



Personality Assessment Inventory™

Law Enforcement, Corrections, and
Public Safety Selection Report

by Michael D. Roberts, PhD, ABPP

Identifying Information

Name : Sample Client	ID number : 4321
Age : -Not Specified-	Date of testing : 05/13/2013
Ethnicity : Caucasian	Gender : Male
Highest level of education: 12	
Previous psychological testing : Never	
Reason for testing : Job Application	
Position applying for or currently occupying: Police Officer, Deputy, Trooper	
Current/previous public safety employment: No Related Experience	

This report is intended for use by qualified professionals only and is not to be shared with the examinee or any other unqualified persons

PAR • 16204 N. Florida Ave. • Lutz, FL 33549 • 1.800.331.8378 • www.parinc.com

The Personality Assessment Inventory, Copyright © 1989, 1990, 1991 by PAR. All rights reserved. PAI Law Enforcement, Corrections, and Public Safety Selection Report, Copyright © 1995, 1996, 1997, 1999, 2000 by Michael D. Roberts, PhD, and PAR. All rights reserved. May not be reproduced in whole or in part in any form or by any means without written permission of PAR.

Version: 3.20.072

Interpretive Caveats

The PAI® Law Enforcement, Corrections, and Public Safety Selection Report is based on administration of the full Personality Assessment Inventory™ (PAI; Morey, 1991). This special report supplements the basic PAI clinical instrument with a number of innovative features designed to improve the accuracy of employment screening decisions in the public safety field.

One of the primary objectives of psychologists who conduct psychological screening of public safety officers is to identify and screen out emotionally unstable applicants. The PAI is particularly well suited to this task. Although almost all applicants for these job classifications will meet minimum emotional stability standards, a significant proportion of applicants display personality traits and characteristics that render them poorly suited to perform essential job functions in the public safety field. This special PAI-based report, which is linked to screening-relevant criteria, is very useful to the evaluating psychologist.

The PAI and this special report should be viewed as only *one* component of a comprehensive screening procedure that should also include at least one other psychological test based on normal personality functioning. A comprehensive personal history questionnaire and a structured interview focused on job-relevant behavior are recommended. The hiring authority's final screening decision should be based on corroborating information gathered from multiple data sources.

Interpretation of the PAI Law Enforcement, Corrections, and Public Safety Selection Report is solely the province of qualified professionals. Interpretation requires familiarity with the PAI and an understanding of the information contained in the Professional Issues chapter of the manual. The usefulness and validity of the PAI Law Enforcement, Corrections, and Public Safety Selection Report is directly related to the knowledge and experience of the qualified professional who interprets this report.

Summary of Psychological Test Results

1. Psychological rating risk factor statement

This Risk Factor statement indicates the likelihood (probability) that the current applicant would be rated as “Poorly Suited” for the job by psychologists with expertise in law enforcement, corrections, and public safety screening.

	Probability	Risk level
Psychological rating risk factor	12 %	Low risk of receiving “poorly suited” rating

2. Critical Items with job-relevant content endorsed by this applicant

Job applicants for public safety positions rarely endorse PAI items at critical levels. It is important to consider the extent and nature of Critical Item endorsement(s) by an applicant when interpreting the PAI Law Enforcement, Corrections, and Public Safety Selection Report. The following table presents the total number of Critical Items endorsed at a level that may indicate job-relevant concerns, the associated percentile value (when compared to the total applicant normative sample), and the interpretive range.

	No. of items endorsed	Percentile	Interpretive range
Critical Items endorsed	5	33rd	Below the average of 10 items.

3. Likelihood of a negative behavioral history in job-relevant domains

The values in the following table indicate the likelihood (probability) that a personal history review with the applicant will elicit admissions of past problem behavior that police and public safety hiring authorities regard as possible negative indicators for the screening decision. These probability statements must be compared with other data sources such as the interview, background information, or polygraph results when formulating a selection recommendation. Refer to the Professional Issues chapter of the manual for additional information about the behaviors and cutoff scores used to define each job-relevant domain.

Job-relevant behavioral domain	Likelihood of problem behavior	
	Probability	Risk Level
Job-related problems	27 %	Moderate
Integrity problems	37 %	Moderate
Anger management problems	30 %	Moderate
Alcohol use concerns	22 %	Low
Illegal drug use concerns	6 %	Low
Substance abuse proclivity	32 %	Moderate

4. T Scores for PAI Full Scales based on the community sample and public safety applicant norms

Norm group	SOM	AN X	AR D	DEP	MA N	PAR	SCZ	BOR	AN T	ALC	DR G	AG G	SUI	STR	NO N
Community	43	36	40	35	54	36	32	34	40	47	42	36	43	37	37
Public safety	53	40	50	39	59	40	36	39	41	54	43	39	46	38	42

Name: Client, Sample

Age: -Not Specified-

ID: 4321


Gender: Male

Ethnic group: Caucasian

Test Date: 05/13/2013


5. PAI Full Scale profile based on public safety applicant and community sample norms

0 Items Omitted




Note. This profile is based on calculations from all applicants in the screening process, regardless of the final selection decision. Ethnic group used for gender- by ethnic-specific profile is Caucasian Male. Refer to the Professional Issues chapter of the manual for the gender by ethnicity group sample sizes. T scores based on public safety applicant norms are often more elevated than those based upon community norms. The relatively homogeneous response to the PAI items by most public safety applicants results in noticeable elevations for those who answer atypically. This feature is useful to the screening psychologist by identifying scale domains and specific items (see Critical Items section of the report) to pursue during the interview. Although the public safety applicant T scores are strongly linked to job-relevant screening criteria and may be used to support the screening decision, it is not appropriate to assume a link between these scores and the standard clinical interpretations that have been established for the community-based norms.

6. PAI Subscale profile based on public safety applicant and community sample norms




Note. This profile is based on calculations from all applicants in the screening process, regardless of the final selection decision. Ethnic group used for gender- by ethnic-specific profile is Caucasian Male. Refer to the Professional Issues chapter of the manual for the gender by ethnic group sample sizes.

7. PAI Full Scale profile based on norms for hired, post-probationary police officers, deputies, and troopers



Note. n = 2,487. This profile is based on norms calculated from applicants who passed all screening criteria, were hired, and have served as sworn police officers, deputies or troopers for at least 1 year. This profile is also generated without regard to gender or ethnicity.

8. PAI Subscale profile based on norms for hired, post-probationary police officers, deputies, and troopers



Note. n = 2,487. This profile is based on norms calculated from applicants who passed all screening criteria, were hired, and have served as sworn police officers, deputies or troopers for at least 1 year. This profile is also generated without regard to gender or ethnicity.

9. Job-relevant Critical Item endorsements

This applicant endorsed the following items at a level that may indicate job-relevant concerns. Note that these items are clustered under the scale or subscale heading to which they belong. The total number of items included in the scale or subscale is printed after the scale name, followed by the public safety *T* score based on the total applicant sample. Below the scale heading is a list of these items beginning with the item number, the item statement, the level of endorsement (i.e., F, ST, MT, and VT), and the percentage of the applicant normative sample who endorsed that item at the same level as the applicant.

Psychologists who are experts in public safety screening agree that the content of these items, which are rarely endorsed in the reported manner by public safety job applicants, may indicate the presence of psychological traits or characteristics that could affect job performance. One should use caution when interpreting these item responses because single items are not as reliable as the scales to which they belong. During the interview, it is useful to discuss selected item endorsements with the applicant to rule out any mismarks or misunderstandings.

Number of Critical Items endorsed = 5

ALC - Alcohol Problems/12 items (PS *T* = 54)

15. Sometimes I feel guilty about how much I drink. (VT, 1%)

RXR - Treatment Rejection/8 items (PS *T* = 52)

282. I can solve my problems by myself. (F, 6%)

SOM-H - Health Concerns/8 items (PS *T* = 63)

172. I've had only the usual health problems that most people have. (F, 12%)

ARD-P - Phobias/8 items (PS *T* = 56)

266. I will not ride in airplanes. (MT, 1%)


ANT-A - Antisocial Behaviors/8 items (PS *T* = 47)

251. I've never been in trouble with the law. (F, 15%)

10. Omitted items

This section presents the items the applicant left unanswered. The profile should be considered invalid if 18 or more items have not been answered. This applicant omitted 0 items.

11. PAI Interpersonal Style Circumplex



PAI community-based T scores

PAI public safety applicant-based T scores

Assessment of interpersonal style using the PAI is based upon Leary’s (1957) interpersonal circumplex model. This model requires identification of two dimensions of personality that are central to human interaction, but not correlated with one another. By considering these two orthogonal scales in combination, the circumplex model characterizes one’s preferred manner of interacting with others into one of four quadrants. Morey (1996) suggests using the PAI Dominance and Warmth scales in this manner to generate the quadrant types displayed above. An associated aspect of the theory is the principle of *complementarity*, which suggests that every interpersonal behavior has a complement; this complement is the natural reaction of others to the initial behavior demonstrated by the individual in question. *This notion appears to have value in the assessment of public safety applicants’ suitability for essential job functions such as teamwork, interpersonal sensitivity, acceptance of criticism, and self control. Because this type of information was not included in the calculation of the risk factors presented on page 2 of this report, it may offer an additional perspective to consider during the interview.*

Warm Control: 70% of public safety applicants are placed in this category using the PAI community norms.

Morey (1996) indicates that individuals whose T scores fall into this quadrant, and who are at average levels (T = 45-55) on both the Dominance and Warmth scales, are likely to be autonomous and well balanced in their expression of assertiveness, friendliness, and concern for others. Those with T scores of 56 to 65 on both scales are generally friendly, extraverted, and quick to help others who need help. However, very high T scores (T > 65) on both scales suggest that the individual’s need for affiliation and attention may result in attempts to control and interfere in social interactions with others. Public safety applicants, particularly those high on both scales, should be interviewed carefully to rule out a history of behavior that is viewed as abrasive, intrusive, challenging, demeaning, or confrontational. Applicants classified in this quadrant are the least likely to be rated as “poorly suited” by psychologists experienced in public safety screening. These applicants are also less likely to report negative background data.

12. PAI item responses

1.	VT	44.	F	87.	F	130.	F	173.	F	216.	F	259.	VT	302.	F
2.	F	45.	F	88.	VT	131.	F	174.	VT	217.	ST	260.	F	303.	F
3.	F	46.	F	89.	F	132.	F	175.	F	218.	MT	261.	F	304.	F
4.	F	47.	F	90.	F	133.	VT	176.	MT	219.	VT	262.	F	305.	F
5.	F	48.	ST	91.	F	134.	F	177.	F	220.	F	263.	F	306.	VT
6.	F	49.	F	92.	F	135.	F	178.	VT	221.	VT	264.	F	307.	VT
7.	F	50.	F	93.	VT	136.	F	179.	F	222.	F	265.	F	308.	F
8.	MT	51.	F	94.	VT	137.	F	180.	F	223.	F	266.	MT	309.	F
9.	F	52.	F	95.	F	138.	ST	181.	F	224.	F	267.	VT	310.	VT
10.	F	53.	VT	96.	VT	139.	VT	182.	F	225.	MT	268.	VT	311.	F
11.	VT	54.	F	97.	F	140.	F	183.	F	226.	ST	269.	F	312.	F
12.	F	55.	F	98.	F	141.	F	184.	F	227.	VT	270.	VT	313.	VT
13.	VT	56.	VT	99.	F	142.	VT	185.	VT	228.	ST	271.	F	314.	F
14.	F	57.	F	100.	F	143.	F	186.	VT	229.	VT	272.	F	315.	F
15.	VT	58.	F	101.	F	144.	ST	187.	F	230.	VT	273.	F	316.	F
16.	VT	59.	F	102.	F	145.	F	188.	F	231.	F	274.	F	317.	VT
17.	F	60.	F	103.	VT	146.	VT	189.	F	232.	F	275.	F	318.	VT
18.	MT	61.	F	104.	F	147.	F	190.	VT	233.	F	276.	F	319.	VT
19.	F	62.	F	105.	F	148.	VT	191.	F	234.	F	277.	VT	320.	VT
20.	F	63.	VT	106.	F	149.	F	192.	F	235.	VT	278.	F	321.	F
21.	F	64.	F	107.	F	150.	F	193.	MT	236.	F	279.	F	322.	F
22.	F	65.	F	108.	MT	151.	ST	194.	F	237.	VT	280.	F	323.	F
23.	F	66.	F	109.	VT	152.	VT	195.	F	238.	F	281.	F	324.	F
24.	F	67.	F	110.	F	153.	F	196.	F	239.	F	282.	F	325.	F
25.	F	68.	VT	111.	F	154.	F	197.	VT	240.	VT	283.	F	326.	VT
26.	F	69.	F	112.	VT	155.	F	198.	F	241.	F	284.	F	327.	F
27.	F	70.	F	113.	F	156.	F	199.	F	242.	MT	285.	VT	328.	F
28.	VT	71.	F	114.	F	157.	F	200.	F	243.	F	286.	VT	329.	F
29.	F	72.	F	115.	VT	158.	F	201.	VT	244.	VT	287.	VT	330.	VT
30.	F	73.	F	116.	F	159.	F	202.	VT	245.	VT	288.	MT	331.	VT
31.	F	74.	F	117.	F	160.	VT	203.	F	246.	VT	289.	F	332.	F
32.	F	75.	VT	118.	F	161.	VT	204.	F	247.	MT	290.	VT	333.	VT
33.	F	76.	MT	119.	F	162.	F	205.	F	248.	ST	291.	VT	334.	VT
34.	F	77.	VT	120.	F	163.	F	206.	F	249.	F	292.	ST	335.	F
35.	F	78.	F	121.	F	164.	VT	207.	F	250.	F	293.	VT	336.	F
36.	MT	79.	F	122.	F	165.	F	208.	F	251.	F	294.	VT	337.	ST
37.	VT	80.	VT	123.	F	166.	F	209.	F	252.	VT	295.	VT	338.	F
38.	F	81.	VT	124.	VT	167.	F	210.	F	253.	VT	296.	VT	339.	F
39.	F	82.	F	125.	VT	168.	ST	211.	VT	254.	F	297.	MT	340.	F
40.	F	83.	F	126.	F	169.	F	212.	F	255.	F	298.	VT	341.	VT
41.	VT	84.	F	127.	VT	170.	F	213.	F	256.	ST	299.	VT	342.	VT
42.	F	85.	MT	128.	VT	171.	F	214.	F	257.	ST	300.	F	343.	VT
43.	F	86.	F	129.	F	172.	F	215.	F	258.	F	301.	VT	344.	ST

*** End of Report ***