Psychology 623: PERSONALITY ASSESSMENT

1:30 to 3:50 pm, Tuesdays, 143 Straub

Instructor: Gerard Saucier, PhD Office: 312 Straub e-mail: gsaucier@uoregon.edu Phone: 346-4927 Office Hours: Wednesdays 9:30-11:30 am <u>Readings</u>: See class schedule; all readings will be made available by the instructor, pdf format on blackboard

The purpose of this graduate course is to give students a useful introduction to basic measurement issues in assessment of individual differences, focusing on personality but with 'personality' defined very broadly. A reasonable broad definition of personality (based on that of Funder, 1997) is "characteristic patterns of thought, motivation, emotion, and behavior, together with the psychological mechanisms behind those patterns." Such a broad definition might encompass much of psychopathology and of attitudinal scales. Among the concepts emphasized are reliability, validity, response bias, factor structure and dimensionality of a measure, measurement invariance across populations, content comprehensiveness, cross-cultural generalizability, key components of item response theory. Measurement issues will be explored broadly, and then in their applications to particular models and measures, including those in which the student has special experience or interest. Indeed, the course will employ measures with which the students are familiar as prime examples, and is designed not only to review the present state of personality (defined broadly) assessment but also to help (present or future) researchers who will be faced with the task of creating a measure of some construct, or evaluating an existing measure with respect to its measurement properties. To that end, the central, unifying theme of the course is "what makes a measure good?"

This is primarily a course about concepts, not about statistics. However, it is assumed that students are familiar with basic statistical techniques of correlation and regression. Those who doubt their facility with these techniques should consult the instructor for suggested readings.

Reading assignments are substantial. Readings for each week are, in many cases, ordered from simple to advanced.

Requirements of the course

1. *Discussion questions based on readings for the current week*. You are responsible for turning in sets of discussion questions based on the readings by two hours before the beginning of <u>five</u> different class meetings (of the nine after the first session). Late discussion questions don't confer credit. Discussion questions are **turned in via e-mail to gsaucier@uoregon.edu**. You can choose the dates of your discussion questions (although sessions with no assigned reading, like Jan. 26, are off limits). Discussion questions, to be worthwhile and to count, should (a) be indicative of

having done the reading and (b) be instances of some degree of critical or insightful thinking. Should you ever develop a "block" about coming up with some, you might consider questions of the following form: *Why is this issue important? How are you defining* _____? *Aren't you assuming* ____? *Isn't it debatable whether* ____? *Does the evidence really support the notion that* _____? *Aren't you leaving out* ____? *Isn't there a limitation with regard to* _____ (e.g., caused by using that methodology)? Responses to selected discussion questions (from the week before, or from the current week if they are submitted to the instructor well in advance of the class session) turned in will be a part of the class sessions, starting with week 2 (although often this will be at the beginning of the next class session after the date on which they are due). Discussions in the class sessions are a very important part of this course, and student discussion questions are one of the stimulants for such discussions.

2. *Midterm exercise.* Around the middle of the term students will be given instructions for a midterm exercise involving the creation/construction of a short scale (with data that will be provided to you) and an examination of its psychometric properties. This exercise will be **due on Feb. 26.**

3. A final paper/project. Students will be asked to identify a personality-related model or measure and discuss basic measurement issues with respect to it. A set of generic questions that should be addressed in the final paper will be made available by week 6. The model or measure chosen may be one with which the student has experience, or one in which the student has a particular interest. Selected research-literature references are likely to be useful in the final paper, although none is strictly required. The final paper is due at the end of the final-exam week. Some kind of advance outline or plan for it (no longer than one page double-spaced) should be submitted by e-mail to the instructor by March 5.

4. A brief presentation based on the final paper (or at least on your early drafts of this paper) during the last two weeks of the course. Your presentation should be focused on questions, difficulties, puzzles, or dilemmas you are experiencing with respect to the content of your final paper (after providing a bit of background). It is not really important to create an impressive presentation performance, but rather the brief presentation is primarily an opportunity to get some feedback from the instructors and other class members on the issues involved. These presentations will be allotted about 10 minutes each although discussion of a presentation may go on considerably longer if issues of interest to many students arise.

The **final grade** is based on: 30% for turning in five sets of discussion questions, 10% for the midterm exercise, 5% for a generally acceptable level of in-class contribution, 10% for the brief presentation, 5% for an advance outline of the final paper, and 40% for the final paper itself.

Bringing in your own data: The instructor uses real data for numerous examples in the course, and it may be particularly edifying for you to be able to see your own data, involving variables of special interest to you, applied in relation to important psychometric principles. If you have some data (even if incomplete, and it does not matter if you think it is not "personality" data) that you would like to see used for

examples in this course, submit in SPSS file format to the instructor, who guarantees that it will be used only for educational purposes and only in this class.

<u>Course Calendar and Readings</u> (some of these readings are likely to be revised)

January 5

Introduction to the course and to psychological measurement in general

January 12

Validity (and its central place in the evaluation of measures) **Readings for this session:** Cronbach (1990) chapter 5; Messick (1988); Borsboom, Mellenbergh, & Heerden (2004)

January 19

Theory of measurement error; reliability assessment; conventional test construction **Readings for this session:** Cronbach (1990) ch. 6; Kline (1998) pp. 25-38; Schmitt (1996); Clark & Watson (1995)

February 2

Factor analysis and important applications in personality measurement and in test construction; illustration with lexically derived factorial models for personality assessment (e.g., the Big Five) and related ones for psychopathology **Readings for this session:** Goldberg and Velicer (in press); Kline (1998) ch. 3 (pp. 51-69); Saucier and Goldberg (2002); Clark and Livesley (1996); Krueger (1999)

February 9

Beyond 20th century test-construction conventions: Unidimensionality, measurement invariance, and equidiscrimination.

Readings for this session: Nunnally & Bernstein (NB), ch. 8, pp. 326-332; Leone et al. (2001); Steenkamp & Baumgartner (1998); other reading TBA

February 16

Problems and limitations in classical test theory; item response theory **Readings for this session:** MD pp. 192-203; McKinley (1989); Embretson & Reise (2000), ch. 2, pp. 13-39; Zickar (2001);

February 23

Halo effects, response biases, and response styles; integrity assessment **Readings for this session:** Edwards (1953); Paulhus (1991); Murphy & Davidshofer (MD), pp. 446-449; Wiggins (1973) pp. 415-425; NB chapter 9 pp. 373-386

March 2

Normal-range personality scales and inventories: comparative validity and comparisons across time; comparability and generalizability across culture **Readings for this session:** Lanyon & Goodstein (1997) pp. 29-87; Goldberg (in press); Clifton, Turkheimer, & Oltmanns (2005); Krueger (2005); Rogler (1999)

March 9

Projective or 'operant' approaches; is implicit motive research subject to the same critiques as projective tests? Also, perhaps a few early presentations. **Readings for this session:** MD pp. 392-401; Lilienfeld, Wood, & Garb (2000); Hibbard (2003); Woike & McAdams (2005) pp. 171-183

Session in the vicinity of finals week (1-3 pm, Monday March 15, or otherwise by agreement among instructor and class members)

Further discussion on issues raised earlier in the course; presentations by students **Readings for this session:** if there are any, these are TBA

Final paper is due on the last day finals week (9 am, Fri. March 19)

Readings listed above are drawn from the following sources:

- Borsboom, D., Mellenbergh, G. J., & van Heerden, J. (2004). The concept of validity. <u>Psychological Review, 111</u>, 1061-1071.
- Clark, L. A., Livesley, W. J., Schroeder, M. L., & Irish, S. L. (1996). Convergence of two systems for assessing specific traits of personality disorder. <u>Psychological</u> <u>Assessment, 8</u>, 294-303.
- Clark, L. A., & Watson, D. (1995). Constructing validity: Basic issues in objective scale development. <u>Psychological Assessment</u>, *7*, 309-319.
- Clifton, A., Turkheimer, E., & Oltmanns, T. F. (2005). Self- and peer perspectives on pathological personality traits and interpersonal problems. <u>Psychological</u> <u>Assessment, 17</u>, 123-131.
- Cronbach, L. J. (1990). <u>Essentials of psychological testing</u> (5th ed.). New York: Harper/Collins.
- Edwards, A. L. (1953). The relationship between the judged desirability of a trait and the probability that the trait will be endorsed. <u>Journal of Applied Psychology, 37</u>, 90-93.
- Embretson, S. E., & Reise, S. P. (2000). <u>Item response theory for psychologists</u>. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Goldberg, L. R. (in press). The comparative validity of adult personality inventories:
 Applications of a consumer testing framework. In S. R. Briggs, J. M. Cheek, & E.
 M. Donahue (Eds.), <u>Handbook of adult personality inventories</u>. New York:
 Plenum.
- Goldberg, L. R., & Velicer, W. F. (in press). Principles of exploratory factor analysis. In S. Strack (Ed.), <u>Differentiating normal and abnormal personality: Second edition</u>. New York: Springer.
- Hibbard, S. (2003). A critique of Lilienfeld et al.'s (2000) "The scientific status of projective techniques." Journal of Personality Assessment, 80, 260-271.
- Kline, P. (1998). <u>The new psychometrics: Science, psychology, and measurement</u>. London: Routledge.
- Krueger, R. F. (2005). Continuity of Axes I and II: Toward a unified model of personality, personality disorders, and clinical disorders. <u>Journal of Personality Disorders</u>, 19, 233-261.
- Krueger, R. F. (1999). The structure of common mental disorders. <u>Archives of General</u> <u>Psychiatry, 56</u>, 921-926.

- Lanyon, R. I.,, & Goodstein, L. D. (1997). <u>Personality assessment</u> (3rd ed.). New York: Wiley.
- Leone, L., Perugini, M., Bagozzi, R. P., Pierro, A., & Mannetti, L. (2001). Construct validity and generalizability of the Carver-White behavioural inhibition system / behavioural activation system scales. <u>European Journal of Personality, 15</u>, 373-390.
- Lilienfeld, S. O., Wood, J. M., & Garb, H. N. (2000). The scientific status of projective techniques. <u>Psychological Science in the Public Interest</u>, 1, 27-66.
- McKinley, R. L. (1989). An introduction to item response theory. <u>Measurement and</u> <u>Evaluation in Counseling and Development, 22, 37-57.</u>
- Messick, S. (1988). The once and future issues of validity: Assessing the meaning and consequences of measurement. In H. Wainer & H. I. Braun (1988), <u>Test validity</u> (pp. 33-45). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Murphy, K. R., & Davidshofer, C. O. (2001). <u>Psychological testing: Principles and</u> <u>applications</u> (5th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Nunnally, J. C., & Bernstein, I. H. (1994). <u>Psychometric theory</u> (3rd ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Paulhus, D. L. (1991). Measurement and control of response bias. In Robinson, J. P., Shaver, P. R., Wrightsman, L. S. (Eds.) <u>Measures of personality and social</u> <u>psychological attitudes</u> (pp. 17-59). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
- Rogler, L. H. (1999). Methodological sources of cultural insensitivity in mental health research. <u>American Psychologist, 54</u>, 424-433.
- Saucier, G. & Goldberg, L. R. (2002). Assessing the Big Five: Applications of 10 psychometric criteria to the development of marker scales. In B. De Raad & M. Perugini (Eds.), <u>Big Five assessment</u> (pp. 29-58). Goettingen, Germany: Hogrefe & Huber.
- Schmitt, N. (1996). Uses and abuses of coefficient Alpha. <u>Psychological Assessment</u>, <u>8</u>, 350-353.
- Steenkamp, J.E.M., & Baumgartner, H. (1998). Assessing measurement invariance in cross-national consumer research. Journal of Consumer Research, 25, 78-90.
- Wiggins, J. S. (1973). <u>Personality and prediction: Principles of personality assessment</u>. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Woike, B. A., & McAdams, D. P. (2005). Motives. In V. A. Derlega, B. A. Winstead, & W. H. Jones (Eds.)., <u>Personality: Contemporary theory and research</u> (3rd ed.) (pp. 156-189).
- Zickar, M. J. (2001). Conquering the next frontier: Modeling personality data with item response theory. In B. W. Roberts & R. Hogan (Eds.), <u>Personality psychology in the workplace</u> (pp. 141-160). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.