

Assessment Title

Individual Adaptability Measure (I-ADAPT)

Assessment Description

The I-ADAPT measures an individual's tendency to adjust their strategy, behavior, cognitive processes, and coping styles effectively and efficiently based on the task, situation, or environment they encounter. Leaders who are highly adaptable tend to be flexible when approaching problems whereas leaders who are less adaptable may use similar approaches regardless of the unique nature of the problem they are facing. Achieving high adaptability is a combination of one's ability, skill, willingness, and motivation to think and act flexibly. Adaptability predicts and explains how leaders act when facing unpredictable and unprecedented situations.

Who is the Army audience?

The I-ADAPT is appropriate for all Army leaders. This assessment is included in Project Athena's Leadership area.

How does the Army benefit?

Administered online through the Army Enterprise Assessment System (AEAS), I-ADAPT assesses the strategies individuals may use to modify how they act or think in response to changes across situations and tasks. I-ADAPT is designed to increase self-awareness of personal tendencies for adaptation when solving problems creatively; handling work stress; dealing with uncertain and unpredictable work situations; handling emergencies or crisis situations; learning work tasks, technologies, and procedures; and demonstrating interpersonal, cultural, and physically-oriented adaptability. Increased self-awareness improves understanding of strengths and weaknesses as well as developing specific skill improvements.

Adaptive performance is important for higher-level professional and supervisory military roles (Pulakos, et. al, 2000). Increased adaptability has several positive outcomes including using multiple perspectives in critical and creative thinking, avoiding oversimplification, recognizing changes in the environment, and changing responses after identifying critical elements of a new situation. An adaptable leader who is comfortable with ambiguity will be better prepared for multi-domain operations that are characterized by constant change and many uncertainties.

What kind of feedback do students receive?

Personnel receive a detailed feedback report and self-development guide immediately after completing the I-ADAPT. This feedback report provides students with scores for total adaptability as well as each of the eight dimensions in comparison to average scores for Army leaders. Each section contains a description of what it means to be adaptable in that dimension. This allows students to compare their adaptability in relation to Army leaders overall and identify areas where they could improve. The feedback report also provides information on finding self-development resources related to adaptability.

The majority of leaders in CCC who took the I-ADAPT, found it to be useful. Specifically, 74% reported that it helped them identify their strengths, 71% reported that it helped them identify developmental needs, and 69% felt it was relevant to their development as a leader.

Why can the Army rely on this assessment?

The I-ADAPT was developed in research projects sponsored by Army laboratories and is available by agreement between Dr. Robert Ployhart (University of South Carolina) and CAPL for specific use for Army leader development. The assessment was created in collaboration with the Army to include aspects of adaptability related to Army situations, critical tasks, and typical leader roles. Using an assessment specifically designed for the Army enhances Army leaders' motivation to self-assess, perceptions of feedback, and confidence in the validity of the test.

For test reliability (i.e., how consistently a construct is measured by an assessment), the I-ADAPT produces results considered excellent for all eight factors. For test validity (the degree to which the assessment measures what it was designed to measure), the I-ADAPT exhibits strong relationships with tests that measure similar constructs. Specifically, I-ADAPT scores are positively related to a measure that assesses the ability to cope and are negatively related to measures assessing stress level and neuroticism (i.e., worry, anxiety, fear).

Fact Sheet Sources and Supporting Information

Psychometrics—Test Reliability

Cronbach's coefficient alphas were good to excellent for all I-ADAPT scales, with the exception of the physical scale. The reliability study did not include this subscale, but it will be included in future iterations.

I-ADAPT	Reliability ^A
Crisis	0.84
Stress	0.79
Creative	0.79
Uncertain	0.78
Learn	0.90
Interpersonal	0.76
Cultural	0.82
Physical	TBD

Psychometrics—Convergent and Divergent Validity

It is important that two measures designed to assess the same or similar constructs are related to each other. Convergent validity refers to the relationship between two measures that should be positively related to each other and divergent validity refers to the relationship between two measures that should be unrelated or negatively related to each other. When compared to measures of stress level, coping skills, and neuroticism, several strong relationships were identified with each factor of adaptability. The I-ADAPT was compared to each of these measures because adaptable people generally cope better, and are characterized by more positivity (e.g., calm) than negativity (e.g., neuroticism, worry), and less stressed. As expected, each factor of the I-ADAPT has a strong positive relationship with coping (with the exception of interpersonal) and acceptable negative correlations with stress level and neuroticism.

I-ADAPT	Stress ^B	Coping ^B	Neuroticism ^B
Crisis	-0.28	0.44	-0.54
Stress	-0.63	0.59	-0.81
Creative	-0.28	0.44	-0.43
Uncertain	-0.51	0.56	-0.72
Learn	-0.23	0.44	-0.33
Interpersonal	-0.09	0.37	-0.29
Cultural	-0.15	0.15	-0.23
Physical	-0.19	0.48	-0.45

The I-ADAPT subscales demonstrated small to moderate correlations with the Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale ($r_s = .24-.40$) suggesting that respondents from CCC engaged in low levels of socially desirable responding (or faking)^C.

Notes

A: Reliability Metric—Cronbach's Alphas: Poor (0.5–0.6), Questionable (0.6–0.7), Acceptable (0.7–0.8), Good (0.8–0.9), and Excellent (> 0.9)

B: Validity Metric—Correlation Categories: Poor ($r < 0.10$; $r > -0.10$), Acceptable ($r = 0.11-0.30$; $r = -0.11- -0.30$), and Excellent ($r = 0.31-1.0$ or $-0.30- -1.0$)

C: Social Desirability Metric—Correlation Categories: Small ($r = .10-.29$), Medium ($r = 0.30-0.49$), and Large ($r = 0.50-1.0$)

References

- Crowne, D. P., & Marlowe, D. (1960). A new scale of social desirability independent of psychopathology. *Journal of Consulting Psychology*, 24(4) 349–354. doi: 10.1037/h0047358.
- Pulakos, E.D., Arad, S., Donovan, M. A., & Plamondon, K.E. (2000). Adaptability in the Workplace: Development of a Taxonomy of Adaptive Performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 85(4), 612-624.