

Potential Use of Hartman's Color Code Personality Profile to Enhance Classroom Group Projects



Lori L. Moore¹
Texas A&M University
College Station, TX 77843-2116

Kimberly A. Gardner²
Del Monte Foods Plant #125
Yakima, WA 98901

Joseph F. Guenther³
University of Idaho
Moscow, ID 83844-2334

Abstract

Employers seek university graduates who possess interpersonal skills. Many instructors make group assignments but some students dislike them. Understanding the strengths and weaknesses of each team member could enhance the group project experience. Many major corporations and organizations use Hartman's Color Code Personality Profile to build stronger interpersonal relationships and enhance team projects. Although little has been published regarding its validity, Hartman's commercially successful program could have useful classroom applications. In one agricultural policy course students completed the Hartman personality profile questionnaire, and then received instruction from a certified Hartman trainer. Groups were formed for a class role-playing project based primarily on student personality profiles. At the end of the semester the 48 students completed a survey regarding their opinions of personality profiles. Results showed there was a "good balance of personalities in the group" (Likert score 4.43, with 5 = Strongly Agree) and that their "group worked well together because of different personalities" (Likert 4.43). Results also showed students did not think "all members having the same personality color would work better together" (Likert 1.83) or there was "too many individuals wanted to be in control of the group" (Likert 1.90). Students in one large group of nine students were less satisfied with group dynamics than those in the smaller groups of four to five students.

Introduction

Employers seek to hire well-qualified employees who can advance in their organizations. Researchers have documented the skills and abilities that business and industry representatives are looking for in new employees, especially in college graduates (Gardner, 2007; Litzenberg and Schneider, 1987; Maricle, 2003). Many of these studies have noted the

need for more "soft" skills. One of those skills is the ability to work in teams or groups (the terms will be used interchangeably). Brown (2001) went so far as to state that "*group effectiveness skills, including interpersonal communication, negotiation, and teamwork, are essential in today's classroom and workplace*" (p. 1).

Many organizations are restructuring their work environments by placing more emphasis on the use of work teams (Brown, 2001, Buckenmyer, 2000). As a result, improving teamwork skills in college students is a developmental goal of many university faculty members. When planning their courses, many faculty members include group projects or team activities in an effort to foster the development of teamwork skills (Buckenmyer, 2000). However, as Brown (2001) noted, "*although group work is seen as an optimal strategy for many job or task challenges, employers claim schools have not adequately prepared students to function well in a team capacity*" (p. 1). Brown went on to state "*it is imperative that educators and trainers take steps to prepare learners to be effective in group situations*" (p. 1) and suggested teachers develop skills as group facilitators to promote effective group interactions. Although some college instructors may possess such skills, those who do not may be providing little guidance when they assign group projects.

Despite the fact that employers want to hire college graduates who possess teamwork skills and that faculty members are including team activities in their courses, many college students do not like working in teams (Brown, 2001; Coplin, 2003). There are many possible contributors creating such a dislike. First, proponents of experiential learning theories would suggest that an individual's attitude toward working in teams stems from their previous experiences working in teams. Anecdotal evidence suggests most students have had experiences working in teams where only a few members do all of the

¹Assistant Professor, Agricultural Leadership, Education, & Communications; Email: llmoore@tamu.edu

²Warehouse Supervisor; Email: kim.gardner@delmonte.com

³Professor, Agricultural Economics and Rural Sociology; Email: jguenther@uidaho.edu

Potential Use

work. As a result of these “bad” experiences, some students have no interest in group projects or assignments. Buckenmyer (2000) reported the findings of an informal classroom inquiry where 17 members of the class reported negative experiences with teams in classes while only four class members reported positive experiences. A second possible contributor to why students do not like working in teams is that for much, if not all of their academic careers, competition and individual achievement have been emphasized over collaboration and group achievement (Brown, 2001; Holloway, 2003). A third possible contributing factor is that very few students receive instruction in how to work in a team setting. Buckenmyer (2000) cited the fact that frequently group members do not know how to build and maintain team effort as one of 10 reasons why students believe teams are unproductive and unpopular in classroom settings. Eastman and Swift (2002) noted while group activities might be assigned, limited in-class time is made available for group development and maintenance with assistance from the teacher. These contributing factors have created situations in which many groups simply assign individuals specific tasks to complete on an individual basis, thereby creating situations in which the group failed to work effectively as a team (Holloway, 2003). According to Buckenmyer (2000), “*such bad experiences may produce negative student attitudes regarding future use of teams, possibly harming those students' careers when they must handle team situations on the job and in the real world*” (p. 99).

The first strategy Brown (2001) identified and discussed to help educators and trainers become more effective facilitators of group activities was to be aware of student learning styles. While Brown focused mainly on learning styles, she did point out that personality inventories, such as the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator, could also be used to illustrate the impact of personality on group behavior by helping students understand their own particular style as well as to appreciate the styles of others. According to Fetzer (2005), “*Getting everyone to understand the other members is important, since any connection builds a sense of commonality. This empathy leads to trust when working together. Any dissimilarities can lead to mistrust and potential conflict. It is important to build understanding and acceptance of these differences, to see them as variations between people, not as factors that impede communication and working together*” (p. 6).

Through the use of teams, organizations are finding success is achieved not by individual members, but instead by the personality of the team members and their interactions with each other. Organizations are learning that teams composed of individuals who have different skills and different personalities allow for more diversity in the goals and objectives of the group.

Studies have been conducted to determine the impact of personality types on the importance of topics covered within a course (McPherson, 1999) and to determine the impact of personality types on team performance (Mohammed and Angell, 2003). While these studies are important, they have focused primarily on the product of teamwork as opposed to the process of working in teams, especially taking personality types into account. Spann (2000) suggested it is important for teams to answer questions related to team dynamics. In doing so, the process aspects of working in the team can be addressed either with or without emphasizing the product(s) produced by the team.

Theoretical Framework

People with different personalities have different inherent strengths and weaknesses. For this reason, the best groups are made up of members with diverse personalities who learn to appreciate and put to use each other's strengths. But what exactly is personality? According to Hogan (1991), the term personality has two different meanings. The first refers to the impression a person makes on others, while the second emphasizes the underlying, unseen structures and processes that explain why a person behaves the way they do, and why each person's behavior tends to be relatively stable. In general, people use the term personality to refer to the characteristics of a person that seem to arise from inside the personality, and to be central and distinctive to a person which is consistent from day to day. Everyone has a distinct personality pattern that includes a specific ways of thinking, reasoning, feeling, and acting.

According to the Color Code (Color Code Communications, 2003) we are born with a single core motive that remains with us throughout our life changing only when being developed over time by strengths and limitations within different situations. Hartman claims that this core motive is the root of why people do what they do. He developed the Hartman Personality Profile to help individuals identify their core motive and provide insight for them to work more efficiently with others. The purpose of the Hartman Personality Profile is to help people identify their personality color in order for them to see themselves in a new way and most importantly, help in building accurate self-awareness (Color Code Communications, 2003).

The Hartman color code separates individuals into four personality “Colors” – Red, Blue, White and Yellow -- that are the main driving core motives of an individual. A Red personality represents a power motive and describes an individual who is motivated by accomplishing tasks and getting things done. Individuals with red personalities seek productivity and have to look good in front of others in addition to always wanting their own way. They bring the gift of

leadership and vision and are generally responsible, decisive, proactive, and assertive wanting things precise, factual, and direct. Reds appreciate those who present them with facts and precision.

The core motive for a Blue personality is intimacy. Blues have the ability to connect with others and strive to be appreciated and understood. Blue personalities are emotional, reliable, loyal, and controlling. They have a tendency to be perfectionist and worry a lot; they thrive on relationships. *“Blues are dependable, thoughtful, analytical, and can be self-righteous, worry-prone, and moody”* (Color Code Communications, 2003, p. 11). When dealing with a Blue, one should be sincere and appreciative.

White personalities are driven by peace. The absence of conflict is what motivates them. They are peacemakers who seek independence and kindness. Whites are generally kind, adaptable, good listeners, and reflective. They tend to be smart, reclusive “thinkers” who don’t need any sort of praise or special recognition. Those dealing with Whites should be kind and accepting.

Yellow personalities are motivated by fun, or the joy of doing something just to say they did it. Yellows are charismatic, spontaneous, positive, happy, adventurous and optimistic. They are also carefree and don’t sit still for long. Yellows may at times be irresponsible, obnoxious, and forgetful. Yellows like interactions that are creative, upbeat and fun.

Hartman claims that people who know their core motives understand their strengths and limitations and can use this knowledge to better relate with others at work, school, and home. Hartman describes the strengths and weaknesses of each of the four personality colors in a non-judgmental manner. As a result, instead of aspiring to change colors, participants can focus on the contribution each color can make in different situations.

Since introducing The Color Code (Hartman, 1987), Dr. Taylor Hartman has developed his personality profile system into a successful commercial enterprise. Hartman Communications (2008) claims that *“Millions of people have already taken this ... personality test to change the way they see themselves.”* Many businesses and organizations use the Color Code to not only make group assignments, but also to make decisions on whom to hire and promote.

In spite of the long running commercial success of the Color Code and its important role in management, there is a paucity of academic research articles regarding its usefulness. Surprisingly, a February 2008 search came up with only one study regarding an evaluation of Hartman's Color Code. In an article titled “Construct Validity and Reliability of Hartman's Color Code Personality Profile” Ault and Barney (2007) describe a January 2006 search conducted by both authors and a Library faculty member that found *“...no known studies had been*

conducted regarding the validity or reliability of the Color Code” (p. 73).

Ault and Barney (2007) conducted two studies to analyze the validity of the Color Code. One author did the first validity study using 34 participants in an upper division Theories of Personality course. The other author conducted an independent replication of the first study, using 98 students enrolled in psychological assessment courses. The procedure was to compare Color Code results with results from Cattell's 16PF instrument, which has long been accepted regarding its utility, reliability and validity. The 16PF tool measures the same traits as those in the Color Code. Research results supported the validity of the Color Code, but suggested an error variance that could cause some individuals to be put in an inaccurate color category.

The Ault and Barney (2007) reliability component of the study consisted of three test-retest experiments with a total of 176 undergraduate students. The time between the test and retest ranged from 21 days to 42 days. The authors concluded the study *“demonstrated respectable stability for up to six weeks in how the Color Code classified people ...”* and it *“appeared to measure more than just transitory moods.”* (p. 78).

One issue of concern in both the validity and reliability research was the forced-choice format used in the Color Code. The Hartman questionnaire requires the user to choose only one item for each question. This causes the instrument to force the user to select an item even if none fits and to choose only one if several fit. Thus the Color Code format *“artificially excludes good matches and artificially includes poor matches.”* (p. 78). Unlike the 16PF instrument that only includes good matches in the score; the Color Code format can cause some users to be put into an inaccurate color category.

Purpose and Objectives

This study involves the on-going development of an undergraduate course in agricultural policy. The third author began teaching the course during the fall of 1995 and has continued to teach the course each fall since then. He used a group role playing project from the beginning. The value the course's role playing as a leadership development tool was documented in Guenthner and Moore (2005).

The first several years the role playing project was assigned with little guidance regarding the makeup of the groups and how the students could efficiently proceed with the work. One factor used from the beginning was a student preference ranking. At the beginning of the semester the students were given a brief overview of the main topics of the course and were told that role playing groups would be formed to make presentations on each topic. Group assignments were based on a simple survey of

Potential Use

students' subject matter interests. Most students were given their first or second choices in assignments to role playing subject matter groups. The role playing presentations went well during those years and student feedback was positive.

As class size grew and groups sizes also expanded, gender balance emerged as a second criterion for making group assignments. Being a gender minority became a bigger concern when group size expanded from three to five students. Since enrollment in this class is usually about half female, the gender balancing was not difficult.

The instructor meets twice with each group outside class to help them prepare for their in-class presentations. He noticed some groups seemed to function better than others, and then began to explore reasons why. He had been exposed to personality profile tools, including the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI) which has been in use since 1943, and thought a personality profile might be a third criterion for forming class project groups. He then saw a presentation at a Leadership Idaho Agriculture conference by a County Extension Educator who was also a certified Hartman Color Code trainer. She convinced him to try the Color Code first as an exciting new subject matter for his agricultural policy students and second as a tool to assign students to group projects.

The instructor has been using the Color Code since 2002. Course evaluations and anecdotal feedback from students has been consistently enthusiastic and positive, but the instructor sought a more formal method of evaluating the tool. In the fall of 2005 he teamed with a faculty member and a graduate student in the Department of Agricultural and Extension Education to conduct an evaluation. They developed the hypothesis that the Color Code enhances group projects for students in this agricultural policy course. Their objective was to implement a student survey to test that hypothesis.

Materials and Methods

The population for this study consisted of students enrolled in an undergraduate agricultural economics course (agricultural and rural policy) at a land grant university in the Pacific Northwest during the fall 2005 semester. A total of 48 students were included in the population frame.

Two instruments were used to collect data: the Hartman Personality Profile (Color Code Communications, 2003) and a researcher-developed survey instrument. At the beginning of the semester and prior to being assigned to groups within the class, each of the 48 students were given the Hartman Personality Profile. The Profile is a two-part 45-question assessment that identifies an individual's core motive. Part One is titled Strengths and Limitations and consists of 30 questions of descriptive words with four words in each group. Respondents pick the word that best describes how

they were as a child. Part Two is titled Situations and consists of 15 situations with four possible reactions. Respondents pick the reaction that best describes how they would react as a child.

Once personality colors were identified the students were separated into 10 groups for a semester-long project. The group assignment was to conduct a role-playing project on one of the following agricultural policy issues: technology, animal rights, marketing, price control, property rights, water, environment, and food safety. Instructors used student topic preferences as one factor in forming groups. They also made sure each group had gender balance and as many personality colors as possible. The groups were compromised of different personality colors to observe how they worked together throughout the semester.

Students were given the Color Code questionnaire during the first week of class as a homework assignment. They then received two class periods of Color Code instruction from a team of two certified Hartman Color Code trainers, who had experience using the Color Code in the medical profession. During these two sessions students learned about their personality and how to interact with other personalities. The instruction included exercises on how to respond to scenarios involving different personalities. A second homework assignment and exam questions tested their knowledge of the topic. Several times later in the semester the instructor had students gather into the four color groups to brainstorm for a class discussion so they could discover what it was like to work with groups in which all the members had the same personality. For the entire semester, class discussion was often enriched by students making comments involving personality profiles.

At the end of the semester, a researcher-developed survey instrument was administered to the 48 participants. The survey consisted of 24 questions, including two multiple choice questions, 17 Likert type questions, four closed response questions with yes and no answer choices, and one fill in the blank question. The 17 Likert type questions were on a five point scale with 1 = Strongly Disagree, 2 = Disagree, 3 = Neutral or Undecided, 4 = Agree, and 5 = Strongly Agree.

All 48 participants identified in the population frame completed both the Hartman Personality Profile and the researcher developed survey instrument for an overall response rate of 100%. Because a 100% response rate was obtained, non-response error was not an issue. Data were analyzed using the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) Version 15.0 for Windows.

Results and Discussion

Of the 48 participants, 38% had Blue personalities, 25% had Red personalities, 23% had White personalities, and 15% were Yellow personalities

(Table 1). That is typical of the personality profiles for other semesters of the same course. For all seven semesters in which the Color Code has been used, 31% of the students have been Blue, 30% Red, 23% White and 17% Yellow. It is not known how this compares to other groups. Ault and Barney (2007) addressed this issue in their study: “Because no normative information existed for the Color Code the descriptive statistics for the participants could not be compared with the general population,” (p. 75).

Some of the survey questions dealt with students' awareness and understanding of personality types at the end of the semester, nearly four months after their first exposure to the Color Code. When asked if they were aware of different color personalities, all but one of the 48 participants indicated they were (Table 1, question 4). When asked if they were able to identify other individuals in their group by their personality color, two-thirds (n=32, 67%) said they could identify some of the individuals in their group by personality color and one-quarter (n=12, 25%) responded that they could identify all of the other individuals in their group by personality group. Only 8% (n=4) indicated they were unable to identify any of the other individuals in their group by their personality colors (question 5). When participants were asked if they understood more about themselves and the way they behave because of what they learned about personality colors, 88% (n=42) responded yes, 10% (n=5) responded no, and 2% (n=1) responded with “somewhat.”

Some of the questions dealt with student perceptions of group dynamics when placed in groups with different color personalities. Means and standard deviations for participant responses to each of the 17 process questions are presented in Table 2. Overall, it would appear as though providing instruction into the different color personalities and mixing such personalities within the groups made a positive impact on the overall group dynamics within the group. Although this study did not include a control group that did not receive personality instruction, the results support the hypothesis that the Color Code can enhance group projects in this course.

The student responses in Table 2 are split into four categories: based on mean scores. The first category consisted of scores ranging from 4.28 to 4.43 on the Likert scale. Tied for the highest score of 4.43 was: “The group worked well together because of different personalities.” Most of the students recognized that an understanding of personalities enhanced group performance. This is reinforced in the high score for Question #3, which was related to group creativity. Also tied for highest was the question regarding balance of personalities in the group. This suggests the instructors were able to provide balance in group formation even though there were 18 Blues and only 7 Whites. The other question in this category: “Our group was relaxed” may have received a high mean score because of the personality balance and understanding within the groups.

The next category of five questions had mean scores ranging from 3.60 to 3.95. The mean of 3.95 for the question: “Personality best defines itself through relationships with other personalities” shows that students recognized the importance of personality differences. Next at 3.90, “Personality played a large role in our group” indicates the students developed an appreciation for different personality types. Questions #7 and #8 involved behavior and dependability. Perhaps since students recognized the strengths and weaknesses of each group member's personality they understood what each could contribute. This was reinforced with the high mean score of 3.60 for the question, “Our group functioned better because we knew each member's personality color.”

The bottom category in Table 2 consists of four questions with mean scores ranging from 1.83 to 1.93. In general the students disagreed there was a lack of communication in their group. They also tended to disagree that it would be good to have groups composed of the same personality color. They also disagreed there was a leadership struggle in their group. Perhaps the identification of the Reds and team members' understanding of Red leadership abilities allowed students to more easily move into roles appropriate for their personalities.

Student responses varied depending on group size. The class was originally split into ten groups, consisting of eight groups of five students and two groups of four students. Since there were only eight

Table 1. Personality profile responses

Q/A	Number	Percent
Q1: What color are you?		
White	11	23%
Red	12	25%
Blue	18	38%
Yellow	7	15%
Q2: Have you taken a personality test?		
Yes	19	40%
No	29	60%
Q3: How many people were in your group		
4	4	8%
5	37	77%
9	6	15%
Q4: Were you aware of other personality colors in your group?		
Yes	47	98%
No	1	2%
Q5: Could you identify the people in your group by their personality colors?		
None	4	8%
All	12	25%
Some	32	67%
Q6: Do you understand more about yourself and the way you behave because you learned about personality colors?		
Yes	42	88%
No	5	10%
Somewhat	1	2%

Potential Use

Table 2. Student perceptions regarding personalities in group dynamics

No.	Question	Mean	SD
Highest mean score group:			
1	The group worked well together because of different personalities	4.43	0.55
2	There was a good balance of personality in our group	4.43	0.55
3	The group was more creative because of our different personalities and ways of thinking	4.28	0.60
4	Our group was relaxed	4.28	0.72
High mean score group:			
5	Personality best defines itself through relationships with other personalities	3.95	0.68
6	Personality played a large role in our group	3.90	0.67
7	Personality is a code of behavior	3.80	0.65
8	Everyone in the group was highly dependable	3.78	1.03
9	Our group functioned better because we knew each member's personality color	3.60	0.84
Low mean score group:			
10	Some personalities in the group were hard to work and reason with	2.40	1.03
11	Our group was intense	2.30	0.85
12	There was contention between individuals in our group	2.08	0.94
Lowest mean score group:			
13	There was a lack of communication in our group	1.93	0.66
14	Conflict occurred in the group because of different personalities	1.90	0.87
15	There was a struggle for leadership in our group	1.88	0.76
16	Too many individuals wanted to be in control of the group	1.85	0.70
17	Groups with all members having the same personality color would work better together	1.83	0.90
<i>Likert Scale: 1 = Strongly Disagree, 2 = Disagree, 3 = Neutral or Undecided, 4 = Agree, and 5 = Strongly Agree</i>			

subject matter topics there were two groups for Marketing and two groups for Property Rights. The two Marketing groups, consisting of nine total members, convinced the instructor to let them combine into one group. The instructor was reluctant to allow that but the group's class presentation was well done. An analysis of that group's survey responses suggests that those nine students had a less satisfactory experience than the other 39 students in smaller groups.

Table 3 is sorted by the mathematical difference between the mean responses from the large group students and the small group students. For question #1, regarding group intensity, the large group mean was 3.00, which was 0.70 higher than the small group mean. This suggests that large groups may cause some intensity by sheer size alone. Question #2: "Conflict occurred in the group because of different personalities" had a mean difference of 0.60. The larger group may have had more conflict for several reasons. First, four of the nine students had Red personalities. Since Reds are motivated by power, there may have been some difficulties in establishing leadership roles. Second, there were no White personalities in the group. Since Whites are peacemakers, this group lacked a valuable personality type. This is reinforced by the large difference in means for Question #4, suggesting that some group members resented other personality types and there was no peacemaker to sooth them.

At the bottom of Table 3, the largest negative

Table 3. Differences in mean values between large group and small groups

No.	Question	Large group	Small groups	Difference
1	Our group was intense	3.00	2.30	0.70
2	Conflict occurred in the group because of different personalities	2.50	1.90	0.60
3	Some personalities in the group were hard to work and reason with	3.00	2.40	0.60
4	There was contention between individuals in our group	2.63	2.08	0.55
5	Groups with all members having the same personality color would work better together	2.25	1.83	0.43
6	Too many individuals wanted to be in control of the group	2.13	1.85	0.28
7	There was a struggle for leadership in our group	2.00	1.88	0.13
8	Personality played a large role in our group	4.00	3.90	0.10
9	Personality is a code of behavior	3.88	3.80	0.08
10	There was a lack of communication in our group	2.00	1.93	0.08
11	The group was more creative because of our different personalities and ways of thinking	4.25	4.28	-0.03
12	Our group was relaxed	4.13	4.28	-0.15
13	Everyone in the group was highly dependable	3.38	3.78	-0.40
14	There was a good balance of personality in our group	4.00	4.43	-0.43
15	Personality best defines itself through relationships with other personalities	3.50	3.95	-0.45
16	Our group functioned better because we knew each member's personality color	3.00	3.60	-0.60
17	The group worked well together because of different personalities	3.75	4.43	-0.68
<i>Likert Scale: 1 = Strongly Disagree, 2 = Disagree, 3 = Neutral or Undecided, 4 = Agree, and 5 = Strongly Agree</i>				

difference is -0.68 for the statement: *“The group worked well together because of different personalities.”* The students in this group of nine, consisting of four Reds, three Blues, two Yellows and no Whites were less satisfied with the experience than were students in smaller, better-balanced groups. Questions 13 through 16 also had lower means for the larger group with mean differences ranging from -0.40 to -0.60. Students in the larger group rated the experience lower in terms of member dependability, personality balance, relationships and group cohesiveness.

Students in the larger group earned high grades on their presentation, which alone would suggest that perhaps group size did not matter much. Most of the students in that group were high academic achievers so maybe they did all right in spite of the large group size. Due mostly to the survey results the instructor now caps group size at five students.

Conclusions

The Hartman Personality Profile was a useful tool to facilitate a group project in the agricultural policy course. Anecdotal evidence in the form of student comments from those who have completed the course has been quite positive. Many students and alumni comment that understanding personality differences has helped them in their personal and professional lives. Some graduates who have gone into leadership positions cite the role playing project as an important part of their leadership development (Guenther and Moore, 2005).

Many instructors make group project assignments, but some lack an understanding of how to facilitate and guide the students' team efforts. The make-up of groups should receive careful consideration. In this case study the instructor used subject matter preference, gender balance and the Hartman Personality Color Code to assign students to teams. Assigning the right mix of students to groups can enhance group projects by providing diversity in motives, strengths, and communication styles. That can be accomplished simply by using the personality profile questionnaire, but instructors should consider doing more than that.

Group projects can be further enhanced by including personality profile subject matter in the course. In the agricultural policy course two 50-minute class periods were used to teach the Color Code. Since this three-credit course included 45 class periods during the semester, those two classes represent a bit more than four percent on the total semester in-class time. Some instructors may balk at using that much class time, but it was a good fit in this agricultural policy course. Instruction on related topics, such as communicating with lawmakers, public officials and non-government organizations was enhanced because of the students' knowledge of personality profiles.

Research results from this study support the hypothesis that group projects can be enhanced by

using the Color Code personality profile. A question that was not answered is: would another type of personality profile be better? Strengths of the Hartman Color Code include: (1) it is simple to administer, (2) it is easy to understand, (3) certified trainers are available and (4) students' feedback was positive.

One weakness of the Hartman Color Code is that there has only been one academic study regarding its usefulness. It has not been thoroughly vetted by academia. Free market advocates might argue that the Hartman system has tacitly been approved in another important arena – the market. The argument is that since it has been a commercial success and is used in many businesses and organizations for a fee, it must have merit.

On the other hand the Color Code might have limitations that could limit its use. Ault and Barney (2007) recognize that their research subjects “enjoyed anonymity and had nothing to gain or lose by the results,” (p. 79). In a more high-stakes employee situation involving hiring, firing or promotion participants might be motivated to alter their responses in a way that the instrument becomes part of a strategy rather than a true measure of personality. While that issue is beyond the scope of this paper it indicates a need for more research on the Color Code. According to Ault and Barney (2007) their studies “... serve as a beginning of what should become a large body of scientific evidence pertaining to the Color Code, if the instrument is to continue to be used” (p. 80).

Literature Cited

- Ault, J.T. and S.T. Barney. 2007. Construct validity and reliability of Hartman's color code personality profile. *International Jour. of Selection and Assessment* 15(1): 72-81.
- Brown, B.L. 2001. Group effectiveness in the classroom and workplace. Center on Education and Training for Employment Practice Application Brief No. 15. <http://cete.org/acve/docs/pab00024.pdf>. Accessed June 19, 2007.
- Buckenmyer, J.A. 2000. Using teams for class activities: Making course/classroom teams work. *Jour. of Education for Business* 76(2): 98-107.
- Color Code Communications. 2003. *The Hartman Personality Profile*. Salt Lake City, UT.
- Coplin, W.D. 2003. 10 things employers want you to learn in college. Berkeley, CA: Ten Speed Press.
- Eastman, J.K. and C.O. Swift. 2002. Enhancing collaborative learning: Discussion boards and chat rooms as project tools. *Business Communication Quarterly* 65(3): 29-41.
- Fetzer, J. 2005. Teams and teamwork. *Analytical & Bioanalytical Chemistry* 383(1): 6-7.
- Gardner, K.A. 2007. Identifying leadership needs of College of Agricultural and Life Sciences undergraduates. M.S. Thesis, University of Idaho, Moscow, ID.

Potential Use

- Guenthner, J.F. and L.L. Moore. 2005. Role playing as a leadership development tool. *The Jour. of Leadership Education* 4(2): 59-65.
- Hartman Communications. 2008. The color code: Why do you act like you do? <http://www.thecolorcode.com/index.html>. Accessed February 18, 2008.
- Hartman, T. 1987. *The color code*. New York, NY: FIRESIDE.
- Hogan, J. 1991. Personality and personality measurement. In: Dunnette, M.D. and L.M. Hough (eds.). *Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, Vol. 2. Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.
- Holloway, J.H. 2003. Student teamwork. *Educational Leadership* 61(4): 91-92.
- Litzenberg, K. and V. Schneider. 1987. Competencies and qualities of agricultural economics graduates sought by agribusiness employers. *American Jour. of Agricultural Economics* 69(5): 1031-1036.
- Maricle, H.K. 2003. Entry-level competencies of animal science professionals. M.S. Thesis, University of Nebraska, Lincoln, NE.
- McPherson, B. 1999. Correlating students' personality types with their rating of topics covered in business communication classes. *Business Communication Quarterly* 62(3): 46-53.
- Mohammed, S. and L.C. Angell. 2003. Personality heterogeneity in teams: Which differences make a difference for team performance. *Small Group Research* 34(6): 651-677.
- Spann, K. 2000. How do you rate your team's teamwork? *Nursing Management* 31(1): 45.
- Williams, S. (n.d.) Appreciating personality diversity. (<http://www.wright.edu/~scott.williams/LeaderLetter/personality.htm>) Accessed June 19, 2007.