

# SAMPLE REPORT



## Case Description: Mr. E – Police Candidate Interpretive Report

Mr. E is a 27-year-old, single male candidate for an entry-level police officer position in a large urban agency. His background revealed a stable work history as a lead package sorter with no reprimands or legal conflicts. Although several coworkers described him as “entitled,” “self-promoting,” and “bossy,” his supervisor (and best friend since high school) attributed those sentiments to coworker resentment over his comparatively high productivity and associated bonuses. During the interview, Mr. E frequently interrupted and spoke over the psychologist. He denied having any conflicts with coworkers and insisted that he was highly regarded and respected by the other workers on his crew.

Case descriptions do not accompany MMPI-3 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. E’s responses to the MMPI-3. Additional MMPI-3 sample reports, product offerings, training opportunities, and resources can be found at [PearsonAssessments.com/MMPI-3](https://PearsonAssessments.com/MMPI-3).

© 2022 Pearson Education, Inc. or its affiliates. All rights reserved. Pearson, Q-global, and Q Local are trademarks, in the US and/or other countries, of Pearson plc. MMPI is a registered trademark of the Regents of the University of Minnesota. CLINA2783a CP 7/22



Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory®-3

Yossef S. Ben-Porath  
Auke Tellegen

## MMPI®-3

### Police Candidate Interpretive Report

*David M. Corey, PhD, & Yossef S. Ben-Porath, PhD*

---

ID Number:	Mr. E
Age:	27
Gender:	Male
Marital Status:	Not reported
Years of Education:	Not reported
Date Assessed:	10/14/2021

SAMPLE


Copyright © 2020 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-3 English Test Booklet*. Copyright © 2020 by the Regents of the University of Minnesota. All rights reserved. Portions excerpted from the *MMPI-3 Manual for Administration, Scoring, and Interpretation*. Copyright © 2020 by the Regents of the University of Minnesota. All rights reserved. Portions excerpted from the *MMPI-3 Technical Manual*. Copyright © 2020 by the Regents of the University of Minnesota. All rights reserved. Used by permission of the University of Minnesota Press.

**Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory** and **MMPI** are registered trademarks of the Regents of the University of Minnesota. **Pearson** is a trademark, in the US and/or other countries, of Pearson Education, Inc., or its affiliates.

This report contains copyrighted material and trade secrets. Qualified licensees may excerpt portions of this output report, limited to the minimum text necessary to accurately describe their significant core conclusions, for incorporation into a written evaluation of the examinee, in accordance with their profession's citation standards, if any. No adaptations, translations, modifications, or special versions may be made of this report without prior written permission from the University of Minnesota Press.

[ 1.4 / RE1 / QG1 ]

## MMPI-3 Validity Scales



Raw Score:	1	1	13	3	0	2	5	2	5	11
T Score:	36	39	50	50	41	53	40	35	56	65
Response %:	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Cannot Say (Raw):	0									


Comparison Group Data: Police Candidate (Men and Women), N = 2,036

Mean Score (◇--◇):	39	39	52F	42	43	44	45	45	57	65
Standard Dev (±1SD):	5	5	5	2	4	4	6	6	12	7
Percent scoring at or below test taker:	54	71	61	99.6	84	99	23	11	58	47

The highest and lowest T scores possible on each scale are indicated by a "---"; MMPI-3 T scores are non-gendered.

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

## MMPI-3 Higher-Order (H-O) and Restructured Clinical (RC) Scales



Raw Score:	0	6	5	0	1	0	2	3	3	4	7
T Score:	32	60	46	36	42	36	44	57	44	55	51
Response %:	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100


Comparison Group Data: Police Candidate (Men and Women), N = 2,036

Mean Score (◇---◇):	37	42	41	39	40	42	43	43	39	42	42
Standard Dev (±1 SD):	5	6	6	4	5	6	6	5	5	6	7
Percent scoring at or below test taker:	21	99.6	85	64	80	39	71	98	87	98	94

The highest and lowest T scores possible on each scale are indicated by a "---"; MMPI-3 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
		RC4	Antisocial Behavior	RC9	Hypomanic Activation

## MMPI-3 Somatic/Cognitive Dysfunction and Internalizing Scales



Raw Score:	0	2	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	5	0	0	0
T Score:	33	52	44	38	44	51	40	44	37	37	56	37	37	43
Response %:	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100


Comparison Group Data: Police Candidate (Men and Women), N = 2,036

Mean Score (◇--◇):	36	43	44	40	45	42	41	41	42	40	47	40	40	44
Standard Dev (±1 SD):	4	6	3	4	2	4	3	5	5	5	8	4	4	4
Percent scoring at or below test taker:	66	96	96	79	98	99.3	89	86	51	72	93	70	73	90

The highest and lowest T scores possible on each scale are indicated by a "---"; MMPI-3 T scores are non-gendered.

MLS	Malaise	SUI	Suicidal/Death Ideation	WRY	Worry
NUC	Neurological Complaints	HLP	Helplessness/Hopelessness	CMP	Compulsivity
EAT	Eating Concerns	SFD	Self-Doubt	ARX	Anxiety-Related Experiences
COG	Cognitive Complaints	NFC	Inefficacy	ANP	Anger Proneness
		STR	Stress	BRF	Behavior-Restricting Fears

## MMPI-3 Externalizing and Interpersonal Scales



Raw Score:	1	1	0	3	4	1	9	8	9	0	3	0
T Score:	43	48	39	52	53	49	55	54	69	40	50	38
Response %:	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100


Comparison Group Data: Police Candidate (Men and Women), N = 2,036

Mean Score (<math>\langle \diamond \text{---} \diamond ></math>):	41	44	42	41	45	43	41	51	49	43	45	42
Standard Dev (<math>\pm 1 \text{ SD}</math>):	6	7	5	5	8	5	8	8	8	6	7	6
Percent scoring at or below test taker:	78	81	67	98	90	94	96	81	100	71	81	59

The highest and lowest T scores possible on each scale are indicated by a "---"; MMPI-3 T scores are non-gendered.

FML	Family Problems	ACT	Activation	SFI	Self-Importance
JCP	Juvenile Conduct Problems	AGG	Aggression	DOM	Dominance
SUB	Substance Abuse	CYN	Cynicism	DSF	Disaffiliativeness
IMP	Impulsivity			SAV	Social Avoidance
				SHY	Shyness

### MMPI-3 PSY-5 Scales



Raw Score:	11	4	3	2	3
T Score:	63	59	45	45	47
Response %:	100	100	100	100	100

Comparison Group Data: Police Candidate (Men and Women), N = 2,036

Mean Score (◇---◇):	47	42	42	40	45
Standard Dev (±1 SD):	6	6	6	5	7
Percent scoring at or below test taker:	99.3	99.3	75	87	67

The highest and lowest T scores possible on each scale are indicated by a "---"; MMPI-3 T scores are non-gendered.

- AGGR Aggressiveness
- PSYC Psychoticism
- DISC Disconstraint
- NEGE Negative Emotionality/Neuroticism
- INTR Introversion/Low Positive Emotionality

## MMPI-3 T SCORES (BY DOMAIN)

### PROTOCOL VALIDITY

Content Non-Responsiveness	0	36	39	50		
	CNS	CRIN	VRIN	TRIN		
Over-Reporting	50	41		53	40	35
	F	Fp		Fs	FBS	RBS
Under-Reporting	56	65				
	L	K				

### SUBSTANTIVE SCALES

Somatic/Cognitive Dysfunction	42	33	52	44	38			
	RC1	MLS	NUC	EAT	COG			
Emotional Dysfunction	32	36	44	51	40	44		
	EID	RCd	SUI	HLP	SFD	NFC		
		36	47					
		RC2	INTR					
		44	37	37	56	37	37	43
		RC7	STR	WRY	CMP	ARX	ANP	BRF
								45
								NEGE
Thought Dysfunction	60	57						
	THD	RC6						
		55						
		RC8						
		59						
		PSYC						
Behavioral Dysfunction	46	44	43	48	39			
	BXD	RC4	FML	JCP	SUB			
		51	52	53	49	55		
		RC9	IMP	ACT	AGG	CYN		
		45						
		DISC						
Interpersonal Functioning	54	69	63	40	50	38		
		SFI	DOM	AGGR	DSF	SAV	SHY	

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-3 interpretation in Chapter 5 of the *MMPI-3 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-3 in the context of preemployment psychological evaluations of police and other law enforcement 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-3 normative sample, as well as scores obtained by the multisite sample of 2,036 individuals that make up the Police 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-3 normative sample. Following recommended practice, only T scores of 65 and higher (with a few exceptions) are considered clinically significant. Scores at this clinical level are generally rare among police candidates.*

*Statements in the Comparison Group Findings and Job-Relevant Correlates sections are based on comparisons with scores obtained by the Police 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.*

*The report includes extensive annotation, which appears as superscripts following each statement in the narrative, keyed to Endnotes with accompanying Research References, which appear in the final two sections of the report. Additional information about the annotation features is provided in the headnotes to these sections and in the MMPI-3 User's Guide for the Public Safety Candidate Interpretive Reports.*

---

## SYNOPSIS

This is a valid MMPI-3 protocol. Scores on the Substantive Scales indicate clinically significant interpersonal dysfunction. Interpersonal difficulties relate to overly domineering behavior.

Comparison group findings point to additional possible concerns about persecutory beliefs, odd perceptions and thoughts, and over-assertiveness.

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

## PROTOCOL VALIDITY

This is a valid MMPI-3 protocol. There are no problems with unscorable items. The test taker responded to the items relevantly on the basis of their content, and there are no indications of over- or under-reporting.

## 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 5 of the MMPI-3 Manual for Administration, Scoring, and Interpretation for details.) Statements containing the word "reports" are based on the item content of MMPI-3 scales, whereas statements that include the word "likely" are based on empirical correlates of scale scores. Specific sources for each statement can be viewed with the annotation features of this report.*

The test taker describes himself as having strong opinions, as standing up for himself, as assertive and direct, and as able to lead others<sup>1</sup>. He likely believes he has leadership capabilities, but is viewed by others as overly domineering<sup>2</sup>.

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

## DIAGNOSTIC CONSIDERATIONS

*This section provides recommendations for psychodiagnostic assessment based on the test taker's MMPI-3 results. It is recommended that he be evaluated for the following:*

### Interpersonal Disorders

- Disorders characterized by excessively domineering behavior<sup>3</sup>

## COMPARISON GROUP FINDINGS

*This section describes the MMPI-3 substantive scale findings in the context of the Police 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.***

### Unusual Thoughts, Perceptions, and Beliefs

The test taker reports a comparatively high level of unusual thinking for a police candidate<sup>4</sup>. Only 1.0% of comparison group members convey such thoughts at this or a higher level. More specifically, he reports a relatively high level of persecutory beliefs for a police candidate<sup>5</sup>. Only 4.0% of comparison group members convey this or a greater level of persecutory thinking.

He reports a comparatively high level of odd perceptions and thoughts for a police candidate<sup>6</sup>. Only 4.0% of comparison group members convey this or a greater level of unusual experiences.

### Interpersonal Problems

The test taker's responses indicate a level of dominance that may be incompatible with public safety requirements for good interpersonal functioning<sup>3</sup>. This level of domineering behavior is uncommon among police candidates. Only 6.0% of comparison group members give evidence of this level of dominance. He reports a comparatively high level of over-assertiveness for a police candidate<sup>7</sup>. Only 3.0% of comparison group members convey this or a greater level of interpersonally aggressive behavior.

## 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 public safety candidate suitability. (Please see MMPI-3 User's Guide for the Public Safety Candidate Interpretive Reports for details.) Statements that begin with "Compared with other police candidates" are based on correlations with other self-report measures obtained in police 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 postprobation 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 candidates, the test taker is more likely to believe he has been mistreated<sup>8</sup>.

He is more likely than most police officers or trainees to exhibit difficulties performing under stressful conditions<sup>9</sup>.

### **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 conditions<sup>10</sup>; cognitive adaptation problems<sup>11</sup>; and report writing problems<sup>11</sup>.

### **Decision-Making and Judgment Problems**

Compared with other police candidates, the test taker is more likely to have thoughts, perceptions, and/or experiences that are rarely reported<sup>12</sup> and to exhibit difficulty with decision-making and judgment<sup>13</sup>.

He is more likely than most police officers or trainees to exhibit difficulties prioritizing multiple and essential functions of the job and performing them in quick succession while maintaining good environmental awareness of vital information (in other words, multi-tasking)<sup>11</sup>. He is also more likely to exhibit difficulties with effective decision-making<sup>9</sup> and with seeking assistance in complex situations as needed<sup>14</sup>.

### **Feedback Acceptance Problems**

Compared with other police candidates, the test taker is less likely to reflect on his behavior<sup>15</sup> and more likely to brush off criticism and other negative feedback<sup>15</sup>.

### **Social Competence and Teamwork Problems**

Compared with other police candidates, the test taker is more likely to be opinionated and outspoken<sup>15</sup>; to be demanding<sup>15</sup>; and to have difficulty trusting others<sup>16</sup>. He is also more likely to feel maligned by others<sup>8</sup>; to have problems with social competence<sup>13</sup>; and to have difficulties with teamwork<sup>17</sup>.

He is more likely than most police officers or trainees to exhibit difficulties stemming from rude and/or overbearing behavior that results in complaints from the public<sup>18</sup> and cooperating with peers and/or supervisors<sup>19</sup>.

### **Integrity Problems**

The test taker is more likely than most police officers or trainees to exhibit difficulties leading to sustained internal affairs investigations<sup>20</sup>; complaints from the public<sup>21</sup>; and investigations about conduct unbecoming a police officer<sup>21</sup>.

### **Conscientiousness and Dependability Problems**

The test taker is more likely than most police officers or trainees to exhibit difficulties with initiative and drive, such as obtaining information and evidence needed to solve crimes and explain incidents<sup>22</sup>. He is also more likely to exhibit difficulties reliably attending court<sup>23</sup>; with punctuality and attendance<sup>24</sup>; and with conscientiousness<sup>25</sup>.

## Impulse Control Problems

The test taker is more likely than most police officers or trainees to exhibit problems controlling and de-escalating conflict<sup>14</sup>.

**The candidate's test scores are not associated with problems in the following domains:**

- Assertiveness
- Substance Use

## ITEM-LEVEL INFORMATION

### Unscorable Responses

The test taker produced scorable responses to all the MMPI-3 items.

### Critical Responses

*Seven MMPI-3 scales—Suicidal/Death Ideation (SUI), Helplessness/Hopelessness (HLP), Anxiety-Related Experiences (ARX), 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. However, any item answered in the keyed direction on SUI is listed.*

The test taker has not produced an elevated T score ( $\geq 65$ ) on any of these scales or answered any SUI items in the keyed direction.

### 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-3 normative sample (NS) and of the Police Candidate Comparison Group (CG) that answered each item in the keyed direction are provided in parentheses following the item content.*

#### Thought Dysfunction (THD, T Score = 60)

- Item number and content omitted. (True; NS 35.7%, CG 14.5%)
- Item number and content omitted. (False; NS 36.5%, CG 16.4%)
- Item number and content omitted. (True; NS 8.3%, CG 1.0%)
- Item number and content omitted. (True; NS 18.2%, CG 5.3%)
- Item number and content omitted. (False; NS 16.4%, CG 6.0%)
- Item number and content omitted. (True; NS 8.9%, CG 0.7%)

#### Note

Item numbers and content are included in the actual reports. To protect test security, the item details do not appear in this sample report.

#### Ideas of Persecution (RC6, T Score = 57)

- Item number and content omitted. (True; NS 8.3%, CG 1.0%)
- Item number and content omitted. (True; NS 30.9%, CG 9.6%)
- Item number and content omitted. (False; NS 16.4%, CG 6.0%)

#### Aberrant Experiences (RC8, T Score = 55)

- Item number and content omitted. (True; NS 35.7%, CG 14.5%)
- Item number and content omitted. (True; NS 38.0%, CG 15.8%)
- Item number and content omitted. (False; NS 36.5%, CG 16.4%)
- Item number and content omitted. (True; NS 18.2%, CG 5.3%)

### Dominance (DOM, T Score = 69)

- Item number and content omitted. (False; NS 85.2%, CG 96.5%)
- Item number and content omitted. (True; NS 78.7%, CG 78.2%)
- Item number and content omitted. (True; NS 68.8%, CG 40.8%)
- Item number and content omitted. (True; NS 74.7%, CG 73.7%)
- Item number and content omitted. (True; NS 74.3%, CG 90.2%)
- Item number and content omitted. (True; NS 60.7%, CG 74.0%)
- Item number and content omitted. (False; NS 80.6%, CG 97.6%)
- Item number and content omitted. (True; NS 66.5%, CG 87.1%)
- Item number and content omitted. (True; NS 39.8%, CG 12.1%)

#### Note

Item numbers and content are included in the actual reports. To protect test security, the item details do not appear in this sample report.

### Aggressiveness (AGGR, T Score = 63)

- Item number and content omitted. (False; NS 85.2%, CG 96.5%)
- Item number and content omitted. (True; NS 78.7%, CG 78.2%)
- Item number and content omitted. (True; NS 68.8%, CG 40.8%)
- Item number and content omitted. (True; NS 74.7%, CG 73.7%)
- Item number and content omitted. (True; NS 74.3%, CG 90.2%)
- Item number and content omitted. (False; NS 74.7%, CG 98.6%)
- Item number and content omitted. (True; NS 60.7%, CG 74.0%)
- Item number and content omitted. (True; NS 66.5%, CG 87.1%)
- Item number and content omitted. (True; NS 44.6%, CG 22.8%)
- Item number and content omitted. (True; NS 42.2%, CG 30.7%)
- Item number and content omitted. (True; NS 39.8%, CG 12.1%)

### Psychoticism (PSYC, T Score = 59)

- Item number and content omitted. (True; NS 35.7%, CG 14.5%)
- Item number and content omitted. (False; NS 36.5%, CG 16.4%)
- Item number and content omitted. (True; NS 18.2%, CG 5.3%)
- Item number and content omitted. (True; NS 8.9%, CG 0.7%)

### 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 public safety candidate 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 Candidate Comparison Group members who gave this response, and the scale(s) on which the item appears.*

- Item number and content omitted. (True; 5.1%; BXD, RC9, IMP, DISC)
- Item number and content omitted. (True; 0.9%; F)
- Item number and content omitted. (True; 5.0%; VRIN, BXD, RC9, IMP, DISC)

## ENDNOTES

*This section lists for each statement in the report the MMPI-3 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.*

- <sup>1</sup> Test Response: DOM=69
- <sup>2</sup> Correlate: DOM=69, Ref. 1, 2, 4, 6, 7, 14
- <sup>3</sup> Inference: DOM=69
- <sup>4</sup> Test Response: THD=60; PSYC=59
- <sup>5</sup> Test Response: RC6=57
- <sup>6</sup> Test Response: RC8=55
- <sup>7</sup> Test Response: AGGR=63
- <sup>8</sup> Correlate: RC6=57, Ref. 3
- <sup>9</sup> Correlate: RC8=55, Ref. 2; PSYC=59, Ref. 2
- <sup>10</sup> Correlate: RC8=55, Ref. 9, 11
- <sup>11</sup> Correlate: RC8=55, Ref. 2
- <sup>12</sup> Correlate: THD=60, Ref. 13; RC8=55, Ref. 5, 13; PSYC=59, Ref. 5, 13
- <sup>13</sup> Correlate: THD=60, Ref. 15; RC6=57, Ref. 15
- <sup>14</sup> Correlate: DOM=69, Ref. 8
- <sup>15</sup> Correlate: DOM=69, Ref. 2
- <sup>16</sup> Correlate: RC8=55, Ref. 2; PSYC=59, Ref. 5, 13
- <sup>17</sup> Correlate: RC6=57, Ref. 15
- <sup>18</sup> Correlate: AGGR=63, Ref. 8
- <sup>19</sup> Correlate: DOM=69, Ref. 8; AGGR=63, Ref. 2, 11
- <sup>20</sup> Correlate: RC8=55, Ref. 13; PSYC=59, Ref. 13
- <sup>21</sup> Correlate: RC6=57, Ref. 11, 13
- <sup>22</sup> Correlate: PSYC=59, Ref. 10, 12
- <sup>23</sup> Correlate: THD=60, Ref. 11, 13; RC8=55, Ref. 11; PSYC=59, Ref. 11, 13
- <sup>24</sup> Correlate: THD=60, Ref. 2, 8; RC8=55, Ref. 2, 8; PSYC=59, Ref. 2, 8
- <sup>25</sup> Correlate: THD=60, Ref. 2; RC8=55, Ref. 2; PSYC=59, Ref. 2

## RESEARCH REFERENCE LIST

The following studies are sources for empirical correlates identified in the Endnotes section of this report.

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*(2), 187–196.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/00223891.2012.730085>
2. Ben-Porath, Y. S., & Tellegen, A. (2020). *The Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory-3 (MMPI-3): Technical manual*. University of Minnesota Press.
3. Corey, D. M., & Ben-Porath, Y. S. (2022). *Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory-3 (MMPI-3): User's guide for the public safety candidate interpretive reports*. University of Minnesota Press.
4. Cox, A., Courrégé, S. C., Feder, A. H., & Weed, N. C. (2017). Effects of augmenting response options of the MMPI-2-RF: An extension of previous findings. *Cogent Psychology, 4*(1), 1323988.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/23311908.2017.1323988>
5. Detrick, P., Ben-Porath, Y.S., & Sellbom, M. (2016). Associations between MMPI-2-RF (Restructured Form) and Inwald Personality Inventory (IPI) scale scores in a law enforcement preemployment screening sample. *Journal of Police and Criminal Psychology, 31*, 81–95. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11896-015-9172-7>
6. Kastner, R. M., Sellbom, M., & Lilienfeld, S. O. (2012). A comparison of the psychometric properties of the Psychopathic Personality Inventory full-length and short-form versions. *Psychological Assessment, 24*(1), 261–267. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0025832>
7. Menton, W. H., Crighton, A. H., Tarescavage, A. M., Marek, R. J., Hicks, A. D., & Ben-Porath, Y. S. (2019). Equivalence of laptop and tablet administrations of the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory-2 Restructured Form. *Assessment, 26*(4), 661–669. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1073191117714558>
8. Roberts, R. M., Tarescavage, A. M., Ben-Porath, Y. S., & Roberts, M. D. (2018). predicting post-probationary job performance of police officers using CPI and MMPI-2-RF test data obtained during preemployment psychological screening. *Journal of Personality Assessment, 101*(5), 544–555.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/00223891.2018.1423990>
9. Tarescavage, A. M., Brewster, J., Corey, D. M., & Ben-Porath, Y. S. (2015). Use of pre-hire Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory-2-Restructured Form (MMPI-2-RF) police candidate scores to predict supervisor ratings of post-hire performance. *Assessment, 22*(4), 411–428.  
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1073191114548445>
10. Tarescavage, A. M., Corey, D. M., & Ben-Porath, Y. S. (2015). Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory-2-Restructured Form (MMPI-2-RF) predictors of police officer problem behavior. *Assessment, 22*(1), 116–132. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1073191114534885>
11. Tarescavage, A. M., Corey, D. M., & Ben-Porath, Y. S. (2016). 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. *Assessment, 23*(2), 173–190.  
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1073191115575070>
12. Tarescavage, A. M., Corey, D. M., Gupton, H. M., & Ben-Porath Y.S. (2015). Criterion validity and practical utility of the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory-2-Restructured Form (MMPI-2-RF) in assessments of police officer candidates. *Journal of Personality Assessment, 97*(4), 382–394.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/00223891.2014.995800>

13. Tarescavage, A. M., Fischler, G. L., Cappel, B. M., Hill, D. O., Corey, D. M., & Ben-Porath, Y. S. (2015). Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory-2-Restructured Form (MMPI-2-RF) predictors of police officer problem behavior and collateral self-report test scores. *Psychological Assessment, 27*(1), 125–137. <https://doi.org/10.1037/pas0000041>
14. Tellegen, A., & Ben-Porath, Y. S. (2008/2011). *Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory-2-Restructured Form (MMPI-2-RF): Technical manual*. University of Minnesota Press.
15. Whitman, M. R., Elias, L. S., Cappel, B. M., & Ben-Porath, Y. S. (2021). Criterion validity of MMPI-3 scores in preemployment evaluations of public safety candidates. *Psychological Assessment*. Advance online publication. <https://doi.org/10.1037/pas0001042>

**End of Report**

SAMPLE



## ITEM RESPONSES

1. 1	2. 1	3. 1	4. 1	5. 2	6. 2	7. 1	8. 1	9. 2	10. 2
11. 1	12. 1	13. 2	14. 1	15. 2	16. 1	17. 2	18. 2	19. 1	20. 1
21. 1	22. 2	23. 2	24. 2	25. 2	26. 2	27. 2	28. 2	29. 2	30. 2
31. 2	32. 1	33. 2	34. 2	35. 2	36. 1	37. 1	38. 2	39. 1	40. 1
41. 2	42. 2	43. 2	44. 2	45. 2	46. 2	47. 1	48. 2	49. 2	50. 2
51. 2	52. 2	53. 1	54. 2	55. 1	56. 2	57. 1	58. 2	59. 1	60. 1
61. 1	62. 1	63. 2	64. 2	65. 1	66. 2	67. 2	68. 1	69. 2	70. 2
71. 2	72. 2	73. 1	74. 2	75. 2	76. 2	77. 2	78. 2	79. 2	80. 2
81. 2	82. 2	83. 1	84. 2	85. 2	86. 2	87. 1	88. 1	89. 2	90. 2
91. 1	92. 2	93. 2	94. 1	95. 2	96. 2	97. 2	98. 2	99. 1	100. 2
101. 2	102. 1	103. 2	104. 1	105. 1	106. 1	107. 2	108. 2	109. 2	110. 2
111. 2	112. 2	113. 1	114. 2	115. 2	116. 2	117. 2	118. 2	119. 2	120. 2
121. 2	122. 2	123. 2	124. 2	125. 1	126. 2	127. 1	128. 2	129. 2	130. 2
131. 2	132. 2	133. 2	134. 1	135. 2	136. 2	137. 2	138. 2	139. 2	140. 1
141. 2	142. 1	143. 2	144. 2	145. 2	146. 2	147. 1	148. 2	149. 2	150. 2
151. 2	152. 2	153. 1	154. 2	155. 2	156. 1	157. 1	158. 2	159. 2	160. 2
161. 2	162. 1	163. 1	164. 2	165. 2	166. 1	167. 2	168. 2	169. 2	170. 1
171. 2	172. 2	173. 2	174. 1	175. 2	176. 2	177. 2	178. 2	179. 1	180. 2
181. 1	182. 1	183. 1	184. 2	185. 1	186. 2	187. 2	188. 2	189. 1	190. 1
191. 2	192. 2	193. 2	194. 1	195. 1	196. 2	197. 1	198. 2	199. 1	200. 2
201. 2	202. 1	203. 2	204. 2	205. 2	206. 1	207. 1	208. 2	209. 2	210. 2
211. 2	212. 2	213. 1	214. 2	215. 2	216. 2	217. 1	218. 1	219. 1	220. 2
221. 1	222. 1	223. 2	224. 2	225. 2	226. 2	227. 1	228. 2	229. 2	230. 2
231. 2	232. 2	233. 2	234. 1	235. 2	236. 1	237. 1	238. 1	239. 1	240. 2
241. 2	242. 2	243. 1	244. 2	245. 2	246. 1	247. 2	248. 2	249. 2	250. 2
251. 2	252. 2	253. 2	254. 2	255. 2	256. 1	257. 2	258. 1	259. 1	260. 2
261. 1	262. 1	263. 1	264. 2	265. 1	266. 2	267. 2	268. 2	269. 1	270. 2
271. 2	272. 1	273. 2	274. 2	275. 2	276. 1	277. 2	278. 1	279. 2	280. 2
281. 2	282. 1	283. 1	284. 1	285. 2	286. 2	287. 2	288. 2	289. 2	290. 2
291. 2	292. 2	293. 1	294. 2	295. 1	296. 2	297. 2	298. 1	299. 2	300. 2
301. 2	302. 1	303. 2	304. 2	305. 2	306. 2	307. 2	308. 2	309. 2	310. 2
311. 2	312. 2	313. 1	314. 2	315. 2	316. 1	317. 2	318. 2	319. 2	320. 2
321. 1	322. 2	323. 1	324. 2	325. 1	326. 1	327. 1	328. 2	329. 2	330. 2
331. 2	332. 1	333. 1	334. 2	335. 2					