



GLOBAL JOURNAL OF HUMAN SOCIAL SCIENCE
ARTS & HUMANITIES

Volume 13 Issue 1 Version 1.0 Year 2013

Type: Double Blind Peer Reviewed International Research Journal

Publisher: Global Journals Inc. (USA)

Online ISSN: 2249-460X & Print ISSN: 0975-587X

Development and Validation of Success Potential Battery (SPB)

By Dr. R.A. Animasahun

University of Ibadan, Ibadan

Abstract - The paper investigated the circumstances and processes involved in the development and validation of Success Potential Battery (SPB) for measuring the success potential of individuals. The population cuts across adolescents, youths, adult and old people of diverse callings since the issue of success know no bounds. Hence, a sample of 2000, with 500 from each of the identified groups was randomly selected to participate in the survey study. The internal consistency values for the subscales ranged between 0.6539-0.9210. Standardized item alpha for the 16 scales ranged from 0.6838-0.9188. The Cronbach alpha ranged between 0.6824-0.9193. The Guttman split half reliability ranged between 0.5186-0.8580. The Convergent validity for the 16 scales ranged between 0.426-0.704 while the Discriminant validity ranged between -.005--.206. The significant inter-factor correlation coefficient is an evidence for strong construct validity of the scales. The significance of the psychological inventory to individuals, researchers, psychologists, students, teachers, counselors, organizations and anybody interested in evaluating his/her success potentials were stressed.

Keywords : *success potential, cronbach alpha, guttman split-half reliability, convergent validity, discriminant validity.*

GJHSS-A Classification : *FOR Code: 940104*



Strictly as per the compliance and regulations of:



Development and Validation of Success Potential Battery (SPB)

Dr. R. A. Animasahun

Abstract - The paper investigated the circumstances and processes involved in the development and validation of Success Potential Battery (SPB) for measuring the success potential of individuals. The population cuts across adolescents, youths, adult and old people of diverse callings since the issue of success know no bounds. Hence, a sample of 2000, with 500 from each of the identified groups was randomly selected to participate in the survey study. The internal consistency values for the subscales ranged between 0.6539-0.9210. Standardized item alpha for the 16 scales ranged from 0.6838-0.9188. The Cronbach alpha ranged between 0.6824-0.9193. The Guttman split half reliability ranged between 0.5186-0.8580. The Convergent validity for the 16 scales ranged between 0.426-0.704 while the Discriminant validity ranged between -.005--.206. The significant inter-factor correlation coefficient is an evidence for strong construct validity of the scales. The significance of the psychological inventory to individuals, researchers, psychologists, students, teachers, counselors, organizations and anybody interested in evaluating his/her success potentials were stressed.

Keywords : success potential, cronbach alpha, guttman split-half reliability, convergent validity, discriminant validity

I. INTRODUCTION

Success means one thing or the other to different people of diverse backgrounds, orientations and callings. Animasahun (2012) paraded some definitions of success gathered from literature as follow:

- Achievement of intention
- Attainment of fame, wealth or power
- When an undertaking turns out well as planned as intended
- The result of commitment, toughness, endurance, persistence, effective management of pressing demands made on the individuals
- Having money all the time
- Knowing what you know how to do best and finding people to pay you for it
- An evident improvement or progress
- Getting up just one more time than you fell
- A good result that removes insult
- Being at the desired and right place at the right time and doing the desired and right thing
- Doing something highly rewarding to oneself and beneficial to mankind in general

- Influencing other peoples' lives positively
- Continuous achievements of worthwhile goals
- Hitting a jackpot or luck
- Feeling satisfied and fulfilled at the end of one's life time
- Being happy throughout one's life with just enough money to cater for one's needs
- Setting out to do something and being able to initiate action steps in realizing such set goals, etc.

However, the importance of success to all human endeavours cannot be over emphasized. It is the ultimate pursuance of all living in any sector they find themselves, and it remains the main thing everybody craves for from cradle to grave. However, the way individuals perceive success would determine how they pursue it. Probably, this is the genesis of chaos and crime in the society because a lot of people pursue what can be termed as pseudo-success. Therefore, they end up being frustrated, unfulfilled, confused and totally disorganized which eventually lead to low productivity, crime, suicide mission or untimely death. In the real sense of it, the long-lasting success that is desirable is complex in nature and made up of certain components, factors or parts.

Hunt (2001), writing on success habit asked: "Can the secrets of success be learnt and followed?" He concluded that the secret of success is first, last and always through the working of thought: the man who does not think he is successful will never know success".....pp 7,8. He defined success as the achievement or attainment of any objective that leads to an improvement in personal circumstances and quality of life. Success is living a harmonious balanced life. Adeyemi (2008) said emphatically that "Success is who you are, what you think, what you see, what you know, what you say and what you do. He explained further that success is a question of the inner man. Ed Brodin (2006) in Banjo (2007) said you are a success if right here and now you are doing the things that are meaningful to you. True success, according to Hunt (2001) refers to the achievement or attainment of any objective that leads to an improvement in personal circumstances and quality of life. He concluded that success is growth. While Akinboye (2003) believed that components of success are Intelligent Quotient, Emotional Intelligence, Creativity and Innovation ($IQ + EQ + CR + INN = \text{Success}$), Emmanuel (2003) opined that certain natural laws guide success such as the laws of self discovery, focus, self development,

Author : Department of Guidance and Counselling University of Ibadan, Ibadan. E-mail : animarotimi@yahoo.com

diligence and thoroughness, consistency, persistence, mentorship, prudence/frugality, planning, customer/client satisfaction, kingdom investment, divine timing and the law of grace. Also in his own submission, Oyedepo (2006) conceptualized that success is an all encompassing construct involving many components out of which vision, information and hard work stand out as the major ones from such other components he called systems which include foundation, imagination, purpose, task, mental, race, choice, financial, fortune, premarital, marital and covenant success habits. All these also have some other components pointing to success. However, in his quest for the major ones, Animasahun (2007), in his own view and many others gathered from literature which were factor-analysed, came out with the following components of success. These are: Positive self component, Decision making, Goal setting, Hard-work, Creativity and innovation, Emotional intelligence, Entrepreneurship behaviour, Character development, Perseverance, Faith in God, Time management, Self control, Leadership development, Problem handling, and Overcoming disadvantage complex.

All the identified components of success are unevenly distributed among people in the society; each person has at least a little deposit of the components in them. While those who have them in high degree are potential success, those with low degrees may not be successful. This is the reason why it is better to test the level of individuals on each of the scale, so as to find out individual status. If the desirable trait is low, counseling psychologists can then use their skills to stimulate the desirable traits so as to make the individual a potential success. The battery which is a package of 16 different tests is diagnostic in nature and could therefore be used as a functional research, clinical and counseling tool for detection of the success potential level of an individual before the commencement of a programme, in the course of a programme or after the completion of a programme. It could also be used for an individual to discover himself and where he stands so as to engage in certain remedial programmes. Finally, the battery could be used for assessment and screening of candidates before employment or to cross-check their performance while doing the job so that round pegs are put in round holes.

II. MATERIALS AND METHODS

a) Item Development

The Success Potential Battery was developed based on diverse perceptions of success by different individuals, specific success characteristics, components of success and factors responsible for success as gathered from literature (Schuller, 1984; Locke & Lantham, 1990; Animasahun, 2000; 2004; 2007; 2009; 2011 and 2012; Hunt, 2001; Oettingen & Gollwitzer, 2001; Akinboye, 2002; 2003; McGrath, Hirsch & Peters, 2002; Emmanuel, 2003; Ed Brodin,

2006; Oyedepo, 2006; Banjo, 2007; Adeyemi, 2008; Orabuche, 2008; Peter, 2009; Akande, 2010). A pool of possible components of success was gathered and factor-analysed. The exercise produced only 16 significantly strong factors for life success which finally made up the battery. Some of the other perceived components that were not listed in the instrument because of their insignificant contributions include: Locus of control, Motivation, Personality and information processing.

b) Relevance of Each Variable to Success

i. Positive Self Component

This, according to Animasahun (2007) include self concept, self esteem, self efficacy, self perception, self disclosure, self knowledge, self evaluation, self value, self worth, self image and self appreciation. All these indicate the general assessment an individual consciously or unconsciously makes and customarily maintains with regard to himself. It expresses an attitude of approval or disapproval and indicates the extent to which the individual believes himself to be capable, significant, successful and worthy (Animasahun 2011). "Positive self component is therefore the situation when all the above is significantly positive about a person" Hunt (2001) postulated that we can but only when we think we can". Pp32. He said further that the plain truth is that you and only you are responsible for you" Pg 106. In fact, Peter (2009) concluded that the way you see yourself on the inside, largely determines your performance on the outside" Pp 32. Adeyemi (2008) submitted that "your self-worth brings you self respect" pg 44.

ii. Decision Making

Decision making is the cognitive process leading to the selection of a course of action among alternatives (Banjo, 2007). Decision making is the bedrock of all human actions (Animasahun, 2004). Michotte (1963) opined that decision making is action-oriented; which means that the kind of decision taken by an individual determines the next line of action he would take to satisfy basic needs and wants. While Fishburn (1972) opined that decision is a deliberate act of selection by the mind of an alternative to accomplish certain goals, Procter (1980) took it to be an arrival at an answer or way out that ends uncertainty above an issue. Fulfilment in life is a decision not an accident, a choice not a must (Akande, 2010). Adeyemi (2008) opined that decision is the starting point for planning. Umoren (1991) summed it up as a commitment to certain actions or inactions. Therefore, ability to think and arrive at a reasonable decision with speed and accuracy is believed to be a factor for success.

iii. Goal Setting

Peter (2009) opined that the first essential requirement for getting whatever you want is to know what you want. What you want is your life – goal or your

life target. The main reason why people do not succeed in life is that they do not know what they want. Hence, the basic reason for failure is the failure to set goals. Ajufo (2003) defined a goal setting as a plan of action for accomplishing the desired result. Locke and Lantham (1990) Goal setting is highly motivational. It does not allow an individual to be idle or stagnant, it leads to goal pursuit by committing oneself to attainment of the goals. Oettingen and Gollaitzer (2001) however, warned that people should adopt desirable and feasible goals to achieve success. Animasahun (2009) postulated that the only difference between a dreamer and a goal setter is adding a deadline to the dream. He therefore recommended goal setting for a lasting success. For an effectual goal setting however, the principle of SMART can be employed:

| | | |
|---|------------|---|
| S | Simple | : The goal must be simple |
| M | Measurable | : It must be measurable |
| A | Achievable | : It must be achievable |
| R | Realistic | : It must be realistic to avoid frustration |
| T | Time bound | : It must have time-bound. |

iv. *Hardwork*

Hardwork has been described as the ideal way to a lasting success (Animasahun, 2009). Emmanuel (2002) said: Hard work does not kill, it only removes hand life. According to Bertrand Russel in Animasahun (2009) no great achievement is possible without persistent work. Banjo (2007) reported Pavlon's 1986 assertion that success depend to a very large measure upon individual's initiative and exertion and cannot be achieved except by dint of hardwork. Infact, the height that great men reached and kept were not attained by sudden flights but while others slept, they kept on toiling and toiling. According to Animasahun (2000), work is a necessity idleness is a disease. Hardwork is only the refuge of weak minds. Harwork is therefore believed to be a factor for success.

v. *Creativity and Innovation*

This refers to the ability to bring something new into existence. Torrance (1962) defined creativity as a process of becoming sensitive to problems deficiencies, gaps in knowledge, missing elements, forming ideas or hypotheses concerning them, testing and retesting these hypotheses and communicating the results. White De Bono (1971) opined that creativity is concerned with bringing about a new ideas and updating old ones. Akinboye (1976) defined it as the generation of statistically infrequent ideas to solve problems of life. Quareshi and Quareshi (1990) defined it as the capacity of an individual to avoid conventional and routine but produce ideas which are original, novel and uncommon. Animasahun (2002) sees it as conscious cognitive processes stimulated by problematic situation, guided by interest and resulting in the generation of statistically infrequent, unique, valuable and appropriate ideas, useful in turning challenges of life into fruitful, beneficial

and profitable outcomes. Possessing this ability is greater magnitude predisposes an individual to achieve success in life. Creativity makes adequate use of information because your information determines your out-formation (Adeyemi, 2008).

vi. *Emotional Intelligence*

Emotional intelligence refers to a set of acquired skills and competencies that predict positive outcomes (Animasahun, 2007). The term Emotional Intelligence was coined by Salovey and Meyer (1990) as a form of social intelligence that involves the ability to monitor one's own feelings and emotions as well as those of others, to discriminate among them and to use the information to guide ones thinking and actions (Mayer and Salovey, 1993). Goleman (1995) exemplified the five components of emotional intelligence namely: self awareness, managing emotions, motivating oneself, empathy and handling relationships. Baron (1996) explained it as ability to deal successfully with other people and with one's feelings. Akinboye (2003) concluded that it is a set of non-cognitive abilities that influence human ability to success in life and the work place. Hence, emotional intelligence is a strong factor for success.

vii. *Entrepreneurship Behaviour*

An entrepreneur is that person with the initiative and drive to bring resources together to produce goods and services that would meet the need of consumers. It is the process of creating an object of value through the commitment of time and other scarce resources. However, it involves risk taking in form of financial, psychologist or social. Nevertheless, it attracts some rewards including financial returns, personal satisfaction feeling of accomplishment and independence (McGrath Histrich and Peters, 2002; Adeyemi 2010 and Macmillan, 2000). Peter (2009) described entrepreneurship as a process of turning ideas into opportunities and opportunities into successful businesses through certain skills. It is all about empowering, control and assuming responsibility.

viii. *Character Development*

Abraham Lincoln in Animasahun (2009) defined character as a personal credential and that no man is a man of honour without it. According to Ann frank in Animasahun (2009), the final forming of a person's characters lies in his own hand. Hence, there is nothing one gains from stubbornness, rudeness and naughtiness and nothing to loose from being obedient, humble and respectful. Adeyemi (2008) concluded that the foundation for success is one's character and that one cannot succeed without character. Campbell and Bond (1982) raised four questions to be answered in order to fully understand what character is:

- What is good character?
- What causes or prevent it?
- How can it be measured so that efforts at improvement can have corrective feedback and how it can

it be best developed? Hence, it requires conscious and careful observations of one's actions for social satisfaction.

ix. *Perseverance*

Hunt (2001) said "failure cannot live with persistence" Pg 110.

Orabuche (2008) said that the 3 strong Ps of success are Patience, Perseverance and Persistent. According to her while patience refers to enduring difficulties or delays calmly, perseverance means keep making an effort despite difficulties and persistence means continue inspite of obstacles. The 3 can therefore be used interchangeably. However, perseverance is the main focus here. Schuller (1984) in his book "Tough Times Never Last but Tough People do" emphasized the importance of perseverance. Perseverance has been described as the key to success in any endeavour. Success belongs to the most persevering. He stated further that persistence produces power, empower dynamic purpose, provides tremendous courage, produces peace and contentment, pays high profits, produces results and the habit of succeeding. Persistence has been taken to be the most important quality of a winner – a winner never quits as quitters never win. He concluded that if an individual persists in the face of failure, setbacks, delays, disappointments and temporary defeats, success will be achieved. Failures are simply successful people who gave up too soon (Adeyemi, 2008).

x. *Faith-in-God*

God is our power source (Adeyemi, 2008). Hence, ability to believe and tap from Him is a great motivation for success. Peter (2009) stated that prayer is the mightier power in the world. It is the most powerful form of energy and the greatest power of life. It is a very profound and powerful means to cope with fear, desolation, despair and hopelessness. He stressed that the golden key to success is the way one prays. It is believed that a mighty power acts when one prays with faith. Hence, prayer gives unlimited strength and a sense of security. Adeyemi (2008) mentioned god-nature as a vital factor for success. He stressed that the consciousness of God facilitates success.

xi. *Time Management*

Time can be defined as a divine resource equitably given to creatures by the creator to utilise for survival, progress and success. It is therefore, an economic resource that cannot be expanded or contracted (Animasahun, 2010). Hence, the way an individual spends his time in the choice made on how he wants to live his life. Time management therefore refers to being in conscious control of one's use of time. The difference between a successful person and failure is time management. It is also what makes the difference between distinction and extinction. Peter (2009) concluded that you can never be a prosperous or a

successful person if you are not conscious of your time. In fact, the quality of one's life is determined by the quality of one's time management. Akande (2010) concluded that when you waste time you waste lives.

xii. *Self Control*

This refers to the sacrificial offering of the disciplined mind to please God, others and to abide but the ethics if the society. It is an extension of discipline which describes cutting off and doing away with the things one likes but which may hinder ones purpose in a particular area of life (Animasahun, 2009). Ability to control oneself in spite of all odds is considered a great virtue of a matured personality and a leadership characteristic. Hence, this is suggested to be a great factor for life success.

xiii. *Leadership – Development*

Leadership was conceptualised as sacrificial obligation executed by an individual by exercising influence and authority over others to achieve a mutual goal. (Animasahun, 2012). Adeyemi (2008) added that our ability to inspire and influence people to achieve worthwhile goals will determine the limit of our success. Peter (2009) opined that leaders are made by circumstances not by birth or genetics. Every leader is as much a product of times and life situations as his own effort and abilities. He stressed further that a leader is the one who knows the way. A worthy leader has a foresights and insight. He sees the writing on the wall, reads the signs of the times and senses trends and tendencies which are at work in his surroundings. Having these virtues is a great pointer.

xiv. *Problem Handling*

Peter (2001) summarised life as full of problems. He said that life is a process of solving problems. According to him, every problem holds positive possibilities. Every problem will change an individual somehow. In fact, every problem contains within itself the seeds of its own solution. Hence, to be successful in life an individual must be highly skilled in handling and solving his problems. Akande (2010) submitted that an individual is born to meet a need. Every individual is born to meet a need. Every individual is a solution to a problem. In fact, what a failure calls a problem is what the success person sees as opportunity (Adeyemi, 2008).

xv. *Overcoming Disadvantage Complex*

Negative anti suggestion discourages. Adeyemi (2008) conceptualised that "Your self-image will always control your behaviour and that you will never attempt to get anything that you feel the person inside you is not qualified to get. Hence, an individual must shun inferiority complex. "We can but only when we think we can" Hunt (2001). Disadvantage complex erodes all traces of confidence in an individual because the individual is convinced and gives reasons why he cannot do certain things or assume certain status. He

sees himself as very weak among competitors of equal calibre. Hence, this is considered to be a serious setback and hindrance to success. However, ability to overcome this and build strong confidence is a strong factor for life success.

III. DESCRIPTION OF THE SCALES IN THE BATTERY

The Success Potential Battery (SPB) is a package containing sixteen (16) subscales. Scale 1 is

the Success Perception scale while the rest fifteen (15) scales are the factors predisposing individuals to achieving success. Table A contains the details.

Table A: Description of the Success Potential Battery

| Test Number | Title of The Test | Number of Items | Number of Negative Items | Minimum Score | Maximum Score | Norm |
|-------------|--|-----------------|--------------------------|---------------|---------------|------|
| 1. | Success Perception scale | 20 | 7 | 20 | 100 | 70 |
| 2. | Positive Self component Scale | 25 | 14 | 25 | 125 | 85 |
| 3. | Decision Making Behaviour Rating Scale | 30 | 15 | 30 | 150 | 100 |
| 4. | Goal Setting Scale | 20 | 9 | 20 | 100 | 80 |
| 5. | Hard work Behaviour Scale | 25 | 11 | 25 | 125 | 85 |
| 6. | Creativity and Innovation Scale | 33 | 12 | 33 | 165 | 125 |
| 7. | Emotional intelligence Scale | 35 | 10 | 35 | 175 | 135 |
| 8. | Entrepreneurship Behaviour Scale | 25 | 8 | 25 | 125 | 85 |
| 9. | Character Development Scale | 25 | 10 | 25 | 125 | 90 |
| 10. | Perseverance Scale | 10 | 7 | 10 | 50 | 35 |
| 11. | Faith-in-God Behaviour Scale | 20 | 10 | 20 | 100 | 80 |
| 12. | Time management Scale | 26 | 12 | 26 | 130 | 90 |
| 13. | Self control Scale | 15 | 8 | 15 | 75 | 50 |
| 14. | Leadership Development Scale | 25 | 14 | 25 | 125 | 85 |
| 15. | Problem Handling Scale | 22 | 9 | 22 | 110 | 80 |
| 16. | Overcoming Disadvantage complex Scale | 10 | 8 | 10 | 50 | 35 |

The Table above shows that a total of 356 positive and negative items made up the inventory package of 16 scales with norms ranging from 35 – 135, whereby scores below the norms indicate inadequacies as far as such scale is concerned whereas scores above the norm show signs of adequacies. The items in each of the scales are scored on 5-point Likert format, which ranged from 1(Strongly Disagree to 5(Strongly Agree).

IV. PROCEDURE

The surviving items of the factor-analytic procedure (356 items) were packaged under the 16 subscales of the battery and administered to over 3000 randomly selected individuals that cut across Nigerian adolescents, youths, adults and old people in all the states of the federation, on the basis of availability and DATA ANALYSIS convenience. However, only 2000 participants finally made the sample. Their ages ranged from 12-72 with a mean of 42 years.

The collected data was analysed through the computer using SPSS package. The Cronbach alpha (a), Guttman split half reliability (r) statistical tools were employed for measuring the coefficient values of the items, while the Convergent and Discriminant validity as well as the internal consistency reliability were also determined. The results are hereby presented in tables 1-16:

V. RESULTS

Table 1 : Internal Consistency Values of Success Perception Scale

| Item | Inter-Item Correlation | RI (T-1) |
|------|------------------------|----------|
| 1 | 0.7938 | P < 0.05 |
| 2 | 0.7917 | P < 0.05 |
| 3 | 0.7870 | P < 0.05 |
| 4 | 0.7932 | P < 0.05 |
| 5 | 0.7981 | P < 0.05 |
| 6 | 0.7951 | P < 0.05 |
| 7 | 0.7907 | P < 0.05 |
| 8 | 0.7915 | P < 0.05 |
| 9 | 0.7911 | P < 0.05 |
| 10 | 0.7863 | P < 0.05 |
| 11 | 0.7915 | P < 0.05 |
| 12 | 0.7923 | P < 0.05 |
| 13 | 0.7895 | P < 0.05 |
| 14 | 0.7918 | P < 0.05 |
| 15 | 0.7943 | P < 0.05 |
| 16 | 0.7954 | P < 0.05 |
| 17 | 0.7890 | P < 0.05 |
| 18 | 0.7893 | P < 0.05 |
| 19 | 0.7943 | P < 0.05 |
| 20 | 0.7933 | P < 0.05 |

Inter-item correlation ranged from 0.7870-0.7981
 Guttman Split Half reliability = 0.7145
 Cronbach Alpha = 0.8003
 Standardised Item Alpha = 0.8012
 Correlation between forms = 0.5559
 Convergent Validity = 0.659
 Discriminant Validity = -0.206
 Norm = 70

Table 2 : Internal Consistency Values of Positive Self Component Scale

| Item | Inter-Item Correlation | RI (T-1) |
|------|------------------------|----------|
| 1 | 0.8533 | P < 0.05 |
| 2 | 0.8478 | P < 0.05 |
| 3 | 0.8493 | P < 0.05 |
| 4 | 0.8539 | P < 0.05 |
| 5 | 0.8481 | P < 0.05 |
| 6 | 0.8503 | P < 0.05 |
| 7 | 0.8473 | P < 0.05 |
| 8 | 0.8575 | P < 0.05 |
| 9 | 0.8555 | P < 0.05 |
| 10 | 0.8515 | P < 0.05 |
| 11 | 0.8458 | P < 0.05 |
| 12 | 0.8467 | P < 0.05 |
| 13 | 0.8492 | P < 0.05 |
| 14 | 0.8462 | P < 0.05 |
| 15 | 0.8455 | P < 0.05 |
| 16 | 0.8518 | P < 0.05 |
| 17 | 0.8517 | P < 0.05 |

| | | |
|----|--------|----------|
| 18 | 0.8482 | P < 0.05 |
| 19 | 0.8505 | P < 0.05 |
| 20 | 0.8472 | P < 0.05 |
| 21 | 0.8475 | P < 0.05 |
| 22 | 0.8477 | P < 0.05 |
| 23 | 0.8482 | P < 0.05 |
| 24 | 0.8494 | P < 0.05 |
| 25 | 0.8481 | P < 0.05 |

Inter-item correlation ranged from 0.8455-0.8575
 Guttman Split Half reliability = 0.7622
 Cronbach Alpha = 0.8547
 Standardised Item Alpha = 0.8542
 Correlation between forms = 0.615
 Convergent Validity = 0.621
 Discriminant Validity = -0.117
 Norm = 85

Table 3 : Internal Consistency Values of Decision Making Behaviour Rating Scale

| Item | Inter-Item Correlation | RI (T-1) |
|------|------------------------|----------|
| 1 | 0.8975 | P < 0.05 |
| 2 | 0.8963 | P < 0.05 |
| 3 | 0.8968 | P < 0.05 |
| 4 | 0.8960 | P < 0.05 |
| 5 | 0.8965 | P < 0.05 |
| 6 | 0.8955 | P < 0.05 |
| 7 | 0.8957 | P < 0.05 |
| 8 | 0.8947 | P < 0.05 |
| 9 | 0.8958 | P < 0.05 |
| 10 | 0.8977 | P < 0.05 |
| 11 | 0.8970 | P < 0.05 |
| 12 | 0.8960 | P < 0.05 |
| 13 | 0.8967 | P < 0.05 |
| 14 | 0.8967 | P < 0.05 |
| 15 | 0.8964 | P < 0.05 |
| 16 | 0.8960 | P < 0.05 |
| 17 | 0.8949 | P < 0.05 |
| 18 | 0.8946 | P < 0.05 |
| 19 | 0.8944 | P < 0.05 |
| 20 | 0.8955 | P < 0.05 |
| 21 | 0.8936 | P < 0.05 |
| 22 | 0.8942 | P < 0.05 |
| 23 | 0.8950 | P < 0.05 |
| 24 | 0.8951 | P < 0.05 |
| 25 | 0.8961 | P < 0.05 |
| 26 | 0.8963 | P < 0.05 |
| 27 | 0.8943 | P < 0.05 |
| 28 | 0.8965 | P < 0.05 |
| 29 | 0.8965 | P < 0.05 |
| 30 | 0.8967 | P < 0.05 |

Inter-item correlation ranged from 0.8936–0.8977
 Guttman Split Half reliability = 0.7521

| | | |
|---------------------------|---|--------|
| Crombach Alpha | = | 0.8989 |
| Standardised Item Alpha | = | 0.8986 |
| Correlation between forms | = | 0.6063 |
| Convergent Validity | = | 0.688 |
| Discriminant Validity | = | -1.180 |
| Norm | = | 100 |

Table 4 : Internal Consistency Values of Goal Setting Scale

| Item | Inter-Item Correlation | RI (T-1) |
|------|------------------------|----------|
| 1 | 0.8792 | P < 0.05 |
| 2 | 0.8787 | P < 0.05 |
| 3 | 0.8745 | P < 0.05 |
| 4 | 0.8753 | P < 0.05 |
| 5 | 0.8748 | P < 0.05 |
| 6 | 0.8753 | P < 0.05 |
| 7 | 0.8757 | P < 0.05 |
| 8 | 0.8752 | P < 0.05 |
| 9 | 0.8761 | P < 0.05 |
| 10 | 0.8733 | P < 0.05 |
| 11 | 0.8727 | P < 0.05 |
| 12 | 0.8732 | P < 0.05 |
| 13 | 0.8740 | P < 0.05 |
| 14 | 0.8734 | P < 0.05 |
| 15 | 0.8756 | P < 0.05 |
| 16 | 0.8751 | P < 0.05 |
| 17 | 0.8746 | P < 0.05 |
| 18 | 0.8749 | P < 0.05 |
| 19 | 0.8765 | P < 0.05 |
| 20 | 0.8748 | P < 0.05 |

| | |
|---|----------|
| Interitem correlation ranged from 0.8727-0.8729 | |
| Guttman Split Half reliability | = 0.8313 |
| Crombach Alpha | = 0.8827 |
| Standardised Item Alpha | = 0.8811 |
| Correlation between forms | = 0.7127 |
| Convergent Validity | = 0.704 |
| Discriminant Validity | = -0.024 |
| Norm | = 80 |

Table 5 : Internal Consistency Values of Hardwork Behaviour Scale

| Item | Inter-Item Correlation | RI (T-1) |
|------|------------------------|----------|
| 1 | 0.8944 | P < 0.05 |
| 2 | 0.8960 | P < 0.05 |
| 3 | 0.8953 | P < 0.05 |
| 4 | 0.8965 | P < 0.05 |
| 5 | 0.8934 | P < 0.05 |
| 6 | 0.8948 | P < 0.05 |
| 7 | 0.8935 | P < 0.05 |
| 8 | 0.8949 | P < 0.05 |
| 9 | 0.8935 | P < 0.05 |
| 10 | 0.8936 | P < 0.05 |
| 11 | 0.8946 | P < 0.05 |
| 12 | 0.8961 | P < 0.05 |
| 13 | 0.8944 | P < 0.05 |

| | | |
|----|--------|----------|
| 14 | 0.8962 | P < 0.05 |
| 15 | 0.8969 | P < 0.05 |
| 16 | 0.8968 | P < 0.05 |
| 17 | 0.8939 | P < 0.05 |
| 18 | 0.8931 | P < 0.05 |
| 19 | 0.8935 | P < 0.05 |
| 20 | 0.8939 | P < 0.05 |
| 21 | 0.8937 | P < 0.05 |
| 22 | 0.8938 | P < 0.05 |
| 23 | 0.8942 | P < 0.05 |
| 24 | 0.8935 | P < 0.05 |
| 25 | 0.8931 | P < 0.05 |

| | |
|---|----------|
| Inter-item correlation ranged from 0.8931- 0.8969 | |
| Guttman Split Half reliability | = 0.8123 |
| Crombach Alpha | = 0.8983 |
| Standardised Item Alpha | = 0.8985 |
| Correlation between forms | = 0.6856 |
| Convergent Validity | = 0.666 |
| Discriminant Validity | = -0.037 |
| Norm | = 85 |

Table 6 : Internal Consistency Values of Creativity and Innovation Scale

| Item | Inter-Item Correlation | RI (T-1) |
|------|------------------------|----------|
| 1 | 0.9160 | P < 0.05 |
| 2 | 0.9166 | P < 0.05 |
| 3 | 0.9165 | P < 0.05 |
| 4 | 0.9172 | P < 0.05 |
| 5 | 0.9163 | P < 0.05 |
| 6 | 0.9161 | P < 0.05 |
| 7 | 0.9167 | P < 0.05 |
| 8 | 0.9160 | P < 0.05 |
| 9 | 0.9159 | P < 0.05 |
| 10 | 0.9162 | P < 0.05 |
| 11 | 0.9163 | P < 0.05 |
| 12 | 0.9158 | P < 0.05 |
| 13 | 0.9169 | P < 0.05 |
| 14 | 0.9164 | P < 0.05 |
| 15 | 0.9167 | P < 0.05 |
| 16 | 0.9159 | P < 0.05 |
| 17 | 0.9167 | P < 0.05 |
| 18 | 0.9160 | P < 0.05 |
| 19 | 0.9165 | P < 0.05 |
| 20 | 0.9156 | P < 0.05 |
| 21 | 0.9177 | P < 0.05 |
| 22 | 0.9172 | P < 0.05 |
| 23 | 0.9161 | P < 0.05 |
| 24 | 0.9174 | P < 0.05 |
| 25 | 0.9173 | P < 0.05 |
| 26 | 0.9166 | P < 0.05 |
| 27 | 0.9162 | P < 0.05 |
| 28 | 0.9168 | P < 0.05 |
| 29 | 0.9192 | P < 0.05 |

| | | |
|----|--------|----------|
| 30 | 0.9199 | P < 0.05 |
| 31 | 0.9202 | P < 0.05 |
| 32 | 0.9190 | P < 0.05 |
| 33 | 0.9210 | P < 0.05 |

Inter-item correlation ranged from 0.9156–0.9210
 Guttman Split Half reliability = 0.8580
 Cronbach Alpha = 0.9193
 Standardised Item Alpha = 0.9188
 Correlation between forms = 0.7733
 Convergent Validity = 0.426
 Discriminant Validity = -.104
 Norm = 125

Table 7 : Internal Consistency Values of Emotional Intelligence Scale

| Item | Inter-Item Correlation | RI (T-1) |
|------|------------------------|----------|
| 1 | 0.8638 | P < 0.05 |
| 2 | 0.8651 | P < 0.05 |
| 3 | 0.8655 | P < 0.05 |
| 4 | 0.8656 | P < 0.05 |
| 5 | 0.8641 | P < 0.05 |
| 6 | 0.8661 | P < 0.05 |
| 7 | 0.8663 | P < 0.05 |
| 8 | 0.8628 | P < 0.05 |
| 9 | 0.8648 | P < 0.05 |
| 10 | 0.8654 | P < 0.05 |
| 11 | 0.8655 | P < 0.05 |
| 12 | 0.8637 | P < 0.05 |
| 13 | 0.8640 | P < 0.05 |
| 14 | 0.8657 | P < 0.05 |
| 15 | 0.8654 | P < 0.05 |
| 16 | 0.8621 | P < 0.05 |
| 17 | 0.8659 | P < 0.05 |
| 18 | 0.8651 | P < 0.05 |
| 19 | 0.8659 | P < 0.05 |
| 20 | 0.8639 | P < 0.05 |
| 21 | 0.8636 | P < 0.05 |
| 22 | 0.8632 | P < 0.05 |
| 23 | 0.8670 | P < 0.05 |
| 24 | 0.8663 | P < 0.05 |
| 25 | 0.8656 | P < 0.05 |
| 26 | 0.8633 | P < 0.05 |
| 27 | 0.8641 | P < 0.05 |
| 28 | 0.8633 | P < 0.05 |
| 29 | 0.8635 | P < 0.05 |
| 30 | 0.8645 | P < 0.05 |
| 31 | 0.8657 | P < 0.05 |
| 32 | 0.8636 | P < 0.05 |
| 33 | 0.8632 | P < 0.05 |
| 34 | 0.8651 | P < 0.05 |
| 35 | 0.8639 | P < 0.05 |

Inter-item correlation ranged from 0.8628 – 0.8670
 Guttman Split Half reliability = 0.8147
 Cronbach Alpha = 0.8680
 Standardised Item Alpha = 0.8689
 Correlation between forms = 0.6875
 Convergent Validity = 0.484
 Discriminant Validity = -.005
 Norm = 135

Table 8 : Internal Consistency Values of Entrepreneurship Behaviour Scale

| Item | Inter-Item Correlation | RI (T-1) |
|------|------------------------|----------|
| 1 | 0.8697 | P < 0.05 |
| 2 | 0.8699 | P < 0.05 |
| 3 | 0.8706 | P < 0.05 |
| 4 | 0.8674 | P < 0.05 |
| 5 | 0.8686 | P < 0.05 |
| 6 | 0.8693 | P < 0.05 |
| 7 | 0.8694 | P < 0.05 |
| 8 | 0.8709 | P < 0.05 |
| 9 | 0.8684 | P < 0.05 |
| 10 | 0.8687 | P < 0.05 |
| 11 | 0.8675 | P < 0.05 |
| 12 | 0.8692 | P < 0.05 |
| 13 | 0.8656 | P < 0.05 |
| 14 | 0.8667 | P < 0.05 |
| 15 | 0.8691 | P < 0.05 |
| 16 | 0.8697 | P < 0.05 |
| 17 | 0.8686 | P < 0.05 |
| 18 | 0.8681 | P < 0.05 |
| 19 | 0.8691 | P < 0.05 |
| 20 | 0.8680 | P < 0.05 |
| 21 | 0.8673 | P < 0.05 |
| 22 | 0.8676 | P < 0.05 |
| 23 | 0.8669 | P < 0.05 |
| 24 | 0.8689 | P < 0.05 |
| 25 | 0.8713 | P < 0.05 |

Inter-item correlation ranged from 0.8656 - 0.8713
 Guttman Split Half reliability = 0.7608
 Cronbach Alpha = 0.8733
 Standardised Item Alpha = 0.8729
 Correlation between forms = 0.6145
 Convergent Validity = 0.436
 Discriminant Validity = -.017
 Norm = 85

Table 9 : Internal Consistency Values of Character Development Scale

| Item | Inter-Item Correlation | RI (T-1) |
|------|------------------------|----------|
| 1 | 0.8971 | P < 0.05 |
| 2 | 0.8967 | P < 0.05 |
| 3 | 0.8965 | P < 0.05 |
| 4 | 0.8969 | P < 0.05 |

| | | |
|----|--------|----------|
| 5 | 0.8978 | P < 0.05 |
| 6 | 0.8971 | P < 0.05 |
| 7 | 0.8967 | P < 0.05 |
| 8 | 0.8975 | P < 0.05 |
| 9 | 0.8981 | P < 0.05 |
| 10 | 0.8970 | P < 0.05 |
| 11 | 0.8978 | P < 0.05 |
| 12 | 0.8980 | P < 0.05 |
| 13 | 0.8963 | P < 0.05 |
| 14 | 0.8968 | P < 0.05 |
| 15 | 0.8968 | P < 0.05 |
| 16 | 0.8972 | P < 0.05 |
| 17 | 0.8987 | P < 0.05 |
| 18 | 0.8974 | P < 0.05 |
| 19 | 0.8986 | P < 0.05 |
| 20 | 0.8968 | P < 0.05 |
| 21 | 0.8969 | P < 0.05 |
| 22 | 0.8969 | P < 0.05 |
| 23 | 0.8967 | P < 0.05 |
| 24 | 0.8974 | P < 0.05 |
| 25 | 0.8984 | P < 0.05 |

Inter-item correlation ranged from 0.8963 - 0.8987

| | | |
|--------------------------------|---|--------|
| Guttman Split Half reliability | = | 0.8074 |
| Cronbach Alpha | = | 0.9010 |
| Standardised Item Alpha | = | 0.9011 |
| Correlation between forms | = | 0.6789 |
| Convergent Validity | = | 0.541 |
| Discriminant Validity | = | -0.045 |
| Norm | = | 90 |

Table 10 : Internal Consistency Values of Perseverance Scale

| Item | Inter-Item Correlation | RI (T-1) |
|------|------------------------|----------|
| 1 | 0.8047 | P < 0.05 |
| 2 | 0.8077 | P < 0.05 |
| 3 | 0.8037 | P < 0.05 |
| 4 | 0.8071 | P < 0.05 |
| 5 | 0.8028 | P < 0.05 |
| 6 | 0.7990 | P < 0.05 |
| 7 | 0.8025 | P < 0.05 |
| 8 | 0.8050 | P < 0.05 |
| 9 | 0.7991 | P < 0.05 |
| 10 | 0.8050 | P < 0.05 |

Inter-item correlation ranged from 0.7990-0.8077

| | | |
|--------------------------------|---|--------|
| Guttman Split Half reliability | = | 0.7555 |
| Cronbach Alpha | = | 0.8198 |
| Standardised Item Alpha | = | 0.8199 |
| Correlation between forms | = | 0.6079 |
| Convergent Validity | = | 0.667 |

| | | |
|-----------------------|---|------|
| Discriminant Validity | = | .135 |
| Norm | = | 35 |

Table 11 : Internal Consistency Values of Faith in God Behaviour Scale

| Item | Inter-Item Correlation | RI (T-1) |
|------|------------------------|----------|
| 1 | 0.8754 | P < 0.05 |
| 2 | 0.8742 | P < 0.05 |
| 3 | 0.8750 | P < 0.05 |
| 4 | 0.8744 | P < 0.05 |
| 5 | 0.8754 | P < 0.05 |
| 6 | 0.8746 | P < 0.05 |
| 7 | 0.8755 | P < 0.05 |
| 8 | 0.8745 | P < 0.05 |
| 9 | 0.8778 | P < 0.05 |
| 10 | 0.8781 | P < 0.05 |
| 11 | 0.8771 | P < 0.05 |
| 12 | 0.8737 | P < 0.05 |
| 13 | 0.8718 | P < 0.05 |
| 14 | 0.8721 | P < 0.05 |
| 15 | 0.8723 | P < 0.05 |
| 16 | 0.8718 | P < 0.05 |
| 17 | 0.8730 | P < 0.05 |
| 18 | 0.8740 | P < 0.05 |
| 19 | 0.8717 | P < 0.05 |
| 20 | 0.8721 | P < 0.05 |

Inter-item correlation ranged from 0.8717 - 0.8781

| | | |
|--------------------------------|---|--------|
| Guttman Split Half reliability | = | 0.8092 |
| Cronbach Alpha | = | 0.8798 |
| Standardised Item Alpha | = | 0.8798 |
| Correlation between forms | = | 0.6829 |
| Convergent Validity | = | 0.536 |
| Discriminant Validity | = | -.114 |
| Norm | = | 80 |

Table 12 : Internal Consistency Values of Time Management Scale

| Item | Inter-Item Correlation | RI (T-1) |
|------|------------------------|----------|
| 1 | 0.9150 | P < 0.05 |
| 2 | 0.9157 | P < 0.05 |
| 3 | 0.9155 | P < 0.05 |
| 4 | 0.9161 | P < 0.05 |
| 5 | 0.9155 | P < 0.05 |
| 6 | 0.9147 | P < 0.05 |
| 7 | 0.9158 | P < 0.05 |
| 8 | 0.9149 | P < 0.05 |
| 9 | 0.9141 | P < 0.05 |
| 10 | 0.9148 | P < 0.05 |
| 11 | 0.9151 | P < 0.05 |
| 12 | 0.9141 | P < 0.05 |

| | | |
|----|--------|----------|
| 13 | 0.9157 | P < 0.05 |
| 14 | 0.9151 | P < 0.05 |
| 15 | 0.9161 | P < 0.05 |
| 16 | 0.9149 | P < 0.05 |
| 17 | 0.9156 | P < 0.05 |
| 18 | 0.9151 | P < 0.05 |
| 19 | 0.9159 | P < 0.05 |
| 20 | 0.9147 | P < 0.05 |
| 21 | 0.9167 | P < 0.05 |
| 22 | 0.9155 | P < 0.05 |
| 23 | 0.9153 | P < 0.05 |
| 24 | 0.9168 | P < 0.05 |
| 25 | 0.9165 | P < 0.05 |
| 26 | 0.9156 | P < 0.05 |

Inter-item correlation ranged from 0.9141 - 0.9168

Guttman Split Half reliability = 0.8378

Cronbach Alpha = 0.9184

Standardised Item Alpha = 0.9185

Correlation between forms = 0.7237

Convergent Validity = 0.435

Discriminant Validity = -.038

Norm = 90

Table 13 : Internal Consistency Values of Self Control Scale

| Item | Inter-Item Correlation | RI (T-1) |
|------|------------------------|----------|
| 1 | 0.6759 | P < 0.05 |
| 2 | 0.6771 | P < 0.05 |
| 3 | 0.6579 | P < 0.05 |
| 4 | 0.6600 | P < 0.05 |
| 5 | 0.6617 | P < 0.05 |
| 6 | 0.6654 | P < 0.05 |
| 7 | 0.6864 | P < 0.05 |
| 8 | 0.6703 | P < 0.05 |
| 9 | 0.6717 | P < 0.05 |
| 10 | 0.6539 | P < 0.05 |
| 11 | 0.6658 | P < 0.05 |
| 12 | 0.6541 | P < 0.05 |
| 13 | 0.6670 | P < 0.05 |
| 14 | 0.6652 | P < 0.05 |
| 15 | 0.6732 | P < 0.05 |

Inter-item correlation ranged from 0.65397 - 0.8864

Guttman Split Half reliability = 0.5186

Cronbach Alpha = 0.6824

Standardised Item Alpha = 0.6838

Correlation between forms = 0.3501

Convergent Validity = 0.408

Discriminant Validity = -.093

Norm = 50

Table 14 : Internal Consistency Values of Leadership Development Scale

| Item | Inter-Item Correlation | RI (T-1) |
|------|------------------------|----------|
| 1 | 0.7898 | P < 0.05 |
| 2 | 0.7838 | P < 0.05 |
| 3 | 0.7812 | P < 0.05 |
| 4 | 0.7879 | P < 0.05 |
| 5 | 0.7811 | P < 0.05 |
| 6 | 0.7802 | P < 0.05 |
| 7 | 0.7874 | P < 0.05 |
| 8 | 0.7812 | P < 0.05 |
| 9 | 0.7844 | P < 0.05 |
| 10 | 0.7877 | P < 0.05 |
| 11 | 0.7870 | P < 0.05 |
| 12 | 0.7805 | P < 0.05 |
| 13 | 0.7818 | P < 0.05 |
| 14 | 0.7813 | P < 0.05 |
| 15 | 0.7851 | P < 0.05 |
| 16 | 0.7916 | P < 0.05 |
| 17 | 0.7921 | P < 0.05 |
| 18 | 0.7845 | P < 0.05 |
| 19 | 0.7872 | P < 0.05 |
| 20 | 0.7809 | P < 0.05 |
| 21 | 0.7868 | P < 0.05 |
| 22 | 0.7830 | P < 0.05 |
| 23 | 0.7849 | P < 0.05 |
| 24 | 0.7852 | P < 0.05 |
| 25 | 0.7964 | P < 0.05 |

Inter-item correlation ranged from 0.7811 - 0.7964

Guttman Split Half reliability = 0.5716

Cronbach Alpha = 0.7926

Standardised Item Alpha = 0.7939

Correlation between forms = 0.4028

Convergent Validity = 0.589

Discriminant Validity = -.012

Norm = 85

Table 15 : Internal Consistency Values of Problem Handling Scale

| Item | Inter-Item Correlation | RI (T-1) |
|------|------------------------|----------|
| 1 | 0.8229 | P < 0.05 |
| 2 | 0.8186 | P < 0.05 |
| 3 | 0.8187 | P < 0.05 |
| 4 | 0.8225 | P < 0.05 |
| 5 | 0.8195 | P < 0.05 |
| 6 | 0.8162 | P < 0.05 |
| 7 | 0.8183 | P < 0.05 |
| 8 | 0.8220 | P < 0.05 |
| 9 | 0.8164 | P < 0.05 |
| 10 | 0.8176 | P < 0.05 |
| 11 | 0.8165 | P < 0.05 |

| | | |
|----|--------|----------|
| 12 | 0.8174 | P < 0.05 |
| 13 | 0.8174 | P < 0.05 |
| 14 | 0.8189 | P < 0.05 |
| 15 | 0.8148 | P < 0.05 |
| 16 | 0.8157 | P < 0.05 |
| 17 | 0.8164 | P < 0.05 |
| 18 | 0.8169 | P < 0.05 |
| 19 | 0.8179 | P < 0.05 |
| 20 | 0.8156 | P < 0.05 |
| 21 | 0.8176 | P < 0.05 |
| 22 | 0.8190 | P < 0.05 |

Inter-item correlation ranged from 0.8148 - 0.8229
 Guttman Split Half reliability = 0.6476
 Cronbach Alpha = 0.8249
 Standardised Item Alpha = 0.8253
 Correlation between forms = 0.4799
 Convergent Validity = 0.532
 Discriminant Validity = -0.017
 Norm = 80

Table 16 : Internal Consistency Values of Overcoming Disadvantage Complex Scale

| Item | Inter-Item Correlation | RI (T-1) |
|------|------------------------|----------|
| 1 | 0.7634 | P < 0.05 |
| 2 | 0.7486 | P < 0.05 |
| 3 | 0.7462 | P < 0.05 |
| 4 | 0.7515 | P < 0.05 |
| 5 | 0.7638 | P < 0.05 |
| 6 | 0.7538 | P < 0.05 |
| 7 | 0.7533 | P < 0.05 |
| 8 | 0.7563 | P < 0.05 |
| 9 | 0.7542 | P < 0.05 |
| 10 | 0.7623 | P < 0.05 |

Inter-item correlation ranged from 0.7462 - 0.7638
 Guttman Split Half reliability = 0.6938
 Cronbach Alpha = 0.7744
 Standardised Item Alpha = 0.7751
 Correlation between forms = 0.5313
 Convergent Validity = 0.589
 Discriminant Validity = -0.089
 Norm = 35

VI. DISCUSSION

The Tables 1-16 displaying the results above vividly reveal that the Success Potential Battery (SPB) actually measures the components of Success which if possessed in high magnitude would predispose an individual to life success or otherwise. The 16 scales have been found to be reliable and valid. The Cronbach alpha values which ranged from 0.6824 and 0.9193 as well as the coefficient analyses using Guttman split half reliability which ranged from 0.5186 and 0.8580

demonstrated that all the scales were reliable. Also, all the items had significant inter-item correlation coefficient as evident in Table 1-16 above. This is a demonstration of high internal consistency among the items and the subscales.

The above results further corroborate the earlier findings of scholars and researchers who have worked on factors responsible for success such as: (Schuller, 1984; Locke & Lantham, 1990; Animasahun, 2000; 2004; 2007; 2009; 2011 and 2012; Hunt, 2001; Oettingen and Gollwitzer, 2001; Akinboye, 2002; 2003; Mc Grath Histrich and Peters, 2002; Emmanuel, 2003; Ed Brodin, 2006; Oyedepo, 2006; Banjo, 2007; Adeyemi, 2008; Orabuche, 2008; Peter, 2009; Akande, 2010).

VII. CONCLUSION

The above evidences attest to the fact that Success Potential Battery (SPB) is both valid and reliable. The results of the inter-item analysis in each of the 16 sections is a prove of high internal consistency which is a sufficient ground for construct validity because the items measured what they are designed to measure. Also, the specification and definitions of domains of components of success provide evidence that the instrument has content validity; and nevertheless, the significant values of the Cronbach alpha and the Guttman split half reliability significantly establish the reliability of the instrument.

Hence, individuals who are interested in testing their success potentials can easily make use of the instrument. Also, parents who are curious in finding out the success potential level of their children would find the instrument useful. Likewise, organizations can use the instrument to measure the success potentials of their employees or use it as a yardstick for employing new workers. Finally, researchers, psychologists, students, teachers, counselors, and anybody interested in evaluating his/her success potentials would find the instrument very useful.

REFERENCES RÉFÉRENCES REFERENCIAS

1. Adeyemi (2010) Opportunities for Entrepreneurship in Nigeria. Paper delivered at the University of Ibadan under the theme: Transforming Nigeria through Enterpreneurships and innovation.
2. Adeyemi S. (2008) Success is who you are. Pneuma Publishing Ltd, Lagos, Nigeria.
3. Ajugo B.T. (2003) Effects of Goal Setting and Self Efficacy Techniques on the Job-Seeking Behaviour of Unemployed Graduates in Oyo State, Nigeria. An Unpublished PhD Thesis, University of Ibadan.
4. Akande A. (2010) Principles of Life. Salvation Forum Ministries (SFM) Pogah Printing Press, Ibadan.
5. Akinboye, J.O. (2002) Psychological Principles for Success in Life and Workplace. Stirling-Horden Publishers, Ibadan.

6. Akinboye, J.O. (2003) Creativity, Innovation and Success. Stirling-Horden Publishers, Ibadan.
7. Akinboye, J.O. (1976) An experimental study of the differential effectiveness of three methods of fostering creativity. An unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, University of Ibadan.
8. Akinboye, J.O. (2003) Creativity, Innovation and Success, Ibadan, Stirling- Horden (Nig) Ltd.
9. Animasahun (2012) Leadership, An Extract From Lecture from Lecture on MPP 721 Individual and Group Behaviour in Organisation, Department of Guidance and Counselling, University of Ibadan.
10. Animasahun R.A. (2004) The Effect of Six Thinking Hats in Enhancing the decision making Behaviour of Nigeria Prisoners. Nigerian Journal of Applied Psychology, Vol 7/8, Number 2/1 Pp 66-77.
11. Animasahun R.A. (2007) Success Potential Battery (SPB)
12. Animasahun R.A. (2010) Time Planning and Management for Working Student. A lecture delivered at the Polytechnic, Ibadan.
13. Animasahun R.A. (2011) For Your Tomorrow. A Package of Guidance and Counselling, Hints for the New Millennium.
14. Animasahun, R.A. (2000) Effectiveness of Six Thinking Hats and Practical Creativity in fostering Positive Life Skills among convicted adolescents in two Nigeria Prisons. An Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, University of Ibadan.
15. Animasahun, R.A. (2000) For your Tomorrow.
16. Animasahun, R.A. (2007) Effectiveness of Emotional Intelligence Education in Enhancing Positive Life Skills of Nigerian Prison Inmates. Education for Social Transformation Edited by I.A. Nwazwoke, E.A., Okediran and O.A. Moronkola. Faculty of Education, University of Ibadan.
17. Animasahun, R.A. (2009) The Road to Success in the doomy days. A validity Lecture delivered at Baptist High School, Illa-Orangun, Osun State, Nigeria.
18. Banjo, O.O. (2007) Validity Estimates of Success Potential Battery (SPB) An unpublished M.Ed Dissertation, University of Ibadan.
19. Baron, R. (1996) Baron Emotional Quotient Inventory: A Measure of Emotional Intelligence. Technical Manual Mini-health Systems, Toronto.
20. Campbell and Bond (1982) Evaluation of a character – education curriculum. In D. McClellan (ed.) Education for Values. New York: Irvington Publishers.
21. De Bono E. (1971) Lateral Thinking for Management. New York: McGraw-Hill.
22. Ed Brodo (2006) In Banjo (2007).
23. Emmanuel, R.A. (2000) Femi Emmanuel Quotes. Series 1-8, Fem Man Publishing House, Ibadan.
24. Fishburn, P.C. (1972) Personalistic Decision. Theory Exposition and Critique. In H.S. Brinkers (Ed) Decision-making, Creativity, Judgement and System. Columbus, Ohio State University Press.
25. Goleman, D. (1995) Emotional Intelligence: Why it can more than IQ. New York, Bantam Books.
26. Hisrich D.R and Peters, P.M (2002) Entrepreneurship, McGraw Hill.
27. Hunt, D.D. (2001) Success Habit. Diamond Publishing House, Barnaby Brockhurst Lane Monks Kirby, Waemicshire V23 ORA.
28. Locke E.A. and Lanthan G.P. (1990) A theory of goal setting and task performance. Englenwood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
29. McGrath G.R. and Macmillan I. (2000) The Entrepreneurial Mindset, Harrard Business School Press.
30. Meyer, J.D and Salovey, P. (1993) The Intelligence of Emotional Intelligence. Intelligence, 17, 413-422.
31. Michotte, A.(1963) The Perception of Causality New York: Basic books.
32. Oettingen, G, and Gollwitzer, P.M. (2001) Goal Setting and goal striving. In A. Tesser and N. Schwarz (Eds.), The Blackwell Handbook of Social Psychology. Oxford: Blackwell.
33. Orabuche, C.G. (2008) Youths Companion. A Therapy to Greatness, Edeji Prints, Onitsha.
34. Peter A. (2009) Principles for success. Better Yourself Books, Bandra, Mumbai.
35. Procter, P.(ed.) (1980). Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English. The English Language Book Society and Longman Group Ltd. Harlow and London.
36. Quareshi, A.N and Quareshi N.N (1990) Intelligence as correlates of verbal creative components, Psycho-Lingua, 20, 2:117-127.
37. Salovey, P. and Meyer, J.D. (1990) Emotional intelligence Imagination. Cognition and Personality, 3, 185-211.
38. Schuller, R. (1984) Tough Times Never Last But Tough People Do; Random House, Inc.
39. Torrance, E. (1962) Guiding Creativity Talent. New Jersey: Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
40. Unoren, G.R. (1991) A science technology society paradigm and Cross River State Literacy Problem Solving and Decision-making Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, University of Ibadan, Nigeria.