enjoy taking on challenges themselves as well as giving others opportunities that challenge them to exceed themselves in some way. Eights are charismatic and have the physical and psychological capacities to persuade others to follow them into all kinds of endeavors—from starting a company, to rebuilding a city, to running a household, to waging war, to making peace.

Eights have enormous willpower and vitality, and they feel most alive when they are exercising these capacities in the world. They use their abundant energy to effect changes in their environment—to “leave their mark” on it—but also to keep the environment, and especially other people, from hurting them and those they care about. At an early age, Eights understand that this requires strength, will, persistence, and endurance—qualities that they develop in themselves and which they look for in others.

Eights do not want to be controlled or to allow others to have power over them (their Basic Fear), whether the power is psychological, sexual, social, or financial. Much of their behavior is involved with making sure that they retain and increase whatever power they have for as long as possible. An Eight may be a general or a gardener, a small businessman or a mogul, the mother of a family or the superior of a religious community. No matter: being “in charge” and leaving their imprint on their sphere is uniquely characteristic of them.

Eights are the true “rugged individualists” of the Enneagram. More than any other type, they stand alone. They want to be independent, and resist being indebted to anyone. They often refuse to “give in” to social convention, and they can defy fear, shame, and concern about the consequences of their actions. Although

Cameron 121
they are usually aware of what people think of them, they do not let the opinions of others sway them. They go about their business with a steely determination that can be awe inspiring, even intimidating to others.

Although, to some extent, Eights fear physical harm, far more important is their fear of being disempowered or controlled in some way. Eights are extraordinarily tough and can absorb a great deal of physical punishment without complaint—a double-edged blessing since they often take their health and stamina for granted and overlook the health and well-being of others as well. Yet they are desperately afraid of being hurt emotionally and will use their physical strength to protect their feelings and keep others at a safe emotional distance. Beneath the tough façade is vulnerability, although it has been covered over by layer of emotional armor.

Thus, Eights are often extremely industrious, but at the price of losing emotional contact with many of the people in their lives. Those close to them may become increasingly dissatisfied with this state of affairs, which confounds Eights. (“I don't understand what my family is complaining about. I bust my hump to provide for them. Why are they disappointed with me?”)

When this happens, Eights feel misunderstood and may distance themselves further. In fact, beneath their imposing exterior, Eights often feel hurt and rejected, although this is something they seldom talk about because they have trouble admitting their vulnerability to themselves, let alone to anyone else. Because they fear that they will be rejected (divorced, humiliated, criticized, fired, or harmed in some way), Eights attempt to defend themselves by rejecting others first. The result is that average Eights become blocked in their ability to connect with people or to love since love gives the other power over them, reawakening their Basic Fear.

The more Eights build up their egos in order to protect themselves, the more sensitive they become to any real or imaginary slight to their self-respect, authority, or preeminence. The more they attempt to make themselves impervious to hurt or pain (whether physical or emotional), the more they “shut down” emotionally to become hardened and rock-like.

When Eights are emotionally healthy, however, they have a resourceful, “can-do” attitude as well as a steady inner drive. They take the initiative and make things happen with a great passion for life. They are honorable and authoritative—natural leaders who have a solid, commanding presence. Their groundedness gives them abundant “common sense” as well as the ability to be decisive. Eights are willing to “take the heat,” knowing that any decision cannot please everyone. But as much as possible, they want to look after the interests of the people in their charge without playing favorites. They use their talents and fortitude to construct a better world for everyone in their lives.

**TYPE 9**

No type is more devoted to the quest for internal and external peace for themselves and others than the Nines. They are typically “spiritual seekers” who have a great yearning for connection with the cosmos, as well as with other people. They work to maintain their peace of mind just as they work to establish peace and harmony in their world. The issues encountered in the Nine are fundamental to all psychological and spiritual work—being awake versus falling asleep to our true nature; presence versus entrancement, openness versus blockage, tension versus relaxation, peace versus pain, union versus separation.

Ironically, for a type so oriented to the spiritual world, Nine is the center of the Instinctive Center, and is the type that is potentially most grounded in the physical world and in their own bodies. The contradiction is resolved when we realize that Nines are either in touch with their instinctive qualities and have tremendous elemental power and personal magnetism, or they are cut off from their instinctual strengths and can be disengaged and remote, even lightweight.
To compensate for being out of touch with their instinctual energies, Nines also retreat into their minds and their emotional fantasies. (This is why Nines can sometimes misidentify themselves as Fives and Sevens, “head types,” or as Twos and Fours, “feeling types.”) Furthermore, when their instinctive energies are out of balance, Nines use these very energies against themselves, damming up their own power so that everything in their psyches becomes static and inert. When their energy is not used, it stagnates like a spring-fed lake that becomes so full that its own weight dams up the springs that feed it. When Nines are in balance with their Instinctive Center and its energy, however, they are like a great river, carrying everything along with it effortlessly.

We have sometimes called the Nine the crown of the Enneagram because it is at the top of the symbol and because it seems to include the whole of it. Nines can have the strength of Eights, the sense of fun and adventure of Sevens, the dutifulness of Sixes, the intellectualism of Fives, the creativity of Fours, the attractiveness of Threes, the generosity of Twos, and the idealism of Ones. However, what they generally do not have is a sense of really inhabiting themselves—a strong sense of their own identity.

Ironically, therefore, the only type the Nine is not like is the Nine itself. Being a separate self, an individual who must assert herself against others, is terrifying to Nines. They would rather melt into someone else or quietly follow their idyllic daydreams.

Nines demonstrate the universal temptation to ignore the disturbing aspects of life and to seek some degree of peace and comfort by “numbing out.” They respond to pain and suffering by attempting to live in a state of premature peacefulness, whether it is in a state of false spiritual attainment, or in more gross denial. More than any other type, Nines demonstrate the tendency to run away from the paradoxes and tensions of life by attempting to transcend them or be seeking find simple and painless solutions to their problems.

To emphasize the pleasant in life is not a bad thing, of course—it is simply a limited and limiting approach to life. If Nines see the silver lining in every cloud as a way of protecting themselves from the cold and rain, other types have their distorting viewpoints, too. For example, Fours focus on their own woundedness and victimization, Ones on what is wrong with how things are, and so forth. By contrast, Nines tend to focus on the “bright side of life” so that their peace of mind will not be shaken. But rather than deny the dark side of life, what Nines must understand is that all of the perspectives presented by the other types are true, too.
APPENDIX F
Study 2 _ Types in Brief

Type One in Brief
Ones are conscientious and ethical, with a strong sense of right and wrong. They are teachers, crusaders, and advocates for change: always striving to improve things, but afraid of making a mistake. Well-organized, orderly, and fastidious, they try to maintain high standards, but can slip into being critical and perfectionistic. They typically have problems with resentment and impatience. At their Best: wise, discerning, realistic, and noble. Can be morally heroic.

- Basic Fear: Of being corrupt/evil, defective
- Basic Desire: To be good, to have integrity, to be balanced
- Key Motivations: Want to be right, to strive higher and improve everything, to be consistent with their ideals, to justify themselves, to be beyond criticism so as not to be condemned by anyone.

Type One—More Depth by Level

Healthy Levels

Level 1 (At Their Best): Become extraordinarily wise and discerning. By accepting what is, they become transcendentally realistic, knowing the best action to take in each moment. Humane, inspiring, and hopeful: the truth will be heard.

Level 2: Conscientious with strong personal convictions: they have an intense sense of right and wrong, personal religious and moral values. Wish to be rational, reasonable, self-disciplined, mature, moderate in all things.

Level 3: Extremely principled, always want to be fair, objective, and ethical: truth and justice primary values. Sense of responsibility, personal integrity, and of having a higher purpose often make them teachers and witnesses to the truth.

Average Levels

Level 4: Dissatisfied with reality, they become high-minded idealists, feeling that it is up to them to improve everything: crusaders, advocates, critics. Into "causes" and explaining to others how things "ought" to be.

Level 5: Afraid of making a mistake: everything must be consistent with their ideals. Become orderly and well-organized, but impersonal, puritanical, emotionally constricted, rigidly keeping their feelings and impulses in check. Often workaholics—"anal-compulsive," punctual, pedantic, and fastidious.

Level 6: Highly critical both of self and others: picky, judgmental, perfectionistic. Very opinionated about everything: correcting people and badgering them to "do the right thing"—as they see it. Impatient, never satisfied with anything unless it is done according to their prescriptions. Moralizing, scolding, abrasive, and indignantly angry.

Unhealthy Levels

Level 7: Can be highly dogmatic, self-righteous, intolerant, and inflexible. Begin dealing in absolutes: they alone know "The Truth." Everyone else is wrong: very severe in judgments, while rationalizing own actions.

Level 8: Become obsessive about imperfection and the wrong-doing of others, although they may fall into contradictory actions, hypocritically doing the opposite of what they preach.

Level 9: Become condemning toward others, punitive and cruel to rid themselves of "wrong-doers." Severe depressions, nervous breakdowns, and suicide attempts are likely. Generally corresponds to the Obsessive-Compulsive and Depressive personality disorders.

Type Two in Brief
Twos are empathetic, sincere, and warm-hearted. They are friendly, generous, and self-sacrificing, but can also be sentimental, flattering, and people-pleasing. They are well-meaning and driven to be close to others, but can slip into doing things for others in order to be needed. They typically have problems with possessiveness and with acknowledging their own needs. At their Best: unselfish and altruistic, they have unconditional love for others.

- Basic Fear: Of being unwanted, unworthy of being loved
- Basic Desire: To feel loved
- Key Motivations: Want to be loved, to express their feelings for others, to be needed and appreciated, to get others to respond to them, to vindicate their claims about themselves.
Type Two—More Depth by Level

Healthy Levels

Level 1 (At Their Best): Become deeply unselfish, humble, and altruistic: giving unconditional love to self and others. Feel it is a privilege to be in the lives of others.

Level 2: Empathetic, compassionate, feeling for others. Caring and concerned about their needs. Thoughtful, warm-hearted, forgiving and sincere.

Level 3: Encouraging and appreciative, able to see the good in others. Service is important, but takes care of self too: they are nurturing, generous, and giving—a truly loving person.

Average Levels

Level 4: Want to be closer to others, so start "people pleasing," becoming overly friendly, emotionally demonstrative, and full of "good intentions" about everything. Give seductive attention: approval, "strokes," flattery. Love is their supreme value, and they talk about it constantly.

Level 5: Become overly intimate and intrusive: they need to be needed, so they hover, meddle, and control in the name of love. Want others to depend on them: give, but expect a return: send double messages. Enveloping and possessive: the codependent, self-sacrificial person who cannot do enough for others—wearing themselves out for everyone, creating needs for themselves to fulfill.

Level 6: Increasingly self-important and self-satisfied, feel they are indispensable, although they overrate their efforts in others' behalf. Hypochondria, becoming a "martyr" for others. Overbearing, patronizing, presumptuous.

Unhealthy Levels

Level 7: Can be manipulative and self-serving, instilling guilt by telling others how much they owe them and make them suffer. Abuse food and medication to "stuff feelings" and get sympathy. Undermine people, making belittling, disparaging remarks. Extremely self-deceptive about their motives and how aggressive and/or selfish their behavior is.

Level 8: Domineering and coercive: feel entitled to get anything they want from others: the repayment of old debts, money, sexual favors.

Level 9: Able to excuse and rationalize what they do since they feel abused and victimized by others and are bitterly resentful and angry. Somatization of their aggressions result in chronic health problems as they vindicate themselves by "falling apart" and burdening others. Generally corresponds to the Histrionic Personality Disorder and Factitious Disorder.

Type Three in Brief

Threes are self-assured, attractive, and charming. Ambitious, competent, and energetic, they can also be status-conscious and highly driven for advancement. They are diplomatic and poised, but can also be overly concerned with their image and what others think of them. They typically have problems with workaholism and competitiveness. At their Best: self-accepting, authentic, everything they seem to be—role models who inspire others.

- Basic Fear: Of being worthless
- Basic Desire: To feel valuable and worthwhile
- Key Motivations: Want to be affirmed, to distinguish themselves from others, to have attention, to be admired, and to impress others.

Type Three—More Depth by Level

Healthy Levels

Level 1 (At Their Best): Self-accepting, inner-directed, and authentic, everything they seem to be. Modest and charitable, self-deprecatory humor and a fullness of heart emerge. Gentle and benevolent.

Level 2: Self-assured, energetic, and competent with high self-esteem: they believe in themselves and their own value. Adaptable, desirable, charming, and gracious.

Level 3: Ambitious to improve themselves, to be "the best they can be"—often become outstanding, a human ideal, embodying widely admired cultural qualities. Highly effective: others are motivated to be like them in some positive way.

Average Levels

Level 4: Highly concerned with their performance, doing their job well, constantly driving self to achieve goals as if self-worth depends on it. Terrified of failure. Compare self with others in search for status and success. Become careerists, social climbers, invested in exclusivity and being the "best."
Level 5: Become image-conscious, highly concerned with how they are perceived. Begin to package themselves according to the expectations of others and what they need to do to be successful. Pragmatic and efficient, but also premeditated, losing touch with their own feelings beneath a smooth facade. Problems with intimacy, credibility, and "phoniness" emerge.

Level 6: Want to impress others with their superiority: constantly promoting themselves, making themselves sound better than they really are. Narcissistic, with grandiose, inflated notions about themselves and their talents. Exhibitionistic and seductive, as if saying "Look at me!" Arrogance and contempt for others is a defense against feeling jealous of others and their success.

Unhealthy Levels

Level 7: Fearing failure and humiliation, they can be exploitative and opportunistic, covetous of the success of others, and willing to do "whatever it takes" to preserve the illusion of their superiority.

Level 8: Devious and deceptive so that their mistakes and wrongdoings will not be exposed. Untrustworthy, maliciously betraying or sabotaging people to triumph over them. Delusionally jealous of others

Level 9: Become vindictive, attempting to ruin others' happiness. Relentless, obsessive about destroying whatever reminds them of their own shortcomings and failures. Psychopathic, murder. Generally corresponds to the Narcissistic Personality Disorder.

Type Four in Brief

Fours are self-aware, sensitive, and reserved. They are emotionally honest, creative, and personal, but can also be moody and self-conscious. Withholding themselves from others due to feeling vulnerable and defective, they can also feel disdainful and exempt from ordinary ways of living. They typically have problems with melancholy, self-indulgence, and self-pity. At their Best: inspired and highly creative, they are able to renew themselves and transform their experiences.

- Basic Fear: That they have no identity or personal significance
- Basic Desire: To find themselves and their significance (to create an identity)
- Key Motivations: Want to express themselves and their individuality, to create and surround themselves with beauty, to maintain certain moods and feelings, to withdraw to protect their self-image, to take care of emotional needs before attending to anything else, to attract a "rescuer."

Type Four—More Depth by Level

Healthy Levels

Level 1 (At Their Best): Profoundly creative, expressing the personal and the universal, possibly in a work of art. Inspired, self-renewing and regenerating: able to transform all their experiences into something valuable: self-creative.

Level 2: Self-aware, introspective, on the "search for self," aware of feelings and inner impulses. Sensitive and intuitive both to self and others: gentle, tactful, compassionate.

Level 3: Highly personal, individualistic, "true to self." Self-revealing, emotionally honest, humane. Ironic view of self and life: can be serious and funny, vulnerable and emotionally strong.

Average Levels

Level 4: Take an artistic, romantic orientation to life, creating a beautiful, aesthetic environment to cultivate and prolong personal feelings. Heighten reality through fantasy, passionate feelings, and the imagination.

Level 5: To stay in touch with feelings, they interiorize everything, taking everything personally, but become self-absorbed and introverted, moody and hypersensitive, shy and self-conscious, unable to be spontaneous or to "get out of themselves." Stay withdrawn to protect their self-image and to buy time to sort out feelings.

Level 6: Gradually think that they are different from others, and feel that they are exempt from living as everyone else does. They become melancholy dreamers, disdainful, decadent, and sensual, living in a fantasy world. Self-pity and envy of others leads to self-indulgence, and to becoming increasingly impractical, unproductive, effete, and precious.

Unhealthy Levels

Level 7: When dreams fail, become self-inhibiting and angry at self, depressed and alienated from self and others, blocked and emotionally paralyzed. Ashamed of self, fatigued and unable to function.
Level 8: Tormented by delusional self-contempt, self-reproaches, self-hatred, and morbid thoughts: everything is a source of torment. Blaming others, they drive away anyone who tries to help them.

Level 9: Despairing, feel hopeless and become self-destructive, possibly abusing alcohol or drugs to escape. In the extreme: emotional breakdown or suicide is likely. Generally corresponds to the Avoidant, Depressive, and Narcissistic personality disorders.

Type Five in Brief
Fives are alert, insightful, and curious. They are able to concentrate and focus on developing complex ideas and skills. Independent, innovative, and inventive, they can also become preoccupied with their thoughts and imaginary constructs. They become detached, yet high-strung and intense. They typically have problems with eccentricity, nihilism, and isolation. At their Best: visionary pioneers, often ahead of their time, and able to see the world in an entirely new way.

- **Basic Fear:** Being useless, helpless, or incapable
- **Basic Desire:** To be capable and competent
- **Key Motivations:** Want to possess knowledge, to understand the environment, to have everything figured out as a way of defending the self from threats from the environment.

Type Five—More Depth by Level

**Healthy Levels**

**Level 1 (At Their Best):** Become visionaries, broadly comprehending the world while penetrating it profoundly. Open-minded, take things in whole, in their true context. Make pioneering discoveries and find entirely new ways of doing and perceiving things.

**Level 2:** Observe everything with extraordinary perceptiveness and insight. Most mentally alert, curious, searching intelligence: nothing escapes their notice. Foresight and prediction. Able to concentrate: become engrossed in what has caught their attention.

**Level 3:** Attain skillful mastery of whatever interests them. Excited by knowledge: often become expert in some field. Innovative and inventive, producing extremely valuable, original works. Highly independent, idiosyncratic, and whimsical.

**Average Levels**

**Level 4:** Begin conceptualizing and fine-tuning everything before acting—working things out in their minds: model building, preparing, practicing, and gathering more resources. Studious, acquiring technique. Become specialized, and often "intellectual," often challenging accepted ways of doing things.

**Level 5:** Increasingly detached as they become involved with complicated ideas or imaginary worlds. Become preoccupied with their visions and interpretations rather than reality. Are fascinated by off-beat, esoteric subjects, even those involving dark and disturbing elements. Detached from the practical world, a "disembodied mind," although high-strung and intense.

**Level 6:** Begin to take an antagonistic stance toward anything which would interfere with their inner world and personal vision. Become provocative and abrasive, with intentionally extreme and radical views. Cynical and argumentative.

**Unhealthy Levels**

**Level 7:** Become reclusive and isolated from reality, eccentric and nihilistic. Highly unstable and fearful of aggressions: they reject and repulse others and all social attachments.

**Level 8:** Get obsessed yet frightened by their threatening ideas, becoming horrified, delirious, and prey to gross distortions and phobias.

**Level 9:** Seeking oblivion, they may commit suicide or have a psychotic break with reality. Deranged, explosively self-destructive, with schizophrenic overtones. Generally corresponds to the Schizoid Avoidant and Schizotypal personality disorders.

**Type Six in Brief**
The committed, security-oriented type. Sixes are reliable, hard-working, responsible, and trustworthy. Excellent "troubleshooters," they foresee problems and foster cooperation, but can also become defensive, evasive, and anxious—running on stress while complaining about it. They can be cautious and indecisive, but also reactive, defiant and rebellious. They typically have problems with self-doubt and suspicion. **At their Best:** internally stable and self-reliant, courageously championing themselves and others.

- **Basic Fear:** Of being without support and guidance
- **Basic Desire:** To have security and support
- **Key Motivations:** Want to have security, to feel supported by others, to have certitude and reassurance, to test the attitudes of others toward them, to fight against anxiety and insecurity.
Type Six—More Depth by Level

Healthy Levels

**Level 1 (At Their Best):** Become self-affirming, trusting of self and others, independent yet symbiotically interdependent and cooperative as an equal. Belief in self leads to true courage, positive thinking, leadership, and rich self-expression.

**Level 2:** Able to elicit strong emotional responses from others: very appealing, endearing, lovable, affectionate. Trust important: bonding with others, forming permanent relationships and alliances.

**Level 3:** Dedicated to individuals and movements in which they deeply believe. Community builders: responsible, reliable, trustworthy. Hard-working and persevering, sacrificing for others, they create stability and security in their world, bringing a cooperative spirit.

Average Levels

**Level 4:** Start investing their time and energy into whatever they believe will be safe and stable. Organizing and structuring, they look to alliances and authorities for security and continuity. Constantly vigilant, anticipating problems.

**Level 5:** To resist having more demands made on them, they react against others passive-aggressively. Become evasive, indecisive, cautious, procrastinating, and ambivalent. Are highly reactive, anxious, and negative, giving contradictory, "mixed signals." Internal confusion makes them react unpredictably.

**Level 6:** To compensate for insecurities, they become sarcastic and belligerent, blaming others for their problems, taking a tough stance toward "outsiders." Highly reactive and defensive, dividing people into friends and enemies, while looking for threats to their own security. Authoritarian while fearful of authority, highly suspicious, yet, conspiratorial, and fear-instilling to silence their own fears.

Unhealthy Levels

**Level 7:** Fearing that they have ruined their security, they become panicky, volatile, and self-disparaging with acute inferiority feelings. Seeing themselves as defenseless, they seek out a stronger authority or belief to resolve all problems. Highly divisive, disparaging and berating others.

**Level 8:** Feeling persecuted, that others are "out to get them," they lash-out and act irrationally, bringing about what they fear. Fanaticism, violence.

**Level 9:** Hysterical, and seeking to escape punishment, they become self-destructive and suicidal. Alcoholism, drug overdoses, "skid row," self-abasing behavior. Generally corresponds to the Passive-Aggressive and Paranoid personality disorders.

Type Seven in Brief

Sevens are extroverted, optimistic, versatile, and spontaneous. Playful, high-spirited, and practical, they can also misapply their many talents, becoming over-extended, scattered, and undisciplined. They constantly seek new and exciting experiences, but can become distracted and exhausted by staying on the go. They typically have problems with impatience and impulsiveness. **At their Best:** they focus their talents on worthwhile goals, becoming appreciative, joyous, and satisfied.

- **Basic Fear:** Of being deprived and in pain
- **Basic Desire:** To be satisfied and content—to have their needs fulfilled
- **Key Motivations:** Want to maintain their freedom and happiness, to avoid missing out on worthwhile experiences, to keep themselves excited and occupied, to avoid and discharge pain.

Type Seven—More Depth by Level

Healthy Levels

**Level 1 (At Their Best):** Assimilate experiences in depth, making them deeply grateful and appreciative for what they have. Become awed by the simple wonders of life: joyous and ecstatic. Intimations of spiritual reality, of the boundless goodness of life.

**Level 2:** Highly responsive, excitable, enthusiastic about sensation and experience. Most extroverted type: stimuli bring immediate responses—they find everything invigorating. Lively, vivacious, eager, spontaneous, resilient, cheerful.

**Level 3:** Easily become accomplished achievers, generalists who do many different things well: multi-talented. Practical, productive, usually prolific, cross-fertilizing areas of interest.

Average Levels

**Level 4:** As restlessness increases, want to have more options and choices available to them. Become adventurous and "worldly wise," but less focused, constantly seeking new things and experiences: the sophisticate, connoisseur, and consumer. Money, variety, keeping up with the latest trends important.
Level 5: Unable to discriminate what they really need, become hyperactive, unable to say "no" to themselves, throwing self into constant activity. Uninhibited, doing and saying whatever comes to mind: storytelling, flamboyant exaggerations, witty wise-cracking, performing. Fear being bored: in perpetual motion, but do too many things—many ideas but little follow through.

Level 6: Get into conspicuous consumption and all forms of excess. Self-centered, materialistic, and greedy, never feeling that they have enough. Demanding and pushy, yet unsatisfied and jaded. Addictive, hardened, and insensitive.

Unhealthy Levels

Level 7: Desperate to quell their anxieties, can be impulsive and infantile: do not know when to stop. Addictions and excess take their toll: debauched, depraved, dissipated escapists, offensive and abusive.

Level 8: In flight from self, acting out impulses rather than dealing with anxiety or frustrations: go out of control, into erratic mood swings, and compulsive actions (maniacs).

Level 9: Finally, their energy and health is completely spent: become claustrophobic and panic-stricken. Often give up on themselves and life: deep depression and despair, self-destructive overdoses, impulsive suicide. Generally corresponds to the Bipolar disorder and Histrionic personality disorder.

Type Eight in Brief

Eights are self-confident, strong, and assertive. Protective, resourceful, straight-talking, and decisive, but can also be ego-centric and domineering. Eights feel they must control their environment, especially people, sometimes becoming confrontational and intimidating. Eights typically have problems with their tempers and with allowing themselves to be vulnerable.

At their Best: self-mastering, they use their strength to improve others' lives, becoming heroic, magnanimous, and inspiring.

- Basic Fear: Of being harmed or controlled by others
- Basic Desire: To protect themselves (to be in control of their own life and destiny)
- Key Motivations: Want to be self-reliant, to prove their strength and resist weakness, to be important in their world, to dominate the environment, and to stay in control of their situation.

Type Eight—More Depth by Level

Healthy Levels

Level 1 (At Their Best): Become self-restrained and magnanimous, merciful and forbearing, mastering self through their self-surrender to a higher authority. Courageous, willing to put self in serious jeopardy to achieve their vision and have a lasting influence. May achieve true heroism and historical greatness.

Level 2: Self-assertive, self-confident, and strong: have learned to stand up for what they need and want. A resourceful, "can do" attitude and passionate inner drive.

Level 3: Decisive, authoritative, and commanding: the natural leader others look up to. Take initiative, make things happen: champion people, provider, protective, and honorable, carrying others with their strength.

Average Levels

Level 4: Self-sufficiency, financial independence, and having enough resources are important concerns: become enterprising, pragmatic, "rugged individualists," wheeler-dealers. Risk-taking, hardworking, denying own emotional needs.

Level 5: Begin to dominate their environment, including others: want to feel that others are behind them, supporting their efforts. Swaggering, boastful, forceful, and expansive: the "boss" whose word is law. Proud, egocentric, want to impose their will and vision on everything, not seeing others as equals or treating them with respect.

Level 6: Become highly combative and intimidating to get their way: confrontational, belligerent, creating adversarial relationships. Everything a test of wills, and they will not back down. Use threats and reprisals to get obedience from others, to keep others off balance and insecure. However, unjust treatment makes others fear and resent them, possibly also band together against them.

Unhealthy Levels

Level 7: Defying any attempt to control them, become completely ruthless, dictatorial, "might makes right." The criminal and outlaw, renegade, and con-artist. Hard-hearted, immoral and potentially violent.

Level 8: Develop delusional ideas about their power, invincibility, and ability to prevail: megalomania, feeling omnipotent, invulnerable. Recklessly over-extending self.

Level 9: If they get in danger, they may brutally destroy everything that has not conformed to their will rather than surrender to anyone else. Vengeful, barbaric, murderous. Sociopathic tendencies. Generally corresponds to the Antisocial Personality Disorder.
Type Nine in Brief

Nines are accepting, trusting, and stable. They are usually creative, optimistic, and supportive, but can also be too willing to go along with others to keep the peace. They want everything to go smoothly and be without conflict, but they can also tend to be complacent, simplifying problems and minimizing anything upsetting. They typically have problems with inertia and stubbornness. At their Best: indomitable and all-embracing, they are able to bring people together and heal conflicts.

- Basic Fear: Of loss and separation
- Basic Desire: To have inner stability "peace of mind"
- Key Motivations: Want to create harmony in their environment, to avoid conflicts and tension, to preserve things as they are, to resist whatever would upset or disturb them.

Type Nine—More Depth by Level

Healthy Levels

Level 1 (At Their Best): Become self-possessed, feeling autonomous and fulfilled: have great equanimity and contentment because they are present to themselves. Paradoxically, at one with self, and thus able to form more profound relationships. Intensely alive, fully connected to self and others.

Level 2: Deeply receptive, accepting, unselfconscious, emotionally stable and serene. Trusting of self and others, at ease with self and life, innocent and simple. Patient, unpretentious, good-natured, genuinely nice people.

Level 3: Optimistic, reassuring, supportive: have a healing and calming influence—harmonizing groups, bringing people together: a good mediator, synthesizer, and communicator.

Average Levels

Level 4: Fear conflicts, so become self-effacing and accommodating, idealizing others and "going along" with their wishes, saying "yes" to things they do not really want to do. Fall into conventional roles and expectations. Use philosophies and stock sayings to deflect others.

Level 5: Active, but disengaged, unreflective, and inattentive. Do not want to be affected, so become unresponsive and complacent, walking away from problems, and "sweeping them under the rug." Thinking becomes hazy and ruminative, mostly comforting fantasies, as they begin to "tune out" reality, becoming oblivious. Emotionally indolent, unwillingness to exert self or to focus on problems: indifference.

Level 6: Begin to minimize problems, to appease others and to have "peace at any price." Stubborn, fatalistic, and resigned, as if nothing could be done to change anything. Into wishful thinking, and magical solutions. Others frustrated and angry by their procrastination and unresponsiveness.

Unhealthy Levels

Level 7: Can be highly repressed, undeveloped, and ineffectual. Feel incapable of facing problems: become obstinate, dissociating self from all conflicts. Neglectful and dangerous to others.

Level 8: Wanting to block out of awareness anything that could affect them, they dissociate so much that they eventually cannot function: numb, depersonalized.

Level 9: They finally become severely disoriented and catatonic, abandoning themselves, turning into shattered shells. Multiple personalities possible. Generally corresponds to the Schizoid and Dependent personality disorders.
APPENDIX G
Study 2_Simonton's Descriptions Group A

Person #34 (Pierce)

"a lively, gay, and magnetic young man of medium height and, like most attractive people, never knew what it was to lack friends or a good time. He was not intellectually gifted: he enjoyed more than anything else the campus drills which he himself conducted. When, at the beginning of this third year at [college], he saw that he ranked lowest in his class, he began, with the help of his friends, to apply himself seriously to work. At his graduation he was fifth in his class" "gay, extroverted" "old convivial habits" "A politician's politician" "dark, curly-haired" "master at knowing how to get along with people" "given a good education" graduated from college "ranked third in his class" "reputation as a loyal party man" "often [drank] more than he could hold—a problem that he fought for the rest of his life" "persuasive orator" in war "fainted twice in action" "ineptness"

"more honest man [than his enemies] would admit." "loyal"
"With wavy hair and a fine physique" "handsome" "about average height—five feet, ten inches—but his erect military bearing caused him to seem taller. Personally magnetic, genial, and congenial, he was regarded as a hale fellow well met and a fancy dresser to boot. On occasion he would become convivial, sometimes too much so, for he had both an over fondness for alcohol and an allergy to it" "As a youth [he] was privileged to attend the best preparatory schools" "a college graduate" "high rank in his class" "turned to the study of law and became a successful practitioner" "no stranger to military affairs, and first hand experience with wholesale bloodshed may have made him...less bellicose...then could have been anticipated" "essentially a man of peace" not "conspicuously bellicose"

"charming but indecisive politician" "attended...college" "began to practice law" "died with few admirers" "He was open, congenial, andpliant. He mixed readily and won friends easily. However, he suffered from periodic bouts of depression. He also fought a longtime battle against alcoholism. He found it hard to say No. He lacked a sustained feeling of self-confidence and was desirous of approbation. Consequently he endeavored to be gracious and accommodating to all who sought [favors]. His graciousness was interpreted by many to mean approval of their requests."

Person #29 (T. Roosevelt)

"exciting" life. had "an inferiority complex which deeply influenced his life." "a discontented and restless spirit" "Some of [his] feeling of inferiority was no doubt the result of an embarrassment about his physical qualities, one of which was small stature. Not only was [he] short; he also had poor eyesight from his boyhood on, and in middle life had the use of only one eye" "He had the deeper limitation of not being an original thinker" "not mediocre" "his delight in vociferousness for its own sake" "strove to build up his health, a task to which he had assiduously set his efforts since he had been in his late teens. He never discontinued the 'strenuous life' "It seems somewhat childish to us today, even considering an early sickliness, that any intelligent adult would exaggerate physical activity to the degree [he] did. His life may actually have been shortened by his strenuous living." "assertiveness" "obstreperous" "a born crusader, with unbounded enthusiasm" "energetic man" "He had knowledge without wisdom, enthusiasm without sympathy" "bellicosity" "He was a voracious reader and had in his mind an unbelievable collection of facts as a result of it. With his knowledge, his curious mind and crusading spirit, his rich cultural background, his priceless experience, and his rare contemporary prestige there is no end to the number of things he might have done for his country and for the world, had he but possessed that pearl of great price—magnanimity." "glamorous" not a "judicial mind" could advertise himself
"vim, vigor, and vitality" "An apostle of 'The Strenuous Life,' [he] climbed the Matterhorn, hunted in Africa, explored Brazil, led cavalry charges,..., and worked as a cowboy..." "practiced boxing and judo" took "long hikes" "also found time to write more than thirty books and tens of thousands of letters" "A pale, sickly boy...given to fits of asthmatic coughing. He led the pampered life of a rich man's son with private tutors, several trips to Europe with his family, and whatever books and presents he asked for" "for the rest of his life [he] seemed to try to outdo everyone else with energy and strength" "While he was a small boy [he] had developed an intense interest in natural science." "His excellent grades won him election to Phi Beta Kappa" "A forceful orator" "in frequent demand as a speaker" "made jingoistic comments" "energetic" "warm-hearted" "most energetic" "most ebullient" "most athletic" "pure act" "seemed to possess limitless vitality, indomitable courage, and indestructive will; and he was a passionate devotee of the strenuous life" "The child...was not father to the man. As a boy...he...was weak and sickly, with a puny body, poor eyes, and an asthmatic cough" "He began working out in a gym which his father installed for him...and continued working out for the rest of his life. He took boxing lessons, studied judo, learned to ride and shoot, played tennis, took long hikes, climbed the Matterhorn, hunted big game in Africa, explored Brazil, and fought [in a war]. He also became a cowboy" "loved war as well as sports; he regarded the two as moral equivalents...looked upon was as a good thing in itself." "acquitted himself bravely, even heroically, on the battlefield" "most assertive" "few...have pursued their way with more personal zest" "A highly sensitive politician" "prosperous, confident, energetic, expansionist, and experimentally minded" "But though a compulsive activist [he] was usually very cautious. He viewed himself as a middle-of-the-roader...settling for what he thought was possible" "tendency to compromise" "alienated many people by the difference between his rhetoric, invariably highly seasoned with morality, and his performance, usually tempered by expediency. His penchant for impulsive actions and his bullying of individuals too helpless to reply infuriated others" "In examining the public addresses [of this person], the reader cannot avoid concluding that [he] far eclipsed all predecessors or successors in his vehement concern for honesty and honor. He repeatedly preached on such themes as the need for honesty in government, honesty in public life, and honesty in politics. One contemporary congratulated him on his original discovery of the Ten Commandments, while another described him as an interesting combination of Saint Paul and Saint Vitus. The blunt truth is that behind the scenes [he] resorted on occasion to devious dealings that in retrospect seem out of step with his noisy commitment to such principles." "A pugnacious man who loved war and who gloried in armed combat" some have called him "both a meddlesome braggart and a barefaced liar" "dynamic" "fiery" "notorious impetuosity" "shyster-like [at times]" "busybody" "immensely popular" "an impatient, impetuous, direct actionist, at heart a lover of war, but more restrained in word and deed than his enemies feared he would be" "born fighter" "clever" "clearly one of the most pugnacious men ever to appear in public life" "hotness of temper and bellicosity [exceeded by only one other in his position, and not by much]" "fought with fists and words" "responsibility sobered [him]? born in a "patrician family" "His early education came largely form tutors and travel abroad." "As a spindly youth [he] was severely handicapped by asthma and an extreme case of shortsightedness. His vision was finally corrected by thick-lensed...spectacles, and his body was strengthened by a self-imposed regimen of exercise. In his prime he was a muscular and stocky five feet, with a heavy brown mustache that only partially concealed strong white teeth" "graduated [from college] with...honors" "competed on the boxing team, surprisingly as a lightweight. By his own admission he did only moderately well in this sport, but he did develop an enduring love for 'the manly art of self-defense,' in later life he made the acquaintance of a number of leading professional pugilists, and repeatedly put on the gloves with friendly opponents,... In one of these impromptus bouts [he] received a punch in his left eye that resulted in partial blindness in it for the rest of his life. Yet he rejoiced that his right eye was spared for marksmanship, and he repeatedly urged boxing as a recreational sport for the armed services. In his view this masculine but brutal exercise helped to keep alive the virile juices and virtues." "had a brief bout with the study of law, which he found too slow and stuffy" "he exhibited his interest in fighting men by publishing a highly creditable book on naval war, the first of about twenty of his literary
contributions" "as a cattle rancher...he...lost most of his money but gained a muscular physique that later served him in good stead" "he toyed with the concept of getting into action at the head of tough fighting men...he ardently hoped for war, since he thought the country had gone soft and needed a rousing foreign blood-letting to stiffen its backbone" "ebullient...displayed an excess of zeal that greatly embarrassed his immediate superior" "impatient...man of action" "glory-hungry" in war "exposed himself and his men recklessly" "colorful, controversial, and combative" "A master of keeping himself in the lime light, at a wedding he eclipsed the bride, at a funeral the corpse"

"constantly assailing someone—or so it seemed. His most spectacular efforts came in public speeches, which he delivered with a high, piercing voice, sometimes between clenched teeth. His hands, fists, and arms would flail the air, as though he were a man fighting bees instead of his assorted foes. He had a 'bully time' knocking heads together, for apparently this exercise kept his virility alive" "seldom a patient man" "Ever the showman" "no coward in a physical sense. This impatient warrior, who had enjoyed a "bully time" charging through the hail of bullets...needed no certification of his bravery. But of one stigma he was clearly afraid, and that was the reputation of being afraid" "Few people, if any, ever accused [him] of being an excessively modest man" "All his life the fight-loving [blank] disliked dreamy-eyed pacifists" "As a fight-lover [he] had clearly one of the most pugnacious personalities" "entered public life as a fighter, and he still was one as he lay on his death bed. He believed that it was better to burn out than to rust out, and he burned out" "avid sportsman [but] a poor sport" "vindicative poor loser" "he wished to be, and was, a figure larger than life, scholar, sportsman, soldier, naturalist and reformer" "vision and courage" "Born into an aristocratic family" "the asthmatic and nearsighted youth built up his strength with sports and natural history outings. At [college] he was a Phi Beta Kappa scholar and graduated...already working on the first of his many history books" "a dynamic reformer and corruption fighter" "liberal approach" "ardent conservationist"

"It was often said that he craved the limelight, that he set out to be, as one observer put it, 'the bride at every wedding, the corpse at every funeral.' He was fearless, decisive, ambitious, proud, and irresistibly charming to men and women alike. He loved children and often took the time to romp with them or gather them round for a story. A gifted raconteur, he captivated listeners with tales of his adventures. He detested dirty jokes, however, and typically walked away in the middle of a story as soon as he detected its off-color nature. Whether delivering speeches before large crowds or engaged in a private conversation, he spoke forcefully in crisp, clipped tones and gesticulated constantly, his fist pounding the air to emphasize a point, his head jerking to and fro virtually with each word. But he was also a good listener, capable of remaining stock still for extended periods totally engrossed in the word of others. He had a prodigious, apparently photographic memory. He often stunned visitors by reciting whole passages of a book he had read decades before. He explained that with concentration the page seemed to appear in his mind's eye and he simply read from it."

Person #30 (Woodrow Wilson)

"first of his family to be able to obtain an education" "from his mother's people...he inherited ability and a predisposition to accomplishment" "possessed of a sincere patriotism and a high code of honor so that positions of truth naturally came his way" "never noted for tact" "bluntness" "serious" "hard worker" "had a capacity for envy and jealousy, even vanity. With all his amazing talents and opportunities, he still did not feel secure. A touchy man, rather than a sensitive one, he could not avoid showing his jealousy" "Intellectually, he was the superior of every one of his contemporaries, [blank] probably excepted; and some...scholars say he was the greatest political thinker [his country] has ever produced" "No other person of his times or probably since has known so much about the theory of government" "scholarly, more humane concepts of public service" "irascibility and envy" "a patriotic man who was not shrewd enough to conceal the requirements of his ego. That was [his] weakness, great though his services were, unimpeachably honest all his policies and statements" "domestic felicity, disinterested scholarship,"
unqualified patriotism, and monolithic character" "worked incomparably hard to keep the peace"
"disinterested" "philosopher-king" "did not always possess magnanimity" "forbidding, unfanciful, the
essence of solidity" "had in [him] too the essence of devotions [he] could not unbend" his Puritan nature
"frowned on displays of emotion and camaraderie; but [he] recognized the value of such traits and in [his
diary] deplored the absence of them in their own constitutions"

"A scholar and proficient writer on the theory of government" "knowledge of political science" "short,
plump" "believed in plain clothes and plain talk" "tried to do what he believed was right...rather than what
was politically expedient. His blunt frankness sometimes lost
him friends, but he was respected for his honesty even by his political enemies. His diaries and letters are
livelier and more entertaining than was his personality, which was often rude and irascible." "wit and love
of books" "more noted for his bluntness than his diplomacy" "He did show wisdom and courage" "one of
the most intelligent, learned, industrious, public-spirited, and far-seeing...also one of the vainest, most
outspoken, testiest, and most abrasive" one contemporary said he was "always an honest man, often a
wise one, but sometimes, and in some things, absolutely out of his senses" "could express himself
forcefully when he wanted to"

"blunt but effective diplomat" "learned advisor" "aggressive delegate" "nonpolitical" "belief in his own
political rectitude and his love of books" "robust love of husbandry" kept an "uninhibited diary" that is
"remarkably self-revealing" in which he "exhibits a notable talent for the delineation of character in
others" "A bundle of contradictions himself, he was sometimes outspoken to the point of rudeness, but at
other times, scholarly and urbane; irascible, jealous, and suspicious, he was also often playful and tender"

"As a young lawyer [he] was not only proud of his learning but apparently ambitious of seeing himself in
print" "a certain unpopularity" "Hating militarism" "He was to remember his critics with great bitterness"
even in old age "he strove to maintain an active life, taking long walks in the countryside"
"became a profile in courage" "vain and...suffered much of his life from the feeling that he was not being
properly appreciated" "dour" "suppressing inclinations to be a minister of the gospel, he turned to the
profession of law, at a time when lawyers were widely regarded as unnecessary troublemakers" "sound
head on substantial points" "has integrity" "vain, irritable, and a bad calculator of the force and probable
effect of the motives which govern men. This is all the ill which can be possibly said of him" "his sound
judgement [occasionally] deserted him" "though basically a man of integrity, was moved in large part by
politics and jealousy [of others on certain occasions]"

"both moral and physical courage" "pride...considerable" did not crave "military glory" "conservative"
"his pride, which was inflated, appears to have been unduly sensitive on points of prestige and honor" "a
vain man with an inferiority complex" "regarded as a 'scholar in politics'"
"brilliant, witty and crusty" "one of the most significant philosophers and planners of the...nation" "son of
distinguished family" "known for his newspaper articles" "commitment to justice" "growing
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radicalism" "tried with some success to stay above partisan politics"

"This sums up the paradox of his personality; he genuinely loved and had deep compassion for humanity
but never learned to deal with individual human beings. To his immediate family, he was a warm,
generously loving man; to outsiders, he appeared cold, aloof, conceited. As a youth he was driven by
ambition. He was determined to be a man of substance and, if circumstances afforded the opportunity, a
great man. Throughout his life he wrestled with his passions. From his mother he inherited his
pugnacity, drive, ready temper, and broad mood swings. He frequently fell to black despair, fits of
depression that were triggered usually by the onset of some illness, public criticism, or lack of recognition
of his achievements. He may have been a manic depressive. Somewhat paranoid, too, he was quick to
see in his unpopularity a plot by others to discredit him and steal credit for themselves."

Person #4 (FDR)
"able to manage a...strong identification with the public" not a "good administrator" "dazzling, exciting"
"lover of crowds...knew exactly how to talk to crowds, how to smile at them, how to glamorize what he had in mind for them" "unquestionably supplied leadership, regardless of how some people came to criticize that leadership" "an educated man" "a country squire, genial, presiding over his large family and cognizant of his patrician origins" "not very familiar with economic theory" "an experimenter" "a very capable politician" "he could not deal generously with opponents"
"jaunty smile, a soothing voice and supreme self-confidence" "a fine speaker" "more than charmer"
"showed himself to be thoughtful, energetic, compassionate, and open to experiment" "was to display remarkable gifts for leadership in a time of crisis" "Despite his conservative background as a country squire...[he] enjoyed breaking precedents and shattering traditions. He thought that dramatic gestures on his part would raise morale" "approach to problems tended to be personal rather than theoretical" "lack of interest in economic theory" "recipient of both passionate adoration and blind hatred"
"a rather shy youth" "After he entered [college] [he] threw himself into undergraduate activities. His strenuous extracurricular and social life left him relatively little time for his studies, in which his record was undistinguished. He was, however, influenced by his economics professors" "gradually abandoned his patrician airs and attitude of superiority" "tall, handsome"
"he demonstrated that he retained his youthful buoyancy and vitality; he also showed that he had matured into a more serious and human person" "zest for sailing and his enjoyment in collecting stamps and naval books and prints" "opponents ascribed to him shallowness, incompetence, trickiness, and dictatorial ambitions. His supporters hailed him as [a] savior and the defender of democracy" "unexcelled in winning and holding popular support"
"He knew a lot about human nature" "comes off well by the test of money—honesty, other troublesome questions arise in connection with his attempts to deceive the public. Here he is more vulnerable for we must remember that he was a professional politician" "often he was surprisingly candid" "a combination of the lion and the fox. At times [he] would courageously meet problems head on; at others he would slink around them with deceptive language or beat a hasty retreat" "realistic" "resorted to considerable deviousness and deception" "In private life [he] appears to have been a man of integrity, except notably for a prolonged and clandestine love affair with a former...secretary"
"hated war" "father and mother were wealthy, and the son was pampered" practiced law "with considerable distaste for several years" "thought on a grand scale" "Handsome as a Greek god and superbly built [he] stood six feet, two inches" "vibrant golden voice" "with jauntily upturned cigarette holder, the smiling [person] exuded confidence" "both a man of peace and a man of war" "a happier warrior when he was fighting for peace...Personally pleasant, outgoing, smiling, bantering, he was not basically pugnacious"
"born into an old, aristocratic family" "an idyllic childhood" "after college,...studied law" "personal tragedy in the form of polio...left him crippled for life. But the disease did not dampen his natural ebullience and optimism" "his sometimes disorganized but still charismatic leadership" "He had been a leader of great strengths and weaknesses, but his heritage to the nation was largely one of crucial and beneficial activism."

"Was ebullient, charming, persuasive, gregarious and genuinely interested in people and their problems. To some he seemed snooty as a young man; his habit of carrying his head back and literally looking down his nose at others reinforced this early image. He worked well under pressure. `His composure under stress was remarkable.' "The main reason for his composure was his serene and absolute assurance as to the value and importance of what he was doing.' Had a devious nature. He never spoke with complete frankness even to his most loyal supporters."

Person #12 (Thomas Jefferson)
"quality of magnanimity" "philosopher-king" "a genius" "great and lifelong passion was egalitarianism"
"complex man" "born an aristocrat" "passion to exhaust a subject before he could say he knew it was a
matter of unshakable integrity" "extraordinarily intuitive and speculative nature, reacting with the utmost
sensitivity to experience" "esthetic side" "not only an artist; he was even somewhat Bohemian" "native
unselfishness in desiring to realize an ideal society" misled "into taking inadequate account of the
inability of people to appreciate his philosophy" "artist-scholastic" "gentle conception of life was a natural
outgrowth of his loving nature." "His interests seem to have covered everything except metaphysics and
such physical recreation as...sports; he was as talented as Leonardo da Vinci" "most civilized man"
"universality of his concerns" "loved friends and glorified friendship" "zealous absorption with an ideal to
an extent that obscured...the practical considerations to which [his] propositions were tangent." did not
hold personal grudges—one of the qualities that gave him his great charm, a charm even his enemies
acknowledged" "certain neurosis" "genuine goodwill and benignity" "unable to take a detached view of
what was done or said" "Master of any talent or profession to which he turned his hand," "achieve[d]
success as lawyer, farmer, philosopher, writer, architect, scientist, musician, and inventor" "Denounced as
a radical and an atheist by his conservative political opponents" "informal" "had an abundance of talents
and interests" "a skillful architect, an accomplished violinist, an ingenious inventor, a competent scientist,
a serious student of religion, and an expert on agricultural methods" "thin-skinned and somewhat shy, and
hated head-on collisions with his adversaries. This meant that he sometimes expressed his opinions more
frankly in private than in public and that he wasn't always candid with his associates" "his
enemies...called him a dangerous radical and a hypocrite" had "a sound classical education" "intellectual
drive" "assiduous in committee work, a skilled legal craftsman, a scholar who drew on his comprehensive
knowledge of law and history." "He rarely made speeches, disliked oral disputes, whether in formal debate
or informal conversation" "the pen was his natural means of expression, and he was a virtuoso in its use"
"His first major essay...displayed an impressive array of learning and logic, demonstrated his capacity for
intense passion and the ability to express it eloquently, and revealed an inclination to intellectual
radicalism" "passionate commitment to intellectual freedom" "passion for books" "He did not exercise an
Olympian calm" in political controversy "He was an extraordinarily learned man, and the range of his
knowledge and inquiry is scarcely credible in the modern age of specialization. He knew Latin, Greek,
French, Spanish, Italian, and Anglo-Saxon and concerned himself with such questions as the difference
between the ancient and modern pronunciation of Greek. At the age of 71 he tackled Plato's Republic in
the original and found its author greatly overrated. He attempted an analysis of the New Testament in
order to discover what Jesus really said as distinguished from what he reported to have said. He enjoyed
the study of mathematics and found its precision and certitude a welcome relief from the untidiness of
politics and government. He was an ardent student of the natural sciences...and sometimes contributed
time and money to progress in these fields. The discovery of fossil remains in various parts of the
country fascinated him, and he tried to collect and classify as many as he could." "While he was abroad,
he sent back to his friends at home various mechanical and scientific gadgets produced in Europe" "His
tavel notes record impressions ranging from nearly ecstatic admiration of architectural movements to
sober economic analysis of the reasons for the differences in prosperity between regions producing white
and red wine" "He was an enthusiastic practitioner of scientific farming, conducted numerous
experiments..., was always on the lookout for some new plant or seed..., and kept meticulous
meteorological records. His interest in architecture was intense and enduring" "voluminous
correspondence...maintained with extraordinary conscientiousness until very near death. He could have
accomplished so much only through rigorous self-discipline and an efficient organization of his time and
activities. Yet, he was one of the most generous and approachable of men. Friends and strangers alike
wrote to him for advice" "was 6 feet 2 inches in height, large boned, slim, erect, and sinewy. He had
angular features, a ruddy complexion, sandy hair, and hazel-flecked gray eyes. His carriage was relaxed
and somewhat awkward, and...he seems to have been regarded as pleasant rather than handsome in
appearance. He was sensitive and perceptive in personal relations, gracious and charming in manner
(though sometimes cold upon first meeting strangers), and almost invariably even tempered. As a matter
of both principle and inclination, he attempted to prevent political differences from creating personal ill-
will. "The private man...remains elusive. There was a reserve of privacy that he kept inviolate." his
"marriage was, by contemporary accounts, an extraordinarily happy one" "ultimately a lonely man"
"prone to inconsistency" "the boon of high school debaters, quotable...on either side of almost every
public question" "a closet philosopher, churning over theories in private, and then often indiscreetly
recording his thoughts in letters sent to his numerous correspondents" "Repeatedly was forced to reverse
himself in response to the iron hand of necessity" "in private letters was prone to exaggerate"
"a bundle of contradictions" "ardent foe of necessity, but not a warrior" "aristocrat" "his correspondence
and public papers abound in expressions of his detestation of war and all it entailed" "a man of peace"
"hatred of war" "regarded as a scholar in politics"
"farmer, lawyer, family man, statesman, scientist, architect, linguist, philosopher, inventor, amateur
musician," "born into distinguished farming family" "avid student from his youth" "wide knowledge of
history and law" "became a noted pamphleteer" "reputation for eloquence and wisdom" "proclaimed
himself for the natural rights of men and opposed to any artificial privilege" "no military man" "began
work on a natural history...which would gain him laurels as a scientist"
"displays a mild, easy and obliging temper though he is somewhat cold and reserved. His conversation
is the most agreeable kind. He was open and approachable, yet he maintained an impregnable core of
inner feeling. His fondness for structure and order can be seen in the meticulous records he maintained
on plant life and weather conditions. Despite his many years in politics, he never acquired two attributes
usually considered essential to success in that profession: a thick skin and a gift for oratory. He was
acutely sensitive to public criticism and, although captivating in small groups, delivered notoriously
unmoving speeches before large crowds. He tended to mumble softly out of earshot of much of his
audience."

Person #1 (Fillmore)

"one of the three handsomest men [ever to attain his position]" "of better than average height, he was of
impressive appearance and possessed an urbanity commensurate with it" "He had very little education"
"was an ambitious youth and learned quickly; not only that, he showed signs of brilliance" "very much
attracted to public life" "handsome appearance and genial manners" "greatest humility" "Although he had
few thoughts of self-interest, [he] lacked forthrightness" "a prestige university "wanted to confer an
honorary degree upon him, but he declined on the ground that he was not entitled to receive such a
degree—an example of honest modesty rare in public life"
"Six feet tall, with blue eyes and a handsome face, [he] was more impressive in appearance than he was in
accomplishment"
"Secondhand, commonplace, mediocre, undistinguished" "never overestimated himself"
"honest, experienced, dignified"
"a rather colorless lawyer" "a fair-minded man" "firmness, fairness, and good-humor, favoring
conciliation over conflict"
"scanty schooling, which...enabled him to teach school for a brief time" "he declined to accept a D.C.L.
degree from Oxford University on the valid grounds that he could present no literary or scientific
achievements to warrant such an honor" "he read law and became a prosperous practitioner"
"firmness, fairness, and good humor [when he] presided over...heated debates" "The adjective commonly
applied to [him] is "colorless", which is another name for what later generations would call "lack of
charisma"" "Yet contemporaries noted that he radiated a dignified and impressive presence, set off by his
five feet, nine inches, his well developed chest, his deep voice, his kindly blue eyes, and his finely
chiseled features. Clearly he was one of the most handsome and gracious of all [those in his position]"
"Ever a compromiser" "if conciliation, moderation, and compromise are the essence of statesmanship,
[he] has valid claims to being a nonbelligerent statesman. On a pugnacity scale he would receive a low
rating, largely because he favored conciliation above coercion"
"a moderate and sensible man whose calm leadership was a welcome change" "left home at an early age to learn tailoring and wool carding and managed to educate himself...he began to study law while teaching school and was admitted to the bar" "presided with a calm impartiality over the fiery debates" "retired to a quiet life"

"was a likable fellow. He mixed readily. He was most persuasive in small groups; his stolid style did not play well before large audiences. He spoke slowly, deliberately, usually using simple expressions and short sentences. His speeches lacked the flourish typical of great orators. A practical, unemotional man, he relied on logic and common sense to make a point in argument. He appealed to the mind rather than to the heart. Although basically a pragmatist, he was capable of genuine idealism if the cause struck his sense of righteousness. 'A spark of idealism smoldered in his mind'. 'Because his whole training had been aimed toward making or improving his livelihood, nothing could ever ignite the spark that would place him in that class of complete idealists who steadfastly cling to their visions no matter how inimical to their interest. But the trait was there, seldom dominating, yet always helping to shape his values.'"
Person #7 (Lincoln)

"lacking in a provincial outlook" "possessed the great quality of magnanimity" "folksy and familiar" "haphazard and a mediocre administrator" "knew the craft of politics and used it" "phlegmatic and gulescent" "possessed a sense of humor bordering even on the melancholy" "personally ambitious on a mighty scale" "would not strive with Fate in order to realize [his] dreams" "force issues for self-advancement" did not "sacrifice a shred of personal dignity to bring events for the self to pass" "although the depth of his feelings for others has sometimes been questioned, could accommodate himself to the needs and notions of others and even, if necessary, feign affection in order to get results" "uncommon" "his interest in people makes us identify ourselves with him" "one of the most difficult personages in all history to describe, much less explain" in this person "we find greatness and we find too, its frequent counterpart—enigma" had "magnanimity" "largeness of mind, nobility of spirit; a nature in which there is no pettiness, a nature that forgives enemies, that gives up profit and advantage in order that the greater number may benefit" "a concern for others greater than the concern for one's self" "He loved mankind, and that meant all men. He was for the underdog, for the poor and downtrodden, white or black, and it did not make any difference [where] they lived. It is the one quality that made him a great man" had "good nature" "It was at times quite impossible to insult him" "a concern with the essentials of life that prevented much worry about 'name calling'" "He was morally and physically courageous, even-tempered and conservative, secretive and sagacious, skeptical and cautious, truthful and honest, firm in his own convictions and tolerant of those of others, reflective and cool, ambitious and somewhat selfish, kind to all and good-natured, sympathetic in the presence of suffering or under an imaginative description of it, lived in his reason and reasoned in his life. Easy of approach and perfectly democratic in his nature, [he] had a broad charity, for his fellow man and had an excuse for unreflective acts of his kind, and in short he loved justice and lived out in thought and act the eternal right" not "that he never deviated from his own nature and his own rules" he "struggled to live the best life possible" "uncommonly ambitious. He was hungry for books. He could not get enough of them. He read and reread. He had less than a years schooling in his whole life; literally self-taught in everything" he "by his own admission, as well as that of others, did not care about physical work. His employers sometimes complained that he did not earn his wages." "he continuously needed time for reading or studying—and for practicing speaking-making. He was an unusually fine mimic and would, on occasions, repeat sermons he heard at church to his associates with appropriate gestures. All through life he had a reputation as a storyteller, often, dignified officials would be annoyed when he bade them listen to some story or joke when they were anxious to get down to serious business—especially as the stories many times had a cultivated, bucolic twist. [His father] always was disappointed that his son spent so much time on [education] instead of doing the work that was immediately necessary," "in his middle twenties before he paid any attention to girls. He had a gaunt and awkward frame, heavily-lined, leathery skin, and large ears; it is more than likely that he did not consider himself a romantic figure. He had other redeeming qualities. He neither smoked or drank liquor. All testify that he never used profanity. He was gentle and kind, for which reason, probably, "he never cared about fishing and hunting. At school he reproved his classmates for tormenting animals and even wrote a paper about it." "Outside of a certain love for literature, it would be correct to say that for the most part, he seemed to be indifferent to the arts. This was the despair of his wife and of his colleagues...It was [his] great qualities as a leader—and his great magnanimity—which rescued him from a dullness that might otherwise have been as total as..." "He also was unsystematic in his work; and although a successful lawyer, and even a famed one, not the superior kind one would be led to expect in a man of his abilities." "it is difficult to imagine the soft-hearted [blank] shooting anybody, considering that he even objected when his playmates molested a turtle." "always read and had almost no business sense" "if, as a young man, he showed no particular "sense of destiny" with respect to himself,
his thoughtfulness now definitely betrayed a feeling that somehow he would be called upon to play an important role in the crisis that was coming." his "complexity and mysticism...was so disturbing to many" "great qualities as an individual. It cannot be denied that he was a poor administrator. Even over his growing sons he had poor control...they were poorly disciplined. But in other necessary qualities of leadership—patience, concentration, ability to separate the petty from the important, the willingness to listen to others, the ability to reject the idea that he was indispensable—in all these [he] was the acme of what could be desired." "appears mystical, unclassifiable" "He never revealed himself entirely to any one man, and therefore he will always to a certain extent remain enveloped in doubt!" "grandeur and melancholy" "emotional in youth to the point of hysteria" "political person, but devoid of even a hint of opportunism"

"lack of education" "innate wisdom and humanity" "in height, six feet, four inches; lean in flesh, weighing, on the average, one hundred and eighty pounds; dark complexion, with course black hair, and grey hair" "won local renown as a wrestler and for his humorous imitations of some of the eccentric members of the community" "instant popularity" volunteered for military service "could tell funnier stories that anyone" "a better storyteller than businessman" as a lawyer he "seized the strong points of a cause, and presented them with clearness and great compactness. His mind was logical and direct, and he did not indulge in extraneous discussion. Generalities and platitudes had no charms for him. An unflailing vein of humor never deserted him...His power of comparison was large.... The framework of his mental and moral being was honesty, and a wrong cause was poorly defended by him...He hated wrong and oppression everywhere.... He was the most simple and unostentatious of men in his habits, having few wants, and those easily supplied." "he had the ability to speak in simple meaningful words that inspired the people of the nation and of all the world to a deeper belief in democracy"

"humorist" "Humor was unquestionably a psychological necessity for [him] though—being a serious, not a solemn, man—he would not have put it quite that way. He once called laughter 'the joyous, beautiful, universal evergreen of life, and he enjoyed droll stories the way some people enjoy detective novels" "he also found amusing stories enormously helpful in putting across important points he wanted to make" "he used his gift as a storyteller to put people at ease, to win them over to his point of view, or simply to get them off the point and out of his office without having to deny their requests in so many words"

"Humor, he once said, was 'an emollient' that 'saves me much friction and distress' his "taste in jokes ran all the way from the lowly pun to the satirical anecdote" "he took keen pleasure in plays upon words"

"But [his] humor ordinarily rose above the level of puns. He particularly enjoyed teasing solemn people" he "was a teetotaler" his "humor wasn't always gentle. Sometimes he used it to point up a blunt truth" "rarely used intemperate language himself" but "was frequently criticized for not being a church member, so he was doubtless amused at hearing profanity from the orthodox" he "laughed at himself as well as at other people" "He joked about his homely looks" he "combined a sense of fun with high seriousness" "he showed himself to be shrewd, thoughtful, selfless, dedicated, strong-willed, resourceful, compassionate, and extraordinarily magnanimous" "he carried out his responsibilities with remarkable patience and determination" "He had a special fondness for Shakespeare" his "love of Shakespeare grew out of his love of fine writing. As a young man he read and reread the King James Bible, Aesop's Fables, Shakespeare, John Bunyan, Daniel Defoe, and Robert Burns, and he worked hard to improve his own vocabulary, grammar, and lucidity of expression" he "developed a distinguished prose style of his own: simple, clear, precise, forceful, rhetorical, poetic, and at times majestic" "deep sense of Providential design in the world, [though][less sure] of God's will" his humor "sometimes had ironic overtones and was wryly self-depreciating" he was "bored by self-righteousness, false humility, and garrulousness" "Six feet four inches tall, he was raw boned and lanky, but muscular and physically powerful" "Good-natured though somewhat moody, talented as a mimic and story-teller, he readily attracted friends" "He was noted not only for his shrewdness and practical common sense...but also for his invariable fairness and utter honesty" "Early in life he had been something of a skeptic and freethinker" "Throughout his life he also believed in dreams and other enigmatic signs and portents" "As he grew older...he developed a profound religious sense, and he increasingly personified necessity as God" "sure judgement' 'perfect balance of thoroughly sound faculties' 'great calmness of temper, great firmness of purpose, supreme moral
principle, and intense patriotism' 'remarkable moderation and freedom from passionate bitterness'
'indifferent to the exercise of power for power's sake'" "His inner qualities—his faithfulness, honesty, resolution, insight, humor, and courage—would 'go a long way to make up a hero,' whatever the man's personal appearance"
"unquestionably honest in dealing with personal money matters" "no doubt one of the most honest of [persons in his position]"
"a man of many contradictions" "a master of English prose" "gained fame as a teller of droll stories, yet he plunged into repeated and bottomless spells of melancholy." "He was known as a man of tender heart and deep compassion" his "bellicosity was defensively aggressive" "His schooling was the scantiest, and his education was primarily self-acquired" "In his prime... towered six feet four inches" "Renowned locally as an exceptionally powerful wrestler" "lanky" "kindly" "not personally a pugnacious human being" "soft hearted" "gentle" "tender-hearted"
"barely literate father,... stepmother... encouraged his bookish side, a total of only about one year in school, work in the village store and reading law on his own" "upwardly mobile" "married [a woman] who came from a relatively higher class" "began to give speeches in a straightforward, down-to-earth style"
"avoided provocative statements" "He was not without flaws" "great spirit to match his tall height"
"By all accounts, he was disarmingly unpretentious, a plain-spoken man genuinely interested in his people and their problems. A good listener, he typically sat in silence rubbing his chin while a visitor explained his point of view. He was at his best in relaxed conversation with small groups. His ready wit, down-home logic, and seemingly endless store of anecdotes delighted those present. 'His custom of interspersing conversation with incidents, anecdotes, and witticisms, commented an observer, 'are well calculated to impress his hearers with kindheartedness of the man. And they are so adroitly and delicately mingled in the thread of his discourse that one hardly notices the digression.' For all his good humor, however, he had a dark side; he wrestled severe bouts of mental depression. He once complained, 'If what I feel were equally distributed to the whole human family, there would not be one cheerful face on earth. Whether I shall ever be better I cannot tell; I awfully forebode I shall not. To remain as I am is impossible; I must die or be better, it appears to me.' He spoke in a high-pitched voice."

Person #39 (Andrew Johnson)

"sensitive about his early life" "combative" "the greatest fault [he] had was his overly outspoken manner. Although he could be dignified and the essence of decorum at times, he was often tactless and undignified in debate; sometimes he would argue with members of his audience. Because it gave the people an incorrect estimate of his usefulness, this did him much harm" "impulsive nature" "When these initial passions had cooled, he became conciliatory and, in fact, adopted the magnanimous attitude" his policy "simple like everything that is great, it is resolute like everything that is good" "impetuous nature" his accusers on occasion called him a drunkard. We have too many testimonials in his behalf from people who knew him intimately to believe that this was true. He did drink liquor, and made no effort to conceal it." "This erstwhile passionate and vindictive man, a member of no church, had instincively obeyed the Biblical injunction to forgive." "heroic and also a drinker"
"fortitude" "never been to school a day in his life" supported "the common man" and spoke "his mind even when it was unpopular to do so" "hardworking" "impressed the townspeople with his seriousness"
"A naturally gifted public speaker" "polished his oratory... by taking an active part in a debating society" "fair-minded, able administrator" "despite [his] humble tone, he was a fearless, even reckless fighter for what he believed in"
"In many respects an impressive figure" "bore the contempt and hatred of [his enemies] with courage and defiance" "had no schooling" "never forgot his humble origins" "he almost never passed a tailor shop without dropping in for a chat. He also liked to stop and talk with mechanics with whom he met on the street." "refused to be intimidated"
"lack of formal schooling" a disadvantage "but it helped him retain a homespun quality and rough credibility" "never faltered in his loyalty"

Cameron 141
"generally regarded as a man of sterling honesty as far as his personal life was concerned" "had developed high standards of personal honesty"

"certainly one of the most contentious men" "His entire life was a battle against somebody or something" 

"[no one in his position] ever rose from more inauspicious beginnings" "never...attended school for as much as one day" "He eventually taught himself to read...and was taught by his wife to write and spell" "a self-made man and, like many of his kind, inclined to be inordinately proud of his maker" "Endowed with the gift of gab....and delighted in battling from the stump" "He was a fighter to the very end" "A stubborn man to the end" "looked like the fighter he was. Stocky of build, five feet, ten inches tall, with unruly hair, heavy brows, and a grim mouth, he was afflicted with a violent temper" "clearly guilty of intemperate speeches, ill-temper, and bad judgement" "tempestuous" "a pugnacious man in politics" "often coarse and usually inept" "born to a poor...family" "Although a bright boy, he never went to school" "Self-assured young man set himself up in business. He worked hard and business prospered" "A compelling, if bombastic speaker, he spoke for his kind of people, the little farmers and small merchants."

"They in turn liked his earthy ways and his good luck" "He rose rapidly through the [political] ranks" "handsome blond" "smalltown views, and strongly held resentments" "his booming voice, so convincing at open-air rallies" "obvious kind of intelligence was not the sort to steer him through the mazes of governmental power" "most of all his inability to be flexible over crucial issues led to cataclysmic clashes"

"He was simple and direct in manner. He spoke bluntly and to some appeared cold. He was generally reserved and sober but went out of his way to remain on friendly terms with old acquaintances and often loaned money to people down of their luck. 'I found him kind and helpful,' recalled one neighbor, 'especially to poor young men, and he was entirely without condescension.' Because of his common roots, he throughout his life identified with the underdog. He was ever polite and carried himself with great dignity. Possessed of a strong, clear, voice. He was a gifted orator."

Person #8 (George Washington)

"has been called cold and heartless" "personally ambitious on a mighty scale [yet] would not strive with Fate in order to realize [his] dreams" did not "force issues for self-advancement" did not "sacrifice a shred of personal dignity to bring events for the self to pass" "serious boyhood" "seriousness" "never on very affectionate terms with mother" "little formal schooling" "was a materialist in every sense of the word, but only on the most honorable of terms" "Repeatedly, in his early years, [he] referred to winning honor and renown" "had a 'sense of destiny' about himself" "loved physical adventure" "passions were always under complete control" "could not avoid being impulsive in youth" "was to become considerably less impulsive" "perennial dignity of [his] character" "bravery" "humbly acknowledged his inadequacy" "was religious" "custom of conferring with others before making decisions" "criticism by his enemies of over cautiousness" "Because he had no great need to satisfy his ego he could easily accept a rejection of his plans when an alternative was shown to be the wiser policy" "His confidence in himself was strong enough to prevent him from considering an abandonment of one of his ideas a reflection on his own ability" "Not a great humanitarian" "possessed that magnanimity" "relations with women exemplary" "no record of even a slight indiscretion anywhere" "relations with [mother] were dutiful but not affectionate" "natural paternal instinct" "natural fondness for the children of others" "great reserve and dignity, even shyness, and was not valuable in conversation" "his colloquial talents [were] not above mediocrity" "his deportment easy, erect, and noble" "Lacking in a provincial outlook" "possessed the great quality of magnanimity" "reserved and diffident" "orderly and an excellent administrator" "strictly nonpolitical" "emotional and passionate" "overly serious, somber" "his mind 'great and powerful without being of the very first order'" "devoutly patriotic man who did not let the demands of his ego interfere with his
usefulness to his country" "aloof though he was, could nevertheless radiate warmth and recruit loyalties"
"political person, but devoid of even a hint of opportunism"
"a towering figure, both in physique and accomplishments. The aristocratic bearing of his six foot-two
inch figure and the calm nobility of his face created awe in those who saw him....an idol among his
contemporaries." "was a mortal, a man with normal appetites and frailties—a man who loved women,
enjoyed gambling, liked to dance all night, and prided himself on his fine horses." contemporaries
"interpreted as a god-like coldness his self conscious determination not to make any blunders that would
reveal the background of a poorly educated orphan who achieved success and riches by a combination of
luck, ingenuity, and resolution. Legends about his strength and honesty won more ready acceptance as
fact then understanding of the human qualities that both helped and hindered him" "His mind was great
and powerful, without being of the very first order; his penetration strong...; and as far as he saw, no
judgement was ever sounder. It was slow in operation, being little aided by invention or imagination, but
sure in conclusion....Perhaps the strongest features in his character was prudence, never acting until every
circumstance, every consideration, was maturely weighed; refraining when he saw a doubt, but, when
once decided, going through with his purpose whatever obstacles opposed. His integrity was most pure,
his justice the most inflexible..., no motives of interest or consanguinity, of friendship or hatred, being
able to bias the decision. He was indeed, in every sense of the words, a wise, a good, and a great man....
On the whole, his character was, in its mass, perfect, in nothing bad, in few points indifferent; and it may
truly be said, that never did nature and fortune combine more perfectly to make a man great"
"never a scholar. Even in his latter years he seldom read books unless they could serve some practical
purpose.... But he had respect for books...Throughout his life [he] wrote extensively in diaries and letters"
"dignified enough, and certainly worthy of the highest respect" as general "performed heroically"
"showed a great deal of common sense" "He made mistakes, of course...But most of the time he showed
sound judgement; and his devotion to the public good in all exigencies was unwavering" "impressive all
right; but he was never as stiff, formal, cold, aloof, and impersonal as legend has pictured him. As a
young man, he engaged in dealing—do like any romantic hero; he was eager to prove himself as a fighter
and so was careless of his own safety in the midst of battle. All his life, moreover, he had an eye for
good-looking women, with whom he liked to flirt. He had an earthy sense of humor...and was not put off
by the subject of sex. He also like good food and wine, enjoyed card-playing, horse-racing, and fox-
hunting, and had a great passion for the theater. At his wife[s] parties, he circulated with obvious
pleasure among the ladies [impressing one as being] 'polite with dignity, affable, without familiarity,
distant without haughtiness, grave without austerity, modest, wise, and good'" his "teeth eventually did
him in. Later in life he suffered frequently from toothaches; finally he had his teeth pulled and a plate
made [but] his first dentures were so ill-fitting that he could barely close his lips when wearing them, and
it was extremely difficult for him to smile" "a many-sided individual possessing kindness as well as
reserve, playfulness as well as dignity, and passionate feeling as well as prudent restraint" "fairly well
trained in practical mathematics—gauging, several types of mensuration, and such trigonometry as was
useful in surveying" "his best training...given him by practical men and outdoor occupations, not by
books" surveying "experience taught him resourcefulness and endurance and toughened both body and
mind" as a farmer "He tried to keep abreast of the latest scientific advances" "For diversion he was fond
of riding, fox hunting, and dancing; of such theatrical performances as he could reach; and of duck
hunting and sturgeon fishing" "He liked billiards and cards and not only subscribed to racing associations
but ran his own horses in races" "In all outdoor pursuits, from wrestling to colt breaking, he excelled"
"very muscular and broad shouldered, but though large boned, weighing only 175 pounds" "six feet two
inches in his stockings" "long arms and legs" "penetrating blue-gray eyes were overhung by heavy brows,
his nose large and straight, and his mouth was large and firmly closed" "His movements and gestures are
graceful, his walk majestic, and he was a splendid horseman" "active church member "military ambition"
"self-reliance, decision, and masterful traits" "displayed the combination of coolness and determination,
the alliance of unconquerable energy with complete poise" "Ambitious for both rank and honour, he
showed a somewhat strident vigor in asserting his desires and in complaining when they were denied"
"showed characteristic decision and energy" "not a great tactician" "Naturally bold and dashing"
"sternness as a disciplinarian" "love of peace" "distrust of his own abilities" "caution, methodological precision, and sober judgement had always characterized him" "his cold and reserved manner was caused by native diffidence rather than any excessive sense of dignity."
"steadfastness" "august presence" "his sense of duty was compelling" "probably no [one in his position] was ever more scrupulously honest" "a man of unstained honor" "universally recognized as a man of sterling integrity" "his integrity was most pure, his justice the most inflexible...He was...a wise, a good, and a great man."
"aristocratic" "was a professional military man and indeed looked like one. Six feet, two inches tall and well-proportioned" "preeminently a man of peace" "could be trusted" "not a dictator or even a militarist" "may not have been first as a military genius" "somewhat slow in thought but generally sound in judgment"
"most...would come to think of him almost entirely in his later years—elderly, upright, formal, aloof—and as an 'indoor' man. [But in his] early years...an 'outdoor' man. "For the fact is that [his] early life was far more like a Huck Finn's than that of the white-marble aristocrat. True, he came from a fine old...family, and his father was...prosperous...But [he] only spent about eight years in school; not only did he never go to college, but he was never as well read in traditional culture as were [others in his position]. Instead, [he as a youth] enjoyed the life of the country gentry—hunting, fishing, boating, riding.... At one point in his teens he wanted to go off and join the [navy] but his mother talked him out of it; instead he became a surveyor, which meant that he continued to spend much of his time outdoors tramping through the...wilds" "served as an officer... and again, he campaigned and fought in quite arduous conditions."
"When [he] retired from military service...he undoubtedly began to live a more domesticated life...and he participated in the social life of a person of his station. But again, this involved a great deal of outdoor, practical activities whether supervising the farming and construction activities...or fishing and foxhunting."
"A man of quiet strength, he took few friends into complete confidence. His critics mistook his dignified reserve for pomposity. Life for him was serious mission, a job to be tackled soberly, unremittingly. He had little time for humor. Although basically good natured, he wrestled with his temper and sometimes lost. He was a poor speaker and could become utterly inarticulate without a prepared text. He preferred to express himself on paper. Still, when he did speak, he was candid, direct, and looked people squarely in the eye. His 'ambition for wealth made him acquisitive and sometimes contentious.' 'He would insist upon the exact payment of every farthing due him' and was determined 'to get everything that he honestly could.' Yet neither his ambition to succeed nor his acquisitive nature ever threatened his basic integrity."

Person #13 (Buchanan)

"at first this naturally intelligent boy did not do well at school for the simple reason that he spent all his time in all kinds of mischief" "graduated first in his class" in college, "volunteered for service in the war."
"His unusual success in his profession was due not only to his knowledge but to his ability as a speaker; through study he had developed considerable oratorical talents" "He was not direct enough; he could not rise to the occasion; he lacked the courage necessary at crucial times" "a man of impeccable honesty and patriotism." "He was devoted to his mother...and admitted he owed much to her" "weak, compromising" "helplessly stood by, unable to take resolute action" "learned arithmetic and bookkeeping, which he used to keep meticulous personal accounts throughout his life." "As a youth, he showed a rebellious streak, being expelled from [college] at the end of his first year because of insubordination to his teachers. He was reinstated at the college when he pledged to settle down and work hard. Keeping his promise, he was graduated the next year." Volunteered for military service in war. "He lived frugally, slowly accumulating a sizable fortune."

"A gentleman of the old school. Distinguished-looking, faultlessly attired and courtly-mannered, he looked, it was said, like a...nobleman of an earlier generation. An eye defect forced him to tilt his head slightly forward and sideways when engaged in conversation, which gave the impression of exceptional courteousness and sensitivity to others. He also had a passion for precision. For years he kept account
books in which he conscientiously recorded every penny that passed through his hands. One person referred to him as "an able man, but in small matters without judgment and sometimes acts like an old maid." During a crisis [he] seemed helpless and irresolute. "regarded as unimaginative, legalistic, and morally obtuse."

"Lacked the soundness of judgement, self-reliance, and moral courage needed to act decisively."

"supposed indecisiveness" "unfairly called...weak" "policy of reconciliation and restraint" "lifelong bachelor...The fiancé of his youth had committed suicide after a trivial lovers' quarrel, and he had shunned matrimony thereafter." "imposing, statesmanlike appearance. Heavy set, he stood an even six feet. Because of defective vision, he carried his head at a tilt, cocked down and to one side" "he got along well with people and impressed many listeners with his gifts as a raconteur." "graduated from...college." "After studying law, he was admitted to the bar...and rose rapidly in his chosen profession. He gained considerable fame as an orator, not only from what he said but also from the impressive way he said it." "a distinguished legalist" "a strain of pugnacity" "more bellicose in public than he was in private" "on the whole [he] was one of the more aggressive, even militant of [those in his position]" "favored concession, compromise."

"Built a political career on ability to appease" "lawyer by training" "solid party man" "unable to take decisive action."

"His personality was marked by `strong family affections,' `engaging social qualities,' `fidelity to friends,' a `forgiving temper towards those who had injured him,' and generosity. He freely loaned money to friends in need and gave funds to the poor. He was scrupulous to avoid even the appearance of conflict of interest. He carried himself with an air of dignity and was at all times graceful and courteous. He was not an especially gifted speaker."

Person #9 (Jackson)

"a doer rather than a deliberator" "audacious resolve to be himself" "impressive and even magisterial appearance,...unconventional conduct, his fearlessness, his opposition to the `money power'" "his military exploits" "although he was a people's idol, his methods were arbitrary and therefore contrary to democratic processes" "enigma" "democrat-autocrat" "violent, revengeful, generous, impatient"

"impassioned" "sensitive about his early life" "combative" "high-spirited fourteen-year old" "no ordinary youth" "physical and moral fearlessness" "vengeful" "strong parental instinct" "tall and gaunt with a long, thin face topped by an immense crop of hair" "his features, while not attractive, were said to be impressive" "a dramatic person" "without being either a student of life or an advocate of any great constructive project, won large groups of people to him" "intuitive talent for identifying himself with the wants and desires of the people" "not a good administrator" "dazzling, exciting" "honest and patriotic" "did indeed retain his immense popularity to the end of his days" "true and genuine reverence for God, a qualifying factor in this turbulent career" "grew up as a poorly educated orphan" "dissipated a small inheritance as a wild teenager" "hotheaded" "fought countless duels, won and lost thousands of dollars on horse races, speculated in land" "hawk-eyed" "uniquely combined the art of a seasoned politician with the decision-making ability of a successful general. His tenacious loyalty towards his friends was matched by an equally unquenchable enmity for anyone who insulted or betrayed him." "tall, slim and straight...His whole being conveyed an impression of energy and daring" "an ardent, generous, sincere nature"

"he had risen gradually to affluence; indeed, many of his habits and manners were those of an aristocrat. Nevertheless, he still displayed some of the rough-and-ready ways of his early life" the upper-class "regarded him as a crude, ignorant, and bellicose brawler." "As a young man [he] had been involved in a series of shooting matches" "at times bellicose" "supporters applauded his forthrightness, fearlessness, generosity, decisiveness, and championship of the people. His enemies thought he was reckless, intolerant, wrong-headed, and dictatorial" "But everyone—friend and foe alike—agreed on one thing: when [he] made up his mind to do something, he did it regardless of opposition" "charismatic" "forthrightness"
"forceful" "exercised vigorously the power and authority of his office" "little opportunity for formal education" "a successful lawyer, but he was too restless and his interests too varied to be confined to a career as an attorney" became involved in both "adventures in trade and in land speculation...The cause of his investments was an unsteady one" "unhappy in being separated from his family" "He was a man of limited education and no pretense to inherited social position. He was the epitome of the self-made man" "vigor and determination in carrying out decisions" "at times, he was...strong-willed and decisive" to excess "His practice of acting upon each question as he met it often made it difficult for even his friends to predict the decisions he would make"

"had many conspicuous faults, but a lack of integrity was not among them. He was ill-educated, ill-tempered, opinionated, suspicious, unbending, dictatorial...vindictive, and a fierce hater. But he was not basically a dishonest man, and so sensitive was he about his honor...that on occasion he would risk his life" "an uncommon man" "bad judgement of character" "hot-tempered" "a man of fiscal integrity" "undiplomatically provocative" "tactless" "man of exceptional honor and integrity"

"vengeful" "pugnacious" "impetuous troublemaker" "unquestionably the most pugnacious man ever to [attain his position]" "misspent his youth. He was more interested in cockfighting, horse racing, and brawling than in reading and writing, and his spelling throughout his adult life continued to be atrocious." "in debate [he] would become so choked with rage that he could not speak coherently" "his physical altercations with clubs, knives, and pistols seem to have run into the dozens" "gradually outgrew the roughneck reputation of his youth and became a[n]...aristocrat" "Six feet, one inch tall, and weighing a scant 140 pounds [he] took to his grave a gaunt, hawklike face, crowned by bushy gray-white hair" "his manners were generally dignified and courtly" "his ill health probably contributed to his cantankerousness, shortness of temper, and determination to have his own way" "a professional military man and an iron disciplinarian" "hotheaded" "fiery" "normally hot-tempered" "irascible" "his "bark was sometimes more fearsome than his bite" "notorious pugnacity"

"self-made man" "came to fame primarily as a military man" "admitted to the bar...and his practice soon prospered" "established a reputation as a fair, if not particularly learned, judge; as always, he was guided mainly by his convictions and intuitions"

"A charismatic figure, he was combative, quick-tempered, and thin skinned. To his friends he was generous, considerate, and above all loyal; to his enemies, mean spirited and spiteful. 'When he hated, it often became a grand passion. He could hate with a Biblical fury and would resort to petty and vindictive acts to nurture his hatred and keep it bright and strong and ferocious.' He at times exploded with anger, but it is believed that he never really lost his temper. Rather, he launched into tirades quite purposefully either to intimidate his opposition or to end debate on a matter that was dragging on too long. Some marveled at his ability to turn his anger on and off at will. One minute he could be shrieking in the high register his voice invariably had whenever he was agitated; the next moment, he was relaxed and in good humor. At social occasions he surprised many with his grace, poise, and charm. Around women he shed his backwoods manner and earthy language to engage comfortably in social discourse. He delighted in disappointing those who, he said, 'were prepared to see me with a tomahawk in one hand and a scalping knife in the other.'"

Person #16 (Truman)

"In order to understand him we must always take into account the intense influence on [him] of his mother, his books, his music, and his faulty vision. All four are severely personal, and in the ordinary man would be the hallmark of an introverted person. To [his] credit it must be stated that he was not self-centered enough to develop into such an individual." "For quite a while seriously aspired to a career in music and studied very hard at it. Wearing spectacles at a very early age, he could not partake in boy's games; such a victim is often automatically turned within himself and forced to find his world in books,
music, and the home. "Was a failure" "clean-living" "his boyhood was a happy and wholesome one," "a mild and undramatic person [at first]" "castigated by his opponents as a strutting, equivocating, cocksure, rabble-rousing...politician" "humanitarian" "[his] language was often careless and inaccurate" "made statements unbecoming to an elder statesman. Such impetuous utterances made him countless enemies." "His background and even his appearance were unpromising." "Without a college education" "spoke the language of a...dirt farmer" "looked like a bank clerk or haberdasher" "unservingly honest man who knew his own mind and [was] one of the most knowledgeable students of history" "no suspicion of dishonesty" "skillful and indefatigable campaigner" "addressed himself to the common people." "His homey appearance...and his sincerity and seriousness won the crowds" his "enormous energy enabled him to work harder." "He retained the early rising habits of a dirt farmer, usually getting up at 5:30 AM and going for a walk of a mile or two, followed by a short swim before breakfast."

"No one questioned [his] honesty and integrity." "He impressed people as being plain, simple, unpretentious, and down to earth" "off-the-cuff remarks and...letters he dashed off in the heat of the moment" "Some people, though, thought [his] language was too salty" "he blew up" "Despite a steady barrage of criticism [he] became increasingly self-confident, and even cocky" "Once called a liar, cheat, fool, cuddler of subversives...he began to appear in retrospect refreshingly independent, straightforward, decisive, and courageous" "frequently said and did exactly what he thought was right even though it wasn't always the politic thing to do"

"The keys to [his] outlook were...[an] agrarianism, a suspicion of big business, and an inordinate interest in history and battles. In personality he was characterized by a low boiling point, a loyalty to his friends, an inoffensive cockiness, and native shrewdness and wariness" "distinguished himself in heavy action" in war "showing bravery and other qualities of leadership" "reputation for honesty and good management" "attention to duties and his friendly personality...won over his colleagues"

"feisty" "exceptionally clever politician"

"gutty" "a born fighter, but not with his fists. Largely because of extreme shortsightedness and thick lensed spectacles, he was reared as a 'mama's boy,' and he spent much of his boyhood practicing on the piano or keeping his nose in a book" "he was five feet, nine inches in height and weighed 167 pounds." "He did his fighting with pen and tongue, both of which revealed his penchant for salty language, perhaps picked up from his mule-trader father." "Was common clay—uncommon common clay" "attended the local high school" but —"never attended college, although he did study law on the side" "As a student he earned good grades and developed a lifelong interest in reading history" "saw heavy action" in war and "won the lasting esteem of his comrades" " rattily dressed "toothy, owlishly bespectacled" "aggressive...at times pugnacious" "on balance, he appears to have been somewhat less combative than his popular image represents him to have been. Even so, he was prone to go off half-cocked and 'shout from the lip'" "one of the most peppery..."

"diminutive, often feisty" "a strong pragmatic hand" "born to a family of...farm pioneers, [he] learned outspoken and assertive behavior from his parents. Forced, however, by an overly protective but loving mother to dress neatly, take piano lessons, and babysit his younger sister, and excluded from rough boyhood games by poor eyesight, [he] was, by his own admission, a 'kind of sissy' as a child. Unable to afford a college education, the quiet and bookish young man traveled down the road...to earn his living as a clerk, bookkeeper and haberdasher, an undistinguished career interrupted by artillery duty [during war]"

"Entering politics...[he] maintained an almost puritanical integrity and honesty" "loyal" "a noted penchant for barnyard epithets" "Privately questioning his own adequacy, [he] conducted himself self-confidently, even aggressively" "spoke bluntly" "proving his political skill and personal mettle" "dispensing a kind of 'cracker barrel' philosophy"

"To really understand him 'you must grasp the importance of humility in his thinking'. To brag about himself or claim credit for something in public was anathema to him. 'But this practice of humility never meant that he downgraded his worth, his accomplishments, in his own mind.' Indeed, he was supremely confident of his own judgement. He acted, decisively. Once he made a decision, he forgot about it and went on to something else. He was earnest, incorruptible, and blunt in speech. He was notorious for his explosive temper and salty language. Although irascible, he was not moody or prone to depression. He
thrived on the rough and tumble of politics. He delivered prepared addresses poorly in a flat voice. He fired up crowds with off-the-cuff speeches, characteristically of simple, straightforward language and short sentences.

Person #32 (Harding)

"patriotic and honest" "typical cocktail drinking, poker-playing, extroverted good fellow" "mediocrity and ineptness. Yet [he] was very likeable and completely patriotic"
"handsome face and genial personality" "He tried studying law and selling insurance, but preferred shooting pool and playing poker with the town sports" "continued to seek popularity" "noble appearance and lofty words" confessed that he liked "to go out into the country" and to "loaf around, chat with people, and in general enjoy" himself. made "long-winded speeches stuffed with shabby ideas, stale cliches, and awkward neologisms" "thought he had a way with words...but it was the wrong way" "He used clumsy words of his own making...He was the master of banal wisdom" "had a passion for alliteration that led him into an orgy of word-mongering" "himself displayed no small-town virtues...He invited his cronies to poker games...at which liquor flowed freely...He also arranged for clandestine meetings with his mistress...and provided secret financial support for her baby" "had no illusions about himself" "himself honest" "grasp of economic realities was...infirm"
"An able public speaker with an impressive manner" "unassuming and undemanding" his "personal integrity was not questioned..." but "his political naivete' and lax administrative standards were apparent" "a small-bore...politician who had ambitions to fill an office beyond his depth. Although handsome, genial, affable, and gracious, he had mental furnishings that were not of the best" "had little or no capacity to detect crookedness or moral halitosis in his associates. He was soon surrounded by poker-playing, nest-feathering cronies" "A good guy" "one of the boys" "Perhaps his greatest weakness was an unwillingness to hurt people's feelings...by saying No" "amiable" "Not a university graduate, [he] was painfully aware of his scanty intellectual background" marital infidelities...suggest that...he had human weaknesses, and that the sixth commandment forbidding adultery held no great terrors for him" one critic said that he "was not a bad man. He was just a slob" "he was a reasonably honest and able politician in beyond his depth. He put in long hours on the job, partly because his abilities were not of the highest" "something of an isolationist" "As a humanitarian and man of good will [he] established a record that partially offsets the dishonest doings of his appointed associates and others" "robust" "volubility, gullibility, and good fellowship"
"a man of peace" "easygoing, 'folksy' person" "well-built six-footer with whitish hair, blue eyes, and a smooth complexion. His slightly dark coloration provided some basis for the...accusation that there was a strain of Negro blood in his family. Whatever the truth, there could be no doubt that he was one of the handsomest men to ever occupy [his position]. His good looks may have had something to do with his having been an unfaithful blood in his family. Whatever the truth, there could be no doubt that he was one of the handsomest men to ever occupy [his position]. His good looks may have had something to do with his having been an unfaithful husband...one of two major scandals is documented with a packet of love letters in his own handwriting." "amiable, weak-willed" "attended [college] but earned no degree" "no military record" "Affable, glad-handing, and somewhat gullible, his pugnacity pressure was extremely low. He was so humane that he would carefully brush off ants rather than crush them." "had early learned that the best way to get along is to go along" "enemyless" "non-warrior"
"Although almost totally incompetent, [he] rose to the highest office in the land by combination of back room shenanigans, complex political tides, and a stream of his own mellifluous rhetoric" "After gaining a small-college degree he tried and failed in several jobs before becoming...a partner in a newspaper" "he married a local banker's daughter...: a formidable and ambitious woman, she drove his political career and also drove him into a series of extramarital liaisons" "During the same period he had the first of several nervous breakdowns" "stentorian fog of his rhetoric" "showed his political acumen by sponsoring no significant legislation whatever" "genial incompetence" "imposing, handsome features; he undoubtedly
looked like a president, and sounded like one, too" "himself not notably corrupt; rather, he was blindly loyal to corrupt cronies and innocently hypocritical"

"He genuinely liked people. His relaxed managerial style made for good labor relations. He never fired a single employee. He was well liked by all, his aversion to confrontation kept him above brute political infighting. In campaigning he always took the high road, pointing out the positive aspects of his candidacy rather than resorting to personal attacks on his opponent. He was truly humble, a humility that sprang from a candid awareness of his own limitations. 'He desperately sought approval all his life, he hated to be forced to decide on matters that might antagonize people. At any given moment of his career, he was prepared to trim his sails in order to please.'"
Please read through the descriptions and rank each Person on every type using a scale of 1 to 7. 1= Does not describe this person at all and 7= Describes this person extremely well. In the last column, please use your judgment to choose just one Type overall for each person.
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<td>#30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX J
Study 2_Likert Chart Group B

Please read through the descriptions and rank each Person on every type using a scale of 1 to 7. 1= Does not describe this person at all and 7=Describes this person extremely well. In the last column, please use your judgment to choose just one Type overall for each person.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Type 1</th>
<th>Type 2</th>
<th>Type 3</th>
<th>Type 4</th>
<th>Type 5</th>
<th>Type 6</th>
<th>Type 7</th>
<th>Type 8</th>
<th>Type 9</th>
<th>Overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX K
Type Description with Cartoons

Type Descriptions

The Enneagram Types

1 THE REFORMER
The Rational, Idealistic Type: Principled, Purposeful, Self-Controlled, and Perfectionistic

2 THE HELPER
The Caring, Interpersonal Type: Demonstrative, Generous, People-Pleasing, and Possessive

3 THE ACHIEVER
The Success-Oriented, Pragmatic Type: Adaptive, Excelling, Driven, and Image-Conscious
4 THE INDIVIDUALIST
The Sensitive, Withdrawn Type: Expressive, Dramatic, Self-Absorbed, and Temperamental

5 THE INVESTIGATOR
The Intense, Cerebral Type: Perceptive, Innovative, Secretive, and Isolated

6 THE LOYALIST
The Committed, Security-Oriented Type: Engaging, Responsible, Anxious, and Suspicious
7 THE ENTHUSIAST
The Busy, Fun-Loving Type: Spontaneous, Versatile, Distractible, and Scattered

8 THE CHALLENGER
The Powerful, Dominating Type: Self-Confident, Decisive, Willful, and Confrontational

9 THE PEACEMAKER
The Easygoing, Self-Effacing Type: Receptive, Reassuring, Agreeable, and Complacent