

PSY 716: ASSESSMENT OF ADULTS

Textbooks

Weiner, I. B., & Greene, R. L. (2008). *Handbook of personality assessment*. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons. (W&G)

Lichtenstein, E. O., & Kaufman, A. S. (2013). *Essentials of WAIS-IV assessment*. (2nd ed.). Hoboken, NJ: Wiley & Sons. (L&K)

If you want some subsidiary information on the process of diagnostic interviewing, I also recommend:

Othmer, E., & Othmer, S. C. (2002). *The clinical interview using DSM-IV-TR, Volume 1: Fundamentals*. Washington, DC: American Psychiatric Publishing. (O&O) –
NOTE: Out of print!

Additional readings will be provided throughout the semester online on WebCampus.

LEARNING OBJECTIVES

In this class, you'll learn *how* to think about the assessment of personality and psychopathology. Specifically, this course is designed to cover the following APA competency areas: a) assessment, b) individual and cultural diversity, and c) communication and interpersonal skills. As you can tell, this course has a lot of bases to cover, and I want to make sure you receive training in all of these areas, as well as covering the history of psychological assessment and diversity in assessment.

To achieve these goals, you'll be learning about some of the most commonly used assessment instruments in the field. However, what's even more important from my perspective is that you're able to be judicious consumers of assessment tools, able to know how to size up the strengths and weaknesses of any instrument with which you're confronted so that you can give the best possible services to your clients and patients.

To that end, we will take a look at ways of contextualizing assessments throughout the history of psychology, as well as the ways in which different systems of thought conceptualize the goals of assessment. We'll examine basic reasoning and statistical tools that are needed to judge the suitability of any assessment tool for a given purpose, and we'll take a look at a number of inventories that assess personality and psychopathology broadly in adults, each of which have different theoretical backgrounds and scale construction strategies. We'll also examine diagnostic interviewing before delving into performance-based cognitive tools, each of which constitutes a very different method of assessment from self- or informant-based reporting.

At this level, I believe that focused collegial discussion is the best tool for letting you learn about the material. There is a certain amount of material that may need to be presented through a lecture format to ensure that it's covered, but if we can discuss it in class, so much the better for all of us. Assessment is fundamentally a collaborative enterprise, as should your graduate learning be. The assigned readings should be considered background material for us to use as a springboard to talk about issues that are raised in assessment. Readings will come both from the textbook and from articles

posted on WebCampus or e-mailed around; the readings on WebCampus should be considered fluid.

Here are some of the questions I anticipate we'll touch on in various ways throughout the semester. What should be the end goal of assessment, and for what purpose is any particular assessment valid? Should raw or standardized scores be used; if the latter, what is an appropriate comparison group to use in standardizing? What does it mean to have a diagnostic syndrome, and how useful are diagnoses, anyway? How stable are traits, and what are they? To what extent do different methods of assessment of the same putative construct yield different constructs altogether, or just constructs measured with a fair amount of error? When should multiple raters be used (e.g., self, parents, friend, teacher), and what should you do when they disagree? What are the ethical implications of any particular assessment? How valid are assessment tools for psychodiagnosis in cultures or developmental samples in which those tools were not initially developed?

COURSE WORK

In the spirit of having multiple assessments in multiple modalities to provide as complete a picture of your understanding of the course material as possible, there will be a variety of assignments and presentations that you'll give throughout the semester. There will be a total of five assignments throughout the course, all of which you may complete with the assistance of your textbooks, handouts and relevant journal articles, notes, and consultation with your classmates. The first assignment will cover basic clinical reasoning and statistics, the second will be a writeup of the results of normal-range self-report personality results, the third will involve writing up the results of clinically-oriented measures, the fourth will entail conducting and reporting on a diagnostic interview, and the fifth will be a WAIS-IV writeup. Each of these will be due at the beginning of each Thursday class noted below; usually, they will be due two weeks after they are assigned.

Because you will be expected to present your work in clinical settings to a small audience of professionals, I'll be giving you experience talking about both specific assessment instruments and questions that you might have about assessment. Because there are so many instruments made to assess specific disorders or personality traits, I believe that it's in this portion of the class that your interests will drive the class discussion most profitably. You will all give a 10-15 minute presentation on a specific assessment instrument of your choosing that is designed to assess a particular cognitive, psychopathological, or personality construct. In your presentation, the following topic areas should be addressed to the degree possible with respect to your chosen measure: representativeness of norms, internal consistency, test-retest reliability, content validity, predictive validity, discriminant validity, incremental validity, diagnostic utility, and treatment utility. Also remember that validity is always a context-dependent concept (i.e., valid for what?). Your grade will come from your completeness in addressing these issues (acknowledging where data just doesn't exist for some of them, as needed) in a meaningful and synthetic way that gives a good picture of your chosen instrument's strengths and limitations, using a minimum of 10 references from the research literature

to support the claims you make in your graphs.

You'll also be expected to shadow an assessment at the PRACTICE with a second-year student clinician; this will introduce you to the rigors of running assessments. You'll review the case file with your student clinician and write up the background of the case from the forms. You may be called on to write this up quickly once the case is assigned, so don't dawdle on it. This assignment will not be graded nearly as stringently as the other assignments. As long as you complete the assignment in a timely fashion to ensure good clinical care and put a good effort into the writeup and scheduling of assessment sessions, you'll earn all the points for this assignment. You'll also sit in on all the other assessment sessions and score along on *photocopies you make* of each test's record form to get familiar with the tests used in the PRACTICE and how they work.

GRADING

Here is the rubric that tells you what percent of your grade will come from which sources:

15% for each assignment (75% total)

15% for the instrument presentation

10% for your assessment shadowing and background information writeup

And here's how the grading scheme breaks down:

93.00%-100% = A; 90.00%-92.99% = A-

87.00%-89.99% = B+, 83.00%-86.99% = B, 80.00%-82.99% = B-

77.00%-79.99% = C+, 73.00%-76.99% = C, 70.00%-72.99% = C-

67.00%-69.99% = D+, 63.00%-66.99% = D, 60.00%-62.99% = D-

<60.00% = F

An A represents a level of mastery of the material consistent with being ready to start practica in assessment. An A- indicates minor deficiencies in understanding that would not be an impediment to starting assessment practica. A B+ suggests a need for a minor refresher or pre-practicum training before starting assessment practica, whereas a B indicates that a pre-practicum in assessment is likely necessary to gain more training and expertise. A B- represents substantial deficits in understanding basic assessment concepts that will require significant outside work to remediate, and anything lower than that indicates a lack of basic competency in psychological assessment such that the course would need to be repeated before going out on even pre-practicum training.

APA CONTENT AREAS

History. Cronbach and Meehl (1955) gives a historical perspective on the construct validity of psychological tests, and the introductory chapters of W&G and L&K likewise provide important background regarding the historical development of psychological assessment methods. W&G Chapter 6 outlines the history of the curious development of the MMPI family of instruments.

Diversity. De Fruyt et al. (2009) describe the cross-cultural similarity of the Big Five as

operationalized by the NEO PI-3 across a wide range of countries. Sue & Sue (1987) describe the differences in assessment strategies that may be used with Asian patients vs. White patients, and they highlight the potential perils of using translators in interviews or other forms of assessment. Finn and Tonsager (1997) and Groth-Marnat and Horvath (2006) both talk about how to give feedback taking a patient's sensibilities and cultural identity in mind.

Lifespan. The bulk of this course focuses on adult versions of assessment of relevant constructs. The readings for Week 5 highlight how the basic factor structure of the Big Five in adults is usually assumed in developing instruments to measure those factors in children. Similarly, Week 8 contrasts the content scales applicable for adults and children, though many content scales remain the same between the MMPI-2 and MMPI-A.

COURSE SCHEDULE

Week 1 (Jan. 19-21): Construct validity; higher-order structure of psychopathology
Readings: Cronbach & Meehl (1955), Krueger (1999), Mash & Hunsley (2005),

Week 2 (Jan. 26-28): Clinical statistics
Readings: clinical statistics handout on WebCampus [W&G Ch. 3 gives additional background info; see Meehl (1973) for an example of clinical polemic]
ASSIGNMENT I

Week 3 (Feb. 2-4): The assessment report
Readings: W&G Ch. 2, Groth-Marnat & Horvath (2006), sample reports on WebCampus

Week 4 (Feb. 9-11): Therapeutic assessment; discuss Assignment I
Readings: W&G Ch. 2, Finn & Tonsager (1997)
TURN IN ASSIGNMENT I

Week 5 (Feb. 16-18): Normal-range personality instruments, etic style: The Big 5
Readings: W&G Ch. 10; De Fruyt et al. (2009), Halverson et al. (2003), Lynam & Widiger (2001)
ASSIGNMENT II

Week 6 (Feb. 23-25): Personality Inventory for DSM-5 (PID-5)
Readings: Anderson et al. (2014), De Fruyt et al. (2013), Krueger et al. (2012)

Week 7 (Mar. 1-3): Broadband psychopathology instruments, etic style: MMPI-2 validity and clinical scales
Readings: W&G Ch. 6
TURN IN ASSIGNMENT II

Week 8 (Mar. 8-10): Broadband psychopathology instruments, etic style: MMPI-2 content, supplemental, and restructured clinical scales; discuss Assignment II
Readings: Nichols (2006), Sellbom et al. (2006), Sellbom et al. (2008)

ASSIGNMENT III

Week 9 (Mar. 15-17): Broadband psychopathology instruments, emic style: The PAI
Readings: W&G Ch. 9; Blais (2010), Boyle & Lennon (1994), McDevitt-Murphy et al. (2007)

MAR. 21-MAR. 26: SPRING BREAK

Week 10 (Mar. 29-31): SPECIFIC ASSESSMENT INSTRUMENT PRESENTATIONS
Readings: none assigned

Week 11 (Apr. 5-7): Introduction to diagnostic interviewing
Readings: [O&O Ch. 1]; Carney et al. (2007), Sue & Sue (1987)

Week 12 (Apr. 12-14): Semi-structured interviewing: SCID; discuss Assignment III
Readings: [O&O Ch. 2-3], Ventura et al. (1998), SCID user's guide
TURN IN ASSIGNMENT III
ASSIGNMENT IV

Week 13 (Apr. 19-21): Writing an integrated report, mini-mental status exam, & detection of malingering
Readings: W&G Ch. 4, [O&O Ch. 6], Edens et al. (2007), Kucharski et al. (2006), Rogers et al. (2009)

Have interview data collected by the end of this week for Assignment IV

Week 14 (Apr. 26-28): Introduction to and practicing intellectual assessment: WAIS-IV; discuss Assignment IV
Readings: L&K 1-4; others on WebCampus
TURN IN ASSIGNMENT IV
ASSIGNMENT V

Week 15 (May 3-5): Interpreting the WAIS-IV
Readings: L&K 5-9; others on WebCampus

May 10: FINAL IN CEB 228 – WMS-IV, D-KEFS, TOMM, and other cognitive tests

MAY 12: TURN IN ASSIGNMENT V

Reading List

- Anderson, J., Snider, S., Sellbom, M., Krueger, R., & Hopwood, C. (2014). A comparison of the DSM-5 Section II and Section III personality disorder structures. *Psychiatry Research, 216*(3), 363-372.
- Blais, M. A. (2010). The common structure of normal personality and psychopathology: Preliminary exploration in a non-patient sample. *Personality and Individual Differences, 48*(3), 322-326. DOI: 10.1016/j.paid.2009.10.028
- Boyle, G. J., & Lennon, T. J. (1994). Examination of the reliability and validity of the Personality Assessment Inventory. *Journal of Psychopathology and Behavioral Assessment, 16*(3), 173-187.
- Carney, D. R., Colvin, C. R., & Hall, J. A. (2007). A thin slice perspective on the accuracy of first impressions. *Journal of Research in Personality, 41*(5), 1054-1072. DOI: 10.1016/j.jrp/2007.01.004
- Cronbach, L. J., & Meehl, P. E. (1955). Construct validity in psychological tests. *Psychological Bulletin, 52*(4), 281-302.
- De Fruyt, F., De Bolle, M., McCrae, R. R., Terracciano, A., Costa, P. T., Jr., & Collaborators of the Adolescent Personality Profiles of Cultures Project. Assessing the universal structure of personality in early adolescence: The NEO-PI-R and NEO-PI-3 in 24 cultures. *Assessment, 16*(3), 301-311. DOI: 10.1177/1073191109333760
- De Fruyt, F., De Clercq, B., De Bolle, M., Wille, B., Markon, K., & Krueger, R. F. (2013). General and maladaptive traits in a five-factor framework for DSM-5 in a university student sample. *Assessment, 20*(3), 295-307.
- Edens, J. F., Poythress, N. G., & Watkins-Clay, M. M. (2007). Detection of malingering in psychiatric unit and general population inmates: A comparison of the PAI, SIMS, and SIRS. *Journal of Personality Assessment, 88*(1), 33-42. DOI: 10.1080/00223890709336832
- Finn, S. E., & Tonsager, M. E. (1997). Information-gathering and therapeutic models of assessment: Complementary paradigms. *Psychological Assessment, 9*(4), 374-385. DOI: 10.1037/1040-3590.9.4.374
- Groth-Marnat, G., & Horvath, L. S. (2006). The psychological report: A review of current controversies. *Journal of Clinical Psychology, 62*(1), 73-81. DOI: 10.1002/jclp.20201
- Halverson, C. F., Havill, V. L., Deal, J., Baker, S. R., Victor, J. B., Pavlopoulos, V., Besevegis, E., & Wen, L. (2003). Personality structure as derived from parental ratings of free descriptions of children. The inventory of child individual differences. *Journal of Personality, 71*(6), 995-1026.
- Krueger, R. F. (1999). The structure of common mental disorders. *Archives of General Psychiatry, 56*(10), 921-926. DOI: 10.1001/archpsyc.56.10.921
- Krueger, R. F., Derringer, J., Markon, K. E., Watson, D., & Skodol, A. E. (2012). Initial construction of a maladaptive personality trait model and inventory for DSM-5. *Psychological Medicine, 42*(9), 1879-1890.
- Kucharski, L. T., Duncan, S., Egan, S. S., & Falkenbach, D. M. (2006). Psychopathy and malingering of psychiatric disorder in criminal defendants. *Behavioral Sciences and the Law, 24*(5), 633-644. DOI: 10.1002/bs1.661
- Lynam, D. R., & Widiger, T. A. (2001). Using the five-factor model to represent the

- DSM-IV personality disorders: An expert consensus approach. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, 110(3), 401-412.
- Mash, E. J., & Hunsley, J. (2005). Evidence-based assessment of childhood and adolescent disorders: Issues and challenges. *Journal of Clinical Child and Adolescent Psychology*, 32(3), 362-379. DOI: 10.1207/s15374424jccp3403_1
- McDevitt- Murphy, M. E., Weathers, F. W., Flood, A. M., Eakin, D. E., & Benson, T. (2007). The utility of the PAI and the MMPI- 2 for discriminating PTSD, depression, and social phobia. *Assessment*, 14(2), 181- 195.
- Nichols, D. S. (2006). The trials of separating bath water from baby: a review and critique of the MMPI-2 Restructured Clinical Scales. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 87(2), 121-138.
- Rogers, R., Payne, J. W., Berry, D. T. R., & Granacher, R. P. (2009). Use of the SIRS in compensation cases: An examination of its validity and generalizability. *Law and Human Behavior*, 33(2), 213-224. DOI: 10.1007/s10979-008-9145-9
- Sellbom, M., Ben-Porath, Y. S., & Bagby, R. M. (2008). Personality and psychopathology: Mapping the MMPI-2 Restructured Clinical (RC) Scales onto the Five Factor Model of personality. *Journal of Personality Disorders*, 22(3), 291-312. DOI: 10.1521/pedi.2008.22.3.291
- Sellbom, M., Ben-Porath, Y. S., McNulty, J. L., Arbisi, P. A., & Graham, J. R. (2006). Elevation differences between MMPI-2 clinical and restructured clinical (RC) scales: frequency, origins, and interpretative implications. *Assessment*, 13(4), 430-441.
- Sue, D., & Sue, S. (1987). Cultural factors in the clinical assessment of Asian Americans. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 55(4), 479-487.
- Ventura, J., Liberman, R. P., Green, M. F., Shaner, A., & Mintz, J. (1998). Training and quality assurance with the Structured Interview for DSM-IV Disorders (SCID-IV). *Psychiatry Research*, 79(1), 163-173.

ACADEMIC MISCONDUCT

Academic integrity is a legitimate concern for every member of the campus community; all share in upholding the fundamental values of honesty, trust, respect, fairness, responsibility and professionalism. By choosing to join the UNLV community, students accept the expectations of the Student Academic Misconduct Policy and are encouraged when faced with choices to always take the ethical path. Students enrolling in UNLV assume the obligation to conduct themselves in a manner compatible with UNLV's function as an educational institution.

An example of academic misconduct is plagiarism. Plagiarism is using the words or ideas of another, from the Internet or any source, without proper citation of the sources. See the *Student Academic Misconduct Policy* (approved December 9, 2005) located at: <https://www.unlv.edu/studentconduct/student-conduct>.

COPYRIGHT

The University requires all members of the University Community to familiarize themselves **with** and to follow copyright and fair use requirements. **You are individually and solely responsible for violations of copyright and fair use laws. The university will neither protect nor defend you nor assume any responsibility for employee or student violations of fair use laws.** Violations of copyright laws could subject you to federal and state civil penalties and criminal liability, as well as disciplinary action under University policies. Additional information can be found at: <http://www.unlv.edu/provost/copyright>

DISABILITY RESOURCE CENTER (DRC)

The UNLV Disability Resource Center (SSC-A 143, <http://drc.unlv.edu/>, 702-895-0866) provides resources for students with disabilities. If you feel that you have a disability, please make an appointment with a Disabilities Specialist at the DRC to discuss what options may be available to you. If you are registered with the UNLV Disability Resource Center, bring your Academic Accommodation Plan from the DRC to the instructor during office hours so that you may work together to develop strategies for implementing the accommodations to meet both your needs and the requirements of the course. Any information you provide is private and will be treated as such. To maintain the confidentiality of your request, please do not approach the instructor in front of others to discuss your accommodation needs.

REGLIGIOUS HOLIDAYS POLICY

Any student missing class quizzes, examinations, or any other class or lab work because of observance of religious holidays shall be given an opportunity during that semester to make up missed work. The make-up will apply to the religious holiday absence only. It shall be the responsibility of the student to notify the instructor **within the first 14 calendar days of the course for fall and spring courses (excepting modular courses), or within the first 7 calendar days of the course for summer and modular courses**, of his or her intention to participate in religious holidays which do not fall on state holidays or periods of class recess. For additional information, please visit: <http://catalog.unlv.edu/content.php?catoid=6&navoid=531>. **8**

TRANSPARENCY in LEARNING and TEACHING

The University encourages application of the transparency method of constructing assignments for student success. Please see these two links for further information:

<https://www.unlv.edu/provost/teachingandlearning>

<https://www.unlv.edu/provost/transparency>

INCOMPLETE GRADES

The grade of I – Incomplete – can be granted when a student has satisfactorily completed three-fourths of course work for that semester/session but for reason(s) beyond the student's control, and acceptable to the instructor, cannot complete the last part of the course, and the instructor believes that the student can finish the course without repeating it. The incomplete work must be made up before the end of the following regular semester. If course requirements are not completed within the time indicated, a grade of F will be recorded and the GPA will be adjusted accordingly. Students who are fulfilling an Incomplete do not register for the course but make individual arrangements with the instructor who assigned the I grade.

TUTORING and Coaching

The Academic Success Center (ASC) provides tutoring, academic success coaching and other academic assistance for all UNLV undergraduate students. For information regarding tutoring subjects, tutoring times, and other ASC programs and services, visit <http://www.unlv.edu/asc> or call 702-895-3177. The ASC building is located across from the Student Services Complex (SSC). Academic success coaching is located on the second floor of the SSC (ASC Coaching Spot). Drop-in tutoring is located on the second floor of the Lied Library and College of Engineering TEB second floor.

UNLV WRITING CENTER

One-on-one or small group assistance with writing is available free of charge to UNLV students at the Writing Center, located in CDC-3-301. Although walk-in consultations are sometimes available, students with appointments will receive priority assistance. Appointments may be made in person or by calling 702-895-3908. The student's Rebel ID Card, a copy of the assignment (if possible), and two copies of any writing to be reviewed are requested for the consultation. More information can be found at: <http://writingcenter.unlv.edu/>

REBELMAIL

By policy, faculty and staff should e-mail students' Rebelmail accounts only. Rebelmail is UNLV's official e-mail system for students. It is one of the primary ways students receive official university communication such as information about deadlines, major campus events, and announcements. All UNLV students receive a Rebelmail account after they have been admitted to the university. Students' e-mail prefixes are listed on class rosters. The suffix is always @unlv.nevada.edu. Emailing within WebCampus is acceptable.

FINAL EXAMINATIONS

The University requires that final exams given at the end of a course occur at the time and on the day specified in the final exam schedule. See the schedule at: <http://www.unlv.edu/registrar/calendars>. **9**

LIBRARY STATEMENT

Students may consult with a librarian on research needs. For this class, the Subject Librarian is (https://www.library.unlv.edu/contact/librarians_by_subject). UNLV Libraries provides resources to support students' access to information. Discovery, access, and use of information are vital skills for academic work and for successful post-college life. Access library resources and ask questions at <https://www.library.unlv.edu/>