



REVIEWER'S REPORT

Manuscript No.: IJAR- 58076

Title: Model of Psychological Readiness for Family, Juvenile, and Gender and Development Assignments: A Mixed-Method Analysis of MMPI-2 and BPAQ Assessment Reports Among Police Personnel,

Recommendation:

Accept after minor revision

Rating	Excel.	Good	Fair	Poor
Originality		✓		
Techn. Quality			✓	
Clarity			✓	
Significance	✓			

Reviewer's ID: Abdul Haseeb Mir

Detailed Reviewer's Report

The manuscript addresses a critically important, highly sensitive, and under-researched intersection within occupational health psychology and law enforcement administration: the evaluation of psychological readiness for police personnel assigned to victim-centered, highly vulnerable populations. Specifically, the study focuses on personnel designated for Family, Juvenile, and Gender and Development (FJGAD) units. The author(s) employ a convergent mixed-method document analysis design, evaluating a sample of 24 completed psychological assessment reports that were generated using the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory-2 (MMPI-2) and the Buss-Perry Aggression Questionnaire (BPAQ).

Conceptual Framework and Significance

The core thesis of the paper is both timely and conceptually sound. Historically, police psychological evaluations—especially fitness-for-duty examinations or pre-employment screenings—have functioned on a deficit-based clinical model. That is, they look for the presence or absence of DSM-categorized psychopathology (such as major depressive disorder, active psychosis, or severe personality disorders). The author(s) correctly argue that for specialized units dealing with highly traumatized demographics (e.g., victims of domestic violence, child abuse, and gender-based crimes), the mere absence of gross clinical psychopathology is an insufficient metric for operational readiness. Instead, these roles demand

REVIEWER'S REPORT

proactive, multidimensional psychosocial competencies, including high empathy, emotional regulation, frustration tolerance, and interpersonal trust.

By evaluating actual historical assessment data, the study uncovers an alarming statistic: only 20.83% of the evaluated personnel were deemed psychologically suitable for FJGAD roles, while 79.17% were classified as not demonstrably suitable. This staggering suitability gap underscores the systemic risk of placing poorly equipped officers into environments that require extreme emotional labor, risking both secondary victimization for citizens and accelerated burnout or behavioral infractions for the officers themselves.

Methodological Execution

The choice of a convergent mixed-method document analysis design is highly appropriate for the research questions posed. By combining quantitative descriptive statistics (frequencies and percentages of suitability, response validity, and behavioral metrics) with qualitative thematic content analysis (via Braun and Clarke's six-phase framework), the study manages to provide both a macro-level view of the institutional problem and a micro-level understanding of the specific behavioral patterns causing these failures.

The quantitative profiling using the MMPI-2 and BPAQ yields important insights, particularly regarding response distortion. The finding that 25.00% of participants exhibited significant response distortion (under-reporting or over-reporting symptoms, or extreme defensiveness) highlights the methodological and operational hurdles of using self-report inventories in high-stakes promotional or transfer environments.

The qualitative thematic analysis is equally robust, successfully isolating eight major psychosocial risk factors:

1. Emotional Dysregulation
2. Anxiety and Depression
3. Interpersonal Mistrust
4. Social Withdrawal
5. Defensiveness
6. Aggressiveness and Impulsivity
7. Low Stress Tolerance
8. Low Assertiveness

These themes are well-integrated and lay a logical foundation for the authors' ultimate contribution: the Police Psychosocial Fitness and Risk Inventory (PPFRI) framework. The PPFRI successfully reorganizes these risks into five proactive assessment domains: Emotional Stability, Interpersonal Competence,

REVIEWER'S REPORT

Behavioral Regulation, Occupational Resilience, and Professional Integrity. This framework transforms a disparate list of clinical red flags into an actionable, positive psychology-informed screening taxonomy.

Style, Tone, and Readability

The manuscript is written in clear, scholarly English. The academic tone is maintained throughout, and the transitions between the quantitative statistical breakdowns and the qualitative thematic discussions are handled smoothly. The tables and conceptual summaries are well-structured, allowing the reader to quickly grasp the interaction between the empirical data collected and the theoretical framework proposed.

However, despite these notable strengths, the manuscript requires several critical refinements before it can be deemed fully ready for archival publication. These primarily concern sample demographics, contextualization of the specific instruments used, and a more thorough engagement with contemporary literature on police trauma and administrative selection policy.

II. Strategic Areas for Improvement

To elevate the manuscript to a standard commensurate with top-tier police science and forensic psychology journals, the author(s) should address the following methodological, theoretical, and structural areas.

1. Elaboration on Demographics and Institutional Context

While the study provides clear operational percentages (e.g., the 20.83% suitability rate), it is critically sparse regarding the baseline demographic and institutional characteristics of the 24 police personnel evaluated.

- **Action Required:** The authors should provide a descriptive table or narrative section detailing the participants' average years of service, rank distribution, gender balance, and prior exposure to specialized investigative units. If the data is fully anonymized to protect the identity of a specific police department, the authors must explicitly state this constraint. However, macro-level contextual data (e.g., whether this is an urban, suburban, or regional police force) must be provided to help readers understand the generalizability of the findings.
- **Rationale:** The psychosocial risks identified—such as high interpersonal mistrust and emotional exhaustion—manifest differently in veteran officers versus newer recruits due to cumulative operational trauma. Contextualizing the sample's background will significantly deepen the interpretation of the qualitative themes.

2. Methodological Justification and Limitations of Self-Report Measures

REVIEWER'S REPORT

The study heavily relies on the MMPI-2 and the BPAQ. While both are gold-standard instruments within forensic and clinical psychology, their application within high-stakes law enforcement personnel selection warrants a more nuanced critique within the Methodology and Discussion sections.

- **Action Required:** The author(s) must expand their discussion on the 25% response distortion rate. Specifically, they should explain which validity scales on the MMPI-2 (e.g., L, F, K, or S scales) were primarily elevated. Additionally, the authors need to address the limitations of using the Buss-Perry Aggression Questionnaire in an administrative screening environment. Because the BPAQ is highly face-valid (i.e., its questions explicitly measure anger and physical/verbal aggression), it is highly susceptible to impression management and "faking good."
- **Rationale:** Acknowledging that officers face immense career pressure to mask aggressive or impulsive tendencies will validate the qualitative finding of "Defensiveness" and demonstrate a sophisticated understanding of forensic psychometrics.

3. Theoretical Integration of the "Low Assertiveness" Theme

The qualitative findings identify "Low Assertiveness" (characterized by passivity, indecisiveness, and low self-confidence) as a major psychosocial risk factor. While this is intuitive for a general leadership position, its specific risk profile within FJGAD assignments requires deeper theoretical justification.

- **Action Required:** In the Discussion section, the authors should explicitly articulate why passivity or low assertiveness poses a distinct risk in victim-centered policing. For example, does it lead to an inability to advocate for victims within the broader judicial system? Does it manifest as conflict avoidance during tense crisis interventions?
- **Rationale:** Connecting low assertiveness directly to operational failures in family and gender-based domestic calls will strengthen the logical bridge between the qualitative findings and the "Interpersonal Competence" domain of the proposed PPFRI framework.

4. Operationalization of the PPFRI Framework

The proposed Police Psychosocial Fitness and Risk Inventory (PPFRI) is an excellent conceptual model. However, as currently presented, it reads more like a descriptive taxonomy than an operational framework.

- **Action Required:** The author(s) should dedicate a distinct subsection outlining how police departments can practically implement the PPFRI. Will it require the development of a brand-new, dedicated psychometric instrument? Or can existing valid tools (including the MMPI-3, NEO-PI-3, or situational judgment tests) be mapped onto these five domains? Providing a brief, actionable blueprint for institutional adoption will vastly increase the paper's citation potential and real-world impact.

REVIEWER'S REPORT

5. Engagement with Contemporary Literature on Police Burnout and Trauma

The manuscript occasionally treats the identified risk factors—such as anxiety, depression, and low stress tolerance—as baseline personality traits or individual deficits.

- **Action Required:** The author(s) should integrate literature regarding organizational versus operational stressors in policing. It is essential to discuss whether these high rates of psychological unsuitability are indicative of systemic, unaddressed post-traumatic stress injury (PTSI) or systemic burnout within the police force, rather than merely individual operational incompetence.
- **Rationale:** Framing these findings within the broader discourse of officer wellness and institutional health changes the narrative from one of individual blame to one of structural necessity, aligning perfectly with the preventative philosophy of the PPFRI framework.

III. Journal Decision and Formal Recommendation

Editorial Recommendation: Minor Revision

Following a comprehensive evaluation of the manuscript's empirical depth, methodology, and theoretical contributions, the formal recommendation is a **Minor Revision**.

The manuscript represents a highly valuable, data-driven critique of existing police screening paradigms and introduces a timely, proactive alternative via the PPFRI framework. The high percentage of unsuitable candidates discovered in this cohort serves as an urgent wake-up call for law enforcement administrators worldwide, proving that specialized, victim-centered assignments require specialized psychometric lenses.

The methodology is structurally sound, the statistical and thematic findings are clear, and the overall narrative flows logically. The necessary revisions do not require the collection of additional empirical data, nor do they challenge the underlying validity of the study's conclusions. Instead, they require the author(s) to contextualize their sample more thoroughly, address the psychometric limitations of self-report inventories in high-stakes environments, deepen the theoretical discussion of specific qualitative themes, and provide a clearer implementation path for their proposed framework.