# **Evaluating Response Bias Scales on the CAT-PD**

# **Kaleigh M. Newcomb** & Matthew M. Yalch

## INTRODUCTION

- The Computer Adaptive Test of Personality Disorder (CAT-PD) has demonstrated reliability and validity of its primary content scales
- However, research has not evaluated its response bias scales: Positive Impression Management (PIM), Infrequency (INF), and Inconsistency (INC).
- In this study, we evaluate these scales using a combination of deliberate feigning conditions and computer simulation.

## **METHODS**

- Participants were 547 workers on Amazon's MTurk.
- Participants completed items about personality traits before being randomized to one of three conditions in which they responded to CAT-PD PIM, INF, and INC.
- We assigned <sup>1</sup>/<sub>3</sub> of participants each to normal responding, faking good, or faking bad conditions.
- We compared scale scores in normal responding condition to comparison conditions using Receiver Operating Characteristic (ROC) analysis.

# RESULTS

- All response bias scales produced a statistically significant AUC (Figures 1-3).
- However, they had low specificity and moderate sensitivity (Table 1).

### DISCUSSION

- Findings suggest CAT-PD response bias scales may be good at detecting bad responses but not sufficiently specific.
- One reason for scales' underperformance may be that participants completed response bias scales isolated from other items on the CAT-PD.
- Future research should attempt to improve upon these limitations include all CAT-PD items/scales as well as manipulation checks.

# **CAT-PD** response bias scales are **good at detecting feigning** (but might provide false positives)



### Table 1

Sensitivity (SN), Specificity (SP), and Optimal Cut Scores

	Cut Score	SN	SP
PIM	23	.71	.55
INF	21	.71	.65
INC	20	.73	.63

### Figure 1

ROC Curve of CAT-PD- PIM Predicting Faking Good



*Note.* AUC = .64

#### Figure 2

ROC Curve of CAT-PD- INF Predicting Faking Bad



*Note.* AUC = .71

### Figure 3

ROC Curve of CAT-PD-INC Predicting Random Responding



*Note.* AUC = .72; INC compared to simulated responses.

