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Abstract

A Comparison of Defensiveness in MMPI-2-RF Profiles of Male Sex Offenders and Child Custody Litigants

by

Kyla Jones, M.S.

Major Advisor: Radhika Krishnamurthy, Psy.D., ABAP

Clinical evaluations have had a long-standing role in criminal and civil legal proceedings due to the intersection between various legal criteria and aspects of psychological functioning. The Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory (MMPI; Hathaway & McKinley, 1943) and its subsequent versions have been among the most commonly utilized and empirically supported measures of personality and psychopathology in assessing forensic populations. One application for which MMPI instruments have been particularly useful is in the evaluation of sex offenders. This is in part due to the tests’ built-in validity scales, as MMPI underreporting scales are found to be effective in assessing sex offenders’ tendency to deny personal faults and/or psychological maladjustment. Defensiveness is also evident in other populations that undergo high-stakes evaluations, such as child custody litigants. However, whether the type of defensiveness across sex offenders and child custody litigants is similar in nature remains undetermined. The current study therefore compared defensiveness on the MMPI-2-RF in a sample of male sex offenders (N = 268) and child custody litigants (N = 260), both representing presumed defensive groups, by evaluating if test scores and item responses distinguish between these groups. Differences were also examined between clearly defensive subgroups of the sex offender (N = 102) and child custody litigant (N = 168) samples, defined as elevating one or both underreporting validity scales. Results of t-test
analyses for the presumed defensive samples comparison revealed child custody litigants were higher on the validity scale measuring denial of maladjustment (K-r), while sex offenders scored higher on overreporting of rare symptomology (F-r). On the clinical scales, multivariate analyses of variance (MANOVAs) and subsequent univariate analyses of variance (ANOVAs) revealed that, while both groups produced generally average range profiles, sex offenders scored significantly higher than custody litigants on 36 of 40 clinical scales. Item-level analysis results supplemented scale-level findings in identifying specific areas of difference. Results from the validity scale analysis for the clearly defensive groups revealed similar results to those of the presumed defensive comparison, with the addition of clearly defensive sex offenders scoring significantly higher than child custody litigants on the validity scale measuring denial of common faults (L-r). There were fewer areas of difference between clearly defensive sex offenders and custody litigants on the clinical scales than in the presumed defensive samples, but the direction of differences remained largely the same with sex offenders producing higher scores and item endorsement rates. Overall, findings indicated that sex offenders and custody litigants differ somewhat in the nature and degree of MMPI-related defensiveness, with sex offenders demonstrating denial of behavioral dysfunction and custody litigants demonstrating denial of certain undesirable interpersonal characteristics, and with child custody litigants consistently producing more defensive profiles. This study identified important implications for forensic practice, which were discussed.
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Chapter 1: Introduction

Sexual offenses are considered a heinous class of criminal behavior that occur at a disturbing rate across the United States. Specifically, data reported by the National Crime Victimization Survey developed by the Bureau of Justice Statistics (Thompson & Tapp, 2021) indicated that 319,950 rapes and sexual assaults were reported in 2020 alone. The National Center for Missing and Exploited Children (2016) further estimated that there are over 850,000 registered sex offenders across the country. However, both of these statistics are likely gross underestimates due to the large number of sex crimes that go unreported or do not result in a conviction. Broadly speaking, sex-related crimes are defined by the National Institute of Justice as “any crimes that have a sexual component,” (para. 1) to include those resulting in either physical or emotional harm to another individual (National Institute of Justice, n.d). This broad definition thus presents yet another obstacle to accurately measuring rates of sex crimes, as there is a wide array of crimes included in that category (e.g., rape, child pornography, sexual assault, indecent exposure) that are often measured independently of each other and may vary in their legal definition from state to state. Thus, it stands to reason that sexual victimization occurs at higher frequencies than any crime data source may currently estimate (Wiseman, 2015).

Unfortunately, even for sex offenders who are detected and arrested for their crime(s), the perceived and actual risk that they pose to the community at large does not necessarily end at the time of conviction. While public perception of sexual recidivism is largely overestimated, there does remain some degree of risk for reoffending that is based in reality. Sexual recidivism rates following incarceration for a sexual offense are estimated to range from approximately five percent after three years to 24 percent after
15 years (Przybylski, 2015). Considering the real and imagined risk that sex offenders may repeat their crimes, many governmental entities at both the state and federal levels, as well as a number of civilian-led organizations, have organized efforts to prevent and reduce the risk of sexual violence. Examples of such action include national legislature such as Megan’s Law and the Adam Walsh Protection Act, which went into effect in 1996 and 2007, respectively. The first of these laws to be passed, Megan’s Law, was initiated following the abduction, rape, and murder of a 7-year-old girl from New Jersey by a neighbor with a record of past sex offenses (Levenson et al., 2005). Once passed, this federal legislature required states to implement a notification system making local residents aware of known sex offenders in their area. Several years later, the Adam Walsh Protection Act built upon this notification system by placing more stringent requirements on sex offender registration, including categorizing sex offenders into one of three tiers based on their crimes and requiring sex offenders to update their addresses for specific, mandated timeframes throughout their time on the national registry. Both of these legal statutes thus outline minimum sex offender registration and community notification procedures across the U.S. that serve as efforts to manage the risk of sex offenders after conviction (Cubellis et al., 2019).

Other legal statutes have also been implemented to determine placement of sexually violent offenders in involuntary inpatient treatment programs. To date, the United States federal government and twenty states have enacted legal statutes permitting the civil commitment of sexually violent predators (Sreenivasan et al., 2020). Research estimates that across the U.S. there are more than 6,300 sex offenders currently detained, some for indefinite lengths of time, due to meeting the criteria of a sexually violent
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predator (SVP). For the purposes of civil commitment in this context, SVPs are defined as individuals with a predisposition to commit future sexually violent acts due to a mental abnormality such as a paraphilic disorder (Levenson & D’Amora, 2007). Completing a comprehensive assessment of personality and psychopathology aids immensely in addressing these issues. The potential consequence of indefinite civil commitment that may result from assessments in this context may incite deceptive responding on measures utilized in these assessments. Avoiding such consequences is likely to play a considerable role in a sex offender’s motive to authentically and validly respond to evaluation questions, since detention is often perceived by offenders as an additional form of punishment despite legislative efforts to endorse it as a form of psychiatric treatment.

A collateral impact that these laws have had on sex offenders is a considerable amount of negative stigma in the eyes of the public. While many individuals who receive a label as an “ex-con” after a criminal conviction or incarceration may experience substantial hardship, sex offenders are particularly vulnerable to perceived stigma surrounding their crimes both during and post-incarceration as a result of the associated egregiousness of their crimes (Cubellis et al., 2019; Levenson et al., 2005; Sreenivasan et al., 2020). One of the most prominent obstacles associated with being on the sex offender registry is the lack of privacy allotted to registered sex offenders, including public access to their photographs, names, and addresses, as well as legal exclusion from jobs, neighborhoods, and internet access. This leaves sex offenders at considerable risk of poverty, assault, and homelessness, all of which are negative risk factors that adversely impact successful reintegration to society (Sreenivasan et al., 2020). Additionally, it is estimated that 5-16 percent of sex offenders have been a victim of physical assault, while
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even more may fall victim to harassment or vigilantism at the hands of misinformed civilians (Cubellis et al., 2019; Levenson et al., 2005). After being accused, convicted, or registered as a sex offender, these individuals are likely to receive threats and experience severe discrimination and alienation (Cubellis et al., 2019).

Recent portrayal of sex crimes in the media and television have further contributed to the stigmatization of sex offenders (Connor & Tewksbury, 2017; Malinen et al., 2014). Specifically, as the media is one of the primary sources for dissemination of information to the public, the sensationalization and heightened media coverage of sex crimes has substantially contributed to negative public perceptions of sex offenders. Portrayals of sex offenders on media platforms as incurable, predatory menaces in society not only contribute to the assumed frequency of sexual violence in their communities, but also create barriers to reintegration of sex offenders into society after incarceration (Malinen et al., 2014). Particularly, the substantial negative depiction of sex offenders has reasonably led to an aversion of community members to live near known perpetrators of sex crimes, as well as reluctance of landlords and employers to offer them housing or job opportunities. While these attitudes are believed by the public to deter the risk of sex crime recidivism, they ultimately result in lack of cohesive re-entry to the community, which serves as a primary risk factor for reoffending. Analysis of television news stories further revealed that crime reports that introduced fear were five times more likely to focus on sex crimes than any others, leading to the perpetuation of public misconceptions regarding the characteristics and risks of sex offenders (Dowler, 2006). Notable myths subsequently reinforced by media coverage of sex offenses include that perpetrators of
such crimes tend to be strangers to their victims and belong to a homogenous group that is unlikely to be rehabilitated.

Considering the potential for such severe social and legal consequences associated with admitting to their crimes, some degree of denial has come to be expected among this population. However, the impact on judicial decisions and the course of clinical treatment can be highly detrimental if defensiveness and denial are not properly identified and interpreted in the evaluation of sex offenders (Rogers, 2018). Reasons for conducting sex offender evaluations include assisting in legal decisions such as determining their risk for recidivism, degree of dangerousness, or to provide clarity of diagnosis and treatment directions. The results from such evaluations have the potential to impact high-stake legal decisions regarding the continued imprisonment or confined treatment of sex offenders.

As such, an accurate understanding of a sex offender’s psychological adjustment and psychosexual functioning is an essential component of making clinical decisions based on sex offender evaluations.

A prominent obstacle to achieving accurate results in sex offender evaluations is the minimization or denial of psychological difficulties. Broad-band personality measures have thus proven to be a useful tool in sex offender evaluations. Not only do they provide a comprehensive indication of an individual’s psychological functioning, but many also contain built-in scales to assess examinee effort and response style (Rogers, 2018). While the broad construct of defensiveness is common among a variety of populations, particularly within different legal contexts, it may present differently across these populations. Because of the particularly unique consequences associated with inaccurate assessment of sex offenders, defensiveness within this specific population should be
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thoroughly understood by the examiner to achieve accurate test interpretation and aid clinical decision making.

The purpose of this study was to refine the understanding of defensiveness among sex offenders by illuminating aspects of defensive responding that are similar to or different from that of other defensive populations. Specifically, child custody litigants represent another group that is prone to respond defensively to psychological evaluations in light of the feared outcome of losing child custody. The current study compared the nature of defensive responding on the MMPI-2-RF in samples representing these two groups.
Defensiveness

Defensiveness is a broad term that has been studied in research dating back to the inception of the field of psychology. One proposed definition of defensiveness is “the deliberate denial or gross minimization of physical and/or psychological symptoms” (Rogers, 2018, p. 7). The American Psychological Association’s dictionary of psychology conversely defines the construct as, “a tendency to be sensitive to criticism or comment about one’s deficiencies and to counter or deny such criticisms” (APA, n.d.). However, these may both be somewhat limited definitions in light of other literature. Dweck and Elliot-Moskwa (2010) suggested that defensiveness is derived from the malleability of an individual’s self-theory, indicating that people may not always have a conscious or clear conception of their tendency to respond defensively in their attempts to protect their valued beliefs about their personal attributes.

Despite many researchers’ efforts to refine the definition of the construct over the decades, it seems that no single definition may fully account for the various forms and dimensions that defensiveness encompasses (Friedman et al., 2015). One factor that likely in part contributes to this general lack of consensus is the abundance of contexts in which defensiveness is discussed. Specifically, professionals within the field of psychology may refer to the construct in terms of one’s behavioral responses (Dweck & Elliott-Moskwa, 2010), intrapsychic dynamics (Cramer, 1998), or response style on measures of psychological functioning (Rogers, 2018). Although definitions of the term defensiveness across each of these contexts may have similar components, the differences between them have generally been insufficiently outlined and discussed in the literature.
For the purposes of the proposed study, the focus was primarily on understanding defensiveness, as well as various dynamics that are considered characteristic of defensiveness, within the context of personality testing in forensic settings. In non-clinical settings, defensiveness may frequently be thought of in terms of an individual’s verbal or behavioral responses to a situation in which they perceive others as questioning or attacking their personal attributes. However, in psychological assessment, defensiveness is typically referred to in terms of response style on self-report measures (Rogers, 2018). Response style in this context references a particular endorsement pattern of test items on a psychological measure that may interfere with the predictive validity of test results (Nichols & Greene, 1997). Within the field of psychological assessment in particular, Nichols and Greene (1997) identified several dimensions associated with deceptive responding, with particular emphasis on defensiveness. These dimensions included dissimulation versus simulation, generic versus specific, crude versus sophisticated, intentional versus non-intentional, and self-deception versus impression management. Each of these dimensions of deception are critical to consider when defining the overarching construct of defensiveness. As such, defensiveness is perhaps better explained as encompassing various dimensions or facets, all of which may present in countless combinations and ultimately result in the underestimation of symptoms and difficulties.

Of the previously mentioned dimensions described by Nichols and Greene (1997), two specifically have been studied extensively with regard to response style in personality assessment: (a) impression management and (b) self-deception or self-deceptive enhancement (Bagby & Marshall, 2004; Paulhus, 1984; Strong et al., 1999).
The impression management response style is described as an effort to present oneself in a positive light to others and is considered to be primarily situationally driven (Rogers, 2018). Individuals may employ this type of defensiveness by denying unfavorable characteristics they actually possess (dissimulation), or by endorsing favorable but inaccurate characteristics (simulation). Self-deception, in contrast, is theorized to present as a more subtle response style in which the respondent is convinced that they possess the excessively positive traits they attribute to themselves. As such, self-deception is traditionally considered to more often be unintentional in comparison to impression management (Paulhus, 1984; Strong et al., 1999). It is further suggested that self-deception is more resemblant of a stable personality characteristic, which may also become detrimental to psychological adjustment at pervasive levels, although this association is largely unresolved in the literature (Strong et al., 1999).

Several factors are thought to influence one’s tendency to respond in a defensive manner. Specifically, one’s situational context, intentional goals, and general personality characteristics can contribute to one’s motivation for responding defensively (Rogers, 2018). Three explanatory models were explored by Rogers and Dickey (1991) that offer potential insight regarding the use of deception among sex offenders specifically. These include the pathogenic, criminogenic, and adaptational models. The pathogenic model of dissimulation is rooted in psychodynamic theory and posits that defensiveness is the result of unconscious forces to deny unacceptable impulses. In contrast, the criminogenic model relies more heavily on personality and contextual factors rather than internal ego defenses, which would suggest that deception is characteristic of antisocial individuals and can be expected to increase in adversarial situations. Similarly, the final model (i.e.,
adaptational) rests on the assumptions that one’s situation is perceived as adversarial, that self-disclosure would likely result in some form of loss, and that engaging in deception is the most effective method to obtain a beneficial outcome. Rogers (2018) further suggested that predicted utility plays a predominant role in response style. Resting on similar premises as the adaptational model, predicted utility theory of deception suggests that an individual’s selection of a certain response style (e.g., defensiveness) is rooted in the weighed probability of achieving a desired outcome (Rogers, 2018). While the concept of secondary gain is perhaps more frequently related to malingering or overreporting, predicted utility offers a similar concept also applicable to the use of defensiveness.

Assessment of Forensic Populations

Personality tests are a vital component for assessing individuals across a wide array of clinical and forensic settings. Specifically, according to several surveys of forensic psychologists, assessment instruments are an essential tool utilized by many professionals in the field since the instillation of the Daubert (1993) criteria for admissibility of expert testimony. In many forensic applications of personality testing, defensiveness is considered a prominent concept as it largely influences the interpretation of test results. As such, broad-band personality measures have become a cornerstone of forensic assessment due to their built-in validity scales to detect response bias (Archer et al., 2016). Examples of specific forensic scenarios in which defensiveness is commonly seen include instances of child abuse allegations and investigations, termination of parental rights (TPR) proceedings, sex offender evaluations, and child custody evaluations. Each of these scenarios, as well as many others, often have an underlying
clinical problem that is called into question. For example, in instances of sexual abuse and other sex crimes, it may be necessary to clarify the alleged perpetrator’s diagnosis and aberrant sexual interests in order to rule out or assign a diagnosis that encompasses paraphilic interests. Additionally, in both TPR and child custody proceedings, psychological assessment is often useful in identifying psychopathology that may interfere with adequate parenting ability. Although personality tests are useful in each of these situations, the groups primarily discussed here are those relevant to the proposed study (i.e., sex offenders and child custody litigants).

**Sex Offenders**

Throughout the history of the field of forensic clinical psychology, sex offenders have remained a relevant population of interest, particularly with respect to the utilization of personality assessment. Growing interest in this population has resulted in an abundance of literature highlighting patterns of clinical features common among sex offenders. However, in the interpretation and generalization of such patterns to individuals accused or adjudicated of a sexual crime, it is important to note the heterogeneous nature of the group as a whole. This is emphasized by Ahlmeyer and colleagues (2003) in a comparison study of sex offenders with general offenders (e.g., non-sexual perpetrators) from an incarcerated population. Upon comparison of these offender groups, it was demonstrated that sex offenders exhibited more varying personality traits than those seen in general inmates. While those not convicted of sex crimes have been found to have more “classically criminal” (p. 315) personality characteristics associated with antisociality, narcissism, and sadism, sex offenders
presented with more prominent traits of social inadequacy, affective disturbances, and various severe psychopathology (Ahlmeyer et al., 2003).

Due to the substantial within-group differences in the sex offender population, researchers in the fields of psychology and criminal justice have classified different subtypes of sex offenders (Rogers, 2018; Rosenberg & Knight, 1988, Simons, 2015). This categorization of sex offenders is often based on demographic and crime variables such as victim characteristics, psychiatric diagnosis, personality features, educational attainment, and ethnicity. For example, the Department of Justice identifies several theory-based sex offender typologies that categorize offenders based on factors such as the age of the victim, use of force and power-assertion, perpetrator gender, and use of the internet (Simons, 2015). Among the most notable of these typologies are pedophilic verses non-pedophilic child abusers. Research examining the characteristics of these types of sexual abusers has revealed that pedophilic abusers are more likely to present with interpersonal anxiety in their adult relationships while non-pedophilic child abusers possessed a general lack of interpersonal assertiveness (Sigre-Lerós et al., 2015). It should also be noted that the broad classification of child abusers may contain other typologies, such as intrafamilial versus extrafamilial abusers and abusers who may target same-sex or opposite-sex victims. All of these offender types are further distinguished from rapist typologies, some of which include crossover offenders (i.e., those who target victims of different ages, genders, and relationship categories) and female offenders. Generally, rapists are distinguished from sex offenders who victimize children in terms of rapists tending to be younger, coming from lower socioeconomic backgrounds, and demonstrating greater interpersonal aggression (Laws & O’Donohue, 2008; Sigre-Lerós
et al., 2015). Empirical studies have further identified various subtypes of sex offenders using cluster analysis (Rosenberg & Knight, 1988). Such research has identified various groupings of sex offenders with shared characteristics in regard to criminal motivation, aggression, impulsivity, and substance use, which ultimately helps identify and inform the treatment for sex offenders belonging to each cluster.

Other commonly examined factors among various types of sex offenders include aspects of their developmental and psychosocial history that may impact their propensity to commit sexual crimes. Specifically, sex offenders’ personal history of sexual victimization has been examined in terms of its impact on future sexual offending, although findings have been mixed. While some researchers indicate that sex offenders, particularly pedophilic offenders, reported higher rates of personal sexual victimization than non-offenders (Phenix & Hoberman, 2016), other studies have suggested that individuals who experienced other forms of maltreatment (i.e., physical abuse and neglect), but not sexual abuse, were at an increased risk for committing sexual offenses (Widom & Massey, 2015).

As previously discussed, sex offenders are often classified and compared according to the type of sex crime of which they have been accused or convicted. Two groups in particular that have been compared within the sex offender population are those of rapists and child molesters (Abracen et al., 2004; Ahlmeyer et al., 2003). Differences between these groups have been noted in terms of both personality traits and psychopathology. Specifically, Ahlmeyer et al. (2003) found that rapists differed from child molesters, with child molesters demonstrating higher levels of psychopathology and more dependent personality characteristics. Abracen et al. (2004) also compared different
types of sexual offenders (e.g., rapists, child molesters, and incest offenders) across a number of variables to analyze their value in evaluating sex offenders. Results indicated differences between groups in various domains, such that rapists exhibited the most criminality, were the least socially competent, and had the highest rates of substance use.

Additional literature highlights types of response styles that may be utilized by sex offenders in efforts to misrepresent their sexual deviation or criminal responsibility (Gottfried et al., 2020). Specifically, they may engage in (a) defensiveness, which serves to minimize or mask their symptoms, (b) hybrid responding in which some symptoms or aspects of their history may be exaggerated or acknowledged openly while others are denied outright, or (c) malingering, which serves to accomplish a secondary gain through deliberately exaggerating or feigning symptoms. Of particular relevance to the proposed study is the defensive response style. While it is noted that defensiveness in this population is often examined solely in the context of denial or minimization of sexually deviant behavior related to the alleged crime (Gottfried et al., 2020; Haywood et al., 1993; Rogers & Dickey, 1991), those who engage in such denial often minimize other personality difficulties as well (Gottfried et al., 2020; Haywood et al., 1993).

**Child Custody Litigants**

Parents involved in child custody litigation proceedings have remained another primary population of interest within the fields of forensic psychology and personality assessment. Psychological assessment instruments, particularly those that measure personality patterns and psychopathology, have been found to be especially useful for examining the psychological adjustment of parents involved in custody disputes to best inform the court of their parenting suitability (Rogers & Bender, 2018). However, it is
widely acknowledged by professionals and researchers that individuals who undergo these evaluations frequently have external motivating factors to conceal their difficulties due to the high stakes associated with the setting. One notable contextual aspect that may impact response style in custody evaluations is the potential for overlap with accusations of child abuse or neglect that can, at times, coincide with custody proceedings and should be considered in the clinical interpretations of assessment results. Researchers also caution evaluators to interpret open (i.e., non-defensive) profiles as a potential indicator that the litigant has been coached to avoid endorsing validity scale items, as non-defensive profiles are typically uncommon in this population (Rogers & Bender, 2018).

Due to the expected resistance to self-disclosure among this population, the key issue in interpreting the presentation of child custody litigants is distinguishing between “normal” parents who display contextual social desirability from those with psychological disturbance who conceal their difficulties through defensiveness (Rogers, 2018). In doing so, several clinical issues are important to consider, including two syndromes commonly associated with individuals in this population: false-memory syndrome and parental alienation syndrome. False-memory syndrome refers to a cluster of psychological symptoms stemming from memories of a traumatic experience despite a lack of supporting evidence of the event’s occurrence (Rogers, 2018). This is particularly relevant in cases of child maltreatment, leading to challenges in making legal and psychological determinations as it further complicates the veracity of an individual’s memory that is already fallible. Parental alienation syndrome is a hypothetical construct that indicates the use of deception by a parent to negatively alter the child’s perception of the other parent, although the construct lacks general acceptability in the field (Thomas &
Regardless of its veracity as a clinical syndrome, such behavior does occur and is important to consider in regard to the use of deception in the context of child custody evaluations.

Reviews of data on the child custody litigant population have also been conducted to reveal trends in various demographic variables and psychological trends among child custody litigants (Zumbach & Koglin, 2015). A review of mental health characteristics of child custody litigants from studies of custody evaluations, particularly in the context of litigation pertaining to parental rights, revealed a trend toward socioeconomic deficits and a lack of educational and intellectual resources. Moreover, analysis of trends revealed that psychopathology in parents in these evaluation contexts was high, particularly as indicated by previous hospitalizations and other psychiatric history. Parental substance abuse was also highly prevalent among this population, with one study reporting a total of 84% of their sample abusing at least one substance (Zumbach & Koglin, 2015).

**Overview of Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventories**

The Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory (MMPI; Hathaway & McKinley, 1943) is a broad-band instrument for assessing personality and psychopathology in adults. Aware of the skepticism of personality testing in the field at that time due to the potential for test taker response biases, the authors incorporated a way to assess response style into the test through the use of validity scales (Greene, 1991). These scales, in addition to the extensive item pool, strong empirical support, and vast range of clinical applications have led the MMPI and its subsequent editions to become some of the most commonly used personality measures across the globe (Greene, 2008).
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The aforementioned validity scales on the original MMPI included the Lie (L) scale and Correction or Defensiveness (K) scale as measures of underreporting, the Infrequency (F) scale to measure overreporting of psychological difficulties, and the Cannot Say (?) index to indicate frequency of unanswered items. Additionally, the test included 10 core clinical scales: Scale 1 Hypochondriasis (Hs), Scale 2 Depression (D), Scale 3 Hysteria (Hy), Scale 4 Psychopathic Deviate (Pd), Scale 5 Masculinity-Femininity (Mf), Scale 6 Paranoia (Pa), Scale 7 Psychasthenia (Pt), Scale 8 Schizophrenia (Sc), Scale 9 Hypomania (Ma), and Scale 0 Social Introversion (Si). Upon publication of the test, there was almost immediate application of the measure in both clinical and forensic evaluations, and it quickly became one of the most widely used personality measures in the field (Ben-Porath, 2012; Graham, 1993). With such popularity also followed an extensive body of research which, over time, led to the development of over 800 supplementary scales, content scales, and subscales (Friedman et al., 2015). Among these were an expansion of validity scales both to measure overreporting of psychological difficulty (i.e., “faking bad” or malingering) and underreporting of psychological difficulty (i.e., “faking good” or defensiveness) to augment the interpretive value provided by the three original validity scales.

The Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory, Second Edition (MMPI-2) was developed in 1989 as an update to the original version (Butcher et al., 1989). The major developments included in this revision were the creation of a contemporary normative sample, the expansion of validity scales, and introduction of a standard set of content and supplementary scales. Despite these changes, many aspects of the MMPI were retained in the MMPI-2 in an effort to preserve continuity between the tests (Friedman et al., 2015;
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Greene, 1991). Specifically, the 10 core clinical scales were initially retained along with the original four validity scales (L, K, F, ?), with item content relatively similar to the original version with the exception of 12 eliminated items and 68 reworded items. However, as the body of empirical literature continued to grow, concerns were noted regarding the 10 core clinical scales, eventually resulting in a restructuring of the clinical scales. The restructured clinical (RC) scales were initially developed as part of a project to address concerns regarding the psychometric properties of the clinical scales on the MMPI-2. Specifically, two primary problems identified in the literature were excessive intercorrelations between the scales and substantial heterogeneity of items within the scales, indicating the scales were not psychometrically optimal (Ben-Porath, 2012).

Ben-Porath and Tellegen (2008) subsequently developed a restructured edition of the entire measure, the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory, Second Edition Restructured Form (MMPI-2-RF), consisting of 338 items selected from the 567-item pool of the MMPI-2. In contrast to the MMPI-2, the MMPI-2-RF utilizes the RC scales as the core clinical scales, whereas they were previously used in addition to the original clinical scales on the MMPI-2. Another main component of the MMPI-2-RF is the implementation of gender-neutral norms. In addition to the added emphasis of the restructured clinical scales and use of non-gendered norms, the MMPI-2-RF has three higher order scales assessing for Emotional/Internalizing Dysfunction (EID), Thought Dysfunction (THD), and Behavioral/Externalizing Dysfunction (BXD). There are also 23 specific problem scales in the domains of somatic/cognitive symptoms, internalizing, externalizing, and interpersonal functioning, a revised set of Personality Psychopathology Five (PSY-5) scales, and two interest scales. While the majority of the validity scales
were modified and retained on the MMPI-2-RF, there were also some additions.
Specifically, validity scales added to the MMPI-2-RF include the Infrequent Somatic
Responses (Fs) scale and Response Bias Scale (RBS), both of which measure
overreporting of specific symptom areas. All the restructured clinical (RC) scales as well
as validity scales of the MMPI-2-RF are interpreted by converting raw scores to
standardized T scores that allow for comparisons to be made across scales (Friedman et.
al., 2015). Overall, while it was not meant to replace or invalidate use of MMPI-2, the
MMPI-2-RF has been sufficiently studied in the field of psychological assessment and
demonstrates ample clinical utility in a variety of settings. Descriptions of constructs
measured by each of the MMPI-2-RF scales are provided in Table 1.

(continues)
### Table 1.

**MMPI-2-RF Scales**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Validity Scales</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cannot Say (?</td>
<td>Excessive omitted or double marked responses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variable Response Inconsistency scale (VRIN-r)</td>
<td>Inconsistent or random responding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>True Response Inconsistency scale (TRIN-r)</td>
<td>Response bias or fixed responding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrequent Responses (F-r)</td>
<td>Infrequent responses in the general population</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrequent Psychopathology Responses (Fp-r)</td>
<td>Infrequent somatic complaints in psychiatric populations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrequent Somatic Responses (Fs)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response Bias Scale (RBS)</td>
<td>Non-credible memory complaints</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symptom Validity Scale (FBS-r)</td>
<td>Non-credible cognitive and somatic complaints</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncommon Virtues (L-r)</td>
<td>Infrequently claimed moral attributes or activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjustment Validity (K-r)</td>
<td>Uncommonly high level of psychological adjustment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Higher-Order (H-O) scales</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional/Internalizing Dysfunction (EID)</td>
<td>Problems with mood and affect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thought Dysfunction (THD)</td>
<td>Problems with thought dysfunction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavioral/External Dysfunction (BXD)</td>
<td>Problems with under-controlled behavior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Restructured Clinical (RC) scales</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demoralization (RCd)</td>
<td>Emotional turmoil and life dissatisfaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somatic Complaints (RC1)</td>
<td>Diffuse physical health complaints</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Positive Emotions (RC2)</td>
<td>Lack of positive emotional experiences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cynicism (RC3)</td>
<td>Beliefs that others are ill-intentioned and untrustworthy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antisocial Behavior (RC4)</td>
<td>Non-conforming, acting-out behavior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideas of Persecution (RC6)</td>
<td>Paranoia and suspiciousness of others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dysfunctional Negative Emotions (RC7)</td>
<td>Various negative emotional experiences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aberrant Experiences (RC8)</td>
<td>Unusual thoughts and perceptions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypomanic Activation (RC9)</td>
<td>Over-active energy level, restlessness, and impulsivity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Specific Problems (SP) scales</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somatic scales</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malaise (MLS)</td>
<td>General sense of poor health and physical debilitation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gastrointestinal Complaints (GIC)</td>
<td>Problems with nausea, vomiting, and poor appetite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head Pain Complaints (HPC)</td>
<td>Problems related to head and neck pain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neurological Complaints (NUC)</td>
<td>Dizziness, numbness, muscle weakness, paralysis, and loss of motor control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive Complaints (COG)</td>
<td>Memory and concentration problems</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(continues)
### Table 1 (cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Internalizing Scales</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suicidal/Death Ideation (SUI)</td>
<td>Thoughts of death and suicide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helplessness/ Hopelessness (HLP)</td>
<td>Pessimism and feelings of hopelessness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Doubt (SFD)</td>
<td>Lack of confidence and uselessness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inefficacy (NFC)</td>
<td>Passivity, indecisiveness, and ineffectualness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stress/Worry (STW)</td>
<td>Problems with stress-reactivity and worry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anxiety (AXY)</td>
<td>Feeling of anxious, dreadful, and frightened</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anger-Proneness (ANP)</td>
<td>Impatient, irritable, and easily angered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavior-Restricting Fears (BRF)</td>
<td>Pervasive fears that restrict normal activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple Specific Fears (MSF)</td>
<td>Specific phonic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Externalizing Scales</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juvenile Conduct Problems (JCP)</td>
<td>History of problematic or illegal behavior as a juvenile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substance Abuse (SUB)</td>
<td>Significant past or current substance use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggression (AGG)</td>
<td>Significant physical aggression and violence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activation (ACT)</td>
<td>Heightened excitement and energy level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interpersonal Scales</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Problems (FML)</td>
<td>Conflictual family relationships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal Passivity (IPP)</td>
<td>Submissiveness and lack of assertiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Avoidance (SAV)</td>
<td>Avoiding or not enjoying social activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shyness (SHY)</td>
<td>Anxious and uncomfortable around others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disaffiliativeness (DSF)</td>
<td>Disliking people and being around them</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interest Scales</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aesthetic-Literary Interests (AES)</td>
<td>Interests in literature, music, and theater</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanical-Physical Interests (MEC)</td>
<td>Interests in building things, sports, outdoor activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Personality Psychopathology Five (PSY-5) Scales</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggressiveness-Revised (AGGR-r)</td>
<td>Instrumental aggression</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychoticism-Revised (PSYC-r)</td>
<td>Disconnection from reality and thought disturbance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disconstraint-Revised (DISC-r)</td>
<td>Impulsivity and under-controlled behavior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative Emotionality/Neuroticism-Revised (NEGE-r)</td>
<td>Anxiety, worry, fear, insecurity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introversion/Low Positive Emotionality-Revised (INTR-r)</td>
<td>Anhedonia, social disengagement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Adapted from Ben-Porath and Tellegen (2011) and Friedman et al. (2015).

**Defensiveness on the MMPI, MMPI-2, and MMPI-2-RF**

As previously noted, the three validity scales on the original MMPI version are the Infrequency (F) scale to measure overreporting, and the Lie (L) and Defensiveness (K) scales to measure underreporting (Greene, 1991). Among the extensive body of
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Research since the test’s inception, the L and K scales and their derivatives on later test versions have all been widely used to assess for defensive responding in a variety of clinical settings (Friedman et al., 2015; Greene, 1991). The original L scale consisted of 15 items whose content contained commonly acknowledged faults and shortcomings that, when endorsed in the keyed direction, indicate an unsophisticated attempt to present oneself in an overly positive manner. The K scale, in contrast, consisted of 30 items with content that reflected the denial of psychopathology when endorsed in the keyed direction.

Extensive MMPI research efforts also led to the development of several indices and composites that utilized these traditional validity scales to further examine response distortion. The F – K Index, also known as the Dissimulation Index, is one common example of such composites associated with defensiveness that was developed by subtracting the Correction/Defensiveness (K) scale raw score from the Infrequency (F) scale raw score on the MMPI (Gough, 1950). This index was believed to be more accurate in detecting inauthentic responding than either of the scales alone. In theory, profiles of individuals overreporting psychopathology would contain high F scores and low K scores, resulting in a positive value when subtracted. Positive F – K Index scores, specifically above the cut score of +9, would suggest “faking bad” or overreporting of symptoms. Alternatively, regarding underreporting or defensiveness, the test taker would be expected to obtain a high K score and lower F score, which would result in a negative F – K Index value. Gough (1950) thus suggested that Index scores less than zero would suggest “faking good” or underreporting, as it indicates denial of psychological maladjustment. However, an abundance of research regarding the efficacy of the F – K
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Index across different versions of the MMPI produced mixed results. Bagby and colleagues (1994), for example, investigated the F – K Index in a contrasted-groups design study and found that a cut score of -12 was needed to obtain a sufficient level of specificity of underreporting, rather than the less than zero criterion originally suggested by Gough.

Another index derived from the validity scales was the Lie plus Correction minus Frequency Index (L + K – F). Calculated using the raw score values of these scales, this Index was designed to detect defensive responding by totaling the number of endorsed items that indicate underreporting and subtracting from that the number of items that would indicate acknowledgement of unusual psychopathology (Lanyon & Lutz, 1984a). As such, higher scores on this Index would indicate more defensive responding, whereas lower scores would indicate more open responding. The notable difference of this index with the aforementioned F – K index is that it accounts for items endorsed on both of the underreporting scales rather than the defensive scale alone. Just as the last calculation in the sequence was used as a separate defensiveness index, the beginning two-thirds of this Index (i.e., L + K) was also utilized as another indicator of defensiveness (Bagby et al., 1997). These indexes have also been utilized across different versions of the test, including the MMPI-2, due to similarly measured constructs measured by the scales on each test.

Other scales developed to detect types of defensive responding on the MMPI include Wiener and Harmon’s Subtle-Obvious scales (S-O) and scales that measure test-takers’ attempts to achieve socially desirable presentations. In developing the S-O scales, Wiener (1948) put forth the idea that MMPI items fall on a continuum ranging from subtle (S) to
obvious (O). Items from five MMPI scales (D, Hy, Pd, Pa, and Ma) were coded as either subtle or obvious, with subtle items intended to better measure the personality characteristics of “normal” individuals whereas obvious items were meant to best distinguish abnormal and normal groups. However, the efficacy of the S-O scales has been highly debated and found to be lacking in support in the years since its creation.

Regarding social desirability scales, two have been widely examined in the literature: the Edwards Social Desirability (Esd) scale and Wiggins Social Desirability (Wsd) scale. Versions of both Esd and Wsd were developed for adaptation to the MMPI-2 and research has also suggested the revised scales adequately measured social desirability (Bagby et al, 1997). The MMPI-2 version of the Esd, for example, has been shown to effectively differentiate between honest responding and underreporting in a patient sample, and the respective version of the Wsd better distinguished honest responding in students from underreporting in a patient sample (Bagby et al., 1997).

The MMPI-2 incorporated some additional scales to measure different degrees and types of defensiveness (Ackerman, 2010). Of note among the MMPI-2 validity scales is the Superlative Self-Presentation (S) scale, which was developed by Butcher and Han (1995) as a measure of self-proclaimed virtuous behavior and denial of personal faults. The S scale was specifically designed to allow for detection of overly positive self-presentation that was less susceptible to conscious distortion than the Lie (L) scale and was more accurate in identifying defensiveness in the general population than the Correction (K) scale. It was developed through contrasting the responses of a sample of male airline pilot applicants and men from the MMPI-2 normative sample. Although it had several overlapping items with both the K and Positive Malingering (Mp) scales, the
content of S compared to K is considered less subtle and more socially desirable (Friedman et al., 2015). The S scale emphasized denial of misanthropic attitudes, such as cynicism, mistrust, and irritability, while asserting possession of virtue, honor, and nobility. It possessed relatively strong construct validity and has been referred to as “the best of the self-deception scales” (Friedman et al., 2015, p. 85).

Also included on the MMPI-2 was Cofer, Chance, and Judson’s Positive Malingering scale (Mp) and the Wiggins Social Desirability (Sd) scale, with these constructs having commonly been associated with defensiveness. The Positive Malingering (Mp) scale originally consisted of 33 items on the MMPI, which was reduced to 27 items on the MMPI-2 (Friedman et al., 2015). Research supporting the validity of this scale has shown that, across comparisons of effect sizes for 10 scales and indices of underreporting, the Mp scale outperformed several of the validity scales, including L, K, and S (Baer et al., 2002). T scores of 60 or higher suggested a deliberate attempt to over-inflate the test taker’s level of adjustment (Friedman et al., 2015). However, it is noted that elevations of Mp are best considered in conjunction with scores on other scales that assess underreporting, such as the Lie (L), Correction (K), Social Desirability (Sd), Socioeconomic Status (Ss), and Superlative Self-Presentation (S) scales. Specifically, when Mp and Sd are higher than K at T scores above 65, and when Ss scores are low to average, it strongly suggests that the individual made a conscious effort to deny indications of maladjustment. On the other hand, when L scores are higher than Mp and Sd, it tends to suggest a naïve or less intentional style of defensive responding. As such, unlike the ambiguity of K elevations alone in terms of indicating either defensiveness or actual coping capacity, the Mp scale was thought to provide some
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indication as to the intentionality of test taker’s underreporting when interpreted appropriately.

The MMPI-2-RF has a total of nine validity scales, most of which were retained from the MMPI-2 with slight modifications (Ben-Porath & Tellegen, 2008). The most relevant group of MMPI-2-RF validity scales for the current study are those that measure underreporting, which include the Uncommon Virtues (L_r) and Adjustment Validity (K_r) scales (Ben-Porath & Tellegen, 2008). Among these scales, the Adjustment Validity scale (K_r) in particular is commonly classified as a measure of examinee defensiveness, as were its MMPI and MMPI-2 counterparts (Ben-Porath, 2012; Heilbrun, 1961). Originally named the Correction (K) scale on the MMPI, the K_r consists of 14 of the same items included on the original scale, although it now also includes five items from the Superlative Self-Presentation (S) scale from the MMPI-2 (Ben-Porath & Tellegen, 2008). Significant elevations on the K_r scale suggest an attempt by test takers to present themselves as psychologically well-adjusted by denying or minimizing psychological difficulties. However, as noted by Friedman et al. (2015), high K_r scale scores need to be interpreted in the context of both the referral question and the test taker’s life circumstances. This is particularly critical given that elevated K scores are positively correlated with higher socioeconomic status and educational background (Friedman et al., 2015). As such, it is possible for individuals who are genuinely better adjusted than average to produce slight-to-moderate elevations on the K_r scale, and therefore extra-test data should be used to verify evidence of underreporting. The Uncommon Virtues (L_r) scale, a revision of the Lie (L) scale on the MMPI and MMPI-2, consists of 14 items that when endorsed in the keyed direction indicate an attempt to portray oneself in a favorable
manner by denying common shortcomings (Ben-Porath & Tellegen, 2008). Further inspection of this scale has revealed that its item content is consistent with the concept of social desirability (Rogers, 2018). Although the K-r and L-r scales are relatively similar in nature and are on occasion both referred to as indications of defensiveness, it is essential to recognize that there are no overlapping items between the two scales. Thus, L-r and K-r can be considered to measure two different styles of underreporting.

In interpreting defensiveness on the MMPI-2-RF, elevations on the L-r and K-r scale are both used as indicators of defensiveness. However, L-r elevations are considered indicative of unsophisticated, extreme test-taking attitudes or distortions rather than the more subtle defensiveness detected by the K-r scale (Ackerman, 2010; Friedman et al., 2015). This is commonly attributed to the item content across each of these underreporting scales. While the L-r scale contains rather obvious item content, the K-r scale in comparison consists of more understated denials of various areas of maladjustment. As noted in the MMPI-2-RF manual (Ben-Porath & Tellegen, 2008), the cutoff scores for L-r and K-r have notable differences from one another, which ultimately further impacts the interpretation of the resulting scores on each scale. Specifically, clinical elevations on L-r are identified at a T score of 65 or higher, whereas K-r scale elevations begin at a score of at least 60T. This is primarily due to the contrasting ceilings on each of the scales. The substantially higher ceiling of 105 on the L-r scale, in contrast to the ceiling of 72 on the K-r scale, indicates that fewer items need to be endorsed in the keyed direction on K-r in order to reach the level of elevation that indicates clinical relevance.
In addition to individual scales designed to detect defensiveness in test takers, an extensive body of research has led to the development of several validity scale configurations and indices that indicate underreporting. A configuration of validity scales that is commonly associated with attempts to minimize and deny problems is referred to as the “Most Closed” validity configuration (Friedman et al., 2015). This pattern is present when both L and K are above a T score of 65, while F is at a T score of 50 or below, indicating elevated defensiveness and minimal reported psychopathology. In comparison to other configurations, the “Most-Closed” arrangement of validity scale scores indicates that the test taker distorts their responses by underreporting in multiple ways (i.e., overtly denying common faults and subtly rejecting aspects of maladjustment).

A comparison of defensiveness scales, subscales, and indexes across all three versions of the test can be found in Table 2.

**Table 2. Comparisons of Defensiveness Indicators on the MMPI, MMPI-2, and MMPI-2-RF**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MMPI</th>
<th>MMPI-2</th>
<th>MMPI-2-RF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lie scale (L)</td>
<td>Lie scale (L)</td>
<td>Uncommon Virtues (L-r)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defensiveness scale (K)</td>
<td>Correction scale (K)</td>
<td>Adjustment Validity (K-r)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L + K – F Index</td>
<td>Superlative Self-Presentation scale (S)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wiener-Harmon Subtle-Obvious Subscales (S-O)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wiggins Social Desirability scale (Wsd)</td>
<td>Positive Malingering Scale (Mp)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edwards Social</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desirability scale (Esd)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Empirical Findings of MMPI-related Defensiveness in Forensic Settings**

Defensiveness as a psychological phenomenon and response style has been studied extensively in the fields of clinical and forensic psychology (Rogers, 2018). The
body of existing empirical literature investigating this construct has been particularly useful in understanding the impact of defensiveness in forensic psychological evaluations. MMPI studies of defensiveness have been conducted in consideration of various types of forensic evaluations including issues of criminal responsibility, competency, and parenting capacity due to the extensive utility of personality tests in assisting with legal and psychological decision making in these contexts. A particular interest among MMPI research in the context of these evaluations has been on sex offender and child custody litigant populations in light of the potential implications for misinterpreted test results in such scenarios. Because individuals undergoing these types of evaluations are likely to be motivated to portray themselves in a favorable manner in attempts to attain a desired outcome (e.g., regain custody, avoid legal consequences), defensiveness is critical to understand and identify in these populations.

**Sex Offender Evaluations**

One focus in the empirical literature of MMPI-related defensiveness of sex offenders has been comparisons of those who admit to versus deny accusations of sexual misconduct. Lanyon and Lutz (1984), for example, examined the utility of traditional MMPI validity indicators in identifying individuals known to demonstrate defensive denial of sex offenses. More specifically, their study aimed to assess the extent to which MMPI scale scores reflected denial and to determine the accuracy of various scales in discriminating between sex offenders who deny versus admit to their crimes. They hypothesized that individuals who demonstrated defensive denial would achieve higher scores on MMPI defensiveness indexes compared to those who admitted to their crimes. Participants were 90 adult men indicted or convicted of a felony sex offense who
underwent evaluation to assess rehabilitation potential, insanity, or competency to stand trial. Participants were administered the MMPI booklet form under standard administration conditions, after which the evaluator examined the respective police report detailing their crimes and conducted an interview to elicit the individual’s account of their behavior to determine group placement (i.e., no denial, part denial, and full denial). In addition to each of the validity and core clinical MMPI scales, three empirically derived validity indexes were examined: L + K, L + K – F, and F – K. Results from univariate analyses of variance for the three groups demonstrated significant differences between each of the validity scales (L, F, K), as well as the supplemental indexes. Analyses also revealed that the L + K – F index had the best correlation (r = .64) with denial versus no denial group membership. Discriminant function analysis between the two groups using only the validity scales and indexes found an overall hit rate of 83%, which rose slightly to 89% when the 10 clinical scales were also included as predictors. Overall, findings confirmed the researcher’s hypothesis that MMPI defensiveness indicators can effectively identify those who engage in real-life defensive denial, with the validity scales demonstrating the best discrimination ability.

In a similar study examining admitting and denying sex offenders, Grossman and Cavanaugh (1989), compared the degree to which sex offenders engaged in minimization of psychological difficulties on the MMPI. Offenders were divided into groups based on acknowledgement of their paraphilia (i.e., those who admitted paraphilic behavior versus those who denied such behavior). The study assessed several empirically supported validity scales and indexes, including the L, F, and K scales, as well as the F – K index, Obvious-minus-Subtle (O – S) subscales, the Gough Dissimulation index (Ds), and the
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Positive Malingering scale (Mp). Of the seven scales and indexes examined, all besides the L scale demonstrated statistically significant differences between admitting and denying sex offenders such that those who denied sexual deviance showed more evidence of minimizing psychopathology. These findings thus suggest that, while defensiveness among sex offenders may be circumscribed to their sexually deviant behavior, such denial may also extend to the minimization of psychological symptoms.

Baldwin and Roys (1998) also compared defensiveness in sex offenders who either denied or admitted to their crimes. They examined the relationship between denial and multiple personality test variables among a sample of 114 treatment-seeking men formally accused of a sex offense against a child. In addition to the MMPI, they used the Multiphasic Sex Inventory-2nd ed. (MSI-2) to measure psychosexual characteristics, as well as measures of sexual interests including the Abel and Becker Sexual Interest Card Sort and a penial plethysmograph (PPG). They also utilized the Shipley Institute of Living Scale WAIS-R Estimate (SILS) as a measure of intelligence. Group classification (i.e., deniers or admitters) was determined by each offender’s level of acknowledgement to the examiner of their culpability for the offense. Group comparisons replicated earlier findings showing that deniers displayed a higher degree of defensiveness compared to admitters (Lanyon & Lutz, 1984; Grossman & Cavanaugh, 1989). Specifically, analysis of response bias on the MMPI indicated that deniers had significantly higher scores on the Positive Malingering (Mp) scale after controlling for differences in intelligence. Moreover, IQ was significantly and negatively associated with the “faking-good” response bias, such that those with lower IQ scores demonstrated the tendency to present themselves in more favorable manner.
Some studies investigating the defensiveness phenomenon among sex offenders have examined defensive response style in relation to other characteristics of this population. Hall (1989) examined the relationship between self-reported anger and response style among sex offenders using MMPI validity indexes. It was hypothesized that a guarded (i.e., defensive) response style would account for more of the shared variance in self-reported anger among sexual offenders than would actual sexual offense characteristics (i.e., victim age and physical force). The Buss-Durkee Hostility Inventory (BDHI) and Hostility Toward Women Scale (HTWS) were utilized as measures of self-reported anger, which item analysis revealed contained similar item content to 35% of the items included in the L + K – F index. The MMPI measures of defensiveness (L + K – F) and social desirability (Esd) were both found to be significantly and negatively associated with HTWS scores, supporting the researcher’s hypothesis. The social desirability (Esd) scale was also found to be significantly and negatively associated with the HTWS, but not the BDHI. Mean scores on the Social Desirability scale and defensiveness index were 29.17 (SD = 6.55) and 12.17 (SD = 10.46), respectively. Moreover, results from multiple regression analyses indicate that defensive response style as measured by the MMPI accounted for a greater portion of the variance in both measures of self-reported anger than did crime characteristics. Hall noted that participants were required to admit to at least their most recent sexual offense as a condition to their admission to the state hospital. This is particularly important considering results from samples in other studies contrasting defensiveness in admitting and denying sex offenders (Baldwin & Roys, 1998; Grossman & Cavanaugh, 1989; Lanyon & Lutz, 1984).
The MMPI-2 has also been utilized to examine defensiveness within this population, particularly in studies of specific populations of sex offenders. For example, Plante and Aldrige (2005) examined MMPI-2 profiles of Roman Catholic clergy members facing substantiated accusations of sexual misconduct. A notable pattern identified by their results indicates significant differences in defensiveness levels compared to the normative sample. In particular, they observed significantly higher scores on both the L ($M = 57.29, SD = 9.16$) and K ($M = 57.38, SD = 9.87$) scales among sexual abusing clergy compared to the national norms. The authors noted that these scales were among the highest mean elevations present in the examined profiles. However, it should be noted that, in this study, neither of these mean scale elevations reached the clinical level of $T = 65$.

Similar findings were suggested by Mann et al. (1992) in their study examining MMPI-2 profiles among incarcerated male sex offenders engaged in state, federal, and military-based treatment programs. Profile analysis revealed that L scale scores were the highest of all the validity scales, while K scale scores were the lowest. Mann and colleagues (1992) suggested that this indicates a naïve form of defensiveness consistent with the motivation level and the lower education and economic status of their incarcerated sample. As such, they concluded that item endorsement may be “a process of balancing the bad with the good in order to not appear too sick, but sick enough to volunteer for treatment” (p. 71).

Regarding assessment of sex offender populations with the MMPI-2-RF, minimal research has been conducted to date investigating any specific aspects of defensiveness. However, Tarescavage et al. (2018) did highlight important findings regarding defensive
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responding in their study examining MMPI-2-RF scores among 304 adult men convicted of sexual offenses against children. Specifically, they found that L-r scores in the sample ($M = 60, SD = 12$) were substantially above normative scores on this scale, while K-r scores ($M = 53, SD = 11$) were only “marginally higher” (p. 432) than scores in the normative sample. Descriptive statistics of validity scales for this sample are provided in Table 3. Based on this finding, the authors suggested that sex offenders may be more inclined to utilize an overt, impressive-management style of underreporting rather than the more covert style that is characteristic of self-deception. Findings resulting from analyses of associations with measures of risk (i.e., STATIC-99 and LSI-R) were also notable. Such analyses were conducted in order to evaluate the proposed utility of MMPI-2-RF scales as measures of risk factors known to increase likelihood of sexual reoffending. Analyses of clinical scales aided in providing clarity in this respect, as substantive scales measuring externalizing behavioral tendencies, which are often associated with dynamic risk factors for recidivism, were found to be substantially higher among sex offenders compared to the normative sample. Specifically, findings revealed that RC4, a measure of non-conforming and acting-out behavior, and JCP, which measures history of problematic behaviors as a juvenile, were the scales that deviated the most from normative means, although it is noted these scale averages were in the subclinical range ($T$ score = 60).

(continues)
Table 3. Tarescavage et al.’s (2018) MMPI-2-RF Validity Scale Means and Standard Deviations for Sample of Adult Male Sex Offenders

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Response Bias</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variable Response Inconsistency (VRIN-r)</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>True Response Inconsistency (TRIN-r)</td>
<td>52F</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>73F</td>
<td>73T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overreporting</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrequent Responses (F-r)</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrequent Psychopathology Responses(Fp-r)</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrequent Somatic Responses (Fs)</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symptom Validity (FBS-r)</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response Bias Scale (RBS)</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Underreporting</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncommon Virtues (L-r)</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjustment Validity (K-r)</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Adapted from Tarescavage et al. (2018). Scales most relevant to defensiveness are indicated in bold.

Overall, while several studies have examined the efficacy of the various MMPI-related defensiveness indicators among this population, the criteria by which researchers classify sex offenders as “defensive” has varied vastly. Additionally, research with the MMPI-2 and MMPI-2-RF (particularly the latter) are relatively lacking in comparison of those that utilized the original MMPI. As such, research among this population to date has not clearly identified the extent to which defensiveness in sex offenders can be differentiated from that in other populations. Despite this limitation, the existing research of this population demonstrates strong utility of several validity and supplementary scales in detecting defensiveness in this population.

**Child Custody Evaluations**

Individuals involved in child custody litigation have been studied extensively in terms of defensiveness and personality testing. Among the extensive research on this
population is a study conducted by Bathurst et al. (1997), which provides normative data for MMPI-2 scores among child custody litigants. Based on a sample of 508 child custody litigants, both defensive responding and self-favorability were commonly indicated among the resulting test profiles. Despite these indicators of underreporting, the highest mean scores among the clinical scales were on Hysteria, Paranoia, and Psychopathic Deviate. No significant gender differences were found, nor were any differences regarding biological versus stepparents found within the sample.

Archer and colleagues (2012) later found substantial consistencies between elevations on the MMPI-2-RF L-r and K-r scales and those previously observed on the MMPI-2 L and K scales in studies such as that by Bathurst et al. (1997). Combined gender means for Archer et al.’s (2012) sample consisted of a mean L-r score of 52.62 (SD = 10.45) and mean K-r score of 57.41 (SD = 9.37). Means and standard deviations for this sample separated by gender are provided in Table 4. Frequency data from this study also revealed that while 28.8 percent of custody litigants obtained an L-r score at or above 65, a total of 32.6 percent obtained a K-r score at or above 65. This is a notable comparison considering the maximum possible T score on K-r is only 72, whereas the same for L-r is 105. Thus, while both scales are often elevated in child custody litigant samples, this difference may be notable when comparing profiles in this population to that of other defensive populations. In terms of the clinical scales, despite participant underreporting, researchers noted that the moderate elevations on scales RC6, which measures mistrust and suspiciousness of others, were also fairly common among this sample. General findings across all other substantive scales revealed mean T-score values at or below the normative sample means which is likely attributable, at least in part, to the
significant rate of underreporting. Overall, the commonalities across findings from Bathurst et al. (1997) and Archer et al. (2012) are notable as they indicate remarkable consistencies between detection of underreporting scales on the different test versions. This not only provides additional context for which future research findings should be considered with this population, but also indicates sufficient consistency between the utility of the MMPI-2-RF and MMPI-2 in evaluating characteristics and psychopathology among child custody litigants.

**Table 4.** Archer et al.’s (2012) MMPI-2-RF Validity Scale Means and Standard Deviations for Sample of Child Custody Litigants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scales</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Women</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Response Bias</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variable Response Inconsistency (VRIN-r)</td>
<td>42.88</td>
<td>7.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>True Response Inconsistency (TRIN-r)</td>
<td>49.41</td>
<td>6.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overreporting</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrequent Responses (F-r)</td>
<td>46.77</td>
<td>7.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrequent Psychopathology Responses(Fp-r)</td>
<td>44.80</td>
<td>4.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrequent Somatic Responses (Fs-r)</td>
<td>47.39</td>
<td>7.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symptom Validity (FBS-r)</td>
<td>49.52</td>
<td>7.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response Bias Scale (RBS)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Underreporting</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncommon Virtues (L-r)</td>
<td>52.28</td>
<td>9.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjustment Validity (K-r)</td>
<td>57.58</td>
<td>8.70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Adapted from Archer et al. (2012). Scales most relevant to defensiveness are indicated in bold.

Bagby and colleagues (1999) examined defensive responding in a sample of parents involved in child custody litigation using nontraditional defensiveness indicators on the MMPI-2. Specifically, they derived a composite score (Wsd-S) using the sum of the Wiggins Social Desirability (Wsd) scale and the Superlative scale (S), in addition to
the traditionally used L and K validity scales as defensiveness indicators. Two sets of underreporting and non-underreporting groups were identified using criteria for the L-K scales and the Wsd-S composite. The underreporting group for those classified with the L-K criterion was determined by T-score elevations greater than or equal to 65 on L, K, or both. Alternatively, the criterion for underreporting using the Wsd-S was composite raw scores beyond the optimal cut score of 42 determined by discriminant function analysis. Using the Wsd-S composite and derived cut score, substantially more litigants (74%) were identified as underreporting than when traditional validity scale criterion was used (52%). No significant differences in clinical scale elevations were present between underreporters and non-underreporters when the traditional validity scale criterion was used. In contrast, MANOVA analysis revealed significant group differences between underreporters and non-underreporters using the Wsd-S criterion. Using the Wsd-S criterion, only the Social Introversion (Si) scale scores were significantly different between groups, with non-underreporters scoring higher than underreporters. The authors noted that the use of K-corrected T scores for comparisons may account for the lack of group differences between underreporting and non-underreporting litigants. Comparison of proportions of litigants with one or more clinical scale elevations identified by the non-traditional criterion indicated a notable but not statistically significant difference between underreporters (35%) and non-underreporters (55%). Overall, findings from this study suggest slight differences between underreporters and non-underreporters across different defensiveness criterion. Results build on previous studies that indicate the significant challenge that underreporting of symptoms presents for psychologists conducting child custody evaluations.
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More recently, Fariña and colleagues (2017) conducted a meta-analytic review of MMPI validity scales to detect defensiveness in child custody litigants. In their meta-analysis, Fariña and colleagues (2017) examined the efficacy of various MMPI defensiveness scales and indexes using effect sizes from 32 studies, all of which utilized child custody litigation samples. Studies included in the analysis utilized either the MMPI, MMPI-2, or MMPI-2-RF, although comparisons on several scales and indexes on the MMPI/MMPI-2 could not be derived on the MMPI-2-RF due to test differences. Results from the analyses revealed significant, positive, generalizable, and large mean true effect sizes for the L, K, S, and Mp scales, as well as the L + K and L + K – F indexes. As such, these scales and indexes were concluded to be the best detectors of defensiveness based on studies examining this population. Results further indicated that generalizable scales/indexes had a discrimination rate between custody and normative populations ranging from 50 to 60 percent. Moreover, there was a .75 to .80 probability of parents involved in child custody disputes obtaining higher scores on these validity scale indicators of defensiveness. Fariña and colleagues (2017) also concluded that defensive attitudes were similar among male and female populations, conflicting with prior conclusions that suggest gender differences in the construct (Roma et al., 2014; Gambetti et al., 2019). They also put forth the notion that, while many of the scales and indices assessed had meaningful effect sizes, no individual scale can fully detect defensiveness on its own (Fariña et al., 2017).

Another recent study by Key and colleagues (2020) examined MMPI-2 profiles of parents undergoing child custody evaluations after substantiated allegations of abuse or neglect. Among the examined profiles, a significant portion (51.7%) were classified as
underreporting based on L scores at T = 70 or above. Notably, indications of more sophisticated defensiveness were less prevalent in the sample as only 27.8% of the sample obtained a T score at or above 65 on the K scale. Due to the lack of K scale elevations present in the sample, authors were unable to examine the combined efficacy of the L and K scales in detecting underreporting. Despite this limitation, Key and colleagues (2020) suggested that L score elevations alone may be sufficient to suppress scores on other MMPI-2 scales, as elevations on several content scales, clinical scales, PSY-5 scales, and non-K-corrected scales in profiles of parents classified as underreporting were significantly lower compared to those who did not underreport.

Other studies have compared personality test profiles of parents undergoing psychological evaluation in different civil litigation contexts. Gambetti and colleagues (2019), specifically, utilized child custody litigants involved in disputes of visitation arrangements after separation as a comparison group to examine MMPI-2 profiles of parents involved in civil proceedings regarding termination, limitation, or maintenance of their parental rights after maltreatment allegations. While they noted several significant differences in the personality characteristics of the two groups, the most relevant results to be discussed here are pertaining to response style and impression management. Such findings indicate that parents in the child custody comparison group obtained significantly higher K scores \((M = 54.55, SD = 9.82)\) but lower L scores \((M = 51.75, SD = 8.94)\) compared to those in parental rights litigation \((M = 51.17, SD = 10.24\) and \(M = 59.29, SD = 9.17, \) respectively). This likely indicates that those undergoing civil proceedings related to their parental rights display a more obvious form of impression management. Moreover, child custody litigants also demonstrated significantly higher
scores on the S scale ($M = 56.88$, $SD = 6.51$) compared to the parental rights sample ($M = 50.75$, $SD = 10.35$). Taken together, the authors concluded that impression management among those in child custody proceedings is marked by a greater ability to limit disclosure of adjustment difficulties (K scale) and present as virtuous and moral (S scale).

Resendes and Lecci (2012) also compared different civil litigation samples, both of which have been shown to demonstrate high prevalence rates of defensiveness. Specifically, they compared MMPI-2 profiles from a sample of individuals being assessed for parental competency and a sample of child custody litigants. It was hypothesized that the competency sample would have elevated L and K scores and, as a result, would have clinical scores that fall below 65T. However, similar to findings reflected in the study by Gambetti and colleagues (2019), comparisons revealed that child custody litigants had higher scores on K ($M = 58.6$) and lower scores on L ($M = 56.01$) relative to parental competency sample (Resendes & Lecci, 2012). Additionally, a series of independent samples $t$ tests revealed that the parental competency sample also obtained higher scores on eight of the 10 clinical scales, most notably scales 4, 2, 0, and 8, although it was noted that the mean clinical scale scores were all below the clinical cutoff score of $T = 65$. Comparisons also found significantly higher scores for the parental competency sample on F, FB, VRIN, and TRIN relative to the child custody sample. The authors ultimately concluded that the two populations differ in their response patterns, despite similar motivations to present as socially desirable. The authors alluded to the fact that higher base rates of significant problems that may interfere with competent parenting may in part contribute to the differences in personality test profiles between the two groups (Resendes & Lecci, 2012).
Ezzo and colleagues (2007) also conducted a study comparing MMPI-2 profiles between parents involved in child maltreatment cases and two types of child custody cases (i.e., married and unmarried). The child custody groups were ultimately combined into one non-maltreatment group in order to more clearly identify potential group differences from the maltreatment group on all MMPI-2 clinical and validity scales. Both the maltreatment and non-maltreatment groups were deemed defensive as indicated by validity scale configurations. While it was noted that majority of examinees did not invalidate their profiles from extreme defensiveness, the authors did not exclude profiles based on defensive validity indicators. Findings indicate that the non-maltreatment custody group showed relatively fewer elevations on the L scale compared to the maltreatment group and relatively more elevations on the K scale (Ezzo et al., 2007).

In light of the previously discussed findings from child custody samples, it is evident that defensiveness significantly impacts the interpretability of MMPI profiles in this population. Additionally, comparisons across similar civil litigations have revealed that differences in MMPI profiles are found between groups presumed to demonstrate defensiveness. Perhaps the most notable and relevant result of these comparisons suggests differences on both the L and K scales relative to various other civil-forensic samples. Moreover, the extensive research conducted on defensiveness that is characteristic of a child custody sample further supports its appropriateness as a comparison sample.
Chapter 3: Rationale and Purpose of Study

Defensiveness occurs at a notably high rate across different forensic evaluation contexts, including both criminal and civil proceedings. This phenomenon is particularly common among sex offenders as well as individuals involved in child custody litigation, both of which may be designated as “presumed defensive” groups. Although research has encouraged a sense of practitioner skepticism in these contexts due to the prevalence of defensiveness and its impact on test findings (e.g., Rogers & Bender, 2018), the extent to which defensiveness in sex offenders varies in intensity or complexity relative to other forensic samples remains unknown. More broadly, the current literature has not clearly determined whether all defensiveness is similar in nature or whether there are different pathways and facets to achieve a similar outcome. Many empirical studies have examined defensiveness and, in doing so, have made meaningful comparisons to various non-defensive groups. Such comparisons have revealed that sex offender response styles tend to differ from both general non-offending and non-sexual offending samples, as well as between different subgroups of sex offenders. However, no known studies to date have compared the construct in sex offenders with other defensive samples. Similarly, while defensiveness in civil forensic populations has been compared to some extent in the contexts of child maltreatment and custody evaluations, it remains unknown whether it is similar in nature to that of sex offender populations.

While defensiveness may be a universally identifiable construct, previous psychological literature has suggested that there may in fact be different forms of defensiveness, as indicated by the numerous concepts used synonymously with the term (e.g., faking good, social desirability, dissimulation, denial, minimization, self-
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deception). This study, therefore, aimed to compare the types and levels of defensiveness as indicated on the MMPI-2-RF across two presumed defensive samples – sex offenders and child custody litigants. Because sex offenders tend to be predominantly men, the current study was limited to men in both samples. Additionally, subgroups of each sample were identified to provide a more in-depth comparison of the nature of defensiveness between groups. These subgroups were comprised of individuals from the sex offender and child custody litigant samples who produced elevated scores on one or both of the underreporting validity scales. The goal for this comparison was therefore to supplement the general comparison by examining whether subgroups of these samples, who more clearly and definitively engage in defensive responding, differ in the more nuanced facets of defensiveness indicated by the test.

The current study examined the extent to which score differences are observed between these presumed defensive samples, as well as clearly identified defensive subgroups of the two samples, which was determined by clinically elevated validity scale scores. In the absence of prior research comparing defensiveness across sex offenders and child custody litigants, this research was largely exploratory in nature. However, because research with sex offenders has shown defensiveness largely presents as high scores on the L-r scale, and research with child custody litigants has largely shown defensiveness in high K-r scores, the expectations for this study were guided by those findings. Specific areas of investigation were as follows:

1. The first goal of the present study was to compare the two presumed defensive samples. Specifically, separate comparisons were conducted to examine differences
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on the validity scales and the substantive scales between presumed defensive sex offenders and child custody litigants.

a. For the validity scale comparison, the study aimed to compare T scores on underreporting validity scales L-r and K-r and overreporting validity scale F-r for the presumed defensive samples in order to specifically identify similarities and differences in test-detected response styles between samples. To some degree, it was expected that these validity scale patterns and scores may be comparable across the two defensive samples. However, based on prior research, it was considered that L-r scores would likely be higher among sex offenders, whereas K-r scores would be higher in child custody litigants, as such patterns have been demonstrated in comparisons of these groups with other samples. The goal was then to compare substantive scale score patterns of the groups under the presumed defensive condition. At a broad level, it was expected that scale scores for both samples would largely be in the average range. However, because the two samples have not been previously directly compared, an exploratory approach was utilized in examining if there were particular areas of difference between scores in the two samples.

b. To further examine potential differences in response style, the next area of investigation aimed to compare presumed defensive samples’ responses on the validity and substantive scales at the item level. The intention of comparing item endorsement frequencies in the keyed direction on the L-r, K-r, and the F-r scales was to evaluate possible patterns in defensive responding that may be based on the content of specific items endorsed by
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each group. Similarly, analysis of item endorsement frequencies in the keyed direction for the 40 substantive scales was aimed at examining potential differences in response patterns for presumed defensive groups on the clinical scales. Outside of the present study, such close analysis of test item endorsement frequencies has yet to be the focus of any literature conducted with these particular groups. As such, item-level analyses were exclusively exploratory in nature without a sufficient prior research basis from which directional hypotheses could be made.

2. The next area of investigation was to examine differences for the clearly defensive subgroups, which consisted of individuals from the presumed defensive samples who produced a T score at or above 65 on the L-r scale and/or 60 or higher on the K-r scale.

   a. The initial goal of this comparison was to identify whether sex offenders and child custody litigants who were identified as defensive according to clinical test interpretation guidelines (Ben-Porath & Tellegen, 2008) produced differences in T scores for three validity scales (i.e., L-r, K-r, F-r). These comparisons were identical to that of the presumed defensive groups, such that T scores were first compared on the three validity scales and were then examined for the 40 substantive scales. Expectations for these analyses were again not directional as previous studies of each of these groups have not included examination of group differences in MMPI-2-RF profiles of sex offenders or child custody litigants who specifically elevated on one or both underreporting validity scales (i.e., L-r, K-r).
b. Finally, the present study aimed to compare item endorsement frequencies between the two clearly defensive subgroups. This consisted of an initial examination of endorsement frequencies of items answers in the keyed direction for the three validity scales L-r, K-r, and F-r. This was followed by comparison of item endorsement rates for the 40 substantive scales. As with the presumed defensive sample comparison, this level of comparison was again exploratory in nature for the clearly defensive subgroups due to the lack of prior research comparing these groups.
Chapter 4: Method

Participants

The current study contained two distinct samples. The primary sample consisted of 268 adult men who had participated in a psychosexual evaluation between 2013 and 2022. Evaluations were completed at a forensic/psychological outpatient treatment facility in Central Florida following formal allegation of and/or criminal charge for a sexual offense, with referrals for alleged offenders being from the family court system and/or the Department of Children and Families (DCF) and referrals for charged offenders being from criminal court personnel (i.e., defense attorneys, judges). Demographic information and test data were obtained from an archival research database to which access was provided by the major advisor for this study, supplemented with data collection by this researcher. Inclusion criteria for this sample required that participants were at least 18 years old, male, had a documented allegation of a sexual offense, and produced a valid MMPI-2-RF profile as indicated by VRIN-r and TRIN-r score of < 80, reflecting the absence of significant inconsistent and biased responding, and a Cannot Say (?) score of < 15, demonstrating minimal response omissions. All participants of this sample met these criteria and were thus included in the “presumed defensive” sex offender group for a total sample size of \( N = 268 \). The mean age of participants in this sample was 36.6 years \( (SD = 13.01; \text{range} = 18-75) \), and the sample was primarily Caucasian \( (n = 171; 63.8\%) \). The majority of participants in the sex offender sample were single \( (n = 109; 40.7\%) \) and all reported having between 0 and 11 children \( (M = 1.59; SD = 1.68) \). Individuals in the sample primarily reported earning at least a high school degree or equivalent \( (n = 233; 86.9\%) \), with 28.3% earning a two-year degree or higher \( (n = 76) \).
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Additional demographic information for this sample is provided in Table 5, including offense information as well as personal and psychological history data.

A subgroup of the sex offender sample (i.e., “clearly defensive” group) was also obtained for further comparison of defensiveness. This subgroup was comprised of 102 participants from the original pool of 268 presumed defensive sex offender sample who, in addition to the above inclusion criteria, also produced elevations on the underreporting validity scales. Specifically, the clearly defensive subgroup of participants had also produced a T score of at least 65 on the L-r scale and/or a K-r scale score of at least $T = 60$, which was based on criteria provided in the test manual (Ben-Porath & Tellegen, 2008). The mean age for this subgroup of sex offenders was 38.22 ($SD = 12.42$; range = 18-73). The majority of this subgroup were Caucasian ($n = 54; 52.9\%$), with 24.5% identifying as Hispanic or Latino ($n = 25$), 13.7% identifying as Black or African American ($n = 14$), 4.9% identifying as Asian ($n = 5$), and one percent identifying as Other ($n = 1$). This subgroup also followed similar patterns for other demographic information to the presumed defensive sample, as most participants reported being employed ($n = 60; 58.8\%$), single ($n = 31; 30.4\%$), and having earned at least a high school diploma ($n = 85; 82.7\%$). Table 5 also shows additional demographic data for this subgroup, including information regarding alleged crimes and personal mental health history.

(continues)
## Table 5. Demographic Data for Sex Offender Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic Variable</th>
<th>Presumed Defensive Sex Offender Sample (N = 268)</th>
<th>Clearly Defensive Sex Offender Subgroup (N = 102)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ethniciy</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>63.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic or Latino</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>14.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black/African American</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>10.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian/Alaska Native</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian / Other Pacific Islander</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No degree</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School Diploma</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Equivalency Diploma (GED)</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some College</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>23.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associates or Two-Year Degree</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelors or Four-Year Degree</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>15.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Degree</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>40.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>27.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separated</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>16.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment Status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>54.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed due to arrest</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>22.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Table 5 (cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic Variable</th>
<th>Presumed Defensive Sex Offender Sample ($N = 268$)</th>
<th>Clearly Defensive Sex Offender Subgroup ($N = 102$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Employment Status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disabled</td>
<td>5 1.9</td>
<td>3 2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>5 1.9</td>
<td>2 2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>21 7.8</td>
<td>7 6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Living Situation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alone</td>
<td>48 17.9</td>
<td>15 14.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With significant other</td>
<td>54 20.1</td>
<td>24 23.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With roommate</td>
<td>13 4.9</td>
<td>0 0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With parents</td>
<td>64 23.9</td>
<td>16 15.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incarcerated</td>
<td>29 10.8</td>
<td>8 7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>60 22.4</td>
<td>39 38.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Evaluation Referral Source</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attorney</td>
<td>186 69.4</td>
<td>52 51.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judge/Court Order</td>
<td>30 11.2</td>
<td>17 16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case Manager</td>
<td>16 6.0</td>
<td>13 12.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>29 10.8</td>
<td>16 15.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>7 2.6</td>
<td>4 3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sex Offense Charge</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact Offense</td>
<td>85 31.7</td>
<td>35 34.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-contact Offense</td>
<td>54 20.1</td>
<td>14 13.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intended Contact</td>
<td>59 22.0</td>
<td>10 9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allegations without current charge</td>
<td>61 22.8</td>
<td>40 39.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>9 2.31</td>
<td>3 3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Relation to Victim</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
<td>71 26.5</td>
<td>36 35.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquaintance</td>
<td>37 13.8</td>
<td>17 16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stranger</td>
<td>75 28.0</td>
<td>16 15.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stepfamily</td>
<td>21 7.8</td>
<td>10 9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>64 22.9</td>
<td>23 22.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 5 (cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic Variable</th>
<th>Presumed Defensive Sex Offender Sample (N = 268)</th>
<th>Clearly Defensive Sex Offender Subgroup (N = 102)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Victim Age in Years</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 or younger</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 to 9</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 to 12</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 to 17</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>39.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 or older</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>27.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk Level of Reoffending</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>35.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low-Moderate</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate-High</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below Average</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above Average</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Assessed/Unknown</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>48.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous Legal History</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>56.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonviolent Offense</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>20.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violent Offense</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex Offense</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combination</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Abuse History</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>69.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>20.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Table 5 (cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic Variable</th>
<th>Presumed Defensive Sex Offender Sample (N = 268)</th>
<th>Clearly Defensive Sex Offender Subgroup (N = 102)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Abuse History</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>69.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>20.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Abuse History</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>10.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>73.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>16.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental Health Treatment History</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>63.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>32.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex Offender or Sex Addiction Treatment History</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>86.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anger Management Treatment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>91.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substance Use History</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>42.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>50.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Substance Use</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>14.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>81.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As seen in Table 5, approximately 70% of participants in the overall presumed defensive sex offender sample \((N = 268)\) were predominantly referred for psychosexual evaluation by their attorney. This was also the most common referral source for the clearly defensive subgroup \((N = 102)\), with about half of participants in this group being referred by their attorney. Nearly one-third of both sex offender groups were charged with a contact sex offense. However, it was noted that approximately 23% of the presumed defensive sample and about 40% of the clearly defensive subgroup were facing
an allegation of a sex offense without criminal charges at the time of evaluation. Additionally, more than half of the presumed defensive sex offender sample were either family members \((n = 71; 26.5\%)\) or strangers \((n = 75; 28\%)\) to their alleged victims. Approximately 40\% of alleged victims in the presumed defensive sample were teenagers between the ages of 13 and 17 years, which was also the most common victim age group for the clearly defensive subgroup. Over half of the presumed defensive sample did not have a previous legal history \((n = 150; 56\%)\), with only 1.5\% of participants \((n = 4)\) having been charged with a prior sexual offense. Three of those four participants charged with a prior sex offense met criteria for the clearly defensive subgroup. Regarding mental health diagnoses, 19\% of participants in the presumed defensive sample had a paraphilia diagnosis \((n = 51)\), while 47\% of this sample received another clinical diagnosis \((n = 126)\). In contrast, only about 7\% of the clearly defensive group were diagnosed with a paraphilic disorder. Less than 10\% of participants in both sex offender groups had prior sex offender or sex addiction treatment, although more than half of both groups had a history of some type of mental health treatment.

The comparison sample of child custody litigants was obtained from a research database \((N = 261)\) of men who had underwent psychological evaluation for the purposes of assisting the court in making child custody determinations, which was partially collected by this researcher. Participants from this sample were evaluated at the same treatment facility as the sex offender sample between 1998 and 2022. Custody litigants who were evaluated prior to 2008 were originally administered the MMPI-2, and their test responses were converted to MMPI-2-RF profiles for the research database following standard procedures provided in the MMPI-2-RF manual. This was done in consideration
of published evidence of the comparability of scores obtained from the two methods (i.e., van der Heijden, Egger, & Derksen, 2010). The same inclusion criteria for age, VRIN-r, TRIN-r, and Cannot Say (?) were applied to this comparison sample, which is henceforth referred to as the “presumed defensive” child custody group. One case in the database was excluded due to violation of inclusion criteria for both VRIN-r and TRIN-r scores, resulting in a final sample size of $N = 260$. The mean age for participants in this sample was 43.5 ($SD = 7.46$; range = 21-64) and the majority were Caucasian ($n = 165; 63.5\%$). Individuals in the sample on average reported having completed 15.6 years of education ($SD = 3.07$; range = 7-27), and most obtained a two-year college degree or higher ($n = 167; 64.2\%$). Additionally, a predominant proportion of the sample reported being employed at the time of evaluation ($n = 222; 85.3\%$). Regarding marital status, 17.7\% of participants reported that they were separated while another 11.2\% reported being divorced at the time of evaluation. Additional demographic information for the entire child custody litigant sample is provided in Table 6, including proceeding information and personal and psychological history data.

Similar to the subgroup for the sex offender sample, a “clearly defensive” child custody group was obtained from the larger presumed defensive child custody sample. In order to be deemed defensive and suitable for the clearly defensive subgroup, participants also had to have produced a T score of at least 65 on the L-r scale and/or 60 on the K-r scale in addition to the previously stated validity criteria. These cutoff scores were derived from the test manual and are consistent with previously discussed research and normative data on child custody litigants. Appendix A summarizes the inclusion criteria applied for all four participant groups involved in this study. After applying these
additional criteria to the sample of 260 male child custody litigants, a subgroup of 167 participants were identified and used for further analysis. The mean age for this subgroup of custody litigants was 43.43 years ($SD = 7.36$; range = 21-60) and the majority were White/Caucasian ($n = 99$; 59.3%). The highest level of education and employment status for this subgroup were consistent with the presumed defensive custody litigant sample, with only 2.4% of the clearly defensive subgroup earning less than a high school diploma or equivalent and majority reporting being employed ($n = 136$; 81.4%).
Table 6. Demographic Data for Child Custody Litigant Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic Variable</th>
<th>Presumed Defensive Child Custody Litigant Sample (N = 260)</th>
<th>Clearly Defensive Child Custody Litigant Subgroup (N = 167)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White/Caucasian</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>63.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black/African American</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>25.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No degree</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School Diploma</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>21.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Equivalency Diploma (GED)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associates or Two-Year Degree</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelors or Four-Year Degree</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>32.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Degree</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>22.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never Married</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widowed</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>11.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separated</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>17.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>59.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment Status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>85.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(cont.)
## Comparing Defensiveness in Forensic MMPI-2-RF Profiles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic Variable</th>
<th>Presumed Defensive Child Custody Litigant Sample <em>(N = 260)</em></th>
<th>Clearly Defensive Child Custody Litigant Subgroup <em>(N = 167)</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reason for Evaluation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Court Ordered</td>
<td>204 (78.5)</td>
<td>129 (77.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint Stipulation</td>
<td>40 (15.4)</td>
<td>26 (15.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>16 (6.2)</td>
<td>12 (7.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type of Proceeding</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial Dissolution</td>
<td>91 (35.0)</td>
<td>56 (33.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modification of Current Custody/Parenting Plan</td>
<td>141 (54.2)</td>
<td>90 (53.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petition for Relocation</td>
<td>9 (3.5)</td>
<td>6 (3.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>19 (7.3)</td>
<td>15 (9.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Legal History</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>89 (34.2)</td>
<td>58 (34.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>134 (51.5)</td>
<td>85 (50.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>37 (14.4)</td>
<td>24 (13.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type of Legal History</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>133 (51.2)</td>
<td>85 (50.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DUI</td>
<td>13 (5.0)</td>
<td>11 (6.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assault/Battery</td>
<td>13 (5.0)</td>
<td>8 (4.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic Violence</td>
<td>17 (6.5)</td>
<td>12 (7.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug-Related Charges</td>
<td>5 (1.9)</td>
<td>3 (1.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Crime</td>
<td>3 (1.2)</td>
<td>3 (1.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Crime</td>
<td>12 (4.6)</td>
<td>10 (6.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>17 (6.5)</td>
<td>6 (3.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple</td>
<td>33 (12.7)</td>
<td>17 (10.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>14 (5.4)</td>
<td>12 (7.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Personal Abuse History</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>74 (28.5)</td>
<td>45 (26.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>171 (65.8)</td>
<td>108 (64.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>15 (5.8)</td>
<td>14 (8.4)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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## Table 6 (cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic Variable</th>
<th>Presumed Defensive Child Custody Litigant Sample ($N = 260$)</th>
<th>Clearly Defensive Child Custody Litigant Subgroup ($N = 167$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$N$</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Abuse History</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>28.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>65.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of Personal Abuse</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>74.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Abuse</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Abuse</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Abuse</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental Health Treatment History</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>36.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>58.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of Treatment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>37.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>21.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family/Marital</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>18.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substance Abuse</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>16.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental Health Diagnosis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>74.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personality Disorder</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mood Disorder</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anxiety Disorder</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychotic Disorder</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substance Abuse Disorder</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Comparison of Defensiveness in Forensic MMPI-2-RF Profiles

### Table 6 (cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic Variable</th>
<th>Presumed Defensive Child Custody Litigant Sample (N = 260)</th>
<th>Clearly Defensive Child Custody Litigant Subgroup (N = 167)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Demographic Variable</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental Health Diagnosis (cont.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disruptive/Behavioral Disorder</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History of Child Custody or DCF Cases</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>36.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>58.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accused Spouse/Partner of Abuse</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>23.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>69.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accused of Abuse</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>61.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accused by Spouse</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>21.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accused by Child</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accused by both Spouse and Child</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of Abuse Accusation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>61.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>11.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Cont.)
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Table 6 (cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic Variable</th>
<th>Presumed Defensive Child Custody Litigant Sample (N = 260)</th>
<th>Clearly Defensive Child Custody Litigant Subgroup (N = 167)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goal for Evaluation</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To Maintain Primary Parental Responsibility</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>13.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seeking Primary Parental Responsibility</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>30.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seeking Contact/Access to Child</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>16.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seeking 50/50 Responsibility or Joint Custody</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>28.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>12.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As seen in Table 6, over 75% of participants in both the presumed defensive and clearly defensive child custody groups were mandated to complete the evaluation due to a Court Order. Additionally, more than half of participants in each sample were involved in proceedings to modify a current parenting plan or custody agreement, while approximately 30% of each group were undergoing initial dissolution custody proceedings. Slightly over 20% of participants in these groups were accused of some form of abuse during their respective custody proceedings by their former spouse or partner. Moreover, about 10% of those accused of abuse in each group were accused of multiple forms of abuse. In the presumed defensive samples, the most common goals of participants in regard to the evaluation outcome were to obtain primary parental responsibility (n = 78; 30%) and to obtain 50/50 parental responsibility or joint custody (n = 73; 28.1%). This was also the case with the clearly defensive subgroup. Regarding participant’s mental health, less than 20% of participants in both child custody groups had a confirmed mental health diagnosis. However, over one-third of the presumed
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defensive child custody sample and more than half of the clearly defensive subgroup had a history of mental health treatment. Of those who had received mental health treatment, the two most common types of treatment among both custody groups were individual and family or marital therapy.

Instruments

*MMPI-2-RF*

The sole measure used in this study was the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory-Second Edition-Restructured Form (MMPI-2-RF). As indicated in the test’s technical manual, the measure has extensive research supporting the sound psychometrics of its validity and reliability as a method to assess adult personality and psychopathology (Ben-Porath & Tellegen, 2008).

Of particular relevance to the current study is the evidence provided in the test’s technical manual showing empirical support for both the validity and reliability of the MMPI-2-RF validity scales (Ben-Porath & Tellegen, 2008). Test data from a subset of the MMPI-2-RF normative sample revealed the test-retest reliability for the L-r and K-r scales were .79 and .84, respectively. Test-retest reliability for the other validity scales ranged from .40 (TRIN-r) to .72 (FBS-r) for the same normative sample subset. Standard Error of Measurement (SEM) for the validity scales ranged from 4 to 8. Additionally, internal consistency reliability for each of the validity scales are provided based on the subset of men from the normative sample. Internal consistency for the L-r and K-r scales among men were .61 and .67, respectively, with all other validity scales ranging from .37 (TRIN-r) to .69 (F-r). Regarding the validity of scores produced on the validity scales, test developers reported correlation coefficients using the normative samples from the
MMPI-2 validity scales with their respective revised MMPI-2-RF validity scales. Both VRIN-r and TRIN-r demonstrated adequate sensitivity to levels of inconsistent responding, with VRIN-r performing similarly to VRIN on the MMPI-2 and TRIN-r outperforming its MMPI-2 counterpart (TRIN). On the MMPI-2-RF overreporting indicators, test developers reported that F-r, Fp-r, and FBS-r detect overreported symptoms as adequately as their MMPI-2 counterparts (i.e., F, Fp, and FBS) as evidenced by data sets from a series of simulation studies with correlations ranging from .95 to .99. Similar findings were reported for the validity of MMPI-2-RF underreporting indicators, as both L-r and K-r were found to effectively detect underreporting in both clinical and nonclinical settings. Both scales were also reported to strongly correlate with their MMPI-2 counterparts (i.e., L and K), and provide incrementally valid information to one another. Intercorrelations among the validity scales further revealed that F-r had the highest correlation with substantive scales, although this is expected given the nature of the scale’s item content. Overall, psychometric data provided by the test developers indicate overwhelming evidence that each MMPI-2-RF validity scales demonstrates sufficient consistency and adequately measures its intended construct (Ben-Porath & Tellegen, 2008).

The test’s technical manual also provides extensive research regarding the psychometrics of the Higher Order (H-O), Restructured Clinical (RC), Specific Problem (SP), and Personality Psychopathology Five (PSY-5) scales (Ben-Porath & Tellegen, 2008). Data from the normative sample revealed test-retest reliability among the H-O scales ranged from .71 (THD) to .90 (EID), with SEMs in the 3-5 range. The internal consistency among H-O scales ranged from .69 (THD) to .86 (EID) for the subset of men
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in the normative sample. The RC scales test-retest reliability ranged from .64 (RC6) to .89 (RC4) with SEM ranging from 3 to 6 among the normative sample. The internal consistency for the RC scales ranged from alpha coefficients .63 (RC6) to .87 (RCd) for men in the normative sample. The test-retest reliability among SP scales, including the Somatic/Cognitive, Internalizing, Externalizing, and Interpersonal scales ranged from .65 (HLP) to .92 (MEC), with SEM between 3 and 7. Internal consistency for these scales among males from the normative sample ranged from .39 (HLP) to .78 (SAV). Test-retest reliability for the PSY-5 scales ranged from .76 (PSYC-r) to .93 (DISC-r), with SEM ranging from 3 to 5 for the normative sample subset. For the subset of men from the normative sample, internal consistency for PSY-5 scales ranged from .69 (PSYC-r) to .77 (INTR-r). Validity data gathered from clinical, forensic, medical, and non-clinical samples have been also reported, corroborating the construct validity of the MMPI-2-RF substantive scales. Specifically, data gathered from therapist and administrative staff ratings, clinical diagnoses, record reviews, and other self-report measures were found to be correlated to the MMPI-2-RF substantive scales. Such correlations offered evidence for adequate convergent and discriminant validity. Convergent validity was further evidenced by strong associations between MMPI-2-RF substantive scales and their respective MMPI-2 counterparts. Evaluation of intercorrelations among the 42 substantive scales revealed correlations between the H-O scales and several RC, SP, and PSY-5 scales, although these intercorrelations are ultimately consistent with the interpretive structure of the test. In summary, research findings provided in the technical manual suggest acceptable-to-strong test score validity such that the H-O, RC, SP, and PSY-5 scales are sufficiently reliable and accurate in measuring their intended construct,
although some specific problem scales may have weaker psychometric support due to limited number of items (Ben-Porath & Tellegen, 2008).

**Procedures**

Data retrieval for the current study began after receiving approval from the Institutional Review Board (IRB) of Florida Institute of Technology and the Doctoral Research Project (DRP) committee. Upon approval, the research supervisor granted access to her existing research database of demographic information and MMPI-2-RF test scores for sex offenders. This was supplemented with data from an additional 50 cases extracted by this researcher from the electronic records of the testing site. All data was derived from psychological evaluation records from an outpatient practice in central Florida. The research database did not contain identifiable information as participants’ names had been removed and replaced with file numbers to protect the participants’ identities. After being extracted from the existing database, all participant data was entered into IBM Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) for analysis. Secure maintenance of test data and electronic databases was achieved by password protecting the electronic files.

Procurement of data for the comparison sample of child custody litigants underwent similar procedures as the primary sample. Demographic information and MMPI-2-RF test scores of child custody litigants who underwent psychological evaluation between 1998 and 2022 at the same outpatient site as the sex offender sample was again retrieved from the research supervisor’s existing archival database. Data from this database was then supplemented with an additional 76 cases extracted by this researcher from the site’s electronic records. As with the primary sample, all identifiable
information was previously removed and replaced with file numbers to protect the participants’ identities. Once collected, data files for this sample were also password protected for secure maintenance of test data.

Data Analyses

Preliminary data analyses of the current study consisted of calculating (a) descriptive statistics for each sample, including means, standard deviations, and percentages, to describe their respective demographics, and (b) MMPI-2-RF scale score means and standard deviations. Main analyses for the current study included the computation of the following inferential statistics:

1. The first series of analyses were conducted to compare scale- and item-level response patterns between the two presumed defensive samples.
   a. At the scale-level, a series of three \( t \)-tests were conducted to compare mean \( L-r \), \( K-r \), and \( F-r \) \( T \) scores as indicators of defensive responding among presumed defensive samples of sex offenders and child custody litigants.
   b. A series of four multivariate analyses of variance (MANOVA) were then conducted to compare the two presumed defensive samples on substantive scales (i.e., \( H-O \), \( RC \), Specific Problem, and PSY-5 scales). This was followed by post-hoc univariate analyses of variance (ANOVA) and Mann-Whitney \( U \) tests for individual scale-level comparisons.
   c. At the item level, frequency data for items endorsed in the keyed direction on the \( L-r \) and \( K-r \) scales, as well as the \( F-r \) scale, were collected to identify potential differences in rates between the two presumed defensive
samples. Items from these validity scales that demonstrated at least a 20% difference in endorsement rate between the two samples were then analyzed further using a chi-square test to determine if the difference was statistically significant. Item-level frequency data for items endorsed in the keyed direction were examined for substantive scales (excluding the two interest scales) to identify differences in endorsement patterns between presumed defensive sex offender and child custody samples. Items that were from scales that had a difference between samples of at least a medium effect size, and that demonstrated at least a 20% difference in endorsement rate between the two samples, were analyzed further using a chi-square test to determine if the difference was statistically significant.

2. The next series of analyses mirrored those listed above and were conducted to compare test profiles for the two clearly defensive subgroups.
   a. A series of three $t$-tests were conducted to examine potential differences in T scores on the three validity scales (L-r, K-r, and F-r) between clearly defensive sex offenders and clearly defensive child custody litigants.
   b. Next, a series of four multivariate analyses of variance (MANOVA) were conducted to compare substantive scale (i.e., H-O, RC, Specific Problem, and PSY-5 scales) T scores for the two clearly defensive groups. This was followed by post-hoc univariate analyses of variance (ANOVA) and Mann-Whitney $U$ tests for individual scale-level comparisons.
   c. Item-level frequency data for L-r, K-r, and F-r items that were endorsed in the keyed direction were compared between the clearly defensive groups.
Items from these scales that demonstrated at least a 20% difference in endorsement rate between the two samples were analyzed further using a chi-square test to test for significant differences. Similarly, items from the substantive scales (excluding the two interest scales) were also examined to identify differences in endorsement patterns between clearly defensive subgroups. Items from scales that had a significant difference in T scores with at least a medium effect size and that demonstrated at least a 20% difference in endorsement rate between the two samples were analyzed further using a chi-square test.
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Chapter 5: Results

Preliminary analyses consisted of calculating descriptive statistics (i.e., means and standard deviations of MMPI-2-RF scale scores) for the two presumed defensive samples and the two clearly defensive subgroups. These scores are provided in Table 7.

Table 7. Means and standard deviations for MMPI-2-RF scale scores for all sex offender and child custody litigant samples.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MMPI-2-RF Scale</th>
<th>Presumed Defensive</th>
<th>Clearly Defensive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SO Sample (N = 268)</td>
<td>CCL Sample (N = 260)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Validity Scales</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variable Response Inconsistency scale (VRIN-r)</td>
<td>50.20 10.42</td>
<td>43.58 7.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>True Response Inconsistency scale (TRIN-r)</td>
<td><strong>55.47</strong> 5.98</td>
<td>54.33 5.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrequent Responses (F-r)</td>
<td><strong>56.43</strong> 17.31</td>
<td>46.60 6.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrequent Psychopathology Responses (Fp-r)</td>
<td>51.40 13.75</td>
<td>45.05 6.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrequent Somatic Responses (Fs)</td>
<td>52.94 13.74</td>
<td>46.53 7.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response Bias Scale (RBS)</td>
<td>54.98 13.88</td>
<td>48.23 8.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symptom Validity Scale (FBS-r)</td>
<td>54.10 11.74</td>
<td>50.29 8.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncommon Virtues (L-r)</td>
<td><strong>58.99</strong> 14.29</td>
<td><strong>56.98</strong> 12.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjustment Validity (K-r)</td>
<td>50.77 11.09</td>
<td><strong>60.50</strong> 8.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher-Order (H-O) scales</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional/Internalizing Dysfunction (EID)</td>
<td>50.18 12.67</td>
<td>40.95 7.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thought Dysfunction (THD)</td>
<td>53.48 12.41</td>
<td>48.68 8.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavioral/External Dysfunction (BXD)</td>
<td>51.79 9.44</td>
<td>47.63 7.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restructured Clinical (RC) scales</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demoralization (RCd)</td>
<td>51.98 12.42</td>
<td>42.28 7.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somatic Complaints (RC1)</td>
<td>52.85 11.41</td>
<td>44.90 9.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Positive Emotions (RC2)</td>
<td>50.09 11.26</td>
<td>45.11 8.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cynicism (RC3)</td>
<td>51.40 12.72</td>
<td>43.00 7.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antisocial Behavior (RC4)</td>
<td>53.87 9.85</td>
<td>46.87 8.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideas of Persecution (RC6)</td>
<td><strong>57.88</strong> 13.20</td>
<td>52.23 10.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dysfunctional Negative Emotions (RC7)</td>
<td>48.09 11.62</td>
<td>39.84 6.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aberrant Experiences (RC8)</td>
<td>52.38 13.02</td>
<td>45.50 7.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypomanic Activation (RC9)</td>
<td>47.10 10.17</td>
<td>43.05 7.90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(cont.)
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MMPI-2-RF Scale</th>
<th>Presumed Defensive</th>
<th>Clearly Defensive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SO Sample (N = 268)</td>
<td>CCL Sample (N = 260)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Specific Problem Scales</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somatic scales</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malaise (MLS)</td>
<td>51.91 (10.57)</td>
<td>46.25 (8.07)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gastrointestinal Complaints (GIC)</td>
<td>51.82 (11.11)</td>
<td>48.72 (8.13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head Pain Complaints (HPC)</td>
<td>51.41 (10.62)</td>
<td>47.30 (8.42)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neurological Complaints (NUC)</td>
<td>53.63 (12.18)</td>
<td>47.46 (9.28)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive Complaints (COG)</td>
<td>53.03 (13.06)</td>
<td>44.43 (7.35)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internalizing Scales</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suicidal/Death Ideation (SUI)</td>
<td>50.20 (12.39)</td>
<td>45.32 (2.59)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helplessness/Hopelessness (HLP)</td>
<td>50.14 (12.40)</td>
<td>43.50 (6.41)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Doubt (SFD)</td>
<td>51.38 (12.15)</td>
<td>44.30 (5.97)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inefficacy (NFC)</td>
<td>51.05 (11.40)</td>
<td>41.40 (6.55)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stress/Worry (STW)</td>
<td>52.39 (10.41)</td>
<td>45.65 (7.17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anxiety (AXY)</td>
<td>52.46 (14.14)</td>
<td>46.53 (6.73)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anger-Proneness (ANP)</td>
<td>47.56 (9.90)</td>
<td>42.63 (6.18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavior-Restricting Fears (BRF)</td>
<td>49.27 (10.36)</td>
<td>44.72 (4.99)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple Specific Fears (MSF)</td>
<td>45.99 (7.76)</td>
<td>45.46 (6.92)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Externalizing Scales</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juvenile Conduct Problems (JCP)</td>
<td>53.63 (10.98)</td>
<td>49.05 (9.48)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substance Abuse (SUB)</td>
<td>50.32 (10.36)</td>
<td>46.67 (6.70)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggression (AGG)</td>
<td>46.76 (10.12)</td>
<td>42.54 (6.65)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activation (ACT)</td>
<td>48.12 (11.46)</td>
<td>42.97 (7.94)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interpersonal Scales</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Problems (FML)</td>
<td>46.77 (9.95)</td>
<td>42.79 (7.74)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal Passivity (IPP)</td>
<td>48.04 (8.99)</td>
<td>47.46 (7.65)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Avoidance (SAV)</td>
<td>52.48 (11.75)</td>
<td>48.58 (8.38)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shyness (SHY)</td>
<td>47.68 (10.27)</td>
<td>42.55 (7.03)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disaffiliativeness (DSF)</td>
<td>50.16 (10.92)</td>
<td>45.48 (4.52)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Personality Psychopathology Five (PSY-5) Scales</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggressiveness-Revised (AGGR-r)</td>
<td>50.54 (8.59)</td>
<td>49.32 (7.34)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychoticism-Revised (PSYC-r)</td>
<td>52.49 (12.29)</td>
<td>46.57 (8.81)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disconstraint-Revised (DISC-r)</td>
<td>53.60 (9.67)</td>
<td>50.57 (8.26)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative Emotionality/Neuroticism-Revised (NEGE-r)</td>
<td>50.62 (10.66)</td>
<td>42.88 (7.45)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introversion/Low Positive Emotivity-Revised (INTR-r)</td>
<td>52.13 (11.54)</td>
<td>49.50 (8.33)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. SO = sex offenders. CCL = child custody litigants. Mean scores at least one-half standard deviation above the normative mean are underlined. Mean scores at least one-half standard deviation below the normative mean are bolded. The Cannot Say scale, which is a raw score count, has been omitted from this table. Scale scores for the Aesthetic-Literary and Mechanical-Physical interests scales, which are non-clinical scales, have also been omitted.
As presented in Table 7 above, descriptive statistics for the presumed defensive sex offender sample show that majority of scale scores were within half a standard deviation of the normative mean of 50, with the exception of a few validity scales. Specifically, TRIN-r was approximately one-half standard deviation above the normative mean. More notably, the highest mean scale score for this sample was on validity scale L-r, which was nearly one standard deviation above the mean. Interestingly, despite this level of defensiveness, the F-r scale was also among the highest mean scores for this sample, and none of the substantive scales for this sample were substantially below the normative mean. However, the RC6 scale was notably above the normative mean for the presumed defensive sex offender group.

Regarding the descriptive statistics for the presumed defensive child custody litigant sample (see Table 7), several differences stand out in comparison to the sex offender sample. Mean validity scale scores, for example, revealed that both L-r and K-r were notably elevated, with L-r being more than one-half standard deviation above the normative mean, and K-r being over one standard deviation above the normative mean. In contrast to the presumed defensive sex offender sample, the child custody litigant sample produced several mean scale scores that were at least one-half standard deviation below the normative mean. Among these was validity scale VRIN-r which was more than one-half standard deviation below the mean of 50. The mean score for the Higher Order scale EID was also notable, at approximately one standard deviation below the mean of the normative sample. Moreover, several of the restructured clinical scales were more than one-half standard deviation below the normative mean, including RCd, RC1, RC3a, and RC9, while RC7 was more than one whole standard deviation below the mean.
Specific problem scale COG, was similarly low, at just above half a standard deviation below the normative mean of 50. Notably low internalizing scales included HLP, SFD, NFC, and ANP which were all more than one-half standard deviation below the mean. Externalizing scales AGG and ACT and interpersonal scale FML were all also noticeably below the mean for the tests normative sample, again by more than one-half standard deviation. The only PSY-5 scale to also follow this pattern was NEGE-r, on which the presumed defensive child custody group obtained a score more than half a standard deviation below the normative mean.

As seen in Table 7, descriptive statistics for the clearly defensive sex offender subgroup revealed substantially elevated mean scores on both underreporting scales. Specifically, the mean L-r score for this subgroup was more than two standard deviations above the normative mean and K-r was more than one-half standard deviation above the normative mean. Several mean substantive scale scores were below a T score of 50, including EID, RC7, and RC9, which were all at least one-half standard deviation below the normative mean. These same scales were also notably below the normative mean for the clearly defensive child custody group. Specific problem scales that were notably low for the clearly defensive sex offender group include the internalizing scale MSF, externalizing scales ACT and AGG, as well as interpersonal scales SHY and FML.

The clearly defensive child custody litigant subgroup also produced notably elevated mean L-r and K-r scores. The mean L-r scale score for this group specifically was more than one standard deviation above the normative mean, while mean K-r scale score was more than one and one-half standard deviation above the normative mean. These were the only scales above the normative mean for this group. In contrast to the
clearly defensive sex offender group, the clearly defensive child custody group produced low scores on substantially more clinical and substantive scales. Specifically, EID, RCd, and RC7 were all more than one standard deviation below the mean. RC3 and RC9 were both about one standard deviation below the normative mean, while RC1 and RC2 were both more than one-half standard deviation below the mean of the normative sample. Several substantive scores were also notably below the normative mean by at least one-half standard deviation, including somatic scales MLS and COG, internalizing scales HLP, SFD, NFC, STW, ANP, BRF, externalizing scales AGG and ACT, interpersonal scales FML, and SHY, and PSY-5 scales PSYC-r and NEGE-r.

**Presumed defensive samples: Scale-level analyses**

The initial portion of the main analyses for this study included a series of three independent samples $t$-tests to compare means for each of the three main validity scales (i.e., L-r, K-r, and F-r) across the presumed defensive sex offender and child custody litigant samples. These tests were conducted to examine potential differences between mean scores on overreporting and underreporting scales between sex offenders and child custody litigants. Levene’s test for homogeneity of variances revealed that variances between presumed defensive sex offender and child custody groups on the L-r scale did not violate the homogeneity of variances assumption, $F(526) = 1.21, p = .27$. Result of the $t$-test comparing L-r mean scores between the presumed defensive sex offender sample and the presumed defensive child custody litigant sample was nonsignificant, $t(526) = 1.69, p = .091$. Levene’s test for the K-r scale revealed that the assumption of homogeneity of variances for the two presumed defensive samples was violated, $F(526) = 16.08, p < .001$. Similarly, the presumed defensive groups’ scores on the F-r scale also
COMPARING DEFENSIVENESS IN FORENSIC MMPI-2-RF PROFILES

violated this assumption based on Levene’s test, $F(526) = 93.35, p < .001$. Corrected statistical models, without the assumption of equal variances, were therefore applied. The $t$-test result for the presumed defensive samples’ mean scores on K-r was significant, with child custody litigants ($M = 60.50, SD = 8.71$) obtaining a higher mean score than sex offenders ($M = 50.70, SD = 11.09$), $t(504.37) = -11.23$. The effect size for the difference in K-r scale scores between groups was calculated using Cohen’s $d$, resulting in a value of .97, which is considered a large effect. Accordingly, comparison of mean scores on the F-r overreporting scale revealed a significant difference between presumed defensive groups, with sex offenders obtaining a higher score ($M = 56.43, SD = 17.31$) than child custody litigants ($M = 46.6, SD = 6.88$), $t(351.51) = 8.62$. The effect size for the difference in F-r scale scores between groups was in the medium-to-large range (Cohen’s $d = .74$).

The next portion of scale-level analyses for the presumed defensive samples consisted of a series of four one-way MANOVAs to determine if there was an overall significant difference in MMPI-2-RF substantive scale scores by scale sets (i.e., H-O, RC, SP, and PSY-5 scales). Results from these analyses are shown in Table 8 below.

**Table 8. MANOVA results for presumed defensive sex offender and child custody litigant samples’ MMPI-2-RF scale clusters**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale Cluster</th>
<th>Pillai’s Trace</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>$p$</th>
<th>Partial $\eta^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Higher Order (H-O)</td>
<td>.180</td>
<td>(3, 524)</td>
<td>38.456</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
<td>.18**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restructured Clinical (RC)</td>
<td>.255</td>
<td>(9, 518)</td>
<td>19.726</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
<td>.26**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific Problem (SP)</td>
<td>.266</td>
<td>(23, 504)</td>
<td>7.952</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
<td>.27**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSY-5 Scales</td>
<td>.165</td>
<td>(5, 522)</td>
<td>20.592</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
<td>.17**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**large effect size**
As seen in Table 8, MANOVA results for each of the four scale clusters were significant, warranting further analysis of individual scale differences. It is noted that Box’s test of equality of covariance matrices for the presumed defensive groups indicated the observed covariance matrices were not equal across groups in each of the MANOVA analyses – H-O scales, Box’s $M = 88.86$, $F(6, 1999636.86) = 14.72$, $p < .001$, RC scales, Box’s $M = 261.81$, $F(45, 907223.27) = 5.71$, $p < .001$, SP scales, Box’s $M = 1559.32$, $F(276, 840218.39) = 5.40$, $p < .001$, and PSY-5 scales, Box’s $M = 109.98$, $F(15, 1111782.32) = 7.26$, $p < .001$. Pillai’s Trace was thus used as an alternative test statistic to Wilks’ Lambda for each MANOVA analysis, as it offers a more robust means of comparison when the assumption of equality of covariance matrices is violated.

For the presumed defensive groups’ mean scale scores, three of the 40 clinical scales (BXD, RC4, MSF) did not violate the assumption of equal error variances as indicated by Levene’s Tests and were then entered into univariate one-way analysis of variances (ANOVA). Of the three scales that met this assumption, ANOVA results from two scales indicated significant differences between the two presumed defensive groups, with sex offenders obtaining higher mean scores than child custody litigants on BXD and RC4. Significant ANOVA results for these scales are seen in Table 9. The remaining 37 scales violated the assumption of equality of error variances according to Levene’s Test and were thus entered into a Mann-Whitney $U$ test, a nonparametric alternative pairwise comparison method, to determine whether group differences between the two presumed defensive samples were statistically significant. All scales with significant group differences according to the Mann-Whitney $U$ Test are shown in Table 10.
### Table 9. Significant ANOVA results for MMPI-2-RF scale scores of presumed defensive sex offender sample and child custody litigant sample that met the assumption of equal error variances

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Presumed Defensive Sex Offender Sample</th>
<th>Presumed Defensive Child Custody Sample</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>Partial $\eta^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BXD</td>
<td>51.79</td>
<td>9.44</td>
<td>47.63</td>
<td>7.93</td>
<td>29.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RC4</td>
<td>53.87</td>
<td>9.85</td>
<td>46.87</td>
<td>8.35</td>
<td>77.22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. Scales MSF was excluded from this table as score differences did not reach the threshold for statistical significance.*

*medium effect size  **large effect size.*
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Table 10. Significant Mann-Whitney U Test results for MMPI-2-RF scale scores of presumed defensive sex offender and child custody litigant samples

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Presumed Defensive Sex Offender Sample</th>
<th>Presumed Defensive Child Custody Sample</th>
<th>U</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>Partial η²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EID</td>
<td>50.18</td>
<td>12.67</td>
<td>40.95</td>
<td>7.64</td>
<td>18572.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THD</td>
<td>53.48</td>
<td>12.41</td>
<td>48.68</td>
<td>8.88</td>
<td>26802.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RCd</td>
<td>51.98</td>
<td>12.42</td>
<td>42.28</td>
<td>7.09</td>
<td>17085.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RC1</td>
<td>52.85</td>
<td>11.41</td>
<td>44.90</td>
<td>9.47</td>
<td>20271.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RC2</td>
<td>50.09</td>
<td>11.26</td>
<td>45.11</td>
<td>8.18</td>
<td>25621.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RC3</td>
<td>51.40</td>
<td>12.72</td>
<td>43.00</td>
<td>7.45</td>
<td>21161.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RC6</td>
<td>57.88</td>
<td>13.20</td>
<td>52.23</td>
<td>10.37</td>
<td>26103.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RC7</td>
<td>48.09</td>
<td>11.62</td>
<td>39.84</td>
<td>6.15</td>
<td>19002.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RC8</td>
<td>52.38</td>
<td>13.02</td>
<td>45.50</td>
<td>7.53</td>
<td>23744.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RC9</td>
<td>47.10</td>
<td>10.17</td>
<td>43.05</td>
<td>7.90</td>
<td>27388.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLS</td>
<td>51.91</td>
<td>10.57</td>
<td>46.25</td>
<td>8.07</td>
<td>23947.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GIC</td>
<td>51.82</td>
<td>11.11</td>
<td>48.72</td>
<td>8.13</td>
<td>30401.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HPC</td>
<td>51.41</td>
<td>10.62</td>
<td>47.30</td>
<td>8.42</td>
<td>27184.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NUC</td>
<td>53.63</td>
<td>12.18</td>
<td>47.46</td>
<td>9.28</td>
<td>24993.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COG</td>
<td>53.03</td>
<td>13.06</td>
<td>44.43</td>
<td>7.35</td>
<td>20398.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUI</td>
<td>50.20</td>
<td>12.39</td>
<td>45.32</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>29352.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HLP</td>
<td>50.14</td>
<td>12.40</td>
<td>43.50</td>
<td>6.41</td>
<td>24560.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFD</td>
<td>51.38</td>
<td>12.15</td>
<td>44.30</td>
<td>5.97</td>
<td>23145.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NFC</td>
<td>51.05</td>
<td>11.40</td>
<td>41.40</td>
<td>6.55</td>
<td>16190.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STW</td>
<td>52.39</td>
<td>10.41</td>
<td>45.65</td>
<td>7.17</td>
<td>21020.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AXY</td>
<td>52.46</td>
<td>14.14</td>
<td>46.53</td>
<td>6.73</td>
<td>27324.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANP</td>
<td>47.56</td>
<td>9.90</td>
<td>42.63</td>
<td>6.18</td>
<td>24677.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRF</td>
<td>49.27</td>
<td>10.36</td>
<td>44.72</td>
<td>4.99</td>
<td>26892.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JCP</td>
<td>53.63</td>
<td>10.98</td>
<td>49.05</td>
<td>9.48</td>
<td>26606.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUB</td>
<td>50.32</td>
<td>10.36</td>
<td>46.67</td>
<td>6.70</td>
<td>28463.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGG</td>
<td>46.76</td>
<td>10.12</td>
<td>42.54</td>
<td>6.65</td>
<td>27009.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACT</td>
<td>48.12</td>
<td>11.46</td>
<td>42.97</td>
<td>7.94</td>
<td>25979.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FML</td>
<td>46.77</td>
<td>9.95</td>
<td>42.79</td>
<td>7.74</td>
<td>26054.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAV</td>
<td>52.48</td>
<td>11.75</td>
<td>48.58</td>
<td>8.38</td>
<td>29006.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHY</td>
<td>47.68</td>
<td>10.27</td>
<td>42.55</td>
<td>7.03</td>
<td>24233.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSF</td>
<td>50.16</td>
<td>10.92</td>
<td>45.48</td>
<td>4.52</td>
<td>27574.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSYC-r</td>
<td>52.49</td>
<td>12.29</td>
<td>46.57</td>
<td>8.81</td>
<td>24625.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DISC-r</td>
<td>53.60</td>
<td>9.67</td>
<td>50.57</td>
<td>8.26</td>
<td>29536.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEGE-r</td>
<td>50.62</td>
<td>10.66</td>
<td>42.88</td>
<td>7.45</td>
<td>18943.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Scales IPP, AGGR-r, and INTR-r were excluded from this table as score differences did not reach the threshold for statistical significance. *medium effect size. **large effect size.
Tables 9 and 10 detail post-hoc analysis findings, which reveal numerous significant differences in mean scale scores between presumed defensive sex offenders and child custody litigants. Specifically, across the ANOVA and Mann-Whitney tests, 36 of the 40 substantive scales exhibited statistically significant score differences between the two presumed defensive samples, with sex offenders consistently obtaining higher scores. These samples notably differed in each of the H-O and RC scales, as well as all but two of the SP scales (MSF and IPP). Additionally, sex offenders also obtained significantly higher scores on three of the five PSY-5 scales, with the exception of AGGR-r and INTR-r. Upon examination of effect sizes for significantly different scale scores, it was shown that score differences between presumed defensive groups on H-O scales EID and BXD, RC scales RCd and RC7, SP scale NFC, and PSY-5 scale NEGE-r demonstrated large effect sizes as each met or exceeded .14, with NFC well surpassing that threshold. Moreover, several scales demonstrated a medium effect size, including RC1, RC3, RC4, RC8, MLS, NUC, COG, HLP, SFD, STW, ANP, SHY, and PSYC-r. The remaining 17 scales met or exceeded the minimum threshold for a small effect size.

In a modified reorganization of the clinical scales according to their broad measured constructs, all six scales pertaining to somatic/cognitive dysfunction were significantly higher for presumed defensive sex offenders, with small to medium effect sizes. In terms of emotional dysfunction scales, 13 of 15 showed significant differences, while all four thought dysfunction scales had significantly different mean scores between samples. Behavioral dysfunction scales showed significantly higher scores among presumed defensive sex offenders on eight of the nine scales compared to custody.
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litigants. Of the remaining six scales which pertain to interpersonal functioning, sex
offenders scored significantly higher on five.

**Presumed defensive samples: Item-level analyses**

The final level of analysis for the presumed defensive samples comparison was
item-level in order to examine similarities and differences in item-endorsement rates
between sex offenders and child custody litigants. This began with analysis of items on
the three validity scales (L-r, K-r, F-r). Items that had at least a 20% difference between
presumed defensive sex offenders and child custody litigants were included in Chi-
Square tests to examine statistical significance of the difference. Results from these
analyses are shown in Table 11 below.

**Table 11. Chi-Square results for K-r, L-r, and F-r scale item endorsement rate
differences between presumed defensive sex offender and child custody litigant samples.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>PD SO endorsement</th>
<th>PD CCL endorsement</th>
<th>% Difference</th>
<th>( \chi^2 )</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>Partial ( \eta^2 )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>K-r</td>
<td>Item 10</td>
<td>63.1%</td>
<td>83.8%</td>
<td><strong>20.7%</strong></td>
<td>30.09</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>.06*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 36</td>
<td>43.3%</td>
<td>65.4%</td>
<td><strong>22.1%</strong></td>
<td>25.97</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 89</td>
<td>65.7%</td>
<td>87.7%</td>
<td><strong>22.0%</strong></td>
<td>35.61</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>.07*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 99</td>
<td>42.5%</td>
<td>70.0%</td>
<td><strong>27.5%</strong></td>
<td>40.41</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>.08*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 171</td>
<td>45.5%</td>
<td>68.5%</td>
<td><strong>23.0%</strong></td>
<td>28.82</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>.06*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 187</td>
<td>41.4%</td>
<td>75.8%</td>
<td><strong>34.4%</strong></td>
<td>65.09</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>.12*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 202</td>
<td>20.4%</td>
<td>40.4%</td>
<td><strong>20.0%</strong></td>
<td>24.70</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 338</td>
<td>54.1%</td>
<td>75.0%</td>
<td><strong>20.9%</strong></td>
<td>25.13</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F-r</td>
<td>Item 106</td>
<td>23.1%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td><strong>20.0%</strong></td>
<td>46.17</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>.09*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note*. CD = clearly defensive. SO = sex offenders. CCL = child custody litigants.
*medium effect size.

A total of nine items were included in Chi-Square tests for the presumed
defensive samples’ validity scale item-level comparison, as they exceeded the threshold
of at least a 20% difference in endorsement rates. As seen in Table 11, eight of the nine
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items analyzed were from the K-r scale, the only exception being item 106 which belongs to the F-r overreporting scale. Notably, no items on the L-r scale had differences in endorsement rates that met the threshold of 20%. Results of Chi-Square tests revealed that all nine items had statistically significant endorsement rate differences between sex offenders and child custody litigants, with small-to-medium effect sizes. It was further observed that all items included from the K-r underreporting scale were endorsed at higher rates by the child custody litigants. Item content among those from the K-r scale related to exaggeration of current wellbeing and denial of an inability to manage difficulties. The one item (item 106) that was endorsed more frequently by sex offenders contains content related to experiencing periods of lost time.

Item level analysis was also conducted for items on each of the H-O, RC, SP, and PSY-5 scales to further examine group differences. Tables 19-28 show all frequency rates of items endorsed in the keyed direction on each clinical scale for presumed defensive samples and clearly defensive subgroups. These tables are presented in Appendices B-F. Items from scales with mean scores that were significantly different between samples in the ANOVA analyses with at least a medium effect size, and that had difference in endorsement rates between sex offenders and child custody litigants of at least 20%, were included in Chi-Square tests to determine statistical significance. Significant Chi-Square results for these items for the presumed defensive samples are shown below in Table 12.
Table 12. Chi-Square test results for MMPI-2-RF substantive scale item endorsement rates for presumed defensive sex offender and child custody litigant samples.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>PD SO endorsement n (%)</th>
<th>PD CCL endorsement n (%)</th>
<th>% Difference</th>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>Partial $\eta^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Item 5</td>
<td>86 (32.1%)</td>
<td>24 (9.2%)</td>
<td>22.9%</td>
<td>41.54</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>.08*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 10</td>
<td>99 (36.8%)</td>
<td>41 (15.8%)</td>
<td>21.0%</td>
<td>30.09</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>.06*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 22</td>
<td>117 (43.7%)</td>
<td>49 (18.8%)</td>
<td>24.9%</td>
<td>37.74</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>.07*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 36</td>
<td>154 (56.5%)</td>
<td>90 (34.6%)</td>
<td>21.9%</td>
<td>25.97</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 38</td>
<td>129 (48.1%)</td>
<td>40 (15.4%)</td>
<td>32.7%</td>
<td>65.57</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>.12*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 55</td>
<td>155 (57.8%)</td>
<td>94 (36.2%)</td>
<td>21.6%</td>
<td>24.90</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 63</td>
<td>86 (32.1%)</td>
<td>15 (5.8%)</td>
<td>26.2%</td>
<td>59.10</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>.11*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 68</td>
<td>125 (46.6%)</td>
<td>51 (19.6%)</td>
<td>27.0%</td>
<td>43.38</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>.08*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 89</td>
<td>92 (34.3%)</td>
<td>32 (12.3%)</td>
<td>22.0%</td>
<td>35.61</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>.07*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 99</td>
<td>154 (57.2%)</td>
<td>78 (30.0%)</td>
<td>27.2%</td>
<td>40.41</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>.08*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 106</td>
<td>62 (23.1%)</td>
<td>8 (3.1%)</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>46.17</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>.09*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 108</td>
<td>83 (31.0%)</td>
<td>24 (9.2%)</td>
<td>21.8%</td>
<td>39.86</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>.08*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 114</td>
<td>99 (36.9%)</td>
<td>37 (14.2%)</td>
<td>22.7%</td>
<td>35.59</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>.07*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 123</td>
<td>107 (39.9%)</td>
<td>35 (13.5%)</td>
<td>26.4%</td>
<td>47.01</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>.09*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 142</td>
<td>93 (34.7%)</td>
<td>32 (12.3%)</td>
<td>22.4%</td>
<td>36.63</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>.07*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 171</td>
<td>145 (53.9%)</td>
<td>82 (31.5%)</td>
<td>22.4%</td>
<td>28.82</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 177</td>
<td>105 (39.2%)</td>
<td>33 (12.7%)</td>
<td>26.7%</td>
<td>47.96</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>.09*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 187</td>
<td>157 (58.6%)</td>
<td>62 (23.8%)</td>
<td>35.0%</td>
<td>65.09</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>.12*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 190</td>
<td>200 (74.6%)</td>
<td>113 (43.5%)</td>
<td>31.1%</td>
<td>53.10</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>.10*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 209</td>
<td>200 (74.6%)</td>
<td>131 (50.4%)</td>
<td>24.2%</td>
<td>33.16</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>.06*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 217</td>
<td>103 (38.4%)</td>
<td>40 (15.4%)</td>
<td>23.0%</td>
<td>35.21</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>.07*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 229</td>
<td>99 (36.9%)</td>
<td>28 (10.8%)</td>
<td>26.1%</td>
<td>50.82</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>.10*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 232</td>
<td>71 (26.5%)</td>
<td>12 (4.6%)</td>
<td>21.9%</td>
<td>47.67</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>.09*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 247</td>
<td>86 (32.1%)</td>
<td>20 (7.7%)</td>
<td>24.4%</td>
<td>48.96</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>.09*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 261</td>
<td>71 (26.5%)</td>
<td>16 (6.2%)</td>
<td>20.3%</td>
<td>39.67</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>.08*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 263</td>
<td>140 (52.2%)</td>
<td>72 (27.7%)</td>
<td>24.5%</td>
<td>33.09</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>.06*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 271</td>
<td>124 (46.3%)</td>
<td>57 (21.9%)</td>
<td>24.4%</td>
<td>34.72</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>.07*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 274</td>
<td>70 (26.1%)</td>
<td>10 (3.8%)</td>
<td>22.3%</td>
<td>50.93</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>.10*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 279</td>
<td>85 (31.7%)</td>
<td>29 (11.2%)</td>
<td>20.5%</td>
<td>32.96</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>.06*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 280</td>
<td>71 (26.5%)</td>
<td>17 (6.5%)</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>37.83</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>.07*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 282</td>
<td>63 (23.5%)</td>
<td>9 (3.5%)</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>45.03</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>.09*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 288</td>
<td>69 (25.7%)</td>
<td>11 (4.2%)</td>
<td>21.5%</td>
<td>47.52</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>.09*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 303</td>
<td>84 (31.3%)</td>
<td>19 (7.3%)</td>
<td>24.0%</td>
<td>48.55</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>.09*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 306</td>
<td>116 (43.3%)</td>
<td>42 (16.2%)</td>
<td>27.1%</td>
<td>46.32</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>.09*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 309</td>
<td>141 (52.6%)</td>
<td>77 (29.6%)</td>
<td>23.0%</td>
<td>28.79</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>.06*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 324</td>
<td>103 (38.4%)</td>
<td>28 (10.8%)</td>
<td>27.6%</td>
<td>55.51</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>.11*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. PD = presumed defensive. SO = sex offenders. CCL = child custody litigants. *medium effect size. Items 39, 194, and 278 were excluded from Chi-Square analysis as their respective scales (AGGR-r/RC9, RC6, SAV) did not have a difference between groups with a medium or large effect size.
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Across the 18 substantive scales with item endorsement rates between presumed defensive samples that had medium or large effect sizes, a total of 36 items had at least a 20% difference in endorsement rates and were entered into Chi-Square tests. As seen in Table 12 above, results from this level of analysis revealed that endorsement rate differences for all 36 items were statistically significant ($p < .001$), with all but three items (item 36, 55, 171) achieving medium effect sizes. All of the 36 items were endorsed more frequently in the keyed direction by sex offenders. The respective content of these items was related to excessive worrying and unhappiness, low self-worth, indecisiveness, unassertiveness, irritability, and legal system involvement.

Unsurprisingly, the item with one of the highest endorsement rate discrepancies (32.7%) between sex offenders and custody litigants was item 38 which was from the RC4 (Antisocial Behavior) scale and acknowledges risky sexual conduct. The only item that had a higher rate of discrepancy between groups was related to emotional distress (item 187).

Clearly defensive samples: Scale-level analyses

The next series of analyses were conducted to compare the clearly defensive subgroups. This consisted of the same inferential statistics as were conducted for the presumed defensive groups. A series of three $t$-tests were conducted to examine group differences in mean L-r, K-r, and F-r scores across the two clearly defensive groups. As was seen in the presumed defensive group comparison, Levene’s test for the L-r scale indicated that the scores for the two clearly defensive groups did not violate the assumption of equal variances on this scale, $F(267) = .27, p = .60$. Results from the $t$-test indicated a significant difference between clearly defensive groups on the L-r scale, such
that sex offenders had a higher average score \((M = 71.39, SD = 14.25)\) on this scale compared to child custody litigants \((M = 61.47, SD = 12.84)\), \(t(267) = 5.90, p < .001\). The effect size for the difference between the two clearly defensive groups was in the medium-to-large range (Cohen’s \(d = .74\)). Levene’s test of homogeneity of variances for the K-r \((F(267) = 40.79, p < .001)\) and F-r scales \((F(267) = 41.65, p < .001)\) revealed the assumption of equal variances was also violated for the clearly defensive groups for these scales. As such, corrected statistical models that did not assume equal variances between groups were used. Comparison of mean K-r scale scores between the clearly defensive groups followed the same trend as the presumed defensive samples, with child custody litigants again obtaining significantly higher scale scores \((M = 65.61, SD = 5.11)\) than sex offenders \((M = 58.42, SD = 9.54)\), \(t(136.97) = -7.02, p < .001\). Calculation of effect size revealed a very large effect for this difference between groups, Cohen’s \(d = 1.01\). The \(t\)-test for the F-r scale also revealed significantly different mean scores between clearly defensive groups, with sex offenders \((M = 51.70, SD = 13.96)\) obtaining a higher score relative to custody litigants \((M = 44.78, SD = 4.50)\), \(t(113.94) = 4.85, p < .001\). This difference also demonstrated a medium-to-large effect size, Cohen’s \(d = .75\). Overall, comparison of validity scale scores for both presumed defensive samples and clearly defensive groups followed similar patterns, with the only exception being the L-r scale which only differed significantly for the clearly defensive subgroups.

Next, mean scale scores on the MMPI-2-RF substantive scales were compared between clearly defensive sex offenders and clearly defensive child custody litigants. Four one-way MANOVAs were conducted to determine whether there were overall
significant differences on MMPI-2-RF clinical scale clusters between the two clearly defensive subgroups. MANOVA results are shown in Table 13 below.

**Table 13. MANOVA results for clearly defensive sex offender and child custody litigant samples’ MMPI-2-RF scale clusters**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale Cluster</th>
<th>Pillai’s Trace</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>Partial η²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Higher Order (H-O)</td>
<td>.134</td>
<td>(3, 265)</td>
<td>13.261</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
<td>.13*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restructured Clinical (RC)</td>
<td>.249</td>
<td>(9, 259)</td>
<td>9.536</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
<td>.25**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific Problem (SP)</td>
<td>.281</td>
<td>(23, 245)</td>
<td>4.163</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
<td>.28**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSY-5</td>
<td>.127</td>
<td>(5, 263)</td>
<td>7.622</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
<td>.13*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*medium effect size **large effect size.

Results from the MANOVAs shown in Table 13 above demonstrate a significant difference between clearly defensive sex offender and custody litigant scores across all four sets of clinical scales. Examination of Box’s test of equality of covariance matrices for each MANOVA revealed that the observed covariance matrices were not equal across groups – the H-O scales Box’s $M = 63.00$, $F(6,303200.76) = 10.36$, $p < .001$, RC scales Box’s $M = 221.726$, $F(45, 152673.62) = 4.74$, $p < .001$, SP scales, Box’s $M = 10004.409$, $F(276, 142105.76) = 3.29$, $p < .001$, and PSY-5 scales Box’s $M = 71.04$, $F(15, 183757.25) = 4.63$, $p < .001$. As such, Pillai’s trace test statistic was used for each of the MANOVA analyses.

Levene’s test of Equality of Error Variances was then examined for each of the 40 clinical scales used for comparing the two clearly defensive groups. Ten scales met the assumption of equal error variances as indicated by Levene’s Test and were subsequently included in ANOVAs to determine if group differences were statistically significant between clearly defensive sex offenders and child custody litigants on the individual clinical scales. Significant ANOVA results are shown in Table 14. Of the 10 scales that
met the assumption of equal error variances, four (RC2, RC4, RC9, JCP) scales showed
statistically different mean scores between clearly defensive groups, with clearly
defensive sex offenders obtaining significantly higher scores than their child custody
litigant counterparts.

Table 14. Significant ANOVA results for MMPI-2-RF substantive scale scores of clearly
defensive sex offender sample and child custody litigant subgroups that met the
assumption of equality of error variances

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Clearly Defensive Sex Offender Sample</th>
<th>Clearly Defensive Child Custody Sample</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>Partial $\eta^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RC2</td>
<td>45.35</td>
<td>6.87</td>
<td>43.54</td>
<td>6.89</td>
<td>4.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RC4</td>
<td>49.33</td>
<td>8.46</td>
<td>45.10</td>
<td>7.69</td>
<td>17.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RC9</td>
<td>42.37</td>
<td>8.09</td>
<td>40.44</td>
<td>6.36</td>
<td>4.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JCP</td>
<td>50.99</td>
<td>10.06</td>
<td>47.93</td>
<td>8.99</td>
<td>6.71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Scales BXD, MSF, SUB, IPP, AGGR-r, and DISC-r were excluded from this table as score differences were not statistically significant. *medium effect size. The remaining significant scales (RC9 and JCP) were both small effect sizes.

The 30 scales that violated the assumption of equal error variances were entered
into a Mann-Whitney $U$ test to examine statistical significance of group differences on
the remaining individual scales. Results of this post-hoc analysis revealed significant
differences between clearly defensive subgroups on all scales except for GIC, AGG,
SAV, and INTR-r. Significant results from Mann-Whitney $U$ tests are showed in Table
15 below.
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Table 15. Significant Mann-Whitney U Test results for MMPI-2-RF scale scores of clearly defensive sex offender sample and child custody litigant samples

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Clearly Defensive Sex Offender Sample</th>
<th>Clearly Defensive Child Custody Sample</th>
<th>U</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>Partial η²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EID</td>
<td>43.04</td>
<td>8.59</td>
<td>37.78</td>
<td>5.33</td>
<td>5063.0  &lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THD</td>
<td>50.59</td>
<td>11.24</td>
<td>46.36</td>
<td>7.30</td>
<td>6722.0  .002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RCd</td>
<td>45.35</td>
<td>9.49</td>
<td>39.53</td>
<td>4.39</td>
<td>4730.0  &lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RC1</td>
<td>50.67</td>
<td>10.21</td>
<td>43.15</td>
<td>8.01</td>
<td>4854.5  &lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RC3</td>
<td>46.40</td>
<td>11.95</td>
<td>40.20</td>
<td>5.81</td>
<td>6075.5  &lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RC6</td>
<td>54.92</td>
<td>12.83</td>
<td>49.48</td>
<td>8.34</td>
<td>6531.0  &lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RC7</td>
<td>41.34</td>
<td>8.82</td>
<td>37.13</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>6004.5  &lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RC8</td>
<td>47.08</td>
<td>10.16</td>
<td>44.07</td>
<td>6.24</td>
<td>7329.5  .037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLS</td>
<td>44.95</td>
<td>7.48</td>
<td>45.38</td>
<td>6.74</td>
<td>6192.0  &lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HPC</td>
<td>49.94</td>
<td>9.78</td>
<td>46.26</td>
<td>7.37</td>
<td>6767.5  &lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NUC</td>
<td>50.64</td>
<td>10.40</td>
<td>46.15</td>
<td>7.87</td>
<td>6426.5  &lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COG</td>
<td>48.11</td>
<td>11.12</td>
<td>42.54</td>
<td>5.25</td>
<td>6023.0  &lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUI</td>
<td>46.70</td>
<td>7.48</td>
<td>45.13</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>8066.0  &lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HLP</td>
<td>45.16</td>
<td>8.57</td>
<td>41.94</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>7012.0  &lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFD</td>
<td>45.46</td>
<td>8.53</td>
<td>42.80</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>7334.5  &lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NFC</td>
<td>46.49</td>
<td>9.76</td>
<td>39.39</td>
<td>4.63</td>
<td>4436.5  &lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STW</td>
<td>47.05</td>
<td>8.11</td>
<td>43.43</td>
<td>5.31</td>
<td>6412.0  &lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AXY</td>
<td>48.45</td>
<td>10.03</td>
<td>45.19</td>
<td>4.76</td>
<td>7305.5  &lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANP</td>
<td>43.61</td>
<td>7.38</td>
<td>40.50</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>6610.5  &lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRF</td>
<td>46.62</td>
<td>7.86</td>
<td>44.32</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>7562.5  .011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACT</td>
<td>44.79</td>
<td>9.86</td>
<td>41.45</td>
<td>7.30</td>
<td>6942.0  .009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FML</td>
<td>43.58</td>
<td>8.47</td>
<td>40.74</td>
<td>5.56</td>
<td>6952.0  .005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHY</td>
<td>44.13</td>
<td>7.94</td>
<td>40.95</td>
<td>4.89</td>
<td>6625.5  &lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSF</td>
<td>47.98</td>
<td>7.80</td>
<td>45.17</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>7192.0  &lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSYC-r</td>
<td>49.05</td>
<td>11.13</td>
<td>44.69</td>
<td>7.42</td>
<td>6586.5  .001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEGE-r</td>
<td>44.77</td>
<td>8.45</td>
<td>39.89</td>
<td>5.26</td>
<td>5376.0  &lt;.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. *medium effect size. **large effect size. GiC, AGG, SAV, and INTR-r are excluded from this table as score differences did not reach the threshold for statistical significance.

As seen in Tables 14 and 15, post-hoc analyses revealed a number of substantive scales on which clearly defensive sex offenders and clearly defensive child custody litigants obtained significantly different mean scores. Overall, across ANOVA and Mann-
Whitney U tests, 30 of the 40 substantive scales showed significantly different mean scores between clearly defensive groups, with sex offenders consistently scoring higher than child custody litigants. Specifically, sex offenders scored higher on Higher-Order scales EID and THD as well as each of the RC scales. Several SP scales followed the same pattern, with sex offenders obtaining higher mean scores on somatic/cognitive scales HPC, NUC, and COG, internalizing scales SUI, HLP, SFD, NFC, STW, AXY, ANP, and MSF, externalizing scales JCP and ACT, and interpersonal scales FML, SHY, and DSF. Two of the PSY-5 scales, PSYC-r and NEGE-r were also significantly higher for the sex offender subgroup. Examination of effect sizes for these scales showed a large effect size for score differences between clearly defensive groups on RC scale RCd (Demoralization) and SP scale NFC. Additionally, EID, RC1, RC3, RC4, RC7, COG, and NEGE-r produced a medium effect size difference. All of the remaining 21 scales that were significantly different between clearly defensive sex offenders and custody litigants had small effect sizes.

Regrouping of scales reflecting dysfunction in five different areas revealed that five of the six somatic/cognitive dysfunction scales were significantly different across clearly defensive subgroups, with sex offenders endorsing relatively more of these complaints. Moreover, each of the four scales reflecting thought dysfunction were significantly higher for sex offenders, although effect sizes were consistently small (Partial $\eta^2 < .06$) across these scales. As seen in the presumed defensive comparison, 13 of 15 scales pertaining to emotional dysfunction also had significantly higher mean scores for the sex offender group. Among the nine scales measuring behavioral dysfunction, only four scales were significantly different, with sex offenders again
endorsing relatively more difficulties included on scales in this area. Four of the six substantive scales measuring aspects of interpersonal functioning also had significantly higher scores among sex offenders.

Relative to the presumed defensive group comparison, the two clearly defensive groups had noticeably fewer scales on which sex offenders and custody litigants obtained significantly different mean scores. More specifically, six of the substantive scales (BXD, SUB, GIC, AGG, SAV, and DISC-r) that were significantly different between the presumed defensive groups did not differ significantly between the clearly defensive subgroups. On the other hand, four scales were consistently found not to have significantly different mean scores in both the presumed defensive and the clearly defensive subgroup comparisons; these were SP scales MSF and IPP and PSY-5 scales AGGR-r and INTR-r. It was further noted that child custody litigants did not obtain significantly higher scores than sex offenders on any of the MMPI-2-RF substantive scales. In fact, across presumed defensive samples and clearly defensive subgroups, sex offenders consistently obtained higher scores compared to child custody litigants at both the scale and item-level.

**Clearly defensive samples: Item-level analyses**

The clearly defensive subgroups were then compared at the item level. Specifically, item analysis for validity scales L-r, K-r, and F-r consisted of a series of Chi-Square tests to examine statistical significance for items on these scales that had at least a 20% difference in endorsement rates between subgroups. Results from these analyses are detailed in Table 16 below.
### Table 16. Chi-Square results for K-r, L-r, and F-r scale item endorsement rate differences between clearly defensive sex offender and child custody litigant samples.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>CD SO endorsement %</th>
<th>CD CCL endorsement %</th>
<th>% Difference</th>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
<th>$p$</th>
<th>Partial $\eta^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L-r</td>
<td>Item 61</td>
<td>58.8%</td>
<td>31.7%</td>
<td>27.1%</td>
<td>19.07</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 211</td>
<td>56.9%</td>
<td>25.1%</td>
<td>31.8%</td>
<td>9.42</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K-r</td>
<td>Item 187</td>
<td>61.8%</td>
<td>90.4%</td>
<td><strong>28.6%</strong></td>
<td>31.97</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>.06*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* CD = clearly defensive. SO = sex offenders. CCL = child custody litigants.

*medium effect size.

Table 16 above shows the three items from the validity scales that were included in Chi-Square tests for the clearly defensive subgroup comparison. Results indicated that all items were endorsed at significantly different rates between sex offenders and child custody litigants, with small to medium effect sizes. Specifically, two items from the L-r scale (Items 61 and 211) were found to have statistically significant differences in endorsement rates for the clearly defensive subgroups, although this was not the case for the item-level comparison for the presumed defensive samples. The content of these items relates to denial of engaging in thrill-seeking behaviors and denial of disliking others. Moreover, the only item that had significantly different rates of endorsement for both the clearly defensive and presumed defensive item-level comparisons was item 187 from the K-r scale. This item specifically pertains to feeling unable to manage current problems, and it also had the largest discrepancy among K-r scale items for the presumed defensive groups (34.4%).

Finally, item analysis was conducted to compare clearly defensive sex offender and child custody litigant responses on the substantive scales. Items from scales with mean scores that were significantly different between clearly defensive groups with a
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medium or large effect size as indicated by post-hoc analyses, and that had a 20% or
greater difference in endorsement rates between subgroups, were included in Chi-Square
tests to determine statistical significance. Significant Chi-Square results for these items
are shown below in Table 17.

**Table 17. Chi-Square test results for MMPI-2-RF substantive scale item endorsement
rates for clearly defensive sex offender and child custody litigant samples.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>CD SO endorsement n (%)</th>
<th>CD CCL endorsement n (%)</th>
<th>% Difference</th>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
<th>$p$</th>
<th>Partial $\eta^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Item 27</td>
<td>29 (28.4%)</td>
<td>10 (6.0%)</td>
<td>22.4%</td>
<td>25.73</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>.10*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 52</td>
<td>70 (68.6%)</td>
<td>16 (9.6%)</td>
<td>59.0%</td>
<td>20.51</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>.08*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 68</td>
<td>43 (42.2%)</td>
<td>23 (13.8%)</td>
<td>28.4%</td>
<td>27.55</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>.10*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 187</td>
<td>39 (38.2%)</td>
<td>16 (9.6%)</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>31.97</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>.12*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 190</td>
<td>72 (70.6%)</td>
<td>65 (38.9%)</td>
<td>31.7%</td>
<td>25.41</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>.10*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 209</td>
<td>69 (67.6%)</td>
<td>71 (42.5%)</td>
<td>25.1%</td>
<td>16.03</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>.06*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 217</td>
<td>32 (31.4%)</td>
<td>18 (10.8%)</td>
<td>20.6%</td>
<td>17.55</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>.07*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 229</td>
<td>29 (28.4%)</td>
<td>13 (7.8%)</td>
<td>20.6%</td>
<td>22.45</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>.08*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 254</td>
<td>40 (39.2%)</td>
<td>15 (9.0%)</td>
<td>30.2%</td>
<td>35.59</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>.13*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 260</td>
<td>29 (28.4%)</td>
<td>10 (6.0%)</td>
<td>22.4%</td>
<td>25.73</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>.10*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 306</td>
<td>30 (29.4%)</td>
<td>15 (9.0%)</td>
<td>20.4%</td>
<td>18.97</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>.07*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 324</td>
<td>27 (26.5%)</td>
<td>5 (3.0%)</td>
<td>23.5%</td>
<td>35.29</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>.13*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. CD = clearly defensive. SO = sex offenders. CCL = child custody litigants.*

*medium effect size. Items 61, 147, 321, and 327 were excluded from these analyses due
to their respective scales (BXD/RC9, IPP) not being significantly different between
groups or having a difference with a small effect size.

As seen in Table 17 above, the number of items that were entered into Chi-Square
tests were notably fewer for clearly defensive groups. Specifically, of the scales with T
score differences that had medium to large effect sizes, only 12 items had a discrepancy
between subgroups of at least 20% and were included in further analysis at the item level.
Results from the Chi-Square tests showed that all 12 items had statistically significant
differences in endorsement rates between clearly defensive sex offenders and clearly
defensive child custody litigants, with medium effect sizes across all items. In contrast to
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te the presumed defensive sample comparison, items analyzed for the clearly defensive subgroups were exclusively endorsed more frequently by sex offenders. Additionally, four of the 12 significant items (items 27, 52, 254, and 260) in this comparison were not included in the presumed defensive Chi-Square tests as endorsement rate differences fell below the designated threshold of 20%. The content of these items relates to physiological and somatic symptoms (items 52, 254), indecisiveness (item 27), and workplace cynicism (item 260). The remaining eight items were found to have significantly different endorsement rates between sex offenders and child custody litigants, both with (clearly defensive) and without (presumed defensive) elevations on scales related to defensiveness (L-r and K-r). Regarding item content, these items involved feeling overwhelmed and blue (items 187, 217), legal involvement (item 190), excessive worries (items 209, 324), unassertiveness (items 68, 229), and forgetfulness (item 306).

In examining differences in item endorsement rates across the presumed defensive and clearly defensive comparisons, it was observed that the presumed defensive samples’ comparison had consistently more areas of difference across sex offender and child custody litigant groups than seen in the clearly defensive groups’ comparison. In fact, both the validity scale and substantive scale item analyses revealed that presumed defensive samples had three times the number of items with significant endorsement rate differences than the clearly defensive subgroups.
Chapter 6: Discussion

Self-report measures of personality and psychological functioning are commonly used as clinical assessment tools for a variety of populations within the legal system. Among these populations are sex offenders and child custody litigants, both of whom commonly undergo psychological evaluation during their respective court proceedings. The various editions of the MMPI are among the most commonly used and empirically supported assessment tools for these purposes (Rogers & Bender, 2018). Findings from MMPI profiles are particularly used to inform clinician opinions regarding legal criteria related to confinement and treatment as well as safety planning and parenting ability, depending on the reason for the evaluation referral. Despite the potential for vast differences between the legal circumstances surrounding sex offenders and child custody litigants, they share several notable factors that make them suitable for comparison in the context of psychological assessment. Specifically, both of these populations often undergo psychological evaluation to inform potentially high-stakes legal decisions. Whether it is related to their ability to move forward with legal proceedings, undergo retributive action for alleged crimes, or maintain custody of their children, clinical opinions based on these assessments have the capacity to weigh heavily on important aspects of the individuals’ lives in these contexts. Each of these populations have thus been the focus of research examining the concept of defensiveness, given their tendency to engage in overt minimization of psychological difficulties. While research has supported the fact that both sex offenders and child custody litigants commonly engage in defensive responding on self-report measures (Rogers & Bender, 2018), no study to date
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has compared their response styles to one another. The present study aimed to fill that
gap in the literature through an in-depth examination of their response styles.

The focus of this study was to determine if defensive response styles on the
MMPI-2-RF, a measure of personality assessment, present differently across two forensic
populations (i.e., sex offenders and child custody litigants). This was explored for
presumed defensive groups, which were classified based simply on membership to these
traditionally defensive populations, and for clearly defensive groups, which met specific
score criteria on the test’s internal defensiveness scales. First, a series of $t$-tests were
conducted to compare scale scores for the two presumed defensive samples on the
validity scales L-r, K-r, and F-r. While this portion of the analyses was primarily
exploratory, it was somewhat expected that sex offenders would demonstrate L-r scores
above the normative mean, while child custody litigants would demonstrate relatively
higher K-r scale scores, given past literature findings. Notably, findings on the validity
scales were partially within expectation in light of prior research, as presumed defensive
child custody litigants demonstrated a relatively higher degree of denial of psychological
maladjustment (K-r). However, it was noted that the mean K-r score for this group was in
the subclinical range ($M = 60.5$). More surprisingly, presumed defensive groups did not
significantly differ in L-r mean scores, despite past literature indicating a tendency for
sex offenders to minimize common faults and shortcomings.

Regarding the substantive scales, a series of MANOVAs were conducted which
were followed by post-hoc ANOVAs and Mann-Whitney $U$ tests to examine differences
between presumed defensive samples in clinical scale scores. It was largely expected that
scale scores for the clinical scales would be within normal limits, given the presumption
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of defensive responding. Otherwise, analysis of group differences on these scales were exploratory in nature considering that these particular populations have yet to be empirically compared to one another. Results were consistent with the expectation that both samples would largely produce scores within normal limits. Nonetheless, comparative analyses revealed that 90% of the substantive scales had significantly higher means among sex offenders, suggesting an overall greater degree of acknowledgement of psychological difficulty across all measured domains of dysfunction. Modified regrouping of scales based on five different areas of potential dysfunction showed that the greatest frequencies of difference for presumed defensive samples lied in somatic/cognitive and thought dysfunction, with 100% of scales in these areas having significantly higher T scores among sex offenders. Specifically, higher sex offender scores on the somatic/cognitive scales indicate comparatively more symptoms related to a broad range of physical health complaints (RC1), generally poor health and physical debilitation (MLS), nausea and other stomach problems (GIC), head and neck pain (HPC), dizziness, numbness, weakness, and balance problems (NUC), and memory and concentration difficulties (COG). Similarly, sex offenders mean scores also indicate significantly more problems with disordered thinking (THD), paranoid and suspicious beliefs about others (RC6), unusual perceptual experiences (RC8), and disconnection from reality (PSYC-r). However, it was noted that the scales with differences that had the largest effect sizes fell primarily within the domain of emotional dysfunction. The specific scale that demonstrated the largest effect was NFC (partial $\eta^2 = 0.21$), suggesting a higher perceived degree of personal indecisiveness and inefficacy (NFC) among sex offenders. Other scales with large effect sizes indicate a higher degree of problems with
mood and affect (EID), general distress and emotional discomfort (RCd), maladaptive anxiety, anger, and irritability (RC7), anxiety, worry, fear, and insecurity (NEGE-r), and problems with under-controlled behavior (BXD) among sex offenders.

Presumed defensive groups were then compared at the item-level. Specifically, frequency rates of items endorsed in the keyed direction for the main validity scales and all substantive scales were subsequently analyzed for differences between presumed defensive samples. Directional hypotheses were not made regarding these analyses due to lack of a sufficient prior research basis. Findings from the presumed defensive item-level comparison were generally consistent with scale-level findings in that over 40% of items from the K-r scale, measuring defensiveness, were endorsed at a higher rate among child custody litigants than sex offenders, with differences ranging from 20-34%. Specifically, custody litigants more frequently endorsed items pertaining to the denial of argumentativeness (item 10), cynicism (item 36), self-criticism (item 89), self-prioritizing (item 99), lying (item 171), and general worrying (item 338), in addition to an item exaggerating their current wellbeing (item 187). Substantive scale item-level findings further suggested that sex offenders endorsed the majority of items across the clinical scales at a significantly higher rate than custody litigants, which is consistent with their tendency to produce higher scale scores. The 36 items from significantly different scales that were analyzed for the presumed defensive groups were all endorsed more frequently by sex offenders. Included among these was an item pertaining to engagement in risky sexual conduct (item 38), which was unsurprisingly more frequently endorsed by sex offenders and had one of the largest effect sizes. The content of other items that demonstrated the greatest effect sizes ($\geq 0.11$; medium) were related to believing that
others are critical (item 63), feeling overwhelmed by troubles (item 187), and worrying over decision-making (item 324).

The analyses for the two clearly defensive groups were identical to those conducted for the presumed defensive group and were exploratory at both the scale and item level due to lack of prior research comparing individuals from these populations who elevated on underreporting scales specifically. Findings of the clearly defensive subgroup comparison provided a deeper understanding of differences in defensive responding between these two groups. Specifically, preliminary examination of mean scale scores revealed that clearly defensive child custody litigants produced three times the number of scales that were at least one-half standard deviation below the normative mean compared to sex offenders. While both subgroups produced L-r scores that were above the normative mean, clearly defensive sex offenders’ mean score on this scale was markedly elevated ($M = 71.39$) and significantly higher than clearly defensive custody litigants’ mean score. This suggests that, among sex offenders and child custody litigants who elevate clinically on the tests’ internal measures of defensiveness, sex offenders are particularly more inclined to engage in an overt style of impression management by disavowing common faults and claiming unusual levels of moral virtue (L-r). This was somewhat consistent with expectation, as past research has shown that sex offenders tend to produce elevated L-r scores (Tarescavage et al., 2018). Results on the other validity scales again suggested a relatively stronger inclination of custody litigants to portray themselves as unrealistically well-adjusted (K-r) than sex offenders; sex offenders again demonstrated higher levels of endorsing infrequent psychological symptoms (F-r) compared to custody litigants.
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Comparison of substantive scales for the clearly defensive subgroups followed relatively similar patterns to presumed defensive comparisons. Although slightly fewer (75%) substantive scales had significantly different scores across these subgroups relative to the presumed defensive samples, sex offenders again consistently produced higher mean scores in comparison to custody litigants. The domain of thought dysfunction also had the highest frequency of scales with significantly different scores across subgroups, although the scale with the highest effect size again indicated increased difficulty with indecision and perceived inefficacy (NFC) among sex offenders. Interestingly, the behavioral dysfunction domain had the fewest scales that were significantly higher for sex offenders, as only about 44% of scales in this area were significantly different for the clearly defensive group comparison. This may suggest a tendency of sex offenders to deny aspects of behavioral dysfunction specifically, while being more open to acknowledge emotional, somatic, or thought difficulties. Prior research has noted a distinct pattern in that sex offenders who deny culpability for their crimes tend to display a greater degree of defensiveness on personality measures compared to those who accept responsibility for their alleged crimes (Baldwin & Boys, 1998; Lanyon & Lutz, 1984; Grossman & Cavanaugh, 1989). It is thus likely that the presumed defensive sex offender sample had a greater frequency of those who admitted to their crimes, potentially offering an explanation for the significantly higher scores compared to custody litigants on scales of behavioral dysfunction (BXD, RC4) among the presumed sample but not for the clearly defensive group.

Item-level analysis was again consistent with the scale-level findings for the clearly defensive groups. It was specifically noted that only three validity scale items had
significantly different rates of endorsement between sex offenders and child custody litigants. These items included only one from the K-r scale, which pertained to a denial of feeling unable to manage problems, and was endorsed more frequently by custody litigants. The remaining two items were from the L-r scale and related to the denial of thrill-seeking behavior and denial of disliking others, with no items from the F-r scale reaching marked levels of difference between clearly defensive subgroups. Only the single item from the K-r scale was also considerably discrepant between the presumed defensive samples. One aspect of the substantive scale item-level analysis for the clearly defensive groups that perhaps further speaks to the response style of these groups are the few items from the IPP scale, which did not differ significantly between groups, that were endorsed at a higher rate by custody litigants. While these items were not included in the Chi-Square analyses, it was observed that they had some of the highest discrepancies in item endorsement rates between clearly defensive groups (31.8-38.8%). These items had content related to possessing a non-dominant and non-threatening communication style, which point to the specific traits that custody litigants who engage in defensiveness attempt to portray as a form of impression management. Overall, this suggests that, while in general item level differences were congruent with scale level findings, this deeper level of analysis provides supplemental information regarding custody litigants’ response style and is worthy of further examination in future studies.

Broad examination of differences in validity scale scores across both presumed and clearly defensive comparisons indicate that sex offenders consistently produced significantly lower scores than child custody litigants on the K-r scale, suggesting higher levels of purported psychological adjustment among custody litigants in both
COMPARING DEFENSIVENESS IN FORENSIC MMPI-2-RF PROFILES

comparisons. This confirmed the general expectation of this study based on prior research demonstrating elevated scores on the MMPI-2-RF K-r scale and MMPI-2 K scale among parents undergoing custody litigation (Archer et al., 2012; Ezzo et al., 2007; Gambetti et al., 2019; Resendes & Lecci, 2012). Interestingly, sex offender mean T scores on the L-r scale were only significantly higher than custody litigants for the clearly defensive subgroup comparison, but not the overall presumed defensive samples. This suggests that, when no validity scale score criteria are set, these two populations demonstrate relatively similar levels of engaging in denial of common shortcomings. However, among individuals in these populations who specifically elevate internal indicators of defensive responding, sex offenders tend to engage in higher levels of this form of defensive responding comparative to child custody litigants. Notably, the F-r scale was consistently shown to have higher mean scores among sex offenders for the presumed defensive and clearly defensive comparisons. Given that this scale measures exaggeration or overreporting of psychopathology, it is of note that even sex offenders who elevate on one or both defensiveness scales still produced higher scores compared to child custody litigants. This is perhaps in part explained by a similar notion put forth by Mann et al. (1992) who suggested that the response style of sex offenders may be impacted by a desire to appear only “sick enough” to account for their current circumstances but not “too sick” (pp. 70-71).

In contrast to the presumed defensive sample comparison findings, item-level analysis for the clearly defensive subgroups indicated markedly fewer items that were at or above the threshold of a 20% difference in endorsement rates between groups. More specifically, only 22% of items with marked group differences for the presumed
defensive sample also met the threshold for the subgroups. The content of these items related to overthinking small actions (item 68), feeling unable to manage troubles (item 187), experiencing legal system involvement (item 190), worrying excessively (item 209), feeling blue (item 217), lacking assertiveness (item 229), experiencing forgetfulness (item 306), and worrying over important decisions (item 324). The four additional items that were only significantly different for the clearly defensive sample had content pertaining to physiological signs of stress (items 52, 254), indecisiveness (item 27), and workplace cynicism (item 260), suggesting sex offenders were more frequently endorsed these symptoms than custody litigants. Additionally, one notable difference from the presumed defensive samples comparison was that the item pertaining to sexual risk taking (item 38) did not meet the threshold of a 20% difference in endorsement rates for clearly defensive groups. In fact, endorsement rates for this item were only 9.7% higher for clearly defensive sex offenders compared to child custody litigants. This potentially offers further support for the conjecture that identifiably defensive sex offenders are more likely to engage in denial of behavioral misconduct.

Summary and conclusions

The present study examined MMPI-2-RF profiles of two samples, both of which previous literature have shown to have some degree of defensiveness, making them suitable for comparison with one another. A reliable finding from this study in particular was that sex offenders were less defensive than child custody litigants. This was true at both the scale and item level, as sex offenders produced consistently higher T scores on clinical scales and endorsement rates of items related to various areas of dysfunction. However, in examining the findings across the presumed defensive and clearly defensive
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comparisons, it is evident that the patterns of differences are not identical. As was
previously discussed, there were generally more differences between presumed defensive
samples than between the clearly defensive subgroups. This would suggest that sex
offenders and child custody litigants who elevate on underreporting/defensiveness
validity scales demonstrate relatively fewer differences in their MMPI-2-RF response
style than is seen when these populations are compared more generally. It was also
observed that mean T scores on the clinical scales were consistently higher among sex
offenders, with no substantive scales being significantly higher among child custody
litigants. This would suggest that the particular response style of child custody litigants
was comparatively more effective in producing test profiles below the level of clinical
interpretation for many scales. While not formally hypothesized by the present study, this
finding is generally consistent with the widely accepted notion that K-r scale elevations
play a role in suppressing scores on clinical scales.

One caveat to these findings is that the present study did not definitively
determine whether child custody litigants are truly, to some degree, better
psychologically adjusted than persons with alleged or charged sex offenses. This is
primarily attributed to the imperfect nature of interpreting self-report measures,
particularly for defensive populations. Furthermore, it is acknowledged that sex offenders
are not a homogenous group, with prior studies having shown that some are better
psychologically adjusted than others (Rogers & Bender, 2018; Rosenberg & Knight,
1988; Sigre-Lerós et al., 2015). However, the focus of this study was comparative rather
than absolute. Another caveat to the present findings is that results may be somewhat
different were the threshold for item-level differences lowered. Specifically, 10% is often
used as a threshold for comparing rates of difference between groups, which would have likely produced far more numerous findings in the present comparison; however, it would in turn make it considerably more difficult to discern meaningful patterns between groups at that level. As the present study’s main goal was to identify primary points of comparison between these two samples and thus focused on the largest and most notable areas of discrepancies, the 20% threshold used in the current study is believed to offer sufficiently robust results to this effect.

**Implications**

The intent of the present study was to determine if defensiveness presented differently across two samples known to demonstrate this response style. While the study’s findings pointed to a certain level of defensiveness for both samples, this was generally more evident for child custody litigants than sex offenders. In terms of the specific style or type of defensiveness displayed by sex offenders and child custody litigants, the present study’s findings suggest defensive sex offenders were found to display a relatively more immature style of overt impression management, as suggested by higher L-r scores, while child custody litigants displayed a tendency toward a more sophisticated denial of adjustment difficulties (K-r). However, it is noted that this pattern may be more generalizable for male custody litigants, whereas it may be limited to sex offenders who specifically elevate clinically on underreporting validity scales.

The contrast in the nature of defensiveness between sex offenders and custody litigants suggests that the vastly different type of high stakes associated with the respective legal proceedings for these two samples may play a role in the type of defensiveness seen on psychological assessments. Findings from this study revealed that
child custody litigants are relatively more inclined to portray themselves as psychologically well-adjusted, whereas defensiveness in sex offenders tends to present as a purported degree of morality. The societal consequences affiliated with being labeled as a sex offender may in part explain this difference, particularly for this sample of pre-trial offenders, as it is likely perceived that presenting as a ‘good person’ may grant them leniency from the court or otherwise aid in their defense to prevent being designated as someone capable of a sex crime. Additionally, sex offenders may attempt to balance acknowledgement of certain psychological disturbance and maladjustment with this expressed sense of morality, which may stem from similar motivations to sway court outcomes in their favor. In contrast, custody litigants may be more inclined to inflate their capacity to tolerate and overcome life stressors as a means of embellishing their parenting ability, resulting in relatively lower acknowledgement of clinical symptoms compared to sex offenders. This style of impression management may stem from individuals in this evaluation context erroneously assuming that their responses to test items have direct bearing on their suitability to make parenting decisions.

The present study generally echoes the literature that urges forensic evaluators who assess these populations to expect and consider a level of defensiveness in these assessment contexts; however, it also emphasizes that evaluators may temper this expectation by recognizing that defensiveness is not identical across different forensic groups. Rather, the evaluation context and associated foreseeable consequences may impact the type and degree of defensiveness displayed on psychological measures.
Comparing Defensiveness in Forensic MMPI-2-RF Profiles

Although these findings of defensiveness are not necessarily directly provided to the court by the evaluator, they would need to be carefully considered in drawing inferences and making recommendations in the context of these forensic evaluations.

Limitations

In considering the limitations of the present study, it is acknowledged that individuals alleged of and under investigation for sex offenses, without current charges levied against them yet at the time of the evaluation, were included in the sex offender sample to ensure approximately equal sample sizes between groups. These individuals were specifically referred for evaluation after being formally accused of abuse during family court proceedings or when past allegations have resulted in the Department of Child and Families (DCF) needing to determine a child’s placement suitability. Alleged and convicted sex offenders may vary in response style compared to custody groups depending on whether they have yet been formally charged and/or whether they were referred by the family court system. Data for the current samples was limited in terms of the information available on referral contexts and thus the present study was unable to examine these differences. Future studies may replicate the present study’s design with alleged sex offenders referred for evaluation specifically by family court to determine if the response styles found in this study hold true in comparison to custody litigants.

Another limitation of the study was that it utilized exclusively male samples. While this was necessary for the sex offender sample considering the relatively rare cases involving female sex offender evaluations compared to males, the same is not true for custody. In fact, some past studies have indicated potential gender differences in response style between male and female custody litigants. Specifically, previous research has
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indicated that women involved in custody litigation may tend to produce more defensive profiles than men (Gembetti et al., 2019; Roma et al., 2014). This may suggest current findings lack generalizability to the overall population of parents undergoing custody litigation. While this finding has produced somewhat conflicted and inconsistent results overall, there is a potential that even greater differences in defensiveness could be seen in female profiles were included in comparative analysis with sex offenders. Future studies may consider specifically testing this theory by seeking out female samples.

It is further acknowledged that the present study did not set inclusion criteria for underreporting or overreporting validity scale scores. While this was essential for this comparison of response styles in these groups, it may be clinically useful to empirically examine if these same patterns of defensiveness are observed in strictly valid test profiles. As such, future studies may choose to expand on the present findings by examining scale- and item-level response patterns for sex offenders and custody litigants that produce defensive but still valid profiles.

Contributions

The present study offers notable contributions to the field of forensic personality assessment. It is specifically the first study of its kind to date that compares defensiveness on the MMPI-2-RF across these particular civil and criminal forensic groups. As such, the findings ultimately shed light on the fact that defensiveness is not identical in nature and degree across populations that are traditionally thought to display this response style. While sex offender defensiveness tends to present as denial of behavioral dysfunction and perhaps accentuate certain areas of emotional dysfunction, defensiveness in child custody litigants may be more suggestive of denial of certain undesirable interpersonal
characteristics. This latter conclusion may in part be attributed to a perception by these individuals that certain interpersonal traits may be associated with poor parenting, which could influence the outcome of their associated legal proceedings. Similarly, defensive sex offenders may be inclined to make the assumption that acknowledging certain undercontrolled behaviors could impact their case negatively, while emotional dysfunction may invoke sympathies.

Clinicians utilizing personality assessment in evaluating individuals from these populations may therefore consider the expected degree of forthcomingness displayed by individuals referred in these contexts. The present study also pointed to fact that while the scale-level findings revealed these different nuances of defensiveness across these two samples, and this is typical level of analysis done by psychological examiners, limited examination of item responses appears to have some additional interpretive value.
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Appendix A

Inclusion Criteria For All Groups

Table 18. Inclusion criteria for all groups.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria Variable</th>
<th>Presumed Defensive</th>
<th>Clearly Defensive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sex Offenders</td>
<td>Child Custody Litigants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>18 +</td>
<td>18 +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VRIN-r</td>
<td>&lt; 80</td>
<td>&lt; 80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRIN-r</td>
<td>&lt; 80</td>
<td>&lt; 80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K-r</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L-r</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cannot Say (?)</td>
<td>&lt; 15</td>
<td>&lt; 15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. SO = = sex offender. CCL = child custody litigant. “–” = no specified inclusion criteria set for the scale for the group. * = individuals with either a K-r score of 60 or higher or a L-r score of 65 or higher meet criteria for the listed “clearly defensive” groups.
### Appendix B

Validity Scale L-r, K-r, and F-r Item Endorsement Frequencies

Table 19. *MMPI-2-RF K-r, L-r, and F-r scale item endorsement frequency rates for presumed defensive sex offender and child custody litigant samples.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Presumed Defensive Sex Offender Sample</th>
<th>Presumed Defensive Child Custody Litigant Sample</th>
<th>% Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L-r</td>
<td>Item 16</td>
<td>71 (26.5%)</td>
<td>94 (36.2%)</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 45</td>
<td>105 (39.2%)</td>
<td>143 (55.0%)</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 61</td>
<td>94 (35.1%)</td>
<td>70 (26.9%)</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 70</td>
<td>11 (4.1%)</td>
<td>2 (0.8%)</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 95</td>
<td>47 (17.5%)</td>
<td>60 (23.1%)</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 127</td>
<td>32 (11.9%)</td>
<td>27 (10.4%)</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 154</td>
<td>152 (56.7%)</td>
<td>129 (49.6%)</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 182</td>
<td>136 (50.7%)</td>
<td>146 (56.2%)</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 183</td>
<td>45 (16.8%)</td>
<td>27 (10.4%)</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 211</td>
<td>75 (28.0%)</td>
<td>50 (19.2%)</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 241</td>
<td>99 (36.9%)</td>
<td>89 (34.2%)</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 268</td>
<td>62 (23.1%)</td>
<td>60 (23.1%)</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 298</td>
<td>179 (66.8%)</td>
<td>140 (53.8%)</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 325</td>
<td>32 (11.9%)</td>
<td>17 (6.5%)</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K-r</td>
<td>Item 10</td>
<td>169 (63.1%)</td>
<td>218 (83.8%)</td>
<td><strong>20.7%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 23</td>
<td>187 (69.8%)</td>
<td>232 (89.2%)</td>
<td>19.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 36</td>
<td>116 (43.3%)</td>
<td>170 (65.4%)</td>
<td><strong>22.1%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 44</td>
<td>186 (69.4%)</td>
<td>232 (89.0%)</td>
<td>19.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 72</td>
<td>83 (31.0%)</td>
<td>129 (49.6%)</td>
<td>18.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 80</td>
<td>217 (81.0%)</td>
<td>227 (87.3%)</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 89</td>
<td>176 (65.7%)</td>
<td>228 (87.7%)</td>
<td><strong>22.0%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 99</td>
<td>114 (42.5%)</td>
<td>182 (70.0%)</td>
<td><strong>27.5%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 155</td>
<td>188 (70.1%)</td>
<td>219 (84.2%)</td>
<td>14.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 171</td>
<td>122 (45.5%)</td>
<td>178 (68.5%)</td>
<td><strong>23.0%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 187</td>
<td>111 (41.4%)</td>
<td>197 (75.8%)</td>
<td><strong>34.4%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 202</td>
<td>55 (20.4%)</td>
<td>105 (40.4%)</td>
<td><strong>20.0%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 322</td>
<td>193 (72.0%)</td>
<td>225 (86.5%)</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 338</td>
<td>145 (54.1%)</td>
<td>195 (75.0%)</td>
<td><strong>20.9%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F-r</td>
<td>Item 14</td>
<td>11 (4.1%)</td>
<td>11 (4.2%)</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 30</td>
<td>47 (17.5%)</td>
<td>8 (3.2%)</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 46</td>
<td>41 (15.3%)</td>
<td>2 (0.8%)</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 56</td>
<td>18 (6.7%)</td>
<td>2 (0.2%)</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 59</td>
<td>50 (18.7%)</td>
<td>18 (6.9%)</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(cont.)
### Table 19 (cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Presumed Defensive</th>
<th>Presumed Defensive</th>
<th>% Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sex Offender Sample</td>
<td>Child Custody Litigant Sample</td>
<td>(N = 268)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F-r</td>
<td>Item 67</td>
<td>24 (9.0%)</td>
<td>3 (1.2%)</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 71</td>
<td>50 (18.7%)</td>
<td>28 (10.8%)</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 74</td>
<td>31 (11.6%)</td>
<td>5 (1.9%)</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 83</td>
<td>30 (11.2%)</td>
<td>8 (3.1%)</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 102</td>
<td>13 (4.9%)</td>
<td>6 (2.3%)</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 106</td>
<td>62 (23.1%)</td>
<td>8 (3.1%)</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 117</td>
<td>35 (13.1%)</td>
<td>3 (1.2%)</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 120</td>
<td>11 (4.1%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 139</td>
<td>14 (5.2%)</td>
<td>3 (1.2%)</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 146</td>
<td>14 (5.2%)</td>
<td>1 (0.4%)</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 164</td>
<td>9 (3.4%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 174</td>
<td>37 (13.8%)</td>
<td>10 (3.8%)</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 203</td>
<td>12 (4.5%)</td>
<td>3 (1.2%)</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 218</td>
<td>12 (4.5%)</td>
<td>3 (1.2%)</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 227</td>
<td>27 (10.1%)</td>
<td>12 (6.5%)</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 231</td>
<td>10 (3.7%)</td>
<td>1 (0.4%)</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 240</td>
<td>36 (13.4%)</td>
<td>1 (0.4%)</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 253</td>
<td>18 (6.7%)</td>
<td>11 (4.2%)</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 264</td>
<td>32 (11.9%)</td>
<td>48 (18.5%)</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 275</td>
<td>33 (12.3%)</td>
<td>7 (2.7%)</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 277</td>
<td>30 (11.2%)</td>
<td>6 (2.3%)</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 281</td>
<td>28 (10.4%)</td>
<td>5 (1.9%)</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 294</td>
<td>25 (9.3%)</td>
<td>11 (4.2%)</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 301</td>
<td>35 (13.1%)</td>
<td>16 (6.2%)</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 310</td>
<td>23 (8.6%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 312</td>
<td>23 (8.6%)</td>
<td>7 (2.7%)</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 332</td>
<td>19 (7.1%)</td>
<td>4 (1.5%)</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Group differences of at least 20% with higher item endorsement rates by child custody litigants are indicated in **bold**. Items with group differences of 20% or greater which were endorsed at a higher rate by sex offenders are **underlined.**
### Table 20. MMPI-2-RF L-r, K-r, and F-r scale item endorsement frequency rates for clearly defensive sex offender and child custody litigant samples.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Clearly Defensive Sex Offender Sample (N = 102)</th>
<th>Clearly Defensive Child Custody Litigant Sample (N = 168)</th>
<th>% Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>n (%)</td>
<td>n (%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L-r</td>
<td>Item 16</td>
<td>51 (50%)</td>
<td>79 (47.3%)</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 45</td>
<td>72 (70.6%)</td>
<td>113 (67.7%)</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 61</td>
<td>60 (58.8%)</td>
<td>53 (31.7%)</td>
<td>27.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 70</td>
<td>4 (3.9%)</td>
<td>1 (0.6%)</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 95</td>
<td>33 (32.4%)</td>
<td>54 (32.3%)</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 127</td>
<td>28 (27.5%)</td>
<td>27 (16.2%)</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 154</td>
<td>79 (77.5%)</td>
<td>97 (58.1%)</td>
<td>19.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 182</td>
<td>73 (71.6%)</td>
<td>106 (63.5%)</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 183</td>
<td>31 (30.4%)</td>
<td>24 (14.4%)</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 211</td>
<td>44 (56.9%)</td>
<td>43 (25.1%)</td>
<td>31.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 241</td>
<td>63 (61.8%)</td>
<td>71 (42.5%)</td>
<td>19.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 268</td>
<td>29 (38.2%)</td>
<td>50 (29.9%)</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 298</td>
<td>82 (80.4%)</td>
<td>102 (61.1%)</td>
<td>19.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 325</td>
<td>28 (27.5%)</td>
<td>13 (7.8%)</td>
<td>19.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K-r</td>
<td>Item 10</td>
<td>76 (74.5%)</td>
<td>156 (93.4%)</td>
<td>18.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 23</td>
<td>95 (93.1%)</td>
<td>162 (97.0%)</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 36</td>
<td>60 (58.8%)</td>
<td>131 (78.4%)</td>
<td>19.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 44</td>
<td>84 (82.4%)</td>
<td>159 (95.2%)</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 72</td>
<td>49 (48.0%)</td>
<td>104 (62.3%)</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 80</td>
<td>82 (80.4%)</td>
<td>153 (91.6%)</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 89</td>
<td>91 (89.2%)</td>
<td>163 (97.6%)</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 99</td>
<td>65 (63.7%)</td>
<td>139 (83.2%)</td>
<td>19.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 155</td>
<td>85 (83.3%)</td>
<td>157 (94.0%)</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 171</td>
<td>65 (63.7%)</td>
<td>137 (82.0%)</td>
<td>18.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 187</td>
<td>63 (61.8%)</td>
<td>151 (90.4%)</td>
<td><strong>28.6%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 202</td>
<td>39 (38.2%)</td>
<td>91 (54.5%)</td>
<td>16.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 322</td>
<td>85 (83.3%)</td>
<td>155 (92.8%)</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 338</td>
<td>72 (70.6%)</td>
<td>149 (89.2%)</td>
<td>18.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F-r</td>
<td>Item 14</td>
<td>4 (3.9%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 30</td>
<td>9 (8.8%)</td>
<td>3 (1.8%)</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 46</td>
<td>12 (11.8%)</td>
<td>5 (3.0%)</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 56</td>
<td>6 (5.9%)</td>
<td>1 (0.6%)</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 59</td>
<td>14 (13.7%)</td>
<td>6 (3.6%)</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 67</td>
<td>2 (2.0%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 71</td>
<td>24 (23.5%)</td>
<td>11 (6.6%)</td>
<td>16.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 74</td>
<td>4 (3.9%)</td>
<td>1 (0.6%)</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 83</td>
<td>8 (7.8%)</td>
<td>4 (2.4%)</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(continuation)
### Table 20 (cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Clearly Defensive Sex Offender Sample $(N = 102)$</th>
<th>Clearly Defensive Child Custody Litigant Sample $(N = 168)$</th>
<th>% Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F-r</td>
<td>Item 102</td>
<td>5 (4.9%)</td>
<td>3 (1.8%)</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 106</td>
<td>8 (7.8%)</td>
<td>2 (1.2%)</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 117</td>
<td>5 (4.9%)</td>
<td>1 (0.6%)</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 120</td>
<td>1 (1.0%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 139</td>
<td>5 (4.9%)</td>
<td>1 (0.6%)</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 146</td>
<td>2 (2.0%)</td>
<td>1 (0.6%)</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 164</td>
<td>1 (1.0%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 174</td>
<td>9 (8.8%)</td>
<td>1 (0.6%)</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 203</td>
<td>2 (2.0%)</td>
<td>1 (0.6%)</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 218</td>
<td>3 (2.9%)</td>
<td>1 (0.6%)</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 227</td>
<td>11 (10.8%)</td>
<td>9 (5.4%)</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 231</td>
<td>2 (2.0%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 240</td>
<td>7 (6.9%)</td>
<td>1 (0.6%)</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 253</td>
<td>5 (4.9%)</td>
<td>5 (3.0%)</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 264</td>
<td>14 (13.7%)</td>
<td>22 (13.2%)</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 275</td>
<td>6 (5.9%)</td>
<td>1 (0.6%)</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 277</td>
<td>7 (6.9%)</td>
<td>1 (0.6%)</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 281</td>
<td>9 (8.8%)</td>
<td>1 (0.6%)</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 294</td>
<td>7 (6.9%)</td>
<td>6 (3.6%)</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 301</td>
<td>8 (7.8%)</td>
<td>5 (3.0%)</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 310</td>
<td>4 (3.9%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 312</td>
<td>2 (2.0%)</td>
<td>3 (1.8%)</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 332</td>
<td>7 (6.9%)</td>
<td>2 (1.2%)</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Group differences of at least 20% with higher item endorsement rates by child custody litigants are indicated in **bold.** Items with group differences of 20% or greater which were endorsed at a higher rate by sex offenders are **underlined.**
### Appendix C

**Higher Order Scale Item Endorsement Frequencies**

Table 21. *MMPI-2-RF* item endorsement frequency rates for Higher Order scales EID, THD, BXD for presumed defensive sex offender and child custody litigant samples.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Presumed Defensive Sex Offender Sample (N = 268) n (%)</th>
<th>Presumed Defensive Child Custody Litigant Sample (N = 260) n (%)</th>
<th>% Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EID</td>
<td>Item 4</td>
<td>40 (14.9%)</td>
<td>12 (4.6%)</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 17</td>
<td>68 (25.4%)</td>
<td>48 (18.5%)</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 22</td>
<td>117 (43.7%)</td>
<td>49 (18.8%)</td>
<td>24.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 25</td>
<td>32 (11.9%)</td>
<td>18 (6.9%)</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 30</td>
<td>47 (17.5%)</td>
<td>11 (4.2%)</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 35</td>
<td>48 (17.9%)</td>
<td>23 (8.8%)</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 37</td>
<td>102 (38.1%)</td>
<td>76 (29.2%)</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 48</td>
<td>70 (26.4%)</td>
<td>39 (15.0%)</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 57</td>
<td>85 (31.7%)</td>
<td>49 (18.8%)</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 64</td>
<td>117 (43.7%)</td>
<td>49 (18.8%)</td>
<td>24.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 73</td>
<td>32 (11.9%)</td>
<td>18 (6.9%)</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 83</td>
<td>48 (17.9%)</td>
<td>23 (8.8%)</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 89</td>
<td>102 (38.1%)</td>
<td>76 (29.2%)</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 91</td>
<td>79 (29.5%)</td>
<td>30 (11.5%)</td>
<td>18.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 102</td>
<td>13 (4.9%)</td>
<td>6 (4.2%)</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 105</td>
<td>40 (14.9%)</td>
<td>14 (5.4%)</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 114</td>
<td>99 (36.9%)</td>
<td>37 (14.2%)</td>
<td>22.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 119</td>
<td>71 (26.5%)</td>
<td>33 (12.7%)</td>
<td>13.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 120</td>
<td>11 (4.1%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 140</td>
<td>40 (14.9%)</td>
<td>14 (5.4%)</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 158</td>
<td>45 (16.8%)</td>
<td>10 (3.8%)</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 167</td>
<td>70 (26.1%)</td>
<td>16 (6.2%)</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 169</td>
<td>32 (11.9%)</td>
<td>2 (0.8%)</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 172</td>
<td>46 (17.2%)</td>
<td>1 (0.4%)</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 187</td>
<td>157 (58.6%)</td>
<td>62 (23.8%)</td>
<td>34.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 202</td>
<td>212 (79.1%)</td>
<td>154 (59.2%)</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 204</td>
<td>61 (22.8%)</td>
<td>11 (4.2%)</td>
<td>18.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 217</td>
<td>103 (38.4%)</td>
<td>40 (15.4%)</td>
<td>23.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 222</td>
<td>60 (22.4%)</td>
<td>28 (10.8%)</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 228</td>
<td>55 (20.5%)</td>
<td>24 (9.2%)</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 232</td>
<td>71 (26.5%)</td>
<td>12 (4.6%)</td>
<td>21.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 234</td>
<td>214 (79.9%)</td>
<td>195 (75.0%)</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 246</td>
<td>16 (6.0%)</td>
<td>4 (1.5%)</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 250</td>
<td>41 (15.3%)</td>
<td>14 (5.4%)</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 261</td>
<td>71 (26.4%)</td>
<td>16 (6.2%)</td>
<td>20.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(continues)
### Table 21 (cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Presumed Defensive Sex Offender Sample</th>
<th>Presumed Defensive Child Custody Litigant Sample</th>
<th>% Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>((N = 268)) n (%)</td>
<td>((N = 260)) n (%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EID</td>
<td>Item 282</td>
<td>63 (23.5%)</td>
<td>9 (3.5%)</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 288</td>
<td>69 (25.7%)</td>
<td>11 (4.2%)</td>
<td>21.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 293</td>
<td>25 (9.3%)</td>
<td>12 (4.6%)</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 322</td>
<td>75 (27.9%)</td>
<td>35 (13.5%)</td>
<td>14.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 331</td>
<td>47 (17.5%)</td>
<td>3 (1.2%)</td>
<td>16.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 335</td>
<td>77 (28.6%)</td>
<td>31 (11.9%)</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 12</td>
<td>56 (20.9%)</td>
<td>19 (7.3%)</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 14</td>
<td>11 (4.1%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 46</td>
<td>41 (15.3%)</td>
<td>8 (3.1%)</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 71</td>
<td>50 (18.7%)</td>
<td>28 (10.8%)</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 85</td>
<td>75 (28.0%)</td>
<td>60 (23.1%)</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 92</td>
<td>7 (2.6%)</td>
<td>4 (1.5%)</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 110</td>
<td>62 (23.1%)</td>
<td>22 (8.5%)</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 122</td>
<td>18 (6.7%)</td>
<td>5 (1.9%)</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 129</td>
<td>2 (0.7%)</td>
<td>3 (1.2%)</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 139</td>
<td>14 (5.2%)</td>
<td>3 (1.2%)</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 150</td>
<td>6 (2.2%)</td>
<td>3 (1.2%)</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 168</td>
<td>11 (4.1%)</td>
<td>5 (1.9%)</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 179</td>
<td>34 (12.7%)</td>
<td>14 (5.4%)</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 199</td>
<td>32 (11.9%)</td>
<td>15 (5.8%)</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 203</td>
<td>12 (4.5%)</td>
<td>3 (1.2%)</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 212</td>
<td>62 (23.1%)</td>
<td>64 (24.6%)</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 216</td>
<td>38 (14.2%)</td>
<td>11 (4.2%)</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 252</td>
<td>3 (1.1%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 264</td>
<td>32 (11.9%)</td>
<td>48 (18.5%)</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 270</td>
<td>7 (2.6%)</td>
<td>1 (0.4%)</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 273</td>
<td>18 (6.7%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 287</td>
<td>11 (4.1%)</td>
<td>5 (1.9%)</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 294</td>
<td>25 (9.3%)</td>
<td>11 (4.2%)</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 311</td>
<td>67 (25.0%)</td>
<td>56 (21.5%)</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 330</td>
<td>36 (13.4%)</td>
<td>11 (4.2%)</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 332</td>
<td>19 (7.1%)</td>
<td>4 (1.5%)</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 21</td>
<td>133 (49.6%)</td>
<td>109 (41.9%)</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 49</td>
<td>99 (36.9%)</td>
<td>64 (24.6%)</td>
<td>12.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 61</td>
<td>174 (63.1%)</td>
<td>190 (73.1%)</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 66</td>
<td>95 (35.4%)</td>
<td>75 (28.8%)</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 84</td>
<td>22 (8.2%)</td>
<td>5 (1.9%)</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 96</td>
<td>71 (26.5%)</td>
<td>19 (7.3%)</td>
<td>19.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 107</td>
<td>81 (30.2%)</td>
<td>103 (39.6%)</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(continues)
Table 21 (cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Presumed Defensive Sex Offender Sample (N = 268)</th>
<th>Presumed Defensive Child Custody Litigant Sample (N = 260)</th>
<th>% Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>n (%)</td>
<td>n (%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 131</td>
<td>102 (38.1%)</td>
<td>89 (34.2%)</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 156</td>
<td>175 (65.3%)</td>
<td>128 (49.2%)</td>
<td>16.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 190</td>
<td>200 (74.6%)</td>
<td>113 (43.5%)</td>
<td>31.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 193</td>
<td>35 (13.1%)</td>
<td>36 (13.8%)</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 205</td>
<td>51 (19.0%)</td>
<td>17 (6.5%)</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 223</td>
<td>77 (28.7%)</td>
<td>47 (18.1%)</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 226</td>
<td>109 (40.7%)</td>
<td>105 (40.4%)</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 231</td>
<td>10 (3.7%)</td>
<td>1 (0.4%)</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 237</td>
<td>66 (24.6%)</td>
<td>46 (17.7%)</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 248</td>
<td>38 (14.2%)</td>
<td>12 (4.6%)</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 253</td>
<td>18 (6.7%)</td>
<td>11 (4.2%)</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 266</td>
<td>16 (6.0%)</td>
<td>1 (0.4%)</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 292</td>
<td>64 (23.9%)</td>
<td>40 (15.4%)</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 312</td>
<td>11 (4.1%)</td>
<td>7 (2.7%)</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 316</td>
<td>109 (40.5%)</td>
<td>68 (26.2%)</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 329</td>
<td>24 (8.9%)</td>
<td>17 (6.5%)</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Group differences of at least 20% with higher item endorsement rates by child custody litigants are indicated in **bold**. Items with group differences of 20% or greater which were endorsed at a higher rate by sex offenders are **underlined**.
Table 22. MMPI-2-RF item endorsement frequency rates for Higher Order scales EID, THD, BXD for clearly defensive sex offender and child custody litigant samples.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Clearly Defensive Sex Offender Sample (N = 102)</th>
<th>Clearly Defensive Child Custody Litigant Sample (N = 167)</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EID</td>
<td>Item 4</td>
<td>6 (5.9%)</td>
<td>2 (1.2%)</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 17</td>
<td>14 (13.7%)</td>
<td>20 (12.0%)</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 22</td>
<td>25 (24.5%)</td>
<td>14 (8.4%)</td>
<td>16.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 25</td>
<td>11 (10.8%)</td>
<td>8 (4.8%)</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 30</td>
<td>9 (8.8%)</td>
<td>3 (1.8%)</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 35</td>
<td>10 (9.8%)</td>
<td>4 (2.4%)</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 37</td>
<td>25 (24.5%)</td>
<td>30 (18.0%)</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 48</td>
<td>10 (9.8%)</td>
<td>5 (3.0%)</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 57</td>
<td>25 (24.5%)</td>
<td>29 (17.4%)</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 64</td>
<td>21 (20.6%)</td>
<td>24 (14.4%)</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 73</td>
<td>16 (15.7%)</td>
<td>14 (8.4%)</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 83</td>
<td>8 (7.8%)</td>
<td>4 (2.4%)</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 89</td>
<td>11 (10.8%)</td>
<td>4 (2.4%)</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 91</td>
<td>18 (17.6%)</td>
<td>11 (6.6%)</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 102</td>
<td>5 (4.9%)</td>
<td>3 (1.8%)</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 105</td>
<td>4 (3.9%)</td>
<td>3 (1.8%)</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 114</td>
<td>24 (23.5%)</td>
<td>12 (7.2%)</td>
<td>16.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 119</td>
<td>8 (7.8%)</td>
<td>9 (5.4%)</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 120</td>
<td>1 (1.0%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 140</td>
<td>8 (7.8%)</td>
<td>8 (4.8%)</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 158</td>
<td>10 (9.8%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 167</td>
<td>13 (12.7%)</td>
<td>6 (3.6%)</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 169</td>
<td>3 (2.9%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 172</td>
<td>3 (2.9%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 187</td>
<td>39 (38.2%)</td>
<td>16 (9.6%)</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 202</td>
<td>62 (60.8%)</td>
<td>76 (45.5%)</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 204</td>
<td>9 (8.8%)</td>
<td>4 (2.4%)</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 217</td>
<td>32 (31.4%)</td>
<td>18 (10.8%)</td>
<td>20.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 222</td>
<td>6 (5.9%)</td>
<td>13 (7.8%)</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 228</td>
<td>7 (6.9%)</td>
<td>5 (3.0%)</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 232</td>
<td>9 (8.8%)</td>
<td>4 (2.4%)</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 234</td>
<td>67 (65.7%)</td>
<td>111 (66.5%)</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 246</td>
<td>3 (2.9%)</td>
<td>4 (2.4%)</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 250</td>
<td>9 (8.8%)</td>
<td>2 (1.2%)</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 261</td>
<td>7 (6.9%)</td>
<td>4 (2.4%)</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 282</td>
<td>11 (10.8%)</td>
<td>3 (1.8%)</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 288</td>
<td>11 (10.8%)</td>
<td>3 (1.8%)</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 293</td>
<td>3 (2.9%)</td>
<td>3 (1.8%)</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 322</td>
<td>17 (16.7%)</td>
<td>12 (7.2%)</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(continues)
Table 22 (cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Clearly Defensive Sex Offender Sample (N = 102)</th>
<th>Clearly Defensive Child Custody Litigant Sample (N = 167)</th>
<th>% Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>n (%)</td>
<td>n (%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EID</td>
<td>Item 331</td>
<td>8 (7.8%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 335</td>
<td>11 (10.8%)</td>
<td>11 (6.6%)</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THD</td>
<td>Item 12</td>
<td>17 (16.7%)</td>
<td>10 (6.0%)</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 14</td>
<td>4 (3.9%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 46</td>
<td>12 (11.8%)</td>
<td>5 (3.0%)</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 71</td>
<td>24 (23.5%)</td>
<td>11 (6.6%)</td>
<td>16.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 85</td>
<td>24 (23.5%)</td>
<td>34 (20.4%)</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 92</td>
<td>2 (2.0%)</td>
<td>1 (0.6%)</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 110</td>
<td>17 (16.7%)</td>
<td>6 (3.6%)</td>
<td>13.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 122</td>
<td>3 (2.9%)</td>
<td>1 (0.6%)</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 129</td>
<td>1 (1.0%)</td>
<td>1 (0.6%)</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 139</td>
<td>5 (4.9%)</td>
<td>1 (0.6%)</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 150</td>
<td>1 (1.0%)</td>
<td>2 (1.2%)</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 168</td>
<td>2 (2.0%)</td>
<td>1 (0.6%)</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 179</td>
<td>3 (2.9%)</td>
<td>2 (1.2%)</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 199</td>
<td>6 (5.9%)</td>
<td>6 (3.6%)</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 203</td>
<td>2 (2.0%)</td>
<td>1 (0.6%)</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 212</td>
<td>21 (20.6%)</td>
<td>27 (16.2%)</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 216</td>
<td>9 (8.8%)</td>
<td>5 (3.0%)</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 252</td>
<td>1 (1.0%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 264</td>
<td>14 (13.7%)</td>
<td>22 (13.2%)</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 270</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 273</td>
<td>2 (2.0%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 287</td>
<td>1 (1.0%)</td>
<td>1 (0.6%)</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 294</td>
<td>7 (6.9%)</td>
<td>6 (3.6%)</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 311</td>
<td>20 (19.6%)</td>
<td>32 (19.2%)</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 330</td>
<td>7 (6.9%)</td>
<td>2 (1.2%)</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 332</td>
<td>7 (6.9%)</td>
<td>2 (1.2%)</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BXD</td>
<td>Item 21</td>
<td>30 (29.4%)</td>
<td>61 (36.5%)</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 49</td>
<td>24 (23.5%)</td>
<td>39 (23.4%)</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 61</td>
<td>42 (41.2%)</td>
<td>114 (68.3%)</td>
<td>27.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 66</td>
<td>33 (32.4%)</td>
<td>44 (26.3%)</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 84</td>
<td>2 (2.0%)</td>
<td>1 (0.6%)</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 96</td>
<td>20 (19.6%)</td>
<td>6 (3.6%)</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 107</td>
<td>22 (21.6%)</td>
<td>59 (35.3%)</td>
<td>13.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 131</td>
<td>27 (26.5%)</td>
<td>50 (29.9%)</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 156</td>
<td>48 (47.1%)</td>
<td>67 (40.1%)</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 190</td>
<td>72 (70.6%)</td>
<td>65 (38.9%)</td>
<td>31.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 193</td>
<td>4 (3.9%)</td>
<td>13 (7.8%)</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 22 (cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Clearly Defensive Sex Offender Sample ((N = 102))</th>
<th>Clearly Defensive Child Custody Litigant Sample ((N = 167))</th>
<th>% Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(n (%))</td>
<td>(n (%))</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 205</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15 (14.7%)</td>
<td>9 (5.4%)</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 223</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30 (29.4%)</td>
<td>30 (18.0%)</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 226</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>31 (30.4%)</td>
<td>60 (35.9%)</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 231</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2 (2.0%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 237</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18 (17.6%)</td>
<td>23 (13.8%)</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 248</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8 (7.8%)</td>
<td>2 (1.2%)</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 253</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5 (4.9%)</td>
<td>5 (3.0%)</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 266</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 (1.0%)</td>
<td>1 (0.6%)</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 292</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22 (21.6%)</td>
<td>21 (12.6%)</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 312</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2 (2.0%)</td>
<td>3 (1.8%)</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 316</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33 (32.4%)</td>
<td>36 (21.6%)</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 329</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3 (2.9%)</td>
<td>7 (4.2%)</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Group differences of at least 20% with higher item endorsement rates by child custody litigants are indicated in **bold**. Items with group differences of 20% or greater which were endorsed at a higher rate by sex offenders are **underlined**.
## Appendix D

### Restructured Clinical Scale Item Endorsement Frequencies

**Table 23. MMPI-2-RF RC scale item endorsement frequency rates for presumed defensive sex offender and child custody litigant samples.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Presumed Defensive Sex Offender Sample (N = 268)</th>
<th>Presumed Defensive Child Custody Litigant Sample (N = 260)</th>
<th>% Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>n (%)</td>
<td>n (%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RCd</td>
<td>Item 6</td>
<td>57 (21.3%)</td>
<td>24 (9.2%)</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 22</td>
<td>117 (43.7%)</td>
<td>49 (18.8%)</td>
<td>24.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 30</td>
<td>47 (17.5%)</td>
<td>11 (4.2%)</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 48</td>
<td>68 (25.4%)</td>
<td>15 (5.8%)</td>
<td>19.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 62</td>
<td>58 (21.6%)</td>
<td>14 (5.4%)</td>
<td>16.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 74</td>
<td>31 (11.6%)</td>
<td>5 (1.9%)</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 89</td>
<td>92 (34.3%)</td>
<td>32 (12.3%)</td>
<td>22.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 105</td>
<td>30 (14.6%)</td>
<td>11 (4.2%)</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 117</td>
<td>35 (13.1%)</td>
<td>3 (1.2%)</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 130</td>
<td>54 (20.1%)</td>
<td>18 (6.9%)</td>
<td>13.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 144</td>
<td>56 (20.9%)</td>
<td>22 (8.5%)</td>
<td>12.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 158</td>
<td>45 (16.8%)</td>
<td>10 (3.8%)</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 172</td>
<td>46 (16.8%)</td>
<td>1 (0.4%)</td>
<td>16.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 187</td>
<td>157 (58.6%)</td>
<td>62 (23.8%)</td>
<td>35.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 204</td>
<td>61 (22.8%)</td>
<td>11 (4.2%)</td>
<td>18.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 217</td>
<td>103 (38.4%)</td>
<td>40 (15.4%)</td>
<td>23.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 232</td>
<td>71 (26.5%)</td>
<td>12 (4.6%)</td>
<td>21.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 247</td>
<td>86 (32.1%)</td>
<td>20 (7.7%)</td>
<td>24.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 261</td>
<td>71 (26.5%)</td>
<td>16 (6.2%)</td>
<td>20.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 274</td>
<td>70 (26.1%)</td>
<td>10 (3.8%)</td>
<td>22.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 288</td>
<td>69 (25.7%)</td>
<td>11 (4.2%)</td>
<td>21.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 299</td>
<td>52 (19.4%)</td>
<td>10 (3.8%)</td>
<td>15.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 315</td>
<td>36 (13.4%)</td>
<td>2 (0.8%)</td>
<td>12.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 331</td>
<td>47 (17.5%)</td>
<td>3 (1.2%)</td>
<td>16.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RC1</td>
<td>Item 2</td>
<td>25 (9.3%)</td>
<td>9 (3.5%)</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 15</td>
<td>12 (4.5%)</td>
<td>4 (1.5%)</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 28</td>
<td>49 (18.3%)</td>
<td>15 (5.8%)</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 43</td>
<td>7 (2.6%)</td>
<td>6 (2.3%)</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 52</td>
<td>78 (29.1%)</td>
<td>29 (11.2%)</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 65</td>
<td>71 (26.5%)</td>
<td>29 (11.2%)</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 69</td>
<td>41 (15.3%)</td>
<td>24 (9.2%)</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 76</td>
<td>31 (11.6%)</td>
<td>18 (6.9%)</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 88</td>
<td>91 (34.0%)</td>
<td>59 (22.7%)</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 101</td>
<td>21 (7.8%)</td>
<td>5 (1.9%)</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(continues)
### Table 23 (cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Presumed Defensive Sex Offender Sample</th>
<th>Presumed Defensive Child Custody Litigant Sample</th>
<th>% Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(N = 268)</td>
<td>(N = 260)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RC1</td>
<td>Item 113</td>
<td>53 (19.8%)</td>
<td>22 (8.5%)</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 125</td>
<td>41 (15.3%)</td>
<td>24 (9.2%)</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 137</td>
<td>22 (8.2%)</td>
<td>12 (4.6%)</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 162</td>
<td>49 (18.3%)</td>
<td>11 (4.2%)</td>
<td>14.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 174</td>
<td>37 (13.8%)</td>
<td>10 (3.8%)</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 176</td>
<td>17 (6.3%)</td>
<td>6 (2.3%)</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 189</td>
<td>53 (19.8%)</td>
<td>37 (14.2%)</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 227</td>
<td>27 (10.1%)</td>
<td>17 (6.5%)</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 230</td>
<td>21 (7.8%)</td>
<td>10 (3.8%)</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 242</td>
<td>17 (6.3%)</td>
<td>6 (2.3%)</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 254</td>
<td>73 (27.2%)</td>
<td>36 (13.8%)</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 265</td>
<td>73 (27.2%)</td>
<td>39 (15.0%)</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 277</td>
<td>30 (11.2%)</td>
<td>6 (2.3%)</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 290</td>
<td>94 (35.1%)</td>
<td>50 (19.2%)</td>
<td>15.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 301</td>
<td>35 (13.1%)</td>
<td>16 (6.2%)</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 313</td>
<td>58 (21.6%)</td>
<td>28 (10.8%)</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 328</td>
<td>43 (16.0%)</td>
<td>9 (3.5%)</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RC2</td>
<td>Item 4</td>
<td>40 (14.9%)</td>
<td>12 (4.6%)</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 17</td>
<td>68 (25.4%)</td>
<td>48 (18.5%)</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 25</td>
<td>32 (11.9%)</td>
<td>18 (6.9%)</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 53</td>
<td>35 (13.1%)</td>
<td>40 (15.4%)</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 64</td>
<td>87 (32.5%)</td>
<td>39 (15.0%)</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 83</td>
<td>30 (11.2%)</td>
<td>8 (3.1%)</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 102</td>
<td>13 (4.9%)</td>
<td>6 (2.3%)</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 140</td>
<td>40 (14.9%)</td>
<td>14 (5.4%)</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 160</td>
<td>71 (26.5%)</td>
<td>51 (19.6%)</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 182</td>
<td>132 (49.3%)</td>
<td>114 (43.8%)</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 195</td>
<td>90 (33.6%)</td>
<td>77 (29.6%)</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 202</td>
<td>212 (79.1%)</td>
<td>254 (59.2%)</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 222</td>
<td>60 (22.4%)</td>
<td>28 (10.8%)</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 246</td>
<td>16 (6.0%)</td>
<td>4 (1.5%)</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 282</td>
<td>63 (23.5%)</td>
<td>9 (3.5%)</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 302</td>
<td>73 (27.2%)</td>
<td>51 (19.6%)</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 323</td>
<td>44 (16.4%)</td>
<td>53 (20.4%)</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RC3</td>
<td>Item 10</td>
<td>99 (36.9%)</td>
<td>41 (15.8%)</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 36</td>
<td>152 (56.7%)</td>
<td>90 (34.6%)</td>
<td>22.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 55</td>
<td>155 (57.8%)</td>
<td>94 (36.2%)</td>
<td>21.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 87</td>
<td>89 (33.2%)</td>
<td>51 (19.6%)</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 99</td>
<td>154 (57.5%)</td>
<td>78 (30.0%)</td>
<td>27.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(cont.)
Table 23 (cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Presumed Defensive Sex Offender Sample (N = 268)</th>
<th>Presumed Defensive Child Custody Litigant Sample (N = 260)</th>
<th>% Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>n (%)</td>
<td>n (%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 121</td>
<td>78 (29.1%)</td>
<td>28 (10.8%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>18.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 142</td>
<td>93 (34.7%)</td>
<td>32 (12.3%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>22.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 171</td>
<td>145 (54.1%)</td>
<td>82 (31.5%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>22.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 185</td>
<td>102 (38.1%)</td>
<td>48 (18.5%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>19.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 213</td>
<td>185 (69.0%)</td>
<td>138 (53.1%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>15.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 238</td>
<td>81 (30.2%)</td>
<td>40 (15.4%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>14.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 260</td>
<td>100 (27.3%)</td>
<td>29 (11.2%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>16.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 279</td>
<td>85 (31.7%)</td>
<td>40 (15.4%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>20.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 304</td>
<td>57 (21.3%)</td>
<td>26 (10.0%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>11.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 326</td>
<td>59 (22.0%)</td>
<td>29 (11.2%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>10.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RC4</td>
<td>Item 5</td>
<td>86 (32.1%)</td>
<td>24 (9.2%)</td>
<td>22.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 19</td>
<td>43 (16.0%)</td>
<td>36 (13.8%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 21</td>
<td>133 (49.6%)</td>
<td>109 (41.9%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>7.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 38</td>
<td>129 (48.1%)</td>
<td>40 (15.4%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>32.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 49</td>
<td>99 (35.4%)</td>
<td>64 (24.6%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>12.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 66</td>
<td>95 (35.4%)</td>
<td>75 (28.8%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 80</td>
<td>49 (18.3%)</td>
<td>32 (12.3%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 96</td>
<td>71 (26.5%)</td>
<td>19 (7.3%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>19.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 126</td>
<td>77 (28.7%)</td>
<td>43 (16.5%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>12.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 141</td>
<td>84 (31.3%)</td>
<td>72 (27.7%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 156</td>
<td>175 (65.3%)</td>
<td>128 (49.2%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>16.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 173</td>
<td>41 (15.3%)</td>
<td>17 (6.5%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>8.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 190</td>
<td>200 (74.6%)</td>
<td>113 (43.5%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>31.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 205</td>
<td>51 (19.0%)</td>
<td>17 (6.5%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>12.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 218</td>
<td>12 (4.5%)</td>
<td>3 (1.2%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 223</td>
<td>77 (28.7%)</td>
<td>47 (18.1%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>10.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 237</td>
<td>66 (24.6%)</td>
<td>46 (17.7%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 253</td>
<td>18 (6.7%)</td>
<td>11 (4.2%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 266</td>
<td>16 (6.0%)</td>
<td>1 (0.4%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 297</td>
<td>38 (14.2%)</td>
<td>1 (0.4%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>13.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 312</td>
<td>11 (4.1%)</td>
<td>7 (2.7%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 329</td>
<td>24 (9.0%)</td>
<td>17 (6.5%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RC6</td>
<td>Item 14</td>
<td>11 (4.1%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 34</td>
<td>63 (23.5%)</td>
<td>21 (8.1%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>15.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 71</td>
<td>50 (18.7%)</td>
<td>28 (10.8%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>7.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 92</td>
<td>7 (2.6%)</td>
<td>4 (1.5%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 110</td>
<td>62 (23.1%)</td>
<td>22 (8.5%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>14.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 129</td>
<td>2 (0.7%)</td>
<td>3 (1.2%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 150</td>
<td>6 (2.2%)</td>
<td>3 (1.2%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(cont.)
Table 23 (cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Presumed Defensive Sex Offender Sample</th>
<th>Presumed Defensive Child Custody Litigant Sample</th>
<th>% Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(N = 268) n (%)</td>
<td>(N = 260) n (%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RC6</td>
<td>Item 168</td>
<td>11 (4.1%)</td>
<td>5 (1.9%)</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 194</td>
<td>110 (41.0%)</td>
<td>42 (16.2%)</td>
<td>24.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 212</td>
<td>62 (23.1%)</td>
<td>64 (24.6%)</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 233</td>
<td>61 (22.8%)</td>
<td>23 (8.8%)</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 252</td>
<td>3 (1.1%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 264</td>
<td>32 (11.9%)</td>
<td>48 (18.5%)</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 270</td>
<td>7 (2.6%)</td>
<td>1 (0.4%)</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 287</td>
<td>11 (4.1%)</td>
<td>5 (1.9%)</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 310</td>
<td>23 (8.6%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 332</td>
<td>19 (7.1%)</td>
<td>4 (1.5%)</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RC7</td>
<td>Item 9</td>
<td>26 (9.7%)</td>
<td>4 (1.5%)</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 23</td>
<td>81 (30.2%)</td>
<td>28 (10.8%)</td>
<td>19.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 35</td>
<td>48 (17.9%)</td>
<td>23 (8.8%)</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 51</td>
<td>48 (17.9%)</td>
<td>15 (5.8%)</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 63</td>
<td>86 (32.1%)</td>
<td>15 (5.8%)</td>
<td>26.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 77</td>
<td>57 (21.3%)</td>
<td>18 (6.9%)</td>
<td>14.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 91</td>
<td>79 (29.5%)</td>
<td>30 (11.5%)</td>
<td>18.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 112</td>
<td>68 (25.4%)</td>
<td>25 (9.6%)</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 119</td>
<td>71 (26.5%)</td>
<td>33 (12.7%)</td>
<td>13.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 132</td>
<td>36 (13.4%)</td>
<td>6 (2.3%)</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 146</td>
<td>14 (5.2%)</td>
<td>1 (0.4%)</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 149</td>
<td>71 (26.5%)</td>
<td>19 (7.3%)</td>
<td>19.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 161</td>
<td>30 (11.2%)</td>
<td>3 (1.2%)</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 206</td>
<td>115 (42.9%)</td>
<td>60 (23.1%)</td>
<td>19.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 228</td>
<td>55 (20.5%)</td>
<td>24 (9.2%)</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 235</td>
<td>30 (11.2%)</td>
<td>6 (2.3%)</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 250</td>
<td>41 (15.3%)</td>
<td>14 (5.4%)</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 263</td>
<td>140 (52.2%)</td>
<td>72 (27.7%)</td>
<td>24.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 275</td>
<td>33 (12.3%)</td>
<td>7 (2.7%)</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 289</td>
<td>39 (14.6%)</td>
<td>5 (1.9%)</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 303</td>
<td>84 (31.3%)</td>
<td>19 (7.3%)</td>
<td>24.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 318</td>
<td>48 (17.9%)</td>
<td>13 (5.0%)</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 322</td>
<td>75 (28.0%)</td>
<td>35 (13.5%)</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 335</td>
<td>77 (28.0%)</td>
<td>31 (11.9%)</td>
<td>16.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RC8</td>
<td>Item 12</td>
<td>56 (20.9%)</td>
<td>19 (7.3%)</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 32</td>
<td>76 (28.4%)</td>
<td>38 (14.6%)</td>
<td>13.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 46</td>
<td>41 (15.3%)</td>
<td>8 (3.1%)</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 85</td>
<td>75 (28.0%)</td>
<td>60 (23.1%)</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 106</td>
<td>62 (23.1%)</td>
<td>8 (3.1%)</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(continues)
Table 2 (cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Presumed Defensive Sex Offender Sample</th>
<th>Presumed Defensive Child Custody Litigant Sample</th>
<th>% Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(n) (%)</td>
<td>(n) (%)</td>
<td>(n) (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 122</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>(6.7%)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>(1.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 139</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>(5.2%)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>(1.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 159</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>(12.7%)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>(1.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 179</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>(12.7%)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>(5.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 199</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>(11.9%)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>(5.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 203</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>(4.5%)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>(1.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 216</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>(14.2%)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>(4.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 240</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>(13.4%)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(0.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 257</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>(16.8%)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>(3.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 273</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>(6.7%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(0.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 294</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>(9.3%)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>(4.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 311</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>(25.0%)</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>(21.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 330</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>(13.4%)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>(4.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RC9</td>
<td>Item 13</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>(26.5%)</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 26</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>(16.8%)</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 39</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>(53.0%)</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 47</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>(45.5%)</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 61</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>(64.9%)</td>
<td>190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 72</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>(69.0%)</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 84</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>(8.2%)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 97</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>(38.8%)</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 107</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>(30.2%)</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 118</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>(56.3%)</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 131</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>(38.1%)</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 143</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>(27.6%)</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 155</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>(29.9%)</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 166</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>(29.5%)</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 181</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>(38.4%)</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 193</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>(13.1%)</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 207</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>(41.4%)</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 219</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>(43.7%)</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 231</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>(3.7%)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 244</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>(77.6%)</td>
<td>202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 248</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>(14.2%)</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 256</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>(48.9%)</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 267</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>(16.4%)</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 292</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>(23.9%)</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 305</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>(33.2%)</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 316</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>(40.7%)</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 327</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>(32.8%)</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(cont.)
### Table 23 (cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Presumed Defensive Sex Offender Sample (N = 268)</th>
<th>Presumed Defensive Child Custody Litigant Sample (N = 260)</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>n (%)</td>
<td>n (%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 337</td>
<td>91 (34.0%)</td>
<td>64 (24.6%)</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Group differences of at least 20% with higher item endorsement rates by child custody litigants are indicated in **bold**. Items with group differences of 20% or greater which were endorsed at a higher rate by sex offenders are **underlined**.
Table 24. MMPI-2-RF RC scale item endorsement frequency rates for clearly defensive sex offender and child custody litigant samples.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Clearly Defensive Sex Offender Sample</th>
<th>Clearly Defensive Child Custody Litigant Sample</th>
<th>% Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(N = 102)</td>
<td>(N = 167)</td>
<td>n (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RCd</td>
<td>Item 6</td>
<td>8 (7.8%)</td>
<td>9 (5.4%)</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 22</td>
<td>25 (24.5%)</td>
<td>14 (8.4%)</td>
<td>16.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 30</td>
<td>9 (8.8%)</td>
<td>3 (1.8%)</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 48</td>
<td>10 (9.8%)</td>
<td>5 (3.0%)</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 62</td>
<td>10 (9.8%)</td>
<td>3 (1.8%)</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 74</td>
<td>4 (3.9%)</td>
<td>1 (0.6%)</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 89</td>
<td>11 (10.8%)</td>
<td>4 (2.4%)</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 105</td>
<td>4 (3.9%)</td>
<td>3 (1.8%)</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 117</td>
<td>5 (4.9%)</td>
<td>1 (0.6%)</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 130</td>
<td>10 (9.8%)</td>
<td>4 (2.4%)</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 144</td>
<td>9 (8.8%)</td>
<td>3 (1.8%)</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 158</td>
<td>10 (9.8%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 172</td>
<td>3 (2.9%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 187</td>
<td>39 (38.2%)</td>
<td>16 (9.6%)</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 204</td>
<td>9 (8.8%)</td>
<td>4 (2.4%)</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 217</td>
<td>32 (31.4%)</td>
<td>18 (10.8%)</td>
<td>20.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 232</td>
<td>9 (8.8%)</td>
<td>4 (2.4%)</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 247</td>
<td>20 (19.6%)</td>
<td>4 (2.4%)</td>
<td>17.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 261</td>
<td>7 (6.9%)</td>
<td>1 (0.6%)</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 274</td>
<td>14 (13.7%)</td>
<td>3 (1.8%)</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 288</td>
<td>11 (10.8%)</td>
<td>2 (1.2%)</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 299</td>
<td>8 (7.8%)</td>
<td>2 (1.2%)</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 315</td>
<td>9 (9.8%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 331</td>
<td>8 (7.8%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RC1</td>
<td>Item 2</td>
<td>6 (5.9%)</td>
<td>7 (4.2%)</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 15</td>
<td>2 (2.0%)</td>
<td>2 (1.2%)</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 28</td>
<td>19 (18.6%)</td>
<td>6 (3.6%)</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 43</td>
<td>1 (1.0%)</td>
<td>1 (0.6%)</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 52</td>
<td>70 (68.6%)</td>
<td>16 (9.6%)</td>
<td>59.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 65</td>
<td>22 (21.6%)</td>
<td>12 (7.2%)</td>
<td>14.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 69</td>
<td>18 (17.6%)</td>
<td>15 (9.0%)</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 76</td>
<td>10 (9.8%)</td>
<td>7 (4.2%)</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 88</td>
<td>36 (35.3%)</td>
<td>29 (17.4%)</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 101</td>
<td>7 (6.9%)</td>
<td>2 (1.2%)</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 113</td>
<td>12 (11.8%)</td>
<td>15 (9.0%)</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 125</td>
<td>6 (5.9%)</td>
<td>13 (7.8%)</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 137</td>
<td>1 (1.0%)</td>
<td>2 (1.2%)</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 162</td>
<td>11 (10.8%)</td>
<td>4 (2.4%)</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(cont.)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Clearly Defensive Sex Offender Sample</th>
<th>Clearly Defensive Child Custody Litigant Sample</th>
<th>% Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(N = 102)</td>
<td>(N = 167)</td>
<td>(n)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 174</td>
<td>9 (8.8%)</td>
<td>1 (0.6%)</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 176</td>
<td>4 (3.9%)</td>
<td>1 (0.6%)</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 189</td>
<td>12 (11.8%)</td>
<td>25 (15.0%)</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 227</td>
<td>11 (10.8%)</td>
<td>9 (5.4%)</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 230</td>
<td>3 (2.9%)</td>
<td>5 (3.0%)</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 242</td>
<td>5 (4.9%)</td>
<td>3 (1.8%)</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 254</td>
<td>40 (39.2%)</td>
<td>15 (9.0%)</td>
<td>30.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 265</td>
<td>21 (20.6%)</td>
<td>17 (10.2%)</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 277</td>
<td>7 (6.9%)</td>
<td>1 (0.6%)</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 290</td>
<td>38 (37.3%)</td>
<td>30 (18.0%)</td>
<td>19.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 301</td>
<td>8 (7.8%)</td>
<td>5 (3.0%)</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 313</td>
<td>20 (19.6%)</td>
<td>14 (8.4%)</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 328</td>
<td>14 (13.7%)</td>
<td>4 (2.4%)</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RC2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 4</td>
<td>6 (5.9%)</td>
<td>2 (1.2%)</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 17</td>
<td>14 (13.7%)</td>
<td>20 (12.0%)</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 25</td>
<td>11 (10.8%)</td>
<td>8 (4.8%)</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 53</td>
<td>14 (13.7%)</td>
<td>28 (16.8%)</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 64</td>
<td>21 (20.6%)</td>
<td>24 (14.4%)</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 83</td>
<td>8 (7.8%)</td>
<td>4 (2.4%)</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 102</td>
<td>5 (4.9%)</td>
<td>3 (1.8%)</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 140</td>
<td>8 (7.8%)</td>
<td>8 (4.8%)</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 160</td>
<td>24 (23.5%)</td>
<td>34 (20.4%)</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 182</td>
<td>29 (28.4%)</td>
<td>61 (36.5%)</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 195</td>
<td>33 (32.4%)</td>
<td>52 (31.1%)</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 202</td>
<td>62 (60.8%)</td>
<td>76 (45.5%)</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 222</td>
<td>6 (5.9%)</td>
<td>13 (7.8%)</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 246</td>
<td>3 (2.9%)</td>
<td>4 (2.4%)</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 282</td>
<td>11 (10.8%)</td>
<td>3 (1.8%)</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 302</td>
<td>21 (20.6%)</td>
<td>25 (15.0%)</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 323</td>
<td>14 (13.7%)</td>
<td>34 (20.4%)</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RC3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 10</td>
<td>26 (25.5%)</td>
<td>10 (6.0%)</td>
<td>19.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 36</td>
<td>42 (41.2%)</td>
<td>36 (21.6%)</td>
<td>19.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 55</td>
<td>41 (40.2%)</td>
<td>42 (25.1%)</td>
<td>15.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 87</td>
<td>24 (23.5%)</td>
<td>23 (13.8%)</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 99</td>
<td>37 (36.3%)</td>
<td>28 (16.8%)</td>
<td>19.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 121</td>
<td>19 (18.6%)</td>
<td>15 (9.0%)</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 142</td>
<td>21 (20.6%)</td>
<td>13 (7.8%)</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 171</td>
<td>36 (35.3%)</td>
<td>30 (18.0%)</td>
<td>17.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 185</td>
<td>30 (29.4%)</td>
<td>19 (11.4%)</td>
<td>18.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(continues)
Table 24 (cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Clearly Defensive Sex Offender Sample (N = 102)</th>
<th>Clearly Defensive Child Custody Litigant Sample (N = 167)</th>
<th>% Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>n (%)</td>
<td>n (%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 213</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>(49.0%)</td>
<td>68 (40.7%)</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 238</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>(14.7%)</td>
<td>20 (12.0%)</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 260</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>(28.4%)</td>
<td>10 (6.0%)</td>
<td>22.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 279</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>(27.5%)</td>
<td>14 (8.4%)</td>
<td>19.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 304</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>(18.6%)</td>
<td>14 (8.4%)</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 326</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>(20.6%)</td>
<td>10 (6.0%)</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RC4</td>
<td>Item 5</td>
<td>17 (16.7%)</td>
<td>6 (3.6%)</td>
<td>13.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 19</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>(11.8%)</td>
<td>18 (10.8%)</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 21</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>(29.4%)</td>
<td>61 (36.5%)</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 38</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>(26.5%)</td>
<td>28 (16.8%)</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 49</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>(23.5%)</td>
<td>39 (23.4%)</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 66</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>(32.4%)</td>
<td>44 (26.3%)</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 80</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>(18.6%)</td>
<td>13 (7.8%)</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 96</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>(19.6%)</td>
<td>6 (3.6%)</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 126</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>(18.6%)</td>
<td>23 (13.8%)</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 141</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>(21.6%)</td>
<td>40 (24.0%)</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 156</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>(52.9%)</td>
<td>67 (40.1%)</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 173</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>(13.7%)</td>
<td>6 (3.6%)</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 190</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>(70.6%)</td>
<td>65 (38.9%)</td>
<td>31.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 205</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>(14.7%)</td>
<td>9 (5.4%)</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 218</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>(2.9%)</td>
<td>1 (0.6%)</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 223</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>(29.4%)</td>
<td>30 (18.0%)</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 237</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>(17.6%)</td>
<td>23 (13.8%)</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 253</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>(4.9%)</td>
<td>5 (3.0%)</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 266</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(1.0%)</td>
<td>1 (0.6%)</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 297</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>(6.9%)</td>
<td>1 (0.6%)</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 312</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(2.0%)</td>
<td>3 (1.8%)</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 329</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>(2.9%)</td>
<td>7 (4.2%)</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RC6</td>
<td>Item 14</td>
<td>4 (3.9%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 34</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>(17.6%)</td>
<td>12 (7.2%)</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 71</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>(23.5%)</td>
<td>11 (6.6%)</td>
<td>16.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 92</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(2.0%)</td>
<td>1 (0.6%)</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 110</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>(16.7%)</td>
<td>6 (3.6%)</td>
<td>13.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 129</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(1.0%)</td>
<td>1 (0.6%)</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 150</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(1.0%)</td>
<td>2 (1.2%)</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 168</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(2.0%)</td>
<td>1 (0.6%)</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 194</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>(24.5%)</td>
<td>18 (10.8%)</td>
<td>13.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 212</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>(20.6%)</td>
<td>27 (16.2%)</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 233</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>(15.7%)</td>
<td>4 (2.4%)</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 24 (cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Clearly Defensive Sex Offender Sample ( (N = 102) )</th>
<th>Clearly Defensive Child Custody Litigant Sample ( (N = 167) )</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 252</td>
<td>1 (1.0%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 264</td>
<td>14 (13.7%)</td>
<td>22 (13.2%)</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 270</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 287</td>
<td>1 (1.0%)</td>
<td>1 (0.6%)</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 310</td>
<td>4 (3.9%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 332</td>
<td>7 (6.9%)</td>
<td>2 (1.2%)</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RC7</td>
<td>Item 9</td>
<td>6 (5.9%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 23</td>
<td>7 (6.9%)</td>
<td>5 (3.0%)</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 35</td>
<td>10 (9.8%)</td>
<td>4 (2.4%)</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 51</td>
<td>6 (5.9%)</td>
<td>7 (4.2%)</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 63</td>
<td>11 (10.8%)</td>
<td>1 (0.6%)</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 77</td>
<td>12 (11.8%)</td>
<td>5 (3.0%)</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 91</td>
<td>18 (17.6%)</td>
<td>11 (6.6%)</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 112</td>
<td>12 (11.8%)</td>
<td>7 (4.2%)</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 119</td>
<td>8 (7.8%)</td>
<td>9 (5.4%)</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 132</td>
<td>7 (6.9%)</td>
<td>2 (1.2%)</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 146</td>
<td>2 (2.0%)</td>
<td>1 (0.6%)</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 149</td>
<td>11 (10.8%)</td>
<td>4 (2.4%)</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 161</td>
<td>3 (2.9%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 206</td>
<td>22 (21.6%)</td>
<td>25 (15.0%)</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 228</td>
<td>7 (6.9%)</td>
<td>5 (3.0%)</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 235</td>
<td>3 (2.9%)</td>
<td>2 (1.2%)</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 250</td>
<td>9 (8.8%)</td>
<td>2 (1.2%)</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 263</td>
<td>38 (37.3%)</td>
<td>31 (18.6%)</td>
<td>18.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 275</td>
<td>6 (5.9%)</td>
<td>1 (0.6%)</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 289</td>
<td>9 (8.8%)</td>
<td>2 (1.2%)</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 303</td>
<td>19 (18.6%)</td>
<td>2 (1.2%)</td>
<td>17.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 318</td>
<td>8 (7.8%)</td>
<td>1 (0.6%)</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 322</td>
<td>17 (16.7%)</td>
<td>12 (7.2%)</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 335</td>
<td>11 (10.8%)</td>
<td>11 (6.6%)</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RC8</td>
<td>Item 12</td>
<td>17 (16.7%)</td>
<td>10 (6.0%)</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 32</td>
<td>9 (8.8%)</td>
<td>19 (11.4%)</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 46</td>
<td>12 (11.8%)</td>
<td>5 (3.0%)</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 85</td>
<td>24 (23.5%)</td>
<td>34 (20.4%)</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 106</td>
<td>8 (7.8%)</td>
<td>2 (1.2%)</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 122</td>
<td>3 (2.9%)</td>
<td>1 (0.6%)</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 139</td>
<td>5 (4.9%)</td>
<td>1 (0.6%)</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 159</td>
<td>5 (4.9%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 179</td>
<td>3 (2.9%)</td>
<td>2 (1.2%)</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(cont.)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Clearly Defensive Sex Offender Sample</th>
<th>Clearly Defensive Child Custody Litigant Sample</th>
<th>% Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(N = 102)</td>
<td>(N = 167) n (%)</td>
<td>n (%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 199</td>
<td>6 (5.9%)</td>
<td>6 (3.6%)</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 203</td>
<td>2 (2.0%)</td>
<td>1 (0.6%)</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 216</td>
<td>9 (8.8%)</td>
<td>5 (3.0%)</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 240</td>
<td>7 (6.9%)</td>
<td>1 (0.6%)</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 257</td>
<td>4 (3.9%)</td>
<td>2 (1.2%)</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 273</td>
<td>2 (2.0%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 294</td>
<td>7 (6.9%)</td>
<td>6 (3.6%)</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 311</td>
<td>20 (19.6%)</td>
<td>32 (19.2%)</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 330</td>
<td>7 (6.9%)</td>
<td>2 (1.2%)</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RC9</td>
<td>Item 13</td>
<td>14 (13.7%)</td>
<td>20 (12.0%)</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 26</td>
<td>6 (5.9%)</td>
<td>5 (3.0%)</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 39</td>
<td>43 (42.2%)</td>
<td>41 (24.6%)</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 47</td>
<td>43 (42.2%)</td>
<td>76 (45.5%)</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 61</td>
<td>42 (41.2%)</td>
<td>114 (68.3%)</td>
<td>27.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 72</td>
<td>53 (52.0%)</td>
<td>63 (37.7%)</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 84</td>
<td>2 (2.0%)</td>
<td>1 (0.6%)</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 97</td>
<td>25 (24.5%)</td>
<td>19 (11.4%)</td>
<td>13.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 107</td>
<td>22 (21.6%)</td>
<td>59 (35.3%)</td>
<td>13.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 118</td>
<td>47 (46.1%)</td>
<td>91 (54.5%)</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 131</td>
<td>27 (26.5%)</td>
<td>50 (29.9%)</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 143</td>
<td>22 (21.6%)</td>
<td>28 (16.8%)</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 155</td>
<td>17 (16.7%)</td>
<td>10 (6.0%)</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 166</td>
<td>32 (31.4%)</td>
<td>33 (19.8%)</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 181</td>
<td>36 (35.5%)</td>
<td>56 (33.5%)</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 193</td>
<td>4 (3.9%)</td>
<td>13 (7.8%)</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 207</td>
<td>43 (42.2%)</td>
<td>56 (33.5%)</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 219</td>
<td>27 (26.5%)</td>
<td>35 (21.0%)</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 231</td>
<td>2 (2.0%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 244</td>
<td>85 (83.3%)</td>
<td>131 (78.4%)</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 248</td>
<td>8 (7.8%)</td>
<td>2 (1.2%)</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 256</td>
<td>44 (43.1%)</td>
<td>61 (36.5%)</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 267</td>
<td>9 (8.8%)</td>
<td>5 (3.0%)</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 292</td>
<td>22 (18.6%)</td>
<td>21 (12.6%)</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 305</td>
<td>19 (18.6%)</td>
<td>38 (22.8%)</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 316</td>
<td>33 (32.4%)</td>
<td>36 (21.6%)</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 327</td>
<td>24 (23.5%)</td>
<td>23 (13.8%)</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 337</td>
<td>18 (17.6%)</td>
<td>21 (12.6%)</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.** Group differences of at least 20% with higher item endorsement rates by child custody litigants are indicated in **bold**. Items with group differences of 20% or greater which were endorsed at a higher rate by sex offenders are **underlined.**
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Specific Problem Scales Item Endorsement Frequencies

Table 25. MMPI-2-RF Specific Problem scale item endorsement frequency rates for presumed defensive sex offender and child custody litigant samples.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Presumed Defensive Sex Offender Sample (N = 102)</th>
<th>Presumed Defensive Child Custody Litigant Sample (N = 167)</th>
<th>% Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Malaise (MLS)</td>
<td>Item 4</td>
<td>40 (4.9%)</td>
<td>12 (4.6%)</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 18</td>
<td>25 (9.3%)</td>
<td>7 (2.7%)</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 25</td>
<td>32 (11.9%)</td>
<td>18 (6.9%)</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 163</td>
<td>94 (35.1%)</td>
<td>40 (15.4%)</td>
<td>19.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 174</td>
<td>37 (13.8%)</td>
<td>10 (3.8%)</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 202</td>
<td>212 (79.1%)</td>
<td>154 (59.2%)</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 262</td>
<td>48 (17.9%)</td>
<td>31 (11.9%)</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 333</td>
<td>76 (28.4%)</td>
<td>33 (12.7%)</td>
<td>15.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gastrointestinal</td>
<td>Item 2</td>
<td>25 (9.3%)</td>
<td>9 (3.5%)</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complaints (GIC)</td>
<td>Item 43</td>
<td>7 (2.6%)</td>
<td>6 (2.3%)</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 76</td>
<td>31 (11.6%)</td>
<td>18 (6.9%)</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 210</td>
<td>32 (11.9%)</td>
<td>9 (3.5%)</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 230</td>
<td>21 (7.8%)</td>
<td>10 (3.8%)</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head Pain Complaints</td>
<td>Item 88</td>
<td>91 (34.0%)</td>
<td>59 (22.7%)</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(HPC)</td>
<td>Item 101</td>
<td>21 (7.8%)</td>
<td>5 (1.9%)</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 176</td>
<td>17 (6.3%)</td>
<td>5 (2.3%)</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 189</td>
<td>53 (19.8%)</td>
<td>37 (14.2%)</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 265</td>
<td>73 (27.2%)</td>
<td>39 (15.0%)</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 328</td>
<td>43 (16.0%)</td>
<td>9 (3.5%)</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neurological Complaints</td>
<td>Item 69</td>
<td>41 (15.3%)</td>
<td>24 (9.2%)</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(NUC)</td>
<td>Item 113</td>
<td>53 (19.8%)</td>
<td>22 (8.5%)</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 122</td>
<td>18 (6.7%)</td>
<td>5 (1.9%)</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 125</td>
<td>41 (15.3%)</td>
<td>24 (9.2%)</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 162</td>
<td>49 (18.3%)</td>
<td>11 (4.2%)</td>
<td>14.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 186</td>
<td>60 (22.4%)</td>
<td>29 (11.2%)</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 227</td>
<td>27 (10.1%)</td>
<td>17 (6.5%)</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 277</td>
<td>30 (11.2%)</td>
<td>6 (2.3%)</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 301</td>
<td>35 (13.1%)</td>
<td>16 (6.2%)</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 313</td>
<td>58 (21.6%)</td>
<td>28 (10.8%)</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(cont.)
### Table 25 (cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Presumed Defensive Sex Offender Sample (N = 102)</th>
<th>Presumed Defensive Child Custody Litigant Sample (N = 167)</th>
<th>% Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive Complaints</td>
<td>Item 31</td>
<td>35 (13.1%)</td>
<td>15 (5.8%)</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 59</td>
<td>50 (18.7%)</td>
<td>18 (6.9%)</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(COG)</td>
<td>Item 102</td>
<td>13 (4.9%)</td>
<td>6 (2.3%)</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 136</td>
<td>72 (26.9%)</td>
<td>20 (7.7%)</td>
<td>19.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 159</td>
<td>30 (11.2%)</td>
<td>3 (1.2%)</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 200</td>
<td>75 (28.0%)</td>
<td>25 (9.6%)</td>
<td>18.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 240</td>
<td>26 (13.4%)</td>
<td>1 (0.4%)</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 257</td>
<td>45 (16.8%)</td>
<td>9 (3.5%)</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 280</td>
<td>71 (26.5%)</td>
<td>17 (6.5%)</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 306</td>
<td>116 (43.3%)</td>
<td>42 (16.2%)</td>
<td>27.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suicidal/Death Ideation (SUI)</td>
<td>Item 93</td>
<td>31 (11.6%)</td>
<td>2 (0.8%)</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 120</td>
<td>11 (4.1%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 164</td>
<td>9 (3.4%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 251</td>
<td>11 (4.1%)</td>
<td>1 (0.4%)</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 334</td>
<td>19 (7.1%)</td>
<td>1 (0.4%)</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helplessness/ Hopelessness (HLP)</td>
<td>Item 135</td>
<td>52 (19.4%)</td>
<td>28 (10.8%)</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 169</td>
<td>32 (11.9%)</td>
<td>2 (0.8%)</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 214</td>
<td>46 (17.2%)</td>
<td>5 (1.9%)</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 282</td>
<td>63 (23.5%)</td>
<td>9 (3.5%)</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 336</td>
<td>71 (26.5%)</td>
<td>37 (14.2%)</td>
<td>12.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Doubt (SFD)</td>
<td>Item 48</td>
<td>68 (25.4%)</td>
<td>15 (5.8%)</td>
<td>19.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 89</td>
<td>92 (34.3%)</td>
<td>32 (12.3%)</td>
<td>22.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 232</td>
<td>71 (26.5%)</td>
<td>12 (4.6%)</td>
<td>21.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 288</td>
<td>69 (25.7%)</td>
<td>11 (4.2%)</td>
<td>21.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inefficacy (NFC)</td>
<td>Item 27</td>
<td>102 (38.1%)</td>
<td>33 (19.6%)</td>
<td>18.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 68</td>
<td>125 (46.6%)</td>
<td>51 (19.6%)</td>
<td>27.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 108</td>
<td>83 (31.0%)</td>
<td>24 (9.2%)</td>
<td>21.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 152</td>
<td>48 (17.9%)</td>
<td>8 (3.1%)</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 198</td>
<td>50 (18.7%)</td>
<td>6 (2.3%)</td>
<td>16.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 229</td>
<td>99 (36.9%)</td>
<td>28 (10.8%)</td>
<td>26.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 271</td>
<td>124 (46.3%)</td>
<td>57 (21.9%)</td>
<td>24.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 274</td>
<td>70 (26.1%)</td>
<td>10 (3.8%)</td>
<td>22.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 324</td>
<td>103 (38.4%)</td>
<td>28 (10.8%)</td>
<td>27.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scale</td>
<td>Item #</td>
<td>Presumed Defensive Sex Offender Sample (N = 102)</td>
<td>Presumed Defensive Child Custody Litigant Sample (N = 167)</td>
<td>% Difference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stress/Worry (STW)</td>
<td>Item 29</td>
<td>85 (31.7%)</td>
<td>32 (12.3%)</td>
<td>19.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 73</td>
<td>67 (25.0%)</td>
<td>31 (11.9%)</td>
<td>13.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 123</td>
<td>107 (39.9%)</td>
<td>35 (13.5%)</td>
<td>26.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 167</td>
<td>70 (26.1%)</td>
<td>16 (6.2%)</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 224</td>
<td>80 (29.9%)</td>
<td>44 (16.9%)</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 234</td>
<td>214 (79.9%)</td>
<td>195 (75.0%)</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 309</td>
<td>141 (52.6%)</td>
<td>77 (29.6%)</td>
<td>23.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anxiety (AXY)</td>
<td>Item 79</td>
<td>35 (13.1%)</td>
<td>10 (3.8%)</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 146</td>
<td>14 (5.2%)</td>
<td>1 (0.4%)</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 228</td>
<td>55 (20.8%)</td>
<td>24 (9.2%)</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 275</td>
<td>33 (12.3%)</td>
<td>7 (2.7%)</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 289</td>
<td>39 (14.6%)</td>
<td>5 (1.9%)</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anger Proneness (ANP)</td>
<td>Item 119</td>
<td>71 (26.5%)</td>
<td>33 (12.7%)</td>
<td>13.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 134</td>
<td>51 (19.0%)</td>
<td>26 (10.0%)</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 155</td>
<td>80 (29.9%)</td>
<td>41 (15.8%)</td>
<td>14.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 248</td>
<td>38 (14.2%)</td>
<td>12 (4.6%)</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 293</td>
<td>25 (9.3%)</td>
<td>12 (4.6%)</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 303</td>
<td>84 (31.3%)</td>
<td>19 (7.3%)</td>
<td>24.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 318</td>
<td>48 (17.9%)</td>
<td>13 (5.0%)</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavior Restricting Fears (BRF)</td>
<td>Item 20</td>
<td>12 (4.5%)</td>
<td>3 (1.2%)</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 56</td>
<td>18 (6.7%)</td>
<td>2 (0.8%)</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 90</td>
<td>40 (14.9%)</td>
<td>11 (4.2%)</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 128</td>
<td>6 (2.2%)</td>
<td>7 (2.7%)</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 165</td>
<td>18 (6.7%)</td>
<td>2 (0.8%)</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 208</td>
<td>15 (5.6%)</td>
<td>3 (1.2%)</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 243</td>
<td>24 (9.0%)</td>
<td>7 (2.7%)</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 284</td>
<td>15 (5.6%)</td>
<td>1 (0.4%)</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 317</td>
<td>13 (4.9%)</td>
<td>1 (0.4%)</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple Specific Fears (MSF)</td>
<td>Item 54</td>
<td>44 (16.4%)</td>
<td>60 (23.1%)</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 82</td>
<td>86 (32.1%)</td>
<td>91 (35.0%)</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 115</td>
<td>74 (27.6%)</td>
<td>74 (28.5%)</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 151</td>
<td>17 (6.3%)</td>
<td>8 (3.1%)</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 184</td>
<td>63 (23.5%)</td>
<td>47 (18.1%)</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 220</td>
<td>126 (47.0%)</td>
<td>116 (44.6%)</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 258</td>
<td>87 (32.5%)</td>
<td>53 (20.4%)</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 286</td>
<td>40 (14.9%)</td>
<td>34 (13.1%)</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 25 (cont.)
## Table 2 (cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Presumed Defensive Sex Offender Sample (N = 102)</th>
<th>Presumed Defensive Child Custody Litigant Sample (N = 167)</th>
<th>% Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(n) (%)</td>
<td>(n) (%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juvenile Conduct Problems (JCP)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 21</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>(49.6%)</td>
<td>109 (41.9%)</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 66</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>(35.4%)</td>
<td>75 (28.8%)</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 96</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>(26.5%)</td>
<td>19 (7.3%)</td>
<td>19.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 205</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>(19.0%)</td>
<td>17 (6.5%)</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 223</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>(28.7%)</td>
<td>47 (18.1%)</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 253</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>(6.7%)</td>
<td>11 (4.2%)</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substance Abuse (SUB)</td>
<td>Item 49</td>
<td>99 (36.9%)</td>
<td>64 (24.6%)</td>
<td>12.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 86</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>(4.1%)</td>
<td>2 (0.8%)</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 141</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>(31.3%)</td>
<td>72 (27.7%)</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 192</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>(9.7%)</td>
<td>8 (3.1%)</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 237</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>(24.6%)</td>
<td>46 (17.7%)</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 266</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>(6.0%)</td>
<td>1 (0.4%)</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 297</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>(14.2%)</td>
<td>1 (0.4%)</td>
<td>13.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggression (AGG)</td>
<td>Item 23</td>
<td>81 (30.2%)</td>
<td>28 (10.8%)</td>
<td>19.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 26</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>(16.8%)</td>
<td>12 (4.6%)</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 41</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(0.7%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 84</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>(8.2%)</td>
<td>5 (1.9%)</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 231</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>(3.7%)</td>
<td>1 (0.4%)</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 312</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>(4.1%)</td>
<td>7 (2.7%)</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 316</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>(40.7%)</td>
<td>68 (26.2%)</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 329</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>(9.0%)</td>
<td>17 (6.5%)</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 337</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>(34.0%)</td>
<td>64 (24.6%)</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activation (ACT)</td>
<td>Item 72</td>
<td>185 (69.0%)</td>
<td>131 (50.4%)</td>
<td>18.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 81</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>(16.8%)</td>
<td>11 (4.2%)</td>
<td>12.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 166</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>(29.5%)</td>
<td>49 (18.8%)</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 181</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>(41.4%)</td>
<td>92 (35.4%)</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 207</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>(41.4%)</td>
<td>98 (37.7%)</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 219</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>(43.7%)</td>
<td>74 (28.5%)</td>
<td>15.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 267</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>(16.4%)</td>
<td>12 (4.6%)</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 285</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>(23.9%)</td>
<td>19 (7.3%)</td>
<td>16.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Problems (FML)</td>
<td>Item 19</td>
<td>43 (16.0%)</td>
<td>36 (13.8%)</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(cont.)
## Table 25 (cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Presumed Defensive Sex Offender Sample (N = 102)</th>
<th>Presumed Defensive Child Custody Litigant Sample (N = 167)</th>
<th>% Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 58</td>
<td>128 (47.8%)</td>
<td>68 (26.2%)</td>
<td>21.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 80</td>
<td>49 (18.3%)</td>
<td>32 (12.3%)</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 103</td>
<td>43 (16.0%)</td>
<td>24 (9.2%)</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 138</td>
<td>25 (9.3%)</td>
<td>15 (5.8%)</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 180</td>
<td>41 (15.3%)</td>
<td>44 (16.9%)</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 215</td>
<td>54 (20.1%)</td>
<td>16 (6.2%)</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 269</td>
<td>25 (9.3%)</td>
<td>11 (4.2%)</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 281</td>
<td>28 (10.4%)</td>
<td>5 (1.9%)</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 307</td>
<td>29 (10.8%)</td>
<td>5 (1.9%)</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal Passivity (IPP)</td>
<td>Item 24</td>
<td>59 (22.0%)</td>
<td>20 (7.7%)</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 60</td>
<td>71 (26.5%)</td>
<td>77 (29.6%)</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 104</td>
<td>120 (44.8%)</td>
<td>113 (43.5%)</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 147</td>
<td>61 (22.8%)</td>
<td>53 (20.4%)</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 197</td>
<td>67 (25.0%)</td>
<td>79 (30.4%)</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 239</td>
<td>55 (20.5%)</td>
<td>47 (31.2%)</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 276</td>
<td>79 (29.5%)</td>
<td>81 (31.2%)</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 302</td>
<td>73 (27.2%)</td>
<td>51 (19.6%)</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 321</td>
<td>180 (67.2%)</td>
<td>163 (62.7%)</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 327</td>
<td>180 (67.2%)</td>
<td>202 (77.7%)</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Avoidance (SAV)</td>
<td>Item 11</td>
<td>194 (72.4%)</td>
<td>177 (68.1%)</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 17</td>
<td>68 (25.4%)</td>
<td>48 (18.5%)</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 47</td>
<td>146 (54.5%)</td>
<td>141 (54.2%)</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 57</td>
<td>85 (31.7%)</td>
<td>49 (18.8%)</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 94</td>
<td>40 (14.9%)</td>
<td>15 (5.8%)</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 109</td>
<td>123 (45.9%)</td>
<td>75 (28.8%)</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 153</td>
<td>95 (35.4%)</td>
<td>98 (37.7%)</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 201</td>
<td>88 (32.8%)</td>
<td>38 (14.6%)</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 222</td>
<td>60 (22.4%)</td>
<td>28 (10.8%)</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 278</td>
<td>107 (39.9%)</td>
<td>43 (16.5%)</td>
<td>23.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shyness (SHY)</td>
<td>Item 35</td>
<td>48 (17.9%)</td>
<td>23 (8.8%)</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 44</td>
<td>82 (30.6%)</td>
<td>28 (10.8%)</td>
<td>19.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 91</td>
<td>79 (29.5%)</td>
<td>30 (11.5%)</td>
<td>18.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 114</td>
<td>99 (36.9%)</td>
<td>37 (14.2%)</td>
<td>22.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 177</td>
<td>105 (39.2%)</td>
<td>33 (12.7%)</td>
<td>26.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 249</td>
<td>131 (48.9%)</td>
<td>90 (34.6%)</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 295</td>
<td>66 (24.6%)</td>
<td>38 (14.6%)</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(continues)
### Table 25 (cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Presumed Defensive Sex Offender Sample (N = 102)</th>
<th>Presumed Defensive Child Custody Litigant Sample (N = 167)</th>
<th>% Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disaffiliativeness (DSF)</td>
<td>Item 8</td>
<td>22 (8.2%)</td>
<td>10 (3.8%)</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 67</td>
<td>24 (9.0%)</td>
<td>3 (1.2%)</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 124</td>
<td>9 (3.4%)</td>
<td>1 (0.4%)</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 175</td>
<td>22 (8.2%)</td>
<td>3 (1.2%)</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 236</td>
<td>27 (10.1%)</td>
<td>6 (2.3%)</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 291</td>
<td>30 (11.2%)</td>
<td>5 (1.9%)</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Group differences of at least 20% with higher item endorsement rates by child custody litigants are indicated in **bold.** Items with group differences of 20% or greater which were endorsed at a higher rate by sex offenders are *underlined.*
### Table 26. MMPI-2-RF Specific Problem scale item endorsement frequency rates for clearly defensive sex offender and child custody litigant samples.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Clearly Defensive Sex Offender Sample ( (N = 102) )</th>
<th>Clearly Defensive Child Custody Litigant Sample ( (N = 167) )</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Malaise (MLS)</td>
<td>Item 4</td>
<td>6 (5.9%)</td>
<td>2 (1.2%)</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 18</td>
<td>6 (5.9%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 25</td>
<td>11 (10.8%)</td>
<td>8 (4.8%)</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 163</td>
<td>21 (20.6%)</td>
<td>18 (10.8%)</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 174</td>
<td>9 (8.8%)</td>
<td>1 (0.6%)</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 202</td>
<td>39 (38.2%)</td>
<td>76 (45.5%)</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 262</td>
<td>11 (10.8%)</td>
<td>12 (7.2%)</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 333</td>
<td>18 (17.6%)</td>
<td>10 (6.0%)</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gastrointestinal</td>
<td>Item 2</td>
<td>6 (5.9%)</td>
<td>7 (4.2%)</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complaints (GIC)</td>
<td>Item 43</td>
<td>1 (1.0%)</td>
<td>1 (0.6%)</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 76</td>
<td>10 (9.8%)</td>
<td>7 (4.2%)</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 210</td>
<td>7 (6.9%)</td>
<td>5 (3.0%)</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 230</td>
<td>3 (2.9%)</td>
<td>5 (3.0%)</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head Pain Complaints</td>
<td>Item 88</td>
<td>36 (35.3%)</td>
<td>29 (17.4%)</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(HPC)</td>
<td>Item 101</td>
<td>7 (6.9%)</td>
<td>2 (1.2%)</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 113</td>
<td>12 (11.8%)</td>
<td>15 (9.0%)</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 122</td>
<td>3 (2.9%)</td>
<td>1 (0.6%)</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neurological Complaints</td>
<td>Item 162</td>
<td>11 (10.8%)</td>
<td>9 (5.4%)</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(NUC)</td>
<td>Item 186</td>
<td>13 (12.7%)</td>
<td>13 (7.8%)</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 227</td>
<td>11 (10.8%)</td>
<td>9 (5.4%)</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 277</td>
<td>7 (6.9%)</td>
<td>1 (0.6%)</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 301</td>
<td>8 (7.8%)</td>
<td>5 (3.0%)</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 313</td>
<td>20 (19.6%)</td>
<td>14 (8.4%)</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive Complaints</td>
<td>Item 31</td>
<td>10 (9.8%)</td>
<td>4 (2.4%)</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(COG)</td>
<td>Item 59</td>
<td>14 (13.7%)</td>
<td>6 (3.6%)</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 102</td>
<td>5 (4.9%)</td>
<td>3 (1.8%)</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 136</td>
<td>11 (10.8%)</td>
<td>6 (3.6%)</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 159</td>
<td>5 (4.9%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(cont.)
Table 26 (cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Clearly Defensive Sex Offender Sample (N = 102)</th>
<th>Clearly Defensive Child Custody Litigant Sample (N = 167)</th>
<th>% Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>n (%)</td>
<td>n (%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suicidal/Death Ideation (SUI)</td>
<td>Item 93</td>
<td>3 (2.9%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 120</td>
<td>1 (1.0%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 164</td>
<td>1 (1.0%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 251</td>
<td>2 (2.0%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 334</td>
<td>3 (2.9%)</td>
<td>1 (0.6%)</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helplessness/Hopelessness (HLP)</td>
<td>Item 135</td>
<td>12 (11.8%)</td>
<td>9 (5.4%)</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 169</td>
<td>3 (2.9%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 214</td>
<td>9 (8.8%)</td>
<td>3 (1.8%)</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 282</td>
<td>11 (10.8%)</td>
<td>3 (1.8%)</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 336</td>
<td>14 (13.7%)</td>
<td>13 (7.8%)</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Doubt (SFD)</td>
<td>Item 48</td>
<td>10 (9.8%)</td>
<td>5 (3.0%)</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 89</td>
<td>11 (10.8%)</td>
<td>4 (2.4%)</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 232</td>
<td>9 (8.8%)</td>
<td>4 (2.4%)</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 288</td>
<td>11 (10.8%)</td>
<td>3 (1.8%)</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inefficacy (NFC)</td>
<td>Item 27</td>
<td>29 (28.4%)</td>
<td>10 (6.0%)</td>
<td>22.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 68</td>
<td>43 (42.2%)</td>
<td>23 (13.8%)</td>
<td>28.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 108</td>
<td>13 (12.7%)</td>
<td>8 (4.8%)</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 152</td>
<td>10 (9.8%)</td>
<td>3 (1.8%)</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 198</td>
<td>9 (8.8%)</td>
<td>2 (1.2%)</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 229</td>
<td>29 (28.4%)</td>
<td>13 (7.8%)</td>
<td>20.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 271</td>
<td>29 (28.4%)</td>
<td>25 (15.0%)</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 274</td>
<td>14 (13.7%)</td>
<td>1 (0.6%)</td>
<td>13.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 324</td>
<td>27 (26.5%)</td>
<td>5 (3.0%)</td>
<td>23.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stress/Worry (STW)</td>
<td>Item 29</td>
<td>17 (16.7%)</td>
<td>9 (5.4%)</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 73</td>
<td>16 (15.7%)</td>
<td>14 (8.4%)</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 123</td>
<td>23 (22.5%)</td>
<td>7 (4.2%)</td>
<td>18.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 167</td>
<td>13 (12.7%)</td>
<td>6 (3.6%)</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 224</td>
<td>20 (19.6%)</td>
<td>24 (14.4%)</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 234</td>
<td>67 (65.7%)</td>
<td>111 (66.5%)</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 309</td>
<td>39 (38.2%)</td>
<td>37 (22.2%)</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 26 (cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Clearly Defensive Sex Offender Sample (N = 102)</th>
<th>Clearly Defensive Child Custody Litigant Sample (N = 167)</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anxiety (AXY)</td>
<td>Item 79</td>
<td>10 (9.8%)</td>
<td>5 (3.0%)</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 146</td>
<td>2 (2.0%)</td>
<td>1 (0.6%)</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 228</td>
<td>7 (6.9%)</td>
<td>5 (3.0%)</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 275</td>
<td>6 (5.9%)</td>
<td>1 (0.6%)</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 289</td>
<td>9 (8.8%)</td>
<td>2 (1.2%)</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anger Proneness (ANP)</td>
<td>Item 119</td>
<td>8 (7.8%)</td>
<td>9 (5.4%)</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 134</td>
<td>14 (13.7%)</td>
<td>7 (4.2%)</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 155</td>
<td>17 (16.7%)</td>
<td>10 (6.0%)</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 248</td>
<td>8 (7.8%)</td>
<td>2 (1.2%)</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 293</td>
<td>3 (2.9%)</td>
<td>3 (1.8%)</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 303</td>
<td>19 (18.6%)</td>
<td>2 (1.2%)</td>
<td>17.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 318</td>
<td>8 (7.8%)</td>
<td>1 (0.6%)</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavior Restricting Fears (BRF)</td>
<td>Item 20</td>
<td>1 (1.0%)</td>
<td>2 (1.2%)</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 56</td>
<td>6 (5.9%)</td>
<td>1 (0.6%)</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 90</td>
<td>6 (5.9%)</td>
<td>6 (3.6%)</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 128</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>4 (2.4%)</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 165</td>
<td>2 (2.0%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 208</td>
<td>5 (4.9%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 243</td>
<td>7 (6.9%)</td>
<td>4 (2.4%)</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 284</td>
<td>5 (4.9%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 317</td>
<td>2 (2.0%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple Specific Fears (MSF)</td>
<td>Item 54</td>
<td>13 (12.7%)</td>
<td>40 (24.0%)</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 82</td>
<td>35 (34.5%)</td>
<td>64 (38.3%)</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 115</td>
<td>33 (32.4%)</td>
<td>47 (28.1%)</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 151</td>
<td>6 (5.9%)</td>
<td>2 (1.2%)</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 184</td>
<td>21 (20.6%)</td>
<td>28 (16.8%)</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 220</td>
<td>41 (40.2%)</td>
<td>80 (47.9%)</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 258</td>
<td>26 (25.5%)</td>
<td>29 (17.4%)</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 286</td>
<td>13 (12.7%)</td>
<td>19 (11.4%)</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 320</td>
<td>31 (30.4%)</td>
<td>58 (34.7%)</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juvenile Conduct Problems (JCP)</td>
<td>Item 21</td>
<td>30 (29.4%)</td>
<td>61 (36.5%)</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 66</td>
<td>33 (32.4%)</td>
<td>44 (26.3%)</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 96</td>
<td>20 (19.6%)</td>
<td>6 (3.6%)</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 205</td>
<td>15 (14.7%)</td>
<td>9 (5.4%)</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 223</td>
<td>30 (29.4%)</td>
<td>30 (18.0%)</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 253</td>
<td>5 (4.9%)</td>
<td>5 (3.0%)</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Cont.)
### Table 26 (cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Clearly Defensive Sex Offender Sample ($N = 102$)</th>
<th>Clearly Defensive Child Custody Litigant Sample ($N = 167$)</th>
<th>% Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Substance Abuse (SUB)</td>
<td>Item 49</td>
<td>24 (23.5%)</td>
<td>39 (23.4%)</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 86</td>
<td>2 (2.0%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 141</td>
<td>22 (21.6%)</td>
<td>40 (24.0%)</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 192</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>2 (1.2%)</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 237</td>
<td>18 (17.6%)</td>
<td>23 (13.8%)</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 266</td>
<td>1 (1.0%)</td>
<td>1 (0.6%)</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 297</td>
<td>7 (6.9%)</td>
<td>1 (0.6%)</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggression (AGG)</td>
<td>Item 23</td>
<td>7 (6.9%)</td>
<td>5 (3.0%)</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 26</td>
<td>6 (5.9%)</td>
<td>5 (3.0%)</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 41</td>
<td>1 (1.0%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 84</td>
<td>2 (2.0%)</td>
<td>1 (0.6%)</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 231</td>
<td>2 (2.0%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 312</td>
<td>2 (2.0%)</td>
<td>3 (1.8%)</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 316</td>
<td>33 (32.4%)</td>
<td>36 (21.6%)</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 329</td>
<td>3 (2.9%)</td>
<td>7 (4.2%)</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 337</td>
<td>18 (17.6%)</td>
<td>21 (12.6%)</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activation (ACT)</td>
<td>Item 72</td>
<td>53 (52.0%)</td>
<td>63 (37.7%)</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 81</td>
<td>9 (8.8%)</td>
<td>5 (3.0%)</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 166</td>
<td>32 (31.4%)</td>
<td>33 (19.8%)</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 181</td>
<td>36 (35.3%)</td>
<td>56 (33.5%)</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 207</td>
<td>43 (42.2%)</td>
<td>56 (33.5%)</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 219</td>
<td>27 (26.5%)</td>
<td>35 (21.0%)</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 267</td>
<td>9 (8.8%)</td>
<td>5 (3.0%)</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 285</td>
<td>15 (14.7%)</td>
<td>11 (6.6%)</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Problems (FML)</td>
<td>Item 19</td>
<td>12 (11.8%)</td>
<td>18 (10.8%)</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 58</td>
<td>29 (28.4%)</td>
<td>28 (16.8%)</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 80</td>
<td>19 (18.6%)</td>
<td>12 (7.8%)</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 103</td>
<td>10 (9.8%)</td>
<td>9 (5.4%)</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 138</td>
<td>6 (5.9%)</td>
<td>4 (2.4%)</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 180</td>
<td>7 (6.9%)</td>
<td>16 (9.6%)</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 215</td>
<td>13 (12.7%)</td>
<td>5 (3.0%)</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 269</td>
<td>6 (5.9%)</td>
<td>7 (4.2%)</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 281</td>
<td>9 (8.8%)</td>
<td>1 (0.6%)</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 307</td>
<td>5 (4.9%)</td>
<td>1 (0.6%)</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(continuation)
## Table 26 (cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Clearly Defensive Sex Offender Sample ((N = 102))</th>
<th>Clearly Defensive Child Custody Litigant Sample ((N = 167))</th>
<th>% Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal Passivity (IPP)</td>
<td>Item 24</td>
<td>17 (16.7%)</td>
<td>9 (5.4%)</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 60</td>
<td>24 (23.5%)</td>
<td>61 (36.5%)</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 104</td>
<td>51 (50.0%)</td>
<td>85 (50.9%)</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 147</td>
<td>20 (19.6%)</td>
<td>38 (50.9%)</td>
<td><strong>31.3%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 197</td>
<td>23 (22.5%)</td>
<td>49 (29.3%)</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 239</td>
<td>9 (8.8%)</td>
<td>25 (15.0%)</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 276</td>
<td>30 (29.4%)</td>
<td>50 (29.9%)</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 302</td>
<td>21 (20.6%)</td>
<td>25 (15.0%)</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 321</td>
<td>25 (24.5%)</td>
<td>103 (61.7%)</td>
<td><strong>37.2%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 327</td>
<td>24 (23.5%)</td>
<td>104 (62.3%)</td>
<td><strong>38.8%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Avoidance (SAV)</td>
<td>Item 11</td>
<td>62 (60.8%)</td>
<td>104 (62.3%)</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 17</td>
<td>14 (13.7%)</td>
<td>20 (12.0%)</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 47</td>
<td>59 (57.8%)</td>
<td>91 (54.5%)</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 57</td>
<td>25 (24.5%)</td>
<td>29 (17.4%)</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 94</td>
<td>12 (11.8%)</td>
<td>6 (3.6%)</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 109</td>
<td>38 (37.3%)</td>
<td>43 (25.7%)</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 153</td>
<td>38 (37.3%)</td>
<td>68 (40.7%)</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 201</td>
<td>27 (26.5%)</td>
<td>17 (10.2%)</td>
<td>16.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 222</td>
<td>6 (5.9%)</td>
<td>13 (7.8%)</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 278</td>
<td>31 (30.4%)</td>
<td>24 (14.4%)</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shyness (SHY)</td>
<td>Item 35</td>
<td>10 (9.8%)</td>
<td>4 (2.4%)</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 44</td>
<td>18 (17.6%)</td>
<td>8 (4.8%)</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 91</td>
<td>18 (17.6%)</td>
<td>11 (6.6%)</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 114</td>
<td>24 (23.5%)</td>
<td>12 (7.2%)</td>
<td>16.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 177</td>
<td>24 (23.5%)</td>
<td>11 (6.6%)</td>
<td>16.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 249</td>
<td>37 (36.3%)</td>
<td>51 (30.5%)</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 295</td>
<td>17 (16.7%)</td>
<td>19 (11.4%)</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disaffiliativeness (DSF)</td>
<td>Item 8</td>
<td>6 (5.9%)</td>
<td>6 (3.6%)</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 67</td>
<td>2 (2.0%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 124</td>
<td>3 (2.9%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 175</td>
<td>7 (6.9%)</td>
<td>1 (0.6%)</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 236</td>
<td>4 (3.9%)</td>
<td>2 (1.2%)</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 291</td>
<td>9 (8.8%)</td>
<td>4 (2.4%)</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Group differences of at least 20% with higher item endorsement rates by child custody litigants are indicated in **bold**. Items with group differences of 20% or greater which were endorsed at a higher rate by sex offenders are *underlined.*
### Appendix F

**PSY-5 Scales Item Endorsement Frequencies**

Table 27. *MMPI-2-RF* PSY-5 scale item endorsement frequency rates for presumed defensive sex offender and child custody litigant samples.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Presumed Defensive Sex Offender Sample (N = 268)</th>
<th>Presumed Defensive Child Custody Litigant Sample (N = 260)</th>
<th>% Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>n (%)</td>
<td>n (%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGGR-r</td>
<td>Item 24</td>
<td>209 (78.0%)</td>
<td>240 (92.3%)</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 26</td>
<td>45 (16.8%)</td>
<td>12 (4.6%)</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 39</td>
<td>142 (53.0%)</td>
<td>74 (28.5%)</td>
<td>24.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 84</td>
<td>22 (8.2%)</td>
<td>5 (1.9%)</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 104</td>
<td>148 (55.2%)</td>
<td>147 (56.5%)</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 147</td>
<td>207 (77.2%)</td>
<td>207 (79.6%)</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 182</td>
<td>136 (50.7%)</td>
<td>146 (56.2%)</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 197</td>
<td>201 (75.0%)</td>
<td>181 (69.6%)</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 231</td>
<td>10 (3.7%)</td>
<td>1 (0.4%)</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 239</td>
<td>213 (79.5%)</td>
<td>213 (81.9%)</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 256</td>
<td>131 (48.9%)</td>
<td>114 (43.8%)</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 276</td>
<td>189 (70.5%)</td>
<td>179 (68.8%)</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 302</td>
<td>195 (72.8%)</td>
<td>209 (80.4%)</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 316</td>
<td>109 (40.7%)</td>
<td>68 (26.2%)</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 319</td>
<td>174 (64.9%)</td>
<td>192 (73.8%)</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 321</td>
<td>87 (32.5%)</td>
<td>97 (37.3%)</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 327</td>
<td>88 (32.8%)</td>
<td>58 (22.3%)</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 329</td>
<td>24 (9.0%)</td>
<td>17 (6.5%)</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSYC-r</td>
<td>Item 12</td>
<td>56 (20.9%)</td>
<td>19 (7.3%)</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 14</td>
<td>11 (4.1%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 34</td>
<td>63 (23.5%)</td>
<td>21 (8.1%)</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 40</td>
<td>31 (11.6%)</td>
<td>6 (2.3%)</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 46</td>
<td>41 (15.3%)</td>
<td>8 (3.1%)</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 71</td>
<td>50 (18.7%)</td>
<td>28 (10.8%)</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 85</td>
<td>75 (28.0%)</td>
<td>60 (23.1%)</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 92</td>
<td>7 (2.6%)</td>
<td>4 (1.5%)</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 129</td>
<td>2 (0.7%)</td>
<td>3 (1.2%)</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 137</td>
<td>22 (8.2%)</td>
<td>12 (4.6%)</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 139</td>
<td>14 (5.2%)</td>
<td>3 (1.2%)</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 150</td>
<td>6 (2.2%)</td>
<td>3 (1.2%)</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 168</td>
<td>11 (4.1%)</td>
<td>5 (1.9%)</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 179</td>
<td>34 (12.7%)</td>
<td>14 (5.4%)</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 199</td>
<td>32 (11.9%)</td>
<td>15 (5.8%)</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 203</td>
<td>12 (4.5%)</td>
<td>3 (1.2%)</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Table 27 (cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Presumed Defensive Sex Offender Sample ($N = 268$)</th>
<th>Presumed Defensive Child Custody Litigant Sample ($N = 260$)</th>
<th>% Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$n$ (%)</td>
<td>$n$ (%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 216</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>(14.2%)</td>
<td>11 (4.2%)</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 240</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>(13.4%)</td>
<td>1 (0.4%)</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 252</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>(1.1%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 264</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>(11.9%)</td>
<td>48 (18.5%)</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 270</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>(2.6%)</td>
<td>1 (0.4%)</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 287</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>(4.1%)</td>
<td>5 (1.9%)</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 294</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>(9.3%)</td>
<td>11 (4.2%)</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 311</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>(25.0%)</td>
<td>56 (21.5%)</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 330</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>(13.4%)</td>
<td>11 (4.2%)</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 332</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>(7.1%)</td>
<td>4 (1.5%)</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### DISC-r

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item 21</th>
<th>133</th>
<th>(49.6%)</th>
<th>109 (41.9%)</th>
<th>7.7%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Item 42</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>(32.1%)</td>
<td>64 (24.6%)</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 49</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>(36.9%)</td>
<td>64 (24.6%)</td>
<td>12.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 61</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>(64.9%)</td>
<td>190 (73.1%)</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 66</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>(35.4%)</td>
<td>75 (28.8%)</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 75</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>(51.1%)</td>
<td>148 (56.9%)</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 107</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>(30.2%)</td>
<td>103 (39.6%)</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 115</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>(72.4%)</td>
<td>186 (71.5%)</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 131</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>(38.1%)</td>
<td>89 (34.2%)</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 156</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>(65.3%)</td>
<td>128 (49.2%)</td>
<td>16.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 190</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>(74.6%)</td>
<td>113 (43.5%)</td>
<td>31.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 193</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>(13.1%)</td>
<td>36 (13.8%)</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 205</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>(19.0%)</td>
<td>17 (6.5%)</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 223</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>(28.7%)</td>
<td>47 (18.1%)</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 226</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>(40.7%)</td>
<td>105 (40.4%)</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 237</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>(24.6%)</td>
<td>46 (17.7%)</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 253</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>(6.7%)</td>
<td>11 (4.2%)</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 292</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>(23.9%)</td>
<td>40 (15.4%)</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 297</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>(14.2%)</td>
<td>1 (0.4%)</td>
<td>13.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 300</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>(53.4%)</td>
<td>145 (55.8%)</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### NEGE-r

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item 9</th>
<th>26</th>
<th>(9.7%)</th>
<th>4 (1.5%)</th>
<th>8.2%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Item 23</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>(30.2%)</td>
<td>28 (10.8%)</td>
<td>19.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 29</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>(31.7%)</td>
<td>32 (12.3%)</td>
<td>19.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 37</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>(38.1%)</td>
<td>76 (29.2%)</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 56</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>(6.7%)</td>
<td>2 (0.8%)</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 73</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>(25.0%)</td>
<td>31 (11.9%)</td>
<td>13.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 77</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>(21.3%)</td>
<td>18 (6.9%)</td>
<td>14.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 116</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>(35.1%)</td>
<td>47 (18.1%)</td>
<td>17.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(cont.)
### Table 27 (cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Presumed Defensive Sex Offender Sample</th>
<th>Presumed Defensive Child Custody Litigant Sample</th>
<th>% Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(N = 268)</td>
<td>(n (%))</td>
<td>(N = 260)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 123</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>(39.9%)</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>(13.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 134</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>(19.0%)</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>(10.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 146</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>(5.2%)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(0.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 155</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>(29.9%)</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>(15.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 167</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>(26.1%)</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>(6.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 206</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>(42.9%)</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>(23.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 209</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>(74.6%)</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>(50.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 234</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>(79.9%)</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>(75.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 263</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>(52.2%)</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>(27.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 277</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>(11.2%)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>(2.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 293</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>(9.3%)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>(4.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 309</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>(52.6%)</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>(29.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTR-r</td>
<td>Item 4</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>(4.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 11</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>(68.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 17</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>(18.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 47</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>(54.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 53</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>(15.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 57</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>(18.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 64</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>(15.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 102</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>(2.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 109</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>(28.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 118</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>(42.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 140</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>(5.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 153</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>(37.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 166</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>(81.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 181</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>(64.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 195</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>(29.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 201</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>(14.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 207</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>(62.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 222</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>(10.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 246</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>(1.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 323</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>(20.4%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Group differences of at least 20% with higher item endorsement rates by child custody litigants are indicated in **bold.** Items with group differences of 20% or greater which were endorsed at a higher rate by sex offenders are **underlined.**
### Table 28. MMPI-2-RF PSY-5 scale item endorsement frequency rates for clearly defensive sex offender and child custody litigant subgroups.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Clearly Defensive Sex Offender Group</th>
<th></th>
<th>Clearly Defensive Child Custody Litigant Group</th>
<th></th>
<th>% Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AGGR-r</td>
<td>Item 24</td>
<td>85 (83.3%)</td>
<td>158 (94.6%)</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 26</td>
<td>6 (5.9%)</td>
<td>5 (3.0%)</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 39</td>
<td>43 (42.2%)</td>
<td>41 (24.6%)</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 84</td>
<td>2 (2.0%)</td>
<td>1 (0.6%)</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 104</td>
<td>51 (50.0%)</td>
<td>82 (49.1%)</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 147</td>
<td>82 (80.4%)</td>
<td>129 (77.2%)</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 182</td>
<td>73 (71.6%)</td>
<td>106 (63.5%)</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 197</td>
<td>79 (77.5%)</td>
<td>118 (70.7%)</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 231</td>
<td>2 (2.0%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 239</td>
<td>93 (91.2%)</td>
<td>142 (85.5%)</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 256</td>
<td>44 (43.1%)</td>
<td>61 (36.5%)</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 276</td>
<td>72 (70.6%)</td>
<td>117 (70.1%)</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 302</td>
<td>81 (79.4%)</td>
<td>142 (85.0%)</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 316</td>
<td>33 (32.4%)</td>
<td>36 (21.6%)</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 319</td>
<td>76 (74.5%)</td>
<td>151 (90.4%)</td>
<td>15.9%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 321</td>
<td>25 (24.5%)</td>
<td>64 (38.3%)</td>
<td>13.8%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 327</td>
<td>24 (23.5%)</td>
<td>23 (13.8%)</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 329</td>
<td>3 (2.9%)</td>
<td>7 (4.2%)</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSYC-r</td>
<td>Item 12</td>
<td>17 (16.7%)</td>
<td>10 (6.0%)</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 14</td>
<td>4 (3.9%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 34</td>
<td>18 (17.6%)</td>
<td>12 (7.2%)</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 40</td>
<td>5 (4.9%)</td>
<td>4 (2.4%)</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 46</td>
<td>12 (11.8%)</td>
<td>5 (3.0%)</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 71</td>
<td>24 (23.5%)</td>
<td>11 (6.6%)</td>
<td>16.9%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 85</td>
<td>24 (23.5%)</td>
<td>34 (20.4%)</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 92</td>
<td>2 (2.0%)</td>
<td>1 (0.6%)</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 129</td>
<td>1 (1.0%)</td>
<td>1 (0.6%)</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 137</td>
<td>1 (1.0%)</td>
<td>2 (1.2%)</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 139</td>
<td>5 (4.9%)</td>
<td>1 (0.6%)</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 150</td>
<td>1 (1.0%)</td>
<td>2 (1.2%)</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 168</td>
<td>2 (2.0%)</td>
<td>1 (0.6%)</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 179</td>
<td>3 (2.9%)</td>
<td>2 (1.2%)</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 199</td>
<td>6 (5.9%)</td>
<td>6 (3.6%)</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 203</td>
<td>2 (2.0%)</td>
<td>1 (0.6%)</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 216</td>
<td>9 (8.8%)</td>
<td>5 (3.0%)</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 240</td>
<td>7 (6.9%)</td>
<td>1 (0.6%)</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 252</td>
<td>1 (1.0%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 264</td>
<td>14 (13.7%)</td>
<td>22 (13.2%)</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Cont.)
Table 28 (cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Clearly Defensive Sex Offender Group</th>
<th>Clearly Defensive Child Custody Litigant Group</th>
<th>% Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(N = 102) n (%)</td>
<td>(N = 167) n (%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 270</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(0.0%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(0.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 287</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(1.0%)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(0.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 294</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>(6.9%)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>(3.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 311</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>(19.6%)</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>(19.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 330</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>(6.9%)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(1.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 332</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>(6.9%)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(1.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DISC-r</td>
<td>Item 21</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>(29.4%)</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 42</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>(31.4%)</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>(23.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 49</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>(23.5%)</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>(23.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 61</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>(41.2%)</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>(68.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 66</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>(32.4%)</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>(26.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 75</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>(46.1%)</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>(55.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 107</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>(21.6%)</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>(35.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 115</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>(67.6%)</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>(71.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 131</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>(26.5%)</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>(29.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 156</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>(47.1%)</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>(40.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 190</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>(70.6%)</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>(38.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 193</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>(3.9%)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>(7.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 205</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>(14.7%)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>(5.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 223</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>(29.4%)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>(18.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 226</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>(30.4%)</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>(35.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 237</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>(17.6%)</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>(13.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 253</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>(4.9%)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>(3.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 292</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>(21.6%)</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>(12.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 297</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>(6.9%)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(0.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 300</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>(45.1%)</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>(55.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEGE-r</td>
<td>Item 9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>(5.9%)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 23</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>(6.9%)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>(3.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 29</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>(16.7%)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>(5.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 37</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>(24.5%)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>(18.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 56</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>(5.9%)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(0.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 73</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>(15.7%)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>(8.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 77</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>(11.8%)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>(3.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 116</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>(17.6%)</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>(9.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 123</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>(22.5%)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>(4.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 134</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>(13.7%)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>(4.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 146</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(2.0%)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(0.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 155</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>(16.7%)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>(6.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 167</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>(12.7%)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>(3.6%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(cont.)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Clearly Defensive Sex Offender Group (N = 102)</th>
<th>Clearly Defensive Child Custody Litigant Group (N = 167)</th>
<th>% Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>n (%)</td>
<td>n (%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 206</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>(21.6%)</td>
<td>25 (15.0%)</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 209</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>(67.6%)</td>
<td>71 (42.5%)</td>
<td>25.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 234</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>(65.7%)</td>
<td>111 (66.5%)</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 263</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>(37.3%)</td>
<td>31 (18.6%)</td>
<td>18.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 277</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>(6.9%)</td>
<td>1 (0.6%)</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 293</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>(2.9%)</td>
<td>3 (1.8%)</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 309</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>(38.2%)</td>
<td>37 (22.2%)</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTR-r</td>
<td>Item 4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2 (1.2%)</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 11</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>104 (62.3%)</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 17</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>20 (12.0%)</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 47</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>91 (54.5%)</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 53</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>28 (16.8%)</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 57</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>29 (17.4%)</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 64</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>24 (14.4%)</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 102</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3 (1.8%)</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 109</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>43 (25.7%)</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 118</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>76 (45.5%)</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 140</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8 (4.8%)</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 153</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>68 (40.7%)</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 166</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>134 (80.2%)</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 181</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>111 (66.5%)</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 195</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>52 (31.1%)</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 201</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>17 (10.2%)</td>
<td>16.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 207</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>111 (66.5%)</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 222</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13 (2.4%)</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 246</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4 (2.4%)</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 323</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>34 (20.4%)</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Group differences of at least 20% with higher item endorsement rates by child custody litigants are indicated in **bold**. Items with group differences of 20% or greater which were endorsed at a higher rate by sex offenders are *underlined.*