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.
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
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

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

Comparison Group Data: Police Officer Candidate (Men and Women), N = 2,074
Mean Score (± 1 SD): 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 8 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.
MMPI-2-RF Somatic/Cognitive and Internalizing Scales

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Raw Score</th>
<th>T Score</th>
<th>Response %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MLS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GIC</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HPC</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NUC</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COG</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUI</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HLP</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFD</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NFC</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STW</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANP</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRF</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSF</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

- Mean Score (σ = 1 SD): 42 46 44 46 43 46 42 43 41 41 45 41 44 45
- Standard Dev (σ ± 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.
MMPI-2-RF Externalizing, Interpersonal, and Interest Scales

Externalizing
Interpersonal
Interest

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.
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: 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 Introversion/Low Positive Emotionality-Revised
# MMPI-2-RF T Scores (By Domain)

## Protocol Validity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0</th>
<th>48</th>
<th>65 T</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Content Non-Responsiveness</td>
<td>CNS</td>
<td>VRIN-r</td>
<td>TRIN-r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over-Reporting</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F-r</td>
<td>Fp-r</td>
<td>Fs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under-Reporting</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>L-r</td>
<td>K-r</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Substantive Scales

### Somatic/Cognitive Dysfunction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>42</th>
<th>46</th>
<th>46</th>
<th>42</th>
<th>41</th>
<th>54</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RC1, MLS, GIC, HPC, NUC, COG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Emotional Dysfunction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>51</th>
<th>51</th>
<th>45</th>
<th>40</th>
<th>56</th>
<th>48</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EID</td>
<td>RCd, SUI, HLP, SFD, NFC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>46</td>
<td>54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RC2</td>
<td>INTR-r</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>52</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RC7, STW, AXY, ANP, BRF, MSF, NEGE-r</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Thought Dysfunction

|                     | 57 | 43 | |
|---------------------|----|----||
| THD                 | RC6 |

### Behavioral Dysfunction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>57</th>
<th>52</th>
<th>50</th>
<th>50</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BXD</td>
<td>RC4, JCP, SUB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>58</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RC9, AGG, ACT, AGGR-r, DISC-r</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Interpersonal Functioning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>68</th>
<th>46</th>
<th>39</th>
<th>65</th>
<th>50</th>
<th>44</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FML</td>
<td>RC3, IPP, SAV, SHY, DSF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Interests

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>39</th>
<th>61</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AES</td>
<td>MEC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*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 excitation.

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 virtues. 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 population. 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 control, and is indeed likely to have a history of violent behavior toward others.

The test taker reports conflictual family relationships and lack of support from family members. He is indeed likely to have family conflicts and to experience poor family functioning, to have strong negative feelings about family members, and to blame family members for his difficulties. He reports not enjoying social events and avoiding social situations. He is likely to be introverted, to have difficulty forming close relationships, and to be emotionally restricted.

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 disorder

Interpersonal Disorders
- Disorders associated with social avoidance such as avoidant personality disorder

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 candidate. 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 candidate. 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 candidate. 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 candidate. 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 candidate. 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 control. 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 functioning. 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 functioning\textsuperscript{20}. 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 them\textsuperscript{21} and to become impatient with others over minor infractions\textsuperscript{22}. He is more likely than most police officers or trainees to exhibit difficulties performing under stressful conditions\textsuperscript{23}.

**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\textsuperscript{24}.

**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 reported\textsuperscript{25}.

**Feedback Acceptance Problems**

The test taker is more likely than most police officers or trainees to exhibit difficulties accepting and responding to constructive performance feedback\textsuperscript{26}.

**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-intimidating\textsuperscript{27} and to be ill at ease in dealing with others\textsuperscript{28}. He is more likely than most police officers or trainees to exhibit difficulties in demonstrating a command presence and controlling situations requiring order or resolution\textsuperscript{29}. 
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 others\(^2\); to be opinionated and outspoken\(^2\); and to be demanding\(^2\). He is also more likely to have a limited social support network\(^2\) and to have difficulty trusting others\(^2\).

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 situation\(^2\). He is also more likely to exhibit difficulties stemming from rude and/or overbearing behavior that results in complaints from the public\(^10\) and cooperating with peers and/or supervisors\(^31\).

Integrity Problems
Compared with other police officer candidates, the test taker is more likely to have skeptical and/or antisocial views of the world\(^2\) and to believe that life is unfair and that exploiting opportunities for personal gain is justified\(^2\).

He is more likely than most police officers or trainees to exhibit difficulties leading to integrity violations\(^32\) and sustained internal affairs investigations\(^32\).

Conscientiousness and Dependability Problems
The test taker is more likely than most police officers or trainees to exhibit difficulties reliably attending court\(^33\); with punctuality and attendance\(^2\); and with reliable work behavior and dependable follow-through\(^36\).

Substance Use Problems
Compared with other police officer candidates, the test taker is more likely to have a history of substance use problems\(^35\).

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 actions\(^2\).

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 behavior\(^36\).

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%)

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%)

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.
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: RC9=58, 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
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