The Personal Globe Inventory (PGI) is designed to measure your interests in activities and help you relate these interests to life decisions such as what to choose for a career and/or a major focus of study, as well as what hobbies and out of work interests you may find rewarding. The goal of the PGI is to give you a model to think about interests and relate how your interests are similar and different from those of other people.

This manual serves as an update of the original manual published in 2002 and the manual for the PGI-Short published in 2010 both in the *Journal of Vocational Behavior* (Tracey, 2002, 2010). The differences here reflect only the inclusions of newer norms for the test taker and integration of scores with O*NET occupations and majors.

There are three versions of the PGI, the extended PGI which is only available on a standalone PC program (available at [http://tracey.faculty.asu.edu/](http://tracey.faculty.asu.edu/)), the regular PGI and the PGI-Short; the latter two of which are available on the internet ([http://pgi.asu.edu](http://pgi.asu.edu)). The extended PGI contains three different sets of items: 108 occupation preference, 113 activity preference and 113 activity competence items. The regular PGI contains only the 113 activity preference and 113 activity competence items. Given that Tracey (2002) found that the different scale types were equally valid, the regular PGI omitting the occupation preference items was adopted as the standard. Finally the PGI-Short was developed using Item Response Theory (IRT) analysis (Tracey, 2010) and consists of only 40 activity preference and 40 activity competence items. Given its shorter length, the PGI-S does not provide all of the scores of the regular PGI.

**How to use the PGI**

The PGI is similar to someone asking you a series of questions about what you like to do and then summarizing your answers into an easy to understand set of scales that represent major interest areas. The goal is to help you organize your thinking about your interests. An advantage to using a formal interest measure like the PGI is that you also get to see how your interests compare to those of others. The information reported can help you think through important life decisions by providing information on:

-what to choose for a career
-what to choose for a major or program of study
-how am I different from others in terms of what I like to do
-new career possibilities that I had not previously considered
-confirm current career plans
-find out new outside-career interests
-help select both a career and hobbies to make me happiest

In general, the more your career, area of study, and outside of work activities match your interests, the more satisfied you will be. The goal is to provide information on your interest area so that you can choose those areas in which you will most likely be satisfied. Examine the scores reported in your PGI profile and use them to think further about your choices.

The PGI does NOT measure your actual abilities, only what you like and feel good at doing. So the scores do not represent how well you will perform in different activities or jobs, only the extent to which you might enjoy doing them.

The PGI is broad enough to provide a wealth of information on a wide range of interest areas. There are over 151 separate scores that are calculated for each individual. However this is far too many scales to be helpful to most all test-takers and further, not all the information is relevant for all individuals. To better enable you to use the most relevant information, only those scores most pertinent to you will be presented. The reporting of scores and the interpretive information are thus geared to you individually. No two individuals will have identical scores reported nor will similar interpretations be made. Indeed, if you compared your report with those of others, you may find that there is little similarity in terms of what is reported, with each having very different charts reported. Of course, you are provided with a complete set of scores on your Technical Information Summary, but only the most important scales are selected for graphing.

**Personal Globe model:**

Research (Tracey, 1997, 2002, 2010; Tracey & Rounds, 1996) has demonstrated that the major interest areas can be represented as points on the surface of a three-dimensional globe, those interest areas closer to each other are more similar and those far apart are dissimilar. The globe is defined by the three dimensions of People versus Things; Data versus Ideas and Prestige. The most important set of interest areas are those that exist on the equator and this set is called the Basic Interest Area Scales which form the basis of the PGI interpretation (depicted in gray below). This Basic Interest Area is the typical way to represent interests. The most common example of this Basic Interest Circle is The six personality types of John Holland (1997). These six types (Realistic, Investigative, Artistic, Social, Enterprising and Conventional, collectively referred to as RIASEC) are included in almost all interest inventories.
Using this model one can “slice up” the globe in any number of different sections. The Personal Globe uses eight types instead of the Holland’s six. It was thought that the eight type model was more easily understood by all and were more specific than the more global scales of Holland. As such the arrangement of the 6 RIASEC types and the 8 PGI octant scales and the two underlying dimensions of People-Things and Data-Ideas are represented in Figure 2. Note that the closer the points are the more similar they are. [Definitions for all of the scales are contained in Appendix 1]
Figure 2. Personal Globe representation of the Basic Interest Circle.

**Basic Interest Areas:** PGI Octant Scores

**Social Facilitating**
Scale measures interest in working with other people by selling, assisting, providing information or administering such services. Occupations related to this area include: Social Service Director, Personnel Director, Publicity Director, Salesperson, Travel Agent, and Aerobics Instructor.

**Managing**
An interest in managing and planning the major activities of business or organizations. The scale includes such activities as processing information, problem solving and decision making, forecasting and planning ahead, communication to others, organizing, coordinating, and supervising others, and persuading. Office Manager, Department Store Manager, Sales Clerk, Sales Manager, and Hotel Manager are examples of occupations scoring high on this scale.
Business Detail
Accounting, assessing, estimating, advising, and budgeting are interests of people scoring high on this scale. Occupations such as Financial Analyst, Bank Examiner, Cost Estimator, and Certified Public Accountant are related to this area.

Data Processing
An interest in the use of mathematics and systems for the analysis and interpretation of data and for clarifying and solving technical problems are represented by this scale. Electrical Engineer, Computer Programmer, and Microelectronics Technician are some of the occupations scoring high on this scale.

Mechanical
Understanding how machinery works and designing, installing and maintaining machinery are the main focus of this scale. Machinery includes large engines to machine tools. Occupational examples are: Airplane Mechanic, Auto Mechanic, Avionics Technician, Chemical Engineer, and Machinist.

Nature/Outdoors
Applying knowledge of the life sciences to plants and animals are interests shared by Ecologist, Forester, Oceanographer, Naturalist, Fish & Game Warden, and Veterinarian.

Artistic
Scale measures interest in visual, performing and literary arts as expressed in occupations such Sculptor, Musician, Composer, Poet, Playwright, and Author.

Helping
An interest in helping relationships with people from all age groups is measured by this scale. Liking to teach, provide for, support, and counsel are interests of people in occupations such as Speech Therapist, School Counselor, Social Worker, Child Care Worker, Family Therapist, and Educational Psychologist.

Basic Interest Areas: PGI Holland Scores

Realistic: Preferring to work with ones hands and with objects. Occupations include civil engineers and carpenters.

Investigative: Preferring to work with ideas and figure out how things work. Occupations include scientists and mathematicians.

Artistic: Preferring to work with ideas but through artistic expression. Occupations include painters, dancers and authors.
Social: Preferring to spend time with others and helping others. Occupations include teachers and social workers.

Enterprising: Preferring to work with others but through persuasion or selling. Occupations include sales and managers.

Conventional: Preference for routine, structured activities. Occupations include accountant and bank examiner.

In addition to the basic interest circle, the Personal Globe incorporates the added dimension of prestige. When this is added, a set of 18 points equally distributed around the globe result. The 18 scales are represented in Figure 3. Again, the closer the scales are the more similar they are. So in addition to the PGI octant scales around the equator, there are 5 high prestige scales and 5 low prestige scales.

Higher Prestige Interest Areas (Some scales omitted in PGI-Short)

Social Sciences (PGI only)
Helping others solve medical and psychological problems in a personal manner are activities associated with occupations such as Clinical Psychologist, Psychiatric Case Worker, Pediatrician, and Family Physician.

Influence
This scale measures an interest in leading and directing people in business, politics, and science. People scoring high like to influencing people's behavior through persuasion and are found in occupations such as Scientific Research Director, Research Scientist, Surgeon, Physicist, and Astronomer.

Business Systems (PGI only)
Writing and designing programs and systems, and applying this knowledge to business and finance is the main focus of this scale. Business Computer Specialist, Business Programmer, System Analyst, and Computer Consultant are examples of occupations scoring high.

Financial Analysis (PGI only)
People in this interest area work directly with customers on their finances. Occupational examples are: Budget Consultant, Business Management Analyst, Market Research Analyst, Personal Investment Analyst, Consumer Affairs Director, and Stockbroker.

Science (PGI only)
Studying phenomena, conducting research, and developing knowledge in biological, physical, and behavior sciences are the areas of interest tapped by this scale. Biologist, Anthropologist, Earth Scientist, Geologist, and Chemist are some of the occupations related to this area.
Lower Prestige Interest Areas (Some scales omitted in PGI-Short)

Quality Control (PGI only)
Checking and protecting the quality and safety of products, materials, and services are interests of people who have high scores on this scale. People with high scores are often found in occupations like Locksmith, Bridge Inspector, Building Inspector, and High School Shop Teacher.

Manual Work
An interest in operating machinery or vehicles and attendant services and working in occupations that have minimal training requirements is expressed by people in these occupations: Maid, Meter Reader, Window Cleaner, Ride Attendant, Cloakroom Attendant, and Bus Driver

Personal Service (PGI only)
Interests in activities offering help to people in everyday transactions is the focus of this scale. People scoring high on the scale like serving others food and drink, giving them information, helping them buy clothes, and seeing to their comfort. Examples of occupations are: Flight Attendant, Sightseeing Guide, Waiter/Waitress, Travel Guide, and Personal Shopper.

Construction/Repair (PGI only)
An interest in working outdoors, working with one's hands building structures and operating or repairing machines is the focus of this scale. Occupations include: Bulldozer Operator, Crane Operator, Tree Pruner, Construction Worker, Roofer, and Building Contractor

Basic Services (PGI only)
This scale measures interest in selling products and services, greeting people, making reservations, renting equipment, and cleaning. People scoring high usually work directly with the customer in such occupations as Receptionist, Hotel Clerk, Hair Stylist, Mail Clerk, Escort, and Secretary
Figure 3: Complete mapping of 18 PGI scales and the three dimensions. Top part is a representation of the globe looking down from the north pole and the bottom is a representation looking up from the south pole.
So the Personal Globe model is a very general representation of interests. It carries many scales and can provide a very complete representation of a person’s interests and how these can match the occupational and educational world.

**Test description**

**PGI**
The PGI is composed of three sets of items: 108 Occupational titles to which respondents endorse their liking from 1 = Strongly Dislike to 7 = Strongly Like; 113 Occupational activities to which the respondents endorse their liking (1 = Strongly Dislike to 7 = Strongly Like) and their perceived competence (1 = Unable to do to 7 = Very Competent). In the extended PGI all three sets of items are given for a total of 334 items. But the more common PGI uses only the occupational activity items (for a total of 226 items).

121 total scores reported for each test taker:
- a. 18 scales of the Personal Globe (liking and competence combined) scored using general sample norm and also using same sex norms,
- b. 18 scales of the LIKING responses,
- c. 18 scales of the Competence responses,
- d. 18 (liking and competence combined) raw scores
- e. the four very general scales of: People, Things, Data, and Ideas (using both general norms and same sex norms),
- f. the six Holland RIASEC types (Realistic, Investigative, Artistic, Social, Enterprising, and Conventional), scores (both using general sample norms and same sex norms)
- g. the dimensional scores of the interest globe: People vs. Things, Data vs. Ideas, and Prestige. scores (both using general sample norms and same sex norms)
- h. The difference between liking scores and competence scores (both using general sample norms and same sex norms)
- i. Validity scales (liking; competence; difference)

In addition a similarity score is provided for each individual regarding how closely his or her interest profile matches all the occupations listed in the O*NET (over 1000) and all the college majors listed in the National Center for Educational Statistics Classification of Instructional Program (CIP) taxonomy (over 250)

**PGI-Short**
The PGI-Short is an abbreviated version of the PGI and is composed of 40 activities to which respondents endorse their liking from 1 = Strongly Dislike to 7 = Strongly Like; and their perceived competence (1 = Unable to do to 7 = Very
Competent). It yields fewer scale scores with the main difference being the omission of all the high and low prestige scale scores except the high prestige (north pole) and low prestige (south pole scale scores. So the PGI-S has only 81 total scores reported for each test taker:

- a. 8 basic interest scales of the Personal Globe and high and low prestige (liking and competence combined) scored using general sample norm and also using same sex norms,
- b. 8 basic interest scales and high and low prestige of the LIKING responses,
- c. 8 basic interest scales and high and low prestige of the Competence responses,
- d. 8 basic interest scales and high and low prestige (liking and competence combined) raw scores
- e. the four very general scales of: People, Things, Data, and Ideas (using both general norms and same sex norms),
- f. the six Holland RIASEC types (Realistic, Investigative, Artistic, Social, Enterprising, and Conventional), scores (both using general sample norms and same sex norms)
- g. the dimensional scores of the interest globe: People vs. Things, Data vs. Ideas, and Prestige. scores (both using general sample norms and same sex norms)
- h. The difference between liking scores and competence scores (both using general sample norms and same sex norms)
- i. Validity scales (liking; competence; difference)

The PGI and the PGI-Short are normed using a representative sample of high school and college students (ages ranging from 16-24 (mean 20.5). This sample contained 500 men and 500 women and were generated to represent the 2010 U. S. census with respect to ethnicity. The instrument reports all scores in T score units (mean =50, SD=10) relative to the total norm group and also relative to the same sex norm group.

**Individualized Reports**

The PGI provides a wealth of information (indeed too much for the average user. As such, each person’s score report is customized to take advantage of how each individual answers. There are three ways that the scores are plotted and reported that vary across people:

- Specific basic interest graph used (four or eight type)
- Endorsement of high or low prestige interests
- Similarity of Interests (activity liking) and Competence

*Basic Interest Graph (PGI and PGI-Short)*
The main piece of information is the graph of the basic interest circle. Most people only get this graph of the 8 type basic interest circle. From the Personal Globe model presented in Figure 1, this is the equator. Generally, the eight PCI octant scales from Figure 2 are presented and the scores for each scale graphed. An advantage to presenting the scores in a circular format is that this is how the scales are arranged in similarity. Scales next to each other are more similar and scales opposite as the most different. So the test taker can quickly look at his or her scores and see how they compare to similar and dissimilar other scale scores. The further the scale scores are from the center, the higher the scores. Figure 4 is an example of the graph of the 8 type scales.

Vector score: The single line from the origin represents an easy to understand summary of the scores and carries two different pieces of information.

The length of the line represents the strength of one’s interest. Long lines represent a clear interest pattern where the likes are strong and different from the dislikes. A short line represents a more undifferentiated pattern of interests where there is not at much distinction between the very different interest areas.

The angle of the line indicates what area the person has the strongest interest.
However if an individual has a low vector score (representing a low amount of differences across the interest areas), then a 4 type basic interest graph is presented. This 4 type model carries the same information as the 8 type but it is simpler. The reason for the simpler presentation is that the test taker is stating that he or she does not see that much difference among the various interest areas, so a simpler model is used as it more closely matches how the test taker is responding. This pattern of lower vector scores is more common in younger individuals who have not had much experience doing and testing out different activities. An example of the more basic interest circle is presented in Figure 5.

The scales reported on the four interest area report are:
- People: focuses on liking to be around others
- Data: focuses on detail activities
- Things: focuses on working with ones hands and on physical things
- Ideas: focuses on a preference for thinking about things
Four type graph

Figure 5: Example of a graph of the PGI four type basic interest circle.

**Prestige Scales**

**Importance of Prestige**

Continuing with the Globe description of the interest scales, the axis running between the north and south pole represents the importance of prestige in what you like to do. Prestige represents the general difficulty, training, knowledge, and education required of the various activities. Some people very much like activities that require extensive training and are difficult to perform. Others prefer activities that are easier to learn and require less training. There are many different interest areas that lie on the northern hemisphere of the PGI Globe reflecting high prestige and many others that lie on the southern hemisphere reflecting lower prestige.

If your scores to the PGI items showed a pattern for either lower or higher prestige interest areas, then these scales are reported and interpreted. For example if you liked the lower prestige activities, you would be provided with scores and charts on the lower prestige interest area scales. If you liked the higher prestige activities, you would be provided with the scores and charts of the higher prestige interest area scales. If you tended to favor neither higher nor lower prestige interests, neither the high nor low prestige scales would be highlighted in your interpretation.
The low prestige scales are:
- Quality Control: focuses on checking details
- Manual Work: focuses on working with hands or simple machines
- Personal Service: focuses on working with people in everyday transactions
- Construction/Repair: focuses on working with machinery to repair to build
- Basic Services: focuses on selling products and services.

The high prestige scales are:
- Social Sciences: focuses on psychological and medical helping
- Influence: focuses on leading and directing others
- Business Systems: focuses applying knowledge to running businesses
- Financial Analysis: focuses on helping others with financial issues
- Science: focuses on a general interest in science

One of the unique aspects of the PGI is that it incorporates prestige in addition to the more typical basic interest scales. Prestige represents the general difficulty, training, knowledge, and education required of the various activities. Some people very much like activities that require extensive training and are difficult to perform. So individuals scoring high on prestige are endorsing a preference for working hard on difficult activities. Others prefer activities that are easier to learn and require less training. Individuals who score low are endorsing a preference for less difficult tasks. Low scores may view themselves as more relaxed. There are many different interest areas that lie on the northern hemisphere of the Personal Globe reflecting high prestige and many others that lie on the southern hemisphere reflecting lower prestige. In the PGI there are 5 high prestige scales and 5 low prestige scales. If an individual’s prestige scores are average (having T scores between 40-60) then no prestige scales are graphed. Average scores are indicative of an average interest in prestige and as such neither the high nor low prestige scales will carry too much information for that individual.

Individuals who score high on prestige (T scores of 60 or higher) will have their prestige scales graphs. Figure 6 is an example of a high prestige graph. A similar graph but with the 5 lower prestige scales would be graphed if an individual scored low on prestige (T score of 40 or less).

The PGI-Short does not provide scores on eight of the ten of the high and low prestige scales only the high prestige and low prestige scales themselves.
In general, the activities that people like agree with those in which people see themselves as competent. The PGI measures both liking and competence perceptions and usually these are not differentiated. But some people score differently on the things they like and the things in which they see themselves as being competent. For these individuals there these differences exist, they are presented with different graphs, one representing interests and one representing competence. The graphs provide an easy means of seeing where the two do not agree. For example an individual might like artistic activities but not feel competent in such activities. In a case such as this, it might be valuable to look into increasing competence through instruction and or practice. Figure 7 is an example of the basic interest graph but where there is a difference between competence and liking scores. There can also be similar liking-competence discrepancy graphs for the high prestige scales or the low prestige scales, if this discrepancy manifested itself with these scales.
Figure 7: Example of Liking-Competence Discrepancy graph.

**Validity Items:**

The PGI and PGI-Short have different validity checks for random responding. In the middle of the presentation of the items to which the person is responding with the degree of liking, an extra item is added that states that the individual should endorse option 4. The same procedure occurs in the middle of the competence assessment. The program prints what the response option provided for each of these items. They both should be “4” or there could be random responding. Also two items are repeated in the PGI and the responses should be similar. The mean difference in the responses is presented as another indication of random responding. Mean differences should not be greater than 1 or it is possible that the test taker was not responding seriously to the instrument.

**Occupational and Major Match** (*PGI and PGI-Short*)

The occupational and educational information of the PGI is very complete with matches provided for a wide variety of occupations and majors.

**Occupations:** The PGI also lists all the occupations in the US O*NET system, the most comprehensive listing of occupations in the U.S. (well over 1000 different occupations). The previous version of the PGI (and the one used in the standalone version of the scale) provided matches to the 332 occupations in the Occupational Outlook Handbook. The shift in 2012 to the O*NET occupations enabled a listing of a broader range of occupations. These occupations are presented in order of similarity. Scores of 100=
perfect match of interests with that occupation or major. Scores of 0=perfect mismatch. So higher similarity scores indicate a better match of interests with the various occupations.

The PGI and PGI-Short also provide matches to the 16 Career Clusters created by the Office of Vocational and Adult Education (OVAE) because this system is used in some educational programs.

**Majors:** The PGI can provide a match with over 250 college majors that are listed in the National Center for Educational Statistics Classification of Instructional Program (CIP) taxonomy. This listing covers the types of majors offered in colleges and universities in the U.S. Since the PGI was developed at Arizona State University, all of the majors offered at ASU are also provided as a benefit for ASU students and staff. Like the occupations, the majors (both the general list and the ASU list) are ranked in terms of similarity from 100 (very similar) to 0 (very dissimilar).
Test Development

The PGI was developed in an empirical indicative manner and is described in detail elsewhere (Tracey, 2002), so only a summary is presented. Tracey and Rounds (1996) generated a large, broad, representative list of occupational titles. They then had a large sample of high school and college students respond with regard to their preference for each of these occupational titles. The preference ratings were then subjected to principal components analysis and they found that there were 4 components underlying the responses: a general component, People/Things, Data/Ideas, and prestige. They also
found that there was no simple structure; occupational titles were found to load on several of the components. Tracy and Rounds then determined that there were at least three circular arrangements of the items in the component space, creating a sphere. Given that the items were evenly spaced around the sphere, they then carved up the sphere into 24 different scales, resembling the current structure of the PGI.

However, the presence of the status component was controversial and some attributed it to existing only in tests that use occupational titles as items. To examine this, Tracey (1997) generated a broad, representative set of over 300 occupational activities and had high school and college students respond to the items regarding their preferring the activity (i.e., liking it) and again with respect to their perceived competence (i.e., self-efficacy). He demonstrated that again both liking and competence was described using the same 4 components and again both liking and competence could be mapped onto similar spherical structures. So activity preference, activity perceived competence and preference for occupational titles could be validly described using a spherical structure of the three dimensions of Data/Ideas, People/Things, and prestige.

Tracey (2002) reduced the item pool using the previous studies to create a set of 18 non-overlapping scales from each of the item types that were uniformly distributed around the sphere. This refined set of items became the Personal Globe Inventory and was originally made available via a free standing, downloadable computer program in the extended form with all three item types: occupational titles, activity preferences and activity competence. When it was put on the web it was reduced to only the activity items. Validity data supported the responses to each of the three scales either separately or in composite. Deleting the occupational items thus did not hurt any of the psychometric support and enabled a briefer administration.

The PGI-Short was developed using item response theory (IRT) by Tracey (2010). The responses to the activity items were examined and the best items selected to form a very brief version. The brief version was only designed to provide scale scores for the basic interest circle (octant scores, Holland’s 6 types, and the 4 types) as well as a simple high prestige and low prestige score. So all of the other high and low prestige scores were deleted. In addition, the IRT method enabled an examination of differential item functioning (DIF) of each item across gender. None of the items selected demonstrated a pattern of DIF. So the PGI-Short provides a good representation of the basic interest circle with the addition of two prestige scales only.

**Use of Test:**

The test is intended to provide useful information to individuals aged 14 to 30 relative to selecting majors and occupations or verifying choices that have been made. The norms are based on a representative sample of high school and college students (1000 males and 1000 females from different ethnic groups reflective of the proportions in the U.S. population) but the test can provide information that many older individuals considering a career change may find helpful.
The PGI is not recommended for use with adolescents under 14 as there has been no research support on its application to this age group as yet. If one is interested in assessing children and young adolescents, the Inventory of Children’s Activities is recommended (Tracey & Ward, 1998).

The PGI regular version (i.e., the one that only includes the activity items) has a reading grade level of under sixth grade (Flesch-Kincaid reading grade level: 5.79 and a Flesch Reading ease score of 61.88) so it can be used by a wide variety of individuals. The PGI occupational scales which are only part of the PGI extended have a higher reading threshold (Flesch-Kincaid reading grade level: 9.19 and a Flesch Reading ease score of 34.22) which is to be expected as occupational titles are more complex than occupational activities.

The PGI regular version is typically taken online as the calculations of all the scale scores is very involved. It is possible to administer the PGI or the PGI-Short in a paper and pencil format if one is only interested in obtaining the raw scale scores. The items and scoring is included in the Appendix. It takes generally 20-30 minutes to complete the regular PGI, while the PGI-Short takes roughly 10 minutes. Anyone can take the PGI in that there is no special access required but the test is complex and it would help to have a qualified professional assist with the interpretation.
Psychometric Support

Psychometric support for the PGI is detailed in Tracey (2002 and 2010) and will be summarized here. Table 1 presents the reliability estimates (internal consistency and two week test retest reliability) for the PGI. As can be seen, the internal consistency estimates (alpha) were uniformly high across the scales and the item types.

Structural validity. The Personal Globe model (like Holland’s model of six interest types) is based on the circular arrangement of the scales. Scales on the basic interest circle are arranged uniformly around the circle, with more similar scales closer to each other and more dissimilar ones more distant or opposite. A crucial demonstration of the validity of the instrument is the extent to which this circular structure holds in different samples. If the circular structure does not hold, then the underlying assumptions about the test and the basis of interpretation are inappropriate. To examine the validity of the circular model, each type of scale was examined for the extent to which it could be validly described using a circular model using the randomization test of hypothesized order relation (Hubert & Arabie, 1987; Tracey, 1997b). This test provides an inferential statistic indicating the significance of any departure in circular fit from chance as well as correlation of model-data fit (correspondence index, CI). The CI ranges from -1.0 to +1.0. A CI value of +1.0 indicates that the data perfectly fit the circle. A CI value of .00 indicates that the fit is roughly 50-50 and a value of -1.0 indicates that there is no fit to a circular structure.
Table 1

Internal Consistency and Test-Retest Reliability Estimates on Interest, Competence, Occupation, and Composite Subscales (N=1381)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Internal Consistency^a (α)</th>
<th>Two week Test-retest r^b</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Int. Comp. Occup. Composite</td>
<td>Composite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eight Basic Interest Scales</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Facilitating</td>
<td>0.69 0.80 0.81 0.88</td>
<td>0.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing</td>
<td>0.77 0.83 0.87 0.91</td>
<td>0.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Detail</td>
<td>0.74 0.89 0.81 0.95</td>
<td>0.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Processing</td>
<td>0.75 0.85 0.88 0.93</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanical</td>
<td>0.78 0.84 0.81 0.93</td>
<td>0.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature/Outdoors</td>
<td>0.79 0.82 0.89 0.92</td>
<td>0.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artistic</td>
<td>0.80 0.78 0.92 0.94</td>
<td>0.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helping</td>
<td>0.80 0.86 0.86 0.93</td>
<td>0.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five Higher Prestige</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Sciences</td>
<td>0.83 0.88 0.90 0.94</td>
<td>0.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Influence</td>
<td>0.85 0.88 0.89 0.89</td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business systems</td>
<td>0.82 0.88 0.88 0.91</td>
<td>0.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Analysis</td>
<td>0.85 0.88 0.90 0.90</td>
<td>0.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>0.86 0.89 0.90 0.93</td>
<td>0.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five Lower Prestige</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality Control</td>
<td>0.87 0.90 0.88 0.88</td>
<td>0.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manual work</td>
<td>0.88 0.88 0.88 0.94</td>
<td>0.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Service</td>
<td>0.89 0.90 0.91 0.95</td>
<td>0.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction/Repair</td>
<td>0.91 0.90 0.91 0.93</td>
<td>0.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic Services</td>
<td>0.92 0.92 0.89 0.90</td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Six Basic Interest Scales</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Realistic</td>
<td>0.85 0.87 0.89 0.93</td>
<td>0.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investigative</td>
<td>0.81 0.85 0.88 0.93</td>
<td>0.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artistic</td>
<td>0.86 0.89 0.90 0.95</td>
<td>0.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>0.86 0.89 0.92 0.94</td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enterprising</td>
<td>0.85 0.92 0.91 0.95</td>
<td>0.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conventional</td>
<td>0.92 0.91 0.91 0.95</td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four Basic Interest Scales</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Things</td>
<td>0.88 0.90 0.92 0.95</td>
<td>0.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideas</td>
<td>0.89 0.90 0.89 0.94</td>
<td>0.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People</td>
<td>0.88 0.89 0.88 0.95</td>
<td>0.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data</td>
<td>0.88 0.90 0.90 0.96</td>
<td>0.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three Dimensional Scales</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People/Things</td>
<td>0.94 0.94 0.93 0.97</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data/Ideas</td>
<td>0.91 0.95 0.95 0.96</td>
<td>0.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prestige</td>
<td>0.93 0.96 0.94 0.97</td>
<td>0.82</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

^a N=1381 across both high school and college samples

^b N=95 college students
Table 2 lists the results of the circular test on the data across different subgroups of high school and college students and across male and female students for all the different types of scales on the PGI. As can be seen there is a significant fit to the circular structure in each case and that the magnitude is high as demonstrated by the CI values. Indeed, the CI values for the Holland scales were higher than the benchmark found across other existing Holland measures (Rounds Tracey, 1996; Tracey & Rounds, 1993).

Table 2

Summary of the Results of the Randomization Test of Hypothesized Circular Order Relations Across Age and Gender Data Sets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>All</th>
<th>Females</th>
<th>Males</th>
<th>Male</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Eight Basic Interest Scales</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>High School Sample</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>181</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predictions Made</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>288</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predictions Met</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>241</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>.0004</td>
<td>.0004</td>
<td>.0004</td>
<td>.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CI</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>College Sample</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>1006</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>602</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predictions Made</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>288</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predictions Met</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>271</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>.0004</td>
<td>.0004</td>
<td>.0004</td>
<td>.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CI</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>High School vs. College</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CI difference</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P difference</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Six Basic Interest Scales** |
| **High School Sample** |
| N                     | 375 | 194     | 181   |
| Predictions Made      | 72  | 72      | 72    |
| Predictions Met       | 65  | 62      | 61    |
| P                     | .02  | .02     | .02   | .48  |
| CI                    | .80  | .72     | .69   | .01  |
| **College Sample**    |
| N                     | 1006| 390     | 602   |
| Predictions Made      | 72  | 72      | 72    |
| Predictions Met       | 68  | 69      | 63    |
| P                     | .02  | .02     | .02   | .39  |
| CI                    | .89  | .92     | .75   | .03  |
| **High School vs. College** |
| CI difference         | -.03 | -.19   | -.08  |
P difference    .38    .07    .28

**Spherical Model (18 scales)**

**High School Sample**

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predictions Made</td>
<td>9472</td>
<td>9472</td>
<td>9472</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predictions Met</td>
<td>7245</td>
<td>7355</td>
<td>7198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CI</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**College Sample**

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>1006</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>602</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predictions Made</td>
<td>9472</td>
<td>9472</td>
<td>9472</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predictions Met</td>
<td>7558</td>
<td>7762</td>
<td>7520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CI</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**High School vs. College**

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CI difference</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p difference</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The construct validity of the PGI scales were also examined as they varied across the different ethnic groups. This is an examination that the scales are being responded to similarly across the different groups. The randomization test results across ethnic group are reported in Table 3e. As can be seen, there is a very similar fit of the PGI responses to the circular model in each ethnic group, supporting the use of the PGI with different U.S. ethnic groups. Rounds and Tracey (1996) found that in general, there was poorer fit to the circular for Holland scales when used with U.S. ethnic minorities. The PGI does not demonstrate this problem.
### Table 3

**Summary of the Results of the Randomization Test of Hypothesized Circular Order Relations Across Ethnicity Data Sets**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>All</th>
<th>Euro</th>
<th>African</th>
<th>Asian</th>
<th>Latino</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Eight Basic Interest Scales</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>High School Sample</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>84</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predictions Made</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>288</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predictions Met</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>257</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p</td>
<td>.0004</td>
<td>.0004</td>
<td>.0004</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CI</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>College Sample</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>1006</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predictions Made</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predictions Met</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p</td>
<td>.0004</td>
<td>.0004</td>
<td>.0004</td>
<td>.0004</td>
<td>.0004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CI</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Combined High School and College Sample</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>1381</td>
<td>852</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predictions Made</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predictions Met</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p</td>
<td>.0004</td>
<td>.0004</td>
<td>.0004</td>
<td>.0004</td>
<td>.0004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CI</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Six Basic Interest Scales</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>High School Sample</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>84</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predictions Made</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predictions Met</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CI</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>College Sample</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>1006</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predictions Made</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predictions Met</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CI</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Combined High School and College Sample</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>1381</td>
<td>852</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predictions Made</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predictions Met</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CI</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Spherical Model (18 scales)**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>375</th>
<th>202</th>
<th>84</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Predictions Made</td>
<td>9472</td>
<td>9472</td>
<td>9472</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predictions Met</td>
<td>7245</td>
<td>7284</td>
<td>7146</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CI</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>1006</th>
<th>650</th>
<th>151</th>
<th>89</th>
<th>80</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Predictions Made</td>
<td>9472</td>
<td>9472</td>
<td>9472</td>
<td>9472</td>
<td>9472</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predictions Met</td>
<td>7558</td>
<td>7589</td>
<td>7504</td>
<td>7452</td>
<td>7298</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CI</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>1381</th>
<th>852</th>
<th>235</th>
<th>123</th>
<th>110</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Predictions Made</td>
<td>9472</td>
<td>9472</td>
<td>9472</td>
<td>9472</td>
<td>9472</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predictions Met</td>
<td>7597</td>
<td>7522</td>
<td>7258</td>
<td>7356</td>
<td>7235</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CI</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
To examine the concurrent validity of the scale, the PGI Holland scales were correlated with General Occupational theme scales from the Strong Interest Inventory (SII, Harmon, et al. 1994) which assess interests and the scales form the Skills, Confidence Inventory (SCI, Betz et al., 1996). The correlations are presented in Table 4. As expected the PGI interest scales correlated highly with the SII interest scales and the PGI competence scales correlated highly with the SCI scales supporting the validity of the PGI scales.

Table 4
Correlations of SII and SCI Scale Scores with the Similar PGI RIASEC

Scores for the College Sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>SII</th>
<th>SCI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>831</td>
<td>404</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGI Interest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Realistic</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investigative</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artistic</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enterprising</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conventional</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGI Competence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Realistic</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investigative</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artistic</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enterprising</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conventional</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGI Occupation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Realistic</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investigative</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artistic</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enterprising</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conventional</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGI Composite</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Realistic</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investigative</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artistic</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enterprising</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conventional</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The PGI-Short was derived from the PGI but given its alteration, it required separate psychometric support. So a similar pattern of tests was conducted to those provided on the PGI. First Table 5 is a reporting of the reliability estimates for the shortened scales. Both internal consistency estimates and the test-retest reliabilities are comparable to the values obtained for the longer scales. So with respect to reliability, there was no drop-off when the scales were shortened.

Table 5
*Internal Consistency and Test-Retest Reliability Estimates on Interest, Competence, and Composite Scales*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Two week Test-retest ( r^b )</th>
<th>Internal Consistency(^a) (( \alpha ))</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Int.</td>
<td>Comp.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eight Basic Interest Scales</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Facilitating</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>0.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Detail</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Processing</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanical</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature/Outdoors</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artistic</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helping</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>0.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Prestige</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>0.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Prestige</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>0.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Six Basic Interest Scales</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Realistic</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>0.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investigative</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artistic</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>0.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>0.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enterprising</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conventional</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four Basic Interest Scales</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Things</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideas</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>0.85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The structural validity was examined as it varied across age and gender with respect to fit to the circular model. These results are reported in Tables 6 and 7. As can be seen, the PGI-S fits the data well and did not differ in fit from that obtained using the longer PGI. Finally, Table 8 summarizes the test of the circular structure across the major ethnic groups. Like the results with the longer PGI, the PGI-S fit each ethnic group well and the values were above those yielded elsewhere for Holland type measures. So overall, there is strong psychometric support for the scales.
Table 6
Summary of the Results of the Randomization Test of Hypothesized Circular Order Relations Across the Original PGI scales and the PGI-Short scales on the Validation Sample for the Basic Interest Scales

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PGI</th>
<th></th>
<th>PGI-S</th>
<th></th>
<th>PGI vs. PGI-S</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CI</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>CI</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>CI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Basic Interest Scales</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>.0004</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>.0004</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>.0004</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>.0004</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>.0004</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>.0004</td>
<td>.0004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females vs. Males</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CI difference</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p difference</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>.0004</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>.0004</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>.0004</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>.0004</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.0004</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.0004</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females vs. Males</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CI difference</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p difference</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composite</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>.0004</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>.0004</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>.0004</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.0004</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>.0004</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>.0004</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females vs. Males</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CI difference</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p difference</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7
Summary of the Results of the Randomization Test of Hypothesized Circular Order Relations Across the Original PGI scales and the PGI-Short scales on the Validation Sample for the Holland RIASEC Interest Scales

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PGI</th>
<th>PGI-S</th>
<th>PGI vs. PGI-S</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CI</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>CI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RIASEC Interest Scales</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females vs. Males</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CI difference</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p difference</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females vs. Males</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CI difference</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p difference</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composite</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females vs. Males</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CI difference</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p difference</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 8

Summary of the Results of the Randomization Test of Hypothesized Circular Order Relations Across Ethnicity in the Validation Sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>1109</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Eight Basic Interest Scales

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>p</th>
<th>CI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interests</td>
<td>.0004</td>
<td>.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competence</td>
<td>.0004</td>
<td>.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composite</td>
<td>.0004</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Six RIASEC Interest Scales

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>p</th>
<th>CI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interests</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competence</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composite</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.86</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

International validity

The PGI has been adapted and translated for use in many countries and there is similar strong, published validity support for the structure in Ireland (Darcy, 2004), Croatia (Sverko, 2008), Serbia, (Hedrih, 2008), China (Long, Adams, & Tracey, 2005), Caribbean (Wilkins, Ramkissoon, & Tracey, 2013), Iran (Akbarzadeh, 2010) and Japan (Long, Watanabe, & Tracey, 2006; Tracey, Watanabe, & Schneider, 1997). It has also been validated in Singapore (Caulum, Tracey, Gresham, & McCarty, 2011) and is being used as a required part of the career planning curriculum for every secondary student in Singapore. There is also substantiated validity support for a pictoral version (Enke, 2009).
The instrument has been adapted and translated for use in many other countries. In each of these countries, there is established validity support, although they are not published. These countries include: Slovenia, Macedonia, Turkey, France, Italy, Hong Kong, Malaysia, Germany, Philippines, and Portugal.

Rounds and Tracey (1996) examined the structural validity of RIASEC measures on U.S. ethnic and international samples relative to benchmark values for majority U.S. samples and found that the fit of the circular model was much less for ethnic U.S. groups and international samples. A comparison of CI values shows that the PGI RIASEC scales fits the U.S., ethnic U.S. and international samples better than other RIASEC measures. So there is strong support for the PGI in U.S. and international contexts.

**Occupational and Major Match Validity**

The PGI provides matches to occupations and majors. There are two key areas where the validity of these need support. First the actual scores for each occupation or major need to be reliably represented. Second, the method of matching the test score to the occupation itself must be valid.

**Occupations:** The original PGI used expert ratings of the People/Things, Data/Ideas, and Prestige for the 332 occupations in the Occupational Outlook Handbook. This was updated in the current version using more current figures from the O*NET occupational list which contains the RIASEC codes for 1030 occupations. The RIASEC scores were transformed using simple trigonometric formulae into People/Things and Data/Ideas.

\[
\text{Things/People} = (2R + I - A -2S - E + C) \\
\text{Data/Ideas} = (1.73E + 1.73C - 1.73I - 1.73A)
\]

Prestige for each O*NET occupation was originally determined using the prestige listings provided by Nakao and Treas (1994). In cases where there was no ratings, two exerts in vocational psychology provided extrapolation scores using the Nakao & Treas (1994) figures for similar occupations and the mean of the two expert ratings was used. So People/Things, Data/Ideas and Prestige ratings were obtained for 1030 occupation. However the latest version (post 2013) uses the mean of the O*NET values ratings of Recognition and Achievement as the occupational index of prestige.

**Major:** A list of 280 common majors offered by most colleges in the country served as the major pool. Each major was rated for People/Things, Data/Ideas, and prestige by three to eight professional or graduate student raters knowledgeable in vocational psychology (“experts”). The mean ICC agreement levels obtained were .91 People/Things, .88 for Data/Ideas and .93 for prestige. The mean of the ratings across the raters was used as the estimate for each major.

To examine the validity of these ratings, each of the 280 occupations was categorized into one of the 23 groups of the World-of-Work map (Prediger & Vansickle, 1992; Swaney, 1995) each of which has associated values for People/Things and Data/Ideas. These
values were correlated with the values obtained by the above rating method. The rating People/Things correlated $r = .88$ with the values based on the ACT and the rating Data/Ideas correlated $r = .86$ with the ACT based values. To examine the prestige, the 280 majors were matched with occupations listed in Nakao and Treas. These values correlated $r = .92$ with the ratings. So the ratings used for each major showed high agreement across different methods of estimation. The ratings of the experts’ ratings were the ones used. A similar procedure was used to derive scores for majors offered at ASU. The same expert raters rated those majors unique to ASU that were not in the list of 280.

**Career Clusters:** To represent each of the 16 Career Cluster created by the Office of Vocational and Adult Education (OVAE), 12 occupations were selected that fell under each cluster. The People/Things, Data/Ideas, and Prestige scores associated with each of these occupations was drawn from the larger pool of O*NET occupations described above. The mean of each score across all 12 occupations was used to represent each career cluster. So there were People/Thing, Data/Idea and Prestige scores calculated for each of the 16 Career Clusters.

**Matching PGI scores to occupations, major and cluster:** Given that there were commensurate People/Things, Data/Ideas and Prestige scores for the PGI, occupations, majors, and career clusters, a simple Euclidean distance algorithm across the three dimensions of People/Things, Data/Ideas and Prestige was used to determine PGI-environment fit. This is the same procedure that was used effectively in matching interest scores to majors in two large nationally representative studies (Tracey & Robbins, 2006; Tracey, Allen, & Robbins, 2011). The Euclidean distance has the benefit of using all the scale data (not just high point codes are typically used) and obviates and problems with ties in scores.
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Appendix A

Items and scoring
Personal Globe Inventory (PGI) Occupations Scales

Below you will find many different occupations. For each occupation choose the number from 1 (strongly dislike) to 7 (strongly like) that describes how you feel about doing that kind of work. Don't worry about whether you would be good at doing the job or whether you have the skills to do the work. Think only about HOW MUCH YOU LIKE OR DISLIKE THE WORK. Please place your response to the space to the left of each occupation and respond to all occupations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STRONGLY DISLIKE</th>
<th>INDIFFERENT</th>
<th>STRONGLY LIKE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

__1. Social Service Director __ 2. Bank Teller
__3. Financial Analyst __ 4. Power Station Director
__5. Airplane Mechanic __ 6. Ecologist
__7. Sculptor __ 8. School Counselor
__9. Personnel Director __ 10. Office Manager
__13. Auto Mechanic __ 14. Forester
__15. Musician __ 16. Speech Therapist
__17. Publicity Director __ 18. Department Store Manager
__21. Avionics Technician __ 22. Oceanographer
__23. Composer __ 24. Social Worker
__25. Sales (Clothes) __ 26. Sales Clerk
__27. Cost Estimator __ 28. Electrician
__29. Chemical Engineer __ 30. Naturalist
__31. Poet __ 32. Child Care Worker
__33. Travel Agent __ 34. Sales Manager
__35. Certified Public Accountant __ 36. Electrical Engineer
__37. Chemical Lab Technician __ 38. Fish & Game Warden
__39. Playwright __ 40. Marriage & Family Therapist
__41. Aerobics Instructor __ 42. Hotel Manager
__43. Accounting Clerk __ 44. Electronics Assembler
__45. Machinist __ 46. Veterinarian
__47. Author __ 48. Educational Psychologist
__49. Clinical Psychologist __ 50. Scientific Research Director
__51. Business Computer Specialist __ 52. Bricklayer
__53. Maid __ 54. Flight Attendant
__55. Budget Consultant __ 56. Social Scientist
__57. Bulldozer Operator __ 58. Receptionist
__59. Psychotherapist __ 60. Research Scientist
__63. Meter Reader __ 64. Sightseeing Guide
__65. Business Management Analyst __ 66. Biologist
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STRONGLY DISLIKE</th>
<th>INDIFFERENT</th>
<th>STRONGLY LIKE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Crane Operator  
2. Pediatrician  
3. Business Programmer  
4. Window Cleaner  
5. Market Research Analyst  
6. Tree Pruner  
7. Family Physician  
8. System Analyst  
9. Ride Attendant  
10. Personal Investment Analyst  
11. Construction Worker  
12. Sociologist  
13. Computer Operator  
14. Coatroom Attendant  
15. Consumer Affairs Director  
16. Roofer  
17. Psychiatric Caseworker  
18. Computer Consultant  
19. Bus Driver  
20. Stockbroker  
21. Building Contractor  
22. Hotel Clerk  
23. Surgeon  
24. Bridge Inspector  
25. Waiter/Waitress  
26. Anthropologist  
27. Hair Stylist  
28. Geneticist  
29. Pipe Fitter  
30. Bartender  
31. Earth Scientist  
32. Mail Clerk  
33. Physicist  
34. Building Inspector  
35. Travel Guide  
36. Geologist  
37. Escort  
38. Astronomer  
39. High School Shop Teacher  
40. Personal Shopper  
41. Chemist  
42. Secretary  
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### Personal Globe Inventory - Activities

Please look at the following list of activities and respond to each TWICE. Once regarding how much you LIKE the activity and once regarding your ABILITY or COMPETENCE to do the activity. Use the scales listed below to rate Liking and Ability.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Liking</th>
<th>Competence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>__________</td>
<td>__________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Greet people when entering a business</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Oversee a hotel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Prepare financial reports</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Oversee a data analysis group</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Install electrical wiring</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Categorize different types of wildlife</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Write poetry</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Help others</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Seat patrons at a restaurant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Sell goods to others</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Estimate costs of new procedures</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Repair computers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Oversee building construction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Write a scientific article</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Sculpt a statue</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Help children with learning problems</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Interview people for a survey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Manage an office</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Maintain office financial records</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Manage an electrical power station</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Design electronics systems</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Teach science</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Paint a portrait</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Study people's behavior</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Sell clothes to others</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Oversee sales</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PLEASE GO ON TO THE NEXT PAGE
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Liking</th>
<th>Competence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27. Prepare insurance reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28. Write computer programs for business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>29. Repair airplanes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30. Draw medical illustrations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31. Write a play</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>32. Teach people to dance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>33. Escort people through a television studio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>34. Organize office records</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35. Keep records of stock sales</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>36. Write computer programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>37. Inspect construction sites for safety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>38. Chart stars</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>39. Draw cartoons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40. Teach others cooking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>41. Do gift wrapping at a store</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>42. Operate an office copy machine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>43. Establish a business accounting procedure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>44. Analyze survey maps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>45. Assemble precision optical instruments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>46. Study wildlife</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>47. Write novels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>48. Supervise children in a nursery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>49. Help others with marriage problems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50. Write legal documents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>51. Sell stocks and bonds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>52. Guard buildings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>53. Drive a truck</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>54. Polish others' fingernails</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>55. Examine financial records of businesses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>56. Conduct chemical experiments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>57. Repair cars</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>58. Serve food in a cafeteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>59. Help others with speech difficulties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>60. Give lecture to large groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>61. Oversee a bank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>62. Check progress of a factory order</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PLEASE GO ON TO THE NEXT PAGE
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LIKING</th>
<th>COMPETENCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Dislike</td>
<td>Strongly Like</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Very Competent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Liking**

- 63. Drive a bus
- 64. Style hair
- 65. Examine finances
- 66. Cure medical ailments
- 67. Grind metal pieces
- 68. Run a vacuum cleaner
- 69. Assist those with mental problems
- 70. Study the effects of elections
- 71. Manage a department store
- 72. Keep track of inventory
- 73. Carry and load containers
- 74. Cook large food orders
- 75. Study causes of stock market fluctuations
- 76. Study genetics
- 77. Install mufflers on cars
- 78. Wash clothes
- 79. Study juvenile delinquency
- 80. Set up social programs
- 81. Counsel others about financial investments
- 82. Use a radio to dispatch repairers
- 83. Drive a taxi
- 84. Train dogs
- 85. Consult with others about how to run a business
- 86. Conduct scientific experiments
- 87. Operate a bulldozer
- 88. Sell pets to people
- 89. Help others with personal problems
- 90. Help others find employment
- 91. Provide financial counseling
- 92. Inspect landfill sites
- 93. Operate a woodworking machine
- 94. Groom pets
- 95. Plan a business budget
- 96. Study the shifts in the earth
- 97. Operate a crane

**PLEASE GO ON TO THE NEXT PAGE**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Liking</th>
<th>Competence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>___________</td>
<td>________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>___________</td>
<td>________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98. Sell hot dogs at a sporting event</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>___________</td>
<td>________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>___________</td>
<td>________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99. Help others with hearing disorders</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>___________</td>
<td>________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>___________</td>
<td>________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100. Defend people in court</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>___________</td>
<td>________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>___________</td>
<td>________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101. Administer loans</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>___________</td>
<td>________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>___________</td>
<td>________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102. Inspect automobiles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>___________</td>
<td>________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>___________</td>
<td>________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103. Smooth wood-furniture with sandpaper</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>___________</td>
<td>________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>___________</td>
<td>________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104. Model clothes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>___________</td>
<td>________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>___________</td>
<td>________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105. Analyze financial records</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>___________</td>
<td>________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>___________</td>
<td>________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106. Study plants</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>___________</td>
<td>________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>___________</td>
<td>________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107. Cut down trees</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>___________</td>
<td>________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>___________</td>
<td>________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108. Rent fishing equipment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>___________</td>
<td>________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>___________</td>
<td>________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109. Work with people</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>___________</td>
<td>________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>___________</td>
<td>________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110. Work with things</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>___________</td>
<td>________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>___________</td>
<td>________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111. Work with ideas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>___________</td>
<td>________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>___________</td>
<td>________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112. Work with data</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>___________</td>
<td>________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>___________</td>
<td>________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113. Work in high prestige activities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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PGI Scoring

Template for Producing Raw Scores for Each Scale (activity preferences, activity competence beliefs and occupational preferences)

Scale Scoring
1. Social Facilitating= i1 + i9 + i17 + i25 + i33 + i41
2. Managing= i2 + i10 + i18 + i26 + i34 + i42
3. Business Detail= i3 + i11 + i19 + i27 + i35 + i43
4. Data Processing= i4 + i12 + i20 + i28 + i36 + i44
5. Mechanical= i5 + i13 + i21 + i29 + i37 + i45
6. Nature/Outdoors= i6 + i14 + i22 + i30 + i38 + i46
7. Artistic= i7 + i15 + i23 + i31 + i39 + i47
8. Helping= i8 + i16 + i24 + i32 + i40 + i48
9. Social Sciences= i49 + i59 + i69 + i79 + i89 + i99
10. Influence= i50 + i60 + i70 + i80 + i90 + i100
11. Business Systems= i51 + i61 + i71 + i81 + i91 + i101
12. Quality Control= i52 + i62 + i72 + i82 + i92 + i102
13. Manual Work= i53 + i63 + i73 + i83 + i93 + i103
14. Personal Service= i54 + i64 + i74 + i84 + i94 + i104
15. Financial Analysis= i55 + i65 + i75 + i85 + i95 + i105
16. Science= i56 + i66 + i76 + i86 + i96 + i106
17. Construction/Repair= i57 + i67 + i77 + i87 + i97 + i107
18. Basic Service = i58 + i68 + i78 + i88 + i98 + i108
19. People =.924 * (Scale8 + Scale1) + 383 * (Scale2 + Scale7)
20. Things =.924 * (Scale4 + Scale5) + .383 * (Scale3 + Scale6)
21. Data =.924 * (Scale2 + Scale3) + .383 * (Scale1 + Scale4)
22. Ideas =.924 * (Scale7 + Scale6) + .383 * (Scale5 + Scale8)
23. Realistic =Scale5
24. Investigative =Scale6
25. Artistic =Scale7
26. Social = (2 * Scale8 + Scale1) =3
27. Enterprising = (2 * Scale2 + Scale1) =3
28. Conventional = (2 * Scale4 + Scale3) =3
29. People/Things =Scale19 - Scale20
30. Ideas/Data =Scale22 - Scale21
31. Prestige = (2 * Scale10 + .71 * (Scale15 + Scale11 + Scale9 + Scale16) -2 * Scale13 - 
    .71 * (Scale12 + Scale17 + Scale14 + Scale18))/2
Preference Globe Inventory – Short

Please look at the following list of activities and respond to each TWICE. Once regarding how much you LIKE the activity and once regarding your ABILITY or COMPETENCE to do the activity. Use the scales listed below to rate Liking and Ability.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LIKING</th>
<th>COMPETENCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Dislike</td>
<td>Unable to do</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Like</td>
<td>Very Competent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Moderately Competent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Like</td>
<td>Very Competent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Liking     Competence

1. Seat patrons at a restaurant
2. Oversee a hotel
3. Prepare financial reports
4. Oversee a data analysis group
5. Install electrical wiring
6. Categorize different types of wildlife
7. Sculpt a statue
8. Help children with learning problems
9. Give lecture to large groups
10. Drive a bus
11. Interview people for a survey
12. Manage an office
13. Maintain office financial records
14. Manage an electrical power station
15. Oversee building construction
16. Write a scientific article
17. Paint a portrait
18. Teach people to dance
19. Study the effects of elections
20. Carry and load containers
21. Sell clothes to others
22. Oversee sales
23. Keep records of stock sales
24. Write computer programs for business
25. Inspect construction sites for safety

PLEASE GO ON TO THE NEXT PAGE
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Liking</th>
<th>Competence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Dislike</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Like</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very to do</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

26. Teach science
27. Write a play
28. Teach others cooking
29. Set up social programs
30. Drive a taxi
31. Escort people through a television studio
32. Organize office records
33. Establish a business accounting procedure
34. Analyze survey maps
35. Assemble precision optical instruments
36. Study wildlife
37. Draw cartoons
38. Supervise children in a nursery
39. Defend people in court
40. Smooth wood-furniture with sandpaper
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Template for Producing Raw Scores for Each Scale
(activity preferences and activity competence beliefs)

Scale Scoring
1. Social Facilitating = i₁ + i₁₁ + i₂₁ + i₃₁
2. Managing = i₁₂ + i₁₂₂ + i₂₂ + i₃₂
3. Business Detail = i₃ + i₁₃ + i₂₃ + i₃₃
4. Data Processing = i₄ + i₁₄ + i₂₄ + i₃₄
5. Mechanical = i₅ + i₁₅ + i₂₅ + i₃₅
6. Nature/Outdoors = i₆ + i₁₆ + i₂₆ + i₃₆
7. Artistic = i₇ + i₁₇ + i₂₇ + i₃₇
8. Helping = i₈ + i₁₈ + i₂₈ + i₃₈
9. High Prestige = i₉ + i₁₉ + i₂₉ + i₃₉
10. Low Prestige = i₁₀ + i₁₂₀ + i₁₃₀ + i₁₄₀
11. People .924 * (Scale8 + Scale1) + 383 * (Scale2 + Scale7)
12. Things .924 * (Scale4 + Scale5) + .383 * (Scale3 + Scale6)
13. Data .924 * (Scale2 + Scale3) + .383 * (Scale1 + Scale4)
14. Ideas .924 * (Scale7 + Scale6) + .383 * (Scale5 + Scale8)
15. Realistic = Scale5
16. Investigative = Scale6
17. Artistic = Scale7
18. Social = (2 * Scale8 + Scale1) / 3
19. Enterprising = (2 * Scale2 + Scale1) / 3
20. Conventional = (2 * Scale4 + Scale3) / 3
21. People/Things = Scale11 – Scale12
22. Ideas/Data = Scale14 – Scale13
23. Prestige = Scale9 – Scale10
Appendix B

Interpretation Samples
**Example 1: female aged 21**

The eight type interest circle (Figure 1) shows that the respondent is oriented toward people, with her Helping and Social Facilitating scores being her highest scores (both T scores around 60). Her Artistic T score is slightly lower at 55. Business Contact is T=50. The other scales are all quite low. This pattern clearly shows a preference for activities involving other people. The vector also demonstrates this pattern, pointing toward People and only slightly toward the Ideas side. This profile is fairly straightforward, and the information provided is similar to that provided by most instruments that report Holland RIASEC scales (except here there are eight scales instead of 6). This woman did not demonstrate any preference for either high or low prestige as demonstrated in her scores listed in Table 1 (hence it is not represented), nor were there any major differences between her Liking responses and her Competence responses (and so neither were these represented). The list of similar occupations are presented in Table 2. there are several that are fairly similar to the individual’s interests, with all focusing on very social and helping aspects (e.g., social worker and human services work).

![Circular graph and vector score for example 1 eight basic interest types.](image)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Composite</th>
<th>Same sex (norm)</th>
<th>Liking</th>
<th>Competence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Spherical scales</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Facilitating</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Detail</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Processing</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanical</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature/Outdoors</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artistic</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helping</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Sciences</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Influence</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Systems</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality Control</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manual Work</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Service</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Analysis</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction/Repair</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic Service</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Liking–Competence</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic Interest</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Prestige</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Prestige</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Six types</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Realistic</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investigative</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artistic</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enterprising</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conventional</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Four types</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Things</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideas</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dimensional</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People/Things</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideas/Data</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prestige</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Similarity score</td>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>Social and recreation workers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>Human services work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>Recreation workers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>Social workers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>Clergy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>Teachers, librarians, and counselors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>Adult education teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>Counselors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>School teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>Special education teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>Psychologists</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>Urbana and regional planners</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>Registered nurses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>Respiratory therapists</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>Dental hygienists’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>Dispensing opticians</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>Electroneurodiagnostic technologists</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>Emergency medical technicians</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>Licensed practitioner nurses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>Medical record technicians</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>Occupational therapists</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>Physical therapists</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>Physician assistants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>Recreational therapists</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>Speech—Language pathologists and audiologists</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>Personnel, training, and labor relations specialists</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>Managers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>Social scientists</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>Economists and marketing research analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>Dentists</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>Optometrists</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>Physicians</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Pharmacists</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>Librarians</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Example 2: male aged 21**

This profile is more complex than example 1 as there were several added pieces of information deemed relevant for this test taker. First the interest circle (Figure 2) and the listing of scores (Table 3) shows a clear preference for Nature/Outdoors and Mechanical activities. These are the only two scale scores above T=50. The vector clearly demonstrates the focus of these interests and their strength (a fairly even balance between working with things and ideas); very much in line with many physical science and engineering occupations (Table 4).

![FIG. 2. Circular graph and vector score for example 2 eight basic interest types.](image)
FIG. 3. Graphs and vectors for higher prestige scales for example 2.
### TABLE 3 Personal Globe Inventory Technical Score Profile for Example 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Composite</th>
<th>Same sex (norm)</th>
<th>Liking</th>
<th>Competence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Spherical scales</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Facilitating</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Detail</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Processing</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanical</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature/Outdoors</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artistic</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helping</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Sciences</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Influence</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Systems</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality Control</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manual Work</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Service</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Analysis</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction/Repair</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic Service</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Liking–Competence</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic Interest</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Prestige</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>66</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Prestige</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Six types</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Realistic</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investigative</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artistic</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enterprising</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conventional</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Four types</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Things</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideas</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dimensional</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People/Things</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideas/Data</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prestige</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Similarity score</td>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>Biological and medical scientists</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>Aerospace engineers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>Electrical and electronics engineers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>Chemical engineers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>Health services managers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>Physicians</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>Architects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>Engineering, science, and data processing managers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>Civil engineers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>Physical scientists</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>Geologists and geophysicists</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>Meteorologists</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>Physicists and astronomers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>Industrial engineers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>Mechanical engineers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>Metallurgical, ceramic, and materials engineers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>Mining engineers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>Nuclear engineers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>Petroleum engineers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>Podiatrists</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>Veterinarians</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>Landscape architects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>Life scientists</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>Agricultural scientists</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Foresters and conservation scientists</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The respondent scored high on Prestige (66) and thus the five high prestige scale scores are depicted in Figure 3. This individual is very interested in Science and Influence (high prestige). This presents a picture of a fairly ambitious individual with Science interests. The high prestige interests involving finances (Business Systems and Financial Analysis) were clearly rejected. Using the Prestige scales results in a more clearly defined picture of the interests for this individual.

This individual also had a large discrepancy between his Liking responses and his Competence responses, indicating that he sees the two as fairly different (see Table 3). The difference between Liking and Competence was manifest for him in the high Prestige scales. Figure 4 is a graphical depiction of the Liking and Competence scores of the high Prestige scales. The main difference is in his assessment of his desire for influence and his lack of perceived competence. This discrepancy needs to be explored with this individual as it could cause considerable disappointment in his future as he may not reach the ideals to which he aspires. Obvious interventions could be directed at helping increase his sense of competence or helping him gain a more realistic perspective of his aspirations. The information presented to this individual is much more complex than it was for the individual in example one as the responses indicated that there was important variance that needed to be represented.
FIG. 4. Graphs and vectors for higher prestige scales for example 2 using liking and competence separately.
Example 3: female aged 18

This is an undifferentiated profile. There is no clear interest pattern demonstrated in the eight scale scores (see Table 5), so the four more molar scales are presented (Figure 5). This individual has a slight preference for people but it is not pronounced. This is a profile of someone who has not specifically thought out what she likes or may not have had enough experience to help her sort out her interests. However, her Prestige score reveals a more differentiated profile. Her Prestige score was low (T=40, listed in Table 5) indicating that she had preferences for lower status activities, and as such the five lower prestige occupations are presented (Figure 6). She demonstrates a differential pattern of interests with Personal Service Basic Service being her highest scores. By incorporating Prestige, the interest pattern of this individual is much more explicit, and much more specific information about occupations can be provided than was possible given just her basic interest scores. As can be seen from her listing of similar occupations presented in Table 6, there are several occupations that are good matches to her interests.

FIG. 5. Circular graph and vector score for example 3 four basic interest scores.
FIG. 6. Graphs and vectors for lower prestige scales for example 3.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Composite</th>
<th>Same sex (norm)</th>
<th>Liking</th>
<th>Competence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Spherical scales</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Facilitating</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Detail</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Processing</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanical</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature/Outdoors</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artistic</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helping</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Sciences</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Influence</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Systems</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality Control</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manual Work</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Service</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Analysis</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction/Repair</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic Service</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Liking–Competence</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic Interest</td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
<td>47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Prestige</td>
<td>55</td>
<td></td>
<td>54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Prestige</td>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Six types</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Realistic</td>
<td>49</td>
<td></td>
<td>52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investigative</td>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
<td>47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artistic</td>
<td>52</td>
<td></td>
<td>52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>57</td>
<td></td>
<td>53</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enterprising</td>
<td>59</td>
<td></td>
<td>52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conventional</td>
<td>52</td>
<td></td>
<td>56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Four types</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People</td>
<td>62</td>
<td></td>
<td>57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Things</td>
<td>46</td>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data</td>
<td>52</td>
<td></td>
<td>53</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideas</td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
<td>49</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dimensional</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People/Things</td>
<td>55</td>
<td></td>
<td>53</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideas/Data</td>
<td>52</td>
<td></td>
<td>54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prestige</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Similarity score</td>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>Cashiers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>Travel agents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>Retail sales workers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>Preschool teachers and child care workers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>Flight attendants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>Barbers and cosmetologists</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>Homemaker—Home health aides</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>Janitors and cleaners and cleaning supervisors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>Private household workers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>Counter and rental clerks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>Interviewing and new accounts clerks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>Reservation and transportation ticket agents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>Secretaries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>Stenographers and medical transcriptionists</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>Teachers’ aides</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>Information clerks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>Hotel and motel desk clerks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>Nurses’ aides and psychiatric aides</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>Occupational therapy assistants and aides</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>Mail clerks and messengers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>Library assistants and bookmobile drivers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>Telephone operators</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>Dental assistants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>Medical assistants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>Physical therapy assistants and aides</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>Chefs, cooks, and other kitchen workers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>Food and beverage service workers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>Correctional officers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>Firefighting occupations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>Guards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>Police, detectives, and special agents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>Private detectives and investigators</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>Insurance agents and brokers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>Manufacturers’ and wholesale sales representatives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>Service sales representatives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Example 4: male aged 17

This is a very undifferentiated profile where there were no clear patterns of difference between the eight basic interest scales (see Table 7), so the more molar four scales are represented (Figure 7). The individual has a slight tendency toward things and less so toward data. General interventions aimed at helping him explore these basic interest types should be used. There were no clear prestige or like-competence discrepancy patterns (see Table 7), so these were not presented. The presentation of similar occupations (Table 8) indicates that there are few occupations which are similar to the interest pattern of this individual. Given this very undifferentiated profile, it seems most appropriate to focus on the four basic scales as a first step to explore himself and the world of work.

FIG. 7. Circular graph and vector score for example 4 four basic interest scores.
TABLE 7. Personal Globe Inventory Technical Score Profile for Example 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Composite</th>
<th>Same sex (norm)</th>
<th>Liking</th>
<th>Competence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spherical scales</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Facilitating</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Detail</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Processing</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanical</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature/Outdoors</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artistic</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helping</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Sciences</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Influence</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Systems</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality Control</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manual Work</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Service</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Analysis</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction/Repair</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic Service</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liking–Competence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic Interest</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Prestige</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Prestige</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Six types</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Realistic</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investigative</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artistic</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enterprising</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conventional</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four types</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Things</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideas</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dimensional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People/Things</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideas/Data</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prestige</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 8. Personal Globe Inventory Listing of Similar Occupations for Example 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Similarity score</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>Computer programmers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>Drafters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>Computer scientists and systems analysts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>Statisticians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>Accountants and auditors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>Engineering technicians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>Library technicians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>Paralegals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>Science technicians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>Inspectors and compliance officers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>Actuaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>Broadcast technicians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Underwriters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Budget analysts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Bank tellers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Clerical supervisors and managers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Computer and peripheral equipment operators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Municipal clerks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Proofreaders and copy markers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Real estate clerks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Statistical clerks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Industrial engineers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Mechanical engineers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Metallurgical, ceramic, and materials engineers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Mining engineers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Nuclear engineers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Petroleum engineers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Court clerks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Credit clerks and authorizers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Credit analysts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Tax examiners, collectors, and revenue agents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Pharmacy technicians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Title examiners and searchers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Mathematicians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Operations research analysts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Veterinary technicians</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Example 5: male aged 37

The basic interest profile (Table 9) is one of someone who is interested in a broad set of activities with high scores (greater than or equal to T scores of 50) on Social Facilitating, Helping, Artistic, Nature/Outdoors and Mechanical (Figure 8). Only Managing, Business Detail and Data Processing are low. However, there was a clear pattern of differences between the Liking and Competence items (see Table 10), and so these scores are represented graphically (Figure 9). This individual sees himself as liking Artistic, Helping, and Social Facilitating activities while he sees himself as not being especially competent in these same activities. The opposite pattern emerges on Nature/Outdoors and Mechanical activities, where he sees himself as competent, but that he does not like these activities. This individual’s broad interest pattern is reflective of his very different pattern for likes and competence. This individual would need to work on finding a people or artistic interest that utilizes his mechanical and outdoor skills. Or if these two very different domains cannot be combined, then perhaps he should search for two separate domains to express each; for example the skills as an occupation and the liking as an avocation. However, given the different pattern of likes and competence, this individual would probably not be satisfied in very technical, less people oriented positions. Although the technical competence would prove helpful, the liking of these activities is low.
FIG. 8. Circular graph and vector score for example 5 eight basic interest scores.
TABLE 9. Personal Globe Inventory Technical Score Profile for Example 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Composite</th>
<th>Same sex</th>
<th>Liking</th>
<th>Compete</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spherical scales</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Facilitating</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Detail</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Processing</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanical</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature/Outdoors</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanical</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helping</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Sciences</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Influence</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Systems</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality Control</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manual Work</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Service</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Analysis</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction/Repair</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic Service</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liking–Competence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic Interest</td>
<td>65</td>
<td></td>
<td>66</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Prestige</td>
<td>57</td>
<td></td>
<td>57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Prestige</td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Six types</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Realistic</td>
<td>47</td>
<td></td>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investigative</td>
<td>56</td>
<td></td>
<td>54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artistic</td>
<td>56</td>
<td></td>
<td>58</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>59</td>
<td></td>
<td>62</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enterprising</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conventional</td>
<td>41</td>
<td></td>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four types</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People</td>
<td>59</td>
<td></td>
<td>62</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Things</td>
<td>47</td>
<td></td>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideas</td>
<td>61</td>
<td></td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dimensional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People/Things</td>
<td>55</td>
<td></td>
<td>57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideas/Data</td>
<td>65</td>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prestige</td>
<td>57</td>
<td></td>
<td>55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Similarity score</td>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>Engineering, science, and data processing managers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>Life scientists</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>Agricultural scientists</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>Communications and transportation managers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>Farm and home management advisers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>Veterinarians</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>Veterinarian technicians</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>Camera and photographic equipment repairs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>Biological and medical scientists</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>Foresters and conservation scientists</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>Social scientists</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>Economists and marketing research analysts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>Psychologists</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>Residential counselors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>Urban and regional planners</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>Reporters and correspondents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>Writers and editors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>Schoolteachers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>Designers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>Photographers and camera operators</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>Social and recreation workers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>Human services work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>Recreation workers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>Social workers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>Teachers, librarians, and counselors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>Adult education teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>Archivists and curators</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>College and university faculty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>Counselors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>Clergy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>Optometrists</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>Special education teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>Librarians</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>Recreational therapists</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>Registered nurses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>Respiratory therapists</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>Speech—Language pathologists and audiologists</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>Occupational therapists</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Pharmacists</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Physical therapists</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Physician assistants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FIG. 9. Circular graph and vector score for example 5 with liking and competence scores represented separately.