

# Caldwell

## REPORTS

Name: Mary Anderson  
Gender: Female  
Age: 49  
Marital Status: Divorced  
Education: 13

Referred By: Dr. Zachary Example  
Tested: April 3, 2020  
Processed: April 4, 2020

TEST ADMINISTERED: Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory-2 ( MMPI-2 )

Custody

### VALIDITY

**Morally Proper Responding:** Her willingness to admit minor faults and shortcomings was slightly greater than average for the MMPI-2 normative sample and considerably more open than average for child custody litigants. Based on scales L, Sd, and a part of K that is not attributable to socioeconomic status.

**Subtle Intentional Minimizing:** There were no indications of any general attempt to consciously disguise interpersonal discomforts or to minimize emotional distresses in her approach to the MMPI2. Based mainly on the Mp scale, secondarily on scales S, Sd, and a part of K that is not attributable to socioeconomic status.

**Atypical and Deviant Responding:** She was candid and self-critical in responding to many of the items of the MMPI-2. Her scores on the scales measuring unusual responding and overreporting of pathology, however, were well within acceptable limits. Based mainly on scales F and Ds and secondarily on scales Fb, Fp, and the difference of raw F minus raw K.

**Positive Social Confidence and Self-Esteem:** Her general level of interpersonal effectiveness, social self-confidence, and self-esteem appears well below average for the MMPI-2 normative group and still more below the average for the sample of child custody litigants. She is apt to be seen as insecure, as keeping her distance from others, and as having impatient, stubborn, or difficult moods. She may feel guilty or as victimized and otherwise cheated by life. It should be noted, however, that this interpretation was probably affected negatively by self-critical elements in her test-taking attitude. Based mainly on Block's Ego Resiliency scale (the best MMPI measure I can find for general likableness) and scale K, and secondarily on the Ss scale, ego strength, Do (as autonomy), and an absence of overly self-favorable responding.

## PERSONAL STYLE

Cheerful vs. Guilt Issues, Depressed: Her responses reported a high level of unhappiness and depression. She is apt to ruminate about how "things will never work out right" for her if not the hopelessness of her circumstances. She would repeatedly find it difficult to "get going". Assertiveness and constructive wilfulness would be strongly inhibited. Based mainly the elevation of scale 2 D, with small additional weights for the deepening effects of scales 7-Pt and 8-Sc and low elevations on 9-Ma.

Energy Level: Slow Pace vs. High Energy: She tests as having a mildly above average level of activity and energy. As her focus of attention shifts, some of her undertakings may not be completed on time. Based strongly on scale 9-Ma with secondary weights on the Ma-2 subscale, the type A scale, 9-Ma greater than 4-Pd, and an energizing aspect of 3-Hy greater than 2-D.

Denying and Repressive vs. Frank and Candid: She tests as a mildly repressive and denying individual. That is, she would be seen as not wanting to engage antagonistic confrontations or perhaps even as becoming physiologically upset when forced to confront someone's anger at her. At times her attitudes would be seen as having a "Pollyanna" quality, looking the other way in order not to have to face uncomfortable problems. Based mostly on scale 3-Hy and additionally on indices of repressiveness, i.e., Hy-Subtle and the Repression-Sensitization scale, and the denial elements of scale L.

Level of Health Concerns: The test scores indicate a readiness to become preoccupied with her physical health. Such concerns and the associated self-care may consume a significant part of her consciousness. This could lead to a reduction of the amount of available activity with her child(ren) as well as restrictions lest a child be injured or become sick. Based centrally on 1-Hs plus some weights on Hy-obvious and the primacy (or not) of Hs in the code.

Awareness of Her Potential for Interpersonal Provocation: Her scores suggest a greater than average awareness of whatever potentially provocative elements are noticeable in her interpersonal presentation. In interviews or similar circumstances, she is apt to be somewhat more than usually capable of concealing any hostile and aggressive impulses she might have. The awareness of interpersonally provocative behaviors is assessed primarily by scores on the Control (Cn) scale. High scorers are typically able to put up a facade and to successfully hide provocative thoughts and aggressive impulses; low scorers have self-justified good intentions with a limited awareness of "bugging" others, this latter being the frequent direction of custody litigant responses. There is also a small influence by weights on L and Mf masculine. Clinical confirmations of these interpretations of Cn have been remarkably strong and consistent.

Oriented Toward Own Agenda vs. Incorporates Others' Interests: She is likely to see things in terms of her own agenda and personal interests. Momentarily genuine expressions of empathy may not dependably guide and restrain her future behavior. She might be inattentive to or even ignore the interests of others--possibly including those of her own child(ren)--when she felt seriously threatened or blocked. Based strongly on 4-Pd and secondarily on 9-Ma, with an additional weight on how much 4-Pd is predominant in the profile, a small weight on a psychotic tilt in the profile (internally driven ideation), and adjustments for defensive covering over.

Social Shyness vs. Extroversion: She tests as in the ambivert or balanced range, neither particularly extroverted nor introverted. Primarily based on the score on the O-Si scale with small adjustments for the shyness content scale (SOD) regarding visibility of the trait and K for consciously trying to appear social and gregarious.

Level of Day-to-Day Organization: Her scores anticipate recurrent struggles in her level of personal organization. This would be generally adequate in dealing with most of her day-to-day problems and responsibilities but somewhat limitedly effective when stressed. Overall, this anticipates uneven effectiveness in many situations. She may consume a significant amount of time and energy in worrying or in ineffective and distracting activities. Basically the ego strength scale with adjustments for the interference of anxiety (Welsh A) and K to assess for an exaggerated assertion of high or low competence.

## ADULT ROLE MODELING

General Emotional Threshold: Her balance between the amount and intensity of the emotional feelings she experiences and expresses versus how much she restrains or inhibits is about average for the MMPI-2 normative sample, although she is less restrained in this respect than average for child custody litigants. The intensity of a child's emotionality per se should not be problematic for her.

The larger weight for this variable is on Welsh's scale R, on which high scores anticipate a constriction of one's engagement with one's emotions, i.e., less open and spontaneous expression, briefer intervals of expression or outbursts, and degrees of a general inhibition; low scores anticipate relatively immediate if not ongoing emotional reactivity, the person's emotions being relatively obvious and present. Minor weights are for the modulating effects of higher K and disinhibition of lower K scores, the emotionally outgoing quality reflected in low scores on Block's Ego Control (EC-5) scale, and the emotional activation (or not) of scale 9-Ma.

Potential for Self-Centered Actions vs. Other-Centered Reactions: When stressed or threatened, she could pursue her self-interests in urgent and possibly dramatic or forceful ways. In past experiences she may have felt that she has never gotten what she wanted unless she went all out for it. Such experiences would disinhibit her social forwardness whenever she feels her interests are likely to be thwarted. At times she may tend to disregard the adverse consequences of her actions on others or even be seen as showing a significant degree of indifference to usual social expectations. Based substantially on scales 9-Ma and 4-Pd, the "9-4" code just within or close to the normal range being the prototype of the DSM criteria for Narcissism. Several pages of algorithms then include the contributions of coding (rank ordering) effects among the eight basic clinical scales.

Externalizing--Internalizing: Her scores indicate a mixed general balance between seeing some of her problems as external to herself and caused by other people versus an awareness of other problems as being due to her own misjudgments or mistakes. This is based on Welsh's I-E Ratio (internalization-externalization), which is the combined sum of the T-scores on scales 3-Hy, 4-Pd, and 9-Ma as externalizing divided by the sum of the T-scores on scales 1-Hs, 2-D, and 7-Pt as internalizing. This has been expanded to cover a wider range of code positions of these scales along with other small weights.

Linear Focus Under Stress vs. Strained Reasoning: Her scores indicate a potential for some different connections or perhaps unexpected points of focus in her stream of thought. When she feels

threatened, her ideas and self-justifications might require careful attention to follow. At times there may be what others perceive as unexpected social attitudes or lapses of judgment. Some individuals with this pattern can identify closely with children and their vulnerabilities, but if there were any indications of mean or punitive reactions or specific deficits or parenting behavior, these may need to be specifically evaluated. Based on scales 6-Pa, 8-Sc, and the Neurotic-Psychotic Index (L. Goldberg).

Interpersonal Functioning: Anxious vs. Self-Comfortable: She tests as readily becoming anxious, as vulnerable to a variety of threats, and as prone to doubt her own interpersonal adequacy. At times she may be seen as moody or self-defeating. At other times she may be seen as irritable and brittle or as otherwise tending to keep a protective distance from others. The primary weight is the Welsh scale A, Anxiety, elevations on which include a substantial element of social impairment; there are also adjustments for K, for scores on Block's Ego Resiliency (ER-S), and for the ANX content scale. Ability to Let Go, to Forgive and Forget: She appears somewhat more able to forgive and forget than the average subject in the MMPI-2 normative sample and considerably more naturally forgiving than the average child custody litigant. Such a minimal level of self-righteous resentments anticipates an ability to let go and to move on with her life, which should in turn be favorable for the child(ren). Most of 12 summed weights involve scale 6-Pa, with special emphasis on the self-righteousness of the Pa3 subscale and the wounded hurt quality of Pa2, as well as the position of scale 6 in the code and the degree to which it is "spiked" above the other scales.

## CONTROL ISSUES

Under-controlled and Ascendant vs. Self-Constrained and Rule-Bound: Her item responses suggest somewhat less than average strictness of control over her conformity to common social mores as compared to the MMPI-2 normative sample, which in turn is considerably less than the relatively high level of self-control typically presented by child custody litigants. At times her energies could go in such directions as self-assertion, social ascendance, or persuasiveness. At other times this could come out as uneven social restraint, some reluctance to comply with authority, and occasional self-indulgences. Responsive to humor, she would be a relatively expressive person with a recognizable social presence. Based on the weighting of a series of scales: Responsibility (Re), Block's Ego Control-5 (EC-5), the properness of the L scale, the righteousness of the Pa3 subscale, and the Overcontrolled Hostility scale (O-H).

Low vs. High Decision Control needs: Her scores suggest a general willingness to go along with family decisions made by others, at least as long as her definite wishes are clearly included in the decision-making process. It should be noted that her level of control needs is slightly below the average for the MMPI-2 normative sample and somewhat more below the average for child custody litigants. Based in part on a series of scales, high Dominance-Autonomy (Do), low Dependency (Dy), the righteous-judgmental aspect of Pa3, and the control aspect of Ma3 subscale. In addition a long complex of weights adds in the code-rank positions of scales 3-Hy, 6-Pa, and 9-Ma, reflecting the three pairwise code combinations which are most characterized by major control issues.

Potential for Antisocial Conduct: The general potential for antisocial behavior appears significantly above average. A potential for seriously problematic reactions if strongly provoked cannot be ruled out. Any past history of physically or verbally aggressive acts would, of course, raise questions as to the dependability and effectiveness of future controls. Essentially the elevations on scales 4-Pd, 8Sc,

and 9-Ma, the three way combination of which is clearly the antisocial pattern on the MMPI-2, plus minor adjustments for inhibitory factors.

**Possible Temper Control Problems:** She did not obtain an MMPI-2 pattern that would be specifically indicative of temper control problems; in general the risk appears slightly below average. That is, in the absence of a definite past history of temper problems, her temper should be generally well controlled and not a serious risk. It would likely have taken a relatively intense provocation to have triggered any such past outbursts. Based mainly on elevations on the "temper control triad": 4-Pd, 6Pa, and 9-Ma with secondary adjustments for alcohol/drug abuse and for the overcontrol and explosive potentials of the O-H scale; 34 steps of weights.

**Vulnerability to Chemical Dependency:** She obtained an about average score on indices for chemical dependency (primarily the MAC-R alcoholism scale together with the AAS items). Although her scores would not definitively rule out problems with chemical agents, her individual item responses are not seriously suggestive of long-term chemical dependence. This is mainly the Mac-R scale with secondary adjustments from the Addiction Admission Scale (AAS) and from 49/94 and 47/74 codes.

## PARENT-CHILD INTERACTIONS POTENTIALS

**Quality of Parent-Child Bonding:** The depth of her parent-to-child bonding appears likely to be somewhat limited. One or two observed occasions of positive parent-child interactions should not be depended on as a solid assurance of unconditional parental love; an affection-hungry child can be quite responsive to more than usually received care and attention. At other important but perhaps not observed moments her personal interests may have overridden the interests of the child(ren). Any identifiable past occasions when the child's attachment would likely have been dampened or to a degree turned off in response to less than then-needed love and protection or perhaps an underlying degree of indifference to the child's welfare would mark this as a potentially long-term developmental problem. Such "turning off" moments can impair the child's future capacity as an adult to sustain stable interpersonal bonds. Based largely on both the absolute elevation of 4-pd and the relative (code) elevation; minor adjustments for scales 8-Sc, 9-Ma, and Neurotic-Psychotic Index (Goldberg). Although Pd has many expressions depending on the scales with which is combined, it nevertheless has a central focus on the quality--or impairment--of attachment. (Megargee et al. demonstrated this dramatically with their "spike 4" prisoner code as the most completely unattached and never bonded of all prisoner codetypes).

**Risk of Alienation of Affection:** Her scores do not suggest any particular tendency to dichotomize people as being for her or against her. She is not likely to be especially sensitive as to whether a child's comments are for or against herself or her former spouse. That is, she may prefer comments favoring herself, but she would not be unduly quick to jump to the conclusion that positive comments about the other parent reflected that parent's efforts to alienate the child from her. Based primarily on scale 6-Pa and the self-righteous subscale Pa3, with small adjustments for whichever of the 7 basic clinical scales the Pa scale is combined when 6-Pa is first or second in the code.

**Presentation as a Parent: &d@ Role-Played Virtue vs. Sincerity:** An effort to present or verbally claim to be a good parent would be seen by others as illusory role-playing if not misleading (in a "white lie" or duplicitous sense of emphasizing "responsibilities" rather than occasions of spontaneous affection). She would be seen as quite uneven if not seriously lacking in unconditional positive love for the child(ren). This combines the absolute elevations of scales 3-Hy and 4-Pd with their code

rankings along with minor adjustments for the Control (Cn) and O-H scales. This is to call attention to the ability of the people with 34/43 patterns to role-play ideal parenting and artfully cover over occasions of personal egocentrism, indifference to the child's distress, and abruptly punitive reactions.

No clinical or judicial decisions should be made from this information alone. This material is only intended to facilitate the individual evaluation process by providing an extended set of hypotheses for clinical exploration. The possible behavioral tendencies noted here should be confirmed, disconfirmed, or otherwise qualified for this individual by the primary clinical evaluator or other appropriate test-knowledgeable persons.

The validity of these ratings derives from two general sources. The first is the decades of research on the basic scales of the MMPI and MMPI-2, on the patterns of interrelationships among these scales, and on information about the wide range of supplemental scales that have additionally been developed. The second source is the consulting and clinical experience in child custody cases of the author, Alex B. Caldwell, Ph.D.. The ratings are not based on research that is specific to these characteristics among child custody litigants because no such body of research exists. Thus, the MMPI-2 is applicable to child custody determinations to the extent that MMPI and MMPI-2 results in general are pertinent to the questions asked in such evaluative procedures.

This report was prepared for our professional clientele. In most cases this is confidential information and legally privileged. The ongoing protection of this privilege becomes the responsibility of the professional person receiving the attached material from Caldwell Report.

Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory-2 profile form. Copyright © by the Regents of the University of Minnesota. 1942, 1943 (renewed 1970), 1989. All rights reserved. Used by permission of the University of Minnesota Press. "MMPI" and "Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory" are registered trademarks owned by the Regents of the University of Minnesota.