



Nonverbal and Verbal Subtests

VIP®

Validity Indicator Profile

Interpretive Report

Richard I. Frederick, PhD

Name:	SAMPLE INTERPRETIVE REPORT
ID Number:	111111111
Age:	48
Gender:	Male
Date Assessed:	04/09/2005



Copyright © 1997, 2003 NCS Pearson, Inc. All rights reserved.
"VIP" is a registered trademark of NCS Pearson, Inc.

INTRODUCTION

The Validity Indicator Profile (VIP®) is a general assessment of response style designed to identify valid and invalid responding. The VIP can be used as a validity indicator for concurrently administered tests of intellectual and cognitive ability, including neuropsychological functioning.

The descriptions, inferences, and recommendations in this report should be evaluated in the context of other information that is available about the client. Such information may include clinician observations, the client's presenting complaint, scores from other assessment instruments, and an evaluation of situational factors that may influence test performance.

OVERVIEW OF VALIDITY

When the VIP indicates that the test-taker's approach to the assessment was valid, the clinician can generally have confidence that the individual intended to perform well on the test and made a concerted effort to do so. When the VIP indicates invalidity, the clinician should be aware that concurrently administered ability tests probably underestimate the test-taker's ability. In some cases, a finding of invalidity on the VIP indicates insufficient effort to respond correctly or suboptimal attention and concentration during testing. In other instances, invalidity indicates a lack of cooperation, reflecting a deliberate attempt to perform poorly.


	<u>Nonverbal subtest</u>	<u>Verbal subtest</u>
Overall subtest validity:	Invalid	Valid
Subtest response style:	Suppressed	Compliant

This individual appears to have exhibited good effort and intended to respond correctly on the Verbal subtest. Tests that cover similar content areas (for example, word knowledge, reading ability, and general language skills) that were administered concurrently with the VIP can probably be interpreted with confidence. However, the results of the Nonverbal subtest are probably not an accurate reflection of his ability. Tests that measure similar content areas (for example, abstract reasoning, perceptual accuracy, and attention to detail) that were administered concurrently with the VIP should be interpreted with caution because they may have been subject to the same influences that produced invalid results for the Nonverbal subtest. For this individual, these influences most likely include an attempt to portray himself as too impaired to understand the test items.

NONVERBAL SUBTEST

Performance Curve

Response Style: **Invalid/Suppressed**



Summary of Scores

Total Score..... 31 Adjusted Score..... 38

Performance Curve Measures

Sector 1 Distance..... NA	Slope..... -0.0035
Sector 2 Distance..... NA	Point of Entry..... 0.6
Sector 3 Distance..... NA	Peak Performance Interval..... NA
Sector 1 Residual..... NA	Patterned Responding..... NA
Suppression Sector..... Yes	
Suppression Sector Starting Point..... 27	
Suppression Sector Ending Point..... 78	
Suppression Sector Distance..... 52	
Suppression Sector Probability... < .01%	

Performance Curve Interpretation (Nonverbal Subtest)

This individual's invalid performance on the VIP probably has implications for his performance on other tests. It is helpful to evaluate features of his Performance Curve to obtain information relating to the probable response style that generated the invalid response pattern. It should be noted that the response style classification made in the following paragraphs is based only on the individual's VIP results and does not take into account any other information that may be available to the clinician.

Based on the predominant characteristics of this individual's Performance Curve, the best conclusion is that he made a strong effort to answer the items incorrectly. His response style is characteristic of **suppressed responding**; that is, there is evidence that he deliberately *suppressed* correct answer choices and instead chose incorrect answers.

His Total Score is 31 (out of 100). It is extremely unlikely that his score would be this low if he was trying to choose the correct responses. The probability of obtaining such a low score even if he was responding randomly is far less than 1%. This low score provides compelling evidence that he was intentionally misrepresenting his true ability with the probable intent of appearing cognitively impaired.

The first point on his Performance Curve (the Point of Entry) indicates that he responded incorrectly to many of the 10 easiest items. This finding is unusual even for individuals with significant cognitive impairment and is consistent with the determination that he intentionally chose the incorrect responses.

The presence of sustained very poor performance on the *moderately difficult* to *most difficult* test items generally confirms the hypothesis that he intended to choose incorrect answers.

Estimate of Reasoning Ability


The VIP Nonverbal subtest was not designed to generate a measure of reasoning ability or a level of general comprehension. However, the Nonverbal subtest items have a wide range of difficulty, and it is often possible to generate reasonable estimates of ability based on characteristics of the individual's Performance Curve and Adjusted Score.

Intentionally choosing the incorrect answer requires the same cognitive capacity as intentionally choosing the correct answer. This capacity is represented by the Adjusted Score. His Adjusted Score is 38. Individuals who can choose the correct answers to this extent typically possess at least below average or higher reasoning ability. The Suppression Sector Ending Point is analogous to Sector 1 Distance for compliant responders. If this point represents the extent to which he can reliably choose the incorrect answer, his minimal ability is estimated to be at least average to high average or higher. Differences in these estimates are not unusual at all. These estimates are provided only to help the clinician generate hypotheses about the test-taker's true abilities.

VERBAL SUBTEST

Performance Curve

Response Style: **Valid/Compliant**



Summary of Scores

Total Score..... 63 Adjusted Score..... 48

Performance Curve Measures

Sector 1 Distance..... 50	Slope..... -0.0092
Sector 2 Distance..... 14	Point of Entry..... 1.0
Sector 3 Distance..... NA	Tail Score..... 0
Sector 1 Residual..... 0.007	Peak Performance Interval..... 35
Suppression Sector..... No	Patterned Responding..... NA

Performance Curve Interpretation (Verbal Subtest)

Performance classified as Valid is assumed to represent compliance. Individuals classified as Compliant demonstrate a predictable decrement in performance as the items increase in difficulty. However, performance that follows such a pattern does not necessarily ensure that the test-taker made his best effort. The clinician should make that determination based on all available information. In the following section, features of the Performance Curve that support the conclusion of **compliant responding** are reviewed.

Based on the predominant characteristics of this individual's Performance Curve, the best conclusion is that he made a strong effort to answer the items correctly. His Performance Curve is elevated for the easier items and progresses toward random responding for the more difficult items. His negative Slope indicates that he intended to respond correctly to the test items.

His Total Score of 63 (out of 78) is much higher than expected for irrelevant responding and indicates that he made an effort to respond correctly. His Total Score is consistent with the conclusion that he intended to answer many of the test items correctly.

The first point on the Performance Curve (the Point of Entry) indicates that he answered all of the 10 easiest items correctly. This is a good indication that he intended to respond correctly and further supports the designation of compliance. His continued success on the items after the Point of Entry affirms the conclusion that he intended to respond correctly. He appears to have made a good effort within Sector 1.

A comparison of the length of the first section of his Performance Curve (Sector 1) and the second section (Sector 2) supports the classification of Compliant responding. Sector 1, which indicates demonstrated ability, is longer than Sector 2, which reflects the transition from knowing to guessing. The best conclusion is that he answered most of the items correctly until the item difficulty exceeded his ability.

The eight most difficult items on the test were designed so that the incorrect answer would appeal to compliant individuals and the correct answer would appeal to individuals who are intentionally trying to choose the incorrect answers. This individual answered all of these items incorrectly, which supports the conclusion that he intended to choose the correct answers for at least some of the items in this subtest.

Estimate of Word Knowledge

The VIP Verbal subtest was not designed to generate a measure of word knowledge or reading ability. However, the Verbal subtest items have a wide range of difficulty, and it is often possible to generate reasonable estimates of ability based on characteristics of the individual's Performance Curve and Adjusted Score. The length of the first section of the Performance Curve (Sector 1), which represents his demonstrated ability, suggests that his word knowledge is at least average to high average or higher. However, this conservative estimate of his ability is not supported by his Adjusted Score, which estimates his word knowledge to be at least low average to average or higher.

SUMMARY OF RESULTS

	<u>Nonverbal subtest</u>	<u>Verbal subtest</u>
Overall subtest validity:	Invalid	Valid
Subtest response style:	Suppressed	Compliant

In conclusion, there are conflicting indications regarding this individual's response style. His performance on the Verbal subtest was classified as Compliant. His Performance Curve characteristics indicate that he intended to do well and applied sustained effort for most of the items. It is conceivable that he would have performed even better if he had tried harder.

His performance on the Nonverbal subtest was classified as Suppressed. His Performance Curve characteristics indicate that he intentionally chose incorrect answers for at least some of the Nonverbal test items. Given that his performance on the Verbal subtest appears to be compliant, there is the potential for sharply different conclusions about the reliability of his performance on cognitive tests. The classification of Suppressed is deliberately conservative, and for these results, the classification is well supported. It is likely that he has a compelling reason to feign disability on tests of reasoning and comprehension but not on tests of word knowledge or reading skill. A careful evaluation of how he approached the testing session is critical to determine if it would be useful to interpret any tests that were administered concurrently.

ITEM RESPONSES

Nonverbal Subtest

1: 2	2: 1	3: 1	4: 1	5: 2	6: 1	7: 1	8: 1	9: 2	10: 2
11: 1	12: 2	13: 1	14: 1	15: 1	16: 1	17: 2	18: 2	19: 1	20: 2
21: 1	22: 2	23: 2	24: 1	25: 2	26: 1	27: 2	28: 2	29: 2	30: 2
31: 2	32: 1	33: 1	34: 1	35: 1	36: 1	37: 2	38: 2	39: 2	40: 2
41: 2	42: 1	43: 2	44: 2	45: 2	46: 2	47: 1	48: 1	49: 2	50: 1
51: 1	52: 1	53: 1	54: 1	55: 1	56: 2	57: 1	58: 2	59: 1	60: 2
61: 2	62: 2	63: 1	64: 2	65: 1	66: 1	67: 1	68: 1	69: 2	70: 1
71: 2	72: 2	73: 2	74: 1	75: 1	76: 2	77: 1	78: 2	79: 2	80: 1
81: 2	82: 1	83: 1	84: 2	85: 2	86: 2	87: 2	88: 2	89: 1	90: 2
91: 1	92: 1	93: 1	94: 1	95: 2	96: 1	97: 1	98: 2	99: 2	100: 1

Verbal Subtest

1: 2	2: 1	3: 2	4: 1	5: 1	6: 2	7: 2	8: 1	9: 2	10: 1
11: 2	12: 2	13: 2	14: 1	15: 1	16: 2	17: 1	18: 2	19: 2	20: 1
21: 1	22: 1	23: 2	24: 2	25: 1	26: 1	27: 2	28: 1	29: 1	30: 2
31: 1	32: 1	33: 2	34: 2	35: 2	36: 2	37: 1	38: 1	39: 1	40: 1
41: 2	42: 1	43: 2	44: 1	45: 2	46: 1	47: 1	48: 2	49: 1	50: 2
51: 1	52: 1	53: 1	54: 2	55: 2	56: 2	57: 1	58: 1	59: 2	60: 1
61: 2	62: 1	63: 1	64: 2	65: 2	66: 2	67: 2	68: 1	69: 1	70: 2
71: 2	72: 2	73: 1	74: 1	75: 2	76: 1	77: 2	78: 1		

End of Report