

Civilian Police Officer Profiles: An IPAT Technical Report

John W. Jones, Ph.D.; Noelle K. Newhouse, M.S.; Michael R. Stowers, M.A.

Executive Summary

The purpose of this technical report is to summarize a collection of research analyses conducted with 236 civilian police officer (CPO) job candidates applying for international peacekeeping assignments. These safety-sensitive positions are typically armed security positions and the assignments take place in countries that are in the process of rebuilding their physical infrastructure and their socio-political infrastructure (e.g., schools, police services, and government) after experiencing a war or major societal disruption. These CPO candidates would be placed in a security position that (1) encounters danger, (2) requires highly responsible behavior, (3) benefits from fast and accurate decision-making, and (4) requires diplomatic and at times patient and respectful interactions with a country's citizens.

The 236 CPO job candidates completed IPAT's PsychEval Personality Questionnaire (PEPQ) which includes the Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire – Fifth Edition (16PF; See Appendix A), a measure of normal personality, along with twelve measures of psychopathology. The PEPQ generates the Protective Services Report Plus (PSR Plus) and is administered post-conditional job offer in order to be in full compliance with the American's With Disability Act of 1991 (ADA). The PSR Plus generates four dimension scores which can be used for personnel selection decisions, including Emotional Adjustment, Integrity/Control, Intellectual Efficiency, and Interpersonal Relations.

The statistical tables included in this preliminary report tend to reflect the job relevancy of the PEPQ/PSR Plus with this population of public safety job candidates. These results will also be presented in a more formal article at a later point in time.

Section 1: CPO Job Analysis

The IPAT Work Styles Survey (WSS), a personality-based job analytic tool, was administered to six (6) subject matter experts who specialize in the recruitment and selection of civilian police officers for international peacekeeping assignments in countries such as Iraq, Afghanistan, Kosovo, and Haiti, among others. More specifically, these experts completed the WSS in an effort to identify those primary personality traits, as measured by the 16PF, that seem to be associated with more outstanding performance among civilian police officers.

Table 1 presents the aggregate personality profile that was derived from the WSS job analysis. At the primary factor level, this profile reveals that the most desirable civilian police officers for international peacekeeping assignments were believed to be highly emotionally stable (C+), dominant (E+), rule-abiding (G+), socially bold (H+), vigilant (L+), and perfectionistic (Q3+). Conversely, the ideal international peacekeepers were seen as being more serious and restrained (F-), objective and utilitarian (I-), practical and solution oriented (M-), and self-assured (O-). At the global factor level, the ideal international peacekeepers were seen as being more extraverted (EX+), stress-resilient (AX-), and self-controlled (SC+). Although slightly above average job analytic scores were obtained for the tough-minded and the independence global factor scores (i.e., 6.5 and 6.2, respectively), these latter two global factors seemed to be more balanced than extreme.

The PSR Plus includes four special dimension scores that form the foundation of the Protective Services Report for high-reliability/high-risk

occupations (e.g., police, military and related security professions). These dimension scores are thoroughly defined in the PSR test user manual. Table 2 in this document reflects the derived STEN scores when the average primary score from the WSS job analysis were used to compute the four dimension scores. Inspection of Table 2 shows that based on the WSS for civilian police officers tasked with international peacekeeping assignments, all four PSR dimension scores are highly job relevant. The two most relevant dimension scores appear to be Emotional Adjustment and Integrity/Control, yet both the Intellectual Efficiency and the Interpersonal Relationships dimension scores were also above average.

Section 2: Benchmarking CPO's Against US Census Norms

Table 3 compares a Sample of 236 CPO's to the US Census Norm Group comprised of 10,261 subjects. Inspection of Table 3 reveals that all between-group differences except one (i.e., the Warmth primary) were statistically significant. Moreover, the obtained mean scores were fairly consistent in terms of magnitude and direction for (1) almost all of the primary scores except for a few (e.g., Vigilance and Reasoning), and (2) all of the global factor scores (see Table 4). The CPO Sample tended to exhibit a slightly below average level of vigilance while the WSS results tended to support a higher level of vigilance, and the CPO Sample tended to exhibit average levels of reasoning skills while the WSS results tended to prefer slightly higher levels of reasoning skills.

More importantly, Table 5 showed that the four PSR dimension scores obtained by the CPO group were all significantly different from the Census Norm Group, as was the D4 composite score. Moreover, the four dimension scores summarized in Table 5 were highly consistent with the Table 2 dimension scores extracted from the WSS job analytic process. The Table 5 results are seen as being extremely important since the four dimension scores and the D4 composite scores

are typically used for most employment decisions¹.

Finally, and as a supplemental set of analyses, Table 6 documented the average predicted Holland code type scores for the CPO Sample compared to the Census Norm Group. (Note: A brief interpretive guide for the Holland code types is presented in Appendix A.) Inspection of Table 6 reveals that the CPO Sample tended to be best described, on average, as Conventional and Realistic. These profiles suggest that this Sample of peacekeepers would be comfortable adhering to CIVPOL processes and procedures while also "living out of pocket" in a foreign country. This group of CPOs also scored relatively high on the Enterprising code type which should be of no surprise since they would be receiving relatively high, tax-free salaries along with a lucrative benefits package.

Section 3: Clinical Risk Exposures

In addition to the 16 primary factors, the 5 global factors, and the 6 vocational personality types predicted by the 16PF questionnaire, a measure of normal range personality, the PSR Plus also includes 12 clinical scales that measure common forms of psychopathology (See Appendix C). Brief descriptions of the 12 clinical scales are summarized in Section III. It was hypothesized that on average, the CPO Sample would show significantly lower levels of psychopathology than the PEPQ norm Sample (N=1,763) and a clinical Sample (N=529) more thoroughly described in the PEPQ test user's manual. (Note: Base rate analyses are presented in Section IV.)

Inspection of Table 7 revealed that the CPO Sample scored significantly lower on 11 of 12 (i.e. 91.66%) clinical scales. This pattern of results suggests that sure enough, the CPO Sample was

¹ Appendix B includes a brief technical report conducted on a separate Sample of CPO's which shows the correlation between the four PSR dimension scores and the results of a behavioral forensic interview conducted by Ph.D.-level psychologists. Additional psychometric research on the validity and the reliability of the PSR reports is summarized in the PSR test manual available at www.IPAT.com.

well-adjusted psychologically compared to the norm Sample (N=1,763) and the clinical control group (N=529). The CPO group did score slightly higher on the Threat Immunity scale indicating a significantly higher level of fearlessness. Previous research suggests that this scale does tend to be slightly more elevated with protective services personnel in general. Post-hoc Comparisons are presented in Table 8.

Section 4: Clinical Scale Base Rate Analyses

For reference purposes, Table 9 presents a between-group analysis comparing the CPO group to the aforementioned clinical control group to reiterate the psychological health of the CPO group in general. Table 9 is of course a subset of the analyses previously presented in Table 7. This section presents some base rate analyses of the CPO group as reflected in Table 10.

It was hypothesized that due to the high levels of emotional resiliency and hardiness of the CPO job candidates compared to the US Census norms, that on average the CPO group would also manifest significantly lower scores on the 12 clinical scales. This pattern of results was definitely obtained in Table 9.

In order to inspect Table 10, the following coding systems were used for the 12 clinical scales:

- Sten > 7 reflects higher risk;
- Sten = 7 reflects borderline risk; and
- Sten < 7 = lower risk.

Of course higher scores indicate greater levels of psychopathology for all of the 12 clinical scales.

Inspection of Table 10 indicates that the CPO group did indeed exhibit extremely low levels of psychopathology. Outside of the Threat Immunity scale which yielded the highest overall scores for this group, Thrill-Seeking was the second major risk area. Hence, the PSR Plus risk-taking scales in general were most elevated for this Sample.

This pattern of results is to be somewhat expected given the nature of the assignments involved with UN peacekeeping work. Parenthetically, both the Threat Immunity and the Thrill-Seeking scale scores can be used to coach CPO job candidates who score in the higher risk range so that they can more successfully avoid dangerous situations on their missions (e.g., land mines and assaults).

The next major areas of concern dealt with distorted thought patterns. That is, both the Paranoid Ideation and the Obsessional Thinking scale scores suggest that approximately 6% of applicants required more in-depth psychological evaluations around these areas of concern. Again, the CPO Sample reflected strong psychological health in general and this was reflected in low clinical scale scores and low base rates of psychopathology.

Section 5: PSR and PEPQ Correlations

Finally, Table 11 presents the intercorrelation comparing the four PSR dimension scores with the 12 psychopathology measures. These two measures were completely independent. Inspection of Table 11 yields useful evidence of construct validity. However it must be reiterated that the 16PF is a measure of normal range personality so only low to moderate correlations would be expected with the clinical scales. This was the pattern of results that was obtained.

Summary

The statistical analyses included in this study support the job relevancy and the construct validity of the Protective Services Report Plus (PSR Plus) when used with civilian police officers (CPO's) seeking international peacekeeping assignments. That is, the personality-based job analysis revealed that the four PSR dimension scores – Emotional Adjustment, Integrity/Control, Intellectual Efficiency, and Interpersonal Relations – were very relevant to the peacekeeping

assignment. Second, the results show that the CPO Sample scored significantly differently from the Census norm Sample of the 16PF primary scales and global factors, and for the most part the direction of their scores was consistent with the WSS-based job analysis. Finally, inspection of the 12 clinical scales reveals that on average, the CPO group scored lower (i.e., exhibited less

psychopathology) than a relevant norm group and a group of persons currently exhibiting some form of psychopathology. These results, coupled with research summarized in the PSR manual along with newer research (e.g., Appendix B), help to document the job relevancy of the PSR Plus with this class of protective services professionals.

Section 1: Civilian Police Officer (CPO) Job Analysis Profile

Table 1. CPO Profile from IPAT WSS Job Analysis

16PF Scale	Mean	Sten Scores										S.D.	
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10		
Primary Factor													
Warmth (A)	6.3												1.4
Reasoning (B)	6.7												1.6
Emotional Stability (C)	8.8												.75
Dominance (E)	7.0												1.1
Liveliness (F)	4.2												.75
Rule-Consciousness (G)	8.0												.63
Social Boldness (H)	7.5												.84
Sensitivity (I)	4.3												.82
Vigilance (L)	7.3												1.0
Abstractedness (M)	3.8												2.3
Privateness (N)	6.5												.84
Apprehension (O)	3.7												1.4
Openness to Change (Q1)	4.7												2.2
Self-Reliance (Q2)	5.0												1.1
Perfectionism (Q3)	6.8												1.2
Tension (Q4)	5.3												1.4
Big Five Global Factor													
Extraversion	7.0												
Anxiety	3.0												
Tough-Mindedness	6.5												
Independence	6.2												
Self Control	7.8												

Table 2. PSR Dimension Scores from IPAT WSS Job Analysis

	Sten Score
Emotional Adjustment	9.18
Integrity/Control	8.11
Intellectual Efficiency	7.28
Interpersonal Relationships	6.07

Section 2: CPO Sample and US Census Norm Sample 16PF Factor Comparisons, PSR Dimension Comparisons, and Holland Type Comparisons

Table 3. CPO Sample and 16PF US Census Norm Sample Primary Factor Comparisons

Factor	CPO Sample Mean (n=236)	US Census Norm Sample Mean (n=10,261)	F	p
Warmth	5.93	5.81	.99	.319
Reasoning	5.20	5.58	9.05	.003
Emotional Stability	7.40	5.34	310.20	.000
Dominance	5.89	5.23	34.33	.000
Liveliness	5.07	5.64	21.68	.000
Rule-Consciousness	7.31	5.54	225.08	.000
Social Boldness	6.86	5.63	90.24	.000
Sensitivity	3.67	5.36	201.58	.000
Vigilance	4.36	5.67	109.20	.000
Abstractedness	3.43	5.50	321.12	.000
Privateness	5.37	5.36	.004	.947
Apprehension	3.36	5.66	391.16	.000
Openness to Change	5.07	5.67	25.90	.000
Self-Reliance	4.22	5.52	116.55	.000
Perfectionism	6.53	5.43	83.34	.000
Tension	3.52	5.30	266.64	.000

Table 4. CPO Sample and 16PF US Census Norm Sample Global Factor Comparisons

Factor	CPO Sample Mean (n=236)	US Census Norm Sample Mean (n=10,261)	F	p
Extraversion	6.19	5.70	17.57	.000
Anxiety	2.73	5.60	490.98	.000
Tough Mindedness	7.20	5.43	229.61	.000
Independence	5.78	5.46	9.14	.003
Self-Control	7.30	5.46	282.37	.000

Table 5. CPO Sample and 16PF US Census Norm Sample PSR Dimensions and D4 Composite Comparisons

Scale	CPO Sample Mean (n=236)	US Census Norm Sample Mean (n=10,261)	F	p
Emotional Adjustment	8.55	5.51	540.32	.000
Integrity/Control	7.44	5.49	221.13	.000
Intellectual Efficiency	6.33	5.56	34.70	.000
Interpersonal Relationships	6.36	5.52	39.51	.000
D4 Composite Score	7.17	5.52	379.62	.000

Table 6. CPO Sample and 16PF US Census Norm Sample Holland Type Comparisons

Type	CPO Sample Mean (n=236)	US Census Norm Sample Mean (n=10,261)	F	p
Realistic	7.62	5.57	269.04	.000
Investigative	6.12	5.62	17.89	.000
Artistic	4.10	5.42	131.59	.000
Social	6.12	5.73	11.77	.001
Enterprising	6.82	5.45	162.82	.000
Conventional	7.94	5.65	372.33	.000

Section 3: CPO Sample, PEPQ Norm Sample, and PEPQ Clinical Sample Three-Way Comparison

Table 7. CPO Sample, PEPQ Norm Sample, and PEPQ Clinical Norm Sample Clinical Scale Comparisons.

Scale	CPO Sample Mean (n=236)	PEPQ Norm Sample Mean (n=1,763)	PEPQ Clinical Sample Mean (n=529)	F	p
Health Concerns	4.14	5.58	6.68	204.31	.000
Suicidal Thinking	5.12	5.98	6.90	179.09	.000
Thrill-Seeking	4.64	5.45	5.20	18.69	.000
Anxious Depression	3.47	5.35	6.30	206.89	.000
Low Energy State	3.48	5.45	6.75	274.23	.000
Self-Reproach	3.79	5.38	6.35	178.40	.000
Apathetic Withdrawal	3.98	5.51	6.62	173.11	.000
Paranoid Ideation	4.36	5.37	5.85	56.83	.000
Threat Immunity	6.57	5.53	4.77	142.13	.000
Perceptual Distortion	3.64	5.35	6.14	176.64	.000
Obsessional Thinking	4.47	5.75	5.90	64.47	.000
Psychological Inadequacy	4.16	5.49	6.50	193.88	.000

Table 8. CPO Sample, PEPQ Norm Sample, and PEPQ Clinical Norm Sample Clinical Scale Post Hoc Comparisons.

Dependent Variable	(I) Group Identifier	(J) Group Identifier	Mean Difference (I-J)	Sig.
Health Concerns	CPO Sample	PEPQ Norm Sample	-1.430(*)	.000
		PEPQ Clinical Sample	-2.530(*)	.000
	PEPQ Norm Sample	CPO Sample	1.430(*)	.000
		PEPQ Clinical Sample	-1.100(*)	.000
Suicidal Thinking	CPO Sample	PEPQ Norm Sample	-.854(*)	.000
		PEPQ Clinical Sample	-1.777(*)	.000
	PEPQ Norm Sample	CPO Sample	.854(*)	.000
		PEPQ Clinical Sample	-.923(*)	.000
Thrill-Seeking	CPO Sample	PEPQ Norm Sample	-.8021(*)	.000
		PEPQ Clinical Sample	-.5483(*)	.001
	PEPQ Norm Sample	CPO Sample	.8021(*)	.000
		PEPQ Clinical Sample	.2538(*)	.025
Anxious Depression	CPO Sample	PEPQ Norm Sample	-1.880(*)	.000
		PEPQ Clinical Sample	-2.833(*)	.000
	PEPQ Norm Sample	CPO Sample	1.880(*)	.000
		PEPQ Clinical Sample	-.953(*)	.000
Low Energy State	CPO Sample	PEPQ Norm Sample	-1.979(*)	.000
		PEPQ Clinical Sample	-3.266(*)	.000
	PEPQ Norm Sample	CPO Sample	1.979(*)	.000
		PEPQ Clinical Sample	-1.286(*)	.000
Self-Reproach	CPO Sample	PEPQ Norm Sample	-1.590(*)	.000
		PEPQ Clinical Sample	-2.561(*)	.000
	PEPQ Norm Sample	CPO Sample	1.590(*)	.000
		PEPQ Clinical Sample	-.971(*)	.000

Table 8. (Continued)

Apathetic Withdrawal	CPO Sample	PEPQ Norm Sample	-1.532(*)	.000
		PEPQ Clinical Sample	-2.645(*)	.000
	PEPQ Norm Sample	CPO Sample	1.532(*)	.000
		PEPQ Clinical Sample	-1.113(*)	.000
Paranoid Ideation	CPO Sample	PEPQ Norm Sample	-1.009(*)	.000
		PEPQ Clinical Sample	-1.486(*)	.000
	PEPQ Norm Sample	CPO Sample	1.009(*)	.000
		PEPQ Clinical Sample	-.477(*)	.000
Threat Immunity	CPO Sample	PEPQ Norm Sample	1.041(*)	.000
		PEPQ Clinical Sample	1.803(*)	.000
	PEPQ Norm Sample	CPO Sample	-1.041(*)	.000
		PEPQ Clinical Sample	.762(*)	.000
Perceptual Distortion	CPO Sample	PEPQ Norm Sample	-1.707(*)	.000
		PEPQ Clinical Sample	-2.498(*)	.000
	PEPQ Norm Sample	CPO Sample	1.707(*)	.000
		PEPQ Clinical Sample	-.791(*)	.000
Obsessional Thinking	CPO Sample	PEPQ Norm Sample	-1.282(*)	.000
		PEPQ Clinical Sample	-1.429(*)	.000
	PEPQ Norm Sample	CPO Sample	1.282(*)	.000
Psychological Inadequacy	CPO Sample	PEPQ Norm Sample	-1.320(*)	.000
		PEPQ Clinical Sample	-2.317(*)	.000
	PEPQ Norm Sample	CPO Sample	1.320(*)	.000
		PEPQ Clinical Sample	-.997(*)	.000

* Mean differences are significant at the .05 level

Section 4: CPO Sample and PEPQ Clinical Sample Comparisons and CPO Clinical Scale Frequencies

Table 9. CPO Sample and PEPQ Clinical Sample Clinical Scale Comparisons

Scale	CPO Sample Mean (n=236)	PEPQ Clinical Sample Mean (n=529)	F	p
Health Concerns	4.14	6.68	382.70	.000
Suicidal Thinking	5.12	6.90	269.82	.000
Thrill-Seeking	4.64	5.20	13.00	.000
Anxious Depression	3.47	6.30	437.13	.000
Low Energy State	3.48	6.75	595.22	.000
Self-Reproach	3.79	6.35	395.77	.000
Apathetic Withdrawal	3.98	6.62	355.12	.000
Paranoid Ideation	4.36	5.85	121.18	.000
Threat Immunity	6.57	4.77	213.45	.000
Perceptual Distortion	3.64	6.14	404.91	.000
Obsessional Thinking	4.47	5.90	124.09	.000
Psychological Inadequacy	4.16	6.50	356.14	.000

Table 10. CPO Sample Categorized Clinical Scale Frequencies

Health Concerns Categorized					
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Low	236	100.0	100.0	100.0

Suicidal Thinking Categorized					
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Low	234	99.2	99.2	99.2
	Borderline	2	.8	.8	100.0
	Total	236	100.0	100.0	

Thrill-Seeking Categorized					
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Low	206	87.3	87.3	87.3
	Borderline	22	9.3	9.3	96.6
	High	8	3.4	3.4	100.0
	Total	236	100.0	100.0	

Table 10. CPO Sample Categorized Clinical Scale Frequencies (continued)

Anxious Depression Categorized					
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Low	236	100.0	100.0	100.0

Low Energy State Categorized					
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Low	236	100.0	100.0	100.0

Self-Reproach Categorized					
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Low	236	100.0	100.0	100.0

Apathetic Withdrawal Categorized					
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Low	228	96.6	96.6	96.6
	Borderline	6	2.5	2.5	99.2
	High	2	.8	.8	100.0
	Total	236	100.0	100.0	

Paranoid Ideation Categorized					
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Low	220	93.2	93.2	93.2
	Borderline	14	5.9	5.9	99.2
	High	2	.8	.8	100.0
	Total	236	100.0	100.0	

Threat Immunity Categorized					
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Moderate Low	5	2.1	2.1	2.1
	Average	112	47.5	47.5	49.6
	Borderline	76	32.2	32.2	81.6
	High	43	18.2	18.2	100.00
	Total	236	100.0	100.0	

Table 10. CPO Sample Categorized Clinical Scale Frequencies (continued)

Perceptual Distortion Categorized					
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Low	234	99.2	99.2	99.2
	Borderline	2	.8	.8	100.0
	Total	236	100.0	100.0	

Obsessional Thinking Categorized					
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Low	222	94.1	94.1	94.1
	Borderline	12	5.1	5.1	99.2
	High	2	.8	.8	100.00
	Total	236	100.0	100.0	

Psychological Inadequacy Categorized					
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Low	232	98.3	100.0	100.0
	Missing System	4	1.7		
	Total	236	100.0	100.0	

Psychological Inadequacy Categorized					
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Low	236	100.0	100.0	100.0

Section 5: PSR and PEPQ Scale Correlations

Table 11. PSR and PEPQ Scale Correlations Using CPO Sample

	Health Concerns	Suicidal Thinking	Thrill-Seeking	Anxious Depression	Low Energy State	Self-Reproach	Apathetic Withdrawal	Paranoid Ideation	Threat Immunity	Perceptual Distortion	Obsessive Thinking	Psychological Inadequacy
Emotional Adjustment												
Pearson Correlation	-.347**	-.303**	-.265**	-.404**	-.297**	-.337**	-.346**	-.322**	.290**	-.405**	-.423**	-.356**
Sig.	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
N	236	236	236	236	236	236	236	236	236	236	236	236
Integrity/Control												
Pearson Correlation	-.139*	-.076	-.228**	-.150*	-.122	-.051	-.241**	-.063	.044	-.076	-.076	-.001
Sig.	.033	.243	.000	.021	.061	.437	.000	.333	.497	.246	.246	.982
N	236	236	236	236	236	236	236	236	236	236	236	236
Intellectual Efficiency												
Pearson Correlation	-.154*	-.172**	-.087	-.289**	-.059	-.167*	-.112	-.196**	.167*	-.210**	-.370**	-.187**
Sig.	0.18	.008	.181	.000	.363	.010	.086	.003	.010	.001	.000	.004
N	236	236	236	236	236	236	236	236	236	236	236	236
Interpersonal Relationships												
Pearson Correlation	-.260**	-.073	.058	-.111	-.192**	-.121	-.408**	-.270**	.123	-.188**	-.284**	-.132*
Sig.	.000	.266	.377	.089	.003	.064	.000	.000	.060	.004	.000	.042
N	236	236	236	236	236	236	236	236	236	236	236	236

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Appendix A

16PF Primary Factor	Left Meaning	Right Meaning
A Warmth	Reserved, Impersonal, Distant	Warm, Outgoing, Attentive to Others
B Reasoning	Concrete	Abstract
C Emotional Stability	Reactive, Emotionally Changeable	Emotionally Stable, Adaptive, Mature
E Dominance	Deferential, Cooperative, Avoids Conflict	Dominant, Forceful, Assertive
F Liveliness	Serious, Restrained, Careful	Lively, Animated, Spontaneous
G Rule-Consciousness	Expedient, Nonconforming	Rule-Conscious, Dutiful
H Social Boldness	Shy, Threat-Sensitive, Timid	Socially Bold, Venturesome, Thick-Skinned
I Sensitivity	Utilitarian, Objective, Unsentimental	Sensitive, Aesthetic, Sentimental
L Vigilance	Trusting, Unsuspecting, Accepting	Vigilant, Suspicious, Skeptical, Wary
M Abstractedness	Grounded, Practical, Solution-Oriented	Abstracted, Imaginative, Idea-Oriented
N Privatness	Forthright, Genuine	Private, Discreet, Non-Disclosing
O Apprehension	Self-Assured, Unworried, Complacent	Apprehensive, Self-Doubting, Worried
Q1 Openness to Change	Traditional, Attached to Familiar	Open to Change, Experimenting
Q2 Self-Reliance	Group-Oriented, Affiliative	Self-Reliant, Solitary, Individualistic
Q3 Perfectionism	Tolerates disorder, Unexacting, Flexible	Perfectionistic, Organized, Self-Disciplined
Q4 Tension	Relaxed, Placid, Patient	Tense, High Energy, Driven

16PF Global Factor	Left Meaning	Right Meaning
EX Extraversion	Introverted, Inhibited	Extraverted, Participating
AX Anxiety	Hardy, Stress-resilient	Stress-prone, Emotionally Unstable
TM Tough-Mindedness	Receptive, Open-minded	Tough-minded, Resolute
IN Independence	Accommodating, Agreeable	Independent, Persuasive, Willful
SC Self-Control	Unrestrained, Follow Urges	Self-Controlled, Reliable



- **Realistic:**
Works effectively with hands and tools
- **Investigative:**
Enjoys research, learning and problem solving and inventing
- **Artistic:**
Imaginative, creates original works in writing, painting, music, and arts
- **Social:**
Interacts effectively with others, enjoys working with and helping others
- **Enterprising:**
Welcomes responsibility and leadership roles, speaks effectively to groups
- **Conventional:**
Strong organizational and arithmetic skills, detailed and accurate

Appendix B

Using the IPAT Protective Services Report (PSR) to Assess International Peacekeeper Candidates: A Construct Validation Study

John W. Jones, Ph.D.; Noelle K. Newhouse, M.S.

Executive Summary

The purpose of this study was to further document the construct validity of the IPAT Protective Services Report (PSR) with a group of 90 international peacekeeper job candidates. These candidates had been offered a conditional offer of employment at the time of this assessment and most candidates had a stellar past record of achievement and ascension within the police and/or military professions. Table 1 documents the average PSR dimension scores for this protective services Sample. Table 2 reveals that all of these average PSR dimension scores were statistically higher than the US census norm group, thus documenting that the PSR dimension scores successfully differentiated the international peacekeepers in the predicted direction.

Table 3 further documents the construct validity of the PSR by presenting statistically significant correlations in the predicted direction between three PSR dimension scores (i.e., Emotional Adjustment, Intellectual Efficiency and Interpersonal Relations) and a structured interview score. The structured interview score was established by Ph.D.-level psychologists who interviewed all 90 peacekeeper candidates. Higher interview

scores reflected higher levels of job “fit” and readiness for duty. A review of Tables 4 and 5 reveals that a Multiple-R of .543 was obtained when the four PSR dimension scores were regressed against the structured interview scores.

Hence, the aforementioned set of analyses further established the construct validity of the PSR dimension scores. That is, pre-qualified and highly reputable international peacekeeper candidates scored significantly higher than the census norm group on the four PSR dimension scores. In addition, statistically significant correlations in the predicted direction were obtained between three of the PSR dimension scores and the structured behavioral interview scores. Future research will focus on the ability of the PSR dimension scores to predict the outcomes of specific behavioral interview questions that were targeted at on-the-job adjustment, conscientiousness, decision-making, and relationships.

Sample Description

The international peacekeeper Sample consists of 90 protective services candidates who were provided with conditional offers of employment. In order to further establish the construct validity of the four scales of the Protective Services Report (PSR), these dimension scores were compared to US census norms in order to establish the construct validity of the PSR. These 90 candidates were prescreened and recruited based on their stellar records of past performance and ascension in the protective services profession (e.g., police and military). In addition, these four PSR dimension scores were first correlated with and then regressed onto a structured behavioral interview score. The interview score was established by Ph.D.-level psychologists who assessed the job readiness of these candidates during a 45-60 minute face-to-face interview session. The focus of the interview also dealt with the subjects’ job-related emotional adjustment, integrity/self-control,

intellectual efficiency, and interpersonal style. Higher scores on all predictor and criterion

measures were associated with stronger job readiness and fitness for duty.

Table 1. Descriptive Statistics

PSR Dimension	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	SD
Emotional Adjustment	5.30	10.00	8.30	1.12
Integrity/Control	2.60	10.00	7.31	1.61
Intellectual Efficiency	1.90	10.00	6.35	1.60
Interpersonal Relationships	2.00	10.00	6.25	1.60
Interview	17.00	45.00	36.54	6.57

Table 2. Comparison of PSR Scale Scores Between UN Peacekeeper Sample and U.S. Census Norms.

Scale	Peacekeeper Mean (n=90)	U.S Norm Sample Mean (n=10,261)	F-Value	p-Value
Emotional Adjustment	8.30	5.51	173.70	.000
Integrity/Control	7.31	5.49	74.02	.000
Intellectual Efficiency	6.35	5.56	13.83	.000
Interpersonal Relationships	6.25	5.53	11.37	.001

The results of the MANOVA show that the UN Peacekeepers score significantly higher on all four of the PSR scales than the U.S. Norm Sample.

Table 3. Correlations Between PSR Dimensions and Interview Scores Corrected for Restriction of Range

PSR Dimension	Uncorrected Correlation with Interview	Corrected Correlation with Interview ^a	Double-Corrected Correlation with Interview ^b
Emotional Adjustment	.403**	.405**	.408**
Integrity/Control	.177	.178	.179
Intellectual Efficiency	.346**	.348**	.350**
Interpersonal Relationships	.365**	.367**	.370**

^a Correlations are corrected for restriction of range on the predictor scores.

^b Correlations are corrected for restriction of range on both the predictor and criterion scores.

** $p < .001$.

Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.543 ^a	.295	.262	5.6414

^a. Predictors: (Constant), IR, IC, IE, EA

Table 5. PSR Scale Regression on Interview Results

Scale	Coefficient	t-Value	p-Value
Emotional Adjustment	.85	1.09	.279
Integrity/Control	.60	1.20	.232
Intellectual Efficiency	1.18	2.66	.009
Interpersonal Relationships	1.25	3.16	.002

Appendix C

PEPQ Depressive Characteristics Scales:

Scale Name:	Low Range:	High Range:
Health Concerns (HC)	Few Health Concerns	More Health Concerns
Suicidal Thinking (ST)	Contented	Despondent
Anxious Depression (AD)	Composed	Shaky, Frightened
Low Energy State (LE)	Energetic	Fatigued, Worn Out
Self-Reproach (SR)	Untroubled	Self-Reproaching
Apathetic Withdrawal (AW)	Participative	Apathetic, Withdrawn

PEPQ Distorted Thought Patterns Scales:

Scale Name:	Low Range:	High Range:
Paranoid Ideation (PI)	Less Paranoid Ideation	More Paranoid Ideation
Obsessional Thinking (OT)	Non-Obsessional	Obsessional Thinking
Alienation/Perceptual Distortion (AP)	Realistic Perceptions	Alienation, Distortion

PEPQ Risk-Taking and Quick Evaluation Scales:

Scale Name:	Low Range:	High Range:
<i>Risk-Taking:</i>		
- Thrill-Seeking (TS)	Restrained	Thrill-Seeking
- Threat Immunity (TI)	Threat Sensitive	Threat Immune
<i>Quick-Evaluation:</i>		
- Psychological Inadequacy (PS)	Adequate	Inadequate

© Copyright 2006 IPAT, Inc.

® 16PF is a registered trademark of the Institute for Personality and Ability Testing, Inc (IPAT). IPAT is a wholly owned subsidiary of OPP Ltd.

® OPP is a registered trademark of OPP.