

# **Personality as a Predictor of Military Suitability**

**Michael R. Stowers**

**Institute for Personality and Ability Testing**

**Jennifer L. Thompson**

**The Chicago School of Professional Psychology**

*Military and paramilitary screening utilizes clinical interviews to screen recruits for suitability, which are costly and time consuming compared to written assessments. This study examined whether the dimensions of Emotional Adjustment, Integrity/Control, Intellectual Efficiency, and Interpersonal Relations from the 16PF Protective Services Report predicted recruits' interview score in order to provide a cheaper alternative. Data from 267 civilian police recruits was used to determine if the dimensions were predictive of interview score. The study found that Intellectual Efficiency and Interpersonal Relations predicted recruits' interview score. Implications for including the PSR in military and paramilitary selection are discussed.*

## **INTRODUCTION**

Military testing has traditionally focused on classifying applicants based on intelligence and ability (Waters, 1997). While often including pathology measures to screen out recruits, normal personality has rarely been taken into account (Hunt, Wittson, & Harris, 1944; Wigdor, Garner, & National Research Council Committee on Ability Testing, 1982). The typical military recruit must pass a written cognitive ability test and psychological interview, designed to “screen out” abnormal personality. The lack of understanding of normal personality and the over-emphasis placed on intelligence in the early 20<sup>th</sup> century may have contributed to this omission. However, with the creation of the normal personality tests, such as the 16 Personality Factor Test (16PF) created by Cattell (1945), the ease with which personality could be measured was increased.

Two other issues contribute to the need to assess normal personality traits in military settings. First, the changing role of military personnel from warfighter to international peacekeeper demands a different kind of individual. Second, the expanded use of private paramilitary contractors and civilian police in overseas deployment increases the need to ensure that those serving are suitable. Paramilitary organizations are those that have a military structure, but do not operate as part of the armed forces. Adding personality to the current assessment strategy can provide the military and contracting organizations with a more complete picture of their members, ensuring the safety of not only their units, but of the populations where they are deployed as well.

The way wars are fought is no longer the same as it was when military testing was first implemented, which begs the questions of whether or not the model can be improved. The differences are that the

definition of the enemy is no longer clear and the military is being forced outside of their normal role and duties.

Historically wars were fought between clearly defined enemies. However, from the Vietnam War through the ongoing war in Iraq, enemy tactics have changed (Alexander, 2005). There are no clear definitions of the “bad guy” and this puts a completely new type of stress on personnel serving in these conflicts. Second, guerilla warfare, or what the military refers to as asymmetric warfare, is the common method of fighting now, where anyone at anytime can be the enemy (Gray, 2004). These small unit actions are not the clear-cut battlefields of the past.

Another strain on the armed forces is the increasing expansion of their duties. The armed forces are trained to be a combat force, not trained as peacekeepers, but find themselves in the role of peacekeepers more and more (Noyes, 1995). They may also be pressed into service as prison guards for the same enemy combatants they were trained to kill. Together, these new responsibilities stretch personnel beyond their training and often beyond the skills they were tested for when enlisting (Gordon, 2006).

Furthermore, armed forces are being supplemented by what are known as paramilitary and civilian police personnel. These persons are employed by private organizations and receive training different to those enlisted in the armed forces. Often times the two forces, enlisted and private, are deployed along side one another and are required to work together (Gomez del Prado, 2008). There can often be conflict between these groups as they are not only trained differently, but they have different incentives as well (Michaels, 2004). This conflict can prevent the necessary communication between the two forces, and complicate the oversight necessary to ensure mission completion.

Given the changes described above it can be seen that military and paramilitary personnel will need to possess certain traits to help them succeed. By being stress-resilient they could be better prepared for the stress encountered on an asymmetric battlefield. Also, it will be necessary to have the ability to make decisions with limited information and have the ability to be confident in those decisions. Finally, the ability to interact with others, including those who are vastly different from oneself, is crucial to adapting to the new partnerships seen in warfare. Normal psychological traits, such as emotional adjustment, intellectual efficiency, interpersonal relations as well as integrity and control could help both military and paramilitary organizations “screen in” the most suitable candidates.

Unfortunately, evidence is beginning to show that personnel, both enlisted and private, are lacking the qualities necessary to perform well. In 2007, 14 members of a 27-member team of the private security company Blackwater were accused of killing 17 Iraqi civilians during an unauthorized traffic blockade (World News Digest, 2008). The team was investigating an alleged car bombing when they attempted to stop a car. They opened fire on the car and continued to shoot nearby civilians, even shooting an unarmed man as he tried to surrender (World News Digest, 2008). There were 13 exonerated members of this team that were reported to behave opposite to the 14 implicated. What were the differences between these two groups?

Although the personnel, including the 14 implicated, had passed all selection and screening tests, the Blackwater incident suggests there could be some fundamental difference between the two that caused them to behave so drastically different. Could the difference have been their fit in terms of normal personality? This case helps to illustrate that screening military and paramilitary personnel for the absence of mental impairment may not be a sufficient selection method, given what we know of the changing demands of military personnel.

In April of 2004, evidence surfaced of US armed forces personnel abusing and torturing Iraqi prisoners at the Abu Gharib facility in Iraq. Those involved were charged with a variety of crimes and recommended for court martial (World News Digest, 2004). These soldiers had passed all the traditional ability measures, but there was no testing to indicate whether their personalities were ideal to cope with this type of stress. Together, this creates an implication that there could be non-pathological characteristics outside of cognitive ability that account for why a person may act inappropriately while in a position of authority.

Examples like these help to illustrate the current procedure of screening enlisted and private military personnel based on cognitive ability and lack of pathology is insufficient. In order to preserve the safety

of the civilians and the reputation of the US forces stationed there, it is imperative that events like the Blackwater killings and Abu Gharib abuse be prevented. Personality testing has a place in helping to make sure these events are not repeated. By evaluating the ways in which people will interact on a constant basis, as well as looking at whether or not an individual possess the key normal personality characteristics identified for success in protective services positions situations like these can be prevented in the future.

Given the shortcomings in the current pathology-only screening model, the changing job requirements, and the inclusion of paramilitary forces, the current military selection methods are costly and may not be anymore valid than self-report assessment procedures based on normal personality. The major disadvantages of the psychologist interview in military and paramilitary selection are the investments of large amounts of money and personnel time. In 2008, the military added 195,972 new recruits (Department of Defense, 2009). The resources required to provide the psychological screening to all of these recruits are quite large (Society for Industrial and Organization Psychologists, 2009). The result is a large expenditure in time of military psychologists and often the need to bring in civilian psychologists who may charge more than what the military would pay their own personnel. Although the interview model provides a good basis for selection, the question remains if there is a more efficient, cost effective, and equally valid way to screen recruits.

Self-report personality questionnaires that assess normal personality may present a way to conduct screening that is more efficient in terms of time and costs significantly less than interviewing (Society for Industrial and Organization Psychologists, 2009). Instead of conducting one-on-one interviews to determine suitability, assessments can be given to large groups at once. With the advent of computerized testing, there is also little need to purchase perishable materials. The use of a self-report personality assessment as a screening tool instead of the interview would not only save military and paramilitary organizations money, but it would also reduce the overall time to matriculate new recruits. A measure of normal personality could provide a viable screening assessment that reduces interpersonal bias that may be present in an interview (Dougherty, Turban & Callender, 1994) and adds additional information, such as integrity, that may be difficult if not impossible to assess in an interview.

The Protective Services Report (PSR) provides a specialized personality screening measure for use in military and private military contractor selection. The PSR was developed directly from the 16 Personality Factor Questionnaire (16PF) and as a result is grounded in normal personality theory. Furthermore, the specialized dimensions of the PSR have been shown to predict job outcomes relevant to the armed forces by the Institute for Personality and Ability Testing (IPAT) (2007). By looking at the normal personality characteristics, it becomes possible to move beyond a “psychologically unfit” screen-out model and to begin to look at what makes a successful protective services agent.

What sets the PSR apart from a standard 16PF interpretation report is the creation of four extra dimensions created exclusively for protective services positions. The four protective service dimensions were originally created from a content analysis of law enforcement literature (IPAT, 1987). The dimensions are made up of combinations of the 16PF’s primary factors.

Emotional adjustment is the first of the protective services dimensions and relates to how a person responds to challenging situations. A candidate who is emotionally adjusted will be better able to cope with the stress and challenges of the new battlefield. Integrity/control is the next dimension and evaluates whether the applicant is likely to act in a dependable and conscientious manner, suggesting the ability to follow orders and comply with established rules of engagement. Intellectual efficiency corresponds to the decision making style of the applicant and their ability to solve problems, indicating their ability to make and remain confident in the critical decisions they will have to make. The last protective services dimension is interpersonal relations, which evaluates how an applicant relates to others and their preference for solitude and independence, which could dictate how well the candidate will interact with different people and the degree to which they will effectively interact with civilians (IPAT, 2007.)

The four PSR dimensions have been shown to indicate success across different areas of military and paramilitary work. Criteria have included things such as training success, being hired, job knowledge, and

work behaviors (IPAT, 2007). These relationships help to demonstrate the use of the PSR dimensions as a screen in tool for selection.

As the clinical interview currently serves as the decision component as to whether a candidate is deployable or not, it is imperative to show that any potential replacement can replicate the results of that interview. Given the secure nature of military and paramilitary organizations, it is nearly impossible to obtain external criteria validation such as performance. Using the existing interview as the performance criteria for this study provides a known and organizationally accepted comparison for the screening ability of the PSR dimensions. The results of this study will begin to illuminate if the PSR has the potential to provide less costly and more efficient assessment alternative to the clinical interview, as well as potentially more useful information.

## **Hypotheses**

This study will test whether:

1. The PSR dimension of emotional adjustment will positively predict the clinical interview score.
2. The PSR dimension of integrity/control will positively predict the clinical interview score.
3. The PSR dimension of intellectual efficiency will positively predict the clinical interview score.
4. The PSR dimension of interpersonal relations will positively predict the clinical interview score.

Furthermore, the study will test through linear regression whether gender moderates the relationship between the PSR dimensions and the interview score. Evaluating the role of gender is important, as any selection procedure needs to be fair and free from adverse impact. Finally, the research question of whether the clinical interview score is more important to the overall recommendation will be explored by logistically regressing the overall recommendation on the PSR composite and the interview score.

## **METHOD**

### **Participants**

The sample consisted of 267 first-time recruits for paramilitary positions in various countries across the globe. The sample was predominantly male (84.6%) in makeup.

### **Measures**

The PSR is a specialty report generated from Raymond Cattell's 16PF that is used to select applicants for high-risk occupations, such as military and paramilitary service. The 16PF is a self-report measure of normal adult personality. The 16PF is written at a fifth grade reading level, and is currently in its fifth edition which, has a norm sample that approximates the demographic breakdown of the population from the 2000 U.S. Census. It is made up of 185 items, which comprise 16 primary factor scales and 5 global factors (IPAT, 1994). The PSR also reports 4 additional dimensions specific to performance in high-risk occupations: Emotional Adjustment, Integrity/Control, Intellectual Efficiency, and Interpersonal Relations.

The PSR dimensions are scored on the Sten scale. Scores of 3 or less are considered to be below average, with scores between 4 and 7 considered average, and 8 or greater being above average. Higher PSR dimension scores are considered to be better and represent a stronger embodiment of the trait.

#### *PSR Dimension: Emotional Adjustment*

Emotional adjustment and relates to how a person responds to challenging situations. High scorers tend to remain calm and act appropriately in uncertain situations. They also tend to be in control of their emotions during tense situations. Emotion adjustment has a linear composite reliability of .76 and a 7-month test-retest reliability of .83 in the norm sample. Reliabilities were not calculated for the study sample, as item level data was not made available.

### *PSR Dimension: Integrity/Control*

Integrity/Control evaluates whether the applicant is likely to act in a dependable and conscientious manner. High scorers tend to have well-developed standards of discipline and tend to be rule followers. They also tend to fulfill their duties and responsibilities. The integrity/control dimension has a linear composite reliability of .83 and a 7-month test-retest reliability of .77 in the norm sample. Reliabilities were not calculated for the study sample, as item level data was not made available.

### *PSR Dimension: Intellectual Efficiency*

Intellectual efficiency corresponds to the decision making style of the applicant and their ability to solve problems. High scorers are able to easily understand abstract issues, and tend to be quick and decisive when making decisions. The linear composite reliability of the intellectual efficiency dimension in the norm sample is .83, and a 7-month test-retest reliability of .71. Reliabilities were not calculated for the study sample, as item level data was not made available.

### *PSR Dimension: Interpersonal Relations*

Interpersonal Relations evaluates how an applicant relates to others and their preference for solitude and independence. High scorers tend to prefer working with others cooperatively and tend to value interaction. Interpersonal Relations has a linear composite reliability of .89 and 7-month test-retest reliability of .78 in the norm sample. Reliabilities were not calculated for the study sample, as item level data was not made available.

### *PSR Overall Score*

Candidates also receive an overall score for the PSR assessment. The overall score is the average of all 4 PSR dimensions. The overall score is used as a quick reference, as those with below average scores across the PSR dimensions will inevitably have low overall scores.

### *Clinical Interview*

The applicants were also assessed using a standardized interview. The interview was created for the clinical evaluation of the same dimensions as the PSR in order to create a clinical comparison and check of the four PSR dimensions. The interview consists of five questions. Four of the questions evaluate each of the respective four PSR dimensions, and the last question assesses the readiness of the recruit for service. Each question is rated on a 1 to 9 scale, with 1 being poor and 9 being exceptional. The scores for each question are summed together to create an overall score for the applicant, with a cutoff score for passing set at 25.

### *Final Recommendation*

After both assessments have been administered, a final recommendation of pass/fail is made. The Final Recommendation is a subjective judgment based on the psychologist's interpretations of the ratings from both the PSR and the interview.

### *Gender*

Gender is categorized as male and female. This variable will be used to assess whether gender plays a role in suitability ratings.

## **Procedure**

All data is archival data that was obtained by permission from IPAT. In order to examine the relationship between the four PSR dimensions and the interview score a multiple regression analysis was conducted. The interview score will be regressed onto the four dimensions in hope of finding a significant regression model. Gender will be included in a second regression model as a moderator to determine if it has a role on the overall test performance of the applicants. How much influence the clinical interview recommendation has on the final recommendation will be examined by using logistic regression. The

overall PSR score and interview score will be used to attempt to correctly classify the candidates' final recommendations made by the clinical psychologists.

## RESULTS

### PSR Regression

In order to test hypotheses 1 through 4 the interview score was regressed on the PSR dimensions of Emotional Adjustment, Integrity/Control, Intellectual Efficiency, and Interpersonal Relations. The multiple regression model was significant  $F(4, 261) = 16.57, p < .001$ . This suggests that the PSR dimension scores are able to predict the Interview Score for candidates. The regression model accounts for approximately 20% ( $R^2 = .20$ ) of the variance in the Interview Score.

Table 1 shows the descriptive statistics and correlations for all variables in the study. Table 2 shows coefficient results for each of the 4 PSR dimensions. From the table we can see Intellectual Efficiency is a significant predictor of Clinical Interview score,  $b = 1.00, t(261) = 4.12, p < .001$ . This result provides support for hypothesis three; Intellectual Efficiency will positively predict Clinical Interview score. This result means that as a candidate's Intellectual Efficiency increases, their Clinical Interview score will also tend to increase.

**TABLE 1**  
**STUDY VARIABLE CORRELATION MATRIX (N=267)**

	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	Gender	Emotional Adjustment	Integrity/Control	Intellectual Efficiency	Interpersonal Relations	PSR Composite	Interview Score
Gender	.15	.36							
Emotional Adjustment	8.11	1.38	-.14*						
Integrity/Control	7.10	1.79	-.12	.62**					
Intellectual Efficiency	6.47	1.64	-.03	.28**	-.18**				
Interpersonal Relations	6.34	1.71	-.04	.21**	.07	-.05			
PSR Composite	7.01	.97	-.13*	.85**	.64**	.41**	.52**		
Interview Score Final	34.73	6.06	.03	.34**	.15*	.29**	.25**	.42**	
Recommendation	.32	.82	-.01	-.31**	-.10	-.26**	-.33**	-.42**	-.49**

\* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level

\*\* Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level

**TABLE 2**  
**PSR DIMENSION REGRESSION COEFFICIENTS (N=267)**

PSR Dimension	<i>b</i>	SE	$\beta$	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>
Emotional Adjustment	.69	.37	.16	1.86	.06
Integrity/Control	.31	.27	.09	1.14	.25
Intellectual Efficiency	1.00	.24	.27	4.12	.00
Interpersonal Relations	.81	.20	.23	3.98	.00

Also it can also be seen that Interpersonal Relations is a significant predictor of Clinical Interview score,  $b = .81, t(261) = 3.98, p < .001$ . This result provides support for hypothesis four; Interpersonal

Relations will positively predict Clinical Interview score. This result means that as a candidate's Interpersonal Relations score also increases, their interview score will also tend to increase

Hypothesis one, Emotional Adjustment will positively predict Clinical Interview score, was not supported. However, the results approach traditional significance  $b = .69, t(261) = 1.86, p = .06$ . This may indicate a trend that would be significant in a larger sample. Hypothesis two, Integrity/Control will positively predict Clinical Interview score was also not supported.

### Gender Moderation

In order to test the hypotheses that gender does not moderate the relationship between the PSR dimensions and Clinical Interview score, another regression was run. In addition to the PSR variables, four moderation vectors were included in the regression. These vectors were created by multiplying each participant's PSR dimension scores by their gender code.

The resulting regression model was significant  $F(8, 257) = 9.04, p < .001$ . The model accounted for 22% ( $R^2 = .22$ ) of the variance in Clinical Interview score. However, none of the moderation vectors were significant predictors of the Clinical Interview score. This means that gender does not determine the relationship between the PSR dimensions and the candidate's interview score. These results provide support for hypothesis five that gender will not moderate the PSR dimension and Clinical Interview relationship. Table 3 shows the resulting coefficients for the regression.

**TABLE 3**  
**GENDER MODERATION REGRESSION COEFFICIENTS (N=267)**

PSR Dimension	<i>b</i>	SE	$\beta$	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>
Emotional Adjustment	.57	.41	.13	1.39	.17
Integrity/Control	.26	.29	.08	.90	.37
Intellectual Efficiency	1.17	.27	.32	4.40	.00
Interpersonal Relations	.87	.22	.25	4.05	.00
Emotion Adjustment x Gender	.12	.99	.05	.12	.91
Integrity/Control x Gender	.71	.81	.29	.88	.38
Intellectual Efficiency x Gender	-.59	.56	-.24	-1.07	.29
Interpersonal Relations x Gender	-.14	.23	-.05	-.26	.80

### Influence of Clinical Interview

In order to answer the research question of whether the Clinical Interview Score is more influential than the PSR Overall Score in making the Final Recommendation (pass/fail), logistic regression was used. The logistic regression model was significant  $\chi^2 = 34.05, p < .001$ . The chi-square results suggest the model is different from chance alone. Large values of -2 log likelihood indicate a poorly fitting model, which is not the case here. The results then suggest that model is useful for classifying candidates into whether or not they receive a pass or fail for their Final Recommendation. Nagelkerke  $R^2$ , which is an indirect analog for traditional  $R^2$  for the model was .53. Larger values of Nagelkerke, such as seen here, suggest a more significant prediction model. The model predicts the Final Recommendation with 98.3% accuracy.

Table 4 gives the coefficient information for both the PSR Overall Score and Clinical Interview score. From the results the Clinical Interview score emerges as the sole predictor of the Final Recommendation  $b = .40, Wald = 9.10, p < .001$ . The results of the logistic regression seem to confirm that the psychologists view their Clinical Interview score as a larger contributor than the PSR Overall Score when determining the final pass or fail recommendation for a candidate.

**TABLE 4**  
**LOGISTIC REGRESSION COEFFICIENTS AND STATISTICS (N=231)**

	<i>b</i> (S.E.)	Wald	<i>p</i>	EXP(B)
PSR Average	.55 (.53)	1.10	.29	1.74
Interview Score	.40 (.13)	9.10	.00	1.49

## DISCUSSION

The results of this study indicate that the Clinical Interview Scores of paramilitary candidates can be reliably and accurately predicted from the PSR dimensions of Intellectual Efficiency and Interpersonal Relations. Those candidates who had higher scores on both dimensions tended to perform better during the clinical interview than those with lower scores. Similar, but approaching significant results were also seen with the Emotional Adjustment dimension from the PSR. These results suggest that the PSR could serve as cheaper, more easily administered alternative to the traditionally cumbersome clinical interview, once validated with performance data.

The relationship between Intellectual Efficiency and the clinical Interview Score makes conceptual sense. The interview presents candidates a series of novel and somewhat ambiguous questions and requires the applicants to form a response in a short time period. Intellectual Efficiency represents the ability to make decisions based on limited information and to have confidence in that information. Those with higher scores could find it easier to formulate acceptable answers to the questions asked during the interview, and would furthermore present confidence in their answer. Given the need for the candidate to repeatedly be able to utilize this skill throughout the interview the strength of Intellectual Efficiency can be explained. Even though only one question is directly asked in the interview to evaluate this dimension, the candidate uses the related skills throughout the whole interview.

The relationship between Interpersonal Relations and the Interview Score should be immediately apparent. The entire interview process is an interpersonal exchange between the candidate and the interviewer. Again, although only one question in the interview process directly addresses interpersonal skills, the candidate must be able to present a warm, friendly, and communicative demeanor during the entirety of the interview. Those with higher Interpersonal Relations scores on the PSR will genuinely be more friendly, open to interaction, and able to communicate with others. It stands to reason then that those with higher Interpersonal Relations scores will be better able to handle the social exchange that takes place during the interview process.

Also interesting is that Emotional Adjustment approaches significance when attempting to predict the interview score. It may be that some candidates find the interview more stressful and as such have to demonstrate more control over their emotional state than those who don't feel as stressed. This may have made it easier for those with higher Emotional Adjustment to demonstrate their skills directly, rather than indirectly through the interview question.

Another more interesting conclusion is that perhaps the interview is only successful at evaluating a candidate's Intellectual Efficiency and Interpersonal Relations. If this is in fact the case, it strengthens the argument for replacing the interview in military and paramilitary selection with the PSR. The PSR would then accurately reproduce the interview results through the Intellectual Efficiency and Interpersonal Relations while providing even more useful information from the Emotional Adjustment and Integrity/Control dimensions. The PSR would do this at a substantially lower cost and in a more efficient manner as well.

The finding of no gender moderation among the PSR dimension also was not surprising. There are very little gender differences on the primary factors that contribute to the makeup of the PSR dimensions, so there was little reason to suspect that differences would manifest within the dimensions themselves. The results indicate that whether or not someone is male or female has no influence on how well they do on the PSR or on the relationship between the dimensions and the interview score. The gender equity of

the PSR adds strength to the idea that it could be used to fairly assess candidates for military and paramilitary service.

Finally, the result that indicates the clinical interview weighs more heavily than the PSR score on the final recommendation is slightly troublesome. Although the value of clinical judgment is unquestionable, using that judgment to override a valid assessment result can be potentially hazardous. Interviews are filled with the potential for bias (Dougherty, Turban, & Callender, 1994), which could contain more bias than the self-report nature of this written assessment. No matter the skill of the interviewer, that bias can never be truly eliminated. If a biased interviewer chooses to override the results of the PSR it could lead to a potentially unqualified candidate to be selected for service. This could endanger not only that candidate's safety but also the safety of his or her team members and that of the population with which the candidate must work. However, further exploration of this phenomenon is necessary to fully understand why it takes place and what is truly driving the decision to overrule.

### **Study Limitations**

There are a couple of limitations when examining the results of the current study. The first is the limited gender diversity present in the sample. The candidates in this study were mostly males, and may not be representative of larger military and paramilitary populations. This would limit the generalizability of the results beyond the current sample, and hinder the case for using the PSR in a broader selection context.

Furthermore the restriction in range of the sample makes complete interpretation of the results impossible. Although all of the participants in the study are first time candidates for civilian police service they may have extensive prior police or military experience. Candidates are required to have prior policing or military service before they are considered for civilian police service. Given their prior training and work experiences it is unlikely that a large number would exhibit low scores on the PSR dimensions. This means it remains unknown how people with low PSR scores would perform on the clinical interview. A better understanding of how low scores relate to the interview is necessary to be confident the PSR actually predicts the interview score for the complete range of scores.

### **Practice Implications**

The results of this study strongly point to being able to use the PSR for selection in military and paramilitary environments, in place of the clinical interview. The overlap with the clinical interview demonstrates the ability of the PSR to capture the same information as the clinician, but at a lower cost and more quickly. While there may be resistance to completely eliminate the clinical interview from the process, the results at least suggest the usefulness of integrating the PSR into already existing models as a way to confirm the interview, and add value through the other dimensions not related to the interview.

In addition, it is probable that the PSR is actually capturing more useful information than the clinical interview. Given that the PSR evaluates Emotional Adjustment and Integrity/Control, which are difficult if not impossible to elicit in an interview, it can be argued that it may serve more usefully than the interview alone. The more complete evaluation should provide a better, more complete picture of recruits allowing for better hiring decisions to be made by the military and paramilitary contractors.

If nothing else the PSR could be implemented as part of a multiple hurdle screening approach. The PSR could be given first to evaluate the normal personality of a recruit. This would serve two functions: 1) identification of those with high potential for success, and 2) eliminating those with unacceptably low scores. Only those who meet the requirements would then be sent on to the clinical interview. This approach would save the money in terms of not having to interview those already identified as being unsuitable, while incorporating the screening in of those with desirable personality traits.

### **Future Research Needs**

In order to more fully understand the ability of the PSR dimensions and the clinical interview to accurately screen military and paramilitary candidates, it will be necessary to validate the measures against actual performance criteria. The validity coefficients for both the PSR dimensions and the

interview score should be examined to determine if, in fact, either is indicative of job performance. Further the incremental validity, if any, of the PSR dimensions over the interview needs to be determined. This research would provide more solid evidence that the PSR dimensions do accurately predict good candidates.

Criteria for future research could include disciplinary actions, number of promotions, and post-deployment Post Traumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD) prevalence. Evaluating the number of disciplinary actions would prove useful in allowing selection of those recruits who would not have problems while serving in military or paramilitary positions. Further, linking the PSR dimensions to the number of future promotions would add to the usefulness by allowing the identification of high potential candidates. Perhaps most importantly, the link between the dimensions and post-deployment PTSD could have the potential to help those returning from conflicts. By knowing ahead of time the risk for PTSD, a more informed decision can be made as to a recruit's suitability based on their ability to reintegrate into society after service. Taken together, these three criteria provide exciting opportunities for future research to demonstrate the ability of the PSR to address performance issues in the military and paramilitary.

Also, future research needs to include a more diverse sample of participants. This would allow for a better determination of any potential gender or racial differences not only within the PSR dimensions, but also on the ability of the PSR dimensions to predict the interview score and performance data. Results from these studies would further demonstrate the fairness of the PSR in screening candidates for military and paramilitary service.

## REFERENCES

- Alexander, J.B. (2005). *The changing nature of warfare, the factors mediating future conflict, and implications for SOF*. Hurlburt Field, FL: Joint Special Operations University.
- Cattell, R.B. (1945). The description of personality: Principles and findings in a factor analysis. *American Journal of Psychology*, 58, 69-90.
- Department of Defense. (2009). *DoD announces recruiting and retention statistics for fiscal year 2008*. (861-08). Washington, D.C: Government Printing Office.
- Dougherty, T. W., Turban, D. B., & Callender, J. C. (1994). Confirming first impressions in the employment interview: A field study of interviewer behavior. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 79, 659-665.
- Gomez Del Prado, J.L. (2008). Private military and security companies and the UN working group on the use of mercenaries. *Journal of Conflict & Security Law*, 13, 429-450.
- Gordon, S. (2006). The changing role of the military in assistance strategies. *HPG Report*, 21, 39-52.
- Gray, C.S. (2004). How has war changed since the end of the cold war? Unpublished paper presented at Changing Nature of Warfare Conference, Washington, D.C.
- Hunt, W.A., Wittson, C.L., & Harris, H.L. (1944). The screen test in military selection. *Psychological Review*, 51, 37-46.
- Institute for Personality and Ability Testing. (1994). *16PF Fifth Edition Technical Manual*. Champaign, IL: IPAT, Inc.
- Institute for Personality and Ability Testing. (2007). *Protective Services Reports Manual*. Champaign, IL: IPAT, Inc.

Michaels, J.D. (2004). Beyond accountability: The constitutional, democratic, and strategic problems with privatizing war. *Washington University Law Quarterly*, 82, 1001-1127.

Noyes, W. (1995). *Peacekeepers and Warfighters: Same Force, Different Mindset*. Newport, RI: Naval War College: Joint Military Operations Department.

Porter, L.W., Bigley, G.A., & Steers, R.M. (2003). *Motivation and Work Behavior*. New York. McGraw-Hill.

Society for Industrial Organizational Psychologists (2009). *Individual Psychological Assessment*. Retrieved from [http://www.siop.org/workplace/employment%20testing/individual\\_psychological\\_assessm.aspx](http://www.siop.org/workplace/employment%20testing/individual_psychological_assessm.aspx)

Waters, B.K. (1997). Army alpha to CAT-ASVAB: Four-score years of military personnel selection and classification testing. In R.F. Dillon (Ed.), *Handbook on Testing*, (pp.187-203). Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.

Wigdor, A.K., Garner, W.R., & National Research Council Committee on Ability Testing. (1982). *Ability Testing: Uses, Consequences, and Controversies*. Washington, D.C.: National Academy Press.

World News Digest. (2004). *Widespread abuse of Iraqi detainees by U.S. prison guards charged*. New York: Facts on File, Inc.

World News Digest. (2008). *U.S. charges Blackwater guards in 2007 Iraqi killings*. New York: Facts on File, Inc.