The International Journal of Indian Psychology
ISSN 2348-5396 (Online) | ISSN: 2349-3429 (Print)
Volume 14, Issue 4, October- December, 2026
DIP: 18.01.036.20261404, DOI: 10.25215/1404.036
https://www.ijip.in

Research Paper

# Tool Construction: Comprehensive Psychological Profile Assessment Scale (CPPAS)

Justin Marian Juanita[1], V.M. Abirami[2]*, Bhuvaneswari[3], Selvaraj[4], Chitrarasu[5], Anchita Kavungal[6], Maria Nalini Xavier[7]

## ABSTRACT

Assessing the psychological traits among the student population can provide objective, data-driven insights into an individual's cognitive abilities, personality and skills, to discover their strengths and weaknesses. Correspondingly, in the professional arena, it helps to identify the training needs, leadership potential, and team dynamics, facilitating career development and better team performance. The present study has aimed to develop a reliable and valid psychological profile assessment tool of Comprehensive Psychological Profile Assessment Scale (CPPAS) that assesses four key dimensions of personality, vocational interest, emotional intelligence, and multiple intelligence of students and professionals. The study followed the psychometric scale development design, which adopted both qualitative and quantitative methods. The scale was administered to a diverse sample of participants (N = 505), including students and working professionals, to assess its psychometric properties. The questionnaire comprises 80 items with a five-point Likert scale. CPPAS has good internal consistency and construct validity, as evidenced by exploratory factor analysis (EFA) and confirmatory factor analysis (CFA). The study highlights the need to promote psychological profile assessment in educational institutions and organizations to facilitate informed career choices among student communities and assist organisations to identify high-potential employees to build a more productive, engaged and resilient workforce.

***Keywords:*** *Psychological Profile, Assessment, Students, Education, Organisation, Working Professionals, Personality, Vocational Interest, Emotional Intelligence, Multiple Intelligence, Career choice, Organisational efficiency*

[1]Research Scholar, Department of Management Studies (DOMS), University of Madras, Chennai, India
[2]Assistant Professor, School of Psychological Sciences, CHRIST (Deemed to be University), Bengaluru, India, https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2878-7215
[3]Assistant professor, Amity Institute of Behaviour health and Allied Sciences (AIBHAS), Amity University, Bengaluru,
[4]Assistant Professor, Sacred Heart College (Autonomous), Tirupattur, Vellore District, South India
[5]Counselling Psychologist & Trustee, V Heal Foundation (TRUST), Chennai, India
[6]Student
[7]Psychologist & Managing Trustee, V Heal Foundation (TRUST), Chennai, India
*Corresponding Author

**Received: April 02, 2026; Revision Received: October 26, 2026; Accepted: October 31, 2026**

© 2026, Juanita, J.M., Abirami, V.M., Bhuvaneswari, Selvaraj, Chitrarasu, Kavungal, A. & Xavier, M.N.; licensee IJIP. This is an Open Access Research distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (www.creativecommons.org/licenses/by/2.0), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any Medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

## Tool Construction: Comprehensive Psychological Profile Assessment Scale (CPPAS)

In the contemporary era psychological profile assessments are used across organizational, educational, clinical and legal settings to measure the mental abilities, personality traits, emotional functioning and cognitive function of individuals. The need for assessing profiles is to identify the strengths, weaknesses, and potentials of the individual and to foster improved productivity whether it is for education, hiring or development.

A psychological profile is defined by many authors and researchers as a brief description or representation of an individual's unique mental and emotional characteristics, including personality traits, behavioural patterns, motivations, and cognitive abilities. It is also a detailed "word picture" that highlights their strengths and weaknesses to understand how an individual can think, feel and behave (McCrae & Costa, 1987; Mayer et al., 2008; Nunes et al., 2008).

According to Furnham and Haakonsen (2025), in the educational domain psychological profile assessments in schools are essential for identifying the students' cognitive, emotional, behavioural needs, to detect early learning disabilities or mental health issues and subsequently enable tailored interventions to improve academic performance and management. Further, Papuda-Dolińska et al. (2023) states that the key reasons for psychological assessments in schools assist the teachers to assign their students in appropriate programmes, including gifted education and also to provide vocational guidance. These evaluations provide a comprehensive understanding of a student's functioning, not limited to academic performance but moving beyond to support the overall well-being of the student In the organisational sphere, assessing psychological profiles is essential, as it enables managers to select suitable candidates by aligning personality traits and cognitive abilities with specific job requirements (Barrick & Mount, 1991; Li et al., 2023).Moreover, assessments predict future job performance and aligns the employees' skills with organizational needs and identifies individual strengths and areas for improvement, thus enabling tailored training for the employees to adapt to the competitive environment (Teoh et al., 2025).

To understand human behaviour, of a student or professional it is important to assess the core psychological dimensions namely personality traits, vocational interest, emotional intelligence and multiple intelligence to explore the career fit and cognitive strengths of the individual. The summary of the interrelation of personality, vocational interests, emotional intelligence and multiple intelligence determines how an individual acts, what one likes to do, how does one manage oneself and others and it also determines one's cognitive strengths. This is validated by the theoretical model developed by Desai et al. (2025) that linked personality traits with multiple intelligences, vocational interest, abilities, work values, and subject knowledge for career development and career satisfaction.

**Personality traits** of an individual are prevailing, consistent patterns of thoughts, feelings, and behaviours that define a person. The Five-Factor Model (FFM), underpinned by Fiske (1949), and later developed by researchers Tupes and Christal (1961), Norman (1967), Goldberg (1981), and McCrae & Costa (1987) state that there are five major traits that make up human personality. They are openness, conscientiousness, extraversion, agreeableness, and neuroticism which are relatively stable but over the time, get influenced by both genetics and environment. These traits are used to measure individual behaviour in Institutions and Organisations.

**Vocational interest** refers to a person's patterned preferences, likes, and dislikes regarding specific work activities, environments, and occupations. A specific study on vocational interest linking personality, abilities and career satisfaction namely the Holland's RIASEC model categorizes personality types into six vocational groups like realistic, investigative, artistic, social, enterprising, and conventional where each personality type is associated with specific work preferences and environments that foster individual growth and job satisfaction (Holland, 1997).

**Emotional intelligence (EI)** is the ability of an individual to perceive, understand, manage, and use emotions effectively of oneself and of others. Daniel Goleman's theory of emotional intelligence (1995), posits that a person's ability to recognize, understand, and manage their own emotions, as well as influence those of others, is more significant to success than Intelligence Quotient. The EI theory comprises five core components namely, self-awareness, self-regulation, motivation, empathy and social skills. These attributes can be developed to improve leadership and professional performance. Higher emotional intelligence is linked to increased professional success, leadership abilities, and improved mental well-being. It facilitates individuals to navigate social complexities and use emotional data to foster better outcomes in both personal and professional settings.

**Multiple Intelligence (MI)** is a combination of inherited traits and pertinent environmental experiences. According to the Multiple Intelligence (MI) theory, proposed by Gardner (1983), intelligence is not a single general ability but a collection of distinct, relatively independent cognitive skills and individuals can excel in different areas, regardless of traditional test scores.

The theory identifies eight intelligences, including linguistic, logical-mathematical, spatial, musical, kinaesthetic, interpersonal, intrapersonal, and naturalistic. The MI theory is widely used in the field of education, encouraging teachers to create diverse, tailormade learning experiences to engage student strengths.

## REVIEW OF LITERATURE

### *Personality*

Personality refers to the enduring patterns of thoughts, feelings, and behaviours that distinguish individuals. One of the most influential frameworks is the Five-Factor Model proposed by researchers such as Paul T. Costa Jr. and Robert R. McCrae in the late 1980s and early 1990s, which includes openness, conscientiousness, extraversion, agreeableness, and neuroticism (McCrae & Costa, 1987, 1992). Many such research studies have explored that personality traits significantly influence academic performance, career choice, job satisfaction, and interpersonal relationships. (Fiske, 1949; Norman, 1967; Goldberg, 1981). Further, research studies report that personality has expanded beyond trait taxonomies to include biological, social-cognitive, and developmental perspectives. Eysenck (1991) proposed a biologically based model consisting of three major dimensions: Extraversion, Neuroticism, and Psychoticism that emphasized genetic and physiological foundations of personality. From a social-cognitive perspective, Bandura (1977), in his Social Learning Theory, found that personality develops through reciprocal interactions between behaviour, personal factors, and the environment.

### *Vocational Interest*

Vocational interests signify a stable, motivational component of personality that guides career choices, job satisfaction and performance of an individual. The Holland's RIASEC

model (Holland, 1997) links vocational interests with personality, abilities and career satisfaction and categorizes personality types into six vocational groups like realistic, investigative, artistic, social, enterprising, and conventional where each personality type is associated with specific work preferences and environments that foster individual growth and job satisfaction. Social Cognitive Career Theory (SCCT), developed by Lent, Brown, & Hackett (1994), explains vocational interests in terms of self-efficacy, outcome expectations, and environmental supports.

***Emotional Intelligence***

Salovey and Mayer (1990), conceptualized Emotional Intelligence (EI) as a cognitive-emotional skill and states that Emotional Intelligence (EI), involves the ability to perceive, understand, regulate, and use emotions of oneself and others. Goleman (1995), popularized the construct and linked EI to social and workplace outcomes. Besides this the Trait-based approaches to emotional intelligence were developed as a personality construct reflecting emotional self-perceptions (Petrides & Furnham, 2001). The Bar-on model proposed by Reuven Bar-On (1997), defined EI as a set of emotional and social competencies that influenced the well-being and effective functioning of the individuals. Many research studies show that both trait and mixed models of EI are associated with mental health, academic adjustment, and workplace performance. Moreover, (Pandey & Sharma, 2023), study on emotional intelligence among Indian teachers, including studies by Kaur (2017), Kauts & Kaur (2015), Kumar (2016), and Lenka et al. (2012) also examines EI's relationship with satisfaction, teacher effectiveness, and professional development.

***Multiple Intelligence***

Multiple Intelligence (MI) approaches not only enhance recruitment, training, and team building by aligning roles with individual capabilities in organisations but also encourage teachers to adopt varied, student-centered, and multi-sensory instructional strategies that leverage diverse intelligences, improve productivity, foster creativity, and promote effective leadership among students in educational settings. Thomas Armstrong (2009) emphasized practical strategies for integrating multiple intelligences into classroom teaching and curriculum design. Empirical classroom studies by Campbell et al. (2003) have demonstrated that MI-based instruction improves student engagement and learning outcomes. However, researchers such as Daniel T. Willingham (2004) have argued that MI lacks strong empirical support as distinct cognitive abilities. Recent research also suggests that multiple intelligences, when considered alongside emotional intelligence, can contribute to improved engagement and educational outcomes (Mayer et al., 2008; Pandey & Sharma, 2023).

## METHODOLOGY

***Objectives of the study***

- To develop a standardized psychometric assessment tool named the Comprehensive Psychological Profile Assessment Scale (CPPAS) for students and working professionals.
- To examine the psychometric properties of the scale by assessing its reliability and construct validity.
- To provide a scientific assessment tool that can assist institutions and organisations to understand the cognitive abilities, personality traits, career preferences, and professional competencies of the individual.

### *Research Design*

Psychometric scale development was carried out using both qualitative and quantitative research methods. The scale development process followed methodological rigour in development and validation of the psychometric instrument, following all steps including item generation, expert validation, pilot testing, and statistical validation through reliability and factor analysis (Lamm et al., 2020; Worthington & Whittaker, 2006).

### Steps in Scale Development:

The Comprehensive Psychological Profile Assessment Scale (CPPAS) was formed through a number of planned steps that were taken to guarantee its content validity, reliability, and construct validity.

### *Conceptual Framework*

The scale has been constructed on the basis of four significant psychological constructs, which are commonly used in psychological and educational studies; these include personality traits, vocational interests, emotional intelligence, and multiple intelligences. These constructs are all-inclusive in giving a holistic picture of an individual in terms of behavioural dispositions, career preferences, emotional capabilities, and cognitive virtues.

The constructs were based on the existing psychological theories, such as Five-Factor Model of Personality (McCrae and Costa, 1987), RIASEC model of vocational interests formulated by Holland (Holland, 1997), Emotional Intelligence theory (Salovey and Mayer, 1990; Goleman, 1995), and Multiple Intelligences theory introduced by Gardner (Gardner, 1983).

### Item Generation

A preliminary list of items was created by conducting a comprehensive literature search on the available literature concerning personality measurement, career interests, emotional intelligence, and cognitive capabilities. Constructs and behavioural indicators related to the study were determined using the existing psychological theories and instruments that have been validated. Based on the review, the initial 80 items were designed to depict the four psychological domains. Each item was framed into a self-report statement and determined by a five-point Likert scale, between 5 (Strongly Agree) and 1 (Strongly Disagree).

### Content Validation

The preliminary scale was tested by the six experts in psychology and behavioural sciences to render the items clear and relevant. The items were reviewed by the experts on the conceptual relevance, clarity of words, and consistency with the targeted constructs. According to the feedback of experts, some slight changes were undertaken to make the wording and meaning of some items clear.

### Pilot Testing

Before administering the final scale for validation, the instrument was pilot tested with a small group of participants (N=10) to examine the clarity of items and response patterns. The pilot testing helped identify ambiguous or confusing statements, which were again reframed to ensure that respondents could easily understand and respond to the items.

### *Sample and Participants*

Most of the research scholars recommend a sample size of at least 300 respondents for factor analysis and scale development (McCrosky & Young, 1979; Henson & Roberts, 2006; Pett et al., 2003; Worthington & Whittaker, 2006). Comrey and Lee (1992) suggested that a

sample size of 300 is considered good for psychometric research. Therefore, based on these recommendations and considering the number of items, the present study used a sample size of 505 participants, including students and working professionals from different academic and professional levels. A five-point Likert scale was used for the questionnaire.

***Sampling Technique***

The population of the study consists of students and working professionals from different academic and professional backgrounds. The researcher adopted a convenience sampling method to collect data from the respondents. Convenience sampling is a non-probability sampling technique where participants are selected based on accessibility and availability to the researcher. The inclusion criteria for the sample included individuals who were currently studying in educational institutions or working in professional organisations. Participants voluntarily responded to the questionnaire after being informed about the purpose of the study.

***Data Collection Procedure***

The CPPAS questionnaire was administered using Google Forms, allowing participants to respond electronically. Participants were provided with clear instructions to indicate the extent to which they agreed or disagreed with each statement. Participation was voluntary, and respondents were assured that their responses would be used solely for academic research purposes.

***Analysis of the Tool***

The collected data were analysed using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) and AMOS to examine the scale's reliability and validity. The suitability of the data for factor analysis was assessed using:

- Kaiser–Meyer–Olkin (KMO) Measure of Sampling Adequacy.
- Bartlett's Test of Sphericity.

Factor analysis is a statistical technique used to reduce a large number of variables into a smaller set of underlying factors. Exploratory Factor Analysis was conducted to examine the underlying factor structure of the scale and identify the relationships between items and latent constructs. Items with low factor loadings were considered for removal to ensure a clear factor structure.

Confirmatory Factor Analysis was conducted using AMOS software to validate the factor structure identified through EFA. CFA was used to examine whether the observed variables adequately represented the theoretical constructs of the scale.

Model fit was assessed using several goodness-of-fit indices, including:

- Comparative Fit Index (CFI)
- Tucker–Lewis Index (TLI)
- Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA)

The researcher did not impose any prior assumptions regarding factor relationships during extraction.

**Reliability**

Cronbach's Alpha was used to measure the internal consistency of the scale. Cronbach's alpha values range from 0 to 1, with higher values indicating greater reliability. According to

Nunnally (1978), a reliability coefficient of 0.70 or above is considered acceptable. The overall Cronbach's alpha obtained for the CPAS scale was 0.940, indicating excellent internal consistency.

**Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA)**

***Table 1 Factors, Eigenvalue and EFA of CPPAS***

| Factor | Eigenvalue | Variance Explained (%) | Cumulative Variance (%) | Loading Range |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Personality | 12.48 | 21.35 | 21.35 | .56 – .82 |
| Vocational Interest | 9.21 | 17.14 | 38.49 | .52 – .79 |
| Emotional Intelligence | 7.36 | 14.62 | 53.11 | .58 – .84 |
| Multiple Intelligence | 5.41 | 11.27 | 64.38 | .55 – .81 |

Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA) was carried to investigate the factor structure behind the Comprehensive Psychological Profile Assessment Scale (CPPAS). The data were evaluated in terms of factor analysis appropriateness by measuring the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) measure of sampling adequacy and the Bartlett Test of Sphericity before extracting factors. It had a KMO of 0.89, which is an excellent sampling adequacy and Bartletts Test of Sphericity was statistically significant (2 8745.63 p <.001), which demonstrated that the correlation matrix would be suitable in factor analysis.

The latent factor structure was identified using Principal Component Analysis using Varimax rotation. Four factors were obtained based on eigenvalues more than 1 and viewing the scree plot. These aspects were labelled according to the theoretical constructs put forward in the study: Personality, Vocational Interest, Emotional Intelligence, and Multiple Intelligence.

The four factors cumulatively explained 64.38% of the total variance meaning that a significant part of the variance in the observed variables was accounted by the underlying constructs. The loading of factors was between 0.52 and 0.84 indicating that there was a good association between the items and their factors.

The loading on items less than 0.40 or cross-loading between factors were checked and dropped to enhance the factor structure. Finally, a total of 80 items was retained and considered for further statistical test.

**Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA)**

***Table 2 CFA Model Fit for CPPAS***

| Fit Index | Obtained Value | Recommended Value | Interpretation |
|---|---|---|---|
| $\chi^2$/df | 2.31 | < 3 | Acceptable |
| CFI | .94 | ≥ .90 | Good fit |
| TLI | .93 | ≥ .90 | Good fit |
| RMSEA | .057 | ≤ .08 | Acceptable |
| SRMR | .046 | ≤ .08 | Good fit |

Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) was done to test the validity of the factor structure identified by EFA, through AMOS software. The measured model of the hypothesis was a 4-latent construct: Personality, Vocational Interest, Emotional Intelligence, and Multiple Intelligence, and each of them was represented by its own observed variables.

Several goodness-of-fit indices were used to test the model fit. The analysis of CFA revealed that the four-factor model fitted the data with an acceptable to a good fit. The chi-square degrees of freedom were 2.31, which falls within the acceptable range of structural equation modelling. Other fit measures were also in favour of the model's adequacy. The Comparative Fit Index (CFI) was 0.94 with a Tucker-Lewis Index (TLI) of 0.93 which is greater than the recommended value of 0.90. Root Mean square error of approximation (RMSEA) was 0.057 which was a logical error of approximation. The Standardized root mean square Residual (SRMR) stood at 0.046, which also espoused good model fit.

The standardized factor loadings were between 0.58 and 0.86 and all the standardized factor loadings were found to be significantly different ($p < .001$), which means that there are strong relationships between the measured variables and the latent constructs of the measured variables.

**Reliability and Validity**

***Table 3 Reliability and Validity***

| Construct | Composite Reliability (CR) | Average Variance Extracted (AVE) |
|---|---|---|
| Personality | .91 | .57 |
| Vocational Interest | .89 | .54 |
| Emotional Intelligence | .93 | .60 |
| Multiple Intelligence | .90 | .56 |

Composite Reliability (CR) and Average Variance Extracted (AVE) were calculated to assess convergent validity.

- **CR values above 0.60** indicate good reliability.
- **AVE values above 0.50** indicate adequate convergent validity.

However, AVE values slightly below 0.50 are acceptable if the **composite reliability is above 0.60** (Fornell & Larcker, 1981).

**Measure and Scoring**

The Comprehensive Psychological Profile Assessment Scale (CPPAS) uses a five-point Likert scale for all items. The response options include:

1 – Strongly Disagree
2 – Disagree
3 – Neutral
4 – Agree
5 – Strongly Agree

Participants were provided with clear instructions for completing the questionnaire by having the participants fill out physical forms and the scores were computed by summing the responses for each dimension.

### Interpretation

Standardized cutoff scores are yet to be set because the Comprehensive Psychological Profile Assessment Scale (CPPAS) is a relatively new tool. Thus, the scores are interpreted as per the distribution of the scores obtained in the current sample. The scores were categorized with the mean and standard deviation method, where a score lower than a standard deviation of the mean refers to low scores in the respective dimension of the psychological dimension, standard deviation of the mean is between zero and one standard deviation which refer to moderate scores and scores above the mean which indicates high scores.

These types of classifications give a rough guide to understanding the personality types of individuals, their vocational interests, emotional intelligence, as well as the profiling of multiple intelligences.

## DISCUSSION

The purpose of the present research was to develop and validate the Comprehensive Psychological Profile Assessment Scale (CPPAS) as a combined psychometric tool to measure four essential psychological dimensions, including personality, vocational interest, emotional intelligence, and multiple intelligences in students and working professionals.

The results indicate empirical evidence on reliability and validity of the scale. CPPAS can be used as a multidimensional instrument to comprehend the psychological profile of individuals in the educational and organizational environments.

The outcome of the Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA) showed that there was a distinct four factor design in line with the theoretically predicted study constructs. The significant Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin value (KMO = 0.89) and the test of Bartlett of Sphericity was high proved that the data were appropriate to factor analyses. The analysed factors accounted a significant percentage of the total variance, which showed that the used items were sufficient to describe the underlying psychological constructs. The loading of the factors that were retained between 0.52 and 0.84 also illustrates that there were significant relationships between the items that were retained and the factors. Such results are in accordance with psychometric principles, which suggest high item loadings as the results of construct representation in the scale development (DeVellis, 2017; Worthington and Whittaker, 2006). The factor structure that was determined in the EFA was additionally confirmed by the Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA). It was found that the hypothesized four-factor model fitted the data generally well with the goodness-of-fit indices (CFI = 0.94, TLI = 0.93, RMSEA = 0.057, SRMR = 0.046). These values are within the suggested values of structural equation modelling and indicate that measurement model has sufficiently recorded the relationships between the measured variables and the latent constructs (Hu & Bentler, 1999). The large standardized factor loadings that are found in CFA are another indication that supports the structural validity of CPPAS.

The reliability analysis indicated that the scale has an excellent internal consistency, whereby the total Cronbach alpha is 0.94. The subscale reliability coefficients were between 0.83 and 0.91 which is more than the recommended level of 0.70 in using psychological instruments (Nunnally, 1978). Moreover, the values of the composite reliability (more than 0.80) also confirm the internal consistency of constructs. Convergent validity was also established based on the results because the values of the Average Variance Extracted were more than the recommended value of 0.50. This (as stated by Fornell and Larcker, 1981)

shows that the constructs can explain an adequate percentage of the variance of the indicators they represent.

The combination of personality traits, vocational interests, emotional intelligence and multiple intelligences is conceptually more holistic in understanding individual differences than the traditional single-construct assessment. Personality traits are known as predictors of academic as well as occupational results (Barrick and Mount, 1991), whereas vocational interests dictate career preference and job satisfaction (Holland, 1997). Emotional intelligence has been linked with the interpersonal effectiveness, leadership skills and psychological well-being (Mayer et al., 2008). Likewise, the theory about multiple intelligences by Gardner points at the variety of cognitive advantages that people have in the fields of learning and work (Gardner, 1983). The CPPAS provides a single psychological assessment instrument by combining the mentioned constructs into one.

The beneficial applications of the CPPAS are applicable in the fields of educational counselling and organization development. The scale can help the counsellors in educational establishment to detect the strengths, career interests and emotional competencies of students to guide them better in terms of academic and career choices. Moreover, in an organizational setting the scale can facilitate recruitment process, leadership development, and training programmes, as it can provide inputs on the psychological nature of the employee and their cognitive strength.

The present study also observed some limitations. Convenience sampling can be a weakness of the study because it can restrict the study from representing the wider population. Also, the use of self-report measures can lead to the social desirability bias. Future studies are recommended to justify the scale among different cultural and occupational population groups and test the predictive validity of the instrument in connection to educational achievement and working performance.

In general, the results reveal that the CPPAS is a valid and sound multidimensional measurement instrument which may be used in psychological profiling, career counselling and human resource development.

## CONCLUSION

In the increasing complex world, psychological assessments for personality, vocational interests, emotional intelligence and multiple intelligences are essential for students and working professionals to enhance self-awareness, improve performance and foster resilience. These assessments help institutions and organisations to identify the strengths and gaps, facilitating better academic achievement, career development, improved teamwork and effective stress management among students and employees. Overall, administering psychological assessments enhance performance and success, academic achievement and development, professional development and leadership, self-awareness and growth and mental wellness and adaptability among students and working professionals.

## REFERENCES

Armstrong, T. (2009). Multiple intelligences in the classroom (3rd ed.). ASCD.

Barrick, M. R., & Mount, M. K. (1991). The Big Five personality dimensions and job performance: A meta-analysis. Personnel Psychology, 44(1), 1-26. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.1991.tb00688.x

Bandura, A. (1977). Social learning theory. Prentice-Hall.

Bar-On, R. (1997). Bar-On Emotional Quotient Inventory (EQ-i): Technical manual. Multi-Health Systems.

Campbell, L., Campbell, B., & Dickinson, D. (2003). Teaching and learning through multiple intelligences (2nd ed.). Allyn & Bacon.

Comrey, A. L., & Lee, H. B. (1992). A first course in factor analysis (2nd ed.). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Desai, M., Nanda, T., & Ghule, V. (2025). A theoretical model linking personality traits with multiple intelligences, vocational interest, abilities, work values, and subject knowledge for career development and career satisfaction. International Journal of Indian Psychology, 13(2). https://doi.org/10.25215/1302.429

DeVellis, R. F. (2017). Scale development: Theory and applications (4th ed.). Sage Publications.

Eysenck, H. J. (1991). Dimensions of personality: 16, 5 or 3?—Criteria for a taxonomic paradigm. Personality and Individual Differences, 12(8), 773–790. https://doi.org/10.1016/0191-8869(91)90144-Z

Fiske, D. W. (1949). Consistency of the factorial structure of personality ratings from different sources. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 44(3), 329-344. https://doi.org/10.1037/h0057198

Furnham, A., & Haakonsen, J. M. (2025). Organisational disenchantment, enchantment and counterproductive work behaviour. Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology, 41(3), 129-134. https://doi.org/10.5093/jwop2025a15

Fornell, C., & Larcker, D. F. (1981). Evaluating structural equation models with unobservable variables and measurement error. Journal of Marketing Research, 18(1), 39–50. https://doi.org/10.1177/002224378101800104

Gardner, R. C. (1983). Learning another language: A true social psychological experiment. Journal of Language and Social Psychology, 2(2-4), 219-239.

Goldberg, L. R. (1981). Language and individual differences: The search for universals in personality lexicons. In L. Wheeler (Ed.), Review of personality and social psychology (Vol. 2, pp. 141-165). Sage.

Goleman, D. (1995). Emotional intelligence: Why it can matter more than IQ. Bantam Books.

Holland, J. L. (1997). Making vocational choices: A theory of vocational personalities and work environments (3rd ed.). Psychological Assessment Resources.

Hu, L. T., & Bentler, P. M. (1999). Cutoff criteria for fit indexes in covariance structure analysis: Conventional criteria versus new alternatives. Structural equation modeling: a multidisciplinary journal, 6(1), 1-55.

Henson, R. K., & Roberts, J. K. (2006). Use of exploratory factor analysis in published research: Common errors and some comment on improved practice. Educational and Psychological Measurement, 66(3), 393–416. https://doi.org/10.1177/0013164405282485

Kaur, M. (2017). Emotional intelligence among teachers in relation to teaching effectiveness. International Journal of Indian Psychology, 4(2), 6–13.

Kauts, A., & Kaur, N. (2015). Emotional intelligence and teacher effectiveness: A study of Indian teachers. Journal of Education and Practice, 6(8), 65–70.

Kumar, R. (2016). Emotional intelligence and its impact on job performance: A study. International Journal of Applied Research, 2(4), 614–618.

Lamm, K. W., Lamm, A. J., & Edgar, D. (2020). Scale development and validation: Methodology and recommendations. Journal of International Agricultural and Extension Education, 27(2), 24-35.

Lent, R. W., Brown, S. D., & Hackett, G. (1994). Toward a unifying social cognitive theory of career and academic interest, choice, and performance. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 45(1), 79-122. https://doi.org/10.1006/jvbe.1994.1027

Lenka, U., Suar, D., & Mohapatra, P. K. J. (2012). Emotional intelligence and employee performance: A study among Indian employees. International Journal of Human Resource Management, 23(5), 1–16.

Li, Y., Kong, C., & Li, X. (2023). Research on the application of psychometric assessment in the recruitment of college teachers. SHS Web of Conferences, 178, 01008. https://doi.org/10.1051/shsconf/202317801008

Mayer, J. D., Roberts, R. D., & Barsade, S. G. (2008). Human abilities: Emotional intelligence. Annual Review of Psychology, 59, 507-536. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.psych.59.103006.093646

McCrae, R. R., & Costa, P. T. (1987). Validation of the five-factor model of personality across instruments and observers. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 52(1), 81-90.

McCroskey, J. C., & Young, T. J. (1979). The use and abuse of factor analysis in communication research. Human Communication Research, 5(4), 375–382. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2958.1979.tb00623.x.

McCrae, R. R., & Costa, P. T. (1992). An introduction to the five-factor model and its applications. Journal of Personality, 60(2), 175-215.

Nunes, M. A. S. N., Cerri, S. A., & Blanc, N. (2008). Towards user psychological profile. Proceedings of IHC 2008, 196-203.

Nunnally, J. C. (1978). Psychometric theory (2nd ed.). McGraw-Hill.

Norman, W. T. (1967). Toward an adequate taxonomy of personality attributes: Replicated factor structure in peer nomination personality ratings. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 66(6), 574-583.

Papuda-Dolińska, B., Knopik, T., Krasowicz-Kupis, G., & Wiejak, K. (2023). The psychological assessment of students with diverse developmental needs: Universal design approach. International Journal of Special Education, 38(3), 47-59. https://doi.org/10.52291/ijse.2023.38.38

Pandey, M., & Sharma, D. (2023). Research on emotional intelligence among Indian teachers: A systematic review and meta-analysis of its correlation with health parameters and impact of gender. F1000Research, 12, 1519. https://doi.org/10.12688/f1000research.135099.2

Petrides, K. V., & Furnham, A. (2001). Trait emotional intelligence: Psychometric investigation with reference to established trait taxonomies. European Journal of Personality, 15(6), 425–448. https://doi.org/10.1002/per.416

Pett, M. A., Lackey, N. R., & Sullivan, J. J. (2003). Making sense of factor analysis: The use of factor analysis for instrument development in health care research. Sage Publications.

Salovey, P., & Mayer, J. D. (1990). Emotional intelligence. Imagination, Cognition and Personality, 9(3), 185-211. https://doi.org/10.2190/DUGG-P24E-52WK-6CDG

Teoh, K., McDowall, A., Kinman, G., Doyle, N., Kwiatkowski, R., & Kurz, R. (2025). Psychometric assessments in occupational health: What they are and how to use them. Society of Occupational Medicine.

Willingham, D. T. (2004). Reframing the mind. Education Next, 4(3), 19-24.

Worthington, R. L., & Whittaker, T. A. (2006). Scale development research: A content analysis and recommendations for best practices. The Counseling Psychologist, 34(6), 806-838. https://doi.org/10.1177/0011000006288127

***Acknowledgment***
The author(s) appreciates all those who participated in the study and helped to facilitate the research process.

***Conflict of Interest***
The author(s) declared no conflict of interest.

***How to cite this article:*** Juanita, J.M., Abirami, V.M., Bhuvaneswari, Selvaraj, Chitrarasu, Kavungal, A. & Xavier, M.N. (2026). Tool Construction: Comprehensive Psychological Profile Assessment Scale (CPPAS). *International Journal of Indian Psychology*, *14*(4)*,* 414-426. DIP:18.01.036.20261404, DOI:10.25215/1404.036