

The Revised Hartman Value Profile

The Hartman Value Profile, while being fully validated, has met with significance resistance in the marketplace from members of different sociological and racial groups because some of the statements are considered to be politically incorrect. The strongest resistance has come because specific statements on Task A are offensive to certain people (statements that refer to slavery, terrorist activity, religious fundamentalism, and war atrocities). Zero Risk HR and Clear Direction, Inc., two providers of commercial products utilizing the Hartman Value Profile, decided to have Dr. Robert Kinsel Smith write axiologically correct statements to replace the offensive ones and then conduct a study to demonstrate that the Revised Task A (with the replacement statements) was statistically the same as the original Task A. By proving the statistical sameness, then all of the validation studies that apply to the original Task A can legitimately be applied to the Revised Task A.

The statements that needed to be replaced were the most extreme transpositions of value on Task A of the Hartman Value Profile (all of the transpositions that had intrinsic values or valuations). They ranged in value from the intrinsic devaluation of an intrinsic value ("Torture a person in a concentration camp") to a systemic devaluation of an intrinsic value ("a madman"). Dr. Smith deriving some of the items and using some of the statements from the Research Edition of the Hartman Value Profile made the following replacements:

Value Combination	Old Statement	Replacement
I sub I murder	Torture a person in a concentration camp This personified evil, torture, murder, or annihilation of life or love.	Using love to commit
E sub I	Blow up an airliner in flight This personified evil, torture, murder, or total annihilation of things.	Totally destroying crops of food
S sub I	Burn a heretic at the stake Disvaluing of life or taking away personal freedom because of false ideas or constructs.	Imprison an innocent person
I sub E	Slavery The practical devaluing of a person or a person who represents or embodies the devaluation of practical things.	A thief

I sub S

A madman

A person who does not tell the truth

The logical devaluing of a person or a person who embodies the devaluation of logic, reason, constructs, or truth

While it may appear that the replacement statements have different meaning from those statements they replace (which they do), two things are true: they are axiologically the same value combinations and the non-application of personhood to these was consistent in the replacements as the application of personhood was in the original statements. What this means is that it would not have worked to just replace a couple of the statements and leave all of the other original statements. It is important to remember that the replacement statements are not being compared to the original statements but that the rankings of the replacements in relation to each other must be statistically the same as the rankings of the originals in relationship to each other. Ultimately, the accuracy of these statements to their counterparts would be confirmed or denied by the statistical analysis of the rankings of the sample group.

The Process

Zero Risk HR conducted the testing of almost 90 people, most of whom had taken the Kinsel-Hartman Profile within the previous three years as a result of their company's using the Profile for personal training and development. The participant group was divided into three groups. Each member of Group A was given a copy of Hartman's Task A to complete. Each member of Group B was given a copy of a revised copy of Hartman's Task A that had been written by Dr. Robert Kinsel Smith (cf. Appendix). And each member of Group C was given a copy of Task A of the Research Edition of the Hartman Value Profile. They were asked to complete the ranking of the Tasks that they had been given and handed them in to the project administrator. The next week each group was given a different of the three Task A's to complete. The following week, each group was given the Task A that they had not yet completed. At the end of the three weeks, each participant had taken all three different Task A's, in different order, one week apart.

Each person's answer sheets were attached together by matching their personal identifying codes. The participant's answers for each of the three tests were entered into a spreadsheet. These answers were compiled and compared. Dr. Smith analyzed the results and found that one of the revised statements was eliciting a response that was significantly different from the responses for the same value statement on the HVP. He also observed that the same value statement on the research edition was eliciting a response comparable to the responses to that item on the HVP. So Dr. Smith substituted the research edition

statement ("a thief") and asked Mike Poskey (head of Zero Risk HR) to have the same people take the newly revised Task A. Mr. Poskey was able to get most of the original participants to take the newly revised Task A. He submitted the answer sheets to the newly Revised Task A to Clear Direction, Inc. for analysis.

Clear Direction, Inc. then ran all of the Task A's of the HVP and the newly revised Task A through their software that scores and compiles the rankings into composite scores. These scores combine the person's dim scores for each dimension of value (how much they vary in relation to the axiological rankings) with the participant's bias valences (whether the person's rankings indicate favorable or unfavorable biases in relation to the axiological rankings). The resultant scores reflect the attitudes and behaviors that flow from these thinking orientations of the participants. Composite scores are much easier to understand, while retaining sufficient distinctiveness to have useful meaning for commercial applications. Approximately thirty tests were excluded from the database because they either did not have a reliable rho (reliability index below 80% reliable), did not have all four task A's by the same person, or did not have codes by which the different sheets could be compared.

Clear Direction, Inc. then sent that spreadsheet with all of the respondents' answers and the resulting composite scores to Dr. Mark Moore (former Chairman of the Robert S. Hartman Institute and President of Phaedo Corporation, Savannah, Georgia) for statistical analysis. The analysis of the different Task A's, the analysis of the composite scores and Dr. Moore's analysis of the answers to the HVP and the newly revised HVP follow.

Comparing the Different Task A's

The original three Task A's that were taken were the HVP, the first version of the Revised HVP, and the Research Version of the HVP. The second group of Task A responses comprise the HVP and the final Revised HVP. Because the worst five statements (#14-18) on Task A were the only ones that were changed and the participants took the different Task A's in different order, one week apart, variance was found in the statement rankings of the unchanged statements by the same participants. In other words,

there is an expected range of variation in how people rank the Profile statements when they rank them multiple times, over a period of time, without feedback concerning their answers.

Such a variance was found in this study and serves as an allowable variance for changed statement rankings. Therefore, the rankings of the changed statements could display at least as much variance as the unchanged statements and still meet the criteria of statistical sameness.

Findings – Group I

The first group of scores provided important information and direction to the researchers. This study provided a number for an expected standard deviation of participants' rankings of the same sets of statements over a period of seven to thirty days. Since the HVP and the revised HVP had exactly the same statements for the 1-13 value statements, we were able to measure the variation comes as a result of time (and thereby life contexts) with no other causes of variance.

Variance of Average Rankings of Different Statements of the HVP vs. the Revised HVP.

Of the thirteen statements (axiological rankings of 1-13) that were not changed, four of them had different average rankings between being on the HVP and the revised HVP. Two of them moved up one ranking while two others each moved down one ranking. What this shows is that with a month lapse from doing a forced ranking of eighteen items a sample population can be expected to invert four out of 13 of those statements, when no changes have been made and none of the changes overlapped into the statements (14-18) that were changed.

Of the five statements that were changed, three had different average rankings from the original average rankings. While this may appear to be problematic at first glance, the following conclusions can be reached:

1. Further analysis is required to determine if these variations are statistically the same as the variances caused only by time (as in the rankings of the statements that were unchanged).
2. Further analysis will determine whether these variances are significant,
3. That the comparing of the averages of rankings is not an analysis of how the profile actually works.

The first two items will be addressed directly by the statistical analysis that follows. The third item is answered in understanding that the key to the Profile is the rankings of each item in relationship to each other item on the same page. Therefore it undoes the value of the instrument to compare all of the first item rankings of many respondents to each other, since the respondents were determining their ranking value by their relative value in relation to the other seventeen statements. Therefore we must look at the composite scores, the

analysis of those relative rankings, to see if the statements have the same relative meaning as the original statements.

This also can be analyzed by going past the general averages to the averages in the context of their standard deviations. An example would be if in a population of 20 people, 17 ranked a statement number 2 and three others ranked that same statement number 18. The average would be skewed significantly with the three causing it to appear that the item did not "fit" because it's average was 4.4 instead of 2.2 like the original statement. This higher average would then cause the rank of this new statement to be different (say the fifth lowest score instead of the second as the original had). If we did not look at the standard deviations, we would be inclined to conclude this statement was not a good substitute for the original. It is by analyzing the averages and rankings in light of the standard deviations that we are able to reach accurate conclusions about the substitutionary value of a particular statement.

Another quick overview of the differences is in how the average rankings compare to the axiological rankings. The HVP compared to the axiological rankings differed in 17 values. This means that of the eighteen different statements, the group average for each item differed by a total of 17 rankings when compared to the axiological rankings. Nine different statements comprised that difference of 17 with two being in the group that was being replaced. In comparing the Revised HVP to the axiological rankings a total of 19 value positions were different, with 11 of the different statements making up the total. One point that leads us to believe that the Revised A is a suitable replacement for the HVP A is that the HVP and the Revised HVP differed in a total of 8 numeric rankings from each other, with four of those differences being found in three of the changed statements and the other four being found in statements that were the same. In other words, the same number of differences existed as a result of time and redoing the rankings than existed within the statements that had been changed.

A second important point is that the only five statements that were changed and only two value rankings differed and they each only differed by one ranking. What this shows is that in the HVP and the Revised HVP, only two of the five statements differed from their axiological rankings and each only differed by one ranking. All of the other differences between the HVP and the Revised HVP were found in the statements that were exactly the same in both tests! From this one can conclude that the variation in the revised statements was actually less than in the statements that were unchanged. **So time and life conditions are seen to be more significant in causing variances in rankings than the actual changing of the five statements.**

A third observation of the data that is telling concerns how varied people were about their responses. Dr. Frank Forest showed the members of the Hartman Institute in 1994 that people generally see transpositions more clearly than they see compositions. This means that we can expect greater variance and standard deviations of the first nine statements (compositions 1-9) than of the

last nine statements (transpositions valued 10-18). And with both the HVP and the Revised HVP this is true. But something even more confirming is found in this review of the standard deviation, the sample group had more agreement about statements 14-18 in both versions than they did all but one of the other 13 statements. In both tests, the clarity of thinking and the expected greater agreement was found.

Dr. Mark Moore's Analysis

For clarity, Dr. Moore refers to the statements by their ordinal position on the Task itself in his conclusion (whereas, I have been referring to the statements by their axiological ranking). The key to Dr. Moore's rankings is as follows:

Axiological Rank	Ordinal Position on the Task (item number)
18	12
17	7
16	8
15	16
14	14

Dr. Moore's Conclusion:

" Confidence measures the degree of certainty that an average is confined within a range under a curve. Using a standard of 95% confidence, we can measure the spread under the curve. The smaller the spread the better the confidence interval. This is driven by the standard deviation. The smaller the standard deviation, the greater the confidence. (The sample size is also a factor.)

In the above comparison, the Smith standard deviation is smaller in 4 of the five items. The HVP standard deviation is better in item 14. The Smith standard deviation in item 7 is only slightly better but not significant.

Thus, the Smith confidence index is better in 3 of the 5 items. These are items 8, 12, & 16. However, the confidence index is equal to HVP in items 7 & 14. In these two items, there is no statistical improvement in the Smith version. However, there may be face validity improvements that would prefer the Smith version over the HVP.

*Put otherwise, the Smith version **does no harm in any item, and is an improvement in 3 of the 5 and therefore provides us with at least a 95% confidence that the Revised Task A will provide the same measure of response as the Hartman Task A.***

Comparing the Computed Scores

Validation of the "sameness" of the Revised Task A in comparison to the HVP Task A can also come from analysis of the scores that are computed. Dr. Hartman defined a way to "score" the respondents' rankings in relation to the axiological values and in accordance with their respective values. So each intrinsic statement's position in relation to it's axiological rank is clustered with the

other five intrinsic statements for that task and two scores are derived: a bias (valence) and a clarity (dim). Clear Direction's and Zero Risk HR's software programs then take those two scores and blend them into a computed score, using a 0-10 point scale, for ease of interpretation. Each person's rankings were processed by that software and the computed scores were compared.

Of the sixty-three participants, 21 of them had computed scores that would indicate some level of meaningful difference between the HVP Task A and the Revised Task A. Sixteen of those were found in the Intrinsic statements, of which three had been changed. Eleven of those were found in the Extrinsic statements, of which one statement had been changed. And one was found in the Systemic statements, of which one statement had been changed. The issue of validity hinges on whether the changes in the statements were the causes of the differences in the scores, or whether some other cause existed.

The Intrinsic Statement

Each participant's scores were evaluated carefully. The analysis of those rankings that led to differing **Intrinsic** computed scores is as follows:

Number of statements that remained unchanged: 3

Number of statements that were changed: 3 (or 50% of the total)

Those whose computed scores differed by 4 points: 4

3 of which were by differences in the rankings of the unchanged statements,

1 because of the differences in the rankings of the changed statements.

Those whose computed scores differed by 3 points: 4

2 of which were by differences in the rankings of the unchanged statements,

2 because of the differences in the rankings of the changed statements.

Those whose computed scores differed by 2 points: 8

3 of which were by differences in the rankings of the unchanged statements,

3 of which were because of differences in the rankings of changed and unchanged statements and,

2 because of the differences in the rankings of the changed statements.

Conclusion Concerning the Changed Intrinsic Statements

8 of the 63 respondents had very significant differences in their computed scores between their HVP Task A and the Revised Task A. Of those eight more than half of were the result of differences in those respondents ranking the same statements in different ways. Yet those statements represented only half of the number of intrinsic statements being ranked. In other words there was a greater variation of the re-rankings of three unchanged statements than there was in the rankings of the three changed statements. It is accurate to conclude that differences in rankings of the changed statements can be attributed to the same randomness as a matter of just retaking the Tasks because the variance fell well within the randomness range of the unchanged statements.

And this is also true of the respondents' Tasks that had less significant difference in the computed scores. Of the 8 of the respondents that had mildly significant differences in their computed scores between their HVP Task A and the Revised Task A, three of those were the result of differences in those respondents ranking the same statements in different ways, while an additional three were caused by both changed and unchanged statements being ranked differently, while only two were the result of the differences in rankings of the changed statements. There was greater variation of the re-rankings of the unchanged statements than there was in the rankings of the changed statements. It is again accurate to conclude that differences in rankings of the changed statements can be attributed to the same randomness as a matter of just retaking the Tasks because the variance fell well within the randomness range of the unchanged statements. **Thus we can conclude with confidence that the Revised Task A is statistically the same as the HVP Task A in the intrinsic statements.**

The Extrinsic Statement

The analysis of those rankings that led to differing **Extrinsic** computed scores is as follows:

Number of statements that remained unchanged: 5

Number of statements that were changed: 1 (or 17% of the total)

Those that differed by 2 or 3 points on the computed scores: 11

9 of which were by differences in the rankings of the unchanged statements,

2 because of the differences in the rankings of the changed statements.

Conclusion Concerning the Changed Extrinsic Statement

Of the 11 the respondents that had significant differences in their computed extrinsic scores between their HVP Task A and the Revised Task A, 9 of the eleven were the result of differences in those respondents ranking the

same statements in different ways. This percentage is statistically the same as the percentage caused by the two respondents ranking the changed statement. In other words there was the same variation of the re-rankings of five unchanged statements as there was in the ranking of the changed statements. It is accurate to conclude that differences in rankings of the changed statements can be attributed to the same randomness as a matter of just retaking the Tasks because the variance fell well within the randomness range of the unchanged statements. **Thus we can conclude with confidence that the Revised Task A is statistically the same as the HVP Task A in the extrinsic statements.**

The Systemic Statement

The analysis of those rankings that led to differing **Systemic** computed scores is as follows:

Number of statements that remained unchanged: 5

Number of statements that were changed: 1 (or 17% of the total)

Those that differed by 2 or 3 points on the computed scores: 1

1 of which were by differences in the rankings of the unchanged statements,

0 because of the differences in the rankings of the changed statements.

Conclusion Concerning the Changed Systemic Statement

The one respondent that had significant difference in the computed systemic scores between the HVP Task A and the Revised Task A, differed in his (her?) ranking of the same statements and did not differ in his ranking of the changed statement. While we cannot accurately discuss the percentage comparisons (because no changes caused by the different ranking of the changed statement would always lead to 0%), it is safe to say that the sixty-three respondents ranked the changed systemic statement in the Revised Task A in such a similar way that those rankings led to the same computed scores as they had for the HVP Task A systemic statements. **Thus we can conclude with confidence that the Revised Task A is statistically the same as the HVP Task A in the systemic statements.**

Overall Conclusion

The HVP Task A has five different statements that are problematic for people in 2001. Many people do not have clear understanding of the meanings of "concentration camps," "heretics," and "madman." Still others take inappropriate personal offense at one statement that they interpret to apply specifically to their race: "slavery." Still others are overly sensitive to recent terrorist activities and are offended by the statement "blow up an airliner in flight." Bottom line; because the HVP is politically incorrect or raises political, cultural, or racial sensitivities it must be revised so it is available to help more people.

While the rankings of the Revised Task As are not exactly the same as those of the HVP Task A, they have the same axiological value combinations. We have found from this study we have a significant level of confidence (greater than 95%) that variations in the rankings are not due to the changes in the five statements. We have also found that changes in the statements were not the causes of the differences in the scoring regimens used to score the Profile rankings.

With these findings we are able to conclude that the Revised Task A is a suitable substitute for the HVP Task A at a confidence level that exceeds 95%.

Appendix

The Revised Hartman Task A

Rank the following statements and things in order from best (give it #1) to worst (give it #18). Make sure you do not use the same number more than one time.

- ___ A good meal
- ___ A technical improvement
- ___ Nonsense
- ___ A fine
(like a speeding ticket)
- ___ A rubbish heap
- ___ A devoted scientist
- ___ Totally destroying crops of food
- ___ Imprison an innocent person
- ___ A short circuit
- ___ "By this ring, I thee wed."
- ___ A baby
- ___ Using love to commit murder
- ___ Love of nature
- ___ A person who does not tell the truth
- ___ An assembly line
- ___ A thief
- ___ A mathematical genius
- ___ A uniform