Essentials LLC

Technical Considerations of the (e3) CORE INSTRUMENT as Critically Evaluated by Gabriel S. Dy-Liacco, M.S. (Principal Investigator) Loyola College in Maryland

A. Normative Sample: The normative sample consists of 4,144 females and 5,238 males. The male sample was drawn from groups of high school students (634), college students (936), graduate students (621), medical students (718), delinquents (293), psychiatric patients (50), and adults (1,986). The female sample was drawn from high school students (410), college students (1,214), graduate students (336), medical students (990), law students (52), and adults (2,092). Ages are not given in the manual for the normative sample.

B. Reliability: Alpha coefficients were calculated from scores of 591 males and 588 females. The derivation of these samples is not described in the manual. Alpha coefficients for the males range from .56 for Change and Succorance to .95 for Favorable, with a median of .76. Alpha coefficients for females range from .53 for Counseling Readiness to .94 for Favorable, with a median of .75. For the males, all scales except the Change and Succorance scales have alpha coefficients over .60, and, for the females, all scales except Counseling Readiness have alpha coefficients over .60. These scores fall within the range of acceptable reliability coefficients for personality measures. Test-retest data for males was gathered in a six-month interval from a sample of 199 (99 college students and 100 military officers). Test-retest reliabilities ranged from .34 for scale A-1 (high origence, low intellectence) to .77 for aggression, with a median of .65 (10 scales had retest correlations lower than .60). Test-retest data for females was gathered in a one-year time interval from a sample of 45 college students. Correlations ranged from .45 for Femininity, A-1, and A-2, to .86 for Exhibition, with a median of .71 (nine scales had retest reliabilities below .60).

C. Validity: Convergent and discriminant validity information is provided in the manual via correlations of scales with the California Psychological Inventory (CPI), the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory, the Terman Concept Mastery Test, and a General Vocabulary Test. These findings support the construct validity of the various scales. The manual provides data showing that the social desirability response bias is "relatively inconsequential as a determiner of scores on the scales (Gough & Heilbrun, 1983, p.33). More recently, the INSTRUMENT has been correlated with measures of the Five-Factor Model (FFM), which has been shown to provide a useful interpretive reference point for understanding the construct validity of the INSTRUMENT scales. Based on their patterns of relations to the FFM, some of the INSTRUMENT scales appear not to reflect their putative constructs and should therefore be interpreted carefully (e.g., Self-Control, the Adapted Child scale and the Origence-Intellectence scales A-1 to A-4).

INSTRUMENT marker scales for these five major personality dimensions have also been developed and evidence good construct validity (John, 1990; Piedmont, McCrae, & Costa, 1991; FormyDuval, Williams, Patterson, & Fogle, 1995). Using these scales can help expand the interpretive and predictive power of the INSTRUMENT.

At the time of the 1983 publication, the INSTRUMENT had been translated into French, German, Hebrew, Italian, Japanese, Norwegian, Portuguese, Spanish, Vietnamese and Thai. A review of abstracts indicates favorable cross-cultural use of the INSTRUMENT in at least 10 countries (Williams, Satterwhite, & Saiz, 1998). INSTRUMENT scales have been related to outcomes in varied contexts such as predicting investor behavior and measuring change resulting from spiritual activity. The INSTRUMENT has been cited in over 700 publications since the publication of the first manual in 1965, and more validity data can be gleaned from these articles.

Evaluation
The INSTRUMENT is a broad-based, versatile assessment tool that can be used in a variety of contexts with adults and adolescents. A clear strength of the INSTRUMENT is the variety of ways in which the adjective list can be used to generate profiles describing personally salient perceptions of different phenomena: self-personality, ratings of others' personalities, personalities of famous people, ratings of ideal personality, stereotypes, characterizations of groups of people or cultures of cities. For counselors, the INSTRUMENT is a very flexible and easy to use instrument. It is ideal for measuring therapeutically related issues, including the client's progress in treatment and clinical outcome. The identification of FFM markers in the INSTRUMENT enhances its usefulness in understanding inner motivations and predicting salient psychosocial and health outcomes, such as well-being, stress levels, and coping ability.