



Minnesota Multiphasic
Personality Inventory-2
Restructured Form®

SAMPLE REPORT

Case Description: Mr. C **Police Candidate Interpretive Report**

Mr. C is a 34-year-old, married male candidate for an entry-level police officer position in a large urban agency. His background revealed some relatively minor juvenile conduct problems. After graduating high school, he married at age 18 but divorced within three years. He then enlisted in the military and was deployed twice to Iraq. Since his discharge four years prior to this evaluation, Mr. C has worked exclusively in construction jobs. The background investigation revealed no adult history of job terminations or legal conflicts. Personal and developed references described him as introverted.

Case descriptions do not accompany MMPI-2-RF reports, but are provided here as background information. The following report was generated from Q-global™, Pearson's web-based scoring and reporting application, using Mr. C.'s responses to the MMPI-2-RF. Additional MMPI-2-RF sample reports, product offerings, training opportunities, and resources can be found at PearsonClinical.com/mmpi2rf.

Copyright © 2015 Pearson Education, Inc. or its affiliate(s). All rights reserved. Q-global, Always Learning, Pearson, design for Psi, and PsychCorp are trademarks, in the U.S. and/or other countries, of Pearson Education, Inc. or its affiliate(s). Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory-2 Restructured Form and MMPI-2-RF are registered trademarks of the University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, MN. 9594 01/15



Minnesota Multiphasic
Personality Inventory-2
Restructured Form®

Yossef S. Ben-Porath, PhD, & Auke Tellegen, PhD

MMPI-2-RF®
Police Candidate Interpretive Report
David M. Corey, PhD, & Yossef S. Ben-Porath, PhD

ID Number: Mr. C
Age: 34
Gender: Male
Marital Status: Married
Years of Education: 14
Date Assessed: 11/11/2013



Copyright © 2014 by the Regents of the University of Minnesota. All rights reserved.
Distributed exclusively under license from the University of Minnesota by NCS Pearson, Inc. Portions reproduced from the MMPI-2-RF test booklet. Copyright © 2008 by the Regents of the University of Minnesota. All rights reserved. Portions excerpted from the *MMPI-2-RF Manual for Administration, Scoring, and Interpretation*. Copyright © 2008, 2011 by the Regents of the University of Minnesota. All rights reserved. Used by permission of the University of Minnesota Press.


MMPI-2-RF, the **MMPI-2-RF logo**, and **Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory-2-Restructured Form** are registered trademarks of the University of Minnesota. **Pearson**, the **PSI logo**, and **PsychCorp** are trademarks in the U.S. and/or other countries of Pearson Education, Inc., or its affiliate(s).

TRADE SECRET INFORMATION

Not for release under HIPAA or other data disclosure laws that exempt trade secrets from disclosure.

[3.0 / 56 / 0.0.0]

MMPI-2-RF Validity Scales



Raw Score:	3	13	0	0	1	5	2	0	4
T Score:	48	65 T	42	42	50	42	38	37	38
Response %:	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Cannot Say (Raw):	0								
								Percent True (of items answered):	42%


Comparison Group Data: Police Officer Candidate (Men and Women), N = 2,074

Mean Score (◇--◇):	41	52 F	44	45	45	46	46	59	63
Standard Dev (±1 SD):	7	6	4	5	6	6	7	13	8
Percent scoring at or below test taker:	92	99	75	78	92	32	20	4	0.7

The highest and lowest T scores possible on each scale are indicated by a "---"; MMPI-2-RF T scores are non-gendered.

VRIN-r	Variable Response Inconsistency	Fs	Infrequent Somatic Responses	L-r	Uncommon Virtues
TRIN-r	True Response Inconsistency	FBS-r	Symptom Validity	K-r	Adjustment Validity
F-r	Infrequent Responses	RBS	Response Bias Scale		
Fp-r	Infrequent Psychopathology Responses				

MMPI-2-RF Higher-Order (H-O) and Restructured Clinical (RC) Scales



	EID	THD	BXD	RCd	RC1	RC2	RC3	RC4	RC6	RC7	RC8	RC9
Raw Score:	10	3	9	4	1	3	4	5	0	7	5	16
T Score:	51	57	57	51	42	46	46	52	43	52	63	58
Response %:	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100


Comparison Group Data: Police Officer Candidate (Men and Women), N = 2,074

	EID	THD	BXD	RCd	RC1	RC2	RC3	RC4	RC6	RC7	RC8	RC9
Mean Score (◇--◇):	36	44	46	40	42	41	44	45	47	38	44	43
Standard Dev (±1 SD):	6	7	7	5	7	6	10	7	7	6	7	8
Percent scoring at or below test taker:	98	96	96	97	68	88	65	87	75	97	98	97

The highest and lowest T scores possible on each scale are indicated by a "---"; MMPI-2-RF T scores are non-gendered.

EID	Emotional/Internalizing Dysfunction	RCd	Demoralization	RC6	Ideas of Persecution
THD	Thought Dysfunction	RC1	Somatic Complaints	RC7	Dysfunctional Negative Emotions
BXD	Behavioral/Externalizing Dysfunction	RC2	Low Positive Emotions	RC8	Aberrant Experiences
		RC3	Cynicism	RC9	Hypomanic Activation
		RC4	Antisocial Behavior		

MMPI-2-RF Somatic/Cognitive and Internalizing Scales



Raw Score:	1	0	0	0	2	0	0	2	2	2	0	1	1	0
T Score:	46	46	42	41	54	45	40	56	48	47	44	47	56	36
Response %:	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100


Comparison Group Data: Police Officer Candidate (Men and Women), N = 2,074

Mean Score (◇--◇):	42	46	44	46	43	46	42	43	41	41	45	41	44	45
Standard Dev (±1 SD):	6	4	6	7	5	2	4	4	6	6	4	5	5	8
Percent scoring at or below test taker:	87	95	83	65	97	99.3	88	99.1	91	91	94	94	98	25

The highest and lowest T scores possible on each scale are indicated by a "---"; MMPI-2-RF T scores are non-gendered.

MLS	Malaise	SUI	Suicidal/Death Ideation	AXY	Anxiety
GIC	Gastrointestinal Complaints	HLP	Helplessness/Hopelessness	ANP	Anger Proneness
HPC	Head Pain Complaints	SFD	Self-Doubt	BRF	Behavior-Restricting Fears
NUC	Neurological Complaints	NFC	Inefficacy	MSF	Multiple Specific Fears
COG	Cognitive Complaints	STW	Stress/Worry		

MMPI-2-RF Externalizing, Interpersonal, and Interest Scales



Raw Score:	1	1	5	3	6	1	7	3	0	1	5
T Score:	50	50	67	48	68	39	65	50	44	39	61
Response %:	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100


Comparison Group Data: Police Officer Candidate (Men and Women), N = 2,074

Mean Score (◇---◇):	48	45	42	44	43	46	46	41	46	42	56
Standard Dev (±1 SD):	9	6	6	9	7	6	8	6	5	8	11
Percent scoring at or below test taker:	76	90	99.9	79	99.9	20	98	95	90	57	73

The highest and lowest T scores possible on each scale are indicated by a "---"; MMPI-2-RF T scores are non-gendered.

JCP	Juvenile Conduct Problems	FML	Family Problems	AES	Aesthetic-Literary Interests
SUB	Substance Abuse	IPP	Interpersonal Passivity	MEC	Mechanical-Physical Interests
AGG	Aggression	SAV	Social Avoidance		
ACT	Activation	SHY	Shyness		
		DSF	Disaffiliativeness		

MMPI-2-RF PSY-5 Scales



Raw Score:	13	3	10	6	8
T Score:	65	56	59	49	54
Response %:	100	100	100	100	100

Comparison Group Data: Police Officer Candidate (Men and Women), N = 2,074

Mean Score (◇--◇):	51	44	50	39	47
Standard Dev (±1 SD):	7	7	8	6	7
Percent scoring at or below test taker:	98	95	93	95	89

The highest and lowest T scores possible on each scale are indicated by a "---"; MMPI-2-RF T scores are non-gendered.

- AGGR-r Aggressiveness-Revised
- PSYC-r Psychoticism-Revised
- DISC-r Disconstraint-Revised
- NEGE-r Negative Emotionality/Neuroticism-Revised
- INTR-r Introversiion/Low Positive Emotionality-Revised

MMPI-2-RF T SCORES (BY DOMAIN)

PROTOCOL VALIDITY

Content Non-Responsiveness	0	48	65 T			
	CNS	VRIN-r	TRIN-r			
Over-Reporting	42	42		50	42	38
	F-r	Fp-r		Fs	FBS-r	RBS
Under-Reporting	37	38				
	L-r	K-r				

SUBSTANTIVE SCALES

Somatic/Cognitive Dysfunction	42	46	46	42	41	54		
	RC1	MLS	GIC	HPC	NUC	COG		
Emotional Dysfunction	51	51	45	40	56	48		
	EID	RCd	SUI	HLP	SFD	NFC		
		46	54					
		RC2	INTR-r					
		52	47	44	47	56	36	49
		RC7	STW	AXY	ANP	BRF	MSF	NEGE-r
Thought Dysfunction	57	43						
	THD	RC6						
		63						
		RC8						
		56						
		PSYC-r						
Behavioral Dysfunction	57	52	50	50				
	BXD	RC4	JCP	SUB				
		58	67	48	65	59		
		RC9	AGG	ACT	AGGR-r	DISC-r		
Interpersonal Functioning	68	46	39	65	50	44		
		FML	RC3	IPP	SAV	SHY	DSF	
Interests	39	61						
		AES	MEC					

Scale scores shown in bold font are interpreted in the report.

Note. This information is provided to facilitate interpretation following the recommended structure for MMPI-2-RF interpretation in Chapter 5 of the *MMPI-2-RF Manual for Administration, Scoring, and Interpretation*, which provides details in the text and an outline in Table 5-1.

*This interpretive report is intended for use by a professional qualified to interpret the MMPI-2-RF in the context of preemployment psychological evaluations of police and other law enforcement officer candidates. **It focuses on identifying problems; it does not convey potential strengths.** The information it contains should be considered in the context of the test taker's background, the demands of the position under consideration, the clinical interview, findings from supplemental tests, and other relevant information.*

The interpretive statements in the Protocol Validity section of the report are based on T scores derived from the general MMPI-2-RF normative sample, as well as scores obtained by the multisite sample of 2,074 individuals that make up the Police Officer Candidate comparison group.

The interpretive statements in the Clinical Findings and Diagnostic Considerations sections of the report are based on T scores derived from the general MMPI-2-RF normative sample. Following recommended practice, only T scores of 65 and higher are considered clinically significant. Scores at this clinical level are generally rare among police officer candidates.

Statements in the Comparison Group Findings and Job-Relevant Correlates sections are based on comparisons with scores obtained by the Police Officer Candidate comparison group. Statements in these sections may be based on T scores that, although less than 65, are nevertheless uncommon in reference to the comparison group.

Sources for interpretive statements in all sections are listed in the Endnotes section of this report. See User's Guide for the MMPI-2-RF Police Candidate Interpretive Report for detailed information on report features.

SYNOPSIS

This is a valid MMPI-2-RF protocol. Scores on the substantive scales indicate clinically significant behavioral and interpersonal dysfunction. Behavioral-externalizing problems relate to aggression. Interpersonal difficulties include family problems and social avoidance.

Comparison group findings point to additional possible concerns about self-doubt, odd perceptions and beliefs, and excitement.

Possible job-relevant problems are identified in the following domains: Emotional Control and Stress Tolerance, Routine Task Performance, Decision-Making and Judgment, Feedback Acceptance, Assertiveness, Social Competence and Teamwork, Integrity, Conscientiousness and Dependability, Substance Use, and Impulse Control.

PROTOCOL VALIDITY

Content Non-Responsiveness

There are no problems with unscorable items in this protocol. The test taker responded relevantly to the items on the basis of their content.

Over-Reporting

There are no indications of over-reporting in this protocol.

Under-Reporting

The candidate's scores show no evidence of under-reporting, indicating a cooperative test-taking approach.

The test taker claimed no uncommon virtues¹. This very rare pattern of responding is found in only 4.0% of the Police Officer Candidate comparison group members.

In addition, he reported being much less well-adjusted than members of the general population². Less than 1% of the Police Officer Candidate comparison group reported this low level of psychological adjustment. As detailed later in this report, his scores on the substantive scales do indeed raise significant concerns about the candidate's psychological adjustment.

CLINICAL FINDINGS

Clinical-level symptoms, personality characteristics, and behavioral tendencies of the test taker are described in this section and organized according to an empirically guided framework. (Please see Chapter 8, Yossef S. Ben-Porath, Interpreting the MMPI-2-RF, for details.) Statements containing the word "reports" are based on the item content of MMPI-2-RF scales, whereas statements that include the word "likely" are based on empirical correlates of scale scores. Specific sources for each statement can be accessed with the annotation features of this report.

The test taker reports engaging in physically aggressive, violent behavior and losing control³, and is indeed likely to have a history of violent behavior toward others⁴.

The test taker reports conflictual family relationships and lack of support from family members⁵. He is indeed likely to have family conflicts and to experience poor family functioning⁶, to have strong negative feelings about family members⁷, and to blame family members for his difficulties⁷. He reports not enjoying social events and avoiding social situations⁸. He is likely to be introverted⁹, to have difficulty forming close relationships¹⁰, and to be emotionally restricted¹¹.

There are no indications of clinically significant somatic, cognitive, emotional, or thought dysfunction in this protocol.

DIAGNOSTIC CONSIDERATIONS

This section provides recommendations for psychodiagnostic assessment based on the test taker's MMPI-2-RF results. It is recommended that he be evaluated for the following:

Behavioral-Externalizing Disorders

- Disorders associated with interpersonally aggressive behavior such as intermittent explosive disorder¹²

Interpersonal Disorders

- Disorders associated with social avoidance such as avoidant personality disorder¹³

COMPARISON GROUP FINDINGS

*This section describes the MMPI-2-RF substantive scale findings in the context of the Police Officer Candidate comparison group. Specific sources for each statement can be accessed with the annotation features of this report. **Job-related correlates of these results, if any, are provided in the subsequent Job-Relevant Correlates section.***

Emotional/Internalizing Problems

The test taker reports a comparatively high level of self-doubt for a police officer candidate¹⁴. Only 2.8% of comparison group members convey this or a greater lack of confidence.

Unusual Thoughts, Perceptions, and Beliefs

The test taker reports a comparatively high level of unusual thinking for a police officer candidate¹⁵. Only 8.7% of comparison group members convey such thoughts at this or a higher level. More specifically, he reports a relatively high level of odd perceptions and thoughts for a police officer candidate¹⁶. Only 3.0% of comparison group members convey this or a greater level of unusual experiences.

Behavioral/Externalizing Problems

The test taker reports a comparatively large number of behavioral problems for a police officer candidate¹⁷. Only 7.3% of comparison group members convey this or a greater level of behavioral difficulties. More specifically, he reports a relatively high level of excitability for a police officer candidate¹⁸. Only 4.8% of comparison group members convey this or a greater level of stimulation and irritable temperament or disinhibition. In particular, his responses indicate a level of physically violent behavior that may be incompatible with public safety requirements for behavioral control¹². This level of aggression is very uncommon among police officer candidates. Only 0.6% of comparison group members give evidence of this or a greater level of physically violent behavior.

Interpersonal Problems

The test taker's responses indicate a level of family problems that may be incompatible with public safety requirements for good interpersonal functioning¹⁹. This level of family conflict is very uncommon among police officer candidates. Only 0.5% of comparison group members give evidence of this or a

greater level of family problems. His responses also indicate a level of social avoidance that may impede conformance with public safety requirements for good interpersonal functioning²⁰. This level of socially avoidant behavior is very uncommon among police officer candidates. Only 4.0% of comparison group members demonstrate this or a greater level of social avoidance.

JOB-RELEVANT CORRELATES

Job-relevant personality characteristics and behavioral tendencies of the test taker are described in this section and organized according to ten problem domains commonly identified in the professional literature as relevant to police officer candidate suitability. (Please see User's Guide for MMPI-2-RF Police Candidate Interpretive Report for details.) Statements that begin with "Compared with other police officer candidates" are based on correlations with other self-report measures obtained in police officer candidate samples that included individuals who were subsequently hired as well as those who were not. Statements that begin with "He is more likely than most police officers or trainees" are based on correlations with outcome data obtained in samples of hired candidates during academy or field training, probation, and/or the post-probation period. Specific sources for each statement can be accessed with the annotation features of this report.

Emotional Control and Stress Tolerance Problems

Compared with other police officer candidates, the test taker is more likely to worry about problems and be uncertain about how to deal with them²¹ and to become impatient with others over minor infractions²².

He is more likely than most police officers or trainees to exhibit difficulties performing under stressful conditions²³.

Routine Task Performance Problems

The test taker is more likely than most police officers or trainees to exhibit difficulties carrying out tasks under non-stressful conditions²⁴.

Decision-Making and Judgment Problems

Compared with other police officer candidates, the test taker is more likely to have thoughts, perceptions, and/or experiences that are rarely reported²⁵.

Feedback Acceptance Problems

The test taker is more likely than most police officers or trainees to exhibit difficulties accepting and responding to constructive performance feedback²⁶.

Assertiveness Problems

Compared with other police officer candidates, the test taker is more likely to avoid situations that others generally view as benign and non-intimidating²⁷ and to be ill at ease in dealing with others²⁸.

He is more likely than most police officers or trainees to exhibit difficulties in demonstrating a command presence and controlling situations requiring order or resolution²⁹.

Social Competence and Teamwork Problems

Compared with other police officer candidates, the test taker is more likely to have a history of problems getting along with others²²; to be opinionated and outspoken²²; and to be demanding²². He is also more likely to have a limited social support network²⁸ and to have difficulty trusting others²².

He is more likely than most police officers or trainees to exhibit difficulties reading people, listening to others, and adapting his language and approach to the requirements of the situation²³. He is also more likely to exhibit difficulties stemming from rude and/or overbearing behavior that results in complaints from the public³⁰ and cooperating with peers and/or supervisors³¹.

Integrity Problems

Compared with other police officer candidates, the test taker is more likely to have skeptical and/or antisocial views of the world²² and to believe that life is unfair and that exploiting opportunities for personal gain is justified²².

He is more likely than most police officers or trainees to exhibit difficulties leading to integrity violations³² and sustained internal affairs investigations³².

Conscientiousness and Dependability Problems

The test taker is more likely than most police officers or trainees to exhibit difficulties reliably attending court³³; with punctuality and attendance²³; and with reliable work behavior and dependable follow-through³⁴.

Substance Use Problems

Compared with other police officer candidates, the test taker is more likely to have a history of substance use problems³⁵.

Impulse Control Problems

Compared with other police officer candidates, the test taker is more likely to behave impulsively or without adequate consideration of the consequences or implications of his actions²².

He is more likely than most police officers or trainees to exhibit difficulties reacting to situations with the proper degree of emotional and behavioral restraint and control, and avoiding impulsive and/or unnecessarily risky behavior³⁶.

ITEM-LEVEL INFORMATION

Unscorable Responses

The test taker produced scorable responses to all the MMPI-2-RF items.

Critical Responses

Seven MMPI-2-RF scales--Suicidal/Death Ideation (SUI), Helplessness/Hopelessness (HLP), Anxiety (AXY), Ideas of Persecution (RC6), Aberrant Experiences (RC8), Substance Abuse (SUB), and Aggression (AGG)--have been designated by the test authors as having critical item content that may require immediate attention and follow-up. Items answered by the individual in the keyed direction (True or False) on a critical scale are listed below if his T score on that scale is 65 or higher. The percentage of the MMPI-2-RF normative sample (NS) and of the Police Officer Candidate (Men and Women) comparison group (CG) that answered each item in the keyed direction are provided in parentheses following the item content.

Aggression (AGG, T Score = 67)

- 23. Item Content Omitted. (True; NS 39.0%, CG 7.8%)
- 26. Item Content Omitted. (True; NS 19.9%, CG 3.3%)
- 84. Item Content Omitted. (True; NS 12.1%, CG 1.8%)
- 316. Item Content Omitted. (True; NS 45.1%, CG 30.7%)
- 337. Item Content Omitted. (True; NS 50.2%, CG 17.4%)



Special Note:

The content of the test items is included in the actual reports. To protect the integrity of the test, the item content does not appear in this sample report.

User-Designated Item-Level Information

The following item-level information is based on the report user's selection of additional scales, and/or of lower cutoffs for the critical scales from the previous section. Items answered by the test taker in the keyed direction (True or False) on a selected scale are listed below if his T score on that scale is at the user-designated cutoff score or higher. The percentage of the MMPI-2-RF normative sample (NS) and of the Police Officer Candidate (Men and Women) comparison group (CG) that answered each item in the keyed direction are provided in parentheses following the item content.

Thought Dysfunction (THD, T Score = 57)

- 12. Item Content Omitted. (True; NS 22.2%, CG 5.8%)
- 199. Item Content Omitted. (True; NS 12.1%, CG 6.7%)
- 330. Item Content Omitted. (True; NS 15.2%, CG 3.5%)

Behavioral/Externalizing Dysfunction (BXD, T Score = 57)

- 61. Item Content Omitted. (False; NS 61.6%, CG 58.7%)
- 84. Item Content Omitted. (True; NS 12.1%, CG 1.8%)
- 107. Item Content Omitted. (True; NS 47.3%, CG 35.5%)
- 131. Item Content Omitted. (True; NS 43.3%, CG 32.9%)
- 156. Item Content Omitted. (True; NS 59.8%, CG 45.9%)
- 205. Item Content Omitted. (True; NS 13.0%, CG 8.6%)
- 226. Item Content Omitted. (True; NS 21.5%, CG 38.1%)
- 237. Item Content Omitted. (False; NS 27.4%, CG 17.2%)
- 316. Item Content Omitted. (True; NS 45.1%, CG 30.7%)

Aberrant Experiences (RC8, T Score = 63)

- 12. Item Content Omitted. (True; NS 22.2%, CG 5.8%)
- 32. Item Content Omitted. (True; NS 21.1%, CG 15.0%)
- 199. Item Content Omitted. (True; NS 12.1%, CG 6.7%)
- 257. Item Content Omitted. (True; NS 12.4%, CG 4.3%)
- 330. Item Content Omitted. (True; NS 15.2%, CG 3.5%)

Hypomanic Activation (RC9, T Score = 58)

- 26. Item Content Omitted. (True; NS 19.9%, CG 3.3%)
- 39. Item Content Omitted. (True; NS 51.0%, CG 42.1%)
- 61. Item Content Omitted. (False; NS 61.6%, CG 58.7%)
- 72. Item Content Omitted. (True; NS 81.5%, CG 52.6%)
- 84. Item Content Omitted. (True; NS 12.1%, CG 1.8%)
- 97. Item Content Omitted. (True; NS 50.5%, CG 24.4%)
- 107. Item Content Omitted. (True; NS 47.3%, CG 35.5%)
- 118. Item Content Omitted. (True; NS 57.4%, CG 55.1%)
- 131. Item Content Omitted. (True; NS 43.3%, CG 32.9%)
- 143. Item Content Omitted. (True; NS 27.5%, CG 20.5%)
- 207. Item Content Omitted. (True; NS 66.9%, CG 43.2%)
- 219. Item Content Omitted. (True; NS 51.5%, CG 35.1%)
- 244. Item Content Omitted. (True; NS 56.9%, CG 84.9%)
- 305. Item Content Omitted. (True; NS 37.6%, CG 59.4%)
- 316. Item Content Omitted. (True; NS 45.1%, CG 30.7%)
- 337. Item Content Omitted. (True; NS 50.2%, CG 17.4%)

Self-Doubt (SFD, T Score = 56)

- 89. Item Content Omitted. (True; NS 35.9%, CG 6.1%)
- 232. Item Content Omitted. (True; NS 21.9%, CG 2.6%)

Family Problems (FML, T Score = 68)

- 19. Item Content Omitted. (False; NS 17.0%, CG 7.8%)
- 58. Item Content Omitted. (True; NS 57.3%, CG 37.4%)
- 103. Item Content Omitted. (True; NS 38.6%, CG 7.6%)

- 180. Item Content Omitted. (True; NS 30.4%, CG 17.4%)
- 215. Item Content Omitted. (True; NS 23.8%, CG 5.2%)
- 307. Item Content Omitted. (True; NS 19.1%, CG 3.6%)

Social Avoidance (SAV, T Score = 65)

- 47. Item Content Omitted. (False; NS 57.1%, CG 49.5%)
- 57. Item Content Omitted. (False; NS 22.1%, CG 15.1%)
- 109. Item Content Omitted. (False; NS 40.0%, CG 24.6%)
- 153. Item Content Omitted. (False; NS 25.9%, CG 29.6%)
- 201. Item Content Omitted. (False; NS 24.8%, CG 12.0%)
- 222. Item Content Omitted. (False; NS 19.6%, CG 6.2%)
- 278. Item Content Omitted. (True; NS 28.3%, CG 13.8%)

Critical Follow-up Items

This section contains a list of items to which the test taker responded in a manner warranting follow-up. The items were identified by police officer screening experts as having critical content. Clinicians are encouraged to follow up on these statements with the candidate by making related inquiries, rather than reciting the item(s) verbatim. Each item is followed by the candidate's response, the percentage of Police Officer Candidate comparison group members who gave this response, and the scale(s) on which the item appears.

- 26. Item Content Omitted. (True; 3.3%; RBS, RC9, AGG, AGGR-r)
- 84. Item Content Omitted. (True; 1.8%; BXD, RC9, AGG, AGGR-r)
- 257. Item Content Omitted. (True; 4.3%; VRIN-r, RC8, COG)
- 318. Item Content Omitted. (True; 2.8%; VRIN-r, RC7, ANP)
- 322. Item Content Omitted. (True; 4.0%; TRIN-r, EID, RC7)
- 330. Item Content Omitted. (True; 3.5%; THD, RC8, PSYC-r)
- 337. Item Content Omitted. (True; 17.4%; VRIN-r, RC9, AGG)

ENDNOTES

This section lists for each statement in the report the MMPI-2-RF score(s) that triggered it. In addition, each statement is identified as a Test Response, if based on item content, a Correlate, if based on empirical correlates, or an Inference, if based on the report authors' judgment. (This information can also be accessed on-screen by placing the cursor on a given statement.) For correlate-based statements, research references (Ref. No.) are provided, keyed to the consecutively numbered reference list following the endnotes.

- ¹ Test Response: L-r=37
- ² Test Response: K-r=38
- ³ Test Response: AGG=67
- ⁴ Correlate: AGG=67, Ref. 10
- ⁵ Test Response: FML=68
- ⁶ Correlate: FML=68, Ref. 2, 10
- ⁷ Correlate: FML=68, Ref. 10
- ⁸ Test Response: SAV=65
- ⁹ Correlate: SAV=65, Ref. 1, 10
- ¹⁰ Correlate: SAV=65, Ref. 4, 10
- ¹¹ Correlate: SAV=65, Ref. 10
- ¹² Inference: AGG=67
- ¹³ Correlate: SAV=65, Ref. 11
- ¹⁴ Test Response: SFD=56
- ¹⁵ Test Response: THD=57
- ¹⁶ Test Response: RC8=63
- ¹⁷ Test Response: BXD=57
- ¹⁸ Test Response: RC9=58
- ¹⁹ Inference: FML=68
- ²⁰ Inference: SAV=65
- ²¹ Correlate: FML=68, Ref. 9
- ²² Correlate: RC9=58, Ref. 3, 9
- ²³ Correlate: SAV=65, Ref. 5, 8
- ²⁴ Correlate: RC8=63, Ref. 5, 7; FML=68, Ref. 5, 8
- ²⁵ Correlate: RC8=63, Ref. 3, 9
- ²⁶ Correlate: AGG=67, Ref. 6
- ²⁷ Correlate: SAV=65, Ref. 9
- ²⁸ Correlate: SAV=65, Ref. 3, 9
- ²⁹ Correlate: SAV=65, Ref. 5
- ³⁰ Correlate: RC9=58, Ref. 9; AGG=67, Ref. 8
- ³¹ Correlate: AGG=67, Ref. 6, 7, 8
- ³² Correlate: RC8=63, Ref. 9
- ³³ Correlate: RC8=63, Ref. 7
- ³⁴ Correlate: SAV=65, Ref. 5, 6
- ³⁵ Correlate: RC9=58, Ref. 3, 5, 9
- ³⁶ Correlate: RC9=58, Ref. 9

RESEARCH REFERENCE LIST

1. Ayearst, L. E., Sellbom, M., Trobst, K. K., & Bagby, R. M. (2013). Evaluating the interpersonal content of the MMPI-2-RF Interpersonal Scales. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 95, 187-196. [doi: 10.1080/00223891.2012.730085](https://doi.org/10.1080/00223891.2012.730085)
2. Block, A. R., Ben-Porath, Y. S., & Marek, R. J. (2013). Psychological risk factors for poor outcome of spine surgery and spinal cord stimulator implant: A review of the literature and their assessment with the MMPI-2-RF. *The Clinical Neuropsychologist*, 27, 81-107. [doi: 10.1080/13854046.2012.721007](https://doi.org/10.1080/13854046.2012.721007)
3. Detrick, P., Ben-Porath, Y.S., & Sellbom, M. (under review). Associations between MMPI-2-RF (Restructured Form) and Inwald Personality Inventory (IPI) scale scores in a law enforcement pre-employment screening sample.
4. Forbey, J. D., Lee, T. T. C., & Handel, R. W. (2010). Correlates of the MMPI-2-RF in a college setting. *Psychological Assessment*, 22, 737-744. [doi: 10.1037/a0020645](https://doi.org/10.1037/a0020645)
5. Tarescavage, A. M., Brewster, J., Corey, D. M., & Ben-Porath, Y. S. (in press). Use of pre-hire MMPI-2-RF police candidate scores to predict supervisor ratings of post-hire performance. *Assessment*.
6. Tarescavage, A. M., Corey, D. M., & Ben-Porath, Y. S. (2014). Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory-2-Restructured Form predictors of police officer problem behavior. *Assessment*. [doi: 10.1177/1073191114534885](https://doi.org/10.1177/1073191114534885)
7. Tarescavage, A. M., Corey, D. M., & Ben-Porath, Y. S. (under review). A prorating method for estimating MMPI-2-RF scores from MMPI responses: Examination of score fidelity and illustration of empirical utility in the PERSEREC police integrity study sample.
8. Tarescavage, A. M., Corey, D. M., Gupton, H. M., & Ben-Porath Y.S. (under review). Criterion validity and practical utility of the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory-2-Restructured Form in assessments of police officer candidates.
9. Tarescavage, A. M., Fischler, G., Cappo, B., Hill, D., Corey, D. M., & Ben-Porath, Y. S. (under review). Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory-2-Restructured Form (MMPI-2-RF) predictors of police officer problem behavior and collateral self-report test scores.
10. Tellegen, A., & Ben-Porath, Y. S. (2008/2011). *The Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory-2-Restructured Form (MMPI-2-RF): Technical manual*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
11. Van der Heijden, P. T., Egger, J. I. M., Rossi, G., Grundel, G., & Derksen, J. J. L. (2012). The MMPI-2 Restructured Form and the standard MMPI-2 Clinical Scales in relation to DSM-IV. *European Journal of Psychological Assessment*. [doi: 10.1027/1015-5759/a000140](https://doi.org/10.1027/1015-5759/a000140)

End of Report

This and previous pages of this report contain trade secrets and are not to be released in response to requests under HIPAA (or any other data disclosure law that exempts trade secret information from release). Further, release in response to litigation discovery demands should be made only in accordance with your profession's ethical guidelines and under an appropriate protective order.

SAMPLE