

12-14-2022

Personality and Flourishing in Seminarians: A Single Case Study

Kylee M. Peterson

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.georgefox.edu/psyd>

 Part of the [Psychology Commons](#)

Personality and Flourishing in Seminarians: A Single Case Study

Kylee M. Peterson

Presented to the Faculty of the
Graduate School of Clinical Psychology

George Fox University

in partial fulfillment

of the requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Psychology

in Clinical Psychology

Newberg, OR

Approval Page

Personality and Flourishing in Seminarians: A Single Case Study

by

Kylee M. Peterson

has been approved

at the

Graduate School of Clinical Psychology

George Fox University

as a Dissertation for the PsyD degree

Committee Members

Celeste Jones, PsyD, ABPP, Chair

Megan Anna Neff, MDiv, PsyD, Member

Mark McMinn, PhD, Member

December 14, 2022

Abstract

This research study utilized a single case design to meet the dual need of applying personality research to clinical populations (Costa Jr, 1991) and the necessity of creating a formative assessment for first-year master and doctoral students to facilitate flourishing in a complex profession. This was done with the primary aim of evaluating the effectiveness of the formative assessment program pilot across stake holders including the executive dean of a Portland seminary, psychologist consultant, and ministry students. The method for this pursuit was an explanatory single case study which includes reviewing quantitative & qualitative student feedback survey data and interviews with the seminary executive dean & psychologist consultant. Findings demonstrate the effectiveness of the formative assessment across stakeholders and provide preliminary population-based personality profile data.

Keywords: ministry, personality assessment, single case study, Big Five

Table of Contents

Approval Page	ii
Abstract.....	iii
Table of Tables	vi
Chapter 1	1
Early Research in Personality.....	1
Five Factor Model of Personality	2
Applications of the Five Factor Model.....	4
Personality Factors Related to Wellbeing	5
Present Study Aims	6
Chapter 2 Methods	6
Unit of Analysis: Portland Seminary.....	6
Procedure.....	7
Data Analysis.....	8
International Personality Item Pool	9
Participants	9
Chapter 3 Results.....	11
Student Feedback.....	11
Resources and Practical Tips.....	12
Whole Person Applicability	13
Expertise of Consultant Psychologist.....	14
Executive Dean Interview	16
Psychologist Consultant Interview	18
Secondary Analyses.....	19

Exploratory Personality Profile	19
Chapter 4 Discussion	24
Effectiveness Across Stakeholders	24
Ministry Personality Profile	26
Implications	27
Personality Profile	28
Suggestions for Future Research	30
References	32
Appendix A Informed Consent for Research Participants	37
Appendix B Informed Consent for Research Participants	38
Appendix C	39
Appendix D	45
Appendix E Semi-Structured Interview Questions	47
Appendix F	48
Appendix G Assessment Questions.....	49
Appendix H Example Assessment	52
Appendix I Things to Consider	57
Appendix J Curriculum Vitae.....	61

Table of Tables

Table 1: Demographic Characteristics of Participants	10
Table 2: Personality Profile Means	20
Table 3: Facet Paired Sample T-test Results, in Rank Order by Facet Score	21

Personality and Flourishing in Seminarians: A Single Case Study

Chapter 1

In this study, the use of an explanatory single case study design was used to examine the utility of a Five Factor Model personality assessment tool as a formative assessment in first-year seminary and doctor of ministry students. The concept of this research project was born out of a conversation with the executive dean of a private seminary program in the Pacific Northwest. The seminary administrator approached doctoral researchers with an interest in exploring different options for formative assessments for the seminarians. In subsequent conversations, they agreed on the need to explore personality factors that may affect the seminarian's ability to flourish in ministry. The need for a combined development of an assessment and program evaluation regarding the utility and sustainability prompted this research study.

This study sought to examine the utility of a personality assessment tool as a formative assessment in first-year seminary and doctor of ministry students. At the outset of the study, a comprehensive literature review was undertaken to guide the development of the research questions and aims. This review included history of research on personality, Five Factor Model, personality factors, the context of ministry, and personality factors related to wellbeing in ministry.

Early Research in Personality

Personality is an internal system influencing how we experience ourselves and others, and how we respond to the demands of our external environments. Our personality informs our needs, motivations, and the goals we ultimately move toward. The current study's contribution to personality research stands on decades of personality research. Gordon Allport was the first to suggest that words describing personality have shared meanings that may reflect underlying

constructs (Allport & Odbert, 1936; Piedmont, 1998). To identify those constructs Allport and Odbert (1936) used a lexical approach and identified 18,000 descriptive words used to describe personality. The initial pool of items was organized into four categories which represented the first attempt to develop categories or the common factors that underlie personality.

Raymond Cattell (1946a) had started his own work in identifying underlying constructs of personality and took the work of Allport and Odbert in a slightly different direction, identifying 14 factors and ultimately adding two more to create a 16-factor personality assessment (Cattell, 1950). The next couple of decades was a rich and prolific time in personality research as researchers including Donald Fiske (1949) joined Cattell, Allport and others in their continued search to identify the underlying categories of personality. Donald Fisk (1949) was the first to suggest that a five-factor model explained much of the variance in the categories of personality. A breakthrough occurred when Digman and Takemoto-Chock (1981), re-analyzed Cattell's data and confirmed five robust factors. This is the origin of what we now call the Five Factor Model of personality (FFM; a more extensive history of personality research is beyond the scope of this project but can be found in Digman, 1996). Understanding this history is essential in communicating the significance of the FFM- that these five categories of personality are an incredible synthesis of 18,000 descriptive words each with their own unique contribution to differences in personality, studied over decades, to provide accessible, comprehensive language for personality work.

Five Factor Model of Personality

Diving into the components that comprise of the FFM, within the hierarchical structure, the five core dimensions include Extraversion (E), Agreeableness (A), Conscientiousness (C), Neuroticism (N), and Openness (O; McCrae & John, 1992). Within each of these five

dimensions are six facets, which share elements related to the broader factor while also being able to stand on their own as distinct components of an individual's personality. Descriptors for each domain are taken from *The Revised NEO Personality Inventory Clinical and Research Applications* (Piedmont, 1998).

Extraversion looks at how a person takes in their external environment. It is seen as one of the more complex and multifaceted domains and is centered around one's tendency toward positive affect as well as assertiveness (McCrae & John, 1992). Those high in extraversion can be seen as dominant, assertive, outgoing, vibrant, people-oriented, and easily excited. Those with low extraversion can be seen as reserved, laid back, timid, and quiet (Piedmont, 1998). Facet scales for extraversion include Gregariousness, Positive Emotions, Warmth, Excitement-Seeking, Activity, and Assertiveness.

Agreeableness assesses the level of warmth and compassion felt towards others. Those high in agreeableness can be seen as passive, very trusting, softhearted, and warm. Those low in agreeableness can be seen as cold, ruthless, and headstrong (Piedmont, 1998). Facet scales within the Agreeableness domain include Tendermindedness, Altruism, Trust, Compliance, Modesty, and Straightforwardness.

Conscientiousness assesses how a person goes about daily tasks and activities. It is highly correlated with work successes, positive health outcomes, and long-term relationship satisfaction (Duckworth et al., 2012). Those high in conscientiousness are seen as diligent and careful and have high levels of impulse control. Those low in conscientiousness can be seen as having poor follow-through, poor attention to detail, and being less ambitious. Facet scales within the Conscientiousness domain include Achievement Striving, Competence, Self-Discipline, Deliberation, Dutifulness, and Order.

Openness refers to how much a person prefers novelty versus predictability. It is defined as one's propensity for seeking new experiences and need for exploration. Those high in openness can be described as “curious, original, untraditional, and creative” (Piedmont, 1998). Those low in openness can be described as conservative, traditional, conventional, and logical. Facets within the Openness domain include Ideas, Actions, Aesthetics, Fantasy, Feeling, and Values.

Neuroticism is a domain focused how someone experiences negative emotion. Those higher in neuroticism refers to a condition marked by emotional suffering and difficulty effectively coping with the demands of life. Everyone experiences negative emotion, but we differ in degree and our specific symptoms of distress. They can be seen as more prone to developing mental health difficulties, may see the world in a negative light, and may be more at risk for negative coping (Piedmont, 1998). As (McCrae & John, 1992) note, “Individuals low in N are not necessarily high in positive mental health...they are simply calm, relaxed, even-tempered, unflappable.” (p. 195). Facet scales within the Neuroticism domain include Anger, Hostility, Impulsiveness, Anxiety, Depression, Self-Consciousness, and Vulnerability.

Applications of the Five Factor Model

In a special issue of the *Journal of Personality*, McCrae and John (1992) asserted the next phase in FFM personality research should be to apply this well-tested model for the purpose of clinical utility. Since this direction was given, there have been broad applications of personality research in a variety of capacities including, personality assessments for diagnostic use (Mullins-Sweatt & Lengel, 2012), professional recruiting, predicting job performance (Tett et al., 1991), and providing patient care for those with various medical diagnoses (Löckenhoff et al., 2009). Personality research within the helping professions has identified the Five Factor Model as an

important tool in identifying characteristics and outcomes such as resilience (Francis et. al., 2018), empathy (Mičák & Zášková, 2008), emotional intelligence, job satisfaction (Gutierrez & Mullen, 2016; Kirkcaldy et al., 1989), and burnout (Armon et al., 2012). Knowing personality research has provided a valuable lens for assisting other helping professions (Dyrbye et al., 2010; Mičák & Zášková, 2008), this research seeks to respond to this call by creating a personality assessment and feedback aiding ministry students in developing insights related to enhanced wellbeing.

Personality Factors Related to Wellbeing

Emerging research can provide insight into how personality factors may impact experiences within ministry roles. These factors include lower shame, higher self-compassion, higher differentiation, and conflict management styles (Barnard & Curry, 2012; Beebe, 2007). Research examining resilience in the first year of ministry found high neuroticism to be the best predictor of emotional exhaustion, high extraversion to be the best predictor of personal accomplishment, and high openness to be the best predictor of depersonalization (Miner, 2007). There are also correlations among high levels of extraversion and the experience of subjective in ministry leaders (Robbins & Hancock, 2015). Tomic et al. found that extraversion (0.87) and emotional stability (0.90) were some of the most predictive factors correlated with church minister wellbeing compared to pressure of work, social support at home, and depersonalization (2004). A study conducted by Case et al., (2020), revealed health intentionality, orientation to ministry, boundaries, and ongoing stressors were related to clergy mental health outcomes. There is also research indicating high levels of humility can mitigate the negative influences of narcissism on religious leaders (Jankowski et al., 2021). Each of these findings points to the use of personality research for ministers in training to gain insight into personality factors and foster

tangible steps towards wellbeing. Thus, personality assessment and feedback are hypothesized to be a valuable way to foster resilience and wellbeing for ministry leaders.

Present Study Aims

The research study used a single case design to explore the clinical utility of a formative assessment using the FFM for seminarians, including the ability of the assessment to facilitate flourishing in the profession. The aim of the assessment was to provide non-diagnostic, strength-based feedback to facilitate first-year seminary and doctor of ministry student insight into their specific risk and protective factors in entering the ministry profession. The primary goal of this study was to review the effectiveness of the formative assessment and feedback program implementation from the perspectives of the seminary students, the executive dean and the psychologist consultant. Secondary analyses explored whether personality traits differed between those who opted in versus out of receiving one-to-one feedback, and normative personality profiles of seminarians.

Chapter 2

Methods

Unit of Analysis: Portland Seminary

Case study research is often conducted in natural settings, focusing on the components of a specific program (Abma & Stake, 2014; Hearne et al., 2017; Wholey et al., 2010). In this single case study, we explored and outlined the development and utility of a personality assessment procedure for first-year seminary and doctor of ministry students. This study was carried out in the single school environment of a private seminary in the Pacific Northwest. Data were collected from key stakeholders including the seminary and doctor of ministry students, executive dean, and the psychologist consultant responsible for creating the assessment.

Procedure

The exploration stage included consultation with the executive dean of the seminary in which she identified the needs of the seminary, including previous assessment tools and the motivation to change to a formative assessment model. Specifically, she was interested in an assessment that provided non-diagnostic, strength-based feedback to facilitate the seminary student's insight into their specific risk and protective factors in entering the demanding ministry profession. As part of the exploration stage, we researched assessments of personality that would meet the above criteria and determined the FFM-informed formative assessment would be an appropriate, evidenced-based assessment tool.

The preparation phase included an extensive review of the literature showing the correlations of the five personality factors and facets within each factor with the helping professions. Following the identification of the personality factors and facets, the International Pool of Items of Personality/NEO 300 was explored to identify specific items with sufficient internal consistency (Cronbach's α above .70; Goldberg, et al., 2006).

The implementation phase required the development of an assessment tool as well as narrative interpretive feedback based on their assessment results. Following completion of the assessment, the students received individualized feedback with an option of meeting with the psychology consultant for one session. Student feedback was obtained through a post-assessment survey. Data from the personality assessment itself was also collected at this time.

The evaluation phase was the focus of this study and included the assessment of satisfaction for students, senior administration (executive dean), and the psychologist consultant. Student satisfaction was measured using a custom survey assessing the participants' perceptions of the helpfulness of the survey, the likelihood students would use the strategies provided, the

usefulness of an hour-long feedback session, and whether students felt they would benefit from more personality assessment integration into courses or training. Of 112 total participants, 46 students completed the feedback questionnaire. Program leadership satisfaction was obtained via a semi-structured interview with the executive dean of the seminary program. The satisfaction of the psychologist consultant creating the assessment was also obtained via a semi-structured interview.

Data Analysis

Qualitative and quantitative data were analyzed using a variety of methods. For the semi-structured interview with the executive dean of the program and psychologist consultant, the qualitative data was analyzed using the Braun and Clarke (2012) method including, “six phase framework which involved: familiarization with the data, generating initial codes, searching for themes, reviewing potential themes, defining and naming themes, and producing sections of the case report” (Hearne et al., 2018, p.322). The second set of data includes both quantitative and qualitative results from the surveys completed by the seminary students. The open-ended portion of this survey were also analyzed using the Braun and Clarke method. The quantitative descriptive data from the online survey were based on a Likert scale and are presented as percentages. These general findings were then presented to the research team and stakeholders to further validate themes found within the analysis.

Initial findings from the student feedback surveys highlighted the importance of the one-to-one feedback session with the psychologist. Due to this discovery, the question of which personality factors are correlated with the decision to seek one-to-one feedback with a psychologist was made relevant for the executive dean and psychologist consultant who developed the assessment. As such, a standard multiple regression was conducted to determine

what personality factors (extraversion, openness, conscientiousness, agreeableness, and neuroticism) were correlated with the decision to engage in one-to-one feedback with a psychologist.

International Personality Item Pool

Specific assessment items were drawn from the International Personality Item Pool, a database created originating from the work of (Hendriks, 1997; Hendriks et al., 2002; Goldberg, 1981) including over 3,000 personality items. These items have been categorized into the three separate inventories that measure NEO, or the FFM which includes Openness, Conscientiousness, Extraversion, Agreeableness and Neuroticism (the “Big Five”), including a 300-item version (Goldberg, 1999). Each of the five personality factors had 18 items, these 18 items were distributed according to the six facets or components (three items per facet) that provide additional nuance to each of the factors. In summary, the 90 items of the Big Five assessment included five factors, six facets per factor with three items per facet. In addition, 10 exploratory items were included for a total of 100 items likening the Big Five. Each item was scored on a 1–5 Likert scale, with 3 being a *neutral* response. Therefore, scores around 54 represent a score profile that may be neutral for a particular factor. The max score possible on a particular personality factor was 90, which would suggest that the personality factor is represented strongly in the individual. The instrument was designed to be an accessible measure for participants, while maintaining high validity (Cronbach's α above .75) and reliability.

Participants

The participants in this study are composed of both seminary and doctor of ministry students attending a private seminary program in the Pacific Northwest. The full list of demographic information can be found in Table 1.

Table 1*Demographic Characteristics of Participants*

Variable	Descriptor	<i>N</i>	%
Age	18–24	13	12.6
	25–34	20	19.4
	35–41	38	36.9
	45–54	16	15.5
	55–64	14	13.6
	65–74	2	1.9
Gender	Male	36	35
	Female	67	65
Ethnicity	White/Caucasian	84	81.6
	East Asian or Asian American	3	2.9
	Latinx, Latino, Hispanic American	4	3.9
	Black, Afro-Caribbean, African, African American	3	2.9
	Multiracial	6	5.8
	Other	1	1
	Prefer not to say	2	1.9
Years in ministry	1–2	23	22.3
	3–5	32	31.1
	6–10	20	19.4
	11–15	7	6.8
	16–25	21	20.4
Denomination	Mainline Protestant	47	45.6
	Non-denominational Christian	32	29.4
	None or undecided	21	19.3
	Greek Orthodox	1	0.9
	Roman Catholic	1	0.9
	Ethiopian Orthodox Church	1	0.9
Career trajectory	Spiritual director	36	35
	Church leadership	26	25.2
	Chaplaincy	8	7.8
	Academics	6	5.8
	Missionary	2	1.9
	Mixture of professions	12	11.7
	Undecided	12	11.7

Chapter 3

Results

This study focused on exploring the clinical utility of a formative assessment for seminarians to facilitate flourishing in their profession. To answer this question, we assessed the perceived effectiveness of the formative assessment from the perspective of the seminary students, executive dean, and psychologist consultant. Two added aims emerged as the research was conducted; the first was to explore what personality factors determined whether students chose to engage in the one-to-one feedback session with the clinical psychologist, the second was describing the personality profile of future ministry leaders. First, the student feedback collected is summarized, including both quantitative results and qualitative themes. Then the qualitative results from the executive dean interview are reviewed, followed by qualitative results from the psychologist consultant interview.

Student Feedback

Student feedback was collected in both Quantitative and Qualitative forms, with key findings summarized here. Quantitative Student feedback regarding the effectiveness of the formative assessment and program implementation showcased consistently positive experiences with the assessment. Quantitative results taken from the feedback survey showed that the students who participated in the feedback survey found the assessment helpful, with 93.3% of students stating it was “very helpful” to them personally and 94.7% saying they “strongly agreed” that understanding their personality is important for their future work as a ministry leader. Most students affirmed they were “very likely” to use the strategies outlined in their report for managing the demands of being a student (70%), demands of ministry (80%), improving interpersonal communication or relationships (80%), and gaining greater self-

reflection/insight or personal formation (91%). These findings highlight the assessment's value across multiple domains of seminarian development. The assessment's ability to foster self-reflection and insight was a primary benefit of the assessment, as reported by 91% of the students. Furthermore, every student who participated in the one-to-one feedback session with the psychologist reported they found it "very helpful."

Results of the qualitative feedback provided further insight on components of the personality assessment students found most beneficial. Three primary themes emerged when students were asked what was most helpful. These themes include the benefits of resources & practical tips (including career trajectory feedback and burnout feedback), emphasis on the student as a "whole person", and the expertise of the consultant psychologist in one-to-one feedback sessions.

Resources and Practical Tips

As part of the assessment, the consultant provided handouts specific to the needs of different personality types that were relevant to the student's personality type. For example, those who were low in conscientiousness were given a handout on techniques to stay focused and organized. These resources and other helpful tips were mentioned several times by students including one student who wrote "I appreciated some of the recommendations for setting boundaries, avoiding burnout, and practicing not being liked." Furthermore, the benefits of resources were frequently mentioned alongside the concept of burnout- another highlighted theme within the qualitative data. One student wrote:

The overall assessment was a blessing to me, however, what I found most helpful was the burnout factors and resources associated with them. It is nice to continually gain feedback

on who you are, but for me it's about growing as an individual and being given the knowledge, resources, and constructive information to do so.

This statement highlights the importance of building insight around topics such as burnout while also being give the resources to put those insights into action.

Whole Person Applicability

Another important highlight connected to the quantitative data, was the emphasis on the student as a “whole person.” In this way, the students reported the assessment was applicable across life domains. One student is quoted saying:

I felt really seen, acknowledged, and appreciated for my whole self in this meeting. They [psychologist consult] had multiple strategies that I could approach my differences with, and I especially noted creating a values system as a way to know myself and what I should be about, so I don't spin my wheels or burn out being involved in so many things.

In addition, students referenced how they would apply the feedback across interpersonal, intrapersonal, professional, and academic settings. Many students noted the importance of the information to their personal lives stating, “The discussion about mindfulness and activities and resources surrounding that were enlightening. Also, that others may perceive me to be more extroverted than I am and place more demand on me [was a] surprising and important insight for me.” Regarding application to professional development, others referenced the benefit of using the personality assessment to speak directly to their career trajectory and goals, making statements such as, “[The psychologist consultant’s] assurance that my personality fit the work I am doing [was most beneficial].” and “[I found most beneficial] the sections talking about what might be helpful in my ministry trajectory.” Regarding academic application, comments were made such as, “They [psychologist consult] helped me organize me thoughts on HSP and empath

characteristics. She also gave me great advice on how to focus on school assignments that adheres to my excitement-seeking personality.” This demonstrates the broad reach of the assessment to provide psychological insights into a multifaceted array of life domains. One student summarized, “It was helpful for me to make connections within my personality which leads to a greater sense of wholeness.”

Expertise of Consultant Psychologist

The students also spoke about the one-to-one feedback with the psychologist consultant as a valuable experience, experiencing the results review as therapeutic and additive to the psychological language used in the report. Students additionally highlighted the benefits of being able to talk through context-specific applications, the value of the psychologist consultant’s therapeutic presence and acceptance, and the utility of the one-on-one feedback session in improving their comprehension of the results.

Students described the added benefit of having dialogue about the application of the assessment results in their various life contexts, including the consideration of environmental factors. For instance, one student noted, “[psychologist consultant]’s ability to reconcile her interpretation of the data in constructive ways in dialogue with my life narrative was beautiful and very helpful.” In this way the student was an active and engaged participant in the application and interpretation of their results, ensuring relevance given environmental factors. Similarly, a student wrote, “I feel that by talking through the results the [psychologist consultant] was able to better understand me and my story, which helped in making connections with the results.” The importance of culturally specific context being integrated into the report through the feedback session was reaffirmed by a student who said:

Talking about my culture and how it's very different from American culture. I hadn't realized how eager I was to discuss how I don't understand the general American mainstream cultures, even though I'm technically an American. This also bleeds over to seminary life.

Moreover, the consulting psychologist's therapeutic presence was highlighted as a significant part of the feedback experience. One student wrote:

They [psychologist consultant] also has offered further help for me that I have been needing for a while and the generosity astounds me and makes me so grateful. There was a lot of permission for me to be me, and for that I am deeply appreciative. The [psychologist consultant] is a good listener, and that was very powerful for me.

Another stated, "[I] felt encouraged that someone was present and accepting of who I am and where I was at." These statements speak directly to the importance of doing the feedback with someone who is interpersonally engaged with the student.

Lastly, students found the opportunity to clarify psychological language used in the assessment contributed to their understanding of their results. One student said:

Being able to talk through some numbers that I may have interpreted more negatively on my own and being able to ask questions, because a lot of the characteristics were unfamiliar to me. That time on the call is what made the assessment worth it to me. I don't know how much time I would have spent reading the results or resources without having had a conversation first.

Likewise, a student wrote:

Dr. Neff's [psychologist consultant] descriptions of where 'balance' should be interpreted rather than 'average' would have been difficult for me to understand without the meeting

with her. This gave me a much better understand of how to interpret the findings of the report and how it related to other personality characteristics I had.

A student was quoted saying:

In several places I really appreciated the opportunity to talk through the feedback, because things like "people pleasing" and "cooperation" didn't quite mean what was on paper, and I would have misunderstood the results if we hadn't talked through them. The zoom call was tremendously helpful.

One last student described the most helpful part of the feedback to be, "The detailed breakdown of the vocabulary used, descriptions given in the assessment and relevance of the information to real life scenarios, personal experiences and everyday application."

Executive Dean Interview

The interview with the executive dean of the seminary explored the origin and intent of this formative assessment program, ideas to ensure the sustainability of the program, and thoughts regarding the findings of this case study. The interview was semi-structured, including prompts such as "What has been helpful about the program?", "What are changes you would like to see?", and "Is there any data you would find helpful in assessing the outcomes of the program?"

Beginning with the development of the pilot, the executive dean described the need for the formative assessment as part of the personality assessment requirements for students in the program. The previous assessment protocol relied on a psychological assessment measure that highlighted potential pathology or mental health problems. She described wanting to take the assessment program in a new direction involving a more culturally sensitive and contextualized assessment with an emphasis on facilitating student insight and wellness. Since then, the

program implemented the formative assessment in two seminary cohorts and one doctor of ministry cohort.

The executive dean also discussed data points of interest in the future and other future directions of the program. The executive dean described a future aim to integrate the assessment experience and results into the curriculum and coursework, having students reflect back on their assessment and incorporate application into relevant courses. Other themes from this conversation included curiosity whether different degree programs had different personality characteristics, interest in whether there were differences in profiles based on demographics such as race and gender, and the importance of cost and accessibility of the assessment for students. The executive dean spoke about the need to make the one-to-one feedback accessible to students. She suggested ideas such as conducting a 30-minute feedback session rather than a one-hour session to improve accessibility.

As part of this meeting, the executive dean was presented with preliminary results including some of the qualitative and quantitative feedback. She commented several times on her appreciation of the “applicability” of the assessment as it was important to her that students have tangible benefit from taking the assessment. She was encouraged by the students’ feedback regarding the utility of the resources including the practical tools and the reported likelihood of using those strategies in the future. She also emphasized the need for cultural sensitivity and competence to be part of the assessment results. The researcher affirmed this was highlighted by diverse students who felt their narrative could easily be integrated into the report. This was an exciting revelation for one student who felt as though the assessment gave them space to process their cultural differences. Similarly, she was encouraged by our findings that there was no relationship between personality type and whether a student signed up for the feedback session.

As the executive dean reflected, “this is a good sign indicating there is not an implicit bias in who is encouraged to engage in the feedback session.”

Overall, the executive dean emphasized the importance of the assessment’s ability to provide students with helpful insights into their careers and personal lives through a lens that integrated the students individualized context and helped them feel seen while giving them tools to grow. Through the review of preliminary data, she felt encouraged that the assessment was meeting those desired needs. She was supportive of the assessment as a tool they are willing to dedicate time and resources toward sustainability as evidenced by their push to integrate the assessment into their overall curriculum.

Psychologist Consultant Interview

The interview with the psychologist consultant was included to explore perspectives on the project success from the consultant’s perspective. The interview was semi-structured with prompts exploring the development of the project, the aimed-for impacts of the assessment, and areas of growth. The psychologist consultant described the initial desire to create and implement a strengths-based assessment that would be applicable and sensitive in cross-cultural applications, promote personal growth in those assessed, and generate results that could be transparently communicated with the seminary and the students both. Prior to this implementation, a lengthy and pathology-oriented personality assessment was used as a fitness screen for seminary students, but research indicated a lack of cultural sensitivity and incorporation of environmental/contextual factors into the type of results provided. In terms of results delivery in the one-to-one feedback session, the process was described as a “bottom-up approach” in which the participants felt as though they were being understood and heard at a personal level with the autonomy to shape how their feedback was given and applied. The

psychologist consultant noted burnout as a multifaceted construct this assessment can prepare seminarians to avoid, providing intrapersonal insights into personality while also evaluating what environment best allows the individual to thrive. She also highlighted the effort to provide specific resources and tools for practical application of the complex psychological insights yielded by the assessment. In terms of areas for ongoing growth, the psychologist consultant noted the need to create more efficiency in generating individual results reports to make the assessment more accessible and affordable for future use on a larger scale. Auto-populated feedback will be an important next step, also allowing for prompt feedback for individuals undergoing assessment.

Secondary Analyses

A secondary analysis explored whether personality traits differed between those who opted in versus out of receiving one-to-one feedback, and normative personality profiles of seminarians. The resounding quantitative and qualitative findings emphasizing the usefulness of the one-to-one feedback session, supported the need for exploratory analysis into personality factors impacting the likelihood a student would sign up for the feedback session. Binary logistic regression analysis was used to explore whether personality type predicted engagement in the one-to-one feedback session. None of the Big Five personality types were identified as significant predictors of engagement in the one-to-one feedback session.

Exploratory Personality Profile

A repeated measures multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was used to explore potential differences between personality factors for the seminary population of students who completed the assessment. Results indicated a significant difference between groups, $\Lambda = .251$, $F(4, 105) = 74.45, p < .001$. Subsequent analyses indicated that there were no significant

differences between the highest-scoring factors Openness ($M = 67.31$, $SD = 7.59$), Conscientious ($M = 67.18$, $SD = 9.94$), and Agreeableness ($M = 66.64$, $SD = 9.94$). In addition, there were no significant differences between the lowest scoring factors, Extraversion ($M = 60.61$, $SD = 9.54$) and Neuroticism ($M = 46.31$, $SD = 9.27$). However, Extraversion was significantly lower than Agreeableness, $t(108) = 4.75$, $p < .001$, $d = .455$. In addition, Neuroticism was significantly lower than Agreeableness; $t(108) = 9.89$, $p < .001$, $d = .948$. The means and standard deviations of each factor and facet can be found in Table 2.

Table 2*Personality Profile Means*

Variable	<i>N</i> items	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Conscientiousness	18	67.18	9.94
Self-efficacy	3	11.79	2.13
Dutifulness	3	11.73	2.24
Achievement Striving	3	11.54	2.33
Cautiousness	3	11.20	2.87
Orderliness	3	10.67	2.36
Self-Discipline	3	9.95	2.66
Agreeableness	18	66.64	9.94
Altruism	3	12.30	2.10
Sympathy	3	11.93	2.01
Straightforwardness	3	11.67	3.25
Trust	3	10.66	1.94
Cooperation	3	10.11	2.71
Modesty	3	9.86	2.80
Neuroticism	18	46.31	9.27
Immoderation	3	8.70	2.88
Anxiety	3	8.45	2.37
Anger	3	8.02	2.32
Self-Consciousness	3	7.73	2.07
Vulnerability	3	7.07	2.49
Depression	3	6.25	2.42
Openness	18	67.31	7.59
Aesthetic	3	13.15	1.83

Emotionality	3	12.51	1.78
Intellect	3	12.16	2.05
Imagination	3	11.05	2.65
Adventurousness	3	9.29	2.53
Liberalism	3	9.05	2.51
Extraversion	18	60.61	9.54
Cheerfulness	3	11.89	1.73
Friendliness	3	10.88	2.48
Excitement Seeking	3	10.11	2.84
Activity	3	9.89	2.43
Assertiveness	3	9.70	2.15
Gregariousness	3	8.14	2.77

As previously described, there are six facets or components within each factor. To explore the differences between facets, five repeated-measures MANOVA were used, with findings indicating significant differences between facets for each of the five factors: Conscientiousness $\Lambda = .61$, $F(5, 98) = 12.75$, $p < .001$, Agreeableness $\Lambda = .5$, $F(5, 98) = 19.59$, $p < .001$, Neuroticism $\Lambda = .49$, $F(5, 98) = 20.23$, $p < .001$, Openness $\Lambda = .26$, $F(5, 98) = 56.7$, $p < .001$, Extraversion $\Lambda = .36$, $F(5, 98) = 35.5$, $p < .001$. Following the significant MANOVA for each of the factors, facets were placed in rank order by factor, and paired sample T-tests between rank-ordered pairs were used to explore the differences between the facets. Results are listed in Table 3.

Table 3

Facet Paired Sample T-test Results, in Rank Order by Facet Score

Pair	Items	Comparison	t	p	d
<u>Conscientiousness</u>					
Pair 1	Self-Efficacy - Dutifulness	SE > D	$t(102) = .25$	$p = .80$	$d = .03$
Pair 2	Dutifulness - Achievement Striving	D > AS	$t(102) = .71$	$p = .48$	$d = .07$
Pair 3	Achievement Striving - Cautiousness	AS > C	$t(102) = 1.29$	$p = .2$	$d = .13$
Pair 4	Cautiousness - Orderliness	C > O	$t(102) = 1.72$	$p = .09$	$d = .17$

Pair	Items	Comparison	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>d</i>
Pair 5	Orderliness - Self-discipline	O > SD	<i>t</i> (102) = 2.39	<i>p</i> = .02	<i>d</i> = .24
<u>Agreeableness</u>					
Pair 1	Altruism - Sympathy	A > S	<i>t</i> (102) = 1.94	<i>p</i> = .06	<i>d</i> = .19
Pair 2	Sympathy - Straightforwardness	S > Sf	<i>t</i> (102) = .99	<i>p</i> = .33	<i>d</i> = .10
Pair 3	Straightforwardness - Trust	Sf > T	<i>t</i> (102) = 2.89	<i>p</i> < .01	<i>d</i> = .29
Pair 4	Trust - Cooperation	T > Co	<i>t</i> (102) = 2.08	<i>p</i> = .04	<i>d</i> = .21
Pair 5	Cooperation - Modesty	Co > M	<i>t</i> (102) = .74	<i>p</i> = .46	<i>d</i> = .07
<u>Neuroticism</u>					
Pair 1	Immoderation - Anxiety	I > Anx	<i>t</i> (102) = .73	<i>p</i> = .47	<i>d</i> = .07
Pair 2	Anxiety - Anger	Anx > Ang	<i>t</i> (102) = 1.64	<i>p</i> = .10	<i>d</i> = .16
Pair 3	Anger - Neuroticism	Ang > N	<i>t</i> (102) = 1.19	<i>p</i> = .24	<i>d</i> = .12
Pair 4	Neuroticism - Vulnerability	N > V	<i>t</i> (102) = 2.55	<i>p</i> = .01	<i>d</i> = .25
Pair 5	Vulnerability - Depression	V > De	<i>t</i> (102) = 3.39	<i>p</i> = .001	<i>d</i> = .34
<u>Openness</u>					
Pair 1	Aesthetic - Emotionality	Ae > E	<i>t</i> (102) = 3.69	<i>p</i> < .001	<i>d</i> = .37
Pair 2	Emotionality - Intellect	E > In	<i>t</i> (102) = 1.75	<i>p</i> = .08	<i>d</i> = .17
Pair 3	Intellect - Imagination	In > Im	<i>t</i> (102) = 4.33	<i>p</i> < .001	<i>d</i> = .43
Pair 4	Imagination - Adventurousness	Im > Ad	<i>t</i> (102) = 5.15	<i>p</i> < .001	<i>d</i> = .51
Pair 5	Adventurousness - Liberalism	Ad > L	<i>t</i> (102) = .72	<i>p</i> = .47	<i>d</i> = .07
<u>Extraversion</u>					
Pair 1	Cheerfulness - Friendliness	Ch > F	<i>t</i> (102) = 4.15	<i>p</i> < .001	<i>d</i> = .41
Pair 2	Friendliness - Excitement Seeking	F > ES	<i>t</i> (102) = 2.49	<i>p</i> = .014	<i>d</i> = .25
Pair 3	Excitement Seeking - Activity	ES > Ac	<i>t</i> (102) = .65	<i>p</i> = .52	<i>d</i> = .06
Pair 4	Activity - Assertiveness	Ac > As	<i>t</i> (102) = .77	<i>p</i> = .45	<i>d</i> = .08
Pair 5	Assertiveness - Gregariousness	As > G	<i>t</i> (102) = 5.56	<i>p</i> < .001	<i>d</i> = .55

Note. SE=Self-Efficacy; D=Dutifulness; AS=Achievement Striving; C=Cautiousness; O=

Orderliness; SD= Self-Discipline; A= Altruism; S= Sympathy; Sf= Straightforwardness; T=

Trust; Co= Cooperation; M= Modesty; I= Immoderation; Anx= Anxiety; Ang= Anger; N=

Neuroticism; V= Vulnerability; De=Depression; Ae= Aesthetic; E=Emotionality; In= Intellect;

Im= Imagination; Ad= Adventurousness; L= Liberalism; Ch= Cheerfulness; F=Friendliness;
ES= Excitement Seeking; Ac=Activity; As=Assertiveness; G=Gregariousness.

Within the Conscientiousness factor, self-discipline was significantly lower than the other facets, $t(102) = 2.39, p = .019, d = .235$, and no other significant differences were noted. Within the Agreeableness factor there were not any significant differences between Altruism, Sympathy, and Straightforwardness, but there were significant differences between these three facets and Trust, Cooperation, and Modesty, $t(102) = 2.89, p < .01, d = .29$. Further, there were significant differences between Cooperation and Modesty and the four higher-scoring facets, $t(102) = 2.08, p = .04, d = .21$. Within the Neuroticism facet Anxiety, Anger, Immoderation and Self-Consciousness were significantly higher than Vulnerability and Depression, $t(102) = 3.39, p = .001, d = .34$. Further, Vulnerability was significantly higher than Depression, $t(102) = 3.39, p = .001, d = .34$. Within the Openness facets Aesthetic was the highest scoring facet, significantly higher than the other five facets, $t(102) = 3.69, p < .001, d = .37$. Emotionality and Intellect ranked next highest, not significantly different from each other, but lower than Aesthetic as mentioned above, and significantly higher than Imagination, Adventurousness, and Liberalism, $t(102) = 4.33, p < .001, d = .43$. Finally, Adventurousness and Liberalism ranked lowest, significantly lower than the other four facets, but not significantly different from each other, $t(102) = 5.15, p < .001, d = .51$. Within the Extraversion factor, Cheerfulness was the highest scoring facet, significantly higher than the other five facets, $t(102) = 4.15, p < .001, d = .41$. Friendliness was the second highest scoring facet, significantly lower than Cheerfulness as described above, and also significantly higher than the other four facets, $t(102) = 2.49, p = .014, d = .2$. Finally, Gregariousness was significantly lower than the other five facets, $t(102) = 5.56, p < .001, d = .55$.

Chapter 4

Discussion

Consistent with a case study analysis, the final report structure is driven by the study's participants (Wholey et al., 2010), in this case the seminary. To this end, the report will focus on the effectiveness of the formative assessment by reviewing data from stakeholders including the seminary and doctor of ministry students, executive dean, and psychologist consultant. Themes such as assessment effectiveness, personality profiles, and suggestions for program improvement will be explored.

Effectiveness Across Stakeholders

The executive dean acted as the study's primary unit of analysis as we sought to answer the question, "Was the assessment program effective?" She also identified guidelines for evaluating the program's effectiveness including the need for the formative assessment to be contextually sensitive, applicable, and wholistic. Results from the quantitative feedback affirmed the benefit of the formative assessment to students, with (93.3%) of students reporting it was "very helpful" to them personally. Themes from the qualitative results demonstrate the formative assessment met the executive dean's overall mission of contextual sensitivity, applicability, and being wholistic. In reference to being contextually sensitive, a student stated, "I feel that by talking through the results with [psychologist consultant] I was able to better understand me and my story, which helped in making connections with the results." In reference to applicability, a student stated:

The overall assessment was a blessing to me, however, what I found most helpful was the burnout factors and resources associated with them. It is nice to continually gain feedback

on who you are, but for me it's about growing as an individual and being given the knowledge, resources, and constructive information to do so.

Describing the wholistic approach of the formative assessment, one student stated, “I felt really seen, acknowledged, and appreciated for my whole self in this meeting. The [psychologist consultant] had multiple strategies that I could approach my differences with.” In sum, the formative assessment met the executive dean’s goals of implementing a contextually sensitive, applicable, and wholistic assessment.

Considering effectiveness from the psychologist consultant’s perspective, they spoke about aligning with the executive dean’s interests and the importance of increased efficiency of completing the profiles. Regarding meeting the executive dean’s goals for the formative assessment, the psychologist consultant spoke about the importance of taking a “bottom-up” approach to allow students autonomy and voice within their own results. In this way, the importance of individual context was woven into the creation of the formative assessment. The psychologist consultant also mentioned the importance of practical tools to combat burnout and allow for the applicability of formative assessment insights. Another goal of the psychologist consultant was to reduce time spent coding the assessments to save on costs and deliver them more efficiently. To do this, the psychologist consultant created auto-populated assessment results. This strategy was deemed successful as the executive dean mentioned it as a helpful tool in reducing wait times between assessments and the psychologist consultant found it decreased the amount of time spent on each profile, thus making the profiles more cost-effective. Each of these points is also evidence of the effective communication between the executive dean and psychologist consultant, which allowed for the psychologist consultant to meet the needs of the

overall program. After a review of the findings, the goals and needs of the psychologist consultant were met through the program.

Considering student perspectives, data suggested the formative assessment was beneficial to students. The qualitative and quantitative student data highlighted the value of a wholistic, contextual, and applicable assessment in meeting the broad needs of each individual student. It also affirmed the importance of the one-to-one feedback session with 100% of the students participating in it calling it “very helpful.” This information can be used to justify the continuation of the formative assessment program and shapes future directions surrounding the imperative of the accessibility of the one-to-one feedback. Possible suggestions for making the one-to-one feedback more accessible to students could be offering a 30 min consultation at a reduced cost as opposed to the current one-hour session. This would reduce the financial burden for students and the time commitment for the psychologist consultant. Similarly, several students mentioned the need for more background information on language used in the assessment and some contextual information about personality assessment in general. Offering a shorter, more informal visit could provide a setting for some of these questions to be clarified without having to go through the entire assessment.

Ministry Personality Profile

Results from the exploratory analysis provide a preliminary personality profile of those pursuing a career in ministry. As forementioned, personality research has been used in different populations for ends such as predicting job performance (Tett et al., 1991) and has been used to identify characteristics related to outcomes like resilience (Francis et al., 2018). Thus, starting the work of norming and describing a personality profile with this specific population is a natural continuation of the application of personality research. Our findings revealed a potential

personality profile of those seeking a career in ministry as having higher Openness, Conscientiousness, Agreeableness, with lower Extraversion and Neuroticism. In addition, there were some significant differences in facet scores. For instance, Vulnerability and Depression were low within Neuroticism, Aesthetic was high within Openness, Gregariousness was low within Extraversion, Self-Discipline was low within Conscientiousness, and within Agreeableness, Altruism, Sympathy, and Straightforwardness were high, while Cooperation and Modesty were low. The application of these findings has the potential to speak further into questions such as, “How is this specific population unequally susceptible or resilient to burnout?” and “What work settings within ministry best fit different personality profiles?”

Implications

The formative assessment proved to be an effective and sustainable tool for facilitating self-awareness and supporting seminarian’s ability to flourish in their chosen career. This was likely due to the assessment being intentionally made to cater to the population-specific needs of future ministry leaders. The population included those who are primarily pursuing careers in spiritual direction ($n = 36, 33.0\%$), pastoral ministry ($n = 26, 24.0\%$), and chaplaincy ($n = 12, 11.0\%$). While there is significant crossover between these three groups, there are specific skills related to being a spiritual director, chaplain, or pastoral leader. For spiritual directors and chaplains, there is a greater emphasis on emotional engagement, interpersonal warmth, and relational insights. Pastoral leaders are asked to have high levels of relational energy and good organizational skills as they facilitate large groups. Because the formative assessment was made specifically for ministry leaders, the feedback directly addressed some of these characteristics. This included identifying levels of extraversion as it related to burnout in a field that is highly relational, and levels of openness related to engaging with patients from a wide variety of

backgrounds and life experiences. While other general personality assessments could have touched on individual differences in these areas, this assessment appeared able to highlight the nuances of how those insights relate to their specific field. Overall, this work speaks to the effectiveness of a population-specific formative personality assessment and opens the door for future work in this area.

Personality Profile

In our analysis we identified a potential personality profile of those seeking a career in ministry as having higher Openness, Conscientiousness, and Agreeableness while having lower Extraversion and Neuroticism. These unique factor combinations have implications for ministry work. For instance, high scores within the Conscientious domain highlight our participants as ambitious and diligent. As forementioned, Conscientiousness is highly correlated with work successes, positive health outcomes, and long-term relationship satisfaction (Duckworth et al., 2012). While Scores in Conscientiousness were high, self-discipline was lower than other Conscientiousness facets. This could suggest that while this population sets high expectations for themselves, they may lack the ability to follow-through on those high standards. Often this combination can result in shame or guilt. A notable finding from the Agreeableness domain were the higher scores in Altruism, Sympathy, and Straightforwardness with lower scores in Trust, Cooperation, and Modesty. This could imply the ministry leaders are drawn to components of ministry that require caring deeply for others and walking alongside community members through a range of life circumstances. These scores also suggest they may not be as drawn to the everyday coordination and logistics of being a ministry leader which necessitate Coordination and Trust. When taken together there is a notable combination between the higher Agreeableness and Conscientiousness. Individuals with this profile may be more susceptible to prioritizing

other's needs to the detriment of their own needs. This is especially important to note as ministry is a highly relational profession with an underlying expectation for leadership to meet the general needs of the congregation they are serving, a dynamic also influenced by one's theological position. If made aware of these potential concerns, this personality type can be caring toward others and retain the self-efficacy and dutifulness to tangibly meet the needs of others without the risk of burnout.

Along with Conscientiousness and Agreeableness, the Openness factor was higher than Extraversion and Neuroticism. Higher Openness can speak into self-care strategies for the population including leaning into appreciation for aesthetics. Those high in the Aesthetic facet may derive pleasure from seeking beauty in the external world by being engrossed in nature or engaging in creative activities like art. Highly open individuals may also be fulfilled by exploring new places or having deep conversations about new ideas. Having this insight can be important to the integration of self-care strategies into ministry leaders' everyday lives, facilitating wellness in this population.

Another notable factor is this population's low Neuroticism. This suggests the presence of internal strategies for coping with stress, perhaps related to spiritual and religious coping. It is notable that Depression and Vulnerability were lower than other facets within Neuroticism. These low scores could point to the benefits of social relationships built through religious communities. Furthermore, Anxiety, Anger, Immoderation and Self-Consciousness were higher than Depression and Vulnerability in this population. Immoderation can be described as having cravings or urges such as eating excessive amounts of food, smoking, media consumption and more. These behaviors are often the result of a need to self-regulate and often stem from emotional or situational triggers. This could have relevance for those in helping professions

because of the social expectations to be in control and self-sufficient. These dynamics can create an environment where one is more likely to engage externalizing behaviors to cope with stress. Also related to immoderation, the lowest facet within the Conscientious domain was self-discipline. Self-discipline and immoderation intersect in that immoderation involves engaging in avoidance behaviors to self-regulate, and having low self-discipline often involves avoiding responsibilities. In addition, a highly conscientious and agreeable person may have high expectations of themselves. In combination with low self-discipline and high immoderation, these kinds of ministry leaders may perceive themselves as not meeting their own high expectations and may cope with that inner conflict with immoderation and avoidance. Ministry leaders with these intersecting personality characteristics may benefit from interventions ranging from task completion techniques to boundary setting and self-compassion.

Lastly, lower scores in Extraversion and Gregariousness could relate to our participants identifying as wanting to work as spiritual directors or chaplains. These are professions where one can answer the ministry call without needing to rely on higher levels of extraversion that are required within other ministry leadership positions such as being a head pastor. Seeing how this profile aligns with the type of work a seminarian or doctor of ministry student may be drawn to suggests insight into an individual's levels of extraversion could help guide prospective students into work settings that would best align with their preferred context for social engagement.

Suggestions for Future Research

Future research could expand on this single case study to explore the use of this kind of formative assessment and feedback in more seminary programs (expanding the generalizability of the results). A larger sample across seminaries would allow for the creation of separate norms for different career paths (e.g., pastoral leadership, spiritual direction, chaplaincy) or degree

programs (DMin. & seminary) including exploration of differences in age, career trajectory, and time spent in the field. To this end, future research exploring the influence of identity markers such as ethnicity and gender could be an important contribution to the field. Additionally, comparing the profile norms from seminarians with other professional populations could provide helpful insights into what makes seminarians unique, helping identify personality types best suited for ministry work. A final direction for future research would be testing the utility of the formative assessment in other training programs in helping professions.

References

- Abma, T., Stake, R. (2014). Science of the particular: An advocacy of naturalistic case study in health research. *Qualitative Health Research*, 28(8), 1150-1161.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1049732314543196>
- Allport, G., & Odbert, H. (1936). Trait-names: A psycho-lexical study. *Psychological Monographs*, 47(1), i-171. <https://doi.org/10.1037/h0093360>
- Armon, G., Shirom, A., & Melamed, S. (2012). The Big Five personality factors as predictors of changes across time in burnout and its facets. *Journal of Personality*, 80(2), 403-427.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-6494.2011.00731.x>
- Barnard, L., & Curry, F. (2012). The relationship of clergy burnout to self-compassion and other personality dimensions. *Pastoral Psychology*, 61(2), 149-163.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s11089-011-0377-0>
- Beebe, R., (2007). Predicting burnout, conflict management style, and turnover among clergy. *Journal of Career Assessment*, 15(2), 257-275.
<http://dx.doi.org.georgefox.idm.oclc.org/10.1177/1069072706298157>
- Braun, V., Clarke, V. (2012). Thematic analysis. *APA handbook of research methods in psychology, research designs. Research designs: Quantitative, qualitative, neuropsychological, and biological (Vol. 2, pp. 57-71)*. American Psychological Association.
- Case, D., Keyes, M., Huffman, F., Sittser, K., Wallace, A., Hkatiwoda, P., Parnell, E., Proeschold-Bell, J., (2020). Attitudes and behaviors that differentiate clergy with positive mental health from those without burnout. *Journal of Prevention & Intervention in the Community*, 48(1), 94-112. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10852352.2019.1617525>

- Cattell, R. (1946a). *Description and measurement of personality*. World Book Company.
- Cattell, R. (1950). *Personality: A systematic theoretical and factual study*. McGraw-Hill.
<https://doi.org/10.1037/10773-000>
- Costa Jr., P. (1991). Clinical use of the five-factor model: An introduction. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 57(3), 393. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327752jpa5703_1
- Digman, J. (1996). The curious history of the Five-Factor Model. In J. S. Wiggins (Ed.), *The five-factor model of personality: Theoretical perspectives* (pp. 1–20). Guilford Press.
- Digman, J., & Takemoto-Chock, N. (1981). Factors in the natural language of personality: Re-analysis, comparison, and interpretation of six major studies. *Multivariate Behavioral Research*, 16(2), 149–170. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327906mbr1602_2
- Duckworth, A., Weir, D., Tsukayama, E., & Kwok, D. (2012). Who does well in life? Conscientious adults excel in both objective and subjective success. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 3. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2012.00356>
- Dyrbye, L., Power, D., Massie, F., Eacker, A., Harper, W., Thomas, M., Szydlo, D., Sloan, J., & Shanafelt, T. (2010). Factors associated with resilience to and recovery from burnout: A prospective, multi-institutional study of US medical students. *Medical Education*, 44(10), 1016–1026. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2923.2010.03754.x>
- Fiske, D. (1949). Consistency of the factorial structures of personality ratings from different sources. *The Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 44(3), 329–344.
<https://doi.org/10.1037/h0057198>
- Francis, K., Gummerum, M., Ganis, G., Howard, I., & Terbeck, S. (2018). Virtual straightforwardness in the helping professions: Simulated action and resilience. *British*

Journal of Psychology, 109(3), 442–465. APA PsycInfo.

<https://doi.org/10.1111/bjop.12276>

Goldberg, L., (1999). A broad-bandwidth, public domain, personality inventory measuring the lower-level facets of several five-factor models. *Personality Psychology in Europe*, 7 (pp. 7-28).

Goldberg, L., (1981). Language and individual differences: The search for universal in personality lexicons. *Review of Personality and Social Psychology* 2, 141-165.

Goldberg, L., Johnson, J., Eber, H., Hogan, R., Ashton, M., Cloninger, C., & Gough, H. (2006). The International Personality Item Pool and the future of public-domain personality measures. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 40, 84-96.

Gutierrez, D., & Mullen, P. (2016). Emotional intelligence and the counselor: Examining the relationship of trait emotional intelligence to counselor burnout. *Journal of Mental Health Counseling*, 38(3), 187–200. <https://doi.org/10.17744/mehc.38.3.01>

Hearne, L., King, P., Geary, T., & Kenny, N. (2018). “Science of the singular”: An explanatory single case study of whole school guidance counselling in Ireland. *International Journal for Educational and Vocational Guidance*, 18(3), 315–335. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10775-018-9363-8>

Hendriks, J. (1997). The construction of the Five-Factor Personality Inventory (FFPI). <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/50859190>

Hendriks, J., Hofstee, W., & Raad, B. (2002). The Five-Factor Personality Inventory: Assessing the Big Five by means of brief and concrete statements. In B. De Raad, M. Perugini (Eds.) *Big Five Assessment* (pp. 79–108). Hogrefe & Huber Publishers

- Jankowski, P., Hall, E., Sandage, S., & Dumitrascu, N. (2021). Religious leaders' well-being: Protective influences for humility and differentiation against narcissism. *Spirituality in Clinical Practice*. <https://doi.org/10.1037/scp0000265>
- Kirkcaldy, B., Thome, E., & Thomas, W. (1989). Job satisfaction amongst psychosocial workers. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 10(2), 191–196. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0191-8869\(89\)90203-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/0191-8869(89)90203-1)
- Löckenhoff, C., Ironson, G., O'Cleirigh, C., & Costa, P. (2009). Five-Factor Model personality traits, spirituality/religiousness, and mental health among people living with HIV. *Journal of Personality*, 77(5), 1411–1436. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-6494.2009.00587.x>
- McCrae, R., & John, O. (1992). An introduction to the Five-Factor Model and its applications. *Journal of Personality*, 60(2), 175–215. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-6494.1992.tb00970.x>
- Miner, M. (2007). Burnout in the first year of ministry: Personality and belief style as important predictors. *Mental Health, Religion & Culture*, 10(1), 17–29. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13694670500378017>
- Mlčák, Z., & Zášková, H. (2008). Analysis of relationships between prosocial tendencies, empathy, and the five-factor personality model in students of helping professions. *Studia Psychologica*, 50(2), 201–216. <https://doi.org/10.1037/t51302-000>
- Mullins-Sweatt, S., & Lengel, G. (2012). Clinical utility of the Five-Factor Model of personality disorder. *Journal of Personality*, 80(6), 1615–1639. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-6494.2012.00774.x>

- Piedmont, R. L. (1998). The Revised NEO Personality Inventory: Clinical and research applications. *Plenum Press*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4899-3588-5>
- Robbins, M., & Hancock, N. (2015). Subjective and psychological type among Australian clergy. *Mental Health, Religion & Culture*, 18(1), 47–56.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/13674676.2014.1003171>
- Tett, R., Jackson, D., & Rothstein, M. (1991). Personality measures as predictors of job performance: A meta-analytic review. *Personnel Psychology*, 44(4), 703–742.
- Tomic, W., Tomic, D., & Evers, W. (2004). A question of burnout among reformed church ministers in the Netherlands. *Mental Health, Religion & Culture*, 7(3), 225–247.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/13674670310001602472>
- Wholey, Hatry, H., & Newcomer, K. (2010). *Handbook of Practical Program Evaluation* (3rd ed.). Jossey-Bass.

Appendix A

Informed Consent for Research Participants

Hello:

The purpose of this study is to assess the perceived effectiveness of receiving personality feedback as part of your seminary training. As part of your seminary training, you'll be completing the Factor-5 Personality Assessment (approximately 10-15 min. to complete) and you will receive an individualized report. The feedback may include factors that influence how you relate to others, approach tasks or projects, and potential strategies to manage the demands inherent in ministry. After receiving the report, a brief follow-up survey will be sent to you inquiring into the perceived helpfulness of this report. The aim of this research is two-fold, first we want to assess the usefulness of personality feedback to you as a seminary student. Your participation in this project is completely voluntary and there are no foreseeable risks associated with this project. However, if you feel uncomfortable answering any questions, you can withdraw from the survey at any point and/or contact the primary research if you want to debrief or discuss your experience of the survey or any aspect of your individualized report. Your survey responses to both the assessment and feedback regarding the helpfulness of the project will be strictly confidential and data from this research will be reported only in the aggregate. Your information will be de-identified, coded and will remain confidential.

A second aim of this research is to better understand the personality traits of those going into ministry. To date, there are no personality assessments which have been normed for ministry leaders and which thus provide tailored feedback for ministry leaders. Your de-identified personality feedback will be used to help establish psychometric norms for ministry leaders. Your completion of the Survey Monkey indicates consent to participate in this project.

If you have questions at any time about the survey or the procedures, you may contact Mary Peterson (mpeterso@gfu.edu), or Megan Anna Neff (mneff14@gfu.edu)

Appendix B

Informed Consent for Research Participants

Hello:

The purpose of this study is to assess the perceived effectiveness of receiving personality feedback as part of your seminary training. The aim of this research is to assess the usefulness of personality feedback to you as a seminary student. Your participation in this project is completely voluntary and there are no foreseeable risks associated with this project. However, if you feel uncomfortable answering any questions, you can withdraw from the survey at any point and/or contact the primary research if you want to debrief or discuss your experience of the survey or any aspect of your individualized report. Your survey responses will be strictly confidential and data from this research will be reported only in the aggregate. Your information will be de-identified, coded and will remain confidential. Your completion of the Survey Monkey indicates consent to participate in this project.

If you have questions at any time about the survey or the procedures, you may contact Kylee Peterson kyleep15@georgefox.edu, Mary Peterson (mpeterso@gfu.edu), or Megan Anna Neff (mneff14@gfu.edu)

Appendix C

1. Email (needed to be able to send you feedback)

2. Age:

- ☐ 18 to 24
- ☐ 25 to 34
- ☐ 35 to 44
- ☐ 45 to 54
- ☐ 55 to 64
- ☐ 65 to 74
- ☐ 75 or older

3. Gender:

- ☐ Female
- ☐ Male
- ☐ Transgender Female
- ☐ Transgender Male
- ☐ Gender Variant/Non-Conforming
- ☐ Not Listed
- ☐ Prefer not to answer

4. Race/Ethnicity: (Check all that apply)

- ☐ White or Caucasian American Indian or Alaska Native
- ☐ Black or African American
- ☐ Hispanic or Latino
- ☐ Asian or Asian American
- ☐ American Indian or Alaska Native
- ☐ Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander
- ☐ White or Caucasian
- ☐ Multiracial
- ☐ Other not listed
- ☐ Prefer not to answer

5. What is your anticipated career trajectory? (Pastor, Chaplain, Spiritual Director, etc.)

6. How many years have you been in ministry?

- ☐ 0-1
- ☐ 2-5
- ☐ 6-10
- ☐ 11-15
- ☐ 16-25

7. I see myself as someone who...

	Very inaccurate	Moderately inaccurate	Neither	Moderately accurate	Very accurate
Anticipates the needs of others.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Avoids mistakes.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Am often down in the dumps.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Handles tasks smoothly.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Has a vivid imagination.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Tends to vote for liberal political candidates.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Gets stressed out easily.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Feels others' emotions.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Takes charge.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Has a rich vocabulary.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Loves to help others.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Get overwhelmed by emotions.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Feels comfortable around people.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Knows how to get things done.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Am afraid to draw attention to myself.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Loves life.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Dislikes myself.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Love excitement.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

	Very inaccurate	Moderately inaccurate	Neither	Moderately accurate	Very accurate
Enjoys the beauty of nature.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Feels that I'm unable to deal with things.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Prefers variety to routine.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Dislikes being the center of attention.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Often feels blue.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Looks at the bright side of life.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Enjoys thinking about things.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Believes that there is no absolute right or wrong.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Can't stand confrontations.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Loves to daydream.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Wants everything to be just right.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Tries to understand myself.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Believes that others have good intentions.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Sets high standards for myself and others.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Suffers from others' sorrows.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Keeps my promises.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Am easily intimidated.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Does a lot in my spare time.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Sees beauty in things that others might not notice.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Am always prepared.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Lose my temper.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Love large parties.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Warms up quickly to others.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

	Very inaccurate	Moderately inaccurate	Neither	Moderately accurate	Very accurate
Seeks adventure.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Can manage many things at the same time.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Loves order and regularity.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Does more than what's expected of me.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Trusts others.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Values cooperation over competition.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Dislikes talking about myself.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

8. I see myself as someone who

	Very inaccurate	Moderately inaccurate	Neither	Moderately Accurate	Very Accurate
Does not like art.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Keeps others at a distance.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Prefers to stick with things that I know.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Doesn't like to draw attention to myself.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Have difficulty starting tasks.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Make myself the center of attention.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Am not embarrassed easily.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Am a creature of habit.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Don't worry about things that have already happened.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Am not interested in theoretical discussions.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Pretends to be concerned for others.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Likes a leisurely lifestyle.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Makes rash decisions.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

	Very inaccurate	Moderately inaccurate	Neither	Moderately Accurate	Very Accurate
Rarely get irritated.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Would never go hang gliding or bungee jumping.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Rarely overindulge.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Am not easily amused.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Doesn't understand things.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Tries not to think about the needy.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Has a sharp tongue.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Believes that we should be tough on crime.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Prefers to be alone.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Postpones decisions.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Misrepresents the facts.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Acts without thinking.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Am not bothered by disorder.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Am calm even in tense situations.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Rarely complains.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Holds a grudge.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Uses flattery to get ahead.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Adapts easily to new situations.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Doesn't like crowded events.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Breaks rules.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Waits for others to lead the way.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Easily resist temptations.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Am able to control my cravings.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Rarely notice my emotional reactions.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

	Very inaccurate	Moderately inaccurate	Neither	Moderately Accurate	Very Accurate
Seldom get lost in thought.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Am indifferent to the feelings of others.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Does just enough work to get by.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Suspects hidden motives in others.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Use others for my own ends.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

9. I often...

	Very inaccurate	Moderately Inaccurate	Neither	Moderately Accurate	Very Accurate
Thinks about the causes of my emotions.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Does not like reading or hearing opinions that go against my way of thinking.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Try to please everyone.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Do crazy things.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Believe that I am always right.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Neglect my duties.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Am a workaholic, with little time for fun or pleasure.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Strive in every way possible to be flawless.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Am usually aware of the way that I'm feeling.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Don't consider a task finished until it's perfect.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Have been told that I am rigid and inflexible.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Cannot be counted on to get things done	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Believe that I am better than others.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Like to act on a whim.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Appendix D

Post-Factor-5 Feedback Survey

1. How helpful was the Factor-5 assessment feedback to you personally?

- ☐ Very helpful
 ☐ Moderately unhelpful
☐ Moderately helpful
 ☐ Very unhelpful
☐ Neutral

2. How likely are you to...

	Very likely	Moderately likely	Somewhat likely	Moderately unlikely	Very unlikely
Use the strategies outlined in your report for managing the demands of being a seminary student?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Use the strategies outlined in your report for managing the demands of ministry?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Use the feedback outlined in your report for improving interpersonal communication or relationships?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Use the feedback in the report for gaining greater self-reflection/insight or personal formation?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

3. Was there specific feedback you found the most helpful?

4. Was there specific feedback that was particularly unhelpful?

5. On a scale of 1-10, how valuable was the use of time spent engaging in this personality assessment? (1- little value; 10 high value)

0 Neutral 10



6. Understanding my personality and personality traits is important for my future as a ministry leader.

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input type="radio"/> Strongly agree | <input type="radio"/> Disagree |
| <input type="radio"/> Agree | <input type="radio"/> Strongly disagree |
| <input type="radio"/> Neither agree nor disagree | |

7. Prior to taking this assessment, I was familiar with the Big5/Factor-5 Personality traits (OCEAN, CANOE, etc.)

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input type="radio"/> Agree | <input type="radio"/> Somewhat disagree |
| <input type="radio"/> Somewhat agree | <input type="radio"/> Disagree |
| <input type="radio"/> Neither agree nor disagree | |

8. I would like to learn more about the Factor-5, including additional inclusion into seminary courses, trainings are through a personal consultation with psychologists.

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input type="radio"/> Strongly agree | <input type="radio"/> Disagree |
| <input type="radio"/> Agree | <input type="radio"/> Strongly disagree |
| <input type="radio"/> Neither agree nor disagree | |

9. For those who chose to do the personalized 1 on 1 video feedback session with the psychologist:

I found it to be:

- | | |
|--|--|
| <input type="radio"/> Very helpful | <input type="radio"/> Moderately unhelpful |
| <input type="radio"/> Moderately helpful | <input type="radio"/> Very unhelpful |
| <input type="radio"/> Neutral | |

10. For those who chose to do a personalized 1 on 1 video feedback session with the psychologist.

The most salient/helpful part of the feedback was:

Appendix E

Semi-Structured Interview Questions (Seminary director)

1. What would you say were your original goals when the team set-out to create this program? In what areas would you say we met these goals and in what areas would you say there needs improvement?
2. What ways do you feel the assessment and feedback sessions have contributed to your students' growth?
3. What would you say has been the most effective part of this program?
4. What would you say are ways the assessment could be made better or more effective?
5. What would you say is the greatest barrier to student participation in the assessment?
6. Have your program's needs changed at all? Is there a way we can continue to cater this program to fit those emerging needs?

Semi-Structured Interview Questions (Megan Anna)

1. What were your initial goals when you set out to create this assessment?
2. How do you feel that you have met or not met these goals?
3. What themes have been your focus in the assessment feedback?
4. What changes to the program have you made along the way and what changes do you foresee in the future?
5. What do you see as the most valuable component of the assessment?
6. Are there any questions about the assessment and feedback processes you would like this research project to answer?

Appendix F

Page 7

**GEORGE FOX UNIVERSITY
HSRC INITIAL REVIEW QUESTIONNAIRE**

Title of Proposed Research: Program Evaluation: Effectiveness of Formative Assessment in preparation for ministry.

Principal Researcher(s): Megan Anna Neff, MDiv, Psy.D; Mary Peterson, Ph.D

Date application completed: 5-6-21

COMMITTEE FINDING:

 X 1) The proposed research makes adequate provision for safeguarding the health and dignity of the subjects and is therefore approved. **Exempt #2**

 2) The proposed research makes adequate provision for safeguarding the health and dignity of the subjects and is therefore approved. Due to the assessment of risk being questionable or being subject to change, the research must be periodically reviewed by the HSRC on an _____ basis throughout the course of the research or until otherwise notified. This requires resubmission of this form, with updated information, for each periodic review.

 3) The proposed research evidences some unnecessary risk to participants and therefore must be revised to remedy the following specific area(s) of non-compliance:

 4) The proposed research contains serious and potentially damaging risks to subjects and is therefore not approved.

Chair or designated member:  Date: 5-6-21

Appendix G

Assessment Questions

Factor	Facet	Alpha	Factor	Facet	Alpha
Neuroticism Get stressed out easily. Adapts easily to new situations. Don't worry about things that have already happened.	Anxiety	.83	Neuroticism Lose my temper Rarely get irritated Rarely complain	Anger	.88
Neuroticism Am often down in the dumps. Dislike myself. Often feel blue.	Depression	.88	Neuroticism Am not embarrassed easily. Am afraid to draw attention to myself. Am easily intimidated	Self-Consciousness	.80
Neuroticism Easily resist temptations. Am able to control my cravings. Rarely overindulge.	Immoderation	.77	Neuroticism Am calm even in tense situations. Feel that I am able to deal with things. Get overwhelmed by emotions.	Vulnerability	.72
Extraversion Keep others at a distance. Feel comfortable around others. Warm up to others quickly.	Friendliness	.87	Extraversion Prefer to be alone. Don't like crowded events. Love large parties.	Gregariousness	.79
Extraversion Wait for others to lead the way. Take charge.	Assertiveness	.84	Extraversion Like a leisurely lifestyle. Can manage many things at the same time. Do a lot in my spare time.	Activity Level	.71
Extraversion Dislike Loud music. Seek adventure. Love excitement.	Excitement Seeking	.77	Extraversion Look at the bright side of life. Love life.	Cheerfulness	.72
Openness Seldom get lost in thought.	Imagination	.83	Openness Enjoy the beauty of nature.	Aesthetic	.84

Have a vivid imagination.

Love to daydream.

Openness **Emotionalit** **.81**
y

Feel other's emotions.

Try to understand myself.

Rarely notice my emotional reactions.

Openness **Intellect** **.86**

Enjoy thinking about things.

Have a rich vocabulary.

Am not interested in theoretical discussions

Agreeableness **Trust** **.82**

Believe that others have good intentions.

Trust others.

Suspect hidden motives in others.

Agreeableness **Altruism** **.77**

Anticipate the needs of others.

Love to help others.

Am indifferent to the feelings of others.

Agreeableness **Modesty** **.77**

Dislike being the center of attention.

Dislike talking about myself.

Make myself the center of attention.

Conscientiousness **Self-** **.78**
Efficiency

Handle tasks smoothly.

Know how to get things done.

Don't understand things.

Conscientiousness **Dutifulness** **.71**

Keep my promises.

Misrepresent the facts.

Break the rules.

Conscientiousness **Self-Discipline** **.85**

See beauty in things that others might not notice.

Do not like art.

Openness **Adventurousn** **.77**
ess

Prefer variety to routine.

Prefer to stick with things that I know.

Am a creature of habit.

Openness **Liberalism** **.86**

Tend to vote for liberal political candidates.

Believe laws should be strictly enforced.

Believe we should be tough on crime.

Agreeableness **Straightforwa** **.75**
rdness

Use others to my own end.

Use flattery to get ahead.

Pretend to be concerned for others.

Agreeableness **Cooperation** **.73**

Can't stand confrontations.

Hold a grudge.

Have a sharp tongue.

Agreeableness **Sympathy** **.75**

Suffer from other's sorrows.

Value cooperation over competition.

Try not to think about the needy.

Conscientiousness **Orderliness** **.82**

Want everything to be just right.

Love order and regularity.

Am not bothered by disorder.

Conscientiousne **Achievement-** **.78**
ss **Striving**

Do more than what is expected than me.

Set high standards for myself and others.

Do just enough work to get by.

Conscientiousness **Cautiousness** **.76**

Am always prepared.
Have difficulty starting tasks.
Postpone decisions.

Avoid mistakes.
Make rash decisions.
Act without thinking.

Appendix H

Example Assessment

Email	
Gender	
Age	
Race	
Career Trajectory	
Church denomination	
Years in Ministry	
Specific Feedback Requests	
Desire to meet with therapist 1 on 1	

*A note about feedback. While personality assessment data is robust, it is typical that some of the interpretation/feedback will fit more so than other pieces. It is possible, not all of this feedback will fit your experiences of yourself. Please, take in what feels helpful to take in, and release the pieces that perhaps do not fit your experiences of yourself.

Validity: You answered in such a way suggesting a tendency to respond in a slightly guarded manner.

GLOBAL VIEW:

EXTRAVERSION	AVERAGE
AGREEABLENESS	HIGH
CONSCIENTIOUSNESS	HIGH
NEUROTICISM	LOW
OPENNESS	HIGH

EXTRAVERTED	52	AVERAGE
Cheerfulness	15	High
Activity Level	11	Average
Assertiveness	9	Average
Excitement Seeking	9	Average
Friendliness	5	Low
Fun-Seeking (Disinhibition)	3	Low
Gregariousness	3	Low
Grandiosity	3	Low

The extraversion domain speaks to how you take in your external environment and your general disposition of experiencing positive things. You have a high level of activity and enthusiasm for life. You have a solid ability to experience positive emotions. While you do not intentionally seek out excitement, you derive pleasure from being alive and have an openness toward experiencing the positive emotions of life.

You have a positive energy that is cheerful, and you easily access the positive emotions of joy, happiness, love, and excitement. You are generally a happy person with a energetic tempo who can accomplish many things. You like to keep busy and live a fast-paced life; some may describe you as "on the go." Your energy means you will be able to accomplish great things when you focus and channel your energy.

Your energy and positivity are balanced with your more reserved nature. You likely prefer to be alone or to spend time with a few close friends and it may take you some time to warm up to others. You value your privacy and will work hard to maintain this. You don't enjoy being the center of attention and may find it difficult when attention is turned toward you. You may experience social crowds, large noises, and commotions as overwhelming to your senses and nervous system. You likely are comfortable with being independent, which means you can adapt well to independent work demands. Your more reserved nature is balanced nicely by your willingness to be assertive when needed. This likely protects you from being taken advantage of by others or from the build-up of resentment.

AGREEABLENESS	76	HIGH
Straightforwardness	15	High
Cooperation	14	High
Altruism	13	High
Modesty	13	High
Sympathy	12	High
Trust	9	Average
People-Pleasing	8	Average

This domain speaks to our styles of interpersonal interaction. You are a sympathetic and compassionate soul with a high level of concern for others. You are warm, soft-hearted, generous, considerate, and selfless. You are attentive to other people's feelings and actively

concerned for other's welfare. Your high sense of straightforwardness and altruism likely means that you have high moral standards and feel a sense of duty to help others. This likely makes you a thoughtful and well engaged citizen and an attentive member of your community. You are humble and may even be self-effacing. While others experience you as humble, this doesn't necessarily mean you struggle with self-confidence or self-esteem.

You are on the more guarded side, and others likely need to earn your trust before you let them in. This may leave you in a precarious position relationally. While you give generously of yourself to others, at times you may have a hard time trusting that others have the best intentions toward you. This may leave you in a position where you are often giving to others, but have a difficult time receiving from others. You may feel more comfortable in asymmetrical relationships where you are the mentor/giver/minister etc. This likely makes you an adept listener who others trust, on the flip side you may find relationships that require a level of vulnerability to be more difficult for you and you may experience feeling missed by others/experience periods of loneliness.

While you are attentive to others, you are willing to assert yourself as needed. Your high cooperation/high agreeable score is balanced nicely with your moderate assertiveness level. However, you have a slight vulnerability toward people pleasing (sacrificing your view/opinion/desires for the sake of relational harmony). You likely feel your best when you care for others from a well-differentiated space—when you have healthy boundaries and are able to create space for your own opinions, desires and wants. When you strike this balance of care and differentiation this will help buoy you in ministry and protect you from compassion fatigue. When you are functioning from a less helpful place, your high value of cooperate may manifest in a pattern of sacrificing your own desire, opinions and preferences for the sake of others. When this becomes a prolonged pattern, we can begin to lose our connection to our self or resentment and fatigue can result. While there is some risk for this, your moderate assertiveness (extraversion) likely protects you from this.

CONSCIENTIOUSNESS	80	HIGH
Duty	15	High
Self-Efficiency	15	High
Cautiousness	13	High
Achievement-Striving	13	High
Self-Discipline	13	High
Responsibility	12	High
Orderliness	11	High

This domain speaks to how we take care of daily tasks and how motivated we are by achievement. You are highly conscientious, meaning you are hard-working, reliable, punctual, well organized, rational, prudent, practical, resourceful, and well-prepared. Some may characterize you as purposeful, determined, self-disciplined, and strong-willed. You have high standards and aspirations and strive for excellence in whatever you do. You enjoy achieving and find this motivating, working hard to achieve your goals. You have a strong sense of duty and adhere to your ethical and moral principles.

You are cautious and deliberate and think carefully before acting. When making big life decisions you put a lot of discernment, intentionality and thought into this process. At times this may be a source of tension for you as making big decisions may weigh on you/cause some anxiety or stress.

You are reliable, have a high level of discipline, and can easily begin and complete tasks. You have rich internal resources to draw from to motivate you to accomplish tasks. Even if the tasks are mundane, tedious, or detailed you can continue toward completion. You have high standards and strive to achieve your goals. When you set your mind to something, you are committed. This will set you up well to achieve professionally. On the shadow side, you may experience stress and emotional letdown when professional goals do not progress as desired.

NEUROTICISM	39	LOW
Immoderation	9	Average
Depression	8	Average
Self-Consciousness	6	Low
Anger	6	Low
Anxiety	6	Low
Perfectionism	5	Low
Workaholism	4	Low
Vulnerability	4	Low

You are secure, hardy, and generally relaxed, even under stressful conditions. You are emotionally stable, calm, and even-tempered. You go with the flow and face stressful situations without it rattling you. You are rarely ruffled by awkward social moments or social situations. You are resilient against stress and feel capable of handling difficult situations. Your low vulnerability scores mean you are resilient to stress and resilient to being pulled into other people's stress and anxiety. This will suit you well in future work as a spiritual director as you will be able to offer a calm, grounding and regulating presence to directees.

OPENNESS	73	HIGH
Intellect	15	High
Aesthetic	15	High
Emotionality	14	High
Emotional Attending	13	High
Imagination	12	High
Adventurous	12	High
Psychological Flexibility	11	Average
Liberalism	5	Low

This domain measures responses to various kinds of experiences. You seek a balance between the old and the new, which provides both a sense of openness and groundedness. You balance openness with reverence. You tend to accept authority and honor tradition; at the same time, you are open to new experiences. You likely have broad interests and are very imaginative. You enjoy an active imagination, appreciate a good aesthetic (beauty), are attentive to your inner feelings, enjoy variety, and are intellectually curious. These are characteristics that are well suited for Seminary and ministry.

You are both curious about your internal world and open to experiencing your emotions. You consider understanding and experiencing your emotions to be an important part of life. Your openness to emotion means you are likely emotionally attuned to yourself and others and have a high level of emotional intelligence. Your curiosity is not limited to the external world, but you are likely curious about your internal world and the internal world of others. These natural tendencies toward introspection and reflection will serve you well as a spiritual director. You may also be more aware of and sensitive to both negative and positive emotions--you aren't afraid to embrace "full-spectrum living (i.e. experiencing and feeling all of the complex emotions that come with being alive). Such full-spectrum living opens you to experiencing the Transcendent and Divine, and you likely invite those around you and those you minister also to experience such full spectrum living. You are likely emotionally responsive, sensitive, empathetic, and have a high value of your feelings and the feelings of those around you. You have a good grasp of your internal world and comfortably access and talk about your emotions.

Your high level of adventurousness means that you are willing to try different activities go to new places or eat unusual foods. You enjoy novelty, enjoy experiencing new things, and enjoy experiencing all that the world has to offer. This likely makes you curious about other cultures, art, practices, and hobbies.

You love beauty and may even experience a physical response to beautiful things. You may be drawn to the arts or music that will lead you to a broad knowledge of culture, arts, and music. External beauty may be a source of connecting to the Divine and a powerful source of spirituality and connection for you. When you are feeling depleted, surrounding yourself with beauty will go a long way in rejuvenating you.

You have a rich thought life. You enjoy intellectual conversation, thinking about things, and abstract conversations (high intellect). In this sense, you are well suited for the intellectual life, rigor, and playfulness of Seminary! You have a lot of intellectual curiosity and enjoy rich conversations. You enjoy playing with ideas, and you will likely thrive in the intellectual climate of graduate school. Finding others who enjoy your curiosity for ideas will likely be deeply enlivening and meaningful for you.

Similarly, you have an active fantasy life, vivid imagination, and likely enjoy daydreaming. Daydreaming may function in several different ways for you--you may daydream as a form of self-soothing or escape; however, daydreaming can also create an interesting and rich inner world. Your rich inner life likely contributes to a rich and creative external life.

Appendix I

Things to Consider



Your Ministry Strengths

- Your resilience against stress, anxiety, and general reactivity will serve you well in high-stress situations. You likely have a soothing and grounding “ministry of presence.” This sort of presence is a gift in high-stakes contexts.
- You care deeply and work hard. This likely means that you consistently, reliably and compassionately show up for those you minister to. People are likely drawn to your grounded and compassionate presence. People are likely also drawn to your reliable and competent nature and appreciate the ability to rely on you.
- You have an active life of the mind and are open to new experiences, beauty and activities. This likely cultivates a spiritual, attuned and creative presence. You likely have a rich source of inner wisdom to offer those around you.
- You prefer close and intimate gatherings over large crowds. Your ability and enjoyment of being deeply present with one person will serve you well as a spiritual director. Your directees are likely to experience you as attentive, present and caring.

Work Habits

- You work hard and diligently. Your high level of self-discipline and intrinsic motivation to accomplish tasks means that you are a hard worker and are likely a reliable and valuable addition to your team. You are responsible, prompt, and work effectively. While high consciousness scores are correlated with improved work life, health, and overall , on the shadow side, it can lead to having overly high standards for yourself which can result

in stress and burn-out. However, your high level of consciousness is balanced nicely with your low perfectionism and workaholism scores.

- Your moderate extraverted scores paired with high conscientious scores means you likely work well independently as you are good at creating your own routine, structure, and goals.

Ministry and Burn-out

Ministry is a high burnout profession. Research has shown that those with High Agreeableness and High Conscientious (High A/C) are the most prone to burnout when it comes to helping professions. They tend to have high standards for themselves, care deeply, and be hard on themselves when they don't perceive themselves to be meeting their standards. At times, this can make it difficult to leave your work at work or emotionally walk away from a difficult situation. There may be some vulnerability to take on more responsibility or take on the "weight of the world." Such personality traits can also make you vulnerable toward conflating your sense of self-worth with your work achievements.

You have mild tendencies toward people-pleasing which may exacerbate some of these high A/C vulnerabilities. Learning to cultivate healthy boundaries (both internal and external), and to practice being okay not always being liked will help buffer you from potential burn-out risks (see *Strategies and Recommendations* below for some ideas on how to work with this vulnerability).

Your low neuroticism scores and resilience against stress provides a nice protection and will help buffer you from some of the risks of burn-out. While you care deeply, you are not likely to become sunken by the emotions of those around you. Additionally, you are less likely to get pulled into other people's stress and anxiety.

Your high levels of cheerfulness and energy may create an "interpersonal magnet" that naturally draws others to you. However, there will be times when you prefer to be alone or to spend time with a few close friends and being able to step away and re-charge will be necessary to avoid overstimulation and burn-out and over stimulation.

Strategies and Recommendations:

A. Given your rich internal world, paired with your tendency to be more reserved you may be tempted to escape into your internal world of fantasy and ideation during times of stress and difficulty. While this can be self-soothing and helpful it can also become a form of escapism that disconnects you from the physical and concrete world. It can be beneficial to have practices that help keep you grounded in earthiness, and in the concrete world during times of stress.

- o **Grounding Earthy Practices:** Centering prayer, particularly prayer that incorporate mindful awareness of your body.
- o **Mindful Activities:** Activities that keep you focused on sensations in the present moment. Some examples include, mindful gardening--spending time

physically encountering the earth and attending to the physical sensation of the dirt, flowers, water, etc. **Mindful Eating:** Focusing attention to the smells, sensation and taste of your food while eating slowly. Additionally, you can infuse mindful eating with gratitude practices. **Mindful Movement**--Yoga, walking, swimming, mindful cleaning, and other forms of physically moving your body and attending to the sensations. To learn more about mindfulness, and how to incorporate a mindful practice check out [Headspace](#) or [Mindfulness Coach](#), for apps that will guide you through and teach you mindfulness skills.

- B. If you observe yourself falling into some of the typical High A/C pitfalls (taking on too many responsibilities/overidentifying with work achievements, etc.), here are some recommendations that may help foster resilience and protection from burn-out.
- Be aware of your heightened sense of responsibility and mindfully create **internal boundaries** around what is yours and what belongs to others. Mindfully observing what is yours to own and releasing that which is not yours will buffer you from the vulnerability of personalizing negative encounters or poor outcomes. Prayer and other spiritual practices can be a powerful way of *releasing* that which is not yours to carry.
 - **Practice Not Being Liked:** Your high A/C means that you likely value being liked, and find it quite difficult when this is not the case. Practice mindfully observing what shows up for you when you are in a relationally tense situation or a situation where people are expressing negative feelings toward you. Practice being okay with not being liked. As a spiritual director, you may be the object of some negative projection or countertransference (people projecting negative judgments or evaluations onto you). This can be hard for High A/C, so the more comfortable you get with not always being liked, the more resilience you will have when encountering difficult situations and difficult people.
 - **Create a Discernment Process for Commitments:** People are likely drawn to your reliable and competent nature. This may mean that you are invited to do many things, resulting in feeling overwhelmed with how much you are committing to. Continuing to observe healthy boundaries around work-life balance and being willing to say no will protect you from compassion fatigue. It may benefit you to have a process of discernment for discerning what ministries/activities you commit to.
 - **Boundaries.** Given your moderate vulnerability toward people-pleasing paired with her high agreeable scores it is possible that you struggle with boundaries when under stress. There are many different kinds of boundaries, from behavioral boundaries we place with other people (“no, sorry, I can’t do that right now”) to internal boundaries (this is not my stressor to carry, so I will release it”). Both internal and external boundaries help us to love and do ministry from a well-differentiated space which both protects our and provides a buffer from compassion fatigue and ministry burn-out. For more information on boundaries

see this worksheet: [Types of Boundaries](#) and [Setting Boundaries Worksheet](#). While your assertiveness scores were average, if you notice struggling to set and maintain boundaries, you may benefit from working through [this self-paced workbook on developing assertive communication](#).

- C. While you give generously of yourself to others, at times you have a hard time trusting that others have the best intentions toward you. This paired with your more introverted nature and your dislike of being the may result in you being more guarded when first meeting new people. And given your dislike of being the center of attention you may be quick to turn the focus of the conversation on the other person. This likely makes you a skilled and adapt listener! However, it could also result in a sense of having lopsided relationships. Finding people (friends, a spiritual director, a therapist) where you feel safe and can be self-disclosing will be beneficial.
- D. **Cultivate rejuvenating activity:** Activity, and experiencing new things is important to you and it will be important to attend to the type of activities that you find rejuvenating. You're likely more cautious around invitations to engage in higher risk activities, and you may experience social crowds, large noises, and commotions as overwhelming. And so, prioritizing the type of external activities you find rejuvenating will be helpful. Your assertiveness is a great tool because it's essential to make time to enjoy life beyond the ever-present demands of ministry.

Appendix J**Curriculum Vitae**

Kylee M. Peterson, MA

kyleep15@georgefox.edu | 541.212.8592 | she/her

EDUCATION**Doctor of Psychology, Clinical Psychology, PsyD** **Expected May 2024**

George Fox University

Graduate School of Clinical Psychology, APA Accredited

Newberg, Oregon

Dissertation: Personality and Flourishing in Seminarians: a program evaluation

Defense scheduled November 2022

Master of Arts, Clinical Psychology, MA **2021**

George Fox University

Graduate School of Clinical Psychology, APA Accredited

Newberg, Oregon

Bachelor of Science, Communication Disorder Sciences, BS **2018**

University of Oregon

College of Education

Eugene, Oregon

CLINICAL EXPERIENCE**Providence Medical Group, Sunset Clinic** July 2022-Present

Practicum III

Behavioral Health Consultant

Supervisors: Andrew Barnes, PhD, Jeri Turgesen, PsyD

Setting: Primary Care Internal Medicine and Family Medicine

- Short-term psychotherapy, ADHD & Dementia screenings, comprehensive assessments, and professional consultation in an integrated medical setting
- Conducted a childhood comprehensive assessment in an in-patient setting
- Coordinated care with medical treatment team
- Patient advocacy through collaboration with medical staff surrounding potential barriers to health care
- Conducted evidence-based therapy including ACT & person-centered

Providence Medical Group Newberg July 2021-July 2022

Practicum II

Behavioral Health Consultant

Supervisor: Jeri Torgesen, PsyD

Setting: Primary Care Family Medicine

- Short-term psychotherapy, ADHD & Dementia screenings, comprehensive assessments, and professional consultation in an integrated medical setting
- Participation in substance abuse rotation; substance use/abuse evaluation, identification of maladaptive coping strategies, co-visits with PCP and patient, and development of harm reduction strategies
- Patient advocacy through collaboration with medical staff surrounding potential barriers to health care
- Conducted evidence-based therapy including person-centered and ACT
- Recipient of federal Health Resources and Services Administration (HRSA) grant; including 50+ hours of additional training, seminars, and didactics consistent with the grant.

George Fox Behavioral Health Center July 2020-July 2021

Practicum I

George Fox University Clinical Practicum Site

Supervisors: Glenna L. Andrews PhD, MSCP, ABPP; Mike Vogel PsyD

- Provided multifaceted services including psychotherapy and comprehensive assessments within a community mental health setting
- Served primarily those who are underinsured or uninsured
- Served diverse populations including those with minority ethnic, sexual orientation, disability, gender identification, and SES backgrounds.
- Received supervision from diverse theoretical perspectives include psychodynamic, narrative therapy, and acceptance and commitment therapy frameworks.
- Participated in didactic training, supervision, and case presentation.
- Developed outreach materials for BHC patient recruitment

George Fox University January 2020- April 2020

Pre-Practicum Therapist

George Fox University Department of Clinical Psychology

Supervisors: Glenna L. Andrews PhD, MSCP, Carl Sallee, MA

- Reviewed and analyzed 20+ hours of video of myself conducting therapy sessions from a person-centered framework.
- Gained knowledge in Person-Centered Therapy and practiced weekly person-centered conceptualization of the volunteer students through group supervision with peers and 4th year graduate clinical psychology mentor

Formative Insights LLC May 2021- September 2022

George Fox University Undergraduate Career and Academic Planning Center

Supervisor: Megan Anna Neff, PsyD

- Assisted in creating a personality assessment and feedback manual for college students needing assistance in academic success.
- Co-developed an LLC focused on personality assessment services for individuals and organizations.

Primary Care Track April 2019-Present

George Fox University, Newberg, Oregon

Supervisors: Kristie Knows His Gun PsyD, Amber Nelson, PsyD

- Crisis consultant training within an emergency department setting
- Specific training to increase depth and breadth in a primary care setting
- Professional development and training to work on a multidisciplinary team and integrated care setting
- Didactic training with Dr. **Strohsal** on practical application of Focused Acceptance and Commitment Therapy in primary care, and follow-up meeting with case conceptualization

Clinical Team August 2019-Present

George Fox University

Supervisors: Amber Nelson PsyD, LCP & Aundrea Paxton, PsyD.

- Group case presentation and consultation
- Each person presents patient cases from their practicum site each semester and receives feedback and suggestions regarding treatment progress.

Project Assistant, Behavioral Health Clinic September 2018- December 2018

George Fox University Behavioral Health Clinic

Primary Supervisor: Colton Larsen MA, QMHP

- Assisted in developing protocols for Behavioral Health Crisis Constant Observers
- Researched and compiled self-regulation strategies for patients

Clinical Interests

- Integrated Behavioral Health Psychology
- Serving diverse populations, including those with minority ethnic, sexual orientation, disability, gender identification, and SES backgrounds.
- Acceptance and Commitment Therapy
- Didactic supervision and effective feedback

RESEARCH EXPERIENCE

Dissertation Research

George Fox University Clinical Psychology Program

Committee Chair: Celeste Jones, PsyD

Committee Members: Mark McMinn, PhD; Megan Anna Neff, PsyD

Title: Personality and Flourishing in Seminarians: A Program Evaluation

Topic: Exploratory study evaluating the effectiveness of a formative assessment for seminary students in mitigating the risk of burnout and facilitating interpersonal insights related to flourishing.

Preliminary Proposal defense completed: April 2022

Final Defense Scheduled: November 2022

Co-researcher, August 2020-present

George Fox University Clinical Psychology Program

Supervised by Amber Nelson, PsyD; Danny Rodriguez, PsyD

- Critical health psychology project on vaccine perceptions of students from a private Christian college.
- Co-assembled a team of students and faculty to develop research experience from a critical health psychology lens.

Research Vertical Team January 2020-Present

Team Member

George Fox University Clinical Psychology Program August 2020-present

Chair: Celeste Jones, PsyD, ABPP

- Bi-monthly small group meeting for developing research competencies
- Research preparation for dissertation, research questions, and literature review
- Collaborative supplemental research projects such as posters and symposiums

Research Assistant, Templeton Foundation Research Grant; Project Amazing Grace Phase 2: Making Sense of Grace, Primary Investigator: Peter C. Hill, PhD 2019-2021.

George Fox University Clinical Psychology Program

Supervised by Mark McMinn, PhD, ABPP

- Transcription and coding of grace interviews involving LGBTQ and Quaker participants.
- Outcomes include a poster and two published articles

Research Assistant, O-SEE Lab, January 2018 -December 2018

Department of Speech, Language and Hearing Sciences, University of Oregon, Eugene, OR

Supervised by Samantha Shune, PhD, CCC-SLP

- Used the BIOPAC program to take and analyze data
- Performed mental status tests on study participants
- Weekly rounds of group research reviews

Research Assistant, Autism and Social Communications Lab June 2018- July 2018

Department of Speech, Language and Hearing Sciences, Portland State University

Supervised by Amy Donaldson, PhD, CCC-SLP

- Worked as an assistant for a Portland State research project called Social Sibs focused on social communication interventions for those with autism.
- Employed an intervention focused on increasing social interactions between kids with autism and their siblings/neurotypical peers.

- Collected live data

Research Assistant, UO Learning Lab September 2017- January 2018

Department of Psychology, University of Oregon, Eugene, OR

Supervised by Caitlyn Fausey, PhD

- Monthly community outreach conducting science classes for kids to assist in participant recruitment.
- Developed a coding manual for infant language input
- Attended weekly research presentations through the psychology program
- Attended weekly research article review meetings
- Collaborated with Dr. Fausey on creative ways to analyze data

PUBLICATIONS & POSTERS

Jones, C., **Peterson, K.**, Cantley, J., Peterson M., Yazzie, R. (August 2022). Five Factor Model: Insights into a College Population. *Current Research in Psychology and Behavioral Science*.

Schollars, N. A., McMinn, M. R., Dunlop, I. H., **Peterson, K.**, Gathercoal, K., Thurston, N., & Webster, K. T. (July 2020). Experiences of grace as told by gay Christians. *Journal of Psychology and Christianity*.

Webster, K. T., McMinn, M. R., Dunlop, I. H., Andrews, G. L., Buhrow, W., Jr., Schollars, N. A., & **Peterson, K.** (February 2021). Experiences of divine grace among Christian Friends. *Journal of Psychology and Theology*.

Peterson, K., Schollars, N. A., McMinn, M. R., & Reinhart, K. (April 2021). LGBTQ Grace Narratives and Clinical Implications. *A poster presented at the Christian Association of Psychological Services Annual Convention 2021, Virtually*.

Peterson, K., Ray, D., Cantley, J., Peterson, M., Gathercoal, K., Rodriguez, D. (August 2022). Leveraging the Big 5 Character Formation. *A poster presented to the annual meeting of the American Psychological Association. Minneapolis, MN*.

Cantley, J., Ray, D., **Peterson, K.**, Peterson, M., Gathercoal, K., Rodriguez, D., Neff, M. A. (August, 2022). Is there a relationship between personality factors and facets and the selection of college majors? *A poster presented to the annual meeting of the American Psychological Association. Minneapolis, MN*.

Ray, D., Cantley, J., **Peterson, K.**, Peterson, M., Gathercoal, K. (August, 2022). The relationship between student virtues and college major. Experiences of divine grace among Christian Friends. *A poster presented to the annual meeting of the American Psychological Association. Minneapolis, MN*.

Powers, S., Jones, C., **Peterson, K.**, Hazel, J. (August, 2022). Diversity Competence in Clinical Psychology Graduate Students: The Impact of Supervisor Traits. *A poster presented to the annual meeting of the American Psychological Association. Minneapolis, MN.*

Williams, C., Wu, N., **Peterson, K.**, Stusser, A., Rodriguez D., Nelson, A., (March 2022). Vaccine Perceptions: Private Christian College Students' Perceptions of the COVID-19 Vaccine. *A poster presented at the Christian Association of Psychological Services Annual Convention 2022, Virtually.*

Wu, N., **Peterson, K.**, Williams, C., Stusser, A., Rodriguez, D., Nelson. A., (April 2022). Vaccine Perceptions: Private Christian College Students' Perceptions from Diverse Ethnic, Religious, and Political Backgrounds. *A poster presented at the Western Psychological Association Conference 2022.*

LEADERSHIP

Graduate Student Council Vice President March 2021-Present

Office Held: Student Wellness Chair, Cohort Representative
George Fox University, Newberg Oregon

- Advocated, discussed, and made critical decisions about distribution of funds for students in emergency need or fund research projects. Including surveying students to increase transparency
- Collaborated with faculty and program director, with consideration for diversity and equity for practicum placements.
- Program consultation and system improvement

Oregon Psychological Association Student (OPA) Committee Chair July 2022-present

Offices Held: OPA Vice chair, Membership Committee member

- Liaison between board members and student constituents advocating for important student issues to the broader Oregon psychological community. Involves being a voting member on the overall Oregon Psychological Association board.
- Collaborating with student members to establish social media, advocacy, community outreach, and recruitment subcommittees.
- Contributed to student recruitment and involvement in OPA.

Oregon Psychological Association Membership Committee July 2020-January present

- Part of a group of psychologists whose mission is to maintain the longevity of the organization through recruiting new members.
- Worked towards paying for all George Fox PsyD students to have their memberships to OPA paid for with student fees.

Community Gathering Team Member September 2019-2020

- Planned events for the George Fox University PsyD community to gather and connect

Hiring Committee Member Spring 2021

George Fox University

- Collaborated with a team composed of professors and students to move through the hiring process of a new faculty member.

Inside-Out Prison Exchange, January 2017- March 2017

- Took the course *Imagined Communities* in the Oregon State Penitentiary 50/50 inmate to university student ratio in the maximum-security Oregon State Penitentiary, located in Salem
- Through course dialogues and activities, we explored the needs and roles of victims, offenders, communities, and justice systems, as well as outlined the principles and values of Restorative Justice.
- Through a critical lens we scrutinized assumptions and labels given to victims and offenders

TEACHING & SUPERVISION OF STUDENTS

Teaching Assistant, George Fox University August 2020-December 2020

Primary Supervisor: Elizabeth Hamilton PhD

- Helped facilitate group case studies one hour a week where I assisted students with complex case conceptualization and diagnostics
- Graded students' case studies and provided feedback via individual meetings with students.
- Provided feedback for 15, first-year doctoral clinical psychology students on case conceptualizations involving practicing diagnosing, ruling out differential diagnoses, considering the interplay of diversity factors, describing the impact of risk and protective factors, utilizing the biopsychosocial model, and implementing applied evidence-based interventions
- Provided additional support and diagnosis clarification for students outside of case conceptualizations

Guest Lecturer June 2021

Attachment and Termination

- Presented on the concept and theory of attachment and the role it plays in termination sessions

Student Writing Peer September 2020-December 2020

Primary Supervisor: Aundrea Paxton PsyD.

- Assisted two first-year students with writing help consisting of 30 min meetings once per week for a semester.

Teaching Assistant May 2017- June 2018

Early Childhood Cares

Department of Speech, Language and Hearing Sciences, University of Oregon,
Eugene, OR

Primary Supervisor: Eileen McNutt CCC-SLP

- Assisted a Speech-Pathologist in executing age-appropriate programming for 3 to 5-year-olds with communication disorders
- Took language samples in a naturalistic setting

Substitute Teacher, November 2018-August 2019

- Performed instructor functions in kindergarten through 12th grade classrooms
- Provided support for students with disabilities as part of an inclusive special education model

HONORS & AWARDS

Federal Health Resources and Services Administration Grant (HRSA) 2021-2022

Providence Medical Group Newberg, Oregon

Integrated Care Models for Practicum Training in Addictions and Culturally congruent treatment (IMPACT)

- Granting Agency: Health Resources and Services Administration
- This project seeks to expand services to underserved, vulnerable populations through simultaneous training for graduate psychology students in treatment for OUD/SUD services.

George Fox University Primary Care Scholarship 2019- 2020

- Selected student in the Primary Care Psychology track given scholarship to aid in unique opportunities for training, research, and academic work within the primary care setting.

P.E.O. Oregon Scholarship 2015- Present

- Scholarship for women demonstrating academic excellent and outstanding community engagement.

VanLith Family Scholarship 2015-2016

- Awarded for excellence in creative writing

CERTIFICATIONS, AND MEMBERSHIPS

Certifications

HIPAA, CITI, CPR, Oregon Early Childhood Step 7, Telehealth Provider

Memberships

Student member, American Psychological Association

Student member, Oregon Psychological Association

Student member, Association for Contextual Behavioral Science
 Student member, International Society for Critical Health Psychology
 Student member, Collaborative Family Healthcare Association

TRAINING

2022

Empowering DEI Agents of Change

William Cox, PhD

Scaffolded Training in Culturally Specific Trauma-Informed Care

HRSA Training

Gil-Kashiwabara PsyD; Knows His Gun PsyD

Erotic Transcendence: Integrating Faith with What's New in Sex Research

Elisabeth Esmiol Wilson, PhD

2021

Demystifying Adult Autism Spectrum Disorder (ASD) Screening

Leslie Carter PhD

Telehealth Training for Behavioral Health Providers

HRSA Training

Jeff Sordahl PsyD

Gender Diverse Clients: Therapy and Interventions Readiness Assessments

Chloe Ackerman, PsyD

Saying "Yes" to Your Embodied Life: An Invitation for Psychotherapists

Janelle Kwee, PhD

2020

HRV Biofeedback: Clinical Applications for Psychotherapy

Fred Wang, MA, MA, LMHC

Introduction to Narrative Letter Writing

Fred Wang, MA, MA, LMHC

Breathing for Stress Reduction and Wellbeing

Fred Wang, MA, MA, LMHC

Tool for Innovation in a Fast-Changing World

Christian Busch, PhD

Mitigating the Effects of ACES & Transforming Primary Care

Amy Stober, PhD

Leadership Workshop

Kyler Shumway, PsyD and Daniel Wendler, PsyD

Effective Therapy with Underserved and Marginalized People

Daniel Gatzembidi, PsyD

Child Adverse Events to Adults with Substance Use Problems

Amy Stoeber, PhD

Examining the Role of Neuropsychology within the Pediatric Cancer Setting

Justin B. Lee, PhD

Complex PTSD: Advanced Case Conceptualization, Assessment, and Treatment Approaches in Trauma Populations

Jason Steward, PhD

2019

HIV, AIDS Stigma Training

Elizabeth Owen, MA

Intercultural Communication Colloquium

Dr. Cherly Foster, PsyD

Promoting Forgiveness Colloquium

Everett Worthington Jr., PhD

Advancing the Work of Behavioral Health Clinicians in Primary Care

- Patricia Robinson, PhD and Bruce Arroll, MBChB, PhD, FRNZCGP
- Completed approximately 20 hours of intensive training on FACT theory and practice in primary care over 3 days.
- Focused on interdisciplinary primary care