
Abstract
Based on a focused review and careful analysis of a large amount of published research, Butcher, Gass, Cumella, Kally and Williams (2008) concluded that the Fake Bad Scale (FBS) does not appear to be a sufficiently reliable or valid measure of the construct “faking bad.” Butcher et al. (2008) pointed out examples of errors in some of the most widely cited studies (including meta-analytic) used to support the FBS, and described potential biases if the FBS is used to impute the motivation to malinger in those reaching its variable and imprecise cut-off scores. In a response to this article, Ben-Porath, Greve, Bianchini, and Kaufmann (2009) dismissed all the concerns raised in it with suggestions that our conclusions were based on faulty premises, misunderstandings of basic concepts, misleading descriptions of MMPI research, flawed analyses, and so on. This reply corrects some of Ben-Porath and colleagues’ (2009) multiple misrepresentations of the points made in Butcher et al. (2008) and identifies eight logical fallacies relevant to the FBS controversy. We end with a challenge to other psychologists to fully examine the underlying FBS research before adopting this scale in their clinical practice.