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INTRODUCTION

Malingering is the intentional overreporting of psychopathology, somatic, or cognitive symptoms for secondary gain. 1
Overreporting can attenuate the criterion validity of substantive scales, and if undetected, lead to erroneous conclusions during evaluations. 2, 3
Previous research demonstrated the MMPI-2* and MMPI-2-RF5 overreporting validity scales can identify protocols invalidated by overreporting of psychopathology, somatic, and cognitive complaints, with most studies using simulation designs or another test as a criterion to identify suspected malingerers.

For instance, using M-FAST elevations to identify suspected malingerers in a disability claimant sample, Chmielowski et al 4 recently found that all examined MMPI-2 and MMPI-2-RF overreporting Validity Scales significantly distinguished between groups. Greatest effects were observed for the MMPI-2-F, and F scales as well as the MMPI-2-RF F-r scale.

AIMS & HYPOTHESES

The current study extends extant research using uncontaminated DSM-IV-TR malingering V Code presence as the criterion to compare mean MMPI-2 and MMPI-2-RF scores of malingering and non-malingering forensic inpatients. We examined independent samples t-tests, Hedges’ g values, and Receiver Operating Characteristic (ROC) Area Under the Curve (AUC) values.
We hypothesized there would be larger differences in mean scores on the psychopathology overreporting scales (i.e., F-r, Fp-r) than on the cognitive or somatic overreporting scales (i.e., Fs, Fb-r, RBS), given the significant potential incentives for overreporting psychological distress in this setting.

METHOD

Participants
A total of 931 forensic psychiatric inpatients completed the MMPI-2 in clinical or forensic evaluations. After invalid protocols were removed, n = 716:
Age: M = 39.92 years (SD = 11.00 years)
Education: M = 12.16 years (SD = 2.65 years)
Sex: n = 505 (70.5%) Male
Most patients were committed as:
Not Guilty by Reason of Insanity (n = 366, 51.1%)
Incompetent to Stand Trial (n = 139, 19.4%)
Mentally Disordered Offender (n = 139, 19.4%)
Measures
MMPI-2: a 567-item True/False self-report measure of psychopathology and personality dysfunction that also includes four overreporting Validity Scales.
MMPI-2-RF: A shortened version of the MMPI-2 that includes five overreporting Validity Scales.
Each measure has garnered significant empirical attention. See Graham1 and Ben-Parah5 for comprehensive reviews.

Procedure
Of the 931 patients who completed the MMPI-2, 138 were excluded due to non-content-based invalid MMPI-2 protocols (CNS ≥ 30, VRIN ≥ 80, and/or TRIN ≥ 80).
After rescoring MMPI-2 items into MMPI-2-RF items, an additional 77 patients were excluded due to non-content-based invalid MMPI-2-RF protocols (CNS ≥ 18, VRIN ≥ 80, and/or TRIN ≥ 80).
Uncontaminated diagnoses of record on the date of MMPI-2 administration were used to determine two criterion groups:
Malingering: Forensic inpatients with malingering V Codes (n = 17)
Non-Malingering: Forensic inpatients without malingering V Codes (n = 699)

RESULTS & DISCUSSION

All MMPI-2 and MMPI-2-RF scales evidenced statistically and practically significant mean score differences across malingering and non-malingering patient groups in the expected direction.
MMPI-2 Hedges’ g values ranged from 0.95 (Fb-r) to 1.07 (Fp-r).
MMPI-2-RF Hedges’ g values ranged from 0.94 (Fb-r) to 1.27 (F-r).
MMPI-2 Fp, F, and Fp-r and MMPI-2-RF F-r, Fp-r and RBS demonstrated the largest effects.
The ROC AUC values demonstrated a similar pattern, with the MMPI-2 Fp-r and MMPI-2-RF F-r scales best discriminating between the malingering and non-malingering groups.
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TABLE 1. COMPARISON OF VALIDITY SCALE SCORES FOR MALINGERING AND NON-MALINGERING PATIENT GROUPS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Malingering (n = 17)</th>
<th>Non-Malingering (n = 699)</th>
<th>Hedges' g Effect Size</th>
<th>ROC AUC Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MMPI-2 Validity Scales</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F: Infrequency</td>
<td>94.35</td>
<td>24.75</td>
<td>66.89</td>
<td>23.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fp: Back Infrequency</td>
<td>85.06</td>
<td>28.70</td>
<td>64.33</td>
<td>19.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fp: Infrequency Psychopathy</td>
<td>96.88</td>
<td>24.84</td>
<td>66.18</td>
<td>23.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FBS: Fake-Bad Scale</td>
<td>70.47</td>
<td>20.28</td>
<td>57.48</td>
<td>13.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MMPI-2-RF Validity Scales</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F-r: Infrequent Responses</td>
<td>98.71</td>
<td>26.63</td>
<td>67.01</td>
<td>24.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fp-r: Infrequent Psychopathy Responses</td>
<td>87.88</td>
<td>27.82</td>
<td>62.30</td>
<td>21.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fs: Infrequent Somatic Responses</td>
<td>80.53</td>
<td>23.62</td>
<td>59.62</td>
<td>19.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FBS-r: Symptom Validity</td>
<td>69.24</td>
<td>19.27</td>
<td>56.06</td>
<td>13.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RBS: Response Bias Scale</td>
<td>81.76</td>
<td>23.78</td>
<td>60.96</td>
<td>18.38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Results are presented as linear T scores. *statistically significant t-test; p < .05. Large (|r| > .80) Hedges’ g values are bolded. ROC = Receiver Operating Characteristic. AUC = Area Under the Curve. Broad AUC interpretive benchmarks are: .60-.69 (modest discrimination), .70-.79 (acceptable discrimination), .80-.89 (excellent discrimination), and .90+ (outstanding discrimination). AUC values with 95% CIs that fall completely in the modest to excellent range are bolded.