

II. THE FOUR TEMPERAMENTS AND SCIENCE

Although this section is titled “The Four Temperaments and Science, Myers begins with a further comment about the four temperaments and astrology. He says, “While the Bobgans claim that the temperaments and astrology are totally inseparable. . . .”⁸⁰ Thus, before addressing the major topic of this section, we must clarify our position, lest the reader be confused by Myers. Please note that there are no quotation marks in the original around this statement. That is because we never made such a statement. This is one more attempt by Myers to misrepresent what we have said. It is one more example of poor scholarship on his part. Our position is that the temperaments and astrology were intricately and intimately together at one time, that individuals, such as Voges and Braund use the temperaments in the form of the DiSC, and that, by doing so, they are using one element of an overall system—astrology. Many individuals, including Larry Burkett, Tim LaHaye, Florence Littauer and SBCC’s own Ken Voges have separated the four temperaments from other elements of astrology. However, even when separated from the other elements, the four temperaments are still part of the occult.

Astrology is a very complex system. The daily horoscope as contained in local newspapers is one aspect of it and relies upon sun signs, such as Virgo, Leo, etc. However, there is no question that the sun signs are part of the whole, though used separately from the rest of astrology. In the same way, the four temperaments, though separated from the rest of astrology in usage, were still originally part of it.

Myers continues his sentence: “. . . they [Bobgans] argue that the temperaments and science are totally incompatible.” Once more there can be no quotation marks here since we have never said this. We do say that the temperaments are not a scientific concept just as Freud’s Oedipus Complex is not a scientific concept. However, both the temperaments and the Oedipus Complex can be put to the test of science with respect to claims made for each. These subtle differences are obviously beyond Myers’ level of understanding. However, we believe that the average reader will see the difference.

Myers complains about us quoting only part of an article from *The Encyclopedia of Psychology*: Here is the part we quoted:

The popularity of typologies can be understood in terms of the fact that they offer an economical way of summarizing complex configurations of variables—a way of characterizing the whole person in terms of a small number of very broad categories. The critics of typological description, on the other hand, have long contended that the simplicity of the typology leads to inaccuracy, that the typical categories are artificial, and that the distinctive features of the individual are lost when one is lumped together with many other people with distinctive qualities of their own.⁸¹

In attempting to make it look as though we are only giving one side of a “scholarly debate,” Myers quotes further from *The Encyclopedia of Psychology*:

In response [sic], it can be argued that every astute typologist (as Ken Voges is an astute typologist) knows that people vary quantitatively in psychological traits and that only a few fit typical categories well. Type has to be understood

as an ideal form or a point of reference useful for describing and understanding individuals to the extent that they approximate it. . . .⁸²

The words in parentheses are obviously added by Myers. Myers makes no comments about this quote, but it is obvious that it is not a rebuttal to our earlier quote from the same work. The section quoted by Myers is actually supportive of our scientific view of typology. Note that “only a few fit typical categories well.”⁸³

Myers says several times in his paper that we omit certain information with the inference that we are doing so dishonestly. We will confront this later. However, Myers did **not** quote the sentences that precede and follow what he quotes from *The Encyclopedia of Psychology*. The sentences which precede his quote are:

Critics have also argued that no extant typology can claim to capture a truly basic set of categories, since each reflects the special interests of its creator. They have also contended that every typology assumes that relevant trait distributions are bimodal—that people tend to have either a lot of the trait that is central to a given type or very little of the trait. Most psychological traits, of course, are distributed unimodally, with relatively few people lying at the extremes that correspond to typical categories. In short, people do not fit neatly into types.⁸⁴

The sentence Myers omits with an ellipsis, which immediately follows what he quotes is this: “It has often been recommended that typical categories be replaced with trait dimensions.”⁸⁵ The sentences Myers omits obviously do not support his position. We do not believe Myers has any dissimulation in mind. Perhaps he simply does not understand the author’s intent in saying that.

In describing the difference between types and traits, one text says:

Type theories usually group people into discrete categories (like introvert *or* extravert) and try to explain behavior on the basis of a few types. Trait theories assume that people vary on a *number of continuous dimensions, or scales*, each of which represents a *trait*. Thus, we could rate an individual on a scale of intelligence or emotional stability or aggressiveness, and so on. To arrive at a global description of personality, we would need to know how the individual is rated on a number of such dimensions.⁸⁶ (Emphasis in original.)

Though there is very little support for either types or traits in the academic literature, there is more support for traits than types. The PPS is designed to measure what Marston identifies as traits: Dominant, Influencing, Steadiness, Compliant. However, in practical application, the DiSC scales divide people into types: “High D,” High I, “High S, and “High C.” The patterns of the four so-called traits then become types. Then people are identified and described according to those categories. In addition to those four types, sixteen additional types are identified as combinations of the original four. The four DiSC categories and their combinations do line up with the four temperaments and their combinations. They are also used in the same way to identify and thereby understand people. Thus the DiSC model, while utilizing a test intended to measure traits, is fraught with shortcomings typical of typologies.

The second paragraph which Myers quotes from *The Encyclopedia of Psychology*, but which we do not quote in our book, is this:

It should be noted that the imprecision of the typology is bound up with its simplicity. In principle, it is possible to achieve a high degree of descriptive precision with a typology, provided we are willing to sacrifice simplicity. If we wish to maintain comprehensiveness, we must cross-classify individuals in terms of a large number of very specific dichotomous variables (as DISC, properly administered, does).⁸⁷

Again, the words in parentheses have been added by Myers. Note that it says, “the imprecision of the typology is bound up with its simplicity.” The paragraph does indicate that “**In principle**, it is possible to achieve a high degree of descriptive precision with a typology, **provided we are willing to sacrifice simplicity**.” (Emphasis added.) The DiSC is an imprecise, simplistic model. The PPS instrument used to categorize people according to the DiSC model is an extremely brief test with a high degree of simplicity. That is precisely why it is popular. If Voges and Braund abandoned the simplicity, they would lose potential customers, a most important consideration for those who profit from such tests.

The final sentence of the quote is another area of disagreement that we would have with Myers. The last sentence states: “If we wish to maintain comprehensiveness, we must cross-classify individuals in terms of a large number of very specific dichotomous variables.” Myers adds in parentheses: “as DISC, properly administered, does.” That is untrue. The DiSC is not even what is administered. Myers is confused about the system he defends. But even if he were to say, “as the PPS, properly administered, does,” he is still wrong. The PPS (with DiSC categories), is too brief to meet the qualifications of comprehensiveness. The PPS (with its DiSC typology) is a very short test (only 24 items!) that results in simplistic types with a small number of general dichotomous variables.

Myers’ desire to support a leader in his church often results in a sacrifice of truth for the sake of proving by fiat rather than fact. This is just one instance of that. Also this is one instance of Myers suggesting that we purposely (meaning deviously) left something out because it proves the opposite of what we claim. One of us has two degrees in mathematics and is a specialist in testing and measurement. What are Myers credentials for the above statements about the PPS and DiSC?

Following the above quotation from *The Encyclopedia of Psychology* is another sentence which Myers left out. It says: “In this way, we can derive complex typal categories that will be more univocally descriptive than any combination of scale scores resting on the same set of information.”⁸⁸ Here again we don’t think Myers is being devious. He possibly lacks the background to know what the sentence means. Suffice it to say that the DiSC does not qualify according to that omitted sentence.

Myers says:

The Bobgans quote various behaviorists [sic] who question personality testing (including the Behavioral Science Research Press). They sound fairly convincing. But we are not told that they stand on one side of a scholarly debate—on what may be the losing side.⁸⁹ (Emphasis his.)

This is false information. Criticisms of typologies are not solely the result of a disagreement between behaviorists and typologists.

To support his point, Myers quotes from *The Encyclopedia of Psychology*:

Although it enjoyed a revival beginning in the 1960's, the study of temperament was long in disrepute in contemporary psychology because, given its association with inherited characteristics, it ran counter to the environmental emphasis of behaviorism.⁹⁰

At one time the emphasis on behaviorism precluded interest in a lot of other aspects of psychology, including the humanistic and transpersonal. However, at the present time all forms of psychology are seen and described in the academic literature.

Now, to put Myers to the test, we ask that he obtain 100 copies of psychology texts normally used at universities. Go to the indexes and look up the word *temperament*. Then look up the word *typology*. Count the number of times you see those references and the number of pages devoted to those two terms. You will find **very, very** few. Now read what is said in the academic literature about the four temperaments. You will find that they are generally treated as simplistic, superstitious relics from the past.

Myers says:

The Bobgans don't tell us this, but the article goes on to defend such temperamental typologies. They cite only the first paragraph, which mentions the astrology-personality link we saw earlier.

The bulk of the article affirms the scientific basis for enduring traits in people (like the four temperaments).⁹¹ (Emphasis his.)

As stated earlier, Myers does not know the difference between types and traits. The four temperaments are types, not traits.

When Myers says, "the article goes on to defend such temperamental typologies," he is wrong. The article is an academic report on personality types in general and on what some individuals have claimed about them. In no way does the author defend the four temperaments as a system. He only touches on the four temperaments in his brief historical overview of typologies. In fact, he says there are too many different typologies to cover in one article.

The following is another sentence Myers should quote from *The Encyclopedia of Psychology*, but doesn't: "So pervasive is this approach to human personality that a comprehensive catalog of all known typologies would be very difficult to compile."⁹² There are **numerous** typologies competing for attention, not just the four temperaments. In spite of the scant amount of attention paid to most of those typologies in academic literature, they often surface in pop psychology articles and books. See Chapter Six, "A Circus of Personality Types," from our book *Four Temperaments, Astrology & Personality Testing*.

If academic psychology thought more highly of the four temperaments, they would not be so extinct in the academic literature. It is true that the temperaments are very popular in bookstores, but so is astrology.

Myers' next remark, which follows the above-quoted sentence from him, is:

. . . and research done on identical twins since the article was written indicates that some of these traits are so basic that they are even inherited.⁹³ (Emphasis his.)

Once more Myers is confusing traits and types. In doing so, he is misrepresenting the article which he uses as his reference. The conclusion of that article ends with these words, which include a quotation from a researcher:

“A lot of people have the simple-minded notion that a gene turns on and magically blossoms into a behavior,” declares Gerald McClearn, a psychologist and twins researcher at Pennsylvania State University. “A gene can produce a nudge in one direction or another, but it does not directly control behavior. It doesn’t take away a person’s free will.” Even E. O. Wilson, the most radical sociobiologist, doesn’t believe that behavior goose-steps to the cadence of the genes. “Admitting that we are all influenced in different ways by our genetic coding doesn’t reduce our freedom to do what we want to do,” he says. The latest research clearly tips the scales toward the nature side—and that’s all it does. Researchers agree that people are creatures both of their genetic coding and of their cultural and environmental experience. All scientists are doing is learning the proportions of the recipe.⁹⁴

If we were Myers and had left out this important piece of information, Myers would have inferred that we were devious or that we “selectively present [our] evidence in a way that borders on dishonest scholarship.” We make no such charges against him. We try to present the facts and let the reader decide.

The struggle between nature (genes) versus nurture (environment) as the basis for personality has been fought for a long time. There is evidence for nature predominating, nurture predominating, a combination of the two with neither predominating, and shades of all the above. But even among those who support nature as predominant, to the extent of personality determined by genetics, we have never found one expert touting the four temperaments.

Wedding the four temperaments to a predominantly nature view of personality is based on faith, not on scientific evidence. Look in a hundred academic books on the issue of nature versus nurture and even books supporting the nature view and just see the absence of the relationship to the four temperaments. The view often held by the nature-oriented view emphasizes traits, but not the four temperaments. It is a generalized view of traits and not one that promotes anything even close to the four temperaments.

Myers then tries to defend the Personal Profile System (PPS). We quote from our book our academic concerns with the PPS:

One of the most important volumes on tests is the *Mental Measurements Yearbook* (MMY). There is no mention of the PPS in the MMY until *The Tenth Mental Measurements Yearbook*. In that volume, the PPS is evaluated. This recent evaluation occurred years after *The Kaplan Report*. We quote from that review:

A serious concern with this instrument is its lack of reported research. While the authors state the instrument shows good reliability and

validity, they provide the user with virtually no data to support these claims.

The reviewer goes on to refer to and then challenge studies that are provided in the PPS manual. In conclusion, the reviewer says that “**the clear lack of data to support this instrument should preclude its use.**” (Emphasis added.) We did a literature search on the PPS and found other reviews that substantiated the MMY recommendation.⁹⁵

For support of the PPS, Myers mentions *The Kaplan Report*. We say in our book:

In the Performax Product Catalog is a listing for *The Kaplan Report: A Study of the Validity of the Personal Profile System*. We obtained a copy of that report. It says:

Since 1972 the PPS has been widely employed. The market for this product is said to be growing daily. Hence, in 1982, PSII [Performax Systems International, Inc.] contracted with Kaplan Associates of Chevy Chase, Maryland for the conduct of a study to establish how the PPS compares as an assessment instrument with highly researched and valid psychological measuring instruments.⁹⁶

Please notice that Performax, the company that owns and markets the PPS, contracted with a firm, Kaplan Associates, to conduct this study. We have read the report and have concerns and questions about it. It definitely does not establish the necessary validity for the PPS.⁹⁷

Contrary to this, Myers believes that *The Kaplan Report* does establish the validity. This is an academic question that can be established by an academic exchange. The complexity of it is such that it does not belong in the current paper.

The key issue that can be dealt with in this paper is the fact that Kaplan Associates are hired consultants. They examined the PPS while being paid to do so by PSII. Myers says, “In 1982 Performax Systems International contracted with Kaplan Associates to conduct a study comparing the PPS instrument with other highly researched and valid psychological measuring instruments.”⁹⁸ There are two issues we wish to address in this quote from Myers. Does Myers understand the bias that normally occurs when a consultant is hired to do research for a company that derives profit for a product? *The Kaplan Report* itself tells why the marketers of the PPS employed them:

The more precise mission given Kaplan Associates was that of designing an experiment to examine the validity of PPS. It was expected that the finding of positive results will serve to attract and broaden the interest of professional users in the clinical, counseling, educational and industrial-psychological communities, the members of which, for the most part, have enormous respect and concern for valid psychometric tools.⁹⁹

Let the reader interpret the meaning of that in the context of a commercial company with a commercial product (PPS) that hopes to increase sales by employing consultants (Kaplan Associates).

To make our point more strongly, let us remind the reader that tobacco companies hire consultants to do research on the effects of tobacco. These are high powered companies with high powered credentials. Should we believe the results of a “hired gun”? We think not. Myers knows the Kaplan Associates are a “hired gun.” Myers would be happy to have you believe them even though he would probably question the tobacco company consultants.

The second part of Myers’ sentence refers to comparisons of the PPS with “other highly researched and valid psychological measuring instruments.” He says these “other personality tests of confirmed validity validated PPS.”¹⁰⁰ (Emphasis his.) The important question is how valid were the other instruments and what do such correlations mean? The second issue of correlations and their meaning is too complex for this paper. However, the first issue has to do with the test comparisons. Myers mentions the MBTI (Myers-Briggs Type Indicator) as one of the “personality tests of confirmed validity.”

The National Research Council has evaluated the MBTI. The Council members are drawn from the councils of the National Academy of Sciences, National Academy of Engineering, and Institute of Medicine. In appraising the MBTI, the National Research Council says:

McCaulley (1988) estimates that the MBTI is used as a diagnostic instrument by 1,700,000 people a year in the United States, and Moore and Woods (1987) list the wide variety of organizations in business, industry, education, government, and the military that use it. It is probably fair to say that the MBTI is the most popular “self-insight, insight into others” instrument in use today. Unfortunately, however, the popularity of the instrument is not coincident with supportive research results.¹⁰¹

In other words, research results do not support Myers’ misplaced confidence in the MBTI! The Council’s particular concern is the **lack of validity for the MBTI**. In concluding the section on validity the Council states: “The evidence summarized in this section raises questions about the validity of the MBTI.”¹⁰²

Regarding the MMY (*Mental Measurements Yearbook*) and the Kaplan report, Myers says:

But didn’t the Mental Measurements Yearbook [sic] reviewer see the report? Was the Kaplan study ever taken into account in the MMY evaluation? The Bobgans would have us believe it was. Just before they quote from the MMY review, they write this:

This recent evaluation [in the MMY] occurred [sic] years after The Kaplan Report.

Clearly the Bobgans want us to think that the reviewer must have seen the report—if she (Dr. Ellen McGinnis) wrote “years after” the review came out. . .

. But, no, the Bobgans would lead us to believe that “the clear lack of data to support this instrument” includes the Kaplan study.¹⁰³ (All emphases his.) This is a false inference by Myers and it borders on libel by attempting to get the readers to believe that we want them to think that the MMY reviewer saw the report. This is another example of what extreme means Myers is willing to use to defend Voges! To be blunt, he is accusing us of being devious at least and lying at worst. He makes the same inference elsewhere in his paper.

The facts are as follows. The Kaplan Report was published in 1983 but done earlier. The MMY was published in 1989. **To date there are no independent favorable academic critiques of the PPS. And the latest evaluation of the PPS in the MMY is 1989, which is years after the one done by the hired gun of Kaplan Associates!** We believe that an objective third party report in the MMY done years after the original hired gun report would carry more weight. We don't know if the MMY reviewer saw the Kaplan Report. **And neither does Myers!** As a matter of fact, she may have and ignored it because of the fact that the Kaplan Associates were hired by PSII.

Myers says:

And was the reviewer really as negative as the Bobgan's [sic] two quotes imply? Here's the sentence they left out just before their first quote:

The theoretical base of the Personal Profile System and its focus on increasing individuals' understanding of their own behavioral patterns in relationship to environmental factors have value in increasing personal effectiveness.¹⁰⁴

Now here's the rest of the paragraph that is conveniently left out by Myers:

A serious concern with this instrument is its lack of reported research. While the authors state the instrument shows good reliability and validity, they provide the user with virtually no data to support these claims.¹⁰⁵

What the reviewer is saying is that while the theoretical base has possible value there is no data to support sufficient reliability or validity for the instrument. Wow! Myers left out a **very** important part of the paragraph! Once more, we are not accusing him of being devious. Perhaps he does not understand what the test reviewer is saying.

Myers uses more of the same libelous-sounding approach when he says:

And here's the full sentence of their [Bobgans'] second slam-dunk partial quote:

While the theory behind this instrument holds promise in increasing individual's awareness of their behavioral styles in interactions with environmental conditions, the clear lack of data to support this instrument should preclude its use.¹⁰⁶ (Emphasis his.)

Again he infers that we purposely left something out and we did so dishonestly. But look at what the reviewer is saying: “the theory behind this instrument.” It is not the instrument, but the theory behind the instrument that “holds promise.” The bottom line is “the clear lack of

data to support this instrument should preclude its use.” Nothing devious here. And nothing to support Myers’ jaundiced point of view.

In addition, part one of the sentence (the part we left out) is gratuitous. It is totally unsupported by anything in the review. It is a personal opinion on the reviewer’s part; while evidence for the second part of the sentence is substantiated in the review. This may be the first and only test review Myers has ever read. This is obviously an area in which he is not trained. Reviewers sometimes do make gratuitous remarks along with their statistical analysis. There are volumes on standards for educational and psychological testing. Those trained in the field know the standards. Those were the standards the reviewer used to condemn the PPS. The reviewer’s generous comment about “the theory behind this instrument” had nothing to do with such standards. If Myers were to read more than just one review on tests, he might find this out, but he appears to be so desperate to prove us wrong and to defend Voges that he is willing to pepper his paper with such egregious remarks.

In the preceding example Myers uses the red herring approach. One logic book describes it this way:

The fallacy of red herring gets its name from the practice of using a herring, a particularly smelly fish when cooked, to divert hunting dogs from the scent of a fox. To commit the fallacy of red herring in an argument is to draw attention away from an issue by raising some other, seemingly related issue.¹⁰⁷

The text advises:

To recognize the fallacy of red herring, look for an argument in which the speaker responds by directing attention away from the issue to other, seemingly related issues.

The above example does smell like an extreme case of red herring being putrefied by Myers.

-
- ⁸⁰80. Brian Myers, "A Critique of Martin and Deidre Bobgan's *Four Temperaments, Astrology and Personality Testing*. Houston, TX: Spring Bran Community Church Administrative Board Position Paper, 1992, p. 9.
- ⁸¹81. R. W. Coan, "Personality Types." *Encyclopedia of Psychology*, Vol. 3. Raymond Corsini, ed. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1984, p. 23.
- ⁸²82. Brian Myers, "A Critique of Martin and Deidre Bobgan's *Four Temperaments, Astrology and Personality Testing*. Houston, TX: Spring Bran Community Church Administrative Board Position Paper, 1992, p. 10.
- ⁸³83. R. W. Coan, "Personality Types." *Encyclopedia of Psychology*, Vol. 3. Raymond Corsini, ed. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1984, p. 24.
- ⁸⁴84. Ibid.
- ⁸⁵85. *Ibid.*
- ⁸⁶86. Ernest R. Hilgard, Rita L. Atkinson, Richard C. Atkinson. *Introduction to Psychology*, Seventh Edition. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Inc., 1979, p. 382.
- ⁸⁷87. Brian Myers, "A Critique of Martin and Deidre Bobgan's *Four Temperaments, Astrology and Personality Testing*. Houston, TX: Spring Bran Community Church Administrative Board Position Paper, 1992, p. 10.
- ⁸⁸88. R. W. Coan, "Personality Types." *Encyclopedia of Psychology*, Vol. 3. Raymond Corsini, ed. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1984, p. 24.
- ⁸⁹89. Brian Myers, "A Critique of Martin and Deidre Bobgan's *Four Temperaments, Astrology and Personality Testing*. Houston, TX: Spring Bran Community Church Administrative Board Position Paper, 1992, p. 10.
- ⁹⁰90. Brian Myers, "A Critique of Martin and Deidre Bobgan's *Four Temperaments, Astrology and Personality Testing*. Houston, TX: Spring Bran Community Church Administrative Board Position Paper, 1992, p. 10.
- ⁹¹91. Brian Myers, "A Critique of Martin and Deidre Bobgan's *Four Temperaments, Astrology and Personality Testing*. Houston, TX: Spring Bran Community Church Administrative Board Position Paper, 1992, p. 10.
- ⁹²92. R. W. Coan, "Personality Types." *Encyclopedia of Psychology*, Vol. 3. Raymond Corsini, ed. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1984, p. 23.
- ⁹³93. Brian Myers, "A Critique of Martin and Deidre Bobgan's *Four Temperaments, Astrology and Personality Testing*. Houston, TX: Spring Bran Community Church Administrative Board Position Paper, 1992, p. 10.
- ⁹⁴94. Stanley N. Wellborn, "How Genes Shape Personality," *U. S. News & World Report*, April 13, 1987, p. 62.
- ⁹⁵95. Martin and Deidre Bobgan. *Four Temperaments, Astrology & Personality Testing*. Santa Barbara, CA: EastGate Publishers, 1992, pp. 157, 158.
- ⁹⁶96. Sylvan J. Kaplan and Barbara E. W. Kaplan. "The Kaplan Report: A Study of the Validity of the Personal Profile System." Kaplan Associates, Chevy Chase, MD, p.3.
- ⁹⁷97. Martin and Deidre Bobgan. *Four Temperaments, Astrology & Personality Testing*. Santa Barbara, CA: EastGate Publishers, 1992, pp. 156, 157.
- ⁹⁸98. Brian Myers, "A Critique of Martin and Deidre Bobgan's *Four Temperaments, Astrology and Personality Testing*. Houston, TX: Spring Bran Community Church Administrative Board Position Paper, 1992, p. 11.
- ⁹⁹99. Sylvan J. Kaplan and Barbara E. W. Kaplan. "The Kaplan Report: A Study of the Validity of the Personal Profile System." Kaplan Associates, Chevy Chase, MD, p.3.
- ¹⁰⁰100. Brian Myers, "A Critique of Martin and Deidre Bobgan's *Four Temperaments, Astrology and Personality Testing*. Houston, TX: Spring Bran Community Church Administrative Board Position Paper, 1992, p. 11.
- ¹⁰¹101. The National Research Council. *In the Mind's Eye* Daniel Druckman and Robert A. Bjork, eds. Washington: National Academy Press, 1991, p. 96.
- ¹⁰²102. Ibid., p. 99.

¹⁰³103. Brian Myers, "A Critique of Martin and Deidre Bobgan's *Four Temperaments, Astrology and Personality Testing*. Houston, TX: Spring Bran Community Church Administrative Board Position Paper, 1992, p. 12.

¹⁰⁴104. Ibid.

¹⁰⁵105. The Tenth Mental Measurements Yearbook. Jane Close Conoley and Jack J. Kramer, eds. Lincoln, NE: The Buros Institute of Mental Measurements, The University of Nebraska-Lincoln, 1989, p. 623.

¹⁰⁶106. Brian Myers, "A Critique of Martin and Deidre Bobgan's *Four Temperaments, Astrology and Personality Testing*. Houston, TX: Spring Bran Community Church Administrative Board Position Paper, 1992, p. 12.

¹⁰⁷107. Johnson, op. cit., p.262.

[Title / Contents](#)

[Introduction / Abstract](#)

[I. Four Temperaments and Astrology](#)

[III. The Four Temperaments and the Bible](#)

[Conclusion](#)

[Responses to Myers Appendices I-V](#)

[End Notes \(complete\)](#)