



The British
Psychological Society

Psychological Testing Centre

Test Review

Facet5

(Facet5)

The British Psychological Society © 2016. All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced or transmitted, in any form or by any means, without permission.

This test has been granted registration as a psychological test by the British Psychological Society, Psychological Testing Centre.

Facet5 (Facet5)

Reviewers: Angus McDonald
& Joanna Yarker

Consulting Editor: Ian Newcombe

Senior Editor: L. A. Marshall

GENERAL INFORMATION AND DESCRIPTION OF THE INSTRUMENT

Test Name: Facet5

Authors of the original test:

Norman Buckley & Rebekah Williams

Local test distributor / publisher:

Facet5 Ltd

Date of Publication of Current Review/Edition: 2016

Date of Publication of the Original Test: 1990

General Description of Test: Facet5 is a personality measure that draws from five factors of personality. Measured under the five factors are 13 sub-factors, using 106 items presented in the semantic differential format. This format uses a five-point scale anchored by 'implicit opposite' descriptions. The five factors are: Will (containing the sub-factors of Determination, Confrontation, Independence), Energy (containing the sub-factors of Vitality, Sociability and Adaptability), Affection (containing the sub-factors of Altruism, Support and Trust), Control (containing the sub-factors of Discipline and Responsibility) and Emotionality (containing the sub-factors of Tension and Apprehension). Emotionality is seen as a factor that affects the interpretation of the other factors.

Facet5 additionally includes an Impression Management scale, based on an analysis of response latency to individual items.

Items were generated using repertory grid studies with managers in UK organisations, with content going through a series of reviews before being trialled. In the current version of the assessment only 83 of the 106 items are scored and contribute to the factor and sub-factor scores, with the remaining 23 being used for research purposes. Responses to Facet5 are interpreted through norm referencing, and a range of norm groups are available to the user. A range of computer-generated reports are also available which include summaries and details of the profiles, and sections focussed on competencies, leaderships and work preferences. Users have access to an administration panel for sending invites to complete Facet5 and for generating reports. Reports can be customised by specifying which sections are to be included in the final report. The same platform gives access to a knowledge-base that supports users in their application of Facet5. A recent addition is the Facet5 app, that allows respondents to enter their profile and overlay it against the profile of another respondent, identifying the expected patterns of interaction and for each factor identifying possible benefits, frustrations, risks and challenges. It also allows comparison with the 'national character data' of 31 countries.

Additional tools are also available to complement the Facet5 assessment, including Backdrop (which provides a matching of individuals to corporate culture), Audition (a job profiling and matching tool) and TeamScape (which incorporates Facet5 into a team development and 360 process).

Classification

Content Domains:

Personality – Trait

Intended or main area(s) of Use:

Work and Occupational

Description of the populations for which the test is intended:

Adult population

Number of scales and brief description of the variable or variables measured by the test:

Five scales, 13 sub scales:

- Will – determination, confrontation and independence
- Energy – vitality, sociability, adaptability
- Affection – altruism, support, trust
- Control – discipline and responsibility
- Emotionality – tension and apprehension

Items format:

Semantic differential scale, anchoring each end with a five point scale between them.

Number of test items:

106 items (83 of which are scored)

Will – 15 items

Energy – 15 items

Affection – 18 items

Control – 17 items

Emotionality – 18 items

Administration modes:

- Computerised Web-based application – unsupervised/self-assessment
- Computerised Web-based application – supervised/proctored

Response mode:

Computerised

Time:

Preparation: 5 minutes

Completion: 35 minutes

Scoring: automated

Analysis: automated

Feedback: 30 mins – 1½ hours for individuals, ½ day to 2 days for teams

Different forms of the test:

The measure is available in self and other form.

Measurement and Scoring***Scoring procedure for the test:***

Computer scoring with direct entry of responses by test taker

Scores:

Conversion of raw scores to sten scores through norm referencing.

Score transformation for standard scores:

- Normalised – scores obtained by use of normalisation look-up table

Scales Used:***Percentile-based scores:******Standard scores:***

- Stens

Computer-Generated Reports***Are computer generated reports available with the instrument?:***

- Yes

Number of Computer Generated Reports available:

6

Do distributors offer a service to correct and/or develop computer generated reports?:

- No

Report Name:

Facet Personal Profile

Brief description of Reports..	
Media:	• Integrated text and graphics
Complexity:	• Medium
Report Structure:	• Scale based
Sensitivity to context:	• One version for all contexts
Clinical–actuarial:	• Based on clinical judgement of group of experts
Modifiability:	• Not modifiable
Degree of 'finish':	• Publication quality
Transparency:	• Clear linkage between constructs, scores and text
Style and tone:	• Directive
Intended recipients:	• Qualified test users • Test takers • Qualified system users

Report Name:

Leading Edge Profile

Brief description of Reports..	
Media:	• Integrated text and graphics
Complexity:	• Medium
Report Structure:	• Construct based
Sensitivity to context:	• One version for all contexts
Clinical–actuarial:	• Based on clinical judgement of group of experts
Modifiability:	• Not modifiable
Degree of 'finish':	• Publication quality
Transparency:	• Clear linkage between constructs, scores and text
Style and tone:	• Directive
Intended recipients:	• Qualified test users • Test takers • Qualified system users • Third parties

Report Name:

Searchlight Profile

Brief description of Reports..	
Media:	• Integrated text and graphics
Complexity:	• Medium
Report Structure:	• Construct based
Sensitivity to context:	• One version for all contexts
Clinical–actuarial:	• Based on clinical judgement of group of experts
Modifiability:	• Not modifiable
Degree of 'finish':	• Publication quality
Transparency:	• Clear linkage between constructs, scores and text
Style and tone:	• Guidance
Intended recipients:	• Qualified test users • Qualified system users

Report Name:

Spotlight

Brief description of Reports..	
Media:	• Unrelated text and graphics
Complexity:	• Simple
Report Structure:	• Factor based
Sensitivity to context:	• One version for all contexts
Clinical–actuarial:	• Based on clinical judgement of group of experts
Modifiability:	• Not modifiable
Degree of 'finish':	• Publication quality
Transparency:	• Mixture of clear/concealed linkage between constructs, scores and text
Style and tone:	• Guidance
Intended recipients:	• Test takers

Report Name:

Work Preferences Profile

Brief description of Reports..	
Media:	• Unrelated text and graphics
Complexity:	• Simple
Report Structure:	• Factor based
Sensitivity to context:	• One version for all contexts
Clinical–actuarial:	• Based on clinical judgement of group of experts
Modifiability:	• Not modifiable
Degree of 'finish':	• Publication quality
Transparency:	• Concealed link between constructs, scores and text
Style and tone:	• Guidance
Intended recipients:	• Qualified test users • Qualified system users

Report Name:

Audition Interview Guide

Brief description of Reports..	
Media:	• Integrated text and graphics
Complexity:	• Complex
Report Structure:	• Scale based
Sensitivity to context:	• One version for all contexts
Clinical–actuarial:	• Based on clinical judgement of group of experts
Modifiability:	• Not modifiable
Degree of 'finish':	• Publication quality
Transparency:	• Clear linkage between constructs, scores and text
Style and tone:	• Directive
Intended recipients:	• Qualified test users • Qualified system users

Supply Condition and Costs

Documentation provided by the distributor as part of the test package:

User manual

Supplementary technical information and updates (e.g. local norms, local validation studies etc)

Technical (psychometric) manual

Methods of publication:

Live Internet (test runs in a web browser)

Start-up costs:

The publisher stated that the Facet5 pricing model is based on a global distribution based on the country and company size. Therefore no standardised pricing can be provided in the review.

Recurrent costs:

See above

Prices for a report generated by user installed software:

See above

Prices for reports:

See above

Prices for a report generated by the Internet services:

See above

Prices for other bureau services:

See above

Test-related qualifications required by the supplier of the test:

- Test specific accreditation

Professional qualifications required for use of the test:

- Practitioner in relevant related professions (therapy, medicine, counselling, education, human resources etc)

Evaluation of Test Materials**Key to symbols:**

★	Inadequate
★★	No longer used
★★★	Adequate/Reasonable
★★★★	Good
★★★★★	Excellent
[N.r.i.o.r]	(for updates only) Item was not rated in original review

Quality of the explanation of the rationale, the presentation and the quality of information provided:

★★★★

Overall rating of the Quality of the explanation of the rationale:	★★★★★
i) Theoretical foundations of the constructs:	★★★★★
ii) Test development procedure:	★★★★★
iii) Thoroughness of the item analyses and item analysis model:	★★★★★
iv) Explanation of content validity:	★★★★★
v) Summary of relevant research:	★★★★★
Adequacy of documentation available to the user (user and technical manuals, norm supplements etc):	★★★★★
i) Rationale:	★★★★★
ii) Development:	★★★★★
iii) Standardisation:	★★★★★
iv) Norms:	★★★★★
v) Reliability:	★★★★★
vi) Validity:	★★★★★
Quality of the Procedural instructions provided for the user:	★★★
i) For test administration:	★
ii) For test scoring, norming etc:	★★★
iii) For interpretation and reporting:	★★★★★
iv) For providing feedback and debriefing test takers and others:	★★★★★
v) For providing good practice issues on fairness and bias:	★★★
vi) Restrictions on use:	★★★
vii) References and supporting materials:	★★★★★
Quality of the materials:	★★★★★
i) General quality of test materials (test booklets, answer sheets, test objects, software, etc):	★★★★★

ii) Test quality of the local adaptation (if the test has been translated and adapted into the local language):	N/A
iii) Ease with which the test taker can understand the task:	★★★★★
iv) Ease with which responses or answers can be made by the test taker:	★★★★★
v) Quality of the items:	★★★★★

Reviewer's comments on the documentation (comment on rationale, design, test development and acceptability):

Facet5 is accompanied by extensive documentation covering the development of the instrument, its technical properties and guidance for users. A useful summary on research into personality and the main issues is also provided, which will likely be helpful to those users who are new to the area of personality assessment. Detailed descriptions of the factors and sub-factors are also given in the manual, including sections on 'what others see' which describe the behaviours that others have reported during feedback reviews using Facet5.

Facet5 is supported by a comprehensive website, where users can set-up and manage assessments and generate reports. There is also an online 'support centre' which contains extensive resources to support the Facet5 assessment itself and the other tools and instruments in the Facet5 family. Information is provided in written format and as videos that can be viewed, and includes an extensive FAQs section and detailed guidance supporting users on giving feedback on Facet5 profiles.

The majority of the test development process is well documented, but could be strengthened in places. For example, more detailed information could be provided on the initial item analysis and selection, as could information regarding the occupational background of the initial development sample.

However, very limited information appears to be given to users about the administration of Facet5. Related to this point, though Facet5 is designed for use in the workplace, guidance on target groups and issues such as minimum language level necessary would provide further support to users.

The Facet5 documentation is generally of high quality, and more is available online via the Facet5 Learning and Support Centre. The extent of the resources available online shows an ongoing commitment by the publishers to provide up-to-date support for their users and ensure high standards in the use of Facet5.

The Facet5 online assessment materials are easy to use and of good quality. The layout is generally clear with full instructions for respondents about what they have to do, though in places it may benefit from having more 'space' in the layout and possibly breaking the instructions over more screens, as there is a tendency for the main instructions screen to look quite 'busy'. Completion of the items themselves is simple – questions are presented largely one by one and it is very clear what the test taker is required to do.

Navigating backwards and forwards is straight forward so respondents can review responses to earlier items if they wish. Overall the online assessment materials are clear and easy to use.

Norms, Validity & Reliability

Evaluation of technical information:

★★★★★

Norms or reference group information:

Overall adequacy:	★★★★★
i) Appropriateness for local use, whether local or international norms:	★★★★★

ii) Appropriateness for intended applications:	★★★★★
iii) Sample sizes:	★★★★★
iv) Procedures used in sample selection:	Non-probability sample – convenience
v) Quality of information provided about minority/protected group differences, effects of age, gender etc:	★★★

Reviewers' comments about the norms:

The range and size of the Facet5 normative samples provided are impressive. Facet5 comes with a range of norm groups – along with UK (n=36,302), Global (n=98,073) and European (n=47,395) norms are sector-specific norms (e.g. Finance, Sales, Human Resources, Information Technology), Managerial norms, and different norms for Public and Private Sector employees. For the Global norm, details are given for the 53 contributing countries, and it is noted that the contribution of the UK, Australia and Brazil has been limited to 10,000 to avoid over-sampling from these countries. All norm groups are at least of 'adequate' size, though many have much larger samples. Gender-specific norms are also available, though these combine samples from the UK and Australia. No rationale is given as to why these two groups have been combined.

The samples on which norms are based are reasonably well described, though in places it is difficult to establish how representative they are. For example, though the proportion of males and females is described no information is given on the representation of respondents from ethnic minorities, though the authors do include a discussion of the potential sources of bias in norm collection and note the difficulty of collecting information such as ethnic origin when assessments are used internationally. The authors state that their database of respondents is reviewed every 12 months to update norms, with priority being given to those norm groups that currently have smaller sample sizes.

Validity:

Overall adequacy:	★★★★★
Construct Validity (overall adequacy):	★★★★★
i) Designs used:	Exploratory Factor Analysis (Corrected) item-test correlations Correlations with other instruments and performance criteria
ii) Sample sizes:	★★★★★
iii) Procedure of sample selection:	Incidental
iv) Median and range of the correlations between the test and other similar tests:	★★★★★

v) Quality of instruments as criteria or markers:	★★★★★
vi) Differential Item Functioning (DIF) analyses:	N/A
Criterion-related validity: overall adequacy:	★★★★
i) Description of the criteria used and characteristics of the populations:	Concurrent
ii) Sample sizes:	★★★★★
iii) Procedure of Sample selection:	Incidental
iv) Median and range of the correlations between the test and criteria:	★★★

Reviewers' comments about validity:

The authors have demonstrated sound construct validity, using a range of well-used and established measures such as the 16PF and OPQ among others. Evidence for criterion related validity is less strong. It is presented through a series of studies that summarise the association between Facet5 profiles and outcomes of assessment centres, performance evaluations and management development programmes. Because the validity evidence is often presented in rather a descriptive fashion, it would be strengthened by more consistent presentation of results (e.g. always reporting validity coefficients). Where correlations are presented they are generally corrected for attenuation, which serves to increase their values by c. 50%. Nonetheless, the uncorrected values are still generally acceptable.

Reliability:

Overall adequacy:	★★★★★
i) Data provided about reliability:	Reliability coefficients for a number of different groups (for each scale or subscale)
Internal consistency:	
i) Sample size:	★★★★★
ii) Median of coefficients:	★★★
Test retest stability:	
i) Sample size:	★★★★★
ii) Median of coefficients:	★★★★★
Equivalence reliability:	

i) Sample size:	N/A
ii) Median of coefficients:	N/A

Reviewers' comments on Reliability (comment on confidence intervals for reliability coefficients and provide Spearman Brown equivalents for a 30-item scale):

A range of studies are presented to demonstrate the reliability of the instrument. There are a number of strengths: the studies are of reasonable to large size and demonstrate good stability over time. Though internal consistency figures are moderate, this follows from the intention to develop a relatively short assessment that covers the breadth of the major areas of personality. Both internal consistency and test-retest figures are adequate for the five factors, but this evidence is far more limited for the sub-factors where only a single study of internal consistency is reported. No evidence for the stability of the sub-factors is given, nor are any reasons for this apparent omission. Given that the internal consistency estimates for some of the sub-factors are fairly low, these should probably not be used in isolation when high-stakes decisions are being made.

Quality of Computer-Generated Reports

Report Name:

Computer-Generated Reports

<i>Overall adequacy of computer-generated reports:</i>	★★★★★
i) Scope or coverage:	★★★★★
ii) Reliability:	★★★★★
iii) Relevance or Validity:	★★★★★
iv) Fairness, or freedom from systematic bias:	★★★★★
v) Acceptability:	★★★★★
vi) Practicality:	★★★★★

Reviewers' comments on the quality of computer generated reports:

A range of different reports can be generated from Facet5 profiles to support recruitment and development activities. Through the online system, users can view reports on-screen or choose to download them as PDF files. A handy feature is that for some reports, when a PDF download is requested, users can specify which sections they want included in the report. In total six reports are available.

Facet Personal Profile

This includes scores and narrative text linked to the factor and sub-factor scores, results of the Impression Management analysis and the 'family portrait' which provides a higher level description of the respondent based on their scales score to four of the five factors – Will, Energy, Control and Affection.

Leading Edge Profile

This uses the 'family' profile to describe 'how a person's manager needs to respond in order to motivate, inspire and manage' the respondent.

Searchlight Profile

This uses the 'family' profile to describe a person's likely strengths under the areas of leadership, interpersonal, communication, analysis and decision making, planning and organising, and initiative and effort.

Work Preferences Profile

This supports the identification of the respondent's core drivers in the workplace. These frame four of the Facet5 factors in slightly different language to align them with work environments: power, participation, people and process.

Audition Interview Guide

This provides a 'fit' of an individual's profile to a role template and a behavioural interview guide to support selection.

Spotlight Profile

This is a development guide intended for use by individuals. It highlights strengths, risks, frustrations and challenges likely to be associated with the respondent's preferences and provides a development planner to support the identification of strengths, challenges and development goals.

Facet5 Personal Profile

This includes all reports in one, apart from the Spotlight Development Report and the Audition Interview Guide.

Overall, reports are of a high quality and present information in a clear and succinct way, meaning users wanting hard copy will not find themselves printing unnecessary pages. Interpretation seems clearly grounded in Facet5 factors and sub-factors, meaning it is fairly easy to draw links between the scales and report output, even when this is not clearly explained in the technical information accompanying Facet5. In some cases, the report language seems a little directive, when more tentative language may be appropriate considering the nature of the assessment. Related to this is the issue of target audience. In some cases this is clear (e.g. the Audition report is clearly not intended for respondents as it supports behavioural interviews in selection contexts), but in others it would be useful to have better guidance on this.

FINAL EVALUATION

Evaluative report of the test:

Facet5 is a simple and easy-to-use assessment of the Big 5 personality traits. The assessment itself is well presented and straightforward to complete, and is accompanied by a range of reports and supporting products that mean it is likely to be an effective tool for a range of applications including recruitment, career development and coaching. The assessment has strong face validity, with content being originally derived from repertory grids used with UK managers. It is supported by a wide range of norms, most of which are reasonably up-to-date.

Facet5 is differentiated from other big five measures primarily through:

1/ its item format. It uses a semantic differential approach whereby each question consists of anchors for each end of the item, with a five-point scale in between

2/ and its positioning of the fifth factor of Emotionality as one that interacts with the others.

Using the Facet5 online platform, users can readily set up administrations and send out invites to test takers. From the test taker's perspective the assessment is easy to complete, with typical completion times being in the region of 10 to 15 minutes. As well as managing the administration of assessments and generation of reports, a particular strength of the Facet5 system is the amount of information and support that is offered to users online. All technical documentation is available for download, along with FAQs and other resources for test users. The website also gives access to other products in the Facet5 suite, many of which can be integrated with the assessment reviewed here.

A good range of reports can be generated online, and for many of the reports users can specify which sections they want included in PDF downloads and which sections omitted. This is a useful feature as it means users can select only those specific sections of a report that are relevant to them. The reports are of a high standard and targeted at a range of uses. Interpretation is primarily based around the five factors of

Facet5, in some cases also including further detail from the 13 sub-factors. Facet5 takes a somewhat unusual approach to interpreting interactions between factors, identifying which of 17 'families' a particular profile most closely resembles. The authors are clear to point out that this is not a Type-based approach, but the resulting reports do have a Type-based feel in places. However, many users are likely to see this as a strength, as it means reports provide rich descriptions of the interactions between scales. Facet5 has a clear rationale, and the documentation details its development and technical properties. The manual is, in itself, a useful document on the Big 5 and personality assessment, in that it provides good descriptions of best practice and what makes a good test. Regarding the information provided in the manual to evaluate Facet5 itself, the volume of information is significant, although it is somewhat difficult to navigate. There are also some places where the data falls short (e.g. for the item analysis and selection) and other places where greater consistency of reporting would be helpful (e.g. correlation coefficients are not consistently reported for all criterion validity studies). Reliability evidence is generally strong, though again there are some inconsistencies in reporting, especially for the sub-factors where far more limited reliability data is available. What data is available indicates that some sub-factors possess low internal consistency, meaning caution should be used when interpreting these. Extensive construct validity evidence is available which provides good support for the assertion that Facet5 provides good coverage of the Big 5. Criterion-related validity is less thoroughly covered. Numerous studies are available, but these use concurrent data and tend to feel quite descriptive in places. They may not consistently give users the information they need to decide whether Facet5 is suitable for their context. Correlations, when presented, have generally been corrected for attenuation, which should be borne in mind when comparing to other tools. Additionally, bias could be more thoroughly explored, as for the UK currently this is limited to the impact of gender on test scores. As recruitment is one of the applications of Facet5, its position would be strengthened through a greater focus on predictive criterion validity and bias.

Conclusions:

Facet5 provides a simple to use and relatively quick measure of the Big 5. It is accompanied by a range of computer-generated reports and additional tools to support its use in contexts such as recruitment, team development and leadership development. The assessment is delivered online in a way that is simple to use for both administrators and respondents. Users also have access to a wealth of online supporting materials. Facet5 has an extensive range of normative data and construct validity evidence, but would be strengthened by further work on predictive criterion validity and issues relating to fairness and bias.

Recommendations:

- Suitable for use in the area(s) of application defined by the distributor, by test users who meet the distributor's specific qualifications requirements

SUMMARY EVALUATION OF THE TEST

Content Domains:

Personality – Trait

Intended or main area(s) of Use:

Work and Occupational

Test Description:

Test Name:	Facet5
Local test distributor / publisher:	

	Facet5 Ltd
Date of Current Review:	
Date of Publication of Current Review/Edition:	N/A
Constructs Measured:	Will (containing the sub-factors of Determination, Confrontation, Independence) Energy (containing the sub-factors of Vitality, Sociability and Adaptability) Affection (containing the sub-factors of Altruism, Support and Trust) Control (containing the sub-factors of Discipline and Responsibility) Emotionality (containing the sub-factors of Tension and Apprehension) Impression Management
Administration Mode:	Computerised Web-based application – unsupervised/self-assessment Computerised Web-based application – supervised/proctored
Response Mode:	Computerised

Instrument Evaluation:

Characteristics	Evaluation
Quality of Documentation	★★★★★
Quality of Materials	★★★★★
Norms and reference groups	★★★★★
Construct validity	★★★★★★
Criterion-related validity	★★★★
Reliability-overall	★★★★★
Number of Computer-Generated Reports	6

The British Psychological Society © 2016. All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced or transmitted, in any form or by any means, without permission.