

HANDBOOK OF POLICE PSYCHOLOGY



Edited by
Jack Kitaeff

HANDBOOK OF POLICE PSYCHOLOGY

SERIES IN APPLIED PSYCHOLOGY
Edwin A. Fleishman, George Mason University
Jeanette N. Cleveland, Pennsylvania State University
Series Editors

Gregory Bedny and David Meister

The Russian Theory of Activity: Current Applications to Design and Learning

Winston Bennett, David Woehr, and Charles Lance

Performance Measurement: Current Perspectives and Future Challenges

Michael T. Brannick, Eduardo Salas, and Carolyn Prince

Team Performance Assessment and Measurement: Theory, Research, and Applications

Jeanette N. Cleveland, Margaret Stockdale, and Kevin R. Murphy

Women and Men in Organizations: Sex and Gender Issues at Work

Aaron Cohen

Multiple Commitments in the Workplace: An Integrative Approach

Russell Cropanzano

Justice in the Workplace: Approaching Fairness in Human Resource Management, Volume 1

Russell Cropanzano

Justice in the Workplace: From Theory to Practice, Volume 2

David V. Day, Stephen Zaccaro, Stanley M. Halpin

Leader Development for Transforming Organizations: Growing Leaders for Tomorrow's Teams and Organizations

James E. Driskell and Eduardo Salas

Stress and Human Performance

Sidney A. Fine and Steven F. Cronshaw

Functional Job Analysis: A Foundation for Human Resources Management

Sidney A. Fine and Maury Getkate

Benchmark Tasks for Job Analysis: A Guide for Functional Job Analysis (FJA) Scales

J. Kevin Ford, Steve W. J. Kozlowski, Kurt Kraiger, Eduardo Salas, and Mark S. Teachout

Improving Training Effectiveness in Work Organizations

Jerald Greenberg

Organizational Behavior: The State of the Science, Second Edition

Jerald Greenberg

Insidious Workplace Behavior

Edwin Hollander

Inclusive Leadership: The Essential Leader-Follower Relationship

Jack Kitaeff

Handbook of Police Psychology

Uwe E. Kleinbeck, Hans-Henning Quast, Henk Thierry, and Hartmut Häcker

Work Motivation

Laura L. Koppes

Historical Perspectives in Industrial and Organizational Psychology

Ellen Kossek and Susan Lambert

Work and Life Integration: Organizational, Cultural and Individual Perspectives

Martin I. Kurke and Ellen M. Scrivner

Police Psychology into the 21st Century

Joel Lefkowitz

Ethics and Values in Industrial and Organizational Psychology

Manuel London

Job Feedback: Giving, Seeking, and Using Feedback for Performance Improvement, Second Edition

Manuel London

How People Evaluate Others in Organizations

Manuel London

Leadership Development: Paths to Self-Insight and Professional Growth

Robert F. Morrison and Jerome Adams

Contemporary Career Development Issues

Michael D. Mumford, Garnett Stokes, and William A. Owens

Patterns of Life History: The Ecology of Human Individuality

Michael D. Mumford

Pathways to Outstanding Leadership: A Comparative Analysis of Charismatic, Ideological, and Pragmatic Leaders

Kevin R. Murphy

Validity Generalization: A Critical Review

Kevin R. Murphy and Frank E. Saal

Psychology in Organizations: Integrating Science and Practice

Kevin Murphy

A Critique of Emotional Intelligence: What Are the Problems and How Can They Be Fixed?

Susan E. Murphy and Ronald E. Riggio

The Future of Leadership Development

Margaret A. Neal and Leslie Brett Hammer

Working Couples Caring for Children and Aging Parents: Effects on Work and Well-Being

Steven A.Y. Poelmans

Work and Family: An International Research Perspective

Robert E. Ployhart, Benjamin Schneider, and Neal Schmitt

Staffing Organizations: Contemporary Practice and Theory, Third Edition

Erich P. Prien, Jeffery S. Schippmann, and Kristin O. Prien

Individual Assessment: As Practiced in Industry and Consulting

Ned Rosen

Teamwork and the Bottom Line: Groups Make a Difference

Heinz Schuler, James L. Farr, and Mike Smith

Personnel Selection and Assessment: Individual and Organizational Perspectives

Kenneth S. Shultz and Gary A. Adams

Aging and Work in the 21st Century

John W. Senders and Neville P. Moray

Human Error: Cause, Prediction, and Reduction

Frank J. Smith

Organizational Surveys: The Diagnosis and Betterment of Organizations Through Their Members

Dianna Stone and Eugene F. Stone-Romero

The Influence of Culture on Human Resource Processes and Practices

Kecia M. Thomas

Diversity Resistance in Organizations

George C. Thornton III and Rose Mueller-Hanson

Developing Organizational Simulations: A Guide for Practitioners and Students

George C. Thornton III and Deborah Rupp

Assessment Centers in Human Resource Management: Strategies for Prediction, Diagnosis, and Development

Yoav Vardi and Ely Weitz

Misbehavior in Organizations: Theory, Research, and Management

Patricia Voydanoff

Work, Family, and Community: Exploring Interconnections

HANDBOOK OF POLICE PSYCHOLOGY

Edited by

Jack Kitaeff

Private Practice of Police Psychology

Arlington, Virginia

 **Routledge**
Taylor & Francis Group
New York London

Routledge
Taylor & Francis Group
270 Madison Avenue
New York, NY 10016

Routledge
Taylor & Francis Group
27 Church Road
Hove, East Sussex BN3 2FA

© 2011 by Taylor and Francis Group, LLC
Routledge is an imprint of Taylor & Francis Group, an Informa business

Printed in the United States of America on acid-free paper
10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1

International Standard Book Number: 978-0-415-87766-4 (Hardback)

For permission to photocopy or use material electronically from this work, please access www.copyright.com (<http://www.copyright.com/>) or contact the Copyright Clearance Center, Inc. (CCC), 222 Rosewood Drive, Danvers, MA 01923, 978-750-8400. CCC is a not-for-profit organization that provides licenses and registration for a variety of users. For organizations that have been granted a photocopy license by the CCC, a separate system of payment has been arranged.

Trademark Notice: Product or corporate names may be trademarks or registered trademarks, and are used only for identification and explanation without intent to infringe.

Visit the Taylor & Francis Web site at
<http://www.taylorandfrancis.com>

and the Psychology Press Web site at
<http://www.psypress.com>

*To my wife Tress, my mother Gertrude, my sister Ellen, my children
Isaiah, Moriah, Mordechai, Hayleigh, and Myles. And to June
and Stella, two good friends, gone, but never forgotten.*

Contents

Series Foreword	xiii
<i>Edwin A. Fleishman and Jeanette N. Cleveland</i>	
Preface.....	xv
About the Editor.....	xvii
About the Contributors	xix
Chapter 1 History of Police Psychology	1
<i>Jack Kitaeff</i>	
 PART I General Practice	
Chapter 2 Police-Specific Psychological Services: Using Behavioral Scientists as Consultants to Public Safety	63
<i>Joseph A. Davis</i>	
Chapter 3 Legal Issues in Hiring and Promotion of Police Officers	67
<i>Arthur Gutman</i>	
Chapter 4 Ethical Issues in Police Psychology: Challenges and Decision-Making Models to Resolve Ethical Dilemmas	89
<i>Jeni L. McCutcheon</i>	
Chapter 5 Probation and Surveillance Officer Candidates: Similarities and Differences With Police Personnel	109
<i>D. Scott Herrmann and Barbara Broderick</i>	
 PART II Pre-Employment Psychological Screening	
Chapter 6 Criterion-Related Validity in Police Psychological Evaluations	125
<i>Peter A. Weiss and William U. Weiss</i>	
Chapter 7 Pre-Employment Screening of Police Officers: Integrating Actuarial Prediction Models With Practice	135
<i>Michael J. Cuttler</i>	
Chapter 8 Appraising and Managing Police Officer Performance	165
<i>Rick Jacobs, Christian Thoroughgood, and Katina Sawyer</i>	

Chapter 9	Assessments for Selection and Promotion of Police Officers	193
	<i>Rick Jacobs, Lily Cushenbery, and Patricia Grabarek</i>	
Chapter 10	The Integration Section of Forensic Psychological Evaluation Reports in Law Enforcement: Culturally Responsive Ending Words	211
	<i>Ronn Johnson</i>	
Chapter 11	Challenging the Police De-Selection Process During the Psychological Interview: How Gullibility Spells Hiring Doom for the Unwary	227
	<i>Jose M. Arcaya</i>	
 PART III Training and Evaluation		
Chapter 12	Police Couples Counseling/Assessment and Use of the Inwald Relationship Surveys	239
	<i>Robin Inwald, Elizabeth Willman, and Stephanie Inwald</i>	
Chapter 13	Principles of Fitness-for-Duty Evaluations for Police Psychologists	263
	<i>David M. Corey</i>	
Chapter 14	Methods for Real-Time Assessment of Operational Stress During Realistic Police Tactical Training.....	295
	<i>Riccardo Fenici, Donatella Brisinda, and Anna Rita Sorbo</i>	
 PART IV Police Procedure		
Chapter 15	Police Use of Force.....	323
	<i>Frank J. Gallo</i>	
Chapter 16	The Role of Psychologist as a Member of a Crisis Negotiation Team	345
	<i>Wayman C. Mullins and Michael J. McMains</i>	
Chapter 17	Domestic Violence: An Analysis of the Crime and Punishment of Intimate Partner Abuse	363
	<i>Trisha K. Straus and Stephanie L. Brooke</i>	
Chapter 18	Police Interviews With Suspects: International Perspectives	383
	<i>Karl A. Roberts and Victoria Herrington</i>	
Chapter 19	Applying Restorative Justice Principles in Law Enforcement	401
	<i>Roslyn Myers</i>	

PART V Clinical Practice

- Chapter 20** Police Personality: Theoretical Issues and Research 421
Gwendolyn L. Gerber and Kyle C. Ward
- Chapter 21** Police and Public Safety Complex Trauma and Grief: An Eco-
 Ethological Existential Analysis 437
Daniel Rudofossi
- Chapter 22** Suicide and Law Enforcement: What Do We Know? 469
Alan A. Abrams, Alice Liang, Kyleeann Stevens, and Brenda Frechette

PART VI Treatment and Dysfunction

- Chapter 23** Cops in Trouble: Psychological Strategies for Helping Officers
 Under Investigation, Criminal Prosecution, or Civil Litigation 479
Laurence Miller
- Chapter 24** Critical Incidents 491
Suzanne Best, Alexis Artwohl, and Ellen Kirschman
- Chapter 25** Developing and Maintaining Successful Peer Support Programs
 in Law Enforcement Organizations 509
Jocelyn E. Roland
- Chapter 26** The Disconnected Values Model: A Brief Intervention for Improving
 Healthy Habits and Coping With Stress in Law Enforcement 525
Mark H. Anshel
- Author Index** 541
- Subject Index** 555

Series Foreword

There is a compelling need for innovative approaches to the solution of many pressing problems involving human relationships in today's society. Such approaches are more likely to be successful when they are based on sound research and applications. Our *Series in Applied Psychology* offers publications that emphasize state-of-the-art research and its application to important issues of human behavior in a variety of social settings. The objective is to bridge both academic and applied interests.

We are very pleased to have the book *Handbook of Police Psychology* in our *Series in Applied Psychology*. Dr. Jack Kitaeff has provided us with outstanding examples of how recent scientific and applied developments from various fields of psychological research can, and are, currently being applied to the solution of many of the problems faced by individuals involved with the many different aspects of police administration and allied fields. He has brought together an outstanding group of experts involved in the relevant research and its applications to a wide variety of law enforcement, forensics, ethical, legal, and policing issues.

Dr. Kitaeff is particularly well qualified to undertake this effort. He is a licensed clinical psychologist in Virginia specializing in forensic and police psychology. He graduated from the City University of New York, has a master's degree in experimental psychology from the State University of New York, and received his PhD from the University of Mississippi. He completed his internship in clinical psychology at Walter Reed Army Medical Center in Washington, D.C.

He received his legal education from George Mason University, where he was awarded his JD degree, and he served his legal clerkship with the U.S. Attorney's Office. His private practice has involved consulting with police and sheriff departments, conducting pre-employment screening of law enforcement candidates, and carrying out fitness-for-duty evaluations. He has held teaching positions and has produced several books, including the recently published *Forensic Psychology*. He has appeared on several television and radio programs.

In his preface to this book, Dr. Kitaeff acknowledges that an earlier book in our series, *Police Psychology Into the 21st Century* (1995, edited by Martin Kurke and Ellen Scrivner), was a successful groundbreaking work that attempted to examine some of the connections between psychological research with needs in different areas of practice in law enforcement. It is interesting to note that these chapter authors in the 1995 book were mainly individuals looking at the available research from their standpoints as law enforcement area job incumbents. There is a great deal of discussion about what needs to be done, and the chapters provided some directions to be pursued. The editors had projected the needs and some of the ways of getting there in the future. The current book provides a remarkable display of progress in achieving many of the objectives set out by Kurke and Scrivner's volume. The earlier volume is still available and would serve as a nice companion to the present new Kitaeff book.

The present volume is an ambitious and comprehensive view of a growing field. Chapter 1 presents a very comprehensive historical review of the long history of the relationships between psychological research and different areas of police psychology. Examples of chapters that follow include ones on legal and ethical issues related to public safety, methods for hiring and promotion of police officers, and issues between police and probation officers. The next section deals with many issues in the screening, selection, and evaluation of police officers. Subsequent sections deal with training, counseling, stress reduction, and evaluation issues. Next, several chapters deal with police procedures, such as hostage negotiations, domestic violence, use of force, and still other issues with international perspectives in law enforcement. The next chapters are concerned with aspects of clinical practice in situations involving grief, public safety, and even suicide in law enforcement. A final

section deals with the treatment of certain dysfunctions, such as helping officers under investigation or prosecution, the use of critical incidents to provide early interventions, developing peer support programs, and improving healthy habits for coping with stress.

Readers will find an extensive list of approximately 150 helpful references for those interested in pursuing some of the sources and issues in more detail. Another feature is the specification of 27 key court cases that proved relevant to some of the issues discussed.

This *Handbook of Police Psychology* makes available needed information that will be of use to the growing community of individuals working in or with law enforcement agencies. The chapter authors have been specifically chosen for their expertise and reputation in working at the local, state, and federal levels of law enforcement. They include psychologists who are or were officers, federal agents, and civilian employees of law enforcement agencies, and other psychologists who provide consulting psychological services to law enforcement agencies. They have broken new ground and contributed to the establishment of environments that have enabled psychologists and police personnel to respect each other and to contribute to the bodies of knowledge of each other's profession.

Edwin A. Fleishman
George Mason University

Jeanette N. Cleveland
Pennsylvania State University

Series Editors

Preface

In 1995, when Martin I. Kurke and Ellen M. Scrivner wrote the preface to their groundbreaking work, *Police Psychology Into the 21st Century* (the precursor to the present book), their title alone bore witness of things to come. More specifically, the title of their book was more than insightful alone; it revealed an understanding of what had been taking place at the dawn of the new century in police psychology. The title of the book was not *Police Psychology “in” the 21st Century*, which would be a static description of the way things were, but rather *Police Psychology “Into” the 21st Century*, which was a dynamic description—bordering on prophetic—of what was happening and transpiring even as these words were written.

In 1995, the authors described police psychology as “an evolving area in which psychological science is applied in the law enforcement managerial and operational environments.” Police psychology (as known in 1995) was regarded as a “relatively new phenomenon” in the history of psychology. The book *Police Psychology Into the 21st Century* was presented as a “core technology consisting of psychological evaluations, counseling, and training.”

In the original book, the careers of the 21 authors contributing to the book were seen as testimony to the growth and adaptation of the field. Each author was regarded by the editors as “experienced police psychologist[s]...some [as] civilian members of a federal, state, or local enforcement agencies...[and] others [as] consultant-contractors to the law enforcement community [at large].” Most authors were presented as having been trained as mental health experts, whereas other authors were described as having backgrounds in industrial and organizational psychology and other nonmental health disciplines.

The editors of the original book viewed it as one “in which experts in different aspects of psychological support to law enforcement agencies would write on police psychology from their own idiosyncratic perspectives.” Authors were seen as practicing psychologists within “working public safety environments [which resulted] in a variety of approaches to the subject and of presentation styles.” Kurke and Scrivner believed that police psychology “must continue to grow in pace, scope, and direction, and that such growth [was] dependent on the development and inclusion of new methods and technologies in support of police officers and their families, police management, and police operations.” The editors saw their book as being a “snapshot of police psychology,” as it turned into the 21st century. They added prophetically, “We can hardly wait to watch and participate in its future.” Well, the future is here.

This book is divided into six parts: General Practice, Pre-Employment Psychological Screening, Training and Evaluation, Police Procedure, Clinical Practice, and Treatment and Dysfunction. Each category presents chapters that are relevant to the general practice and procedures of police psychology as they stand 10 years into the 21st century.

The first section is preceded by the chapter “The Introduction and History of Police Psychology” (Kitaëff), which presents an overall picture of where we are as a profession, the definitions of the profession, and how we got here.

The section General Practice covers police psychological consultation to public safety as a whole (Davis), legal issues involved in the hiring and promotion of police officers (Gutman), ethical issues in police psychology (McCutcheon), and police versus probation and surveillance differences (Herrmann & Broderick).

The section Pre-Employment Psychological Screening contains chapters on psychological evaluations of an actuarial and clinical nature (Weiss & Weiss, and Cutler), appraising and managing police officer performance (Jacobs, Thoroughgood, & Sawyer), the selection and promotion of police

officers (Jacobs, Cushenbery, & Grabarek), the integration of psychological reports (Johnson), and a challenge to the deselection process of police applicants based on interview aspects (Arcaya).

The Training and Evaluation section includes chapters on couples' counseling and assessment (Inwald, Willman, & Inwald), fitness-for-duty-evaluations (Corey), and biological indicators of stress during police tactical training (Fenici, Brisinda, & Sorbo).

The section Police Procedure includes chapters on police use of force (Gallo), hostage negotiations (Mullins & McMains), domestic violence (Straus & Brooke), police interviews with suspects (Roberts & Herrington), and applying restorative justice principles in law enforcement (Myers).

The Clinical Practice section contains chapters on the police personality (Gerber & Ward), complex trauma and grief (Rudofossi), and suicide in law enforcement (Abrams, Liang, Stevens, & Frechette).

Finally, the section Treatment and Dysfunction contains chapters on psychological strategies for helping officers in trouble (Miller), critical incident reactions (Best, Artwohl, & Kirschman), peer support programs in law enforcement (Roland), and a brief intervention model for improving healthy habits and coping skills (Anshel).

Some of the chapters in this book would be barely unrecognizable when *Police Psychology Into the 21st Century* was published in 1995. But the chapters, recognizable or not, are of equal importance in the current field and state of practice of police psychology. As will be repeated several times throughout this book, the professions of police and police psychology have continued to grow geometrically, yet there is a familiar thread that runs through every decade and every topic. It is the thread of professionalism that continues to bind our young profession.

Although Hugo Münsterberg advocated for psychology's involvement in the detection of crime and the presence of psychologists in the criminal process, he could barely imagine the extent to which this now takes place on a daily basis. Although in 1917 Lewis Terman advocated for testing using the Stanford-Binet in the hiring of police officers, he could hardly imagine the breadth of present-day pre-employment applicant-screening programs. Nor could L. L. Thurstone in 1922 have imagined the same thing. Certainly, in 1954, when Martin Reiser became this nation's first full-time police department psychologist, could he ever had foreseen the extent of the influence that present-day psychologists would have in the selection, hiring, and management of present-day police officers at all levels and how *police psychology* itself would come to be recognized as a legitimate psychological specialty by the American Psychological Association.

Although Kurke and Scrivner saw *Police Psychology Into the 21st Century* as a snapshot of police psychology as it existed in 1995, the present *Handbook of Police Psychology* represents a panoramic digital image of how police psychology appears in 2010 and how it stands poised to change even further over the coming decades.

Jack Kitaeff

About the Editor

Jack Kitaeff, PhD, JD, is a licensed clinical psychologist in the Commonwealth of Virginia specializing in police and forensic psychology. He received his undergraduate education at Brooklyn College, and his graduate psychology education at the State University of New York at Cortland and the University of Mississippi. He received his law degree from the George Mason University School of Law, and completed a legal clerkship with the U.S. Attorney's Office, Eastern District of Virginia.

Dr. Kitaeff completed a clinical psychology internship at Walter Reed Army Medical Center, and served as a psychologist and Major in the U.S. Army Medical Service Corps. He became the first police psychologist for the Arlington County Police Department, where he established a pre-employment psychological screening program for police applicants. From 1984 to the present, he has been the consulting police psychologist for numerous law enforcement agencies in the northern Virginia area, including the Arlington County Sheriff's Office, among others. Dr. Kitaeff is an adjunct professor of psychology with the University of Maryland, University College. He is also a faculty member in the School of Psychology at Walden University. He is a Diplomate in Police Psychology from the Society of Police and Criminal Psychology, and a member of the American Psychological Association.

Dr. Kitaeff is the editor of *Malingering, Lies, and Junk Science in the Courtroom* (Cambria Press, 2007), and the author of *Jews in Blue* (Cambria Press, 2006) and *Forensic Psychology* (Prentice-Hall, 2010).

About the Contributors

Alan A. Abrams

California Department of Corrections,
California Facility
Vacaville, California

Mark H. Anshel

Middle Tennessee State University
Murfreesboro, Tennessee

Jose M. Arcaya

John Jay College of Criminal Justice
New York, New York

Alexis Artwohl

Private Behavioral Sciences Consultant
to Law Enforcement
Tucson, Arizona

Suzanne Best

Lewis and Clark Graduate School of Education
and Counseling
Portland, Oregon

Donatella Brisinda

Clinical Physiology-Biomagnetism Center
Catholic University of Sacred Heart
Rome, Italy

Barbara Broderick

Maricopa County Adult Probation Department
Phoenix, Arizona

Stephanie L. Brooke

Capella University
Lakeville, New York

David M. Corey

Consulting and Forensic Psychology
Lake Oswego, Oregon

Lily Cushenbery

Pennsylvania State University
State College, Pennsylvania

Michael J. Cuttler

Law Enforcement Services, Inc.
Greensboro, North Carolina

Joseph A. Davis

California Department of Justice
Institute of Criminal Investigations
San Diego, California

Riccardo Fenici

Catholic University of Sacred Heart
Rome, Italy

Brenda Frechette

California Department of Corrections,
California Facility
Vacaville, California

Frank J. Gallo

Western New England College
Springfield, Massachusetts

Gwendolyn L. Gerber

John Jay College of Criminal Justice
City University of New York
New York, New York

Patricia Grabarek

Pennsylvania State University
State College, Pennsylvania

Arthur Gutman

Florida Institute of Technology
Melbourne, Florida

Victoria Herrington

Australian Graduate School of Policing
Charles Sturt University
New South Wales, Australia

D. Scott Herrmann

Superior Court of Arizona
Phoenix, Arizona

Robin Inwald

Inwald Research, Inc.
Cleverdale, New York

Stephanie Inwald

Inwald Research, Inc.
Cleverdale, New York

Rick Jacobs

Pennsylvania State University
State College, Pennsylvania

Ronn Johnson

University of San Diego
San Diego, California

Ellen Kirschman

Private Practice
Redwood City, California

Jack Kitaeff

Private Practice of Police Psychology
Arlington, Virginia

Alice Liang

California Department of Mental Health,
Napa State Hospital
Napa, California

Jeni L. McCutcheon

Independent Public Safety and Clinical
Psychology Practice
Phoenix, Arizona

Michael J. McMains

Retired, San Antonio Police Department
San Antonio, Texas

Laurence Miller

Clinical and Forensic Psychologist and Law
Enforcement Educator
Boca Raton, Florida

Wayman C. Mullins

Texas State University
San Marcos, Texas

Roslyn Myers

John Jay College of Criminal Justice
New York, New York

Karl A. Roberts

Australian Graduate School of Policing,
Charles Sturt University
New South Wales, Australia

Jocelyn E. Roland

Independent Practitioner
Modesto, California

Daniel Rudofossi

New York University
Retired NYPD Uniform Psychologist/Police
Sergeant
New York, New York

Katina Sawyer

Pennsylvania State University
State College, Pennsylvania

Anna Rita Sorbo

Clinical Physiology-Biomagnetism Center
Catholic University of Sacred Heart
Rome, Italy

Kyleeann Stevens

St. Elizabeth's Hospital
Washington, District of Columbia

Trisha K. Straus

Attorney-at-Law
Granger, Georgia

Christian Thoroughgood

Pennsylvania State University
State College, Pennsylvania

Kyle C. Ward

John Jay College of Criminal Justice
City University of New York
New York, New York

Peter A. Weiss

University of Hartford
West Hartford, Connecticut

William U. Weiss

Portland State University
Portland, Oregon

Elizabeth Willman

Inwald Research, Inc.
Cleverdale, New York

6 Criterion-Related Validity in Police Psychological Evaluations

Peter A. Weiss

William U. Weiss

INTRODUCTION

Use of psychological assessment instruments such as the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory-2 (MMPI-2), Personality Assessment Inventory (PAI), and California Psychological Inventory (CPI) has become a frequent practice in police psychological evaluations in recent years. Such instruments are often used in conditional pre-employment psychological evaluations as well as for other purposes such as fitness-for-duty (FFDE) evaluations (Weiss, 2010; Weiss, Weiss, & Gacono, 2008). A major issue with such assessment instruments is that many of these tests were originally designed for purposes of clinical diagnosis and treatment planning and are not in fact instruments originally designed for use in employment settings. While certain newer instruments, such as the M-PULSE (Davis & Rostow, 2008), were designed especially for purposes of police psychological evaluations and were originally validated with law enforcement populations, most of these instruments were not, and validity studies had to be performed to make these instruments (particularly personality inventories such as the MMPI-2 and PAI) acceptable for use in law enforcement evaluations. As a result of the current emphasis by the American Psychological Association (APA) on promoting evidence-based practice, it is important for psychologists using such instruments in their practice of police psychology to have an understanding of the validity of these tests for applications in police work. The purpose of this chapter is (1) to better acquaint the practicing police psychologist with the validity issues applicable to the use of such assessment instruments, and then (2) to review the evidence supporting the validity of the most popular instruments.

TEST VALIDITY ISSUES IN POLICE PSYCHOLOGICAL EVALUATIONS

In teaching about the validity of psychological tests, the present authors have divided it into three components. The first may be termed *rational validity*, which may be further broken down into face validity and content validity. Essentially, rational validity is the degree to which an assessment instrument makes sense during an inspection process; in other words, whether the test items appear to measure what the test developers say they should measure. Face validity is whether or not test items obviously measure the characteristic the test developer is attempting to measure. According to Kazdin (1998), this is not typically part of the psychometric development of a measure but rather an informal evaluation of its usefulness. Content validity is evidence that the items on a test or measure relate to the concept underlying the measure. It asks the question: Does the test appropriately sample the universe of items associated with the concept? Problems with face or content validity are rarely a problem in contemporary psychological testing; tests that are ultimately validated from predictive, construct, and criterion points of view also have good face and content validity. However, this is an

important first question to ask in establishing the validity of a measure for any purpose: Does this instrument at least *appear* to measure what it claims to measure on the surface?

The second type of validity is *construct validity*, which relates to the degree to which a test supposedly measures the construct, or concept, that it claims to measure. For example, does this test actually measure a concept such as depression, locus of control, or self-esteem? The concept of construct validity has been extensively explored by Campbell and Fiske (1959), who proposed the multitrait-multimethod matrix for establishing the construct validity of a measure.

The kind of test validity that is perhaps the most important for police psychologists and other mental health practitioners, however, is the third kind, which is commonly referred to as *criterion-related validity*. This is the degree to which a particular measure can be used to predict some external criterion. For example, if scores on the MMPI-2 could be used to accurately predict termination for cause within police departments, then the MMPI-2 would be said to have criterion-related validity for that purpose. According to Kazdin (1998) psychologists use both concurrent validity (correlation with a measure at one point in time) and predictive validity (correlation with a measure at some point in the future) as ways of establishing the criterion-related validity of an instrument. Most police psychologists are concerned with the degree to which assessment instruments used as part of a psychological evaluation can be used to predict performance—either good or bad—at some point in the future, so predictive validity is the aspect of criterion-related validity most often explored by police psychologists. However, there are special issues with validating tests used for law enforcement purposes that make establishing their criterion-related (especially predictive) validity difficult.

PROBLEMS AND LIMITATIONS IN LAW ENFORCEMENT TEST RESEARCH

While tests used in psychological evaluations in law enforcement need to be validated for their predictive validity, particularly in the area of police selection, there are a number of limitations to research that must be overcome. A major limitation of such research is that pure predictive validity studies are not practical. A pure predictive validity study in the area of law enforcement would be one in which a wide variety of individuals obtained through random sampling are given a test and then hired as police officers; next, the data would be analyzed to determine if the test predicted either poor or good performance. However, such a procedure would undoubtedly expose police departments to lawsuits because hiring applicants using a random sampling procedure would result in individuals becoming police officers who exhibited performance problems. Given that law enforcement is a sensitive, high-risk profession in which officers have the right, under certain circumstances, to take life and liberty, such an approach to research would be highly impractical.

Another related limitation is that psychological evaluations are the last thing considered in making law enforcement hiring decisions. According to the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), such evaluations—even if mandated by law—can only be performed after all other factors have been considered and a conditional offer of employment has been extended to the candidate (Weiss, Weiss, & Gacono, 2008). While certain kinds of psychological tests can be given on a pre-offer basis (see, for example, Jones, Cunningham, & Dages, 2010), most psychological tests fall into the category of “medical tests” and therefore can only be used postoffer. While this restriction is obviously necessary to prevent discrimination, it also presents a challenge to law enforcement researchers because subjects who find their way into police validity studies tend to be more psychologically healthy than the rest of the general population (Weiss, Hitchcock, Weiss, Rostow, & Davis, 2008).

These problems, while unavoidable, create a situation in which criterion-related validity studies in police psychology lose power. Most data samples for research on police psychological evaluations consist of assessment data collected during the course of routine evaluations. As stated earlier, this means the sample has been highly preselected, and most individuals with unusual behavioral or

personality characteristics are already eliminated from the sample at earlier stages of the process. Therefore, the researcher must work with data samples that have extreme restrictions on predictor variables. As an example, the sample in the Weiss, Hitchcock, et al. (2008) study had mean PAI clinical scale scores that were a half standard deviation below the population mean, and most other criterion-related studies of police evaluations have similar sets of descriptive statistics. In addition, in making these preselections, we also limit the range of the criterion variables because most individuals in the sample wind up being excellent candidates for police work. For example, few candidates who are eventually hired will be terminated for cause, or engage in seriously problematic on-the-job behaviors because of the rigor of modern police-screening procedures. As a result of the truncation of range of both criterion and predictor variables, validation studies in police psychology lose a great deal of power, and effect sizes tend to be small.

THE ISSUE OF EFFECT IN CRITERION VALIDITY POLICE STUDIES

The issues described above make it clear that researchers, and consumers of research, must keep an open mind when reading and interpreting validity studies of police psychological evaluations. Moreover, small effect sizes in research can be highly significant when the stakes are high, as they are in police psychological evaluations. Making an error in a pre-employment psychological evaluation can result in serious departmental liability problems—or even loss of life. Therefore, the researcher and consumer must carefully weigh results to determine the true significance of the findings. High correlations are rarely found in this kind of validation research, yet this does not mean that the tests discussed above have no predictive power. Rather, most studies suffer from truncation of range, and small effects can be highly important. A more thorough discussion of these issues can be found in Hitchcock, O’Conner, and Weiss (2010).

EVIDENCE FOR THE VALIDITY OF TESTS IN POLICE PSYCHOLOGICAL EVALUATIONS

Ethically, psychologists should not be using instruments in their evaluations that have no predictive power. According to APA guidelines, psychologists should follow the basic principles of evidence-based practice (American Psychological Association, 2002). For police psychological evaluations, what this means for the practitioner is that the tests used as part of the evaluation procedure have been proven to work for the purposes for which they are used. This emphasis is particularly important when using tests relating to personality and psychopathology, because in most cases (for example, the MMPI-2 and PAI), these tests were not originally developed for use with police populations. In such cases, being able to present evidence for the usefulness of such tests for police evaluations is crucial.

As stated earlier, although effect sizes in research on police psychological evaluations are small, in most cases these effects are small but significant. There are a number of measures for which extensive validation research exists and justifies their use. The remainder of this chapter is devoted to a discussion of the evidence for the validity of some of the most popular measures used in pre-employment police psychological evaluations. The authors hope readers will find this summary useful for justifying their own evidence-based practice. It should be noted that instruments originally developed as measures of personality and psychopathology will be dealt with separately from instruments originally designed for use with, and normed on police populations, as differences exist in how such instruments may be used and interpreted.

TESTS OF PERSONALITY AND PSYCHOPATHOLOGY

The MMPI-2

The MMPI-2 and its predecessor, the MMPI, have been used for years in the field of police psychology. In 1959, King, Norrell, and Erlandson published an article in which they attempted to use the

original MMPI to predict police academy grades. This article represents the first attempt to validate this test for personnel selection. Since that time, numerous validation articles have been published on the MMPI and MMPI-2 in police psychological evaluations (Weiss & Weiss, 2010). The MMPI was restandardized in 1989, and the resultant version, the MMPI-2, is the one in use today. It is similar to the original MMPI, but it has a more representative standardization sample, and item content has been revised so that objectionable items were deleted and archaic language updated. The test is interpreted using standard (T) scores, which have a mean of 50 and a standard deviation of 10. Any T score greater than 65 on the MMPI-2 is considered clinically significant and therefore noteworthy.

The main purpose of the MMPI-2 is the detection of psychopathology. Therefore, in accordance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, it is considered a *medical test* and is only considered appropriate for use in police selection after all other factors have been considered. However, its criterion validity for use as a postoffer screening measure has been relatively well established, particularly with regard to the validity scales. The use of the L (Lie) scale as a tool in postoffer police selection has been investigated by Weiss, Davis, Rostow, and Kinsman (2003). The hypotheses for the Weiss et al. (2003) study were taken primarily from earlier work by Herndon (1998) and Boes, Chandler, and Timm (1997), which suggested that individuals who obtain elevated L scale scores on the MMPI-2 tend to engage in problem behaviors if hired by police departments. In this study, which used a sample of 1,347 officers, it was discovered that high L scale scores were associated with future performance problems such as termination for cause, knowledge mistakes, failure to complete the requirements for traditional hire, and insubordination. While such candidates appear normal in a clinical interview, their denial, excessive sense of virtue, and lack of a sense of their own shortcomings make them poor candidates for a high-stress occupation such as police work. In addition, their high-L presentation may in part be due to attempts to conceal psychological adjustment problems. Weiss et al. (2003) recommend a raw score cutoff of eight for psychological screening. A follow-up study (Weiss, Weiss, Davis, & Rostow, 2010) has confirmed the usefulness of this cutoff score.

While research on the L scale as a tool in police selection has shown the usefulness of the scale, the clinical scales have presented a more mixed picture. A full review of the evidence for the use of the MMPI-2 Basic Scales, as well as other subscales and scales, can be found in Weiss and Weiss (2010) and is beyond the scope of the present chapter. However, Brewster and Stoloff (1999) have made the argument based on prior MMPI-2 research that any applicant obtaining a T score greater than 65 on any of the MMPI-2 Basic Scales (with the possible exception of scale 5) can be justifiably removed from the applicant pool. In addition, other studies—particularly that of Sellbom, Fischler, and Ben-Porath (2007)—have suggested the usefulness of the Basic Scales in the psychological screening of law enforcement officers.

Aamodt (2004), in his meta-analysis of test results in law enforcement selection, has presented a more modest picture of the ability of the MMPI-2 to discriminate between good and bad applicants. Aamodt states that Scale 9 (Ma) is significantly correlated but at a low level, with poor supervisor ratings of performance and poorer police academy grades as a law enforcement officer. Aamodt states that other Basic Scales produced insignificant results for a number of criterion variables in his meta-analysis. However, it should be noted that the truncation-of-range problems discussed earlier in the chapter are likely to be problems in such a meta-analysis; very few hired applicants actually develop performance problems, and very few applicants with extreme scores on the MMPI-2 even make it to the psychological evaluation phase due to ADA regulations. However, it does seem a relatively safe practice to eliminate individuals with extreme MMPI-2 clinical scale scores from the applicant pool, although such individuals are rare because of contemporary assessment practices. As stated earlier, most applicants with personality problems or levels of psychopathology that would cause elevated scores on MMPI-2 clinical scales are eliminated from the applicant pool at earlier stages of the hiring process. Those individuals given a psychological evaluation (the last procedure

in the hiring process) typically produce clinical (but not necessarily validity) scale scores that are within the normative range.

The Personality Assessment Inventory (PAI)

The Personality Assessment Inventory, or PAI (Morey, 2007), has been the subject of fairly extensive criterion-related validity research by the present authors in recent years. For the last 10 years, we have researched all of the validity scales as well as a number of the clinical scales that appeared related to law enforcement work. The PAI, like the MMPI-2, is a personality inventory oriented around measuring psychopathology, and it has several features that have made it generally appealing to most psychologists doing self-report evaluations. These features have caught the attention of police psychologists as well. It is shorter (344 as opposed to 567 items) and easier to read, and it has a 4-point scale for each item as opposed to a forced-choice true/false format. It also has scales that provide general diagnostic information—such as those measuring certain personality disorders—not generally in use on the MMPI-2.

The PAI takes a somewhat different approach to the assessment of profile validity than the MMPI-2. Two of its scales, Inconsistency (ICN) and Infrequency (INF), measure not a response style but rather whether an individual is paying attention to item content when taking the test. These are similar in function to the VRIN and TRIN scales on the MMPI-2. The VRIN scale on the MMPI-2 is a measure of random responding that compares a series of similar item pairs. Individuals who respond randomly to the MMPI-2 typically endorse these similar items in opposite directions due to inattention. The TRIN scale is a measure of all-true and all-false responding that compares items with similar content typically endorsed by subjects in opposite directions. The ICN scale also works by comparing item pairs with similar content, but INF is derived in a different manner from VRIN and TRIN. The INF scale consists of items infrequently endorsed by all subjects regardless of psychopathology. Individuals scoring high on these scales (ICN and INF) have generally produced PAI profiles that are invalid and are not interpretable, because they have answered randomly, or have trouble with attention or reading comprehension.

However, the two other validity scales on the PAI, Negative Impression (NIM) and Positive Impression (PIM), have been of much more interest to researchers. Studies by Weiss, Rostow, Davis, and Decoster-Martin (2004), and Weiss, Zehner, Davis, Rostow, and Decoster-Martin (2005) showed that elevated NIM scores are modestly correlated with problem performance as a police officer after hire. These studies discovered that high NIM officers engaged in neglect of duty, made conduct mistakes, and were more likely than other officers to receive reprimands from supervisors. While part of the NIM effect may have been due to associated elevations in clinical scales, these findings are interesting and useful for the police psychologist and suggest that high NIM scorers can be excluded from applicant pools.

Unlike the MMPI-2, in which the L-scale, a measure of positive impression management, has been associated with poor performance as a law enforcement officer, such findings have not been confirmed on the PAI with PIM. In fact, in the study by Weiss et al. (2004), higher scores on PIM were very modestly correlated with good performance as a police officer for some outcome variables. This finding is probably because research has shown that PIM measures a different aspect of impression management than the MMPI-2 L scale (Weiss, Serafino, & Serafino, 2000). PIM probably is a good measure of positive impression management; however, L is more a measure of deceptiveness.

Some criterion-related research has also been performed on the PAI clinical scales for purposes of law enforcement selection. The Antisocial (ANT) scales on the PAI have been relatively well researched for their ability to predict performance as a police officer. The Weiss et al. (2004) and Weiss et al. (2005) studies showed that the ANT full scale and its subscales (ANT-A/Antisocial Behaviors, ANT-E/Egocentricity, ANT-S/Stimulus Seeking) were associated with problem behaviors such as insubordination, excessive citizen complaints, neglect of duty, conduct mistakes, and termination for cause. Further investigation using a multiple regression format (Weiss et al., 2005)

showed that these scales can be used together to predict the performance of law enforcement personnel. This research evidence suggests that a case could be made to eliminate such individuals with high scores ($T \geq 70$) from the applicant pool in police selection work. Similarly, support for the criterion-related validity of the Aggression (AGG) scale and its subscales also exists due to the Weiss et al. (2004) study. This study suggested that clinically elevated scores on the AGG scale and its subscales (Physical Aggression/AGG-P, Aggressive Attitude/AGG-A, and Verbal Aggression/AGG-V) are associated with a number of negative performance characteristics.

As of this writing, one major study (Weiss, Hitchcock, et al., 2008) has been conducted on the PAI Borderline scales. This study also included the Drug and Alcohol scales as predictor variables as well. A total performance score that summed performance errors across 32 performance variables was used as the criterion variable. This study did not obtain significant results with the entire sample, but when a subsample of the 132 officers who exhibited the most on-the-job performance problems was used, significant correlations with poor performance were found for the Borderline Full Scale (BOR), BOR-N (Negative Relations), and DRG (Drug Use) scales. This study provides further support for the use of the PAI in the pre-employment screening of law enforcement officers.

Despite the extensive research on scales measuring validity, problem behaviors, personality disorders, and alcohol/drug use, virtually no peer-reviewed research exists supporting the criterion-related validity of the PAI scales that measure primarily Axis I psychopathology. However, this is not likely due to problems with the validity of these scales; rather, it is probably due to the issue, discussed earlier, of few individuals exhibiting such psychopathology ever getting to the psychological evaluation part of the hiring process in the first place. Weiss, Hitchcock, et al. (2008) comment on the fact that law enforcement candidates tend to produce profiles on self-report tests of psychopathology that have lower means than those found in normative samples, and very few individuals produce scale elevations. While new research should be conducted, this lack of research evidence speaks to the problems with criterion-related validity research discussed earlier.

The California Psychological Inventory (CPI)

The California Psychological Inventory (CPI) has become a popular pre-employment screening measure in recent years because it can be used alongside a test of psychopathology as a measure of more ordinary, commonplace personality characteristics. The CPI has 434 items and measures 20 dimensions of personality over four major areas of personality: measures of poise, measures of normative orientation and values, measures of cognitive and intellectual functioning, and measures of role and interpersonal style. Over the years, the CPI has proven to be one of the more popular measures used in pre-employment screening for police and security personnel. It was the second most widely used test for pre-employment screening in Super's (2006) survey of pre-employment screening instruments. Although this study was limited geographically (it mainly included departments in the southeastern United States), there is little question that it is popular because it is not a test of psychopathology and has been shown to be useful for pre-employment purposes. It has been frequently used in conjunction with tests of psychopathology so that psychologists will have one test oriented toward psychopathology (such as the PAI or MMPI-2) and one oriented toward more commonplace personality characteristics.

There have been multiple validation studies on the CPI. However, Aamodt (2004) ran a meta-analysis of studies of the CPI in predicting the criterion variables of performance ratings, academy performance, and discipline problems. This meta-analysis is probably the best overall summary of the efficacy of the CPI for police work. The meta-analysis for performance ratings was a rather large study as it involved between 13 and 17 studies, with overall N 's of between 1,072 and 1,400 participants. While most of the r 's in Aamodt's meta-analysis were small, as with most criterion-related police research, moderate correlations were found for the Tolerance and Intellectual Efficiency Scales, which produced some correlations above .20, which are fairly large effects in this type of research. According to Aamodt (2004), individuals scoring high in tolerance are tolerant, nonjudgmental, and

resourceful; those scoring high in Intellectual Efficiency are intelligent, clear thinking, and capable. According to Aamodt (2004), these are desirable characteristics in law enforcement officers, and low scorers on these scales at times have performance problems; similarly, officers high in these characteristics tend to do well on the job and are well liked by supervisors. Certainly, a case can be made for using the CPI—particularly these two scales—in the pre-employment screening of law enforcement officers.

TESTS DESIGNED FOR LAW ENFORCEMENT POPULATIONS

The Inwald Personality Inventory (IPI)

The Inwald Personality Inventory (Inwald, 1982) was the first test developed and validated for the psychological screening of applicants for high-risk occupations. Inwald (2008) has extensively documented the process of development and validation of the IPI, so users of this test are strongly encouraged to consult her article for a thorough understanding of the criterion-related validity of the IPI. However, a brief description of the validity of the IPI is presented here. The IPI is a 310-item true/false self-report inventory that focuses mainly on admitted past behavior patterns in an attempt to predict future job-related behaviors (Inwald, 2008). Particular emphasis was placed on admissions of past antisocial behaviors during the development of this test. When initially published, the test had the advantage of a very large normative sample of more than 2,500 law enforcement candidates, and early research on the IPI showed considerable promise. According to Inwald (2008), an independent meta-analysis conducted using the IPI studies available in 1991 (Ones, Viswesveran, Schmidt, & Schultz, 1991; Ones, Viswesveran, & Schmidt, 1993) revealed a very respectable validity coefficient of .37 for prediction of future job performance.

Since the early 1990s, multiple validity studies have been conducted on the IPI. Because of space concerns, we will not list all of these studies here. However, the police psychologist interested in gaining a thorough understanding of the validity behind the IPI is strongly encouraged to consult Inwald's (2008) article, which contains a thorough list of abstracts related to validity research on the IPI. In addition, Inwald has developed multiple other measures that are often used in police psychology, and a thorough discussion of these can be found in this article as well. The IPI continues to be the most popular of the Inwald–Hilson measures for police psychological assessment (see, for example, Super, 2006).

The Matrix-Predictive Uniform Law Enforcement Selection Evaluation Inventory (M-PULSE)

An exciting new addition to the battery of tests available to the police psychologist is the Matrix-Predictive Uniform Law Enforcement Selection Evaluation Inventory, commonly known as the M-PULSE (Davis & Rostow, 2008).

The M-PULSE is a 455-item inventory scored on a four-point scale that focuses primarily on identifying law enforcement officer candidates at risk for specific liabilities most frequently associated with performance problems as a law enforcement officer. The M-PULSE consists of 18 liability scales that focus on these specific areas such as Potential for Termination and Criminal Conduct. It also has four empirical scales, each with a series of subscales, that assess personality characteristics and attitudes that could negatively influence law enforcement work. These are Negative Self-Issues, Negative Perceptions Related to Law Enforcement, Unethical Behavior, and Unpredictability. The M-PULSE also has two validity scales to assess the degree to which the examinee responds in an open and honest fashion. While the M-PULSE is a new instrument in the field of police selection, the results for correct classification of various future performance problems as a law enforcement officer using the liability scales have been particularly impressive. The classification rates for each performance problem using these scales are presented in detail in the M-PULSE manual (Davis &

Rostow, 2008) based on the norming sample of 2,000 officers. While further validation research on the M-PULSE is currently conducted, this test appears to present an actuarial method for identifying officer candidates who are at risk for potential performance problems.

Other Measures

This review has attempted to take into account the most popular and recent measures used for police evaluations and to provide the reader with some understanding of the basis for their criterion validity. However, many measures have been used in the psychological assessment of law enforcement officers. For example, other tests such as the 16PF and Wonderlic Personnel Test have sometimes been used, but probably not with the frequency of the tests reviewed above. In recent years, there has been some discussion in the literature regarding the potential use of the Rorschach Comprehensive System in police psychological evaluations, mainly due to the fact that it is less susceptible to attempts at impression management than most other self-report tests (Brewster, Wickline, & Stoloff, 2010; Weiss, 2002; Weiss, Weiss, & Gacono, 2008). While the Rorschach certainly has a great deal of potential, the process of conducting validation research has been slow, and much research needs to be performed to establish its criterion validity in police psychological evaluations. The psychologist wishing to use tests for evaluations should be aware of their established validity for the type of evaluation that he or she is conducting, especially with those instruments encountered less frequently in police work.

CONCLUSION

In this chapter, we discussed the importance of criterion-related validity in police psychological evaluations. Clearly, in making decisions regarding such issues as selection of law enforcement personnel, the psychologist should be aware of the ability of a chosen test to perform a particular function. Fortunately, criterion-related validity studies exist for the vast majority of tests currently used in police psychological evaluations. A brief review of the criterion-related validity data for a number of the most popular and recent tests is presented here. However, we encourage readers to investigate these issues further and to become knowledgeable consumers of research on the tests they utilize in clinical practice.

REFERENCES

- Aamodt, M. G. (2004). *Research in law enforcement selection*. Boca Raton, FL: Brown Walker.
- American Psychological Association. (2002). Ethical principles of examiners and code of conduct. *American Psychologist*, 57, 1060–1073.
- Boes, J. O., Chandler, C. J., & Timm, H. W. (1997). *Police integrity: Use of personality measures to identify corruption-prone officers*. Monterey, CA: Defense Personnel Security Research Center.
- Brewster, J., & Stoloff, M. L. (1999). Using the good cop/bad cop profile with the MMPI-2. *Journal of Police and Criminal Psychology*, 14(2), 29–34.
- Brewster, J., Wickline, P. W., & Stoloff, M. L. (2010). Using the Rorschach Comprehensive System in police psychology. In P. A. Weiss (Ed.), *Personality assessment in police psychology: A 21st century perspective* (pp. 188–226). Springfield, IL: Charles C Thomas.
- Campbell, D. T., & Fiske, D. W. (1959). Convergent and discriminant validation by the multitrait multimethod matrix. *Psychological Bulletin*, 56, 81–105.
- Davis, R. D., & Rostow, C. D. (2008). *M-PULSE Inventory: Matrix-Predictive Uniform Law Enforcement Selection Evaluation Inventory Technical*. Toronto: MHS.
- Herndon, J. (1998, October). *Correlates of the MMPI-2 L Scale: Elevations in an LEO selection test battery*. Paper presented at the 27th annual meeting of the Society for Police and Criminal Psychology, Portland, OR.
- Hitchcock, J. H., O'Conner, R., & Weiss, P. A. (2010). Effect sizes in police psychology personality assessment research: A primer. In P. A. Weiss (Ed.), *Personality assessment in police psychology: A 21st century perspective* (pp. 250–278). Springfield, IL: Charles C Thomas.

- Inwald, R. E. (1982). *Inwald Personality Inventory (IPI) technical manual*. New York: Hilson Research, Inc. (Reprinted [2008], Chicago IL: IPAT, Inc., a subsidiary of OPP Ltd.)
- Inwald, R. E. (2008). The Inwald Personality Inventory (IPI) and Hilson Research inventories: Development & rationale. *Journal of Aggression and Violent Behavior, 13*, 298–327.
- Jones, J. W., Cunningham, M. R., & Dages, K. D. (2010). Pre-offer police integrity testing: Scientific foundation and professional issues (pp. 159–187). In P. A. Weiss (Ed.), *Personality assessment in police psychology: A 21st century perspective*. Springfield, IL: Charles C Thomas.
- Kazdin, A. (1998). *Research design in clinical psychology* (3rd ed.). Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- King, P., Norrell, G., & Erlandson, F. L. (1959). The prediction of academic success in a police administration curriculum. *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 19*, 649–651.
- Morey, L. C. (2007). *Personality Assessment Inventory: Professional manual* (2nd ed.). Lutz, FL: Psychological Assessment Resources.
- Ones, D. S., Viswesveran, C., & Schmidt, F. L. (1993). Comprehensive meta-analysis of integrity test validation: Findings and implications for personnel selection and theories of job performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 78*, 679–703.
- Ones, D. S., Viswesveran, C., Schmidt, F. L., & Schultz, S. D. (1991). *Meta-analysis results for criterion-related validity of the Inwald Personality Inventory*. Unpublished manuscript, University of Iowa, Department of Management and Organizations.
- Sellbom, M., Fischler, G. L., & Ben-Porath, Y. S. (2007). Identifying MMPI-2 predictors of police officer integrity and misconduct. *Criminal Justice and Behavior, 34*, 985–1004.
- Super, J. T. (2006). A survey of pre-employment psychological evaluation tests and procedures. *Journal of Police and Criminal Psychology, 21*(2), 83–90.
- Weiss, P. A. (2002). Potential uses of the Rorschach in the selection of police officers. *Journal of Police and Criminal Psychology, 17*(2), 63–70.
- Weiss, P. A., Hitchcock, J. H., Weiss, W. U., Rostow, C., & Davis, R. (2008). The Personality Assessment Inventory borderline, drug, and alcohol scales as predictors of overall performance in police officers: A series of exploratory analyses. *Policing and Society, 18*, 301–310.
- Weiss, P. A., & Weiss, W. U. (2010). Using the MMPI-2 in police psychological assessment. In P. A. Weiss (Ed.), *Personality assessment in police psychology: A 21st century perspective* (pp. 59–71). Springfield, IL: Charles C Thomas.
- Weiss, P. A., Weiss, W. U., & Gacono, C. B. (2008). The use of the Rorschach in police psychology: Some preliminary thoughts. In C. B. Gacono & F. B. Evans (Eds.), *The handbook of forensic Rorschach assessment* (pp. 527–542). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Weiss, W. U. (2010). Procedural considerations in security personnel selection. In P. A. Weiss (Ed.), *Personality assessment in police psychology: A 21st century perspective* (pp. 299–316). Springfield, IL: Charles C Thomas.
- Weiss, W. U., Davis, R., Rostow, C., & Kinsman, S. (2003). The MMPI-2 L scale as a tool in police selection. *Journal of Police and Criminal Psychology, 18*(1), 57–60.
- Weiss, W. U., Rostow, C., Davis, R., & Decoster-Martin, E. (2004). The Personality Assessment Inventory as a selection device for law enforcement personnel. *Journal of Police and Criminal Psychology, 19*(2), 23–29.
- Weiss, W. U., Serafino, G., & Serafino, A. (2000). A study of the interrelationships of several validity scales used in police selection. *Journal of Police and Criminal Psychology, 15*(1), 41–44.
- Weiss, W. U., Weiss, P. A., Davis, R. D., & Rostow, C. D. (2010, March). *Exploring the MMPI-2 L scale cutoff in police selection*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Society for Personality Assessment, San Jose, CA.
- Weiss, W. U., Zehner, S. N., Davis, R. D., Rostow, C., & Decoster-Martin, E. (2005). Problematic police performance and the Personality Assessment Inventory. *Journal of Police and Criminal Psychology, 20*(1), 16–21.