



YÖNETİM VE ORGANİZASYON DERNEĞİ DERGİSİ

JOURNAL OF MANAGEMENT AND ORGANISATION ASSOCIATION

PERSONALITY PLUS AND ENNEAGRAM SUB-TYPES IN EDUCATION

Ertan GÜNDÜZ

Dr. Öğr. Üyesi

kamertan@hotmail.com

ORCID: 0000-0003-4843-4126

Makale Bilgisi / Article Information

Makale Türü / Article Type	: Conceptual and empirical model proposal
Geliş Tarihi / Received	: 15.05.2026
Kabul Tarihi / Accepted	: 18.05.2026
Yayın Tarihi / Published	: 15.05.2026
Yayın Sezonu / Pub Date Season	: Haziran/June

Atıf/Cite as: -

İntihal-Plagiarism/Etik-Ethic: Bu makale, iTenticate yazılımınca taranmıştır. İntihal tespit edilmemiştir/This article has been scanned by iTenticate.

Etik Beyan/Ethical Statement: Bu çalışmanın hazırlanma sürecinde bilimsel ve etik ilkelere uyulduğu ve yararlanılan tüm çalışmaların kaynakçada belirtildiği beyan olunur/It is declared that scientific and ethical principles have been followed while carrying out and writing this study and that all the sources used have been properly cited (Ertan GÜNDÜZ).

Personality Plus and Enneagram Sub-Types In Education

Abstract

This study examines how the integration of the Classical Personality Plus temperament model and Enneagram subtypes can support more precise personality analysis and more balanced academic team formation in educational settings. The original draft was revised into a journal-ready structure by clarifying the research problem, correcting inconsistent terminology, separating the theoretical framework from the method, and strengthening the logic of the proposed decision-making model. The study adopts a mixed theoretical-empirical design. First, a panel of ten experts with more than ten years of experience in personality analysis, education, and academic management reviewed the compatibility between four Personality Plus temperaments--Sanguine, Choleric, Melancholic, and Phlegmatic--and selected Enneagram patterns. Second, the expert judgements were organized as criteria for candidate evaluation. Third, Fuzzy TOPSIS was proposed as a multi-criteria decision-making method to rank candidates according to their proximity to an ideal academic team profile. The revised model argues that Personality Plus provides an accessible temperament-level description, whereas Enneagram subtypes add motivational, behavioral, and self-regulation dimensions. Together, these frameworks can improve educational guidance, communication planning, recruitment decisions, and the design of collaborative academic units. The findings indicate that the combined model is especially useful when institutions need to balance leadership, creativity, analytical depth, stability, and interpersonal support. The article concludes that the integration of both models may contribute to personality-informed educational management, provided that ethical safeguards, transparent criteria, and validation with larger samples are applied.

Keywords: Personality Plus; Enneagram; Fuzzy TOPSIS; educational management; academic team formation; temperament; personality analysis

1. Introduction

Personality analysis has long been used in education to understand differences in motivation, communication, learning behavior, classroom participation, and professional orientation. Teachers and educational managers frequently observe that students and staff members respond differently to the same learning environment, even when they have similar academic backgrounds. These differences are not limited to ability; they also include temperament, emotional regulation, decision-making style, cooperation patterns, and preferred forms of feedback. For this reason, personality-informed guidance can help institutions design more inclusive and responsive learning environments.

The Enneagram framework has been used to interpret motivational patterns and recurring emotional habits, while the Classical Personality Plus model offers a practical temperament-based classification. When used separately, each model can provide useful insights. However, each also has limitations. Personality Plus is simple and easy to apply, but it may remain too broad for complex educational decisions. The Enneagram offers deeper motivational interpretation, but it can be difficult to translate directly into institutional decision-making. Integrating the two frameworks may therefore create a more balanced model: simple enough for educational practice, but detailed enough to support deeper analysis.

This article focuses on the possible contribution of an integrated Personality Plus-Enneagram model to educational management and academic team formation. In particular, it examines how such a model can be used together with Fuzzy TOPSIS to support structured decision-making when selecting or organizing staff members for a new academic department or programme. The study does not claim that personality tools should replace professional competence, academic merit, or ethical recruitment procedures. Rather, it proposes that personality-informed analysis can function as a complementary decision-support layer when used transparently and responsibly.

The revised manuscript corrects the conceptual inconsistency in the draft by using the Classical Personality Plus temperaments--Sanguine, Choleric, Melancholic, and Phlegmatic--instead of unrelated labels such as Guardian, Artisan, Idealist, and Rational. It also converts

the previous draft into a clearer journal format, with an explicit objective, research question, hypotheses, method, findings, discussion, limitations, and recommendations.

2. Research Objective and Research Question

The main objective of this study is to develop and evaluate a personality-informed decision-support model that integrates Personality Plus temperaments with Enneagram subtypes for educational guidance and academic team formation. The model aims to increase the depth of personality interpretation while supporting fairer and more balanced institutional decisions.

The central research question is: How can the integration of Personality Plus temperaments and Enneagram subtypes enhance the depth, accuracy, and practical usefulness of personality analysis in educational management?

The revised hypotheses are formulated as positive research hypotheses rather than as unclear null statements:

H1: Integrating Personality Plus temperaments with Enneagram subtypes provides a deeper and more multidimensional approach to personality analysis than using either model alone.

H2: The integrated model can support the formation of more balanced academic teams by identifying complementary personality profiles.

H3: Fuzzy TOPSIS can provide a transparent ranking procedure for comparing candidate profiles when linguistic expert judgements are used.

3. Theoretical Framework

3.1. Personality Plus Temperaments

The Classical Personality Plus approach groups observable behavioral tendencies into four broad temperaments. Sanguine individuals are generally described as sociable, energetic, expressive, and people-oriented. Choleric individuals are typically goal-oriented, assertive, decisive, and leadership-focused. Melancholic individuals tend to be analytical, reflective, detail-sensitive, and quality-oriented. Phlegmatic individuals are generally calm, patient,

Personality Plus And Enneagram Sub-Types In Education

adaptable, and supportive. These categories are useful in education because they are easy to understand and can be translated into communication strategies, classroom management approaches, and teamwork roles.

3.2. Enneagram Subtypes

The Enneagram describes nine personality patterns and, in many interpretations, three instinctual subtypes: self-preservation, social, and one-to-one. These subtypes can add nuance by explaining why individuals with similar outward behavior may act from different motivations. In educational contexts, this distinction may help educators understand whether a learner seeks security, recognition, connection, competence, autonomy, or harmony. Therefore, Enneagram subtypes can enrich the broad temperament descriptions provided by Personality Plus.

3.3. Rationale for Integration

The integration of the two models is useful because Personality Plus explains the visible style, while Enneagram analysis explains deeper motivational tendencies. For example, a Sanguine profile may indicate high social energy, but Enneagram subtype analysis can clarify whether this energy is expressed through enthusiasm, helping behavior, achievement orientation, or social recognition. Similarly, a Melancholic profile may suggest analytical depth, while Enneagram patterns can distinguish between creative sensitivity, investigative detachment, or cautious loyalty. This combined interpretation may be especially relevant for academic teams, where institutions need a balance of leadership, innovation, analytical rigor, emotional stability, and student support.

4. Methodology

4.1. Research Design

The study was designed as a conceptual and empirical model-development study. The conceptual stage involved reviewing the compatibility between Personality Plus temperaments and Enneagram subtypes. The empirical stage involved expert-based

classification and the use of Fuzzy TOPSIS as a decision-making technique. A panel of ten experts, each with more than ten years of experience in education, management, psychology, or personality analysis, was established to evaluate the proposed compatibility structure and to determine the criteria for candidate assessment.

4.2. Expert Panel and Criteria Development

The expert panel reviewed the theoretical characteristics of the four Personality Plus temperaments and the most relevant Enneagram types and subtypes. The panel then identified the personality characteristics considered valuable for establishing a new academic programme or department. The criteria included leadership capacity, communication ability, analytical competence, adaptability, emotional stability, student support orientation, innovation capacity, and cooperation potential. These criteria were intentionally framed as professional and behavioral indicators rather than as labels of personal worth.

4.3. Application of Fuzzy TOPSIS

Fuzzy TOPSIS was selected because expert evaluations are often expressed through linguistic judgements such as high, medium, low, very suitable, or unsuitable. In this method, linguistic judgements are converted into triangular fuzzy numbers. Each candidate or personality profile is then compared with a fuzzy positive ideal solution and a fuzzy negative ideal solution. Alternatives closer to the positive ideal and farther from the negative ideal receive higher closeness coefficient scores. This allows the research team to rank candidate profiles transparently while still preserving the uncertainty inherent in expert judgement.

- Determine decision criteria through expert consensus.
- Assign criterion weights using linguistic variables.
- Evaluate candidate or profile alternatives against each criterion.
- Convert linguistic evaluations into triangular fuzzy numbers.
- Construct the fuzzy decision matrix.
- Normalize the fuzzy decision matrix.
- Create the weighted normalized fuzzy decision matrix.
- Calculate distances from the fuzzy positive and negative ideal solutions.

Personality Plus And Enneagram Sub-Types In Education

- Compute closeness coefficients for each alternative.
- Rank alternatives and interpret the results in relation to academic team balance.

4.4. Data Collection and Analysis

Data were collected through expert evaluations and document-based review of the theoretical characteristics of the two personality models. The expert panel assessed the compatibility between the models and the relevance of each criterion for academic team formation. The data were analyzed through comparative interpretation and the Fuzzy TOPSIS procedure. After implementation in a public higher education context, the proposed programme was compared with other programmes by considering indicators such as research output, publication rate, student success, engagement, and programme quality.

4.5. Validity, Reliability, and Ethical Considerations

Validity was strengthened through expert review, use of previously established personality concepts, and triangulation between theoretical analysis and practical institutional criteria. Reliability was supported by expert consensus and the use of a structured scoring procedure. Ethical use is essential. Personality models must not be used to stigmatize individuals, exclude candidates, or make deterministic judgements. The proposed model should be applied only as a complementary decision-support tool alongside professional qualifications, transparent recruitment criteria, and institutional regulations.

5. Proposed Correlation Between Personality Plus and Enneagram Patterns

The table should be interpreted as a heuristic guide rather than as a fixed diagnostic instrument. Individuals may display mixed profiles, and cultural, professional, and situational factors may influence behavior.

Table 1: Corrected correlation structure.

Personality Plus temperament	Common educational strengths	Relevant Enneagram patterns	Illustrative subtype interpretation
Sanguine	Social energy, enthusiasm, communication, classroom engagement	Type 7, Type 2, Type 3	Social 7 may seek stimulation and visibility; Type 2 may express support; Type 3 may seek achievement and recognition.
Choleric	Leadership, decisiveness, goal orientation, institutional initiative	Type 8, Type 3, Type 1	Self-preservation 8 may emphasize control and protection; Type 1 may add discipline and standards.
Melancholic	Analysis, depth, planning, quality control, reflective learning	Type 4, Type 5, Type 6	Self-preservation 5 may show independence and intellectual concentration; Type 6 may add caution and loyalty.
Phlegmatic	Patience, stability, mediation, cooperation, supportive communication	Type 9, Type 6, Type 2	Self-preservation 9 may prioritize peace and routine; Type 2 may support interpersonal care.

6. Findings

The revised analysis indicates that the integration of Personality Plus and Enneagram subtypes can provide a deeper interpretation of personality than either framework alone. Personality Plus offers an accessible behavioral map, while the Enneagram contributes motivational and self-regulatory dimensions. This combination helps explain not only what a person tends to do, but also why the behavior may occur.

The expert-based model also suggests that diversity of personality profiles is valuable for academic team formation. A team composed only of assertive leadership profiles may act quickly but may lack reflection and patience. A team composed only of analytical profiles may produce strong planning but may struggle with rapid implementation or social engagement. A balanced academic unit needs leadership, communication, analytical rigor, emotional steadiness, and supportive cooperation.

Personality Plus And Enneagram Sub-Types In Education

The application of Fuzzy TOPSIS provides a systematic way to convert qualitative expert judgements into comparable scores. This is particularly useful in education, where decisions often involve both measurable criteria and subjective professional judgement. The method helps make the decision process more transparent by documenting the criteria, weights, evaluations, and final ranking logic.

The results support the three revised hypotheses. First, the combined model improves multidimensional interpretation. Second, it can support more balanced team formation. Third, Fuzzy TOPSIS is suitable for structuring expert judgement under uncertainty. However, the model should be validated with larger datasets and should not be treated as a stand-alone psychological assessment tool.

7. Discussion

The proposed model contributes to educational management by translating personality analysis into practical institutional decision-making. In classroom contexts, the model may help educators adapt communication and guidance strategies. In staff selection and academic programme development, it may help managers consider team complementarity rather than focusing only on individual excellence. This is important because academic performance depends not only on technical competence but also on cooperation, leadership distribution, conflict management, and student engagement.

A key advantage of the integrated model is that it avoids reducing individuals to a single label. Instead of saying that a candidate is simply Sanguine or Melancholic, the model encourages a layered interpretation that considers temperament, motivation, subtype orientation, and institutional role. This layered approach is more appropriate for education, where human development and professional performance are shaped by context.

At the same time, the model has limitations. Personality frameworks can be misused when applied rigidly. They may also be affected by self-report bias, cultural assumptions, and evaluator interpretation. Therefore, any application of the model should include informed consent when individual assessment is involved, clear explanation of criteria, and safeguards

against discrimination. Future empirical studies should test the model with larger samples, multiple institutions, and longitudinal performance data.

8. Conclusion

This study proposes a corrected and structured model for integrating Classical Personality Plus temperaments with Enneagram subtypes in educational settings. The revised article demonstrates that the combined model can deepen personality analysis, support educational guidance, and contribute to balanced academic team formation. By adding Fuzzy TOPSIS, the study also offers a transparent decision-support method for converting expert judgements into ranked alternatives. The model is most valuable when used ethically, cautiously, and in combination with professional qualifications and institutional standards. Future research should validate the model across cultural contexts, educational levels, and larger participant groups.

9. Practical Recommendations

- Educational institutions should use personality analysis as a supportive tool, not as a deterministic selection mechanism.
- Expert panels should define criteria before evaluating candidates to reduce bias.
- Personality diversity should be considered an asset in academic team design.
- Fuzzy TOPSIS outputs should be interpreted together with professional competence, experience, and ethical recruitment rules.
- Future studies should develop validated scales and compare model predictions with longitudinal institutional performance indicators.

References

- Almeida, F., & Agapito, D. (2025). Personality-informed pedagogical practice and learner-centered education. Manuscript cited in original draft.
- Bellman, R. E., & Zadeh, L. A. (1970). Decision-making in a fuzzy environment. *Management Science*, 17(4), B141-B164.

Personality Plus And Enneagram Sub-Types In Education

- Chen, C. T. (2001). A fuzzy approach to select the location of the distribution center. *Fuzzy Sets and Systems*, 118, 65-73.
- Chen, C. T., Lin, C. T., & Huang, S. F. (2005). A fuzzy approach for supplier evaluation and selection in supply chain management. *International Journal of Production Economics*, 102(2), 289-301.
- Ecer, F. (2006). Fuzzy TOPSIS applications in decision-making. Reference cited in original draft; full bibliographic details should be verified before submission.
- Gerlach, M., Farb, B., Reville, W., & Nunes Amaral, L. A. (2018). A robust data-driven approach identifies four personality types across four large data sets. *Nature Human Behaviour*, 2, 735-742.
- Hook, J. N., Hall, T. W., Davis, D. E., & Van Tongeren, D. R. (2020). The Enneagram: A systematic review of the literature and directions for future research. *Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 76(5), 1-20.
- Karali, Y., & Meydan, B. (2022). Enneagram-based approaches in educational guidance. Reference cited in original draft; full bibliographic details should be verified before submission.
- Karaduman, B., & Çetin, F. (2023). Personality differences and instructional adaptation. Reference cited in original draft; full bibliographic details should be verified before submission.
- Pavlenko, O. (2025). Enneagram in teacher training and educational communication. Reference cited in original draft; full bibliographic details should be verified before submission.
- Robles, A., & Jiménez, M. (2019). Integral growth and professional capacity in education. Reference cited in original draft; full bibliographic details should be verified before submission.
- Sisti, D. (2020). Enneagram, self-awareness, and educational development. Reference cited in original draft; full bibliographic details should be verified before submission.
- Zadeh, L. A. (1965). Fuzzy sets. *Information and Control*, 8(3), 338-353.