

【研究論文】

心の教育をする教師になるためにⅡ —人格検査による自己認識—

広島文教女子大学人間科学部

グローバルコミュニケーション学科 講師 クレイグ・アンソニー・ネヴィット

Teachers Cultivating Future Minds Ⅱ : Self-awareness through Personality Typology Tests

Craig Anthony Nevitt

Abstract

Hiroshima Bunkyo Women's University (HBWU), in 2014, implemented a course of once-a-month, 45-minute study sessions titled Ikushin Program プログラム「育心」—for the purpose of this paper to be translated into “Enriching the Mind Program” (EMP). The translation of the explanation of the EMP in the student handbook is as follows:

育心育人の精神に基づく他者への配慮, 多様性への理解, 自らの人間性の向上を通じて人間性あふれる豊かな社会を実現しようとする態度を身につけることができます。

Based on the notion of “Enriching the Mind and the Self,” students can acquire the attitudes necessary to realize a rich and humane society through improving themselves personally, considering others, and understanding diversity.

This is the second stage in an ongoing process toward finding a suitable EMP curriculum for Hiroshima Bunkyo Women's University. Nevitt's proposal is to have students take a different personality typology test each session, then talk about the outcomes of these tests and engage in other activities related to the types depicted in the tests. Section one recounts a first attempt to use typology. Unfortunately, various complications prevented a satisfactory outcome. Section two illustrates why it may not be possible to teach morality in university. Section three discusses typology. Section four relates the creation and results of a questionnaire to check student perception of and desire to learn self-awareness. In the end, too few participants and too low a correlation coefficient does not prove any of the hypotheses. Students do, however, indicate a strong desire to action regarding self-awareness. Therefore, the next stage for creating an EMP curriculum is to retry the typology sessions in such a way as to avoid the complications of the last attempt and revise the questionnaire based on the results of this initial survey.

1 The Class

This section relates the attempt to begin the process of using personality typology tests in the EMP as a way toward self-awareness and some of the complications encountered.

Student turn-out was lower than expected. Nevitt was under the assumption that EMP sessions were mandatory and thus was surprised when less than half of the students attended the first session. This cohort of students had been functioning under the opposite assumption that attendance was not necessary, so it was acceptable to spend the 45 minutes studying independently. The difference in expectations created an adversarial relationship. Prior to the first session, Nevitt should have confirmed expectations and adjusted accordingly. Additionally, due to inconsistent student attendance, it was difficult to create an ongoing curriculum. Thus, in the end only one personality test was introduced and revisited several times, with other, unrelated materials from a different instructor interspersed as well. The following is some of what was covered, over several classes.

The first typology test chosen was from a book titled *Better Than Before* from the 2015 Business Insider best nonfiction books list (Martin, 2015) that resonated with Nevitt. In the book, the author, Gretchen Rubin, creates her own typology she calls the Four Tendencies. Rubin (2015) makes it clear she does not see Four Tendencies as the final word in self-awareness, stating, “This quiz isn’t dispositive; it’s just meant to help you get a clearer reading on yourself” (p. 267). This is true for all personality typology tests. Accordingly, teachers should make this clear to students, so they do not misinterpret the reason for the tests, as just a stepping stone toward self-awareness.

After finding their type, students were instructed to sit in groups of the same type for the activities and discussions. After the group discussions, a representative from each group would present what was found. The discussion topics were varied; the following are some examples.

The story of the blind men and the elephant was told, and the students were instructed to try to think about the metaphors contained therein. Most readers are probably familiar with the story of the king who assembles blind men in his palace, where each man is instructed to touch a different part of the elephant and report what they think an elephant resembles. Since each man touches a different part, they all have a different answer. For example, the man who touches the tusks says the elephant is like a spear; the man who touches the tail says it is like a rope, etc. However, one part of the story that is often omitted is when the men come to blows over their differences, and the king is overjoyed by the spectacle. The students had several suggestions as to the stories meaning. However, as a metaphor, readers are left to their own devices: What do the blind men, the elephant and the laughing king represent in your life? After the story, students were given a puzzle to solve that required looking at the problem through English—a blind spot for several of the students.

A large part of the book *Better Than Before* is dedicated to creating healthy habits. Several sets of discussions were related to habit and how students should create better habits. The reason for shifting the focus was the revelation that a large part of our days is lived in autopilot, relying on our habits. “Habits are the invisible architecture of daily life. Research suggests about 40 percent of our behavior is repeated almost daily, and mostly in the same context” (Rubin, 2015, p. 7). This made Nevitt think that since the plan of having students doing different typologies was unraveling with inconsistent attendance, self-contained sessions on habits would be a useful direction. Additionally, the notion of habits was found to connect with the virtues proposed in stage one of this study through a quote by Thomas Aquinas that indicates habitual action confirms virtue. “Human virtue which is an operative habit, is a good habit, productive of good works” (Q. 55, A. 3). Thus, habits became the focus of the several remaining sessions.

One other discussion in the final EMP sessions by Nevitt revealed a troubling finding. Students were given

two scenarios to discuss, similar to the narrative approach used by Reitaku and Edogawa Universities. The first scenario was close to their current situation as students to get them warmed up.

It is 6:00 on the evening, before a big test and Jane is sitting down to begin studying for the test. Suddenly, she remembers that she has to work at her part-time job from 7:00 to 11:00. Also, at the same time, she receives a message from her friend May. The message says that they are going to have a surprise birthday party for her friend Alice at 7:00.

Students discussed what they would do. As one would expect there were several opinions regarding the best action to take. The options presented were to go to work and let their test score suffer, call out sick at work and study, call out sick and go to the party. Then, the students were asked what habits they could create to prevent such a situation. Solutions ranged from better scheduling habits to better study habits. The next scenario was related to a situation the students may encounter in future jobs.

In October 2017, Kobe Steel admitted to falsifying data on aluminum, copper and steel products. If you were in charge, would you falsify data to protect your job? Would you falsify data if your supervisor directed you to do so?

Most students were loath to say yes, when they are in charge but only a few would clearly say no. However, many of them were comfortable in saying yes when directed by a supervisor. This makes it clear that students need some strategy to prevent this from happening.

Nevitt was worried about this situation and presented about it at the JALT conference in 2018. The participants brought up the following points: It may be easier to address the issue of cheating on a test because it is a narrative closer to the students situation before jumping into the Kobe Steel scenario; students should think what would happen if the falsification were to be made public, since their names would be the one on the falsified report; once students agreed to falsifying data, because it is what they were ordered to do, they should be introduced to the idea of the “Good Nazi,” who was also just following orders; lastly, one participant simply said, “Perhaps students are not ready to think about such moral questions.” This idea is revisited in section 2.

Nevitt suggests if the students are properly taught self-awareness, they could create a strong identity, and it would be easier to refuse such a situation. Thus, through a better understanding of themselves, students will become more reliable members of society.

2 Why Not Teach Morality

Opinions on teaching morality vary greatly. There is no agreed upon notion of how morality should be taught, what should be taught, or even if it should be taught. Therefore, creating a university curriculum to teach morality in a way that would satisfy all the stakeholders of a given university—to say nothing of a curriculum spanning a country or the world—lies just over the border in the realm of impossible. Thus, it would appear moral relativism is the solution. Unfortunately, this is in appearance only, for moral relativism is as disputed as the ways, means and rationales of teaching morality. This section touches the tip of the iceberg which is moral education and ends with the suggestion that we should teach students self-awareness before teaching morality, with a brief hint at the unlikely possibility of employing mythology.

There is no way a paper of this size could hope to cover the volumes of space necessary to explain the ever-expanding, myriad view points on teaching morality. Nevitt suggests the book *Debating Moral Education: Rethinking the Role of the Modern University* by Kiss and Euben, (2010) as a primer. This book as noted in the introduction by Noah Pickus “captures both the complexity and the urgency of the debate over the future of moral education in the modern university” (loc. 126). This section shares some insights on why when teaching morality, it may not be possible to address the needs of everyone concerned—despite, or perhaps because, the fact that all mankind is concerned.

In order to teach morality, we first need to know where our notion of morality comes from. In the past, religions were often seen as the vessels of moral law. However, many incidents of immoral actions instigated within religion, from the Christian crusades, onto priestly pedophilia, beheadings for Islamic Jihad and through to Buddhist burning of Rohingya houses, have made for a world dubious on religion as a moral guidepost. So, moral education has sometimes turned to ethics of Aristotle, Confucius or to morals as civics or in politics. And, sometimes morality forgoes the classroom entirely. Kiss and Euben (2010) point out “the teaching and learning of ethics goes on whether we like it or not, the question is not whether it should be taught but how, when, and by whom” (loc. 345). Recently, students are not looking to teachers in the classroom to teach morality. One may imagine students’ objection to the teaching morality is that there are no qualified teachers. David A. Hoekema, (2010) recounts the story of Plato in Meno where the top candidates for the role of teaching virtue “prove to be unqualified” (loc. 4608). Hoekema goes on to say the modern university faces the same problem of failing to have qualified teachers or suitable methods for teaching virtue. However, overall, students are not consciously avoiding the classroom. They learn morality from what they consume. In the past, this was stories passed down from elders. When a certain story gained enough followers, it became a mythological story, or in greater extremes a religion. This is not to lower one or lift the other. Mythology and religion are one in the same. As Joseph Campbell (2001) clarifies, “Mythology may, in a real sense, be defined as other people’s religion. And religion may, in a sense, be understood as a popular misunderstanding of mythology” (p. 8). Now, however, our myths have lost their strength through being misunderstood as stories for children, or worse, lies. So, our movies and other media are replacing the mythic teaching of the past. And, the morals being taught through the media is as varied as the voices making them. In Japan, some of media hearken to Confucian morals. As Born (2009) points out, in some “contemporary manga, importance was placed on friendship, duty, training, and winning, key values that the readers embraced in the postwar era. So, there is an interplay between societal Confucian values already adhered to at some levels in the readership and what the editors and authors may be trying to promote into their stories” (p. 50). Perhaps the authors of these media are conscious of the references made. Whether or not on purpose, however, the messages are being transmitted. A group more interested in willfully engaging in morality is science. “In the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, American intellectuals commonly view science as

a potent source of moral guidance” (Reuben, 2010, loc. 740). Naturally, the varied voices also carry many points of view as to the role of science—or lack thereof—in molding morality. Sam Harris, best-selling author and neuroscientist, wrote he wished to “begin a conversation about how moral truth can be understood in the context of science” (p.2) in his 2010 publication *The Moral Landscape: How Science Can Determine Human Values*. A conversation can take place among people with many opinions, so Nevitt gives Harris the benefit of the doubt that his inflammatory statements are an attempt to open the conversation. The mixed reception to the book reveals that others are less able to forgive references such as those made by Harris in reference to Gregory Paul’s research, in which he sees “greater support for a link between religious conviction and societal insecurity” (p. 146), or when he equates believing in God to believing in an “imaginary friend” (p.24). These statements seem aimed at shutting down conversation rather than opening it. Jung (1969) would have countered Harris’ questioning the truth of “the basic claims of religion” (p. 26) by calling him childish for holding “the prejudice against the role which mythological assumptions play in the life of the psyche” (p. 91). Harris, despite his degree in philosophy from Stanford, is forgetting we need our mythologies to carry us. We have carried them with us for so long we cannot just put them aside entirely because science says so. Our mythologies or religions “are concepts of a kind that have accompanied human life from prehistoric times, and that still break through into consciousness at any provocation” (Jung, 1979, p. 76). Thus, there are many points of view on what constitutes morality. The extremes now are science on the one hand and religion on the other. However, they are both only trying to deal in the facts. And this is where they are both failing to understand. The messages expressed in our mythologies are not facts. They are metaphors. We should endeavor to understand them as metaphors, not facts to be embraced or ejected. They are meant to be learned from. “All the messages of myth...are talking about that which constitutes the values of one’s life, and of all lives” (Campbell, 2001, p. 49). All our relationships with each other and the transcendent are beautiful through metaphors properly viewed but backfire when not interpreted correctly. Unfortunately, metaphors for our contact with the transcendent, one major source of our religious texts, are subjective, and often backfire because there is no common frame of reference for one person’s subjective experience. Take the analogy of skiing down a mountain. Many people have the experience. Nevertheless, everyone experiences it differently. Moreover, there are many people who know what skiing is, but have never actually tried it. And, for those who have skied or at least seen it in some way, whether on TV or in person, when a person starts to tell a skiing story from a recent visit to the Swiss alps, they can generally understand it. Even though they did not have the same experience as the person who is telling the story. Even if they have never been to Switzerland. Readers should note the further listeners get from having had a similar experience, the more metaphors the skier must utilize to tell their story. However, what if a skier were to take a long detour on the return trip from the alps to stop by a small village in the Amazon delta? The people they encounter there would have no point of reference to snow, or even a hill, so most metaphors would backfire. There is little to no hope the Amazonians will understand an experience that transcends their reality. Thus, it should become clear just how difficult it would be to express a transcendent, religious experience to someone without a frame of reference to understand it. Some people may be moved by the story and wish to believe it. Others would call the storyteller a liar. Accordingly, our myths have broken down. Unfortunately, because of these exact extreme views of our myths, teaching morality through these metaphors, no matter how engaging Nevitt may feel it to be, is just as controversial as all the others. Science calling them lies—religion calling them blasphemy. And, thus the method is equally likely to be rejected.

This small glimpse around the various sides debating the five Ws and one H of morality should make it clear no matter how a university chooses to teach it, there will be people who disagree to some degree. Thus, in the spirit of rhetoric, we should all take a step back and look for a point on which to agree. As mentioned in section one: “perhaps students are simply not ready to deal with questions of morality.” Nevitt is not suggesting shying

away from teaching morality because it is difficult. The suggestion is that students need to know themselves before placing themselves in relation to issues of morality. As Grant (2010) points out students do not understand their own reasoning behind their judgment of right and wrong—the basic building block of morality. “They are not particularly self-aware or self-critical when it comes to their own motivations in making these judgments” (loc. 5325). So, Nevitt suggests that teachers should help students to become more self-aware to start them toward the path to proper judgment.

3 Why Teach the Self

This section is similar to section two as a sliver shaved from an iceberg of the ideals surrounding understanding the self in order to justify teaching self-awareness through the EMP. As only the second stage in continuous study, there are questions left unanswered, however, hopefully, more instructors will be inspired to join in creating an EMP curriculum. The questions put forth are: (1) Can an agreement be reached on the viability of studying the self? (2) Can typology be used to start students down the path to understanding themselves?

Before proposing an EMP curriculum for self-awareness, it is necessary to define self, as well as explain why Nevitt favors it. Notions of self are as varied as those of morality. The study of the self seems to have begun in 1897 by Wilhelm Wundt the founder of “the first psychological laboratory in Leipzig, Germany” (Ewen, 1998, p. 7). From then to now, the cast of theorists include Alfred Adler, Gordon W. Allport, Sigmund Freud, Karen Horney, Carl Jung, Abraham H. Maslow, Rollo May and Carl Rogers to name but a few. Each one had their own ideas of the self and they are as varied as one might expect. Defined by Jung (1971), “the self designates the whole range of psychic phenomena in man. It expresses the unity of the personality as a whole” (p. 460). The question is, are the theories of self and how to find it as inflammatory as those of morality? That is to say, if a university creates a curriculum according to Adler, will those who embrace in the theories of Rogers revolt? Thus, more in the way of research on the attitudes of the teachers in university is required. Another possible hitch with teaching self-awareness is the Japanese concept of ‘self.’ Doi (1986) refers to the self, stating, “identity is to be aware of oneself as oneself.” Prior to which he writes, “the Japanese translation of ‘identity’ douitsusei 同一性 is not very familiar to most people” (p. 80). Thus, teaching about the concept of self in relation to Japanese society may be necessary prior to teaching students how to become aware. The two opposing key concepts in Japanese culture of *tatema* 建て前 and *honne* 本音 may also need to be addressed in the first session. This may especially be true because of the current “disregard for *tatema*” which is leading to a fading “sense of belonging.” So, much so that “Young people... can no longer grasp their identities. Even adults who once thought they knew themselves very well are now often placed in situations where they must ask themselves again just who they are” (Doi, 1986, pp. 80-81). Thus, as we cross cultures with concepts, a greater need for discussion over a curriculum for self-awareness is made painfully clear. Nevitt, being born into the Western traditions of thought, would perhaps start the conversation with Fromm’s self-interest because of the rationality contained therein. “Man has only one real interest and that is the full development of his potentialities, of himself as a human being” (Fromm, 1949, p. 134). Developing student potential should perhaps be a goal for teachers. However, readers knowledgeable in Eastern thought will be quick to point out some doctrine preach extinguishing the self. Ever more reason for a discussion between stakeholders in Japanese universities as to the viability of a curriculum of self-awareness. Perhaps readers who are not convinced to the validity of teaching self-awareness are wondering why Nevitt has chosen such a focus. Naturally, he could justify it as being important. As he does indeed feel. However, this may also stand as his admission that he feels a lack of his own self-awareness. “When we deal in

ideas, we inevitably make a confession, for they bring to the light of day not only the best that in us lies, but our worst insufficiencies and personal shortcomings as well. This is especially the case with ideas about psychology” (Jung, 2011, p. 117). And, any teacher who has worked on a curriculum, will agree it is the same for education. We too teach what we want—or perhaps need—to learn. There are few people who can say they have attained self-awareness. “The complete realization of our whole being is an unattainable ideal. But unattainability is no argument against the ideal, for ideals are only signposts, never the goal” (Jung, 1954, p. 172). So, teachers will also benefit from a course on self-awareness. The end goal of full understanding will never be attained, but we can point students in a direction toward which to head in searching for the beginning of the path they have to cut themselves. They should also be taught to be content in walking the path toward ‘self,’ which will never be attained. A proper curriculum would teach them this is not a reason for resentment and keep them from giving up.

With some justification of teaching self-awareness laid out, this next paragraph presents some of the perks and perils of self-awareness. The self and personality having been established in the definition by Jung in the paragraph above, it could be inferred that being self-aware is akin to a healthy personality. This dovetails nicely with the definition of a healthy personality by Jahoda (as cited in Erikson, 1980), “a healthy personality actively masters his environment, shows a certain unity of personality, and is able to perceive the world and himself correctly” (p. 53). Need there be any other benefit? Critics may say the path to self-awareness for young people is full of pitfalls. They would be right. Meg Jay, clinical psychologist and author of the book *The Defining Decade* tells of a patient she calls Helen, who in her late 20’s was hoping that “the right retreat or right conversation in therapy or with friends might reveal, once and for all, who she was.” Jay points out that “...an extended period of navel-gazing is usually counterproductive for twentysomethings” (p. 4). So, these critics will warn, the danger of spending the EMP on self-awareness could be a cohort of navel-gazing good-for-nothings. The word danger perhaps sounds a bit strong to some readers, however, Jung (2011) says that for ageing people introspection is a “duty and a necessity,” but “for a young person is it almost a sin—and certainly a danger—to be too much occupied with himself” (p. 111). The danger is never spelled out directly, but in a metaphor for the sun rising in the sky, Jung intimates young people should be shining their light on the world, not within. Even more reason for teaching self-awareness—so students can see their place and how to illuminate it. Precisely because, as Jay’s session with Helen illustrates, they are all waiting for the ‘right’ thing to come along and resonate with them. University students are already navel-gazing on their own. It may be the case that, a bit of directed introspection could give them just what they need to fill their role. And, it is an important role. Because there are too few people comfortably on the path to becoming themselves, we are in crisis. The world needs self-aware people who can see their place in society in order to stand up to injustice. The individual who is not self-aware can “band together into groups and organizations as much as it likes—it is just this banding together and the resultant extinction of the individual personality that makes it succumb so readily to a dictator. A million zeros joined together do not, unfortunately, add up to one. Ultimately everything depends on the quality of the individual” (Jung, 2014, p. 39). Current affairs make it clear this is our situation. Perhaps a world of self-aware people would not have let things get so dire. Perhaps, newly aware people will be able to stand up for what is right both alone and in groups to better our situation. Perhaps they will not agree to falsify information and feel justified by saying, “I was only following orders.” Where will these aware people come from unless taught to become so?

As mentioned in section one. Nevitt began by speculating that an initial juncture for self-awareness would be to have students take various personality typology tests. This paragraph lays out the justification for typing, with some objections and their offsets. The first justification begins as a refutation of teaching morality based on its strain on the student-teacher relationship. Teachers need to come down to the level of the students to avoid

the appearance of indoctrination. Moreover, teachers teaching morality stand at or on a wall from the student's point of view. On one hand, they are butting up against the same wall of lofty moral expectations as the students. Accordingly, students question the teacher legitimacy to teach something not yet attained. On the other hand, some students may view the teacher as being elevated to moral rightness, then they feel looked down upon, being preached at from unattainable heights. This would create a similar situation to the psychologist and the patient wherein, "the preaching of even the worthiest precepts only provokes the patient into open hostility or a secret resistance and thus needlessly endangers the aim of the treatment" (Jung, 2014, pp. 38). So, students may too become averse to learning morality just as Aesop's fox to the sour grapes. Thus, teachers should come down to the student level and admit they too are still on the path to self-awareness—as the path is never-ending. Thus, the teachers teaching it do not need to be experts, or as is sometimes the case, pretend to be experts, they only need to show they too are treading the path themselves. The second justification is that typology is a 'game' that students can enjoy. It is "astonishing" the "effects that learning one's type has on people" (Emre, 2018, p. 267). In fact, several teachers have observed students enjoy fortune-telling and learning which House of Hogwarts they are sorted into based on taking typology tests online. The 'game' aspect of typology leads to, the first objection from Jung (1971) himself, in the forward to the Argentine edition of *Psychological Types*, in reference to using his typology to classify people. "This regrettable misunderstanding completely ignores the fact that this kind of classification is nothing but a parlour game," and he goes on to say it was not meant "in any sense to stick labels on people at first sight" (p. Xiv). To use typology in EMP, teachers will need to clearly state the purpose is not to place students in a box. This is similar to the one-sidedness to which Jung was opposed, prompting him to create a solution to transcend one-sidedness and achieved individuation. Individuation is a noble goal, but it would require more time than is afforded by the EMP. This does not mean typology should be discarded. In fact, Myers (2019) paraphrases Jung from *Psychological Types* to justify exceptions to using typology in such a superficial manner "such as development in the early part of life, dealing with situations that do not allow individual freedom, or as a stepping stone for individuation" (p. 3). Thus, the three criteria of the exception are met. Students are still in the early stage of life. They are in a situation lacking individual freedom. And, they need a stepping stone to find themselves. The Myers-Briggs Type Indicator MBTI is one of the more popular typologies—indeed it is the test upon which the Houses of Hogwarts quiz is based. The MBTI was used by large companies and universities throughout the USA in the mid-1950's (Emre, 2018, p. 161). Critics question the MBTI scientific validity also point out the original creators had "taken a complex philosophical explanation for human subjectivity and flattened it into unrecognizable caricatures of psychological theory: the self dwindled into a four-letter acronym" (Emre, 2018, p. 217). However, the appeal of the test far outweighs its validity. There are "Testimonials of the thousands of people who, upon discovering type, claimed that it had helped them clarify not just who they were but who they wanted to be" (Emre, 2018, p. 260). So, the debate over personality typology tests may continue. Although it is not being used in the original fashion desired by Jung, it does appear to be a tool students could enjoy, and teachers could utilize. Finding ourselves is a long journey—indeed a never-ending journey. But we all must start somewhere. The EMP could be the starting line. Naturally, it should be made clear during EMP classes, repetitively, that understanding their type is not the goal. It is just a step.

If the above argument can find enough support to start implementing personality typology tests in the EMP, an early step would be to find the ideal typology. The psychology department could be enlisted to organize using different tests in different classes. Over time, the perfect set of typologies to give the student a glimpse into themselves, which is also enjoyable, could be made. Moreover, integrated into the EMP sessions, students should be taught to self-regulate. Efklides (2002) points out it is not a foregone conclusion that awareness leads to control. "Self-awareness entails self-monitoring, and self-monitoring does not automatically entail control of behavior, as self-regulation demands" (p. 223). Our goal should not simply be for students to understand

themselves, but for them to regulate themselves. The directions of their regulation will become up to the students. We can but show them examples of people acting from the better angels of their nature, become such examples ourselves, and hope they learn by example. Personality typology is not the perfect answer. But we don't need a perfect answer, teachers just need to nudge students toward their own individual paths.

4 Questionnaire and Hypotheses

Nevitt decided to see if there was a correlation between university students' self-reporting of their tendency to engage in the self-awareness activities and student self-reporting of their desire to improve their engagement in said activity. Additionally, he wanted to test if these perceptions or desires were affected by having taken personality typology tests in the past.

Hypotheses:

1. The more students self-report their tendency to engage in a self-awareness activity, the more they will desire to amend their engagement with said activity.
2. The more students self-report their tendency to engage in a self-awareness activity, the more they will desire for those activities to be taught in university.
3. The more students desire to amend their engagement in a self-awareness activity, the more they will desire for those activities to be taught in university.
4. An increased number of typology tests taken will result in an increase in student perception of self-awareness.
5. An increased number of typology tests taken will result in an increase in student desire to action regarding self-awareness.

His search led him to a 2016 study by Dr. Anna Sutton of Manchester Metropolitan University, Manchester, UK in which she created the Self-Awareness Outcomes Questionnaire (SAOQ) in order to “measure of the outcomes of self-awareness,” as well as identify “the main impacts of self-awareness on people’s day-to-day lives” (p. 658). The questionnaire contains 38 questions pertaining to positive and negative impacts of self-awareness. The questions on the questionnaire were divided into four subscales. The first three of which were deemed to have positive impacts, whereas the last subscale had questions related to negative impacts of self-awareness.

Table 1: the subscale divisions of the SAOQ (Sutton, 2016, p. 651)

Subscales	positive/ negative	items
reflective self-development	positive	the development of continuous attention to the self, with a focus on conscious, reflective and balanced learning
acceptance of self and others	positive	positive self-image and confidence as well as a deeper understanding of others
proactive at work	positive	self-awareness in the workplace and represents an objective and proactive approach to dealing with work
costs of self-awareness	negative	potential negative emotional impacts of being more aware of oneself, such as guilt, fear, vulnerability and fear

Nevitt used these questions as a basis for a questionnaire. The questions in the third subscale were reworded

to reflect university rather than work. The questionnaire administered to students was split into two major sections. The first section contained the 38 questions formulated by Sutton. Additionally, at the end of the first three subscales the students were asked to what degree they thought universities should teach the type of items referenced within the subscale. This question was left off the fourth subscale because of the negative aspects of the questions. After completing the 41 questions, students were given the second section of the questionnaire which asked questions to gauge their desire to correct their engagement on each aspect of self-awareness from the questions—more engaged in positive aspects or less engaged in negative aspects. On each question, students indicated their answers on a 6-point likert scale, the divisions being 1) I definitely think so, 2) I moderately think so, 3) I somewhat think so, 4) I somewhat think not, 5) I moderately think not, 6) I definitely think not. The questions from both sections are in appendix A. The results of the questions related to self-awareness are listed in tables two to five.

Table 2 Subscale 1: Questions related to Reflective Self-development

QUESTION	Perception	of 41	Desire	sig
I observe myself.	Affirmative	35	82%	0.044
	Negative	6	100%	-0.420
I have insight into myself.	Affirmative	31	90%	-0.017
	Negative	10	100%	-0.533
I look at why people act the way they do.	Affirmative	37	89%	0.243
	Negative	4	100%	-0.870
I have learnt about myself and how I see the world.	Affirmative	31	90%	-0.211
	Negative	10	100%	-0.612
I am continuing to develop myself.	Affirmative	32	97%	0.166
	Negative	9	89%	-0.043
I focus on ways of changing my behavior for the better.	Affirmative	39	92%	0.150
	Negative	2	100%	0.000
I feel generally positive about self-awareness.	Affirmative	28	82%	0.073
	Negative	13	100%	-0.412
I reassess my own and others' responsibilities.	Affirmative	30	84%	-0.126
	Negative	11	91%	0.247
I'm aware of my abilities and limitations.	Affirmative	29	81%	-0.091
	Negative	12	75%	0.712
I am reflective.	Affirmative	34	80%	-0.144
	Negative	7	100%	-0.512
I am realistic about myself.	Affirmative	35	83%	0.043
	Negative	6	100%	-0.420
			significance	
			percept	desire
I think universities should teach students more about the matters referred to in the questions above.	Affirmative	32	0.404	-0.269
	Negative	9	0.745	-0.077

Table 3 Subscale 2: Questions related to Acceptance of Self and Others

QUESTION	Perception	of 41	Desire	sig
I have a good self-image.	Affirmative	17	76%	-0.132
	Negative	24	84%	-0.400
I feel on the whole very comfortable with the way I am.	Affirmative	15	80%	-0.275
	Negative	26	84%	-0.245

I have fun.	Affirmative	32	75%	-0.268
	Negative	9	100%	-0.438
I am consistent in different situations or with different people.	Affirmative	27	67%	-0.256
	Negative	14	86%	-0.279
I have compassion and acceptance for others.	Affirmative	36	89%	-0.257
	Negative	5	100%	0.000
I interact well with classmates or peers.	Affirmative	37	81%	-0.061
	Negative	4	100%	0.000
I understand myself well.	Affirmative	33	91%	-0.198
	Negative	8	100%	-0.480
I am confident.	Affirmative	13	77%	-0.660
	Negative	28	93%	-0.664
I stop and think before judging.	Affirmative	34	88%	-0.030
	Negative	7	86%	-0.201
I understand my emotions.	Affirmative	34	79%	-0.134
	Negative	7	86%	-0.540
I am objective.	Affirmative	29	79%	-0.243
	Negative	12	100%	-0.325
			significance	
			percept	desire
I think universities should teach students more about the matters referred to in the questions above.	Affirmative	34	0.357	0.318
	Negative	7	0.904	-0.190

Table 4 Subscale 3: Questions related to Proactive in University

QUESTION	Perception	of 41	Desire	sig
I see my life as something I have power to affect.	Affirmative	35	77%	0.084
	Negative	6	50%	-0.131
I can separate myself from situations to understand them better.	Affirmative	27	89%	-0.272
	Negative	14	93%	-0.492
I am content with my university situation.	Affirmative	26	92%	0.013
	Negative	15	87%	0.011
I think about how my personality fits with university student responsibilities.	Affirmative	26	73%	-0.103
	Negative	15	80%	0.577
I understand how I work within a team.	Affirmative	34	88%	-0.002
	Negative	7	86%	-0.471
I have changed the way I do tasks.	Affirmative	22	96%	0.321
	Negative	19	95%	-0.242
I take control of my tasks.	Affirmative	30	90%	-0.043
	Negative	11	91%	-0.149
I recognize the stress and worry in my current university situation.	Affirmative	35	77%	-0.183
	Negative	6	83%	0.000
I think about how as classmate we interact with each other.	Affirmative	28	93%	0.202
	Negative	13	76%	0.117
			significance	
			percept	desire
I think universities should teach students more about the matters referred to in the questions above.	Affirmative	32	0.426	0.332
	Negative	9	0.910	0.075

Table 5: Subscale 4: Questions related to the Cost of Self-awareness

QUESTION	Perception	of 41	Desire	sig
I feel vulnerable.	Affirmative	27	93%	0.245
	Negative	14	71%	0.563
I feel exposed.	Affirmative	24	63%	0.082
	Negative	17	35%	0.472
I find making changes is difficult and scary.	Affirmative	21	81%	0.008
	Negative	20	60%	0.377
I feel guilty for criticizing others.	Affirmative	29	48%	-0.101
	Negative	12	47%	0.686
I feel my emotions deeply.	Affirmative	31	52%	0.332
	Negative	10	80%	0.000
I find it scary to try something new or step out of what I know.	Affirmative	24	88%	0.371
	Negative	17	77%	-0.173
I have had to revisit difficult past experiences.	Affirmative	30	44%	0.142
	Negative	11	46%	-0.483

This initial admiration of the questionnaire had only 41 participants, thus it is too few to properly reflect the student population. However, tendencies were revealed. The results of the questionnaire show too weak a correlation to be of any significance to prove the first hypothesis—the more students self-reported engaging in a self-awareness activity, there did not appear to be an equal increase in said desire. The rows highlighted in grey-scale show a slight tendency on those specific questions. This, however, further negates the hypothesis in so far as nine of the ten instances are in cases when students self-reported not engaging in the activities. In six of the nine cases in the first three subscales, the correlation is negative, meaning that the less the students perceived themselves to be able to engage in the activity, the more they wished to learn about it.

Similarly, the second hypothesis is negated as there is little correlation, and the instances of possible correlation are all in cases when students, on average, self-reported not engaging in the activities mentioned in the subscale.

The third hypothesis shows no correlation at all. Thus, student desire to engage in the activities listed in a subscale was not reflected in their desire to have them taught in university. This raises the question as to where they propose to engage in these activities. Without further inquiry, this is unanswerable.

The fourth and fifth hypotheses are not quantified in the tables above. The final questions of the questionnaire asked for student opinions regarding personality typology tests and the number of times they had taken a such a test. The answer to the question of quantity of tests taken was then correlated to the students' average, self-reported engagement as well as desired engagement in each of the self-awareness activities. The results are in table 6.

Table 6: Hypotheses regarding typology tests and self-awareness.

Hypothesis	sig
An increased number of typology tests taken will result in an increase in student perception of self-awareness.	-0.257
An increased number of typology tests taken will result in an increase in student desire to action regarding self-awareness.	0.000

Again, there appears to be little to no correlation regarding the number of personality typology tests taken and either the students' self-perception of action or desire to action.

Overall, none of the hypotheses appeared to have strong correlation. As mentioned above, however, the number of students surveyed is too low to accurately represent the student population. Nevertheless, the one statistic that seems promising and prompts the need for further study is the high rate at which students indicated a desire to engage in the activities. These averages are listed in table 7.

Table 7: Average of the percentages for student desire to action in self-awareness activities

Subscales	average
reflective self-development	91%
acceptance of self and others	86%
proactive at work	84%
costs of self-awareness	63%

The results show that for the first three subscales, students exhibit a strong desire to action. The fourth subscale was related to the more negative impacts of self-awareness. Thus, it comes as no surprise students were more reluctant to engage in activities within this subscale, even if the questions of desire were phrased so as to reflect improving the ability to overcome the negative impacts of these activities.

4 Further Discussion

Once again, as an ongoing study there are no definitive conclusions. However, the strong desire to engage in some of the positive aspect of self-awareness shown in Table 7 suggests that further study is necessary. Therefore, the next stage should be refining the questionnaire to exclude the fourth subscale and administering it to a larger student population. Additionally, a better execution of several personality typology tests in EMP sessions is necessary.

Appendix A: Questionnaire

sub-scale	First section of the questionnaire (perceived action)	Second section of the questionnaire (desire for improvement)
Reflective Self-development	I observe myself.	I think I should observe myself more.
	I have insight into myself.	I think I should have better insight into myself.
	I look at why people act the way they do.	I think I should consider why people act the way they do.
	I have learnt about myself and how I see the world.	I think I should learn about myself and how I see the world.
	I am continuing to develop myself.	I think I should continue developing myself.
	I focus on ways of changing my behavior for the better.	I think I should change some of my behaviors for the better.
	I feel generally positive about self-awareness.	I think I should be more positive about self-awareness
	I reassess my own and others' responsibilities.	I think I should assess my own and others' responsibilities.
	I'm aware of my abilities and limitations.	I think I should be more aware of my abilities and limitations.
	I am reflective.	I think I should be more reflective.
	I am realistic about myself.	I think I should be realistic about myself.
		I think universities should teach students more about the matters referred to above.

Acceptance of Self and Others	I have a good self-image.	I think I should improve my self-image.
	I feel on the whole very comfortable with the way I am.	I think I should become comfortable with myself.
	I have fun.	I think I should have more fun.
	I am consistent in different situations or with different people.	I think I should become more consistent.
	I have compassion and acceptance for others.	I think I should become more compassionate and accepting of others.
	I interact well with classmates or peers.	I think I should interact with classmates or peers better.
	I understand myself well.	I think I should understand myself better.
	I am confident.	I think I should be more confident.
	I stop and think before judging.	I think I should stop and think before judging.
	I understand my emotions.	I think I should understand my emotions better.
	I am objective.	I think I should become more objective.
I think universities should teach students more about the matters referred to above.		
Proactive at University	I see my life as something I have power to affect.	I think I should try to have more power to affect my life.
	I can separate myself from situations to understand them better.	I think I should try to separate myself from situations to understand them better.
	I am content with my university situation.	I think I should try to be content with my university situation.
	I think about how my personality fits with university student responsibilities.	I think I should consider how my personality fits with university responsibilities.
	I understand how I work within a team.	I think I should consider how I work within a team.
	I have changed the way I do tasks.	I think I should try to take control of my tasks.
	I take control of my tasks.	
	I recognize the stress and worry in my current university situation.	I think I should consider the stress and worry in my current university situation.
	I think about how as classmate we interact with each other.	I think I should consider how as classmates we interact with each other.
	I think universities should teach students more about the matters referred to above.	
Costs of Self-awareness	I feel vulnerable.	I wish I felt less vulnerable.
	I feel exposed.	I wish I felt less exposed.
	I find making changes is difficult and scary.	I wish I felt change not to be difficult or scary.
	I feel guilty for criticizing others.	I wish I felt less guilty for criticizing other.
	I feel my emotions deeply.	I wish I felt my emotions less deeply.
	I find it scary to try something new or step out of what I know.	I wish I felt that new and unfamiliar things were not scary.
	I have had to revisit difficult past experiences.	I wish I didn't have to revisit difficult past experiences.
Personality Tests	I have taken personality tests ___ times.	
	I think the results of personality tests are valid.	
	I think psychology trait tests helped me to understand yourself better?	
	Why did you take the tests?	
	If you can remember any of the names of the tests, please list them below.	

References

- Aquinas, St. T. (1274). *Summa Theologica, Part I–II (Pars Prima Secundae) From the Complete American Edition*. Retrieved from <https://www.gutenberg.org/ebooks/17897>
- Born C. A. (2009). In the Footsteps of the Master: Confucian Values in Anime and Manga. *ASIANetwork Exchange*, 18(1), 39-53. Retrieved from <http://www.ebscohost.com>
- Campbell, J. (2001). *Thou Art That: Transforming Religious Metaphor*. Novato, CA: New World Library.
- Doi, T. (1986). *The Anatomy of Self: The Individual Versus Society*. Tokyo, Japan: Kodansha International.
- Efklides, A & Tsiora, A (2002). Metacognitive Experiences, Self-concept, and Self-regulation. *Psychologia*, 45, 222-236. Retrieved from <http://www.ebscohost.com>
- Emre, M. (2018). *The Personality Brokers: The Strange History of Myers–Briggs and the Birth of Personality Testing*. New York, NY: Doubleday. [Kindle for iPad]. Retrieved from <http://www.amazon.com>
- Erikson, E. H. (1980). *Identity and the Life Cycle*. New York, NY: W. W. Norton & Company.
- Ewen, R. B. (1998). *An Introduction to Theories of Personality, 5th Ed.* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Fromm, E. (1949). *Man for Himself: An Enquiry into the Psychology of Ethics*. London, UK. Routledge & Kegan Paul, Ltd.
- Grant, R. W. (2010). Is Humanistic Education Humanizing? In E. Kiss & J.P. Euben (Ed.) *Debating Moral Education: Rethinking the Role of the Modern University*. (loc. 5172-5386). Durham, NC: Duke University Press. [Kindle for iPad]. Retrieved from <http://www.amazon.com>
- Harris, S. (2010). *The Moral Landscape: How Science Can Determine Human Values*. New York, NY: Free Press.
- Hoekema, D. A. (2010). Is There an Ethicist in the House? How Can We Tell? In E. Kiss & J.P. Euben (Ed.) *Debating Moral Education: Rethinking the Role of the Modern University*. (loc. 4574-4872). Durham, NC: Duke University Press. [Kindle for iPad]. Retrieved from <http://www.amazon.com>
- Jay, M. (2013). *The Defining Decade: Why Your Twenties Matter and How to Make the Most of Them Now*. New York, NY: Hachette Book Group
- Jung, C. G. (1954). *The Collected Works of C. G. Jung, Vol. 17, Development of Personality*. New York, NY: Princeton University Press.
- Jung, C. G. (1969). *The Collected Works of C. G. Jung, Vol. 8, The Structure and Dynamics of the Psyche*. New York, NY: Princeton University Press.
- Jung, C. G. (1971). *The Collected Works of C. G. Jung, Vol. 6, Psychological Types*. New York, NY: Princeton University Press.
- Jung, C. G. (1979). Approaching the Unconscious. In C. G. Jung (Ed.) *Man and His Symbols*. (pp. 1-94). New York, NY: Dell Publishing Co., Inc.
- Jung, C. G. (2011). *Modern Man in Search of a Soul*. North American eBook. [Kindle for iPad]. Retrieved from <http://www.amazon.com>
- Jung, C. G. (2014). *The Undiscovered Self*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Kiss, E., & Euben, J.P. (2010). *Debating Moral Education: Rethinking the Role of the Modern University*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press. [Kindle for Android]. Retrieved from <http://www.amazon.com>
- Martin, E. (2015, December 26). The 20 Best Nonfiction Books of 2015, *Business Insider Website*. Retrieved from <https://www.businessinsider.com/the-20-best-nonfiction-books-of-2015-2015-12>
- Myers, S. (2019). *Myers–Briggs Typology VS Jungian Individuation: Overcoming One–sidedness in Self and Society*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Reuben, J. A. (2010). The Changing Contours of Moral Education in American Colleges and Universities. In E. Kiss & J.P. Euben (Ed.) *Debating Moral Education: Rethinking the Role of the Modern University*. (loc. 604-1091). Durham, NC: Duke University Press. [Kindle for iPad]. Retrieved from <http://www.amazon.com>
- Rubin, G. (2015). *Better than Before: Mastering the Habits of Our Everyday Lives*. New York, NY: Crown Publishing Group.
- Sutton, A. (2016). Measuring the Effects of Self-Awareness: Construction of the Self-Awareness Outcomes Questionnaire. *Europe's Journal of Psychology*, 12(4), 645–658. Retrieved from <http://www.ebscohost.com>