*International Journal of Applied Science and Engineering*
Citation: *IJASE*: **12**(02): 125-131, December 2024
**DOI:** 10.30954/2322-0465.2.2024.2

RESEARCH PAPER

APPLIED PSYCHOLOGY

# Evaluating Intra-Individual Intercorrelations in Differential Psychological Diagnostics: Conventional Methods and Emerging Approaches

**Tobey Gross**

*Chairman, International Council of Academics for Progressive Education (ICAPE), Germany*

*Corresponding author:* chair@icape-edu.com

**Received:** 11 Oct., 2024 **Revised:** 25 Nov., 2024 **Accepted:** 02 Dec., 2024

## ABSTRACT

This paper examines conventional statistical methods in differential personality diagnostics and presents an alternative approach to capture intra-individual intercorrelations. Traditional techniques, including Pearson correlation coefficients and z-scores, standardize individual deviations using group-level data but often fail to reflect subtle interactions among personality facets. This omission can result in incomplete diagnostic profiles, potentially overlooking clinically significant patterns. We describe the mathematical underpinnings of these methods and introduce a procedure that computes the product of z-scores as a proxy for intra-individual covariance. Although this approach offers enhanced insight into individual personality structures, it is not without limitations and does not represent a definitive solution. Implications for clinical practice, epistemology, and future research in precision psychology are discussed to support more robust diagnostic evaluations. Overall, the study clearly highlights the pressing need to combine refined statistical methods with clinical insight for a more accurate understanding of personality, paving the way for further research.

**Keywords:** Differential Psychology, Intra-individual Intercorrelations, Pearson Correlation, Z-Score, Diagnostic Methods, Precision Psychology

In contemporary differential psychology, psychometric diagnostics based on data patterns play a pivotal role in capturing and interpreting the multifaceted nature of personality traits. Modern instruments—such as the IPIP, IPIP-NEO, and NEO-PI-R—are designed upon hierarchical models that progress from broad dimensions to more nuanced facets and individual items (McCrae & Costa, 1997; Goldberg, 1993). These

**How to cite this article:** Gross, T. (2024). Evaluating Intra-Individual Intercorrelations in Differential Psychological Diagnostics: Conventional Methods and Emerging Approaches. *IJASE.,* **12**(02): 125-131.

**Source of Support:** None; **Conflict of Interest:** None

instruments operate under the assumption that personality characteristics within a normative population are relatively stable, and that diagnostic relevance emerges from the degree to which an individual's scores deviate from established norms.

Despite the success of these conventional approaches, they exhibit important limitations. Traditional methods predominantly rely on the Pearson correlation coefficient and z-score transformations to quantify deviations of an individual's facet values from normative means. Such procedures effectively standardize individual scores according to the overall dispersion in the reference group (Cronbach, 1951). However, they are inherently designed to capture only the magnitude of deviation from a central tendency and do not adequately reflect the intricate interrelationships among different facets in an individual's profile. This narrow focus may obscure diagnostically relevant patterns—especially when the covariances among individual characteristics diverge markedly from normative intercorrelations.

From an epistemic perspective, the measurement of personality is not merely a statistical exercise but also a reflection of our evolving understanding of psychological constructs. Historical debates have emphasized the importance of capturing the complexity inherent in human behavior rather than reducing it to isolated deviations from a mean (Meehl, 1954; Carmines & Zeller, 1979). The traditional reliance on aggregated, population-based statistics assumes that group-level intercorrelations mirror those at the intra-individual level. However, this assumption can be misleading. In practice, the relationships among personality facets within a single individual may exhibit significant discrepancies compared to the normative structure, thereby compromising the accuracy of diagnostic interpretations.

Statistically, while the use of z-scores offers a straightforward method to measure how many standard deviations an individual's score lies from the norm, this process inherently collapses the covariance structure into a single standardized value. The resulting loss of information becomes critical when unique intra-individual correlation patterns carry potential implications for understanding personality dynamics or irregular patterns that may carry inherently vital information for clinical perspectives. Recent advancements in statistical modeling advocate for approaches that account not only for deviations in individual facet scores but also for the covariance among facets—thereby providing a more comprehensive picture of personality (Gelman, 2000).

The methodological innovation presented in this paper is motivated by the need to reconcile these statistical and epistemic concerns. By supplementing traditional z-score computations with an analysis of intra-individual intercorrelations, we propose a refined approach that better captures the unique interplay among personality facets in an individual profile. Such an approach can reveal diagnostic nuances that standard methods might overlook, thereby enhancing both the validity and the interpretability of personality assessments. In doing so, our method aligns with the broader trend toward precision psychology, which stresses the importance of tailoring diagnostic tools to account for individual variability (Funder, 2001).

In the subsequent sections, we detail the mathematical foundations of both conventional and novel diagnostic techniques. We also discuss the limitations of standard procedures and argue for the integration of epistemic considerations with rigorous statistical logic. This integrated framework is essential for advancing differential psychological diagnostics beyond the constraints of traditional methodologies.

## Conventional Calculations and their Limitations

This section explains the standard procedures used in differential psychological diagnostics. We begin by outlining the calculation of the Pearson correlation coefficient and the corresponding covariance, followed by an explanation of the hierarchical structure of measurement and the computation of z-scores. While these conventional methods have been valuable for many years, it is important to recognize both their potential flaws and that, despite improvements, they are not without limitations.

## Pearson Correlation Coefficient

The Pearson correlation coefficient is a widely used statistical measure that quantifies the strength and direction of the linear relationship between two variables. For example, for two facets $f_1$ and, $f_2$ the Pearson coefficient is defined as:

$$r(f_1, f_2) = \frac{Cov(f_1, f_2)}{\sigma_{f_1} \cdot \sigma_{f_2}}$$

Here, $Cov(f_1, f_2)$ represents the covariance between $f_1$ and $f_2$, and $\sigma_{f1}$ and $\sigma_{f2}$ are their respective standard deviations. In simple terms, this equation tells us how much two sets of scores change together relative to how widely the scores vary individually. Clinically, this is used to determine whether different aspects of a personality profile are related.

The covariance itself is defined as:

$$Cov(f_1, f_2) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} (f_{1,i} - \overline{f_1})(f_{2,i} - \overline{f_2})$$

In this formula:

$f_{1,i}$ is the value of the facet $f_1$ for the $i$th individual,

$\bar{f}_1$ is the mean value of facet $f_1$ across the normative sample of $N$ individuals.

For a clinical user, think of this as a way to compare individual differences against the average behavior seen in a large group. However, note that while the Pearson correlation provides useful insights, it assumes that the relationships are the same at both the group level and the individual level—a presumption that is sometimes problematic.

## Hierarchical Structure

In psychometric assessments, tests are often designed with a hierarchical structure. A personality profile is built from broad dimensions that are further divided into facets and then into individual test items. The mean values for facets are calculated as follows:

$$\overline{f_1^X} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} f_{1^X,i}, \forall f_n^X, n \in \{1,2,\dots,n_X\}, X = \{f_1^X, f_2^X, \dots, f_n^X\}$$

$$\overline{f_1^Y} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} f_{1^Y,i}, \forall f_m^Y, m \in \{1,2,\dots,m_Y\}, Y = \{f_1^Y, f_2^Y, \dots, f_m^Y\}.$$

The complete picture of relationships among all facets in the normative sample is captured by the intercorrelation matrix $R$:

$$R = \begin{pmatrix} r(f_1^X, f_1^X) & r(f_1^X, f_1^Y) & \cdots & r(f_1^X, f_k^Z) \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ r(f_k^Z, f_1^X) & r(f_k^Z, f_1^Y) & \cdots & r(f_k^Z, f_k^Z) \end{pmatrix}$$

which can also be presented as:

$$\Rightarrow \begin{pmatrix} 1 & r(f_1^X, f_1^Y) & \cdots & r(f_1^X, f_k^Z) \\ r(f_1^Y, f_1^X) & 1 & \cdots & r(f_1^Y, f_k^Z) \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ r(f_k^Z, f_1^X) & r(f_k^Z, f_1^Y) & \cdots & 1 \end{pmatrix}$$

$$\forall f_k^Z, k \in \{1,2,\ldots,k_Z\}, Z = \{f_1^Z, f_2^Z, \ldots, f_k^Z\} etc.$$

For clinicians, this matrix is useful because it summarizes how all the facets interact with one another on average. However, the assumption here is that these average relationships are also reflective of what is occurring within an individual, which may not always be true.

## Calculation of the Conventional Z-Scores and Their Limitations

The z-score is a common statistical tool that indicates how many standard deviations a particular score is from the mean of the normative sample. It is defined as follows:

$$z = \frac{f_n^P - \overline{f_n^N}}{\sigma_{f_n^N}}$$

Here:

$f_n^P$ is the value of the facet $f_n$ for the individual (patient),

$\overline{f_n^N}$ is the mean value of $f_n$ in the normative sample $N$,

$\sigma_{f_n^N}$ is the standard deviation of $f_n$ in $N$.

This calculation is simple and offers an immediate sense of how far an individual's score deviates from the norm. However, there is a catch: the z-score only reflects the absolute deviation of a single facet from the normative mean, and it does not capture any information about how different facets may interact with one another. In clinical practice, this means that even if a patient's overall deviations are known, subtle but potentially important relationships between different personality dimensions may be overlooked.

*Comment:* Although z-scores are easy to compute and interpret, relying solely on them can be misleading. It is like judging an entire movie by watching only a few scenes—you may miss the context and interplay between characters (facets). Hence, while contemporary methods based on z-scores may be better than older, cruder approaches, they still do not provide the complete picture.

## Calculation of Intercorrelations for a Single Individual

In a standard diagnostic setting, the Pearson correlation is computed using the variability across many subjects. However, when we attempt to apply these calculations to a single individual, a fundamental problem arises: there is no sample variability to assess covariance. This limitation means that standard methods for computing covariance simply cannot be applied when only one individual's data is available.

To address this issue, we introduce the use of delta values to approximate the concept of covariance for a single individual. For a given subject *P* and two example facets, $f_1^X$ and, $f_4^Y$ the deviation from the normative mean for each facet is calculated as follows:

$$\Delta f_{1^X} = f_{1_P^X} - \overline{f_1^X}$$

$$\Delta f_4^Y = f_{4_P^Y} - \overline{f_4^Y}$$

Here, $f_1^{X_P}$ represents the value of facet $f_1^X$ for the individual *P*, and similarly for $f_4^Y$. These delta values express how far each facet deviates from its normative mean, thereby capturing the individual's idiosyncratic profile.

To further standardize these deviations, we compute z-scores for each facet:

$$z_{f_{1_P^X}} = \frac{\Delta f_{1_P^X}}{\sigma(f_1^X)_N}$$

Once the z-scores are computed, we determine the correlation between the two facets for the individual by multiplying these standardized deviations:

$$r_P(f_1^X, f_4^Y) = z_{f_1^{X_P}} \cdot z_{f_4^{Y_P}}$$

Because the z-scores reflect the number of standard deviations by which each facet deviates from the normative mean, their product effectively captures the joint deviation in a manner analogous to the traditional Pearson correlation for groups.

*Comment:* This multiplication of z-scores can provide important diagnostic insights by highlighting relationships between facets that may differ from normative intercorrelations. However, clinicians should be cautious. This method is an approximation—it offers a better glimpse into intra-individual variability than standard z-scores but is not a flawless measure. Like all models, it is not the “holy grail” of personality diagnostics, though it represents progress compared to earlier, less nuanced methods.

## Summary of the Conventional Methodology

In summary, the conventional approach to personality diagnostics involves:

- Computing Pearson correlations based on large normative samples,
- Using the z-score to standardize individual deviations from normative means,
- Approximating inter-facet intercorrelations for single individuals through the product of z-scores.

While these methods provide a structured framework for evaluating personality traits, they inherently assume that individual behavior mirrors group-level averages. This assumption can sometimes obscure unique intra-individual patterns that may be crucial for accurate and clinically useful diagnostics. Thus, while contemporary methods based on these calculations are certainly improvements over previous techniques, they still have notable limitations that must be taken into account during clinical interpretation.

*Final Note:* It is essential for practitioners to understand that no single method can capture the full complexity of personality. These conventional calculations are useful tools in the diagnostic toolbox but should be complemented by other approaches and clinical judgment to achieve the most comprehensive understanding of an individual’s profile.

## CONCLUSION

In this paper, we have revisited and expanded the conventional methods used in differential psychological diagnostics, with special attention to the role of intra-individual intercorrelations. Traditional approaches, such as the computation of the Pearson correlation coefficient and the use of z-scores, have long provided a framework for comparing individual scores against normative data. However, as detailed earlier, these methods inherently assume that the relationships observed at the group level adequately reflect what is happening within a single personality profile. This assumption can lead to a loss of diagnostically significant information, especially when the subtle interplay among personality facets does not conform to normative patterns.

The alternative approach presented here—calculating the product of z-scores to approximate inter-facet correlations for an individual—offers a promising avenue to better capture this intra-individual variability. By focusing on the deviations from normative means and their joint behavior, clinicians can detect nuances that are often overlooked by standard methods. This approach, while an improvement over more rudimentary techniques, is not without its own limitations. It should not be regarded as the ultimate solution or a “holy grail” but rather as a step toward more refined diagnostic practices.

From a clinical perspective, it is crucial to understand that no single statistical method can fully encapsulate the complexities of human personality. Contemporary methods, although better than previous ones, still simplify a multidimensional reality. Practitioners must therefore interpret the results within a broader context that includes both empirical evidence and clinical judgment. The integration of epistemic considerations with robust statistical analysis not only strengthens the validity of the diagnostic process but also encourages an appreciation for the inherent uncertainty in psychological measurement.

Future research is needed to further refine these methodologies. In particular, advances in hierarchical and multi-level modeling may offer more sophisticated tools to parse the variance at both the group and individual levels. Additionally, complementing quantitative measures with qualitative clinical insights could yield a more comprehensive diagnostic framework. As the field moves toward precision psychology, the integration of these diverse approaches will be critical for developing diagnostic tools that are both empirically sound and clinically meaningful.

In summary, this work has highlighted that while current conventional methods in personality assessment provide a useful starting point, they are limited in their ability to capture the full spectrum of intra-individual dynamics. The proposed approach of analyzing the product of z-scores is a valuable improvement that enhances our understanding of individual personality profiles. Nonetheless, the complexity of human personality necessitates ongoing refinement and a cautious interpretation of any single diagnostic measure. Clinicians are encouraged to use these methods as part of a broader, multimodal assessment strategy, ensuring that the benefits of statistical rigor are balanced by critical clinical insight.

## REFERENCES

1. Carmines, E.G. and Zeller, R.A. 1979. *Reliability and validity assessment: Theory and application.* Sage.

2. Cronbach, L.J. 1951. Coefficient alpha and the internal structure of tests. *Psychometrika,* **16**(3): 297–334.

3. Funder, D.C. 2001. Personality. *Annual Review of Psychology,* **52**: 197–221.

4. Gelman, A. 2000. *Data analysis using regression and multilevel/hierarchical models.* Cambridge University Press.

5. Goldberg, L.R. 1993. The structure of phenotypic personality traits. *American Psychologist,* **48**(1): 26–34.

6. McCrae, R.R. and Costa, P.T. 1997. Conceptions and correlates of openness to experience. *In* R. Hogan, J. Johnson, & S. Briggs (Eds.), Handbook of personality psychology (pp. 257–276). Academic Press.

7. Meehl, P.E. 1954. *Clinical versus statistical prediction: A theoretical analysis and a review of the evidence*. University of Minnesota Press.