

**PERSONALITY PATTERN
INVENTORY
VALIDITY STUDIES
Taibi Kahler, Ph.D.**

INTRODUCTION

The Personality Pattern Inventory (PPI) has its foundations in behavioral psychology and was originally designed to identify positive and negative characteristics of individuals (1972).

Of major importance to this Process Communication Model[®] (PCM) is the research findings (1982) that a person is motivated by certain psychological needs, and that if these needs are not met positively, then the person will attempt to get the exact same psychological (motivational) needs met *negatively*, through very predictable non-productive behaviors in his/her personal and professional life, *with* or *without* awareness.

These basic psychological needs are tied to (correlated with) phases of a person's life and determine the individual's positive and negative motivations.

The PPI can predict normal and severe distress sequences for the individual.

Further research yielded correlations with standard management and communication concepts.

Again, since this is a model based in personality theory and psychological dynamics, the results allow cross-cultural utilization. The Personality Pattern Inventory has been administered to more than 700,000 men and women in the United States (October 2007); it has been translated into Spanish, German, French, Flemish, Finnish, Korean, Romanian, Norwegian, Danish, Italian, and Japanese, and it has been taught on 5 continents.

The PPI was used by Dr. Terry McGuire of NASA from 1992 – 1996 in the selection of astronauts and payload specialists because of its accuracy in predicting individual distress sequences, as well as assessing compatibility.

As of January 1, 2008, nine dissertations have been completed on the model with doctorates awarded.

**PERSONALITY PATTERN INVENTORY
VALIDATION STUDIES**

As the Personality Pattern Inventory (PPI) was first conceived, the following five elements germane to the experimental design construction were considered:

1. That a set of questions is administered to each participant in a structured manner to ensure that the method of administration remains consistent across different persons giving and taking the inventory.
2. That the responses to the inventory are considered to be a sample of his or her behavior.
3. That a number is assigned to each response that inferences can be drawn about the participant's possession of the variable or traits measured by the inventory.
4. That objective measures must be taken in the assigning of numerals and in inferring the quantity of the trait possessed.
5. That reliability and validity measures must be determined by objective, empirical procedures.

Two key words in understanding the essence of good empirical design are reliability and validity. Reliability means accuracy. Procedures for determining reliability are procedures for measuring the accuracy of a test. In other words, the degree to which a participant's inventory score reflects his Personality Type, rather than the effects of error.

Validity addresses the question, "Does the inventory yield the information that it was designed to?"

Face, concurrent, and predictive validity are all relevant to the PPI. Face validity refers to the participant's impression that the PPI measures what he or she thinks, feels, or believes that it did. Concurrent validity refers to the focus of the inventory to produce an assessment of the participant into one of the six Personality Types. Predictive validity refers to the predicting of the participant whether or not he or she will develop a criterion-state, such as a given Failure Pattern or new, open Channel of Communication.

The following steps and procedures were carried out in the development of the PPI:

In psychology and psychiatry, clinical diagnostic categories are used to identify clusters of maladaptive behavior patterns in order to understand the underlying dynamics and to determine a treatment plan.

Trained "experts," usually psychologists and psychiatrists, are called on to use their clinical skills of observation and evaluation to diagnose a person, *i.e.*, give a name to the maladaptive behavior pattern that has been officially defined and described in the diagnostic and Statistical Manual III. Such widely used tests as the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory are often administered to determine diagnoses.

In 1972, the Kahler Transactional Analysis Script Checklist was taken by 990 people. Ten items were ranked (Drivers) nine items were open-end responses, and seventy-eight items were judged agree or disagree. These Drivers were: 1. be perfect 2. please 3. be strong 4. try hard 5. hurry up

Each of these was positioned to be aimed at self or others. They also were presented as conditional. For example, the be perfect forms were: "I am OK if I am perfect" and

“You are OK if you are perfect.” Correlating these ten item Drivers with the seventy-eight personality variables yielded few high correlations, except with those items that identified the themes of scripts. (>.25) This did, however, provide the author with insight into discovering the reinforcement pattern of sentence structures and counterscripts (Drivers) in the formulation of the life script.

The following high, but not significant, correlations were discovered between the Driver “types” and life script themes:

“Type”	Life Script
I’ll please you	After
I’ll be perfect for you	Until
You be perfect for me	Until
I’ll be strong for you	Never
I’ll try hard for you	Always
You be strong for me	Always
I’ll try hard to please you and please you	Over & Over (Almost I)
I’ll be perfect for you or you be perfect for me and I’ll please you	Open End (Almost II)

With completed responses by 982 of the 990 who took the TASP (originally handed out to 1200), six of the ten Drivers were selected as the most experienced. The four that were never identified as being experienced first and most often were: 1) you please me, 2) you try hard for me, 3) I’ll hurry up for you, and 4) you hurry up for me.

The following demographics were available:

N=(982)		
Type	Females (524)	Males (458)
I’ll please you (363) 37%	298 O:3, B:13, W:282	65 B:1, W:54
I’ll be perfect for me (206) 21%	41 B: 5, W: 36	165 O:7, B:12, W:14
You be perfect for me (137) 14%	22 B:2, W:20	115 B:8, W:107
I’ll be strong for you (78) 8%	42 W:42	36 B:1, W:35
I’ll try hard for you (167)	112 B:12, W:100	55 B:9, W:46

17%		
You be strong for me (31) 3%	9 B:1, W:8	22 B:8, W:14

Later in the middle seventies this author considered personality types not just as maladaptive behaviors but also to include the complementary positive behaviors as well.

Six Personality Types were identified based on the general personality clusters associated with six of the Drivers in the original study: Reactor (please you), Workaholic (be perfect for you), Persister (be perfect for me), Dreamer (be strong for you), Rebel (try hard for you), and Promoter (be strong for me). With Kahler’s (1978) theory of Process Therapy, positive patterns of behavior were associated with each Personality Type, yielding both positive and negative (maladaptive) behavior patterns.

In 1982, three “experts” in assessing the six Personality Types independently interviewed 100 people. All six Personality Types were represented in the sample. All three judges agreed on 97 assessments: A and B on 98, A and C on 97, and B and C on 99, thus yielding high inter-judge reliability (significant as $>.001$).

These same experts were also asked to determine “phase,” or the current mode of Personality Type behavior. Using again Kendall’s coefficient of concordance, W, and testing this significance with the critical values of chi-square, inter-judge reliability was again significant as $>.001$.

An additional number of people were assessed and selected by the judges independently so that a minimum number of 30 persons were available for each classification of Personality Type, yielding a total sample of 180 identified “assessed” people.

Two hundred and thirteen items including extractions from the original study item pool were administered to 112 randomly selected subjects. Analysis of this data indicated a “natural” loading on six criteria – the six Personality Types.

Two hundred and four of these items were administered to the 180 identified Personality Types. Only items with a correlation of greater than .60 (significant at $>.01$) were accepted for inclusion in the final Personality Pattern Inventory.

Two forms of the PPI were constructed from these significant items. Both forms have twenty-two items, with six answers each to be ranked by the participant. This yields a score on each of the Personality Type scales. The following correlations are reported for items and scales for each form:

KENDALL CORRELATIONS

Original Items	PCM 1 2	Reactors	Workaholics	Promoters	Rebels	Persisters	Dreamers	X
1.	X	.89	.77	.44	.77	.54	.72	.69
2.	X X	.96	.94	.62	.79	.65	.85	.80
3.	X X	.67	.95	.83	.88	.77	.64	.79
4.	X	.93	.85	.59	.56	.42	.72	.68
5.	X X	.95	.80	.70	.78	.76	.76	.79
6.	X	.67	.88	.64	.56	.54	.76	.68
7.	X X	.94	.95	.87	.82	.55	.72	.81
8.	X	.82	.91	.70	.72	.67	.75	.76
9.	X	.64	.92	.54	.62	.60	.73	.68
10.	X	.97	.94	.76	.83	.62	.52	.77
11.	X X	.79	.75	.81	.75	.61	.72	.74
12.	X	.66	.77	.83	.62	.58	.76	.70
13.	X	.95	.92	.82	.62	.50	.86	.78
14.	X X	.99	.78	.74	.72	.75	.71	.78
15.	X	.93	.68	.62	.65	.73	.90	.75
16.	X X	.99	.84	.48	.83	.51	.66	.72
17.	X X	.90	.71	.75	.71	.6	.90	.77
18.	X	.64	.94	.53	.71	.91	.65	.73
19.	X X	.95	.91	.85	.74	.51	.63	.77
20.	X	.96	.71	.64	.70	.64	.88	.76
21.	X	.79	.94	.50	.75	.51	.74	.71
22.	X X	.96	.68	.77	.72	.66	.57	.73
23.	X X	.54	.73	.88	.60	.70	.66	.69
24.	X	.74	.84	.62	.62	.40	.71	.66
25.	X	.60	.89	.57	.45	.66	.64	.64
26.	X	.64	.58	.72	.64	.56	.58	.62
27.	X	.78	.57	.75	.72	.70	.70	.70
28.	X	.66	.94	.70	.50	.62	.57	.67
29.	X	.60	.66	.85	.65	.62	.57	.66
30.		.42	.70	.77	.54	.75	.87	.68
31.	X	.64	.77	.72	.74	.75	.77	.73
32.	X X	.94	.85	.635	.70	.62	.58	.67
33.	X	.70	.64	.55	.57	.79	.40	.61
34.	X	.56	.73	.81	.47	.77	.76	.66

N=30 for each

Personality	Type	Reactors	Workaholics	Promoters	Rebels	Persisters	Dreamers
PCM ₁	X's:	.80	.79	.71	.69	.64	.70
PCM ₂	X's:	.82	.83	.72	.69	.63	.70
PPI (1&2)	X's:	.81	.81	.72	.69	.63	.70
PCM ₁	X=.72						
PCM ₂	X=.73						
PPI (1&2)	X=.73	Significant at .0001 level					

The original study did not demonstrate significant correlations between the six major groupings of Driver (types) and those expected item responses (comprised mainly of descriptions of negative, distressed behaviors).

The author viewed these six Driver types analogous to personality condominiums.

Please you	I'll be perfect	You be perfect	I'll be strong	I'll try hard	You be strong
N= 363	206	137	78	167	31
Later Called:					
Reactors	Workaholics	Persisters	Dreamers	Rebels	Promoters

With the theory of phase, or a time in some people's lives where they experience being another Personality Type, especially demonstrating negative behaviors when in distress, a revisiting of the original data was warranted.

This time, no matter what type – Reactor, Workaholic, Persister, Dreamer, Rebel, or Promoter – expected item responses of the Driver phase (negative behaviors) were analyzed.

Review of evidence gathered in earlier studies demonstrated that the original theory needed refinement. A new hypothesis, to be tested, was called for. Two distinct procedures were developed and performed: 1) specify a “refined” hypothesis subsequent to review and analysis of prior results; and 2) design a protocol such that the “refined” hypothesis would be well and correctly tested.

Refining theory and hypothesis began with the identification of six (6) Personality Types and the confirmation of the primary Driver for each type. Secondly, “Phases” were postulated (Phase distress). These behaviors were related (associated) to a given Personality Type, as defined by the Driver phase the person was experiencing in his foreground – not necessarily the Driver Personality Type, as originally hypothesized. The original research did not include the critical importance of this phase concept. Hence the “refined” hypothesis was crafted to include the concepts of “Base” and “Phase.”

Next a design of a statistical testing protocol was undertaken. Returning to previously gathered data, all checklists that had ranked one of the following Drivers as primary were included in the sample: I'll be perfect for you; You be perfect for me; I'll be strong for you; You be strong for me; I'll please you; and, I'll try hard for you. This resulted in a population of 982 cases. These cases were composed of undergraduates, graduate students, faculty members, friends, associates, and clients residing in West Lafayette, Indiana. (Note: there were *no* active psychotics included.) Since the (1982) study indicated significant (at the 0.001 level) correlations between Driver and Personality Types *and* Phases, a reclassification of the original data was possible. This reclassification allowed testing of correlations between Driver phase and the seventy-

eight personality variables. This “test” examined the correlation of *Phase Driver* with each “agree” or “disagree” response. This was adequate as the (1982) study confirmed that phase Personality Type negative personality variables are those observable under (normal) distress.

The results of the above protocol supported the design of the PPI to include both Base and Phase metrics. (Note: only traits that were significant at greater than the 0.05 level were included.)

Each form of PPI is designed to overcome a participant from endorsing socially desirable items (fake good) and from endorsing socially unusual or uncommon responses (fake bad).

By examining the responses relative to the normal characteristics of each Personality Type scale, a “questionable validity” comment may be assigned, as well as levels of confidence for both base and phase. Interview techniques by experts in Process Communication could also determine this.

Relative Manager Scores and Relative Interaction Scores for all six Personality Types are recorded and statistical procedures are performed to help determine usefulness.

Also available are confidence levels for both phase and base, as well as a validity statement.

For both model and management printouts the following distribution statistics apply:

Phase Confidence Levels

X (mean) = 52

S.D. (standard deviation) = 14

Standard Deviation	-2	-1	0	+1	+2
Score	24	38	52	66	80
Percentile Ranking	2	16	50	84	98

Base Confidence Levels

X (mean) = 74

S.D. (standard deviation) = 24

Standard Deviation	-2	-1	0	+1	+2
Score	26	50	74	98	
Percentile Ranking	2	16	50	84	

The higher the score, the greater the degree of confidence that the phase and base is accurate. A very low score is most often a sign of questionable validity.

Questionable Validity is identified when the information given on the inventory is analyzed and the results do not fall within statistical limits to insure that the profile is a clear and accurate picture of the person.

Also printed when there is Questionable Validity will be FGC (Fake Good Conscious), FGU (Fake Good Unconscious), FBU (Fake Bad Unconscious), or FBC (Fake Bad Conscious).

In the early 1990s, the two PPI forms were combined: three questions were deleted (that were duplicated), and four added for data collection purposes.

Each seminar given worldwide requires a completed evaluation by the attendee for face validity purposes.

The following reported data has been collected from all of the attendees, on a scale of 1 to 10: 1) personal significance of the seminar. 9.19; 2) professional significance of the seminar. 9.48; 3) accuracy of the profile. 9.07; and 4) competency of the trainer. 9.25.

The Advanced Seminar asks additional phase questions: 1) 97% reported that they had experienced the PTM expected frequent and intense miniscript phase distress sequence in resolving the issue and had phased, and 2) of these, 93% reported that they had experienced the PTM expected issue cover up feeling, and then the underlying authentic emotion, resulting in their phasing.

Of the 700,000 profiled people around the world as of January 2008, approximately 17,000 have been clinical reports.

In the general population, 33% did not phase, 28% phased one time, 20% phased two times, 15% phased three times, 3% phased four times, and only 1% phased 5 times.

Test retest reliability research using the first validated instrument indicates that 85.2% of the time the order of the personality structure remains constant, and that phase order change is predictable.