

The Omnia Profile: Essential Information for Clients

This document is designed to help professionals make informed decisions about using the Omnia Profile® as a business tool.

This document contains:

1. Omnia Profile description, instructions, and uses.
2. Validation Study information including reliability, validity, and fairness.
3. An information summary.

1. The Omnia Profile: Description, Instructions, Uses

Description

The Omnia Profile is a personality profiling instrument that assesses an individual's behavioral characteristics for various business purposes. These purposes include employee hiring, management/retention, training, development, and team-building.

An Omnia client who submits a Profile for processing receives an individually-written report closely tailored to that client's specific needs. The report is written to be easily understood by a business professional with no prior testing experience. Completed Profile reports are provided to clients within three business hours.

The Omnia Profile contains four parts and takes 10-15 minutes to complete.

Parts 1 & 2 consist of 82-item adjective checklists. In Part 1, the individual is instructed to select all adjectives that describe "how other people see you." Part 2 adjectives selected by the individual describe "how you see yourself." Parts 3 & 4 focus on identifying the individual's perception of appropriate job behavior and preferred work environment.

A trained Omnia Analyst objectively evaluates Profile data, draws conclusions based upon a client's unique needs, and presents these findings in a one page report. Written from start to finish by an Omnia Analyst rather than produced by a computer, each report passes a series of quality checks before being returned to the client. Express one hour service is available.

For each client, the Omnia Group maintains an extensive database of information. Clients fill out position description forms detailing the client's work environment, the demands of each job for which Profiles may be submitted, and various job-relevant criteria such as pay structure and advancement opportunities. Additionally, clients may add managers' and/or "top performing" employees' Profiles to the Omnia database at no additional cost. This allows Omnia Analysts to compare an individual to top performing employees, and also to make management suggestions based on a particular manager's characteristics.

Instructions for administering the Omnia Profile

The Omnia Profile was designed to be non-invasive, ensuring that each person may respond to it comfortably and naturally. Clear, simple, and complete instructions are included with each Profile form, which should be administered in a quiet, well-lit environment. No additional instructions need be provided to individuals completing an Omnia Profile.

If the Omnia Profile is being used for new employee selection, it should be administered before any planned interviews are conducted. Therefore, every candidate completes a Profile, though the hiring manager may choose to submit to the Omnia Group only Profiles of those candidates who make the "short list" for hire after the interview process. Having every candidate complete a Profile helps an organization

maintain consistency in the interview process, and submitting only Profiles of “finalist” candidates enables the client to control expenses appropriately.

Submitting the Omnia Profile for processing

A client may submit Profile data to the Omnia Group either through the Omnia online system (accessible 24 hours a day, 7 days a week), by fax, or by regular mail. Omnia Service Consultants are fully trained Omnia Analysts who are accessible by telephone or e-mail.

The focus of an Omnia Profile report: appropriate uses of an Omnia Profile

Because each Omnia Profile report is individually written, its focus or purpose depends upon the client’s needs - there is no additional charge for specific client requests.

For new employee selection, a client receives an Omnia Compatibility Rating (OCR), which is a numerical score that reflects an individual’s fit with the position for which he/she is being considered. A one-sentence recommendation within the Profile report complements the OCR score.

The issue of employee retention has gained importance as the concept of “employee for life” has diminished. The Omnia Profile is appropriately used as a management tool and can assist clients concerned about maintaining the motivation and productivity of existing employees. Retention-focused Profiles also promote effective employee-manager communication and may recommend work environment adaptations.

Another common and appropriate use of the Omnia Profile is as a resource when an existing employee is being considered for promotion. The client may request that the employee’s Profile be compared to a new position and/or a new manager’s Profile (no charge for the manager’s Profile if no write-up is requested), which helps ensure smooth internal personnel moves and management changes.

The Omnia Profile report may be appropriately used for employee selection and/or management for a wide range of positions. No employee selection or management decision should be made based upon only one criterion or source of information. The Omnia Profile report is not designed to be used as the sole determining factor for employee selection or management decisions. It should be used in addition to other sources of information such as structured interviews and background checks.

2. Validation Study Information

Two independent validation studies have been performed by Industrial Psychologists on the Omnia Profile. The first of these studies was conducted in 1987; its conclusions strongly supported the reliability, accuracy, and fairness of the Profile. Since periodic validation is a recommended practice for assessment instruments such as the Profile, the Omnia Group commissioned a second validation study in 2000. Conclusions drawn in the second validation study support findings from the first study.

Both studies had the following objectives:

1. To determine the reliability (the accuracy and stability of measurements).
2. To determine the validity (face/content and construct accuracy).
3. To determine the fairness of the Omnia Profile.

No changes had been made to parts 1 & 2 of the Omnia Profile since 1987. In an effort to ensure optimum reliability and to keep Profile words current with modern language usage, the group performing the second validation study considered whether or not updating some Profile words would be advisable. Extensive analysis produced a group of replacement words which, when incorporated into the Profile, resulted in increased reliability and accessibility.

Validation Study # 1

The first independent validation of the Omnia Profile was performed by Hurst and Associates in 1987. The following text summarizes and explains the results of the study; quotations are taken directly from the report.

1. Reliability

Two methods were used to evaluate the Omnia Profile's reliability. For the first assessment, the Omnia Profile was administered to a group of 381 working adults. Internal consistency reliabilities were determined using coefficient alpha, the most generalized index of reliability for standard variables.

For the second reliability analysis, the Omnia Profile was administered to a portion of the original sample group. These individuals were then given the Profile a second time, four to nine months later. Examining the relationship between the scores on both occasions provides an individual examination of the Omnia Profile's test/retest reliability. Test/retest reliability indicates the degree of stability one might expect from scored results.

A reliability coefficient of 1.00 indicates perfect reliability, while a reliability coefficient of 0.00 indicates that a measure is completely unreliable. The coefficient alpha internal consistency reliabilities for the Omnia Profile constructs range between 0.74 and 0.88, with an average reliability of 0.82. The test/retest reliabilities for the sample group ranged between 0.51 and 0.80, with an overall average reliability of 0.63. The reliability coefficient is higher than average for a personality measure and the test/retest reliabilities are moderate for a personality measure.

“Since the internal consistency reliabilities are quite high, the Omnia Profile accurately assesses several characteristics which are subject to change.” This data indicates that the Omnia Profile construct scores can be viewed with confidence.

Since the Omnia Profile is used exclusively for corporate fit and is in a sense a snapshot in time, the issue of reliability indexes for internal consistency and test-retest reliability is viewed differently. In such a business setting, a high accuracy (internal consistency) would be favored, but only a moderate test-retest reliability would be required. Too high a test-retest reliability would essentially indicate that human beings are incapable of adapting or changing, even to a moderate degree. “Based on this, the Omnia Profile is best used to obtain a fit between an individual and a position at a particular point in time rather than indicating what may be a fit at some future point. Using the Profile in this way leaves plenty of opportunity for training, experience, changing conditions, and re-assessments to influence decision-making at later points in time.”

2. Validity

Once it was established that the Omnia Profile's adjective checklist was reliable, the next step was to determine if each construct measured the concept (or behavioral characteristics) it was designed to measure. The internal and external relationships pertaining to each construct affect the constructs' integrity. Most desirable are strong internal and weak external relationships.

The first consideration for defining the validity of the Omnia Profile was whether there was face/content validity to the scales. Face validity is determined by examining the items used to define each construct.

“It is apparent from these results that the item content does seem to describe the constructs defined for each scale. The fact that item-total correlations are extremely similar from both the ‘Other’ and ‘Self’ perspectives lends additional support to the face and content validity of the construct scales.”

The second consideration was construct validity from the standpoint of factor analysis. In conducting the factor analysis, evidence to corroborate, or not, the reliability, face, and content validity data was sought.

Four major factors were found which corresponded to the aggressiveness, sociability, pace, and compliance scales.

Sixty-seven percent (67%) of the items loading significantly (loading greater than or equal to .35) on the first factor were from the “aggressiveness” scale. Sixty-nine percent (69%) of the significant items on the second factor were from the “pace” scale, and 90% of the significant items on the fourth factor came from the “compliance” scale; the remainder came from the other scales. “These results indicate that the ‘folk concepts’ held together quite reasonably under this procedure.”

“These interscale correlations support construct validity since they were largely as one would expect.”

Interpretive Validity

To examine interpretive validity is to ask the following question: does the Omnia Profile significantly predict individuals’ behavior, performance, or fit? The issue is whether or not the interpretation derived from the scale scores is accurate.

At one company, a sample of employees who worked together closely in sales rated the accuracy of each of five interpretive comments as applied to the self-concept and job-concept. Each employee made his/her own assessment and had a colleague make a separate assessment of the accuracy of the statements with respect to vocational relevance.

In the self-concept, individuals assigned Profile statements an average accuracy rating of 83%; the average accuracy rating assigned by colleagues was 89%. In the job-concept, individuals provided an average accuracy rating of 93%, and their colleagues provided an average accuracy rating of 92%.

Since there was relatively little variation in the statement ratings, further interpretation accuracy ratings were collapsed to address the overall accuracy of the self-concept and job-concept interpretations.

In this aspect of the validation study, the ratings were consistently very high (89 to 91%) with the variation low (7.5 to 12.1%). These results indicate that the persons taking the Omnia Profile felt that the interpretations were very accurate. Furthermore, colleagues of respondents felt the interpretations were also very accurate.

“The very high accuracy rating assigned by both respondents and their colleagues to both the self concept and job concept interpretations strongly suggest that the Omnia Profile can be a valid descriptive instrument in the hands of competent interpreters.”

3. **Fairness / Adverse Impact**

The study also included procedures conducted in order to determine whether the results of the Omnia Profile demonstrate any pattern of age, racial or gender bias.

The original sample of 381 working adults was used to analyze the impact of age and sex on the Omnia Profile results. In addition, the participation of another group of working adults was sought through the Chamber of Commerce in Tampa, Florida. This included a group of African American and Hispanic people who participated in the racial studies.

“As long as the limits of interpretation are not extended beyond the underlined normative scores when making interpretations, The Omnia Profile should have no adverse impact.”

“Assuming that the interpreters maintain the (standard Omnia procedure) of producing their descriptions with respect to the ratio scores rather than any possible cut-off scores, there should be no adverse impact since there is no significant difference between the groups at a statistically significant level with respect to the scores as they are used in interpretations.”

Validation Study # 2

The second independent validation of the Omnia Profile was performed by Personnel Decisions Research Institutes in 2000. The findings of this study were similar to those of the earlier validation study. The following text summarizes and explains the results of this second study; quotations are taken directly from the report.

1. Reliability: convergent analysis

The first part of this project was to evaluate the internal reliability of the Omnia Profile construct scales. This was done by examining the coefficient alphas, the coefficient alpha if an item was deleted and the item-total correlations for each scale. For these analyses, Omnia provided a set of 500 previously collected and scored Omnia Profiles.

“A coefficient alpha of .80 or above is generally thought to indicate that the items are working together to measure the same construct (Nunnally & Bernstein, 1994; U.S. Department of Labor, 1999).”

The average coefficient alpha of the Profile’s 5 constructs was .79 in the ‘self’ section and .78 in the ‘other’ section. Though these scores were very close to the .80 guideline recommended by the Department of Labor, the Omnia Group asked PDRI to determine whether or not they could be improved.

To identify words as viable candidates for replacement, the purity of each word was analyzed in various ways. Once a finalized list of words for replacement consideration was compiled, words that might be introduced as replacements were identified and analyzed. As a result, new words were added to the existing Profile words to create what was called the “Transitional” Profile. This was used for data collection purposes for the remainder of the validation study.

With the new words substituting for the replacement words, the coefficient alpha scores increased.

“Because coefficient alpha is a function of the length of a scale as well as the average correlation between the items, it is helpful to inspect the inter-item correlations in addition to the coefficient alphas. PDRI determined that the inter-item correlations within the Omnia Profile were acceptable (Cortina, 1993), and further support the reliability of the Profile.

“The reliability results reported here are consistent with a previous validation of the original Omnia Profile (Hurst & Associates, 1987). Provided that the individual scale scores are being used descriptively, as they are in applying Omnia’s Proprietary scoring methodology, the obtained reliabilities are within the acceptable range (Nunnally & Bernstein, 1994; U.S. Department of Labor, 1999).”

2. Validity: convergent analysis

The first of two methods (the other being criterion) used to evaluate the validity of the Omnia Profile was convergent evaluation. In this context, convergent means the degree to which the Omnia Profile converges with an established and validated instrument of a type similar to the Profile. Strong convergence between instruments would provide evidence of the Profile’s validity.

The NEO Five Factor Inventory was selected for this part of the study because “the NEO-FFI is a relatively established and well-respected measure of personality, and thus correlations between the Transitional Profile and scores on the NEO scales can be used to support the convergent validity of the Omnia instrument. Specifically, theory-based predictions were made regarding which constructs on each measure (Profile/NEO) should correlate and to what extent. These were compared to the observed correlations.”

Convergent validation data was collected by administering both the Omnia Transitional Profile and the NEO-FFI to incumbents in a variety of organizations. PDRI tallied 380 usable Profiles for this part of the study.

To serve as a basis for evaluating convergent validity, PDRI staff generated a matrix that represents the predicted relationships among the constructs of the Omnia Profile and the NEO-FFI. Then a matrix representing the actual, or observed, correlations was created.

Of the 25 predicted correlations in the matrix, only 5 were inconsistent with PDRI's predictions. 13 were statistically significant and completely consistent with the theory-based predictions. 2 predictions were of the strength and direction predicted but were not statistically significant. 5 predictions were of the direction predicted but the strength varied between significant moderate and strong.

“Taken as a whole, the agreement between what was predicted and the obtained correlations is quite good and supports the construct validity of the Omnia Profile based on its relation to the NEO-FFI.”

Criterion Validation

The second and final method used to evaluate the reliability and validity of the Omnia Profile was criterion-based. “Criterion-related validity is established when a predictor (in this case the Omnia Profile) is meaningfully correlated with a criterion measure that indicates successful performance on the job, such as supervisory performance ratings. If such a relationship can be demonstrated, it supports the use of the Profile as an aid in selecting employees more likely to be successful in their jobs.”

For the criterion sample, 332 inbound call center employees from 5 different organizations completed the Omnia Profile. After PDRI deleted 17 cases due to incomplete data, the total sample size was 315. PDRI obtained supervisor ratings for these subjects and analysts at the Omnia Group scored the 315 Profiles, providing an Omnia Compatibility Rating (OCR) for each Profile.

“The OCR is an index of how strongly Omnia recommends a person for a particular position. This is based on the fit between 1) the person's Profile results and 2) the Omnia Position Description & Job Set-Up results.” A higher OCR, which is a predictor measure, should be associated with a higher supervisor rating, which is a criterion measure.

“Similar to the convergent sample, the criterion sample's average coefficient alphas were above the .80 recommendation (Nunnally & Bernstein, 1994; U.S. Department of Labor, 1999). The correlations among the constructs are also relatively high indicating that the constructs are measuring relatively similar characteristics.”

“Of primary interest in the criterion validation are correlations between the OCR score and the performance ratings.” PDRI research indicated significant correlation in the measures of dependability, cooperation, safety, integrity and professional honesty. In the case of dependability, for example, this demonstrates validity for using the OCR to determine the extent to which an employer can depend upon an employee.

PDRI reported that a test with the overall validity rating obtained for the Omnia Profile “can contribute considerably to the usefulness of a selection program (Taylor and Russell, 1939).”

3. Fairness / Adverse Impact

Of critical importance to employers considering using the Omnia Profile for selection and management purposes is the issue of fairness.

Biased or unfair assessment procedures are those on which one race, sex, or ethnic group characteristically obtains lower scores than members of another group and the differences in the scores are not reflected in differences in the job performance of members of the groups (U.S. Department of Labor, 1999).

In the convergent section of the validation study, PDRI “evaluated the correlations between the demographic data and the Omnia Profile Constructs. Few of these were statistically significant, and these are discussed further in conjunction with the criterion-related validity dataset.”

In the criterion section, PDRI established correlations between demographic variables and Omnia Profile Construct scores and the OCR. “Several of these are significant, and are worth noting.”

“Tenure with Company and Age both correlate to the OCR, but this is largely to be expected; given that OCR indicates job fit, certainly people who have been on the job longer would be expected to have higher OCR scores. Additionally, Education Level is correlated with higher OCR scores, most likely because more educated employees in this sample also tended to be older and are likely more achievement-oriented and motivated to succeed.”

“Overall, none of these correlations indicates cause for legal concern. Importantly there is no correlation between Race/Ethnicity and the OCR.”
--

These findings indicate that the Omnia Profile is in compliance with EEOC standards. Since there is no factor in the Profile either measuring or dependent upon physical ability, compliance also exists with ADA standards.

3. **Summary**

The Omnia Profile is a validated employee selection and management tool designed to be administered quickly and easily. It can be completed in approximately 10-15 minutes; clients receive individually written Profile reports within three business hours. The Profile provides information about a subject’s behavioral strengths and weaknesses, as well as his or her compatibility with specific jobs, work environments, co-workers, and managers. It has been independently proven to be effective and fair, and should be used to complement a responsible selection and management program rather than utilized as the sole basis for hiring or management decisions.