ABRIDGED TEST RETEST RELIABILITY FOR THE PPI

Mr. Pat Stansbury

[The following excerpt was extracted from a study titled Report of Adherence to Theory Discovered When the Personality Pattern Inventory ™ was Administered to Subjects Twice. Report commissioned by and delivered to Dr. Taibi Kahler in July 1990: Baton Rouge, LA; Stansbury C.P. (1990)]

This annotation describes evidence found to support "Phase" and "Phase Change" theory as well as to identify consistency of measurement by the Personality Pattern Inventory.

Purpose and overview of the Study:

This study was commissioned by Kahler Communications, Inc., Little Rock, AR for the purpose of reviewing what support, if any, there was to be found of Dr. Kahler's theory with respect to Phase progression/regression/statics and, additionally, examine the consistency of described personality profiles of individuals. These objectives were to be accomplished via the comparison of test scores of a number of persons who had taken the "inventory" at least twice. "Inventory", in this study refers to the Personality Pattern Inventory (hereafter PPI) developed, copyrighted, trademarked and distributed by Dr. Taibi Kahler and Kahler Communications, Inc. The cases (individual's PPI results) used in this study were drawn from Kahler Communications files in a search for all individuals who had submitted valid PPI "answer sheets" on at least two occasions within the six (6) year period ending February, 1990. Restated, the objectives of this study were:

- Determine if there was evidence in support of Dr. Kahler's theory with respect to Phase change;
- And, examine the consistency of the test instrument (the PPI) in specification of "personality patterns".

The procedure adopted to address these two objectives was to specify a number of statements (so called "null hypotheses") and then to test the numerical case evidence for the purpose of accepting or rejecting these "hypotheses". Some of the major hypotheses were:

- Any differences found between Phase Type and Kahler's theory are due to random fluctuations from sampling.
- Time interval between "testing" sessions is not a predictor of current indicated Phase Type.
- "Questionable Validity" alerts (printed statements on the Results Form) are not predictors of current indicated Phase Type.
- Changes in the specific order of sub-measures do not indicate variance from Phase Theory.
- Raw sub-measure (test) scores are consistent.

There will be detailed discussion of the tests and findings related to each of the above hypothesis in the "Discussion of Findings". In this current section only a statement of the major results will be presented.

85.2% of the 204 cases examined (408 test sessions) were found to conform to Dr. Kahler's theory – the results are accurate +/- 3% at one (1) Standard Error or +/- 6% at two (2) Standard Error. In other words, 66.7% of the time we can be confident that the true results are within +/- 3% of 85.2% or 95% of the time, within +/- 6^ of 85.2% Hence considerable confidence can be placed upon Kahler's theory in its ability to predict changes in behavior. Corollary to the previous proof is the evidence that "time interval" is not predictive of Phase. Within the realm of the statistical tests performed and, also, within the realm of logic, if time were a major predictor then Kahler's theory would have weakened foundations. That is, if time was a valid predictor it would discredit the theory which states that; Phase change is based upon "need", long-term distress and/or short-term eustress, as explained to the writer by Dr. Kahler. Put another way, if Phase could be explained by time it would negate the effects of life experiences; this is to say, if the passage of time is a controlling variable, then all subjects would exhibit correlated and similar changes in a given time span. This introduces a dichotomy, either the PPI measures changes in Phase types which are dependent upon the expiration of time of the Inventory measures changes in Phase types which are influenced by other factors. Therefore it was entirely possible for the writer to test the theory without either knowledge or understanding of the theory. Time explained changes in Phase Type – or not. Specifically, Kahler's Phase types were treated as classifying dependent variable and the time interval between tests was treated as an independent variable. A model encompassing these attributes was analyzed using a multivariate least squares computer program (MGLH of the SYSTAT System copyright © 1986 SYSTAT, Inc.). Coefficients of the time variable ranged between =0.007 and 0.006; none of which could be considered significant, regardless of the respective F-Statistics or probabilities.

"Questionable Validity" alerts relate to psychological interpretation by definition. These were quickly dismissed as having any Phase type predictive capability. Changes in the specific order of sub-measures indicate volatile "personalities" – which is to say that certain cases exhibited re-orderings in the "pattern" of Phases. Explanation of these alterations calls for a psychological statement: such statements can only, and properly, be issued by Dr. Kahler. This re-ordering did significantly reduce the "hits" of predicted phase type. Theory is upheld. The last examination performed was the consistency of sub-measure scores. This test was included as an additional look at the test instrument as a measuring device. Some variation was expected – but such variation was anticipated – 5 of 6 sub-measures correlated at the 68.6% or higher level; 4 of 6 sub-measures correlated at 80.8% or higher.

Therefore, the PPI:

- 1) Effectively measures change;
- 2) is consistent in description of personality patterns;
- 3) is not controlled by time;
- 4) is essentially accurate in predicting behavior patterns.