

Original Research Article

Open Access

The Townsend Personal and Relational Assessment Tool: An Initial Validation of an Instrument for Measuring Character Capacities

John Townsend, Ph.D.¹, Steve Shamblen, Ph.D.², Karen Bergstrom, Ph.D.¹, Chris McFarland, MA¹, Margaret Christmas Thomas, Ph.D.¹, Alfreda Alvarez Wubbenhorst, MS^{3,4}, William H Wubbenhorst, MBA^{3,4,*}

¹ Townsend Institute for Leadership and Counseling at Concordia University (Irvine, CA)

² Pacific Institute for Research and Evaluation (PIRE)

³ Institute for Studies of Religion, Baylor University (non-resident fellow)

⁴ Harvest Home Institute, LLC

*Correspondence to: William H Wubbenhorst, Harvest Home Institute, LLC 9835 Dockside Terrace, Montgomery Village, MD 20886; Email: scvwilliam@yahoo.com

Abstract: The Townsend Personal and Relational Assessment Tool (TPRAT) is a multidimensional measure for assessing and enhancing professional and personal abilities, consisting of four character capacities, sometimes also termed character structures: Attachment, Separation, Integration and Adulthood. While there are many instruments measuring some of these capacities, the TPRAT provides comprehensive coverage of these four aspects of personal and relational interactions in an integrated fashion. This formative study is based on a survey of 1,145 adults. We conducted confirmatory factor analysis of a 20-item instrument (five items per each of the four character capacities). The four TPRAT scales showed a moderate to positive association with the corresponding validated instruments in most instances, as well as demonstrating high internal consistency.

Keywords: Assessment; Attachment; Separation; Integration; Adulthood

1. Introduction

Understanding individual proficiency in life capacities and character is significant, because it is demonstrative of abilities necessary for functioning well in life (Caligor, Kernberg, Clarkin, Yeomans, 2018; Covey, 2018; Goleman, Boyatzis, and McKee, 2013; Lencioni, 2022). The Character Growth Model (CGM) conceptualizes these within a model of character growth, based on research and clinical, business and leadership experience (Cloud, 1990; Cloud and Townsend, 2001; Cloud, Townsend, et al. 1997; Townsend, 1991; Townsend, 2019). The

CGM, in keeping with many researchers and theories of psychological development, some of which are examples located in the above references, proposes that there are four key character capacities, identified as Attachment, Separation, Integration, and Adulthood.

We define character (or character structure) as subsuming *those capacities required to meet the demands of reality* (Cloud, 1990, 2006; Cloud & Townsend, 2001; Townsend, 1991, 2019; Townsend 2019). That is, success in life requires humans to perform and be competent within themselves (behavior, cognitions and emotions), their relationships, and their work. These four



© The Author(s) 2026. **Open Access** This article is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>), which permits unrestricted use, sharing, adaptation, distribution and reproduction in any medium or format, for any purpose, even commercially, as long as you give appropriate credit to the original author(s) and the source, provide a link to the Creative Commons license, and indicate if changes were made.

capacities are developmental in nature and are informed by various schools of psychological theory, including ego psychology, object relations theory, neurobiology theory, attachment theory, cognitive behavioral theory, existential theory, family systems theory, trauma-focused theory and somatic theory, among others (Beck et al., 2015; Blanck & Blanck, 1974; Bowen, 1978; Bowlby, 1969; Caligor et al, 2018; Ecker et al., 2012; Fonagy et al., 2002; Fosha, 2021; Freud, 1961; Greenberg and Mitchell, 1983; Kernberg, 1975; Klein, 1975; Levine, 1997; Mahler et al., 1975; Panksepp, 1998; Rogers, 1961; Schore, 1994; Siegel, 1999; Solms, 2021; Van der Kolk, 2014; Yalom, 1980,).

The dimensions of Attachment, Separation, Integration, and Adulthood have their basis in definitions offered in the literature. Attachment incorporates the attributes of bonding, healthy need-based relationships, vulnerability, and emotional access (Ainsworth 2014; Shaver & Fraley 2008 2008; Fosha 2021; Johnson, 2008). Separation involves determining self-definition, owning one's "voice", establishing personal boundaries, and confronting competently. (Blanck & Blanck, 1974; Cloud & Townsend, 2017; Mahler, Pine & Bergman, 1975; Spitz & Godfrey, 1966). Integration is defined as managing the positives and negatives of oneself, others, and the world. This capacity assists the individual in dealing successfully with failure, imperfection and losses (Beck, Davis, & Freeman, 2015; Horner, 1984; Kernberg, 1980; Hartmann, 1958). Adulthood focuses on clarity in one's life purpose and career, maintaining a mutual orientation toward those in authority, as well as having a mature perspective on one's sexuality (Fenichel, 1945; Freud, 1961; Horney, 1991; McWilliams, 2011). We next consider the importance of these variables in predicting functioning well in life.

2. Importance of The CGM Character Capacities

Attachment

An increase in attachment security is linked to prosocial behavior, self-compassion, self-concept clarity and transformational leadership abilities. Specifically, interventions designed to increase attachment security have shown beneficial effects on mental health, prosocial behavior and intergroup relations (Shaver & Mikuliner, 2007). Additionally, robust associations exist between self-compassion and

adult (Huang & Wu, 2024). Further, there is a positive association between secure attachment and successful leadership abilities, which is recognized as a valued ability for organizational and team effectiveness. Research has shown that a secure attachment style is significantly related to transformational and charismatic leadership styles (Underwood, Mohr, & Ross, 2016). Underwood and colleagues (2016) demonstrated that a transformational and charismatic leader is likely to have trusting relationships with others as well as a positive view of themselves, as compared to insecure leaders. A secure attachment also contributes to mindfulness and self-concept clarity, both of which are linked to better decision-making and leadership effectiveness. As such, securely attached leaders are better equipped to handle workplace challenges, maintain emotional balance, and inspire trust among team members, leading to a more cohesive and successful work environment (Yang and Oshio 2024). These findings point to the strong connection between secure attachment and better leadership and decision-making.

Separation

Several studies report positive associations between separation, or higher *differentiation of self* (DoS), such as life satisfaction among heterosexual marital partners, similarities in DoS partner levels for psychological and physical health and the level of emotional reactivity of male and female participants within family systems. Higher DoS predicts higher marital satisfaction, which in turn improves life satisfaction for couples (Isik, Erkan, Serife, Schweer-Collins, & Martino, 2020). High DoS has also been associated with better psychological health, lower physical health problems, better couple relationships, and better intergenerational relationships (Calatrava, Martins, Schweer-Collins, Duch-Ceballos, & Rodriguez-Gonzalez, 2022). As DoS increases, ruminative thoughts and emotional regulation difficulties decrease, which may serve a protective role (Güler and Karaca, 2021). Thus, a person with high levels of DoS may remain calm and behave considerately in intense emotional situations and be more flexible and adaptive in the face of extreme situations, while coping with stress. In contrast, low DoS was associated with chronic anxiety, becoming more easily dysfunctional under stress, and having more physical and psychological symptoms (Güler & Karaca, 2021). All these studies underscore the important role DoS plays in improved emotional regulation, adaptability

in stressful situations, and overall better psychological health.

Integration

Integration is related to greater self-esteem (Muris & Otgaar, 2023) and well-being (Cordaro, Bai, Bradley, et al., 2024); and less depression (Ruan, Shen, Wu et al., 2025), stress, and negative affect (Dunkley, Zuroff, & Blankstein, 2006). A lack of integration is associated with several syndromes, such as perfectionism, where perfectionism is related to poorer mental health, including depression, anxiety, suicidal ideation, burnout, psychological distress, cynicism, and low levels of self-confidence (Fang & Liu, 2022; Thomas & Bigatti, 2020). Dichotomous thinking, defined as a propensity for individuals to see events in a binary way, is related to having socially undesirable traits (Bonfa-Araujo, Oshio, & Hauck-Filho, 2021). Dichotomous thinking is associated with aggressiveness, eating disorders, intolerance of ambiguity, narcissism, antisocial personality, pursuit for perfections and the Dark Triad (personality traits signaling pathologies) (Bonfa-Araujo et al, 2021).

Adulthood

Adulthood has been found to be associated with positive attributes, such as well-being, personal empowerment, and having a life purpose; however, also negative attributes, such as anxiety, and having a life *devoid* of purpose. Indicators of relational maturity such as establishing an equal relationship with parents and developing greater consideration for others were identified as markers of well-being (Sharon, 2016). Personal empowerment is a developmental process that requires an experience of one's own self-direction and one's connection to meaningful roles in the social world (Mouchrek, and Benson, 2023). Personal empowerment has important implications for individuals and their social contributions like formulating and disseminating cultural innovation, while transitioning to adulthood and creating contexts where youth can play meaningful roles in their 'emerging' social world offering positive potential for society (Mouchrek & Benson, 2023).

Being high on the dimension of adulthood is seen as having purposeful life with attributes such as self-organization and a life aim, is associated with significantly lower levels of depression and anxiety (Boreham & Schutte, 2023). Conversely, lower levels of adulthood are associated with a life *devoid* of meaning, filled of goals,

and feelings of mattering, which are associated with psychological burnout (Alfuqaha, Al-olaimat, Abdelfattah, Jarrar, Almodallal, & Abuajameih, 2021).

3. The Need for an Integrated Instrument

In personal growth as well as in organizational and leadership engagement, it is often useful for individuals to understand their standing on these dimensions, as these dimensions affect their personal life and relationships within the work arena. Individuals understanding where they stand on these capacities is important for establishing a path of growth to develop and improve upon these capacities.

There is no integrated instrument measuring these capacities, but individual instruments exist to measure these capacities (e.g., Adult Attachment Questionnaire, Bell Object Relations and Reality Testing Inventory, and the Structured Interview of Personality Organization-Revised). This step was necessary to ensure all scales are using the same response anchors (e.g., similar error in measurement) and to allow comparisons across the dimensions measured (e.g., relative to the population mean).

Previous unpublished work examined an initial pool of 120 items measuring these four character capacities of the CGM, executed in partnership with the Townsend Institute for Leadership and Counseling, Concordia University Irvine. This initial pool of items was developed based on a review of the literature on these four character capacities, followed by interviews with various colleagues about which items seemed to have more merit and face validity. An exploratory principal component analysis confirmed a four-component solution. For the present study, a smaller set of five high loading items for each of these scales was examined. These items were subjected to a confirmatory factor analysis. Convergent and divergent validity was established by examining relationships between these dimensions and similar measures offered in the literature. Finally, content validity was assessed by a panel of clinical psychologists.

4. Method

4.1. Participants

The participants, recruited in the western US, consisted of 1,145 individuals (male $n = 332$, female $n = 813$), with 16% over the age of 65 ($n = 183$), 38% between 50-65 years ($n = 435$), 24% between the ages of 40-

50 ($n = 275$), and 22% below the age of 30 ($n = 252$). Over half (56%) had a master's or doctoral degree or a professional certification ($n = 641$), 29% had a Bachelor's degree ($n = 332$), 12% an Associate's Degree or some college ($n = 137$), and 4% had a High School Diploma/GED or less ($n = 46$). In addition, 70% of the individuals surveyed were married ($n = 802$), 15% were single ($n = 172$), 11% were divorced ($n = 126$), 2% were widowed ($n = 23$), and 2% were separated ($n = 23$). Over three-quarters (77%) had at least one child ($n = 882$).

4.2. Measures

We assessed the degree to which previously validated scales measuring character capacities similar (or dissimilar) to the CGM character capacities, as well as the underlying structure of the pool of items presumed to measure the CGM character capacities. We also assessed the internal consistency of the scales used in our validation by calculating Cronbach's alpha (continuous items) or Kuder-Richardson Formula 20 (dichotomous items). All reliabilities were acceptable (i.e., .70 or greater), so they are not mentioned in the interest of brevity. The scales used as part of our validation analyses are as follows.

Measures Potentially Associated with Attachment

The Attachment capacity was measured with Simpson and colleagues' two-dimensional 17-item Adult Attachment Questionnaire (AAQ; Simpson, Rholes, & Phillips, 1996). This measure consists of eight items measuring Avoidance and nine items measuring Anxiety, where participants respond on a seven-point Likert scale, from 'I Strongly Disagree' to 'I Strongly Agree'.

Measures Potentially Associated with Separation

The Separation capacity was measured with the Differentiation of Self Inventory (DSI-SF; Sloan and Dierendonck, 2016) contains four scales measuring Emotional Reactivity (6 items), I-Position (6 items), Fusion with Others (5 items), and Emotional Cutoff (3 items). Participants respond to a six-point Likert scale, from 'Not at All Characteristic of Me' to 'Very Characteristic of Me'.

Measures Potentially Associated with Integration

The Integration capacity was measured using a 10-item Hypersensitive Narcissism Scale (Hendin & Cheek, 1997) was used to assess narcissism, where participants respond to items on a five-point response scale, from 'Strongly Disagree' to 'Strongly Agree'. Perfectionism was assessed with 24-items from the abbreviated version

of the Multidimensional Perfectionism Scale (MPS; Hewitt & Flett, 1991). Nine items were used to measure Other-Oriented Perfectionism, another nine items for Self-Oriented Perfectionism and six items were used to measure Socially Prescribed Perfectionism. Participants responded to these 24 items on a seven-point Likert scale, with responses ranging from 'Disagree' to 'Agree'. Self-esteem was measured with the ten item Rosenberg (1965) Self-Esteem scale, where participants responded to ten items on a four-point Likert scale, with responses ranging from 'Strongly Agree' to 'Strongly Disagree'. This instrument was also used to assess validity for the Adulthood capacity area below.

Measures Potentially Associated with Adulthood

The Adulthood capacity was measured with the 23 item PERMA Profiler (Flourish, 2011) measures Positive Emotions (3 items), Engagement (3 items), Relationships (3 items), Meaning (3 items), Accomplishment (3 items), Overall Well-Being (prior 5 scales and one face-valid happiness item), Negative Emotion (3 items), Health (3 items), Loneliness (1 face-valid item). Participants respond to items on a 1 = Not at All to 10 = Completely response scale. It was also thought that the Rosenberg Self-Esteem scale (described above) would be related to adulthood.

A Pool of Items to Measure the CGM

Twenty items with equal numbers of items per character capacity were examined. Participants responded to these items on 1 = Never, 2 = Rarely, 3 = Sometimes, 4 = Often, and 5 = Always response scale.

5. Results

5.1. Scale Construction

We used confirmatory factor analysis to examine whether items presumed to measure each of the constructs were empirically supported. All models were run using the lavaan package (Rosseel, 2012) in R and models were fit using full information maximum likelihood. Considering absolute values of completely standardized factor loadings, loadings were strong for Adulthood (.44 to .71), Attachment (.62 to .84), Integration (.49 to .74), and Separation (.46 to .76). The model fit the data reasonably well: RMSEA = .070 (90% Confidence interval: .07 to .07), Comparative Fit Index = .88, and Tucker-Lewis Index = .86. As can be seen in **Table 1**, the scales were internally consistent (a and $w > .74$) and the scales were intercorrelated ($r > .43$).

Table 1. Internal consistency reliabilities and loading weighted scale intercorrelations.

	Reliability		TPRAT Character Capacity			
	<i>a</i>	<i>w</i>	<i>A</i>	<i>AT</i>	<i>I</i>	<i>S</i>
<i>A</i>	.75	.77	1.00			
<i>AT</i>	.80	.81	.52	1.00		
<i>I</i>	.75	.75	.74	.44	1.00	
<i>S</i>	.79	.80	.67	.56	.63	1.00

Note: A = Adulthood, AT = Attachment, I = integration, and S = Separation; all correlations between scales are statistically significant, $p < .05$, two-tailed

5.2. Content Validity

A separate brief survey was conducted with eight psychologists, asking them to assess the content validity of each of the four scales. After being presented with the 5 items measuring each named character capacity, they were asked to use a seven-point Likert scale to indicate whether “the survey items encompass

the key dimensions of this construct”. The descriptive statistics presented in **Table 2** suggest that the survey items indeed encompass the key dimensions of the constructs. The mean, median and mode for all four of the character capacities were 6.00 or higher. Integration was the strongest measure ($M = 6.38$, Median = 6.50 Mode = 7.00).

Table 2. Content validation descriptives

Character Capacity	Mean	Median	Mode	SD	Min.	Max.
<i>Attachment</i>	6.25	6.00	6.00	.71	5.00	7.00
<i>Separation</i>	6.13	6.00	6.00	.64	5.00	7.00
<i>Integration</i>	6.38	6.50	7.00	.74	5.00	7.00
<i>Adulthood</i>	6.00	6.50	7.00	1.20	4.00	7.00

Note: N = 8; descriptives are for 7-point Likert ratings of “the survey items encompass the key dimensions of this construct”

5.3. Convergent Validity

Convergent and divergent validity were assessed using simple Pearson correlations between the character capacities and other scales potentially associated with these character capacities. Only predicted relationships

are presented in **Table 3**. Cohen’s (1988) thresholds of small ($|r| = .10$), medium ($|r| = .30$), and large ($|r| = .50$) as a guide to interpret the magnitude of relationships in our narrative.

Table 3. Correlations examining convergent and divergent validity.

Instrument	Scale				Descriptives	
	<i>A</i>	<i>AT</i>	<i>I</i>	<i>S</i>	Mean	SD
<i>AAQ Avoidance</i>	---	-.64	---	---	3.20	1.06
<i>AAQ Anxiety</i>	---	-.24	---	---	3.08	1.12
<i>DSI SF Emotional Cutoff</i>	---	---	---	.16	4.50	1.10
<i>DSI SF Emotional Reactivity</i>	---	---	---	.45	3.62	1.11
<i>DSI SF Fusion with Others</i>	---	---	---	.45	4.21	.99
<i>DSI SF “I” Position</i>	---	---	---	.28	4.09	.67
<i>Hypersensitive Narcissism Scale</i>	---	---	-.47	---	2.41	.65
<i>MPS Other Oriented</i>	---	---	-.11	---	3.88	.87
<i>MPS Self Oriented</i>	---	---	-.22	---	3.98	1.24
<i>MPS Socially Prescribed</i>	---	---	-.32	---	3.39	1.05
<i>Rosenberg Self Esteem</i>	.64	---	---	---	3.23	.58
<i>PERMA Positive Emotions</i>	.59	---	---	---	7.21	1.63
<i>PERMA Engagement</i>	.43	---	---	---	7.16	1.54

Continuation Table:

Instrument	Scale				Descriptives	
	A	AT	I	S	Mean	SD
PERMA Relationships	.46	---	---	---	7.13	1.78
PERMA Meaning	.64	---	---	---	8.15	1.67
PERMA Accomplishment	.60	---	---	---	7.77	1.37
PERMA Overall Well Being	.65	---	---	---	7.49	1.37
PERMA Negative Emotion	-.44	---	---	---	3.85	1.59
PERMA Health	.32	---	---	---	6.80	1.93
PERMA Loneliness	-.38	---	---	---	4.15	2.61
Mean	3.61	3.43	3.82	3.11	---	---
SD	.70	.77	.54	.39	---	---

Note: A = Adulthood, AT = Attachment, I = integration, and S = Separation; --- in the scale columns indicates a relationship that was not predicted, so it is not reported; all correlations with an absolute value of .06 or larger are statistically significant, $p < .05$, two-tailed.

Adulthood

The scales that were thought to be associated with the Adulthood scale were generally strong. Of the nine PERMA measures, four of the measures (Positive Emotions ($r = .62$), Meaning ($r = .71$), Accomplishment ($r = .64$), Overall Well-Being ($r = .69$)) showed a strong positive association with the Adulthood scale, with the remaining five (Engagement ($r = .48$), Relationships ($r = .46$), Negative Emotion ($r = -.42$), Health ($r = .32$), Loneliness ($r = -.37$)) showing a moderately positive association. The association of the Negative Emotion and Loneliness ($-.42$ and $-.37$, respectively) to Adulthood was in the expected direction. In addition, the Rosenberg Self-esteem measure also showed a strong positive association with the Adulthood scale ($r = .64$).

Attachment

The Attachment scale, which is scored in the direction of a secure style, was negatively correlated with both the AAQ Anxiety ($r = -.24$) and Avoidance ($r = -.64$) measures in the expected direction; however, the relationship was somewhat weak for Anxiety.

Integration

Findings for the Integration scale had a moderate positive association with the Hypersensitive Narcissism Scale ($r = -.47$). Integration also showed a moderate positive association with Multidimensional Perfectionism Scale (MPS) Socially Prescribed ($r = -.32$), but a weak positive association with MPS Other Oriented ($r = -.11$) and MPS Self Oriented ($r = -.22$) in the expected direction.

Separation

The Separation scale showed a moderately positive

association with the DSI Emotional Reactivity ($r = .45$) and Fusion with Others ($r = .45$) scales. However, it only showed a weak positive association with the DSI I Position ($r = .28$) and DSI Emotional Cutoff ($r = .16$) scales.

5.4. Divergent Validity

There were five construct groups where we observed correlations smaller than anticipated ($r = |.30|$ or below) with the character capacity scales, which required further exploration. These smaller relationships can likely be explained as instances of divergent validity. The relationship between AAQ Anxiety and TRPAT Attachment was smaller than expected ($r = -.24$), which is likely due to the Adult Attachment Questionnaire subscale on Anxiety focusing on romantic attachments and abandonment issues (e.g., “*I often worry that my partner(s) don't really love me*”), whereas the Attachment items take a more universal approach to attachments, with more of a focus on vulnerability issues (e.g., “*I have a tough time talking about my feelings, even with those I am close to*”).

We expected MPS Other-oriented and Integration to be related ($r = -.11$); however, all the items for the Multidimensional Perfectionism subscale on Other-oriented focus on attitudes towards others (e.g., “*I can't be bothered with people who won't strive to better themselves*”), whereas three of the five the Integration items are focused on the respondents themselves (e.g., “*I know and accept my weaknesses*”). MPS Self-oriented and Integration unexpectedly had a small inverse relationship ($r = -.22$), which is likely attributable to the MPS Self-oriented subscale items

interpreting perfectionism as a negative, by way of comparison to the Integration items. Specifically, the Integration items do not assume that perfectionism is equivalent to failure. An individual can fail from normal attempts to succeed (defined as reaching a “good enough” or “excellent” outcome), and not have perfectionistic expectations (e.g., “*When I fail, I can deal with the disappointment in a healthy way*”).

The small positive relationship between DSI SF Emotional Cutoff and Separation ($r = .16$) was unexpected; however, the Emotional Cutoff subscale of the Differentiation of the Self Inventory Short Form focuses on the level of ease or difficulty for a respondent relative to closeness (“*When one of my relationships becomes very intense, I feel the urge to run away from it*”). The Separation items, in contrast, focus more on the relative ease or difficulty in asserting oneself (“*When I disagree with someone, I prefer to remain silent*”). Finally, DSI SF I Position and Separation ($r = .28$) had an unexpectedly small relationship, but this is likely due to the DSI SF I Position subscale centering around personal life stresses (e.g., “*I tend to be pretty stable under stress*”). By way of contrast, the Separation items focus on stresses in relationships with others (e.g., “*I can communicate what I want and do not want in my work and relationships*”).

6. Discussion

The present study serves as a formative validation of the primary character capacities in the Character Growth Model. We have named this instrument the Townsend Personal and Relational Assessment Tool (or TPRAT) to reflect the foundational importance of one’s personal traits, as well as one’s relational dynamics with others, in how well an individual functions in life, attachments and work. The TPRAT, designed for the general population, is a convenient and internally consistent 20 item instrument with four five item scales measuring each of the four dimensions of the CGM: Attachment, Separation, Integration, and Adulthood. Analyses demonstrated content validity of the measure and convergent validity through moderate to strong associations with validated measures assessing similar constructs. An assessment of divergent validity suggested that while the TPRAT does overlap with the construct space of other validated instruments, there are

specific character capacities in the CGM that are better assessed by the TPRAT.

Specifically, our analyses highlight three key areas of difference between the TPRAT and existing validated instruments. The TPRAT Anxiety measure has more of a focus on global attachment and vulnerability, as opposed to anxiety and fear of abandonment. The TPRAT Integration measure does not so much focus on the negative aspects of feeling the need to perform (e.g., perfectionism), but it instead focuses on being able to deal with inevitable failures along the way in a healthy manner. Finally, the TPRAT Separation scale focuses on skills and abilities to deal with potentially challenging relationships, as opposed to behavioral tendencies (e.g., tendency to avoid conflict) in relationships that are assessed in validated instruments.

Theoretical and Practical implications

There are three primary theoretical insights that can be drawn from this study. First, while the TPRAT uses a developmental based on object relations theory, and ego psychology, it is supportive of, and interacts well, with other orientations, such as attachment theory and cognitive behavioral theory. It would be helpful to also see neuroscience research on the instrument as well. For example, understanding more about the specific areas of the brain which operate the capacities could help in knowing why certain clinical approaches and interventions work well, how to improve techniques, and how to create new and effective ones as well. Second, the TPRAT focuses on the character structure of the individual, rather than the symptomatology. For instance, two people can experience the exact same symptoms of a persistent depressive disorder, but with the disorder driven by two different character capacity etiologies. The counselor who does not make that distinction is at risk of determining a treatment approach that does not address the underlying issue. Thus, the instrument allows for more precision of what the individual’s character deficiency is. Third, when compared to other similar instruments, the TPRAT has a valence toward the primacy of relationships, versus only assessing the person’s self-experience, that provides a more comprehensive look at growth, struggle, and pathology.

There are also several practical aspects of the instrument. One has to do with its relative brevity, being composed of only 20 items. Being able to come to some conclusions about the strength or weakness of

one's character capacities using a tool that takes about 10 minutes is an enormous accelerant for insight, focus, and determining how to grow in a needed direction. Also, the vernacular and verbiage of the TPRAT is constructed so that it avoids the common assessment problems of either risking a "shame attack" in the individual, so that they "fake good", or, in the opposite direction, being so careful to not bring out deficiencies that the individual comes away with no sense of initiative to better their life and relational dimensions. Finally, and related to the prior point, the design of the instrument provides scores on both strengths and weaknesses. Therefore, a person can use their strengths in a better way to be successful in life, while they are also addressing the resolution of the character deficiencies that are obstacles to a meaningful life.

Limitations and Future Directions

A limitation of the study was that the sample was likely not a representative sample of the US (i.e., 71% female and 70% married). This clearly limits the utility of these data for generating parameter estimates (e.g., normative scale values); however, we believe this is less of a concern for this paper, as the analyses conducted here were correlational in nature. That is, while the sample may not have been proportional to the population, we do not believe the sample was so unrepresentative as to restrict the range of the correlations examined.

We fully acknowledge that instrument validation is a multi-step process and this paper serves as the first formative steps to establish the validity of the TPRAT. One goal of future investigations of the TRPAT will be to establish normative standards for the TPRAT, such that TRPAT scale scores can be interpreted relative to a more representative sample of the US population. Second, once these normative standards are established, it will be important to establish where one stands relative to these normative standards exhibiting discriminant and predictive validity. For example, it would help counselors to predict challenge areas in their clients' structures, to help them repair and strengthen those areas earlier in treatment, before the internal issue leads to a personal crisis. To know that a client needs work in Separation could help them set the appropriate limits to help resolve a depression caused by fear of conflict or save a troubled marriage in which there are control issues.

In a business organizational context, it would help employers to predict challenging areas in their employees' structures, to help them function in their jobs at higher levels of competency. In the work arena, for example, employees in sales must face rejection of a product regularly. If they are challenged in the capacity of Integration, they could easily struggle with perfectionism and unrealistic expectations of success. But as they then learn to accept failure and loss as normative, they can deal with rejection and continue learning better sales skills.

On balance, we feel the TPRAT has been shown to be an instrument that can adequately measure the components of the Character Growth Model. When individuals are aware of their strengths and challenges, they are more able to focus their time and energy on growing in those contexts. Much like how individuals who would like to be physically in shape will enter a diagnostic process of health, lifestyle, diet, sleep and balance, and learn what needs to change to optimize one's body, the TPRAT can be a key instrument to provide individuals with information to improve their lives, emotional health, relationships and careers.

Data Availability Statement

The data that support the findings of this study are available from the Townsend Institute for Leadership and Counseling at Concordia University, but restrictions apply to the availability of these data, which were used under license for the current study and so are not publicly available. The data are, however, available from the authors upon reasonable request and with the permission of the Townsend Institute for Leadership and Counseling (Townsend Institute for Leadership & Counseling | Concordia University Irvine).

Declaration of Interest

The authors declare that they have no known competing financial interests or personal relationships that could have appeared to influence the work reported in this paper.

Acknowledgement

The Townsend Personal and Relational Assessment Tool (TPRAT) is based on Dr. Townsend's Character Growth Model (CGM). The CGM itself is founded on the research, clinical work, and materials developed in partnership with Dr. Henry Cloud, Dr. Townsend's close friend, colleague, and co-author. Since those

days, Dr. Townsend has developed additional constructs and content to what was created in the beginning. So, in that sense, much credit also goes to Dr. Cloud's contributions, ultimately leading to the TPRAT itself.

References

- [1] Ainsworth, M., Biehar, M., Waters, E., & Wall, S. (2014). *Patterns of attachment: A psychological study of the strange situation*. Psychology Press.
[DOI:10.4324/9781315802428](https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315802428)
- [2] Alfuqaha, O. A., Al-olaimat, Y., Abdelfattah, A. S., Jarrar, R. F., Almudallal, B. M., & Abu ajameih, A. I. (2021). Existential vacuum and external locus of control as predictors of burnout among nurses. *Nursing Reports*, 11(3), 558–567.
[DOI:10.3390/nursrep11030053](https://doi.org/10.3390/nursrep11030053)
- [3] Beck, A. T., Davis, D. D., & Freeman, A. (Eds.). (2015). *Cognitive therapy of personality disorders* (3rd ed.). The Guilford Press.
<https://psycnet.apa.org/record/2014-50109-000>
- [4] Blanck, G., & Blanck, R. (1974). *Ego psychology: Theory and practice*. Columbia University Press.
- [5] Boreham, I. D., & Schutte, N. S. (2023). The relationship between purpose in life and depression and anxiety: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 79(12), 2736–2767.
<https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/37572371/>
- [6] Bowlby, J. (1969). *Attachment and loss*, Vol. 1: Attachment. Basic Books.
- [7] Bowen, M. (1978). *Family therapy in clinical practice*. Jason Aronson
- [8] Calatrava, M., Martins, M. V., Schweer-Collins, M., Duch-Ceballos, C., & Rodriguez-Gonzalez, M. (2022). Differentiation of self: A scoping review of Bowen Family Systems Theory's core construct. *Clinical Psychology Review*, 91.
[DOI:10.1016/j.cpr.2021.102101](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cpr.2021.102101)
- [9] Caligor, E., Kernberg, O., Clarkin, J., & Yeomans, F. (2018). *Psychodynamic therapy for personality pathology: Treating self and interpersonal functioning*. American Psychiatric Association Publishing.
<https://psychiatryonline.org/doi/10.1176/appi.ajp.2018.18080908>
- [10] Cloud, H. (1990). *Changes that heal: How to understand your past to ensure a healthier future*. Zondervan Publishing.
https://www.christianbook.com/changes-understand-healthier-future-unabridged-audiobook/henry-cloud/9780310261452/pd/DA13940-CP?utm_source=bing&kw=%2Fpd%2F&mt=b&dv=c&event=PPCSRC&p=1215904&cb_src=bing&cb_typ=search&cb_cmp=313107482&cb_adg=1241348712202415&cb_kyw=%2Fpd%2F&msslkid=f222e94e838612ac652e80cdfbc4f192&utm_source=bing&utm_medium=cpc&utm_campaign=B_Search%3A%20NB%20Dynamic%20Search%20Ads&utm_term=%2Fpd%2F&utm_content=DSA%20detail%20pages
- [11] Cloud, H., & Townsend, J. (1997). Impact of treatment on God image and personal adjustment, and correlations of God image to personal adjustment and object relations development. *Journal of Psychology and Theology*, 25(2), 227–239.
https://www.academia.edu/111918231/Impact_of_Treatment_on_God_Image_and_Personal_Adjustment_and_Correlations_of_God_Image_to_Personal_Adjustment_and_Object_Relations_Development
- [12] Cloud, H. (2006). *Integrity: The courage to meet the demands of reality*. HarperCollins Publishers.
<https://www.amazon.com/integrity-courage-meet-demands-reality/dp/006084969x>
- [13] Cloud, H., & Townsend, J. (2017). *Boundaries: When to say yes, how to say no, to take control of your life*. Zondervan Publishing.
https://www.amazon.com/s?k=boundaries+townsend+and+cloud&adgrpid=1334807680041764&hvadid=83425550933069&hvbmt=be&hvdev=c&hvlocphy=91398&hvnetw=o&hvqmt=e&hvtargid=kwd-83425822901415%3Aloc-190&hydadcr=24625_10645877&mcid=444eae1a29ab38a88ebc7ef801d69aaa&tag=mh0b-20&ref=pd_sl_834t2jgs9k_e
- [14] Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences* (2nd ed.). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.
<https://utstat.toronto.edu/~brunner/oldclass/378f16/readings/CohenPower.pdf>
- [15] Cloud, H., & Townsend, J. (2001). *How People Grow: What the Bible reveals about personal growth*. Zondervan Publishing.
- [16] Cordaro, D. T., Bai, Y., Bradley, C. M., Zhu, F., Han, R., Keltner, D., Gatchpazian, A., & Zhao, Y.

- (2024). Wellbeing Beyond Happiness. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 25(15).
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s10902-024-00729-8>
- [17] Covey, S. (2018). *The seven habits of highly effective people* (30th Anniversary Edition).
<https://www.amazon.com/Habits-Highly-Effective-People/dp/1471195201>
- [18] Covey, S. (2018). *The speed of trust: The one thing that changes everything*. Free Press.
<https://www.amazon.com/SPEED-TRUST-Thing-Changes-Everything/dp/1416549005>
- [19] Dunkley, D. M., Zuroff, D. C., & Blankstein, K. R. (2006). Specific perfectionism components versus self-criticism in predicting maladjustment. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 40(4), 665–676.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2005.08.008>
- [20] Ecker, B., Ticic, R., & Hulley, L. (2012). *Unlocking the emotional brain: Eliminating symptoms at their roots using memory reconsolidation*. Routledge.
- [21] Erkan, I., Serife, O., Schweer-Collins, M. L., & Martino, R. G. (2020). Differentiation of self predicts life satisfaction through marital adjustment. *The American Journal of Family Therapy*, 48(3), 235–249.
[DOI:10.1080/01926187.2020.1732248](https://doi.org/10.1080/01926187.2020.1732248)
- [22] Fang, T., & Liu, F. (2022). A review on perfectionism. *Open Journal of Social Sciences*, 10(1).
[DOI:10.4236/jss.2022.101027](https://doi.org/10.4236/jss.2022.101027)
- [23] Fenichel, O. (1945). *The psychoanalytic theory of neurosis*. Norton Press.
<https://psycnet.apa.org/record/1946-01097-000>
- [24] Fonagy, P., Gergely, G., Jurist, E. L., & Target, M. (2002). *Affect regulation, mentalization, and the development of the self*. Other Press.
- [25] Fosha, D. (Ed.). (2021). *Undoing aloneness and the transformation of suffering into flourishing: AEDP 2.0*. American Psychological Association Publishing.
<https://www.apa.org/pubs/books/undoing-aloneness-transformation-suffering-flourishing>
- [26] Freud, S. (1961). *A general introduction to psychoanalysis*. Washington Square Press.
<https://www.amazon.com/General-Introduction-Psychoanalysis-Sigmund-Freud/dp/1539798461>
- [27] Goleman, D., Boyatzis, R., & McKee, A. (2013). *Primal leadership: Unleashing the power of emotional intelligence*. Harvard Business Review Press.
https://www.researchgate.net/publication/230854764_Primal_Leadership_Realizing_the_Power_of_Emotional_Intelligence
- [28] Greenberg, J., & Mitchell, S. A. (1983). *Object relations in psychoanalytic theory*. Harvard University Press. ProQuest Ebook Central.
<http://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/upenn-ebooks/detail.action?docID=3301385>
- [29] Hendin, H. M., & Cheek, J. M. (1997). Assessing hypersensitive narcissism: A reexamination of Murray's Narcissism Scale. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 31(4), 588–599.
[DOI:10.1006/jrpe.1997.2204](https://doi.org/10.1006/jrpe.1997.2204)
- [30] Hewitt, P. L., & Flett, G. L. (1990). Perfectionism and depression: A multidimensional analysis. *Journal of Social Behavior & Personality*, 5(5), 423–438.
<https://psycnet.apa.org/record/1991-04621-001>
- [31] Horner, A. (1984). *Object relations and the developing ego in therapy*. Jason Aronson.
<https://archive.org/details/objectrelations00horn>
- [32] Horney, K. (1991). *Neurosis and human growth: The struggle toward self-realization*. Norton Press.
<https://www.norton.com/books/9780393307757>
- [33] Huang, M., & Wu, E. Z. (2024). The associations between self-compassion and adult attachment: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 0(0).
[DOI:10.1177/02654075241265766](https://doi.org/10.1177/02654075241265766)
- [34] Johnson, S. (2008). *Hold me tight: Seven conversations for a lifetime of love*. Little, Brown and Spark.
https://ia802901.us.archive.org/9/items/ebooks_202003/Sue%20Johnson/Hold%20Me%20Tight%20%281518%29/Hold%20Me%20Tight%20Seven%20Conversations%20for%20a%20Lifetime%20of%20Love.pdf
- [35] Kernberg, O. F. (1975). *Borderline conditions and pathological narcissism*. Jason Aronson.
- [36] Kernberg, O. (1980). *Internal world and external reality: Object relations theory applied*. Jason Aronson.
https://openlibrary.org/books/OL4120840M/Internal_world_and_external_reality
- [37] Klein, M. (1975). *The writings of Melanie Klein* (Vols. 1–4). Hogarth Press.
- [38] Lencioni, P. M. (2022). *The 6 types of working*

- genius*. Ben Bella Books.
https://www.amazon.com/s?k=6+types+working+genius&adgrpid=1345804629562174&hvadid=84113061571424&hvbmt=bp&hvdev=c&hvlocphy=91398&hvnetw=o&hvqmt=p&hvtargid=kwd-84113831185131%3Aloc-190&hydadcr=766613723051&mcid=aeaf600f19fd3e7ab8012abc74f4e9a4&msclid=aa094527a43f1e743fef2ca423c8a85b&tag=mh0b-20&ref=pd_sl_6b7vp619tz_p
- [39] Levine, P. A. (1997). *Waking the tiger: Healing trauma through the body*. North Atlantic Books.
- [40] Mahler, M., Pine, F., & Bergman, A. (2000). *The psychological birth of the human infant: Symbiosis and individuation*. Basic Books Publishing.
<https://psycnet.apa.org/record/1976-12025-001>
- [41] McWilliams, N. (2011). *Psychoanalytic diagnosis*. Guilford Press.
<https://psycnet.apa.org/record/2011-22100-000>
- [42] Mouchrek, N., & Benson, M. (2023). The theory of integrated empowerment in the transition to adulthood: Concepts and measures. *Frontiers in Sociology, 8*.
[DOI:10.3389/fsoc.2023.893898](https://doi.org/10.3389/fsoc.2023.893898)
- [43] Mikulincer, M., & Shaver, P. R. (2007). Boosting attachment security to promote mental health, prosocial values, and inter-group tolerance. *Psychological Inquiry, 18*(3), 139–156.
<https://psycnet.apa.org/record/2007-13150-001>
- [44] Muris, P., & Otgaar, H. (2023). Self-Esteem and Self-Compassion: A Narrative Review and Meta-Analysis on Their Links to Psychological Problems and Well-Being. *Psychol Res Behav Manag, 16*, 2961-2975.
<https://doi.org/10.2147/PRBM.S402455>.
- [45] Panksepp, J. (1998). *Affective neuroscience: The foundations of human and animal emotions*. Oxford University Press.
- [46] Rogers, C. R. (1961). *On becoming a person: A therapist's view of psychotherapy*. Houghton Mifflin.
- [47] Ruan, Q. N., Shen, G. H., Wu, Y. W., Xu, D., & Yan, W. J. (2025). Linear self-acceptance and nonlinear social comparison: interacting influences on adolescent depression. *BMC Psychiatry, 25*(1), 485.
<https://doi.org/10.1186/s12888-025-06873-6>.
- [48] Schore, A. N. (1994). Affect regulation and the origin of the self: The neurobiology of emotional development. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- [49] Siegel, D. J. (1999). *The developing mind*. Guilford Press.
- [50] Simpson, J. A., Rholes, S. W., & Phillips, D. (1996). Conflict in close relationships: An attachment perspective. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 71*(5), 899–914.
[DOI:10.1037/0022-3514.71.5.899](https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.71.5.899)
- [51] Solms, M. (2021). *The hidden spring: A journey to the source of consciousness*. Norton.
- [52] Thomas, M., & Bigatti, S. (2020). Perfectionism, impostor phenomenon, and mental health in medicine: A literature review. *International Journal of Medical Education, 11*, 201–213.
[DOI:10.5116/ijme.5f54.c8f8](https://doi.org/10.5116/ijme.5f54.c8f8)
- [53] Rosseel, Y. (2012). Lavaan: An R package for structural equation modeling. *Journal of Statistical Software, 48*(2), 1–36.
[DOI:10.18637/jss.v048.i02](https://doi.org/10.18637/jss.v048.i02)
- [54] Rosenberg, M. (1979). *Conceiving the self*. Basic Books.
<https://www.amazon.com/Conceiving-Self-Morris-Rosenberg/dp/046501352X>
- [55] Shaver, P. R., & Fraley, R. C. (2008). Attachment, loss, and grief: Bowlby's views and current controversies. In J. Cassidy & P. R. Shaver (Eds.), *Handbook of attachment: Theory, research and clinical applications* (pp. 48–77). Guilford Press.
<https://psycnet.apa.org/record/2008-13837-003>
- [56] Sharon, T. (2016). Constructing adulthood: Markers of adulthood and well-being among emerging adults. *Emerging Adulthood, 4*(3), 161–167.
[DOI:10.1177/2167696815579826](https://doi.org/10.1177/2167696815579826)
- [57] Shaver, P. R., & Mikulincer, M. (2007). Adult attachment strategies and the regulation of emotion. In J. J. Gross (Ed.), *Handbook of emotion regulation* (pp. 446–465). Guilford Press.
<https://psycnet.apa.org/record/2007-01392-022>
- [58] Sloan, D., & van Dierendonck, D. (2016). Item selection and validation of a brief, 20-item version of the Differentiation of Self Inventory—Revised. *Personality and Individual Differences, 97*, 146–150.
[DOI:10.1016/j.paid.2016.03.037](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2016.03.037)
- [59] Spitz, R., & Cobliner, G. (1966). *The first year of life: A psychoanalytic study of normal and deviant object relations*. International Universities Press.
<https://psycnet.apa.org/record/1966-00393-000>

- [60] Townsend, J. (1991). *Hiding from love: How to change the withdrawal patterns that isolate and imprison you*. NavPress.
<https://www.amazon.com/Hiding-Love-Withdrawal-Patterns-Imprison/dp/B006W437IK>
- [61] Townsend, J. (2019). *People Fuel: Fill your tank for life, love and leadership*. Zondervan Publishing.
- [62] Underwood, R., Mohr, D., & Ross, M. (2016). Attachment style, leadership behavior, and perceptions of leader effectiveness in academic management. *Journal of Leadership Education*, 15(4), 100–116.
[DOI:10.12806/V15/I4/R7](https://doi.org/10.12806/V15/I4/R7)
- [63] van der Kolk, B. A. (2014). *The body keeps the score: Brain, mind, and body in the healing of trauma*. Viking.
- [64] Wirtz, N., & Thomas, R. (2020). When grandiose meets vulnerable: Narcissism and well-being in the organizational context. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 29(4), 556–569.
[DOI:10.1080/1359432X.2020.1731474](https://doi.org/10.1080/1359432X.2020.1731474)
- [65] Yalom, I. D. (1980). *Existential psychotherapy*. Basic Books
- [66] Yang, F., & Oshio, A. (2024). A secure mind is a clear mind: The relationship between attachment security, mindfulness, and self-concept clarity. *Current Psychology*, 43, 11276–11287.
[DOI:10.1007/s12144-023-05250-4](https://doi.org/10.1007/s12144-023-05250-4)
- [67] Yavuz Güler, Ç., & Karaca, T. (2021). The role of differentiation of self in predicting rumination and emotion regulation difficulties. *Contemporary Family Therapy*, 43, 113–123.
[DOI:10.1007/s10591-020-09559-1](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10591-020-09559-1)

TPRAT Questions on Relationship Status and Family

Please indicate your marital Status

1. Single/Unmarried
2. Married
3. Divorced
4. Separated
5. Widowed

Please indicate the number of children in your household in each of the following age ranges

1. 0-5 Number of Children _____
2. 6-11 Number of Children _____
3. 12-18 Number of Children _____
4. 19 and over Number of Children _____

[TPRAT – 6-point Likert scale]

1. I know and accept my weaknesses.

-Strongly Disagree -Disagree -Somewhat Disagree -Somewhat Agree -Agree -Strongly Agree

2. *People tell me that I connect with them at an emotional level.*

-Very False -Somewhat False -More False Than True -More True Than False -Somewhat True -Very True

3. I rarely beat myself up when I fail at something.

-Very False -Somewhat False -More False Than True -More True Than False -Somewhat True -Very True

4. I am able to express what I want and do not want in my work and relationships.

-Strongly Disagree -Disagree -Somewhat Disagree -Somewhat Agree -Agree -Strongly Agree

5. I am a better “starter” than a “finisher.”

-Strongly Disagree -Disagree -Somewhat Disagree -Somewhat Agree -Agree -Strongly Agree

6. *I can easily recognize the feelings of others accurately.*

-Strongly Disagree -Disagree -Somewhat Disagree -Somewhat Agree -Agree -Strongly Agree

7. I find myself seeking approval from those who are important to me.

-Very False -Somewhat False -More False Than True -More True Than False -Somewhat True -Very True

8. When someone is struggling, I do not know how to support or encourage them.

-Very False -Somewhat False -More False Than True -More True Than False -Somewhat True -Very True

9. When I am stressed, I tend to isolate myself from others.

-Strongly Disagree -Disagree -Somewhat Disagree -Somewhat Agree -Agree -Strongly Agree

10. When I make a mistake, I am too hard on myself.

-Strongly Disagree -Disagree -Somewhat Disagree -Somewhat Agree -Agree -Strongly Agree

11. In a group setting, I prefer that others get the attention instead of myself.

-Very False -Somewhat False -More False Than True -More True Than False -Somewhat True -Very True

12. *I can confront those in authority in ways that work for both of us.*

-Strongly Disagree -Disagree -Somewhat Disagree -Somewhat Agree -Agree -Strongly Agree

13. I look on the bright side of *nearly* all situations.

-Strongly Disagree -Disagree -Somewhat Disagree -Somewhat Agree -Agree -Strongly Agree

14. I can easily express myself when it is time to say “yes” and or “no.”

-Strongly Disagree -Disagree -Somewhat Disagree -Somewhat Agree -Agree -Strongly Agree

15. I can easily identify the emotions I am feeling.

-Strongly Disagree -Disagree -Somewhat Disagree -Somewhat Agree -Agree -Strongly Agree

16. It is *difficult* to be in touch with my deeper emotions.

-Strongly Disagree -Disagree -Somewhat Disagree -Somewhat Agree -Agree -Strongly Agree

17. I am frustrated I have not *sufficiently* developed my potential enough.

-Strongly Disagree -Disagree -Somewhat Disagree -Somewhat Agree -Agree -Strongly Agree

18. I am *equally strong* in giving negative and positive feedback.

-Very False -Somewhat False -More False Than True -More True Than False -Somewhat True -Very True

19. When I need emotional support, I have *various* people that I readily turn to.

-Strongly Disagree -Disagree -Somewhat Disagree -Somewhat Agree -Agree -Strongly Agree

20. I can feel and express sadness to others when I experience a loss.

-Very False -Somewhat False -More False Than True -More True Than False -Somewhat True -Very True

21. When I am struggling, I ask for support in my relationships.

-Very False -Somewhat False -More False Than True -More True Than False -Somewhat True -Very True

22. I am assertive in expressing my desires and opinions.

-Very False -Somewhat False -More False Than True -More True Than False -Somewhat True -Very True

23. I am comfortable being with people who express their anger.

-Strongly Disagree -Disagree -Somewhat Disagree -Somewhat Agree -Agree -Strongly Agree

24. I value others' viewpoints more than I do my own.

-Very False -Somewhat False -More False Than True -More True Than False -Somewhat True -Very True

25. When I am in a small group, I tend to keep my vulnerable feelings to myself.

-Very False -Somewhat False -More False Than True -More True Than False -Somewhat True -Very True

26. People in positions of authority rub me the wrong way.

-Strongly Disagree -Disagree -Somewhat Disagree -Somewhat Agree -Agree -Strongly Agree

27. I am more concerned about how others feel than *recognizing and expressing* my own feelings.

-Strongly Disagree -Disagree -Somewhat Disagree -Somewhat Agree -Agree -Strongly Agree

28. I have had trouble *with* expressing negative attitudes toward authority figures.

-Very False -Somewhat False -More False Than True -More True Than False -Somewhat True -Very True

29. I know I have talents, but I am not using them in the best way.

-Very False -Somewhat False -More False Than True -More True Than False -Somewhat True -Very True

30. People have told me that I tend to think too highly of myself at times.

-Very False -Somewhat False -More False Than True -More True Than False -Somewhat True -Very True

31. I have energy and excitement about my vocation or calling.

-Very False -Somewhat False -More False Than True -More True Than False -Somewhat True -Very True

32. Feelings of grief are better dealt with in private than with other people.

-Strongly Disagree -Disagree -Somewhat Disagree -Somewhat Agree -Agree -Strongly Agree

33. People tell me that I micromanage or am controlling with others.

-Very False -Somewhat False -More False Than True -More True Than False -Somewhat True -Very True

34. I am clear on my life's mission, talents, passions, and the path I am on.

-Strongly Disagree -Disagree -Somewhat Disagree -Somewhat Agree -Agree -Strongly Agree

35. I am comfortable relating to those in authority and feel I am equal to them.

-Strongly Disagree -Disagree -Somewhat Disagree -Somewhat Agree -Agree -Strongly Agree

36. I feel free to say "yes" or "no" to a person's request without worrying about their response.

-Strongly Disagree -Disagree -Somewhat Disagree -Somewhat Agree -Agree -Strongly Agree

37. I tend to be direct and open when I have conflicts with others.

-Very False -Somewhat False -More False Than True -More True Than False -Somewhat True -Very True

38. It is difficult for me to tell others how much they really mean to me.

-Strongly Disagree -Disagree -Somewhat Disagree -Somewhat Agree -Agree -Strongly Agree

39. I have difficulty being clear on my own opinions and values.

-Very False -Somewhat False -More False Than True -More True Than False -Somewhat True -Very True

40. I can *easily* forgive others for their mistakes.

-Very False -Somewhat False -More False Than True -More True Than False -Somewhat True -Very True

41. I am often more interesting than other people.

-Strongly Disagree -Disagree -Somewhat Disagree -Somewhat Agree -Agree -Strongly Agree

42. I have a *tough* time talking about my feelings, even with those I am close to.

-Very False -Somewhat False -More False Than True -More True Than False -Somewhat True -Very True

43. I have put too much time and energy into people-pleasing.

-Strongly Disagree -Disagree -Somewhat Disagree -Somewhat Agree -Agree -Strongly Agree

44. I give my time and energy to others at the expense of my own self-care.

-Strongly Disagree -Disagree -Somewhat Disagree -Somewhat Agree -Agree -Strongly Agree

45. Avoiding confrontation has been costly to me.

-Very False -Somewhat False -More False Than True -More True Than False -Somewhat True -Very True

46. When there is a problem, it's better to think positive and not focus on the negative.

-Strongly Disagree -Disagree -Somewhat Disagree -Somewhat Agree -Agree -Strongly Agree

47. It is difficult for me to ask for help or support from others.

-Very False -Somewhat False -More False Than True -More True Than False -Somewhat True -Very True

48. People in positions of authority tell me I collaborate well with them.

-Very False -Somewhat False -More False Than True -More True Than False -Somewhat True -Very True

49. When I disagree with someone, I prefer to remain silent.

-Strongly Disagree -Disagree -Somewhat Disagree -Somewhat Agree -Agree -Strongly Agree

50. When I am disappointed by someone, I am still mindful of their good points at the same time.

-Strongly Disagree -Disagree -Somewhat Disagree -Somewhat Agree -Agree -Strongly Agree

51. Over the years, I have often struggled with finding my career niche.

-Strongly Disagree -Disagree -Somewhat Disagree -Somewhat Agree -Agree -Strongly Agree

52. When I fail, I am able to deal with the disappointment and try again.

-Very False -Somewhat False -More False Than True -More True Than False -Somewhat True -Very True

53. I *easily* ask for, and receive, relational support from others.

-Very False -Somewhat False -More False Than True -More True Than False -Somewhat True -Very True

54. I have perfectionistic tendencies that affect my relationships and work.

-Strongly Disagree -Disagree -Somewhat Disagree -Somewhat Agree -Agree -Strongly Agree

55. I am successfully following my life's purpose.

-Very False -Somewhat False -More False Than True -More True Than False -Somewhat True -Very True

56. I do not feel impatient toward people who dwell on their past difficulties.

-Strongly Disagree -Disagree -Somewhat Disagree -Somewhat Agree -Agree -Strongly Agree

57. I avoid saying "no" so that I will not risk rejection or hurt someone's feelings.

-Very False -Somewhat False -More False Than True -More True Than False -Somewhat True -Very True

58. I give in too easily to those in authority.

-Very False -Somewhat False -More False Than True -More True Than False -Somewhat True -Very True

59. It is a challenge for me to know what I am feeling.

-Strongly Disagree -Disagree -Somewhat Disagree -Somewhat Agree -Agree -Strongly Agree

60. I am more comfortable doing tasks and activities than relating to people on an *emotional* level.

-Very False -Somewhat False -More False Than True -More True Than False -Somewhat True -Very True

[Adult Attachment Questionnaire – 7-point Likert Scale]

61. I find it relatively easy to get close to others.									
I strongly Disagree	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	I Strongly Agree	
62. I'm not very comfortable having to depend on other people.									
I strongly Disagree	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	I Strongly Agree	
63. I'm comfortable having others depend on me.									
I strongly Disagree	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	I Strongly Agree	
64. I rarely worry about being abandoned by others.									
I strongly Disagree	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	I Strongly Agree	
65. I don't like people getting too close to me.									
I strongly Disagree	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	I Strongly Agree	
66. I'm somewhat uncomfortable being too close to others.									
I strongly Disagree	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	I Strongly Agree	
67. I find it difficult to trust others completely.									
I strongly Disagree	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	I Strongly Agree	
68. I'm nervous whenever anyone gets too close to me.									
I strongly Disagree	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	I Strongly Agree	
69. Others often want me to be more intimate than I feel comfortable being.									
I strongly Disagree	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	I Strongly Agree	
70. Others often are reluctant to get as close as I would like.									
I strongly Disagree	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	I Strongly Agree	
71. I often worry that my partner(s) don't really love me.									
I strongly Disagree	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	I Strongly Agree	
72. I rarely worry about my partner(s) leaving me.									
I strongly Disagree	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	I Strongly Agree	
73. I often want to merge completely with others, and this desire sometimes scares them away.									
I strongly Disagree	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	I Strongly Agree	
74. I'm confident others would never hurt me by suddenly ending our relationship.									
I strongly Disagree	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	I Strongly Agree	
75. I usually want more closeness and intimacy than others do.									
I strongly Disagree	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	I Strongly Agree	
76. The thought of being left by others rarely enters my mind.									
I strongly Disagree	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	I Strongly Agree	
77. I'm confident that my partner(s) love me just as much as I love them.									
I strongly Disagree	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	I Strongly Agree	

[Differentiation of Self Short Form – 6-point Likert Scale]

78. I tend to remain pretty calm even under stress.								
Not characteristic of me	1	2	3	4	5	6	Very characteristic of me	
79. I usually need a lot of encouragement from others when starting a big job or task.								
Not characteristic of me	1	2	3	4	5	6	Very characteristic of me	
80. No matter what happens in my life, I know that I'll never lose a sense of who I am.								
Not characteristic of me	1	2	3	4	5	6	Very characteristic of me	
81. I tend to distance myself when people get too close to me.								
Not characteristic of me	1	2	3	4	5	6	Very characteristic of me	
82. When my spouse/partner criticizes me, it bothers me for days.								
Not characteristic of me	1	2	3	4	5	6	Very characteristic of me	

- 83. At times my feelings get the best of me and I have trouble thinking clearly.**
Not characteristic of me 1 2 3 4 5 6 Very characteristic of me
- 84. I'm often uncomfortable when people get too close to me.**
Not characteristic of me 1 2 3 4 5 6 Very characteristic of me
- 85. I feel a need for approval from virtually everyone in my life.**
Not characteristic of me 1 2 3 4 5 6 Very characteristic of me
- 86. At times, I feel as if I'm riding an emotional roller-coaster.**
Not characteristic of me 1 2 3 4 5 6 Very characteristic of me
- 87. There's no point in getting upset about things I cannot change.**
Not characteristic of me 1 2 3 4 5 6 Very characteristic of me
- 88. I'm overly sensitive to criticism.**
Not characteristic of me 1 2 3 4 5 6 Very characteristic of me
- 89. I'm fairly self-accepting.**
Not characteristic of me 1 2 3 4 5 6 Very characteristic of me
- 90. I often agree with others just to appease them.**
Not characteristic of me 1 2 3 4 5 6 Very characteristic of me
- 91. If I had an argument with my spouse/partner, I tend to think about it all day.**
Not characteristic of me 1 2 3 4 5 6 Very characteristic of me
- 92. When one of my relationships becomes very intense, I feel the urge to run away from it.**
Not characteristic of me 1 2 3 4 5 6 Very characteristic of me
- 93. If someone is upset with me, I can't seem to let it go easily.**
Not characteristic of me 1 2 3 4 5 6 Very characteristic of me
- 94. I often feel unsure when others are not around to help me make a decision.**
Not characteristic of me 1 2 3 4 5 6 Very characteristic of me
- 95. I'm very sensitive to being hurt by others.**
Not characteristic of me 1 2 3 4 5 6 Very characteristic of me
- 96. My self-esteem really depends on how others think of me.**
Not characteristic of me 1 2 3 4 5 6 Very characteristic of me
- 97. I tend to feel pretty stable under stress.**
Not characteristic of me 1 2 3 4 5 6 Very characteristic of me

[Hypersensitive Narcissism Scale – 5-point Likert Scale]

98. I can become entirely absorbed in thinking about my personal affairs, my health, my cares or my relations to others

Very uncharacteristic or untrue; strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 Very characteristic or true; strongly agree

99. My feelings are easily hurt by ridicule or by the slighting remarks of others.

Very uncharacteristic or untrue; strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 Very characteristic or true; strongly agree

100. When I enter a room I often become self-conscious and feel that the eyes of others are upon me.

Very uncharacteristic or untrue; strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 Very characteristic or true; strongly agree

101. I dislike sharing the credit of an achievement with others.

Very uncharacteristic or untrue; strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 Very characteristic or true; strongly agree

102. I dislike being with a group unless I know that I am appreciated by at least one of those present.

Very uncharacteristic or untrue; strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 Very characteristic or true; strongly agree

103. I feel that I am temperamentally different from most people.

Very uncharacteristic or untrue; strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 Very characteristic or true; strongly agree

104. I often interpret the remarks of others in a personal way.

Very uncharacteristic or untrue; strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 Very characteristic or true; strongly agree

105. I easily become wrapped up in my own interests and forget the existence of others.

Very uncharacteristic or untrue; strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 Very characteristic or true; strongly agree

106. I feel that I have enough on my hands without worrying about other people's troubles

Very uncharacteristic or untrue; strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 Very characteristic or true; strongly agree

107. I am secretly "put out" when other people come to me with their troubles, asking me for my time and sympathy.

Very uncharacteristic or untrue; strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 Very characteristic or true; strongly agree

[Multidimensional Perfectionism Scale – 7-point Likert Scale]

108. When I am working on something, I cannot relax until it is perfect.

Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Agree

109. I am not likely to criticize someone for giving up too early.

Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Agree

110. It is not important that people I am close to are successful.

Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Agree

111. I seldom criticize my friends for accepting second best.

Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Agree

112. I find it difficult to meet others' expectations of me.

Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Agree

113. One of my goals is to be perfect in everything I do.

Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Agree

114. Everything that others do must be of top-notch quality.

Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Agree

115. I never aim for perfection on my work.

Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Agree

116. Those around me readily accept that I make mistakes too.

Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Agree

117. It doesn't matter when someone close to me does not do their absolute best.

Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Agree

118. The better I do, the better I am expected to do.

Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Agree

119. I seldom feel the need to be perfect.

Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Agree

120. Anything that I do that is less than excellent will be seen as poor work by those around me.

Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Agree

121. I strive to be as perfect as I can be.

Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Agree

122. It is very important that I am perfect in everything I attempt.

Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Agree

123. I have high expectation for the people who are important to me.

Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Agree

124. I strive to be the best at everything I do.

Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Agree

125. The people around me expect me to succeed at everything I do.

Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Agree

126. I do not have very high standards for those around me.

Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Agree

127. I demand nothing less than perfection of myself.

Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Agree

128. Others will like me even if I don't excel at everything.

Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Agree

129. I can't be bothered with people who won't strive to better themselves.

Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Agree

130. It makes me uneasy to see an error in my work.

Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Agree

131. I do not expect a lot from my friends.

Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Agree

[Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale – 4-point Likert Scale]**132. On the whole, I am satisfied with myself**

Strongly Agree Agree Disagree Strongly Disagree

133. At times I think I am no good at all.

Strongly Agree Agree Disagree Strongly Disagree

134. I feel that I have a number of good qualities.

Strongly Agree Agree Disagree Strongly Disagree

135. I am able to do things as well as most other people.

Strongly Agree Agree Disagree Strongly Disagree

136. I feel I do not have much to be proud of.

Strongly Agree Agree Disagree Strongly Disagree

137. I certainly feel useless at times.

Strongly Agree Agree Disagree Strongly Disagree

138. I feel that I'm a person of worth, at least on an equal plane with others.

Strongly Agree Agree Disagree Strongly Disagree

139. I wish I could have more respect for myself.

Strongly Agree Agree Disagree Strongly Disagree

140. All in all, I am inclined to feel that I am a failure.

Strongly Agree Agree Disagree Strongly Disagree

141. I take a positive attitude toward myself.

Strongly Agree Agree Disagree Strongly Disagree

[Adult Attitude to Grief Scale – 5-point Likert Scale]**142. I feel able to face the pain which comes with loss.**

Strongly Agree Agree Neither Agree Nor disagree Disagree Strongly Disagree

143. For me, it is difficult to switch off thoughts about the person I have lost.

Strongly Agree Agree Neither Agree Nor disagree Disagree Strongly Disagree

144. I feel very aware of my inner strength when faced with grief.

Strongly Agree Agree Neither Agree Nor disagree Disagree Strongly Disagree

145. I believe that I must be brave in the face of loss.

Strongly Agree Agree Neither Agree Nor disagree Disagree Strongly Disagree

146. I feel that I will always carry the pain of grief with me.

Strongly Agree Agree Neither Agree Nor disagree Disagree Strongly Disagree

147. For me, it is important to keep my grief under control.

Strongly Agree Agree Neither Agree Nor disagree Disagree Strongly Disagree

148. Life has less meaning for me after this loss.

Strongly Agree Agree Neither Agree Nor disagree Disagree Strongly Disagree

149. I think it's best just to get on with life and not dwell on this loss.

Strongly Agree Agree Neither Agree Nor disagree Disagree Strongly Disagree

150. It may not always feel like it but I do believe that I will come through this experience of grief.

Strongly Agree Agree Neither Agree Nor disagree Disagree Strongly Disagree

[The Workplace PERMA Profiler – 10-point Likert Scale]

151. To what extent is your work purposeful and meaningful?

Not at all 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Completely

152. How often do you feel you are making progress towards accomplishing your work-related goals?

Not at all 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Completely

153. At work, how often do you become absorbed in what you are doing?

Not at all 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Completely

154. In general, how would you say your health is?

Not at all 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Completely

155. At work, how often do you feel joyful?

Not at all 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Completely

156. To what extent do you receive help and support from coworkers when you need it?

Not at all 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Completely

157. At work, how often do you feel anxious?

Not at all 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Completely

158. How often do you achieve the important work goals you have set for yourself?

Not at all 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Completely

159. In general, to what extent do you feel that what you do at work is valuable and worthwhile?

Not at all 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Completely

160. At work, how often do you feel positive?

Not at all 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Completely

161. To what extent do you feel excited and interested in your work?

Not at all 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Completely

162. How lonely do you feel at work?

Not at all 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Completely

163. How satisfied are you with your current physical health?

Not at all 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Completely

164. At work, how often do you feel angry?

Not at all 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Completely

165. To what extent do you feel appreciated by your coworkers?

Not at all 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Completely

166. How often are you able to handle your work-related responsibilities?

Not at all 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Completely

167. To what extent do you generally feel that you have a sense of direction in your work?

Not at all 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Completely

168. Compared to others of your same age and sex, how is your health?

Not at all 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Completely

169. How satisfied are you with your professional relationships?

Not at all 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Completely

170. At work, how often do you feel sad?

Not at all 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Completely

171. At work, how often do you lose track of time while doing something you enjoy?

Not at all 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Completely

172. At work, to what extent do you feel contented?

Not at all 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Completely

173. Taking all things together, how happy would you say you are with your work?

Not at all 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Completely

[Adjective Check List]

To complete the ACL, select the adjectives that you believe describe yourself. Any number of items may be selected from the list of adjectives.

1. absent-minded	51. cowardly	101. gloomy	151. mild	201. reliable	251. strong
2. active	52. cruel	102. good-looking	152. mischievous	202. resentful	252. stubborn
3. adaptable	53. curious	103. good-natured	153. moderate	203. reserved	253. submissive
4. adventurous	54. cynical	104. greedy	154. modest	204. resourceful	254. suggestible
5. affected	55. daring	105. handsome	155. moody	205. responsible	255. sulky
6. affectionate	56. deceitful	106. hard-headed	156. nagging	206. restless	256. superstitious
7. aggressive	57. defensive	107. hard-hearted	157. natural	207. retiring	257. suspicious
8. alert	58. deliberate	108. hasty	158. nervous	208. rigid	258. sympathetic
9. aloof	59. demanding	109. headstrong	159. noisy	209. robust	259. tactful
10. ambitious	60. dependable	110. healthy	160. obliging	210. rude	260. tactless
11. anxious	61. dependent	111. helpful	161. obnoxious	211. sarcastic	261. talkative
12. apathetic	62. despondent	112. high-strung	162. opinionated	212. self-centered	262. temperamental
13. appreciative	63. determined	113. honest	163. opportunistic	213. self-confident	263. tense
14. argumentative	64. dignified	114. hostile	164. optimistic	214. self-controlled	264. thankless
15. arrogant	65. discreet	115. humorous	165. organized	215. self-denying	265. thorough
16. artistic	66. disorderly	116. hurried	166. original	216. self-pitying	266. thoughtful
17. assertive	67. dissatisfied	117. idealistic	167. outgoing	217. self-punishing	267. thrifty
18. attractive	68. distractible	118. imaginative	168. outspoken	218. self-seeking	268. timid
19. autocratic	69. distrustful	119. immature	169. painstaking	219. selfish	269. tolerant
20. awkward	70. dominant	120. impatient	170. patient	220. sensitive	270. touchy
21. bitter	71. dreamy	121. impulsive	171. peaceable	221. sentimental	271. tough
22. blustery	72. dull	122. independent	172. peculiar	222. serious	272. trusting
23. boastful	73. easy going	123. indifferent	173. persevering	223. severe	273. unaffected
24. bossy	74. effeminate	124. individualistic	174. persistent	224. sexy	274. unambitious
25. calm	75. efficient	125. industrious	175. pessimistic	225. shallow	275. unassuming
26. capable	76. egotistical	126. infantile	176. painful	226. sharp-witted	276. unconventional
27. careless	77. emotional	127. informal	177. pleasant	227. shiftless	277. undependable
28. cautious	78. energetic	128. ingenious	178. pleasure seeking	228. show-off	278. under standing
29. changeable	79. enterprising	129. inhibited	179. poised	229. shrewd	279. unemotional
30. charming	80. enthusiastic	130. initiative	180. polished	230. shy	280. unexcitable
31. cheerful	81. evasive	131. insightful	181. practical	231. silent	281. unfriendly
32. civilized	82. excitable	132. intelligent	182. praising	232. simple	282. uninhibited
33. clear-thinking	83. fair-minded	133. interests narrow	183. precise	233. sincere	283. unintelligent
34. clever	84. fault-finding	134. interests wide	184. prejudiced	234. slipshod	284. unkind
35. coarse	85. fearful	135. intolerant	185. preoccupied	235. slow	285. unrealistic
36. cold	86. feminine	136. inventive	186. progressive	236. sly	286. unscrupulous
37. commonplace	87. fickle	137. irresponsible	187. prudish	237. smug	287. unselfish
38. complaining	88. flirtatious	138. irritable	188. quarrelsome	238. snobbish	288. unstable
39. complicated	89. foolish	139. jolly	189. queer	239. sociable	289. vindictive
40. conceited	90. forceful	140. kind	190. quick	240. soft-hearted	290. versatile
41. confident	91. foresighted	141. lazy	191. quiet	241. sophisticated	291. warm
42. confused	92. forgetful	142. leisurely	192. quitting	242. spendthrift	292. wary
43. conscientious	93. forgiving	143. logical	193. rational	243. spineless	293. weak
44. conservative	94. formal	144. loud	194. rattlebrained	244. spontaneous	294. whiny
45. considerate	95. frank	145. loyal	195. realistic	245. spunky	295. whole some
46. contented	96. friendly	146. mannerly	196. reasonable	246. stable	296. wise
47. conventional	97. frivolous	147. masculine	197. rebellious	247. steady	297. withdrawn
48. cool	98. fussy	148. mature	198. reckless	248. stern	298. witty
49. cooperative	99. generous	149. meek	199. reflective	249. stingy	299. worrying
50. courageous	100. gentle	150. methodical	200. relaxed	250. stolid	300. zany