36 ITEM QB6 SCORING INSTRUCTIONS

HONESTY/PROPRIETY

#						=
1	Add values circled for statements 11, 17 & 29		+	+	=	
2	Add values circled for statements 5, 23 & 35		+	+	=	
3	Subtract (-) total of line 2 from '15'				=	
4	Combine the two totals from lines 1 and 3		+		=	
5	mean response	Divide (÷) line 4 by '6'			=	

AGREEABLENESS

#							=
1	Add the values circled for statements 8 & 32		+		=		
2	Add the values circled for statements 2, 14, 20 & 26	+	+	+	=		
3	Subtract (-) total of line 2 from '20'				=		
4	Combine the two totals from lines 1 and 3		+				
5		Divide (÷) line 4 by '6'			=		

RESILIENCY VS. INTERNALIZING NEGATIVE EMOTIONALITY

#						=
1	Add the values circled for statements 12 & 36		+		=	
2	Add the value circled for statements 6, 18, 24 & 30	+	+	+	=	
3	Subtract (-) total of line 2 from '20'				=	
4	Combine the two totals from lines 1 and 3		+		=	
5		Divide (÷) line 4 by '6'			=	

EXTRAVERSION

#					=
1	Add the values circled for statements 3, 15 & 27	+	+	=	
2	Add the value circled for statements 9, 21 & 33	+	+	=	
3	Subtract (-) total of line 2 from '15'			=	
4	Combine the two totals from lines 1 and 3	+		=	
5	Divide (÷) line 4 by '6'			=	

ORIGINALITY/TALENT

#					=
1	Add the values circled for statements 10, 16 & 34	+	+	=	
2	Add the value circled for statements 4, 22 & 28	+	+	=	
3	Subtract (-) total of line 2 from '15'			=	
4	Combine the two totals from lines 1 and 3	+		=	
5	Divide (÷) line 4 by '6'			=	

CONSCIENTIOUSNESS

#					=
1	Add the values circled for statements 1, 13 & 25	+	+	=	
2	Add the value circled for statements 7, 19 & 31	+	+	=	
3	Subtract (-) total of line 2 from '15'			=	
4	Combine the two totals from lines 1 and 3	+		=	
5	Divide (÷) line 4 by '6'			=	

For scores on a scale of 1-100 (useful for comparing scores from different inventories and that use different length likert scales), multiply each mean score by 20.

You can compare scores to the mean scores for a sample of 470 college students, collected at the University of Oregon in 2008 and 2009. This sample had a mean age of 19 and was about 65% female.
* Note that a 1-5 rating scale (rather than 0-5) was used in the two samples described here, and in the published article mentioned below. *

Scale	Mean	SD	α	VIR	*M100*
Conscientiousness	3.20	.67	.70	.018	*55.00*
Honesty/Propriety	3.38	.73	.70	.017	*59.50*
Agreeableness	3.37	.69	.70	.011	*59.25*
Resiliency	3.10	.78	.79	.010	*52.50*
Extraversion	3.99	.57	.60	.017	*74.75*
Originality/Talent	3.40	.55	.59	.009	*60.00*

Alternatively, you can compare scores to the mean scores for a sample of 607 adult community residents, from 2008. This sample had a mean age of 64 and was about 57% female.

Scale	Mean	SD	α	VIR	*M100*
Conscientiousness	4.02	.58	.68	.004	*75.50*
Honesty/Propriety	4.12	.62	.65	.009	*78.00*
Agreeableness	3.50	.69	.73	.010	*62.50*
Resiliency	3.59	.71	.74	.008	*64.75*
Extraversion	3.75	.66	.69	.012	*68.75*
Originality/Talent	3.47	.67	.71	.004	*61.75*

In both tables above "VIR" refers to the variance of the interitem correlations for the scale, which can be used as one index of unidimensionality (the greater the value, the higher the multidimensionality present in the set of items). In both tables, "Mean" refers to average item response to the 6 scale items when using a 1-to-5 response scale, and "M100" rescales this mean so it varies from 0 to 100 – M100 thus being the percentage of the highest possible score obtainable. Such an "M100" score makes it possible to compare mean scores from data having different numbers of response points.

VALIDITY INDICATIONS:

In a comparative validity study (student sample, N = 227), the 36QB6 predicted important life outcomes six months after participation (grade point average [GPA] and number of student conduct violations charged and found responsible for), better than significantly longer Big Five questionnaires (the NEO-FFI [60 items], IPIP-50 [50 items], BFI [44 items]). See:

Thalmayer, A.G., Saucier, G., & Eigenhuis, A. (2011). Comparative validity of brief to medium-length Big Five and big six personality questionnaires. *Psychological Assessment, 23,* 995-1009. doi: 10.1037/a0024165

For information from ongoing studies of predictive validity of the 36QB6, contact Dr. Saucier.