

Persistent Personality Differences on the CPI?

Richard C. Thompson & Nicole A. Herk
CPP, Inc.

In examining personality differences across ethnic groups, previous research has revealed mixed results. For example, a study by Heuchert, Parker, Stumph, and Myburgh (2000) showed that the five-factor model of personality resulted in similar scores across Blacks, Whites, Indians, and mixed race participants in South Africa, although significant differences in some mean scores were found. Other research has also shown similar results as significantly higher scores have been found for African Americans on a number of the scales of the MMPI assessment (Butcher, Braswell, & Raney, 1983), yet only trivial differences have been found between ethnic groups sampled using the CPI 260 instrument (Gough & Bradley, 2005) and the CPI434 instrument (Schaubhut, Donnay, Thompson, & Morris, 2004). In looking specifically at Native Americans, previous studies using the CPI instrument to examine such differences have generally found that lower overall scores exist on most scales for Native American samples (Davis, Hoffman, & Nelson, 1990; Mason, 1967, 1969).

It has become standard practice in testing with different cultural groups to examine both the measurement properties of an assessment, as well as differences in scores in order to determine if a measure can be considered appropriate for cross cultural use. This study examines the CPI 260 assessment by comparing the

measurement properties and standard score profiles for Native Americans to a comparable sample of Caucasians.

To obtain the samples for the current study, the CPP commercial database for the CPI 260 assessment was utilized. Specifically, individuals who self-reported their ethnicity as Native Americans were extracted; a small sample was obtained. The criteria for inclusion included responding to several demographic items, not having and indicators of invalidity in their protocol results, and being over age 18. The comparison sample of respondents, who self-identified as being either White or Caucasian, was obtained by randomly selecting cases from a much larger pool of participants to create a group that very closely approximated the Native American sample in terms of self reported gender, age, employment status, and for those employed, organizational level. The Native American sample consisted of 186 individuals (45.7% female, 54.3% male), and the Caucasian sample consisted of 186 individuals (37.6% female, 62.4% male). All participants completed the CPI 260 assessment, which measures psychological characteristics and attributes through 20 folk-concept scales, six occupation-oriented scales, and three higher-order measures (Gough & Bradley, 2005). The data for this study were analyzed by ethnic group within gender samples and as a combined gender sample. All

participants consented to have their results used for research purposes by CPP.

Two analyses of the measurement properties of the CPI 260 assessment were completed. The first examined the internal consistency reliability of the CPI 260 assessment scales for the two samples; the results are summarized in Table 1. Overall, this analysis revealed that the measures were generally similar across samples. A second analysis examined the consistency of the factor structure of the CPI 260 assessment in the two samples. Here, the Native American sample was compared to the Caucasian sample using the Wrigley-Neuhaus factor similarity coefficient (1955). The programmer of an automated program permitted us to use his method to compute the factor similarity coefficients (A.L. Comrey, personal communication, August 30, 2006). This analysis follows that used by Gough to evaluate the CPI 260 assessment across cultures (Gough & Bradley, 2005). The results showed the factor structure to be highly similar across the two samples, with all coefficients of congruence above .90. These two analyses indicate the CPI 260 assessment is functioning in an equivalent psychometric manner across the two samples. As a result, comparisons of the average scores on the CPI 260 instrument measures were computed and compared.

To examine mean differences on the CPI 260 assessment scales by ethnic group and gender, a 2 (ethnic group) X 2 (gender) Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was conducted. As shown in Table 2,

significant main effects were found for gender on Dominance ($F(1, 368) = 12.87, p < .001$), Capacity for Status ($F(1, 368) = 6.63, p < .01$), Social Presence ($F(1, 368) = 13.83, p < .001$), Self-acceptance ($F(1, 368) = 4.76, p < .05$), Independence ($F(1, 368) = 16.21, p < .001$), Empathy ($F(1, 368) = 6.77, p < .01$), Well-being ($F(1, 368) = 9.56, p < .01$), Conceptual Fluency ($F(1, 368) = 14.16, p < .001$), Insightfulness ($F(1, 368) = 6.14, p < .05$), Flexibility ($F(1, 368) = 4.65, p < .05$), Sensitivity ($F(1, 368) = 118.12, p < .001$), v_1 ($F(1, 368) = 6.33, p < .05$), v_3 ($F(1, 368) = 6.05, p < .05$), Managerial Potential ($F(1, 368) = 12.57, p < .001$), Work Orientation ($F(1, 368) = 6.13, p < .05$), Creative Temperament ($F(1, 368) = 9.53, p < .01$), Leadership ($F(1, 368) = 8.76, p < .01$), and Law Enforcement Orientation ($F(1, 368) = 10.31, p < .001$).

Significant main effects were found for ethnicity on Capacity for Status ($F(1, 368) = 5.52, p < .05$), Social Presence ($F(1, 368) = 5.67, p < .05$), Empathy ($F(1, 368) = 6.98, p < .01$), Responsibility ($F(1, 368) = 8.08, p < .01$), Communality ($F(1, 368) = 5.87, p < .05$), Well-being ($F(1, 368) = 6.89, p < .01$), Tolerance ($F(1, 368) = 19.74, p < .001$), Achievement via Independence ($F(1, 368) = 25.14, p < .001$), Achievement via Conformance ($F(1, 368) = 6.82, p < .01$), Insightfulness ($F(1, 368) = 10.08, p < .01$), Flexibility ($F(1, 368) = 18.42, p < .001$), v_3 ($F(1, 368) = 16.10, p < .001$), Managerial Potential ($F(1, 368) = 11.61, p < .001$), Creative Temperament ($F(1, 368) = 11.31, p < .001$), and Amicability ($F(1, 368) = 10.35, p < .001$). These results were consistent with the independent samples t-tests reported in Table 3,

where mean scores for Native Americans and Caucasians were examined. In addition to the results of the ANOVA, t-tests revealed significant differences ($p < .05$) between the Native American and Caucasian samples on Achievement via Conformance and Work Orientation. The interaction between gender and ethnicity was also found to be significant for Achievement via Independence $F(1, 368) = 4.24, p < .05$ and Insightfulness $F(1, 368) = 4.22, p < .05$).

To further examine these differences, independent sample t-tests were calculated separately for females and males in the Native American and Caucasian samples (see Tables 4 and 5). Significant differences between Native American females and Caucasian females, respectively, were found on Capacity for Status (Mean = 53.28, 56.74, $p < .05$), Social Presence (Mean = 47.46, 51.57, $p < .05$), Empathy (Mean = 56.66, 60.26, $p < .05$), Responsibility (Mean = 54.36, 56.97, $p < .05$), Communality (Mean = 50.62, 53.10, $p < .05$), Well-being (Mean = 52.72, 56.07, $p < .05$), Tolerance (Mean = 55.12, 60.57, $p < .001$), Achievement via Independence (Mean = 55.55, 61.14, $p < .001$), Conceptual Fluency (Mean = 52.83, 56.18, $p < .05$), Insightfulness (Mean = 54.46, 58.75, $p < .01$), Flexibility (Mean = 47.34, 52.56, $p < .01$), V3 – Orientation toward Self (Mean = 55.49, 60.63, $p < .01$), Managerial Potential (Mean = 58.99, 62.25, $p < .05$), Creative Temperament (Mean = 49.89, 54.66, $p < .01$), and Amicability (Mean = 54.55, 58.50, $p < .05$).

Similarly, significant differences between Native American males and Caucasian males, respectively, were found on Responsibility (Mean = 54.44, 56.61, $p < .05$), Tolerance (Mean = 57.88, 60.43, $p < .05$), Achievement via Independence (Mean = 56.91, 58.40, $p < .05$), Flexibility (Mean = 50.39, 53.90, $p < .01$), V3 – Orientation toward Self (Mean = 59.10, 61.84, $p < .05$), and Managerial Potential (Mean = 62.37, 65.46, $p < .01$).

Generally, the results of this study show that the CPI 260 has very similar measurement properties for Native Americans compared with a similar sample of Caucasians. In addition, the study shows similar scores for Native Americans and Caucasians for the CPI 260 instrument measures, although some small mean differences were found. The results suggest that care should be taken when using the CPI 260 with Native American respondents to ensure that the results are not misinterpreted.

References

- Butcher, J. N., Braswell, L., & Raney, D. (1983). A cross-cultural comparison of American Indian, Black, and White inpatients on the MMPI and presenting symptoms. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 51*, 587-594.
- Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical power analysis for the behavior sciences*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Cohen, J. (1992) *A Power Primer. Psychological Bulletin, 112*, 155-159.

- Davis, G. L., Hoffman, R. G., & Nelson, K. S. (1990). Differences between Native Americans and Whites on the California Psychological Inventory. *Psychological Assessment, 2*, 238-242.
- Gough, H. G., & Bradley, P. (2005). CPI 260™ Manual. Mountain View, CA: CPP, Inc.
- Heuchert, J.W.P., Parker, W.D., Stumph, H., & Myburgh, C.P.H. (2000). The five-factor model of personality in South African college students. *American Behavioral Scientist, 44*, 112-125.
- Mason, E. P. (1967). Comparison of personality characteristics of junior high students from Native American, Mexican, and Caucasian ethnic backgrounds. *The Journal of Social Psychology, 73*, 145-155.
- Mason, E. P. (1969). Cross-validation study of personality characteristics of junior high students from Native American, Mexican, and Caucasian ethnic backgrounds. *The Journal of Social Psychology, 77*, 15-24.
- Schaubhut, N. A., Donnay, D. A. C., Thompson, R. C., & Morris, M. L. (2004). Gender and Ethnic Differences on CPI™ 434 Scales. Poster presented at the Annual Convention of the American Psychological Association, Washington, D.C.
- Wrigley, C.S., & Neuhaus, J.O. (1955). The matching of two sets of factors. *American Psychologist, 10*, 418-419.

Table 1.

Internal Consistency (Alpha) Coefficients for CPI 260 Scales—Native Americans and Caucasians

CPI Scale	Native Americans	Caucasians
Do	.88	.88
Cs	.76	.72
Sy	.79	.79
Sp	.67	.70
Sa	.68	.74
In	.73	.70
Em	.58	.60
Re	.70	.59
So	.63	.60
Sc	.76	.69
Gi	.78	.70
Cm	.40	.37
Wb	.81	.73
To	.82	.64
Ac	.72	.58
Ai	.73	.66
Cf	.77	.73
Is	.60	.44
Fx	.70	.64
Sn	.59	.63
v1	.82	.80
v2	.55	.56
v3	.87	.81
Mp	.79	.78
Wo	.75	.55
Ct	.72	.71
Lp	.86	.88
Ami	.80	.71
Leo	.49	.59

Table 2.
ANOVA Summary Table

CPI Scales		df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Partial η^2
<i>Dealing with Others</i>						
Do	Main Effect Gender	1	1090.389	12.868	.000***	.034
	Main Effect Ethnicity	1	16.347	.193	.661	.001
	Interaction	1	.927	.011	.917	.000
	Error	368	84.735			
Cs	Main Effect Gender	1	540.215	6.630	.010**	.018
	Main Effect Ethnicity	1	449.912	5.522	.019*	.015
	Interaction	1	133.341	1.636	.202	.004
	Error	368	81.480			
Sy	Main Effect Gender	1	162.260	1.901	.169	.005
	Main Effect Ethnicity	1	37.757	.442	.506	.001
	Interaction	1	43.434	.509	.476	.001
	Error	368	85.366			
Sp	Main Effect Gender	1	1195.442	13.833	.000***	.036
	Main Effect Ethnicity	1	489.672	5.666	.018*	.015
	Interaction	1	281.501	3.257	.072	.009
	Error	368	86.422			
Sa	Main Effect Gender	1	388.680	4.758	.030*	.013
	Main Effect Ethnicity	1	129.651	1.587	.209	.004
	Interaction	1	7.600	.093	.761	.000
	Error	368	81.685			
In	Main Effect Gender	1	1011.030	16.213	.000***	.042
	Main Effect Ethnicity	1	80.477	1.291	.257	.003
	Interaction	1	21.814	.350	.555	.001
	Error	368	62.358			
Em	Main Effect Gender	1	590.556	6.767	.010**	.018
	Main Effect Ethnicity	1	609.482	6.984	.009**	.019
	Interaction	1	89.069	1.021	.313	.003
	Error	368	87.273			
<i>Self-management</i>						
Re	Main Effect Gender	1	1.636	.026	.872	.000
	Main Effect Ethnicity	1	511.475	8.076	.005**	.021
	Interaction	1	4.343	.069	.794	.000
	Error	368	63.335			
So	Main Effect Gender	1	.220	.004	.950	.000
	Main Effect Ethnicity	1	180.387	3.163	.076	.009
	Interaction	1	4.800	.084	.772	.000
	Error	368	57.026			
Sc	Main Effect Gender	1	11.738	.150	.699	.000

CPI Scales		df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Partial η^2
Gi	Main Effect Ethnicity	1	6.992	.089	.766	.000
	Interaction	1	88.179	1.124	.290	.003
	Error	368	78.479			
	Main Effect Gender	1	145.196	1.746	.187	.005
	Main Effect Ethnicity	1	6.319	.076	.783	.000
Cm	Interaction	1	18.951	.228	.633	.001
	Error	368	83.182			
	Main Effect Gender	1	137.082	2.108	.147	.006
	Main Effect Ethnicity	1	381.448	5.865	.016*	.016
	Interaction	1	16.226	.249	.618	.001
Wb	Error	368	65.035			
	Main Effect Gender	1	662.680	9.559	.002**	.025
	Main Effect Ethnicity	1	477.885	6.893	.009**	.018
	Interaction	1	98.015	1.414	.235	.004
	Error	368	69.325			
To	Main Effect Gender	1	153.971	2.117	.147	.006
	Main Effect Ethnicity	1	1435.816	19.737	.000***	.051
	Interaction	1	188.198	2.587	.109*	.007
	Error	368	72.748			
	<i>Motivations and Thinking Style</i>					
Ac	Main Effect Gender	1	9.455	.172	.678	.000
	Main Effect Ethnicity	1	197.685	3.601	.059	.010
	Interaction	1	.005	.000	.992	.000
	Error	368	54.898			
	Ai	Main Effect Gender	1	140.828	2.509	.114
Main Effect Ethnicity		1	1411.438	25.144	.000***	.064
Interaction		1	237.891	4.238	.040*	.011
Error		368	56.134			
Cf		Main Effect Gender	1	940.029	14.163	.000***
	Main Effect Ethnicity	1	452.333	6.815	.009**	.018
	Interaction	1	111.091	1.674	.197	.005
	Error	368	66.374			
	<i>Personal Characteristics</i>					
Is	Main Effect Gender	1	370.675	6.136	.014*	.016
	Main Effect Ethnicity	1	608.745	10.076	.002**	.027
	Interaction	1	254.715	4.216	.041*	.011
	Error	368	60.414			
	Fx	Main Effect Gender	1	431.849	4.651	.032*
Main Effect Ethnicity		1	1710.559	18.423	.000***	.048
Interaction		1	65.758	.708	.401	.002
Error		368	92.850			

CPI Scales		df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Partial η^2
Sn	Main Effect Gender	1	7244.494	118.119	.000***	.243
	Main Effect Ethnicity	1	87.294	1.423	.234	.004
	Interaction	1	42.472	.692	.406	.002
	Error	368	61.332			
<i>Higher-Order Measures</i>						
v1	Main Effect Gender	1	568.594	6.329	.012*	.017
	Main Effect Ethnicity	1	.029	.000	.986	.000
	Interaction	1	7.411	.082	.774	.000
	Error	368	89.845			
v2	Main Effect Gender	1	185.614	2.915	.089	.008
	Main Effect Ethnicity	1	8.226	.129	.719	.000
	Interaction	1	.324	.005	.943	.000
	Error	368	63.681			
v3	Main Effect Gender	1	523.339	6.054	.014*	.016
	Main Effect Ethnicity	1	1392.003	16.103	.000***	.042
	Interaction	1	129.984	1.504	.221	.004
	Error	368	86.445			
<i>Work-Related Measures</i>						
Mp	Main Effect Gender	1	976.519	12.568	.000***	.033
	Main Effect Ethnicity	1	901.844	11.607	.001***	.031
	Interaction	1	.686	.009	.925	.000
	Error	368	77.696			
Wo	Main Effect Gender	1	401.424	6.132	.014*	.016
	Main Effect Ethnicity	1	240.521	3.674	.056	.010
	Interaction	1	41.683	.637	.425	.002
	Error	368	65.460			
Ct	Main Effect Gender	1	984.826	9.525	.002**	.025
	Main Effect Ethnicity	1	1169.752	11.313	.001***	.030
	Interaction	1	120.717	1.168	.281	.003
	Error	368	103.396			
Lp	Main Effect Gender	1	630.128	8.756	.003**	.023
	Main Effect Ethnicity	1	156.725	2.178	.141	.006
	Interaction	1	24.714	.343	.558	.001
	Error	368	71.965			
Ami	Main Effect Gender	1	106.460	1.303	.254	.004
	Main Effect Ethnicity	1	845.528	10.349	.001***	.027
	Interaction	1	70.118	.858	.355	.002
	Error	368	81.699			
Leo	Main Effect Gender	1	1114.206	10.307	.001***	.027
	Main Effect Ethnicity	1	143.168	1.324	.251	.004
	Interaction	1	3.060	.028	.866	.000

CPI Scales	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Partial η^2
Error	368	108.100			

Note. * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$. Do = Dominance; Cs = Capacity for Status; Sy = Sociability, Sp = Social Presence; Sa = Self-acceptance; In = Independence; Em = Empathy; Re = Responsibility; So = Social Conformity; Sc = Self-control; Gi = Good Impression; Cm = Communality; Wb = Well-being; To = Tolerance; Ac = Achievement via Conformance; Ai Achievement via Independence; Cf = Conceptual Fluency; Is = Insightfulness; Fx = Flexibility; Sn = Sensitivity; V1 = Vector 1; V2 = Vector 2; V3 = Vector 3; Mp = Managerial Potential; Wo = Work Orientation; Ct = Creative Temperament; Lp = Leadership; Ami = Amicability; Leo = Law Enforcement Orientation.

Table 3.

CPI260 Scale Scores by Ethnic Group—Means, Standard Deviations, and Significance Levels

CPI Scale	Native Americans (<i>n</i> = 186)		Caucasians (<i>n</i> = 186)		<i>p</i>	Cohen's <i>d</i>
	M	SD	M	SD		
Do	59.92	9.45	60.61	9.23	.476	-.07
Cs	55.28	9.58	57.51	8.60	.019*	-.25
Sy	55.31	9.48	55.95	9.01	.504	-.07
Sp	50.40	9.52	52.74	9.45	.018*	-.25
Sa	56.51	9.10	57.83	9.04	.161	-.15
In	59.10	8.32	60.23	7.78	.175	-.14
Em	58.59	9.57	61.24	9.26	.007**	-.28
Re	54.41	8.70	56.75	7.10	.005**	-.29
So	53.18	7.95	54.63	7.09	.064	-.19
Sc	57.64	9.49	58.05	8.17	.651	-.05
Gi	60.21	9.86	60.65	8.32	.639	-.05
Cm	50.17	8.31	52.07	7.82	.024*	-.23
Wb	54.76	9.43	57.11	7.29	.007**	-.28
To	56.62	10.07	60.48	6.72	.000***	-.45
Ac	56.77	8.20	58.28	6.48	.049*	-.20
Ai	57.11	8.14	60.91	6.90	.000***	-.50
Cf	55.19	8.81	57.51	7.76	.007**	-.28
Is	56.48	8.54	58.96	7.12	.002**	-.32
Fx	49.00	10.18	53.40	9.16	.000***	-.45
Sn	42.31	8.95	42.68	9.03	.687	-.04
v1	42.70	9.82	42.52	9.24	.861	.02
v2	55.60	7.64	55.17	8.33	.605	.05
v3	57.45	10.41	61.38	8.19	.000***	-.42
Mp	60.83	9.49	64.25	8.36	.000***	-.38
Wo	55.94	9.31	57.63	6.78	.046*	-.21
Ct	52.32	10.46	56.00	10.11	.001***	-.36
Lp	60.34	8.70	61.79	8.43	.104	-.17
Ami	55.62	9.97	58.63	8.01	.001***	-.33
Leo	62.18	10.11	61.17	10.90	.355	.10

Note. **p* < .05, ***p* < .01, ****p* < .001. Do = Dominance; Cs = Capacity for Status; Sy = Sociability, Sp = Social Presence; Sa = Self-acceptance; In = Independence; Em = Empathy; Re = Responsibility; So = Social Conformity; Sc = Self-control; Gi = Good Impression; Cm = Communality; Wb = Well-being; To = Tolerance; Ac = Achievement via Conformance; Ai Achievement via Independence; Cf = Conceptual Fluency; Is = Insightfulness; Fx = Flexibility; Sn = Sensitivity; V1 = Vector 1; V2 = Vector 2; V3 = Vector 3; Mp = Managerial Potential; Wo = Work Orientation; Ct = Creative Temperament; Lp = Leadership; Ami = Amicability; Leo = Law Enforcement Orientation.

Table 4.

CPI260 Scale Scores by Ethnic Group and Gender—Means, Standard Deviations, and Significance Levels—Females

CPI Scale	Native Americans (<i>n</i> = 85)		Caucasians (<i>n</i> = 70)		<i>p</i>	<i>Cohen's d</i>
	M	SD	M	SD		
Do	57.97	10.08	58.50	9.75	.742	-.05
Cs	53.28	10.07	56.74	9.14	.028*	-.36
Sy	54.20	10.46	55.55	9.69	.412	-.13
Sp	47.46	9.86	51.57	10.20	.012*	-.41
Sa	55.22	9.62	56.71	9.59	.337	-.16
In	57.01	8.80	58.45	8.12	.296	-.17
Em	56.66	10.01	60.26	9.50	.024*	-.37
Re	54.36	8.65	56.97	6.93	.043*	-.33
So	53.33	8.14	54.51	6.71	.330	-.16
Sc	58.37	9.67	57.66	8.41	.629	.08
Gi	59.76	9.79	59.57	9.06	.899	.02
Cm	50.62	8.58	53.10	6.68	.049*	-.32
Wb	52.72	10.22	56.07	7.15	.022*	-.38
To	55.12	10.41	60.57	6.22	.000***	-.64
Ac	56.59	8.60	58.07	6.05	.228	-.20
Ai	55.55	8.12	61.14	6.24	.000***	-.77
Cf	52.83	8.88	56.18	7.86	.015**	-.40
Is	54.46	8.91	58.75	7.16	.001**	-.53
Fx	47.34	10.08	52.56	8.55	.001**	-.56
Sn	47.56	7.70	47.86	6.52	.798	-.04
v1	44.22	10.09	43.91	10.34	.853	.03
v2	56.35	6.93	56.11	7.71	.837	.03
v3	55.49	10.66	60.63	8.00	.001**	-.55
Mp	58.99	9.75	62.25	9.00	.034*	-.35
Wo	54.42	10.26	56.74	6.51	.104	-.27
Ct	49.89	10.45	54.66	10.25	.005*	-.46
Lp	58.62	9.54	60.47	8.70	.214	-.20
Ami	54.55	10.89	58.50	7.58	.011*	-.42
Leo	60.17	10.55	59.09	10.13	.520	.10

Note. **p* < .05, ***p* < .01, ****p* < .001. Do = Dominance; Cs = Capacity for Status; Sy = Sociability, Sp = Social Presence; Sa = Self-acceptance; In = Independence; Em = Empathy; Re = Responsibility; So = Social Conformity; Sc = Self-control; Gi = Good Impression; Cm = Communality; Wb = Well-being; To = Tolerance; Ac = Achievement via Conformance; Ai Achievement via Independence; Cf = Conceptual Fluency; Is = Insightfulness; Fx = Flexibility; Sn = Sensitivity; V1 = Vector 1; V2 = Vector 2; V3 = Vector 3; Mp = Managerial Potential; Wo = Work Orientation; Ct = Creative Temperament; Lp = Leadership; Ami = Amicability; Leo = Law Enforcement Orientation.

Table 5.

CPI260 Scale Scores by Ethnic Group and Gender—Means, Standard Deviations, and Significance Levels—Males

CPI Scale	Native Americans (<i>n</i> = 101)		Caucasians (<i>n</i> = 116)		<i>p</i>	Cohen's <i>d</i>
	M	SD	M	SD		
Do	61.56	8.60	61.89	8.69	.783	-.04
Cs	56.95	8.85	57.98	8.27	.381	-.12
Sy	56.24	8.50	56.20	8.60	.968	.00
Sp	52.88	8.52	53.44	8.94	.636	-.06
Sa	57.59	8.54	58.50	8.67	.438	-.11
In	60.86	7.48	61.31	7.39	.654	-.06
Em	60.22	8.91	61.83	9.10	.191	-.18
Re	54.44	8.78	56.61	7.22	.047*	-.27
So	53.05	7.83	54.70	7.33	.111	-.22
Sc	57.02	9.33	58.29	8.04	.282	-.15
Gi	60.58	9.95	61.30	7.80	.549	-.08
Cm	49.80	8.10	51.44	8.40	.147	-.20
Wb	56.48	8.38	57.74	7.34	.238	-.16
To	57.88	9.65	60.43	7.03	.026*	-.30
Ac	56.91	7.89	58.40	6.75	.135	-.20
Ai	58.43	7.96	60.77	7.29	.025*	-.31
Cf	57.17	8.28	58.31	7.62	.295	-.14
Is	58.17	7.87	59.09	7.12	.367	-.12
Fx	50.39	10.09	53.90	9.51	.009**	-.36
Sn	37.89	7.43	39.56	8.91	.138	-.20
v1	41.42	9.44	41.69	8.45	.825	-.03
v2	54.97	8.16	54.61	8.66	.752	.04
v3	59.10	9.95	61.84	8.31	.028*	-.30
Mp	62.37	9.02	65.46	7.74	.007**	-.37
Wo	57.21	8.27	58.17	6.90	.355	-.13
Ct	54.36	10.08	56.81	9.99	.074	-.24
Lp	61.80	7.67	62.59	8.20	.463	-.10
Ami	56.52	9.08	58.71	8.29	.065	-.25
Leo	63.88	9.45	62.43	11.20	.308	.14

Note. **p* < .05, ***p* < .01. Do = Dominance; Cs = Capacity for Status; Sy = Sociability, Sp = Social Presence; Sa = Self-acceptance; In = Independence; Em = Empathy; Re = Responsibility; So = Social Conformity; Sc = Self-control; Gi = Good Impression; Cm = Communality; Wb = Well-being; To = Tolerance; Ac = Achievement via Conformance; Ai = Achievement via Independence; Cf = Conceptual Fluency; Is = Insightfulness; Fx = Flexibility; Sn = Sensitivity; V1 = Vector 1; V2 = Vector 2; V3 = Vector 3; Mp = Managerial Potential; Wo = Work Orientation; Ct = Creative Temperament; Lp = Leadership; Ami = Amicability; Leo = Law Enforcement Orientation