

AperTO - Archivio Istituzionale Open Access dell'Università di Torino

**The Development of the Inventory of Problems-29: A Brief Self-Administered Measure for Discriminating Bona Fide From Feigned Psychiatric and Cognitive Complaints**

**This is the author's manuscript**

*Original Citation:*

*Availability:*

This version is available <http://hdl.handle.net/2318/1617686> since 2016-11-28T17:14:35Z

*Published version:*

DOI:10.1080/00223891.2016.1233882

*Terms of use:*

Open Access

Anyone can freely access the full text of works made available as "Open Access". Works made available under a Creative Commons license can be used according to the terms and conditions of said license. Use of all other works requires consent of the right holder (author or publisher) if not exempted from copyright protection by the applicable law.

(Article begins on next page)

This is the author's final version of the contribution published as:

Viglione, Donald J; Giromini, Luciano; Landis, Patricia. The Development of the Inventory of Problems–29: A Brief Self-Administered Measure for Discriminating Bona Fide From Feigned Psychiatric and Cognitive Complaints. *JOURNAL OF PERSONALITY ASSESSMENT*. None pp: 1-11.

DOI: 10.1080/00223891.2016.1233882

The publisher's version is available at:

<https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/00223891.2016.1233882>

When citing, please refer to the published version.

Link to this full text:

<http://hdl.handle.net/2318/1617686>



**The Development of the Inventory of Problems-29: A Brief Self-Administered Measure for Discriminating Bona Fide from Feigned Psychiatric and Cognitive Complaints**

Journal:	<i>Journal of Personality Assessment</i>
Manuscript ID	JPA-2016-095.R1
Manuscript Type:	General Submission
Keywords:	Inventory of Problems, Feigning, Malingering < Content or Topic, Test Development < Content or Topic, Validity

SCHOLARONE™  
Manuscripts

## DEVELOPMENT OF THE IOP-29

**Abstract**

This article describes the development of the Inventory of Problems-29 (IOP-29), a new, short, paper-and-pencil, self-administered measure of feigned mental and cognitive disorders. Four clinical comparison, simulation studies were conducted. Study 1 ( $n = 451$ ) selected the items and produced an index of potential feigning. Study 2 ( $n = 331$ ) scaled such index to produce a probability score, and examined its psychometric properties. Study 3 tested the generalizability of Study 2's findings with two additional samples ( $ns = 128$  and  $90$ ). Results supported the utility of the IOP-29 for discriminating bona fide from feigned psychiatric and cognitive complaints. Validity was demonstrated with mild traumatic brain injury, psychosis, PTSD, and depression. Within the independent samples of studies 2 and 3, the brief IOP-29 performed similarly to the MMPI-2 and PAI, and perhaps better than the TOMM. Classifications within these samples with base rates of .5 produced sensitivity, specificity, positive predictive power, and negative predictive power statistics of about .80. Further research is needed testing the IOP-29 in ecologically valid field studies.

*Keywords:* Inventory of Problems, feigning, malingering, test development, validity

## DEVELOPMENT OF THE IOP-29

1  
2  
3 The Development of the Inventory of Problems-29: A Brief Self-Administered  
4 Measure for Discriminating Bona Fide from Feigned Psychiatric and Cognitive Complaints  
5  
6  
7  
8

9  
10 Malingering of mental and cognitive disorders costs millions of dollars each year  
11 (Chafetz & Underhill, 2013). Undetected cases of malingering are costly to taxpayers, as  
12 funds, for example, are allocated to provide malingering criminals with housing and  
13 unnecessary psychiatric treatment in hospitals rather than prisons. Insurance companies and  
14 businesses fund treatment for malingered neuropsychological and psychological complaints,  
15 as well as pay awards in malingered workman's compensation cases. To some degree,  
16 malingering compromises the efficacy of the mental health system, as practitioners may not  
17 be able to provide accurate diagnoses, recommendations, or effective treatment to those  
18 malingered psychological complaints. Also, true patients may be viewed with a suspicious  
19 eye and have more difficulty accessing treatment and compensation.  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30

31  
32 Reported rates of malingering vary greatly, because malingering involves both  
33 "situation-specific and issue specific" (Rogers & Salekin, 1998, p.148), there is a strong  
34 motivation to avoid detection, and different detection methods are used. In a review of  
35 literature, Rogers (1997) cited two large surveys estimating malingering prevalence rates to  
36 range between 15.7% and 17.4% among forensic settings. Nevertheless, these rates are in fact  
37 highly variable in forensic practice, with a standard deviation of 14.4% (Rogers, Salekin,  
38 Sewell, Goldstein, & Leonard, 1998). More recently, Larrabee (2003) grossly estimated the  
39 average rate of neuropsychological malingering from research publications to be 41%,  
40 although estimates in the individual studies differed by as much as 50%.  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50

51  
52 Given the importance of the phenomenon, it is not surprising that research on the  
53 detection of malingering in the form of feigning on psychological tests, has dramatically  
54 increased during the past few decades, and a number of instruments and scales to detect  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## DEVELOPMENT OF THE IOP-29

1  
2  
3 feigning<sup>1</sup> of mental disorders, cognitive impairment, and medical complaints have been  
4  
5 proposed (Rogers, 2008). Multiscale personality inventories such as the Minnesota  
6  
7 Multiphasic Personality Inventory (MMPI-2; Green, 1991; MMPI-RF; Ben-Porath &  
8  
9 Tellegen, 2008) and Personality Assessment Inventory (PAI, Morey, 1996) include validity  
10  
11 indices aimed at detecting atypical response styles and exaggeration. Some interview-based  
12  
13 and multi-method assessment procedures specifically focus on detecting feigning of mental  
14  
15 disorders also have been described. Among them, Rogers and his coworkers (Rogers, Gillis,  
16  
17 Dickens, & Bagby, 1991; Rogers, Gillis, Bagby, & Monteiro, 1991; Rogers, Sewell, &  
18  
19 Gillard, 2010) have developed the Structured Interview of Reported Symptoms (SIRS), an  
20  
21 instrument to detect feigning of mental disorders that has received widespread acceptance in  
22  
23 the forensic community (Archer, Buffington-Vollum, Stredney, & Handel, 2006; Lally,  
24  
25 2003).

26  
27  
28  
29  
30 Because these instruments require either extended administration time or trained  
31  
32 examiners, several brief and easy to use instruments to detect feigning of mental disorders  
33  
34 have also been introduced. For example, Miller (2001) developed the Miller-Forensic  
35  
36 Assessment of Symptoms Test (M-FAST), a 25-item structured interview for feigned  
37  
38 psychopathology which has demonstrated good scale characteristics. As another example,  
39  
40 Beaber and his associates (Beaber, Marston, Michelli, & Millis, 1985) developed the M Test,  
41  
42 a short, self-administered, self-report measure, designed to expose false psychotic complaints.  
43  
44 Along the same lines, Smith and Burger (1997) developed the Structured Inventory of  
45  
46 Malingered Symptomatology (SIMS), a 75-item self-report tool aimed to detect commonly  
47  
48 feigned conditions such as psychosis, neurological impairment, and affective disorders.  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54

---

55  
56 <sup>1</sup> Consistent with Rogers and Bender (2013), here we refer to *malingering* to indicate the “deliberate fabrication  
57 or gross exaggeration of psychological or physical symptoms of the fulfillment of an external goal” and *feigning*  
58 to indicate the “deliberate fabrication or gross exaggeration of psychological or physical symptoms (Rogers &  
59 Vitacco, 2002) without any assumptions about its goals.” (p. 518)

## DEVELOPMENT OF THE IOP-29

1  
2  
3 In addition, a number of brief measures also have been developed with the purpose to  
4  
5 detect feigned cognitive impairment. These instruments, sometimes referred to as “tests of  
6  
7 effort” or “performance validity tests,” generally include cognitive tasks that may appear  
8  
9 difficult at a first sight, but are in fact relatively simple. Thus, by exerting inadequate or  
10  
11 suboptimal effort, feigners often perform more poorly than individuals with genuine  
12  
13 cognitive impairment. Examples of these instruments include the Test of Memory  
14  
15 Malinger (TOMM; Tombaugh, 1996), the Victoria Symptom Validity Test (VSVT; Slick,  
16  
17 Hopp, Strauss, & Thompson, 2005), and the Word Memory Test (WMT; Green, Allen, &  
18  
19 Astner, 1996).  
20  
21  
22

23 All of these instruments vary in their merits, foci, and limitations. For example, some,  
24  
25 such as the TOMM or the WMT, only focus on certain, specific cognitive abilities (e.g.,  
26  
27 recognition memory) and are less likely to detect feigned affective disorders or psychosis. In  
28  
29 contrast, others, such as the M Test, are designed to detect a specific, single diagnostic target,  
30  
31 such as feigned psychosis, but may not detect other feigned cognitive or affective problems.  
32  
33 Both cases are somewhat problematic, in that individuals attempting to feign mental or  
34  
35 cognitive disorders often present with a multitude of symptoms and problems within a  
36  
37 specific life predicament or context rather than limiting their efforts to a single, specific  
38  
39 diagnostic target. Furthermore, some of these screening tools have mostly been studied using  
40  
41 simulators<sup>2</sup> and honest, non-patient controls, while for the sake of generalizability to real life  
42  
43 situations it would be optimal if simulators were contrasted to and matched with genuine  
44  
45 patients. Also, many focus on only a single detection strategy, possibly under the influence of  
46  
47 internal consistency concerns, so that their items do not vary systematically to provide  
48  
49 comprehensive coverage of tactics adopted by malingerers (Rogers, 2008). Perhaps more  
50  
51 importantly, all suffer from some errors in prediction, shrinkage from developmental research  
52  
53  
54  
55

56  
57 <sup>2</sup> The word *simulators* is used here to characterize research participants in simulation studies feigning any  
58  
59 psychiatric disorders or cognitive impairments; in contrast, the word *malingerers* is used to describe individuals  
60  
presenting disorders or impairments in real life.

## DEVELOPMENT OF THE IOP-29

1  
2  
3 to validation and field research, and uncertainty regarding the cutoff scores across situations  
4  
5 and studies, the last of which is a routine problem in decision-making in practice.  
6

7  
8 In an attempt to overcome some of these limitations and to help examiners decision-  
9  
10 making in the field, we developed the Inventory of Problems-29 (IOP-29), a short, paper-and-  
11  
12 pencil, self-administered measure to detect feigning of mental or cognitive disorders. With  
13  
14 this first, IOP-29 study, we intended to provide evidence that such measure can detect  
15  
16 feigning of both psychiatric and cognitive disorders within simulation studies.  
17

**Overview**

18  
19  
20 Four guiding principles shaped the development the IOP-29. First, we conceptualized  
21  
22 *malingering* as a person-situation interaction with a developmental course over a period of  
23  
24 time, reinforced through powerful incentives (Rogers, 1988). Secondly, since malingerers  
25  
26 adopt different strategies and situations induce various approaches from individuals (Rogers  
27  
28 & Bender, 2013; Rogers, Harrell, & Liff, 1993), we concluded that a short, but  
29  
30 comprehensive feigning measure would necessitate multiple detection strategies. Third, an  
31  
32 implication of these principles is that test and person interact in a particular context or  
33  
34 predicament. Within this interaction, malingering behaviors may ebb and flow as a function  
35  
36 of environmental stimuli. Potentially, a test can induce and measure feigning behaviors that  
37  
38 otherwise might not be available. Finally, consistent with Arbisi and Ben-Porath (1995), we  
39  
40 focused on incremental validity in developing items and selecting items and strategies. Thus,  
41  
42 in the test development we retained items that incremented over the easier to develop keyed  
43  
44 true, atypical or extreme complaint items. Such descriptions dominate many self-report  
45  
46 malingering tests.  
47  
48  
49  
50

51  
52 From the sentiment in the field about the advantages of interviewing techniques and  
53  
54 the research supporting the validity of complex interviewing techniques (e.g., Rogers, 2008),  
55  
56 we concluded that we had to create a different type of objective test. Such a test might  
57  
58  
59  
60



## DEVELOPMENT OF THE IOP-29

1  
2  
3 incorporate “proven” techniques from interviews. Thus, in our test development studies  
4  
5 leading up to the IOP-29, we investigated a number of different item structures and  
6  
7 organizational methods. First, we included a variety of cognitive problems along with the  
8  
9 more conventional test item declarative statements. Problem-solving included memory,  
10  
11 calculation, and reasoning items (e.g., “Reading is to a Book, as Listening is to a Song”).  
12  
13 Secondly, we added the response choice of “doesn’t make sense” to the typical true-false  
14  
15 response selections. We hypothesized that this three response choice structure would allow  
16  
17 more precise identification of feigned versus true psychopathology. In addition, it potentially  
18  
19 allowed us to address the simulators’ use of extreme or nonsensical complaints more easily,  
20  
21 so that honest test takers could answer “doesn’t make sense” to items assuming a malingering  
22  
23 response set (e.g., “It never stops torturing me”). Alternatively, feigned cognitive deficiency  
24  
25 and resistance to the evaluation might emerge as frequent endorsement of “doesn’t make  
26  
27 sense” (Rogers, 1997). Furthermore, responses to problem-solving items were not restricted  
28  
29 to this “true-false-doesn’t make sense” response choice, allowing us to incorporate  
30  
31 approximate answers or near-miss phenomena (e.g., “Answer this problem:  $165 - 121 = ?$ ”).  
32  
33 We also attempted to address “test-behaviors” that we might induce (and simulators might  
34  
35 self-report) during the test itself. For example, we speculated that simulators presenting false  
36  
37 disorders might note that they are shaking uncontrollably or that they might report concerns  
38  
39 about the test not surveying all of their problems.  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44

45 An extensive series of studies and three prior versions of the instrument (Viglione &  
46  
47 Landis, 1994) contributed to the development of the IOP-29. This long developmental period  
48  
49 adapted concepts, techniques, and statistical procedures derived from the literature and  
50  
51 empirical experience with the versions of the scale. Our focus was on ecological validity and  
52  
53 utility by focusing on helping examiners in the field in forming an opinion about whether the  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## DEVELOPMENT OF THE IOP-29

1  
2  
3 presenting complaint is bona fide or feigned<sup>3</sup>. In each stage of our research, strategies,  
4  
5 techniques, items, and item combinations were revised, trimmed, and enhanced based on the  
6  
7 empirical findings. We concerned ourselves with discriminating simulators from patients,  
8  
9 with little emphasis on honest, non-patient controls, as they are very easy to identify. To  
10  
11 maximize generalizability of our findings, our research studies utilized adult, non-college,  
12  
13 community samples and included instructions not to overdo feigning roles.  
14  
15

16  
17 Initially, based on our review of the literature and experience, we developed 27  
18  
19 potential feigning strategies and 245 items (Viglione & Landis, 1994). These strategies  
20  
21 included concepts such as: (a) endorsement of atypical symptoms, that do not occur or are  
22  
23 very rare even with significantly disturbed individuals; (b) failure of easy cognitive problems,  
24  
25 which bona fide patients and non-patient controls almost always answer correctly; (c)  
26  
27 externalization or minimization of one's own responsibility concerning his or her own  
28  
29 psychological condition or situation; (d) criticism or nervousness of or problematic reactions  
30  
31 to the evaluation context, the test itself, or the testing condition; and (e) refusal to admit  
32  
33 qualified positive attributes or experiences, which bona fide patients and non-patient controls  
34  
35 almost always endorse. Thus, using Rogers and Bender's (2013) words, we combined both  
36  
37 *unlikely* and *amplified* mental disorder detection strategies with both *excessive impairment*  
38  
39 and *unlikely presentations* strategies to feign cognitive impairment within a single instrument  
40  
41 to maximize prediction. Moreover, many items were worded in ways to capture a variety of  
42  
43 disorders, and each item corresponded to one or more feigning detection strategies to serve  
44  
45 our goal of using the test to address a wide variety of disorders. This initial research was an  
46  
47 attempt to determine which of these detection strategies might work in identifying feigning. It  
48  
49 included 226 simulators, a few suspected, malingerers in vivo, and patients.  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54

---

55  
56  
57 <sup>3</sup> In practice, of course, this decision is complicated by both multiple, related response styles, and the fact that  
58  
59 motivation, i.e. malingering, cannot be deduced from test findings. Also, findings from individual tests are often  
60  
indeterminate regarding the likelihood of feigning (Rogers & Bender, 2013).

## DEVELOPMENT OF THE IOP-29

1  
2  
3 Based on the findings, we retained those strategies, items, and item and response  
4 structures that discriminated well, we eliminated those that did not, and modified others. We  
5 added items for empirically supported detection strategies, modified items so that they  
6 accessed multiple strategies, and added items according to the emerging research in the field.  
7 Thus, we created a second, developmental version of the instrument (IOP-Developmental  
8 Version-2; IOP-DV2), which consisted of 162 items intermixing a minority of cognitive  
9 items with self-report items. Noteworthy, the great majority of these 162 items had already  
10 demonstrated validity in identifying simulators, with a smaller number of new items being  
11 based on generalizations from strategies and item types that had demonstrated validity in our  
12 first pilot research.

**The Current Studies**

13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
The main goal of the current group of studies was to develop, scale, and cross-validate  
the IOP-29, a brief, self-administered measure of feigning. Its main application is to serve as  
a decision-making tool to discriminate bona fide patients from feigners. We present three test  
development, simulation studies with various independent samples. The first study was  
conducted to select a small subset of items which together best discriminate feigning from  
bona fide disorders. We thus selected the 29 items of the IOP-29. The second study was  
conducted to scale the IOP-29 and produce a feigning probability score. The third study  
cross-validated the probability score obtained from Study 2. All studies included clinical  
comparison samples.

**Study 1: Scale Construction****Method**

To select the best subset of the 162 items, which as a group would optimize the  
validity of the scale, we retrieved archival data from eight studies. Each study used specific  
procedures and measures, and investigated different samples with different purposes.

## DEVELOPMENT OF THE IOP-29

1  
2  
3 Nevertheless, all included data on the IOP-DV2 and followed relatively similar procedures in  
4  
5 terms of inclusion and exclusion criteria, diagnostic status verification, and simulation task  
6  
7 presentation. For the purpose of this study, we only extracted from each study the IOP-DV2  
8  
9 data and only included patients' and simulators' data.  
10

11       **Sampling procedures and participants.** The sample utilized for Study 1 combined  
12  
13 data ( $n = 451$ ) from six dissertation studies (Green, 1999; Jansak, 1996; Landis, 1996;  
14  
15 McDougall, 1996; Mellin, 1996; Schaich, 2000) and two unpublished studies, for a total of  
16  
17 160 bona fide patients and 291 simulators. Most of the data, 76%, were collected with a  
18  
19 computerized version of the IOP-DV2 (e.g., Landis, 1996) with 24% being collected with a  
20  
21 paper-and-pencil version (e.g., Jansak, 1996). In most of the cases, simulators and to a lesser  
22  
23 degree patients were recruited from the general community through newspapers,  
24  
25 advertisements, and flyers. Most of the patients (e.g., Mellin, 1996; Schaich, 2000) were  
26  
27 instead recruited through inpatient hospitals, outpatient clinics, day treatment centers, or  
28  
29 criminal investigation units. In most cases (i.e., Green, 1999; Jansak, 1996; Landis, 1996;  
30  
31 McDougall, 1996; Mellin, 1996; Schaich, 2000) participants were compensated for their  
32  
33 participation with a small amount of money.  
34  
35  
36  
37

38       All diagnoses of the patient group were verified either by the chief evaluator of the  
39  
40 referring site, or by the hospital records, or through some consolidated assessment  
41  
42 instruments such as the Structured Clinical Interview for the DSM-IV (SCID-IV; First,  
43  
44 Spitzer, Gibbon, & Williams, 1995), or the PTSD Interview (Watson, Juba, Manifold,  
45  
46 Kucala, & Anderson, 1991). In almost all cases, criteria for inclusion in the simulator group  
47  
48 included no evidence of severe psychopathologies or active substance abuse disorder. For  
49  
50 some of the studies, additional inclusion criteria for the simulator group also included no  
51  
52 evidence of a specific "target" diagnosis. Landis' (1996) study, for example, aimed at  
53  
54 contrasting bona fide PTSD patients to PTSD simulators, and also excluded potential  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## DEVELOPMENT OF THE IOP-29

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

simulators if they exceeded the PTSD severity criteria. In all cases, simulators were given a brief scenario with descriptions of symptoms to provide a life-like motivation to malingering. For example, simulators of depression were asked to imagine that they had had an accident at work, that such accident was caused by their boss' negligence, that their boss decided to unreasonably limit their recovery time (thereby cutting their disability payments), and that their only chance to remain on disability would be to fake depression. To limit extreme, unrealistic portrayals of disorders by simulators and to minimize an artificially large effect size that might limit generalization to real life situations, simulators were warned that if they presented their symptoms too dramatically, their performance would not be believable (Rogers & Bender, 2013; Viglione, Wright, Dizon, Moynihan, DuPuis, & Pizitz, 2001). Finally, in most of the cases simulators were also told that the most "successful feigners," that is those who were not detected, would be put in a lottery and could win additional financial rewards.

Most of the patient group had a diagnosis of depression ( $\approx 46\%$ ), a diagnosis in the schizophrenia spectrum ( $\approx 27\%$ ), or a diagnosis of PTSD ( $\approx 18\%$ ). However, a small proportion ( $\approx 9\%$ ) also included other diagnoses (e.g.,  $\approx 7\%$  had a bipolar disorder). Similarly, most of the simulator group were non-patients who faked depression ( $\approx 25\%$ ), schizophrenia ( $\approx 39\%$ ), or PTSD ( $\approx 20\%$ ). The rest of the simulator group consisted of incarcerated inmates simulating incompetence to stand trial ( $\approx 10\%$ ) or non-patient simulators faking other disorders ( $\approx 6\%$ ).

Individual demographic information was available, albeit with some missing values, for 282 out of 451 cases. By supplementing these data with group and sample demographic descriptions reported by Green (1999), Jansak (1996), Landis (1996), McDougall (1996), Mellin (1996), and Schaich (2000), in their doctoral dissertations, we were able to produce a relatively accurate characterization of the entire sample: Within the patient sample, ages

## DEVELOPMENT OF THE IOP-29

1  
2  
3 ranged from 20 to 79 years old, with a mean age of 38.8 ( $SD = 11.5$ ); within the simulator  
4  
5 sample ages ranged 16 to 80 years old, with a mean age of 33.8 ( $SD = 10.7$ ). Although such a  
6  
7 difference is statistically significant,  $t_{(449)} = 4.6$ ,  $p < .01$ ,  $d = .45$ , it consists of merely five  
8  
9 years, which in adulthood is likely to not affect the IOP-DV2 data. Gender did not differ,  $\Phi$   
10  
11 =  $-.01$ ,  $p = .89$ , with about 52% males and about 48% females in the patient sample and about  
12  
13 51% male and 49% female among simulators. Within the patient sample, about 26%, were  
14  
15 non-Caucasians, with about 12% of African-Americans, about 8% of Hispanics, about 3% of  
16  
17 Asian-Americans, and about 3% of other ethnicities. Within the simulator sample, a similar  
18  
19 proportion, i.e., about 24%, of non-Caucasians was observed, with about 12% of Hispanics,  
20  
21 about 4% of Asian-Americans, about 3% of African-Americans, and about 5% of other  
22  
23 ethnicities. The percentage of Caucasians vs. non-Caucasian within the patient and simulator  
24  
25 samples, thus, did not statistically differ,  $\Phi = -.01$ ,  $p = .77$ . Within the patient sample about  
26  
27 53% had at least attended some college, whereas such percentage within the simulator sample  
28  
29 was about 75%. Thus, the simulator group was more educated than the patient group,  $\Phi = -$   
30  
31  $.23$ ,  $p < .01$ . Finally, about 14% of the patient sample was married, while about 23% of the  
32  
33 simulator sample was married. This difference, again, is statistically significant,  $\Phi = -.10$ ,  $p$   
34  
35 =  $.03$ , although the small effect size was small.

40  
41 **Item selection.** Aiming at developing a brief, paper-and-pencil self-report measure, a  
42  
43 sub-set of the initial 162 IOP-DV2 items was selected. To do so, we followed a three-step  
44  
45 procedure. First, we excluded all items that were not suitable for a paper and pencil self-  
46  
47 administration. For example, we excluded some memory items in that they required images  
48  
49 to be shown on a computer screen. This initial screening yielded 126 items to be further  
50  
51 examined. Secondly, we calculated the Phi correlations between each item (1 = response in  
52  
53 the key direction; 0 = response not in the key direction) and group (dummy code 1 =  
54  
55 simulator; 0 = bona fide patient). Item/response combinations with significant Phi values ( $p \leq$   
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## DEVELOPMENT OF THE IOP-29

1  
2  
3 .05) and in the expected direction were retained for the third step of our item selection  
4  
5 procedure. Thus, a given keyed true item was retained only if the response “true” (1 = true; 0  
6  
7 = not true) produced a positive and significant Phi correlation with group, and, similarly, a  
8  
9 given keyed false item was retained only if the response “false” (1 = false; 0 = not false)  
10  
11 produced a positive and significant Phi correlation with group. Although the item selection  
12  
13 process focused on the true vs. false options, the additional “doesn’t make sense” choice  
14  
15 option effects this process. Potentially, this third response option allows for a more refined  
16  
17 and less ambiguous understanding of the meaning of the true and false response selection by  
18  
19 eliminating its forced choice character and reducing error.  
20  
21

22  
23 We found 114 significant item/response Phi correlations among the 126 items, a  
24  
25 testament to the validity of the item development and validity of our procedures to this point.  
26  
27 We implemented a relatively complex algorithm to extract a small subset of items that  
28  
29 together would maximize the IOP-29 correlation with group while minimizing redundancy  
30  
31 among the items. The first item selected is the item/response combination with the highest  
32  
33 Phi value, i.e., the best predictor. Subsequent items were those with the best incremental  
34  
35 validity. To select those items one-by-one, we partialled out previously selected item(s) from  
36  
37 the remaining item/response-group correlations, and selected the item with the highest partial  
38  
39 Phi correlation. This procedure was stopped after selecting 29 items, when the highest  
40  
41 remaining partial Phi correlation approached zero.  
42  
43

44  
45 **Item weights.** With these 29 items, an initial feigning index (Single Weight Score)  
46  
47 was produced by summing them with one point for each item/response combination. We then  
48  
49 selected all item/response combinations from these 29 items that demonstrated incremental  
50  
51 validity – operationally defined by a significant Phi correlation in the expected direction after  
52  
53 partialling out the Single Weight Score. This procedure resulted in multiple weighting for the  
54  
55 subset of items with strong validity and involved the “doesn’t make sense” response more  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## DEVELOPMENT OF THE IOP-29

1  
2  
3 directly in the scaling. For example, a given item keyed false may have a +1 weighting for  
4  
5 “false”, a 0 weighting for “doesn’t make sense” and a -1 weighting for “true.” The resulting  
6  
7 index was named Multiple Weight Score.  
8

**Results**

9  
10  
11 The point bi-serial correlations between group (dummy code 1 = simulator; 0 = bona  
12  
13 fide patient) and the two feigning indexes under investigation were respectively .687,  $p <$   
14  
15 .001, for the Single Weight Score, and .714,  $p <$  .001, for the Multiple Weight Score. The  
16  
17 difference between these two correlations was significant ( $z = 2.7 p <$  .001), using procedures  
18  
19 described by Meng, Rosenthal, and Rubin (1992) for comparing correlations obtained from  
20  
21 the same sample that share a common variable. The receiver operator characteristic curve  
22  
23 (AUC) for the Single Weight Score was .913 ( $SE = .014$ ), the AUC for the Multiple Weight  
24  
25 Score was .932 ( $SE = .012$ ). Cohen’s  $d$  values were 1.97 for the Single Weight Score and  
26  
27 2.13 for the Multiple Weight Score.  
28  
29  
30  
31

**Study 2: Probability Scaling**

32  
33  
34 Study 2 utilized the Multiple Weight Score derived from Study 1 to produce and to  
35  
36 cross-validate a False Disorder Probability Score. That is, a second, independent sample was  
37  
38 used to generate the transformations of raw scores to the scale used for the IOP-29, a  
39  
40 probability of feigning score. The independence of the samples in Study 1 and 2 prevents  
41  
42 distortions of the normative scaling. Similar to Study 1, data were retrieved from a number of  
43  
44 studies that used a variety of procedures and measures. Again, all included studies followed  
45  
46 relatively similar inclusion and exclusion criteria, diagnostic status verification, and  
47  
48 simulation task presentation. Also consistent with Study 1, for the purpose of Study 2 only  
49  
50 the IOP data were utilized and data from non-patient, honest participants was excluded. Half  
51  
52 of this dataset was randomly selected to produce the False Disorder Probability Score, and  
53  
54 the other half was used to cross-validate this score.  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



## DEVELOPMENT OF THE IOP-29

**Development of the False Disorder Probability Score**

**Sampling procedures and participants.** Subsequent to creating the 162 items of the IOP-DV2, we tested some additional items and developed a third, developmental version of the instrument (IOP-Developmental Version-3; IOP-DV3), a 181 item, computer-administered feigning measure. This version of the IOP includes all the 29 items that form the IOP-29<sup>4</sup>. Thus, to produce the IOP-29 False Disorder Probability Score, the current study investigated data from four simulation studies conducted with the IOP-DV3. Each study addressed one of the four disorder categories for which the IOP-DV3 was designed, i.e., neuropsychological deficit (Pizitz, 2001), schizophrenia and psychosis (O'Brien, 2004), Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder (Connell, 2004), and depression (Abramsky, 2005). Moreover, some combination of these four likely addresses a great majority of the malingering forensic clinical practice. All four studies used a simulation design contrasting a clinical comparison group of approximately 40 bona fide patients to approximately 40 individuals feigning the disorder. Participation was on a voluntary basis with prior consent obtained before participating, and in three of the four a small monetary compensation was given to all participants. Procedures used for these four studies are very similar to those described above for Study 1 (for additional details, see Abramsky, 2005; Connell, 2004; O'Brien, 2004; and Pizitz, 2001). As reported in Table 1, patients and simulators in this large ( $n = 333$ ), combined sample did not differ from each other in terms of gender, age, ethnicity, education, and marital status.

As noted above, to produce our feigning probability score, and cross-validate it with an independent sample, we split this  $N = 331$ , Study 2 sample. Half of each the patient and simulator samples within each study were randomly assigned to the developmental sample or validation sample. Thus, the developmental sample included 168 participants, 84 of which

---

<sup>4</sup> Accordingly, both the DV2 and DV3 versions of the IOP contain the IOP29 items. Both also included other items being evaluated for a longer more complex test of feigning.

## DEVELOPMENT OF THE IOP-29

1  
2  
3 were bona fide patients and 84 simulators. Ultimately, missing data reduced this number to  
4  
5 166 participants, 84 patients and 82 simulators, with approximately 20 patients and  
6  
7 simulators in the four diagnostic groups: mild traumatic brain injury (MTBI) as an example  
8  
9 of cognitive or neuropsychological disorders, schizophrenic spectrum-psychosis patients,  
10  
11 PTSD, and depression.  
12

13  
14 **Results.** The Multiple Weight Score from Study 1 was investigated with the  
15  
16 developmental sample of Study 2. The point bi-serial correlation between group (dummy  
17  
18 code) and the Multiple Weight Score was  $.625, p < .001$ . The difference in the score of  
19  
20 simulators and patients corresponded to a Cohen's  $d$  of 1.59. The AUC was  $.868 (SE = .029)$ .  
21  
22

23  
24 To produce a feigning probability score, the Multiple Weight Score was then used as  
25  
26 predictor in logistic regression with group as the outcome. The model was significant,  $\chi^2(1) =$   
27  
28  $78.51, p < .001$ , with a Nagelkerke  $R^2$  of  $.502$ . The  $exp(B)$ , or odds ratio of the Multiple  
29  
30 Weight Score was 258,483. Using a cut-off of  $.50$ , which nearly matches the feigning base  
31  
32 rate in this sample ( $.494$ ), the resulting, False Disorder Probability Score correctly classified  
33  
34  $81.3\%$  of the cases, with 14 patients erroneously classified as simulators (i.e.,  $8.4\%$  of the  
35  
36 total, and  $17.7\%$  of those predicted to be malingering), and 17 simulators erroneously  
37  
38 classified as patients (i.e.,  $10.2\%$  of the total, and  $19.5\%$  of those predicted to be not  
39  
40 malingering). Sensitivity is  $.79$ , specificity  $.83$ . Using the base rate observed in our sample  
41  
42 (i.e.,  $.494$ ), positive predictive power (PPP) is  $.82$ , negative predictive power (NPP) is  $.80$ ,  
43  
44 and overall correct classification (OCC) is  $.81$ . Consistent with findings obtained for the  
45  
46 Multiple Weight Score, the AUC was  $.868 (SE = .029)$  also for the False Disorder Probability  
47  
48 Score.  
49  
50

**Cross-Validation of the False Disorder Probability Score**

51  
52  
53  
54 Next, we tested the validity of our feigning indexes with the independent Study 2  
55  
56 validation sample consisting of 165 participants with 82 bona fide patients and 83 simulators.  
57  
58  
59  
60

## DEVELOPMENT OF THE IOP-29

1  
2  
3       **Results.** The point bi-serial correlations between group (dummy code) and the  
4  
5 Multiple Weight Score was  $.625, p < .001$ ; the difference in the score of simulators and  
6  
7 patients yielded a Cohen's  $d$  of 1.67; the AUC was  $.867 (SE = .029)$ . These findings are  
8  
9 virtually identical to those obtained from the developmental sample, so that no shrinkage was  
10  
11 shown, thus lending credence to our item development and item weighting procedures. With  
12  
13 a cut-off of  $.50$ , the False Disorder Probability Score correctly classified around 80% of the  
14  
15 cases, with 17 false positive classifications (i.e., 10.3% of the total, and 20.2% of the  
16  
17 positives), and 16 false negative classifications (i.e., 9.7% of the total, and 19.8% of the  
18  
19 negatives), and 16 false negative classifications (i.e., 9.7% of the total, and 19.8% of the  
20  
21 negatives).

22  
23       Sensitivity, specificity, PPP, NPP, and overall correct classification (OCC) statistics  
24  
25 were calculated. Due to the PPP, NPP, and OCC statistics being highly dependent on the  
26  
27 prevalence or base rate of the condition being tested (Meehl & Rosen, 1955), in addition to  
28  
29 the approximately  $.50$  base rate<sup>5</sup> of our sample, base rates of  $.25$ ,  $.10$ , and  $.05$  were also  
30  
31 explored by adjusting the PPP, NPP, and OCC formulas accordingly (Streiner, 2003). These  
32  
33 additional base rates were selected in that they may present a priori base rates or prevalence  
34  
35 in a variety of clinical, forensic, disability, benefit, or compensation settings. In addition, we  
36  
37 also surveyed probability score cutoffs, because they influence positive and negative  
38  
39 predictive power, and false positive and false negative errors are associated with different  
40  
41 predictive power, and false positive and false negative errors are associated with different  
42  
43 cost-benefit ratios. Results, reported in Table 2, indicate that when a cut-off of  $.50$  is adopted,  
44  
45 about 80% of the simulators are detected (sensitivity =  $.81$ ), and about 80% of the patients are  
46  
47 correctly labeled as non-simulators (specificity =  $.79$ ). Also, the OCC is maximized when the  
48  
49 cut-offs under examination reflect the base rates. For example, when a base rate of  $.50$  is  
50  
51 considered, the OCC is maximized (OCC =  $.80$ ) if the cut-off of the False Disorder  
52  
53

54  
55  
56  
57  
58       <sup>5</sup> The base rate for malingering in Study 3 is  $.503$ .

## DEVELOPMENT OF THE IOP-29

1  
2  
3 Probability Score is .50; similarly, when a base rate of .10 is considered, the OCC is  
4  
5 maximized (OCC = .92) for a False Disorder Probability Score of .90.  
6

7       **Comparative validity.** For about half of the samples utilized for Study 2, we also had  
8  
9 available data on frequently used feigning scales to address the comparative validity of the  
10  
11 IOP-29 against the MMPI-2 and TOMM. Specifically, O'Brien's (2004) psychotic sub-  
12  
13 sample had MMPI-2 data from 43 patients and 45 simulators, and Abramsky's (2005)  
14  
15 depression sub-sample included TOMM data from 43 patients and 42 simulators. To  
16  
17 maximize the stability and reliability of the statistics, comparative validity analyses were  
18  
19 conducted using all the available participants (i.e., 88 for the psychotic sub-sample, and 85  
20  
21 for the depression sub-sample). Because about half of these data were also included in the  
22  
23 developmental sample of Study 2 and used to produce the final scaling of the False Disorder  
24  
25 Probability Score, however, in addition to False Disorder Probability Score also the Multiple  
26  
27 Weight Score was examined. This latter score is completely independent of the scaling in the  
28  
29 second study, so could not possibly provide any over-estimation of the effect size.  
30  
31  
32  
33

34       As for the MMPI-2, consistent with O'Brien's (2004) work, the F, Fp, and Ds-r2  
35  
36 scales were selected for these analyses, as they are particularly useful in detecting feigning of  
37  
38 schizophrenia or psychosis (e.g., Elhai, Gold, & Frueh, 2000; Rogers, Sewell, & Ustad, 1995;  
39  
40 Viglione et al., 2001). As for the TOMM, consistent with Abramsky's (2005) work as well as  
41  
42 with previous research (e.g., Rees, Tombaugh, Gansler, & Moczynski, 1998; Tombaugh,  
43  
44 1996), both the number of correct responses on the first trial (TOMM-1), second trial  
45  
46 (TOMM-2), and entire test (TOMM-tot) were inspected.  
47  
48

49       The correlations calculated between each measure and group are presented in Table 3,  
50  
51 along with the respective AUC values. These data indicate that the IOP-29 performs similarly  
52  
53 to the selected MMPI-2 scales, and perhaps better than the TOMM. Also noteworthy, the  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## DEVELOPMENT OF THE IOP-29

IOP-29 performed similarly well for all of the four diagnostic groups taken into consideration for this study, i.e., MTBI, Schizophrenia/Psychosis, PTSD, and Depression.<sup>6</sup>

**Study 3: Generalizability of the Findings**

The analyses performed with the validation sample of Study 2 provide initial cross-validation of the IOP-29 False Disorder Probability Score. However, because they utilized the randomly excluded half of the subsamples used to develop the feigning probability score, Study 3 was designed to further validate the IOP-29 with independent samples.

**Method**

**Sampling procedures and participants.** Study 3 included two additional, independent samples from two dissertations. The first was a forensic sample of 128 volunteer participants on community-based county and federal probation (McCullaugh, 2011); half responded genuinely, half simulated mental health symptoms. The second sample included 90 participants: half were patients with Schizophrenia or Schizoaffective Disorder and half simulators (Wood, 2008). For both samples, the IOP-DV3 and Personality Assessment Inventory (PAI; Morey, 1991, 1996, 2007) were administered. To avoid extreme, unbelievable performances, participants were warned not to “overdo” their presentations, otherwise their performance would not be believable (Viglione et al, 2001).

**McCullaugh’s (2011) forensic sample.** Participants ( $n = 128$ ) were volunteer offenders on community-based county and federal probation. Twenty-four were recruited from a local, private forensic psychologist’s practice; all were being treated using a mixture of manual-based cognitive behavioral therapy (CBT) treatment for sexual offenders and substance abuse treatment. Confirmation that all these individuals were on probation was provided by the treating psychologist. The remaining 104 participants were recruited via

---

<sup>6</sup> As reported in Table 3, AUC was .845 ( $SE = .042$ ) for the psychotic sub-sample and .898 ( $SE = .037$ ) for the depression sub-sample. For the PTSD sub-sample AUC was .903 ( $SE = .037$ ); for the MTBI sub-sample AUC was .840 ( $SE = .048$ ).

## DEVELOPMENT OF THE IOP-29

1  
2  
3 volunteer postings on the internet. To verify that they also were on probation, the San Diego  
4  
5 Country Court Index website was used.  
6

7  
8 Half of the sample (randomly selected) was asked to respond genuinely, the other half  
9  
10 was asked to simulate mental health symptoms. Inclusion criteria required that participants  
11  
12 were not prescribed anti-psychotic medication, did not experience psychotic symptoms, and  
13  
14 did not report substance use within the last 30 days. Approximately 80% were men, the mean  
15  
16 age was about 36 (SD approximately 10), and about 70% were Caucasian. No significant  
17  
18 differences between the two groups were found for age, gender, ethnicity, education, marital  
19  
20 or employment status. Following completion of the procedures, all participants were  
21  
22 debriefed about the aims of the study, provided with \$20.00 incentive for participation, and  
23  
24 thanked for participating. Two additional raffle winners were drawn after study completion  
25  
26 and provided with \$100.00 cash prizes.  
27  
28

29  
30 Consistent with Rogers and Gillard's (2011) recommendations, simulators were given  
31  
32 a vignette to facilitate feigning. Based on details of an actual case of suspected malingerer  
33  
34 from another study (Weber, 2008), these vignettes were rich in contextual and historical  
35  
36 detail. Raters judged these vignettes as a group to include diffuse mental health symptoms,  
37  
38 including post-traumatic stress, neuropsychological impairment, and depressive symptoms,  
39  
40 but not schizophrenic or psychotic ones. For example, one of the vignettes asked the  
41  
42 individual to imagine having suffered an injury while working at a horse stable. The injury  
43  
44 resulted in being laid off without receiving disability income. Faking mental health symptoms  
45  
46 would be the way to receive compensation benefits for his or her disability. All simulators  
47  
48 were asked to carefully read these vignettes, and respond to the measures as the individual  
49  
50 depicted, reflecting history and symptom presentation.  
51  
52

53  
54 ***Woods' (2008) psychotic sample.*** The second sample included in Study 4 is a  
55  
56 psychotic sample, derived from a dissertation study (Wood, 2008) conducted with the IOP-  
57  
58  
59  
60

## DEVELOPMENT OF THE IOP-29

1  
2  
3 DV3. Patients ( $n = 45$ ) were recruited from local day treatment programs, and all had a  
4  
5 diagnosis of Schizophrenia or Schizoaffective disorder, as confirmed by their treating  
6  
7 psychiatrists. Simulators ( $n = 45$ ) were matched with patients on gender and level of  
8  
9 education: In each group there were 34 men and 11 women, 36 had no college education and  
10  
11 11 did. The mean age within patients was 40 years ( $SD = 10$ ), while the simulators were  
12  
13 younger, with a mean age of 28 years ( $SD = 10$ ). In both groups of this diverse sample, about  
14  
15 one third of the participants identified themselves as Caucasian, about one third as African-  
16  
17 American, and about one third as Latino. Approximately 70%, in each group, were single. All  
18  
19 patients, but none of the simulators, had a history of psychiatric hospitalization and were  
20  
21 currently taking psychotropic medication. Prior to taking the IOP, simulators were given ten  
22  
23 minutes to review the instructions, which included a description of the disorder. In short, they  
24  
25 were asked to complete the psychological testing as if they were trying to appear psychotic in  
26  
27 a given real-life scenario (e.g., they were asked to pretend they had been accused of  
28  
29 committing a crime, and that the only way to avoid incarceration would be to appear  
30  
31 psychotic). Furthermore, simulators were also told that the best fakers would receive an  
32  
33 additional \$50.00, in addition to the \$20.00 compensation given to all participants.  
34  
35  
36  
37

38 **Measures.** Both McCullough' (2011) and Wood' (2008) also used the PAI, a 334-  
39  
40 item, self-report, personality inventory widely used in research on malingering. Positive  
41  
42 findings for the PAI capacity to identify malingering has been reported consistently in the  
43  
44 literature (e.g., Archer et al., 2006; Blanchard et al., 2003; Sellbom, Bagby, & Rogers, 2008).  
45  
46 According to a recent meta-analysis (Hawes & Bocaccini, 2009), the Negative Impression  
47  
48 Management (NIM; Morey, 1996) and the Malingering Index (MAL; Morey, 1996) have  
49  
50 demonstrated the best overall classification rates for malingering. Specifically, a NIM cut  
51  
52 score of  $T \geq 81$  resulted in an average hit rate of .79 ( $SE = .09$ ), sensitivity of .73 ( $SE = .13$ ),  
53  
54 and specificity of .83 ( $SE = .07$ ); a cut score of  $MAL \geq 3$  yielded an average hit rate of .71  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## DEVELOPMENT OF THE IOP-29

( $SE = .05$ ), sensitivity of .58 ( $SE = .08$ ), and specificity of .86 ( $SE = .04$ ). Additionally, the Rogers Discriminant Function (RDF; Rogers, Sewell, Morey, & Ustad, 1996) also has demonstrated some clinical utility in applied settings, even though it does not strongly correlate with the SIRS (Edens, Poythress, & Watkins-Clay, 2007). For the RDF, Morey (2007) suggested that raw scores above zero are indicative of risk of malingering.

**Results**

The point bi-serial correlation between the IOP-29 False Disorder Probability Score and group is comparable to that obtained with the PAI scales, and AUC analyses similar to for the PAI and IOP-29 (Table 4). Mean IOP-29 differences for simulators and patients yields a Cohen's  $d$  of 2.66 in the forensic sample, and a  $d$  of 1.95 in the psychotic sample. For the PAI NIM scale (T score), the Cohen's  $d$  values are 2.85 within the forensic sample, and 1.69 within the psychotic sample. For the MAL (raw score), Cohen's  $d$  was 1.36 within the forensic sample, and 1.78 within the psychotic sample. For the RDF, Cohen's  $d$  was 1.82 within the forensic sample, and 1.75 within the psychotic sample.

Using a cut score of .50 for the IOP-29, and cut scores recommended by Hawes and Bocaccini (2009) for the NIM and MAL, and by Morey (1996) for the RDF scales of the PAI, we then calculated diagnostic efficiency statistics for both the forensic and the psychotic samples. Results, reported in Table 5, confirm similar validity findings for both the PAI and the IOP-29, with the IOP-29 False Disorder Probability Score producing OCC rates equal to or greater than .80.

**General Discussion**

We presented development and psychometric foundation research for a new, brief, self-administered measure of feigning of a variety of disorders, the IOP-29. Study 1 selected the items to be retained from a pool of items of which most had already been validated as a measuring feigning. In addition, it produced a feigning index, the Multiple Weight Score.



## DEVELOPMENT OF THE IOP-29

1  
2  
3 Study 2 scaled this index and produced a probability score, the False Disorder Probability  
4  
5 Score. Finally, Study 3 cross-validated the False Disorder Probability Score with two  
6  
7 additional independent samples. What emerged from this series of studies is a 29-item scale  
8  
9 to measure feigning of psychiatric and cognitive or neuropsychological disorders. It includes  
10  
11 26 self-report items and 3 cognitive items. We found a way to capture in vivo behavior that  
12  
13 often is only accessed in interviews: Some of the most effective items are “test behavior”  
14  
15 items, which refer to reactions to the test itself. Some items are worded in vague ambiguous  
16  
17 ways with “it” or “problems” so as to capture malingering response style sets and a broad  
18  
19 array or feigned difficulties. For self-report items, we included a third response alternative,  
20  
21 namely “doesn’t make sense,” in addition to the standard “true” and “false,” because we  
22  
23 found it increased validity. Nonetheless, our investigation only focused on clinical  
24  
25 comparison and simulation studies, therefore further research testing the IOP-29 in  
26  
27 ecologically valid field studies is needed.  
28  
29  
30  
31

32 Taken together, the results of our studies lend initial support to the validity of the  
33  
34 IOP-29 in discriminating bona fide patients from feigners. Within a number of independent,  
35  
36 validation samples with base rates of about .50, and an a priori, statistically-determined cut  
37  
38 score of .50, the IOP-29 correctly classified about 80% of the cases, with sensitivity,  
39  
40 specificity, PPP, and NPP being around .80. Noteworthy, the samples under investigation  
41  
42 came from a total of 14 independent studies, 12 doctoral dissertations and 2 unpublished  
43  
44 studies, and were diverse in terms of age, sex, ethnicity, marital status, and educational  
45  
46 background. The 29 items are an optimal combination selected from approximately 250 items  
47  
48 with independent re-validations. Individual items were cross-validated at multiple stages in  
49  
50 the test development process. Shrinkage in the later stages of development was minimal. In  
51  
52 fact, the AUC of the False Disorder Probability Score was .87 both in the developmental and  
53  
54 validation samples of Study 2 (SE’s  $\approx$  .03), and reached .94 (SE = .02) and .92 (SE = .03) in  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## DEVELOPMENT OF THE IOP-29

1  
2  
3 the forensic and psychotic samples of Study 3. Thus, it is reasonable to anticipate that the  
4  
5 IOP-29 will generalize well and perform similarly in different cultural contexts and future  
6  
7 clinical comparison, simulation studies.  
8

9  
10 Most of the available feigning scales adopt classic test theory and normative scaling  
11  
12 approaches and produce, for example, t-score comparisons between simulators (or suspected  
13  
14 malingerers) and non-patient or patient groups. As a result, selecting optimal threshold scores  
15  
16 for real life situations might be challenging, at times. The IOP-29 provides examiners with a  
17  
18 fully cross-validated, easy to use probability score: The higher the False Disorder Probability  
19  
20 Score, the higher the probability that the tested individual is trying to feign a psychological,  
21  
22 psychiatric or neurological disorder. The interpretation of this score is simple and  
23  
24 straightforward, and should contribute to the decision at hand, i.e., whether the presenting  
25  
26 complaint is bona fide or feigned. However, users should keep in mind that while a cut-off  
27  
28 score of .50 is likely to work best when the a priori probability is .50, other cut-off scores  
29  
30 may be more appropriate for different a priori probabilities. For example, if in a given  
31  
32 environment the expected prevalence rate of malingering is about .10, a cut-off of .90 might  
33  
34 be more appropriate. Also, the selection of the best cut-off score of the IOP-29 should always  
35  
36 be based on the purposes of the examination and on the costs and benefits associated with  
37  
38 false positive and false negative classifications. Thus, if the IOP-29 is used as a screening  
39  
40 tool, lower probability cut-offs might be preferable so as to maximize NPP.  
41  
42  
43  
44

45  
46 Despite the IOP-29 consisting of only 29 items, neither the MMPI, the TOMM, nor  
47  
48 the PAI outperformed the IOP-29 in discriminating between bona fide patients and  
49  
50 simulators. These findings, again, support the potential utility and validity of the IOP-29 as a  
51  
52 brief, feigning measure. To further investigate the comparative validity of the IOP-29, future  
53  
54 studies should also compare its performance to that of other brief instruments, such as the  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## DEVELOPMENT OF THE IOP-29

1  
2  
3 SIMS or the M Test. Most importantly, future research should focus on ecologically valid  
4  
5 field studies rather than simulation studies.  
6

7  
8 Despite these encouraging findings, some limitations persist. The most obvious  
9  
10 limitation is that we investigated large archival files but did not test the instrument in its final  
11  
12 29-item format, and the great majority were administered in a computerized versus paper-  
13  
14 and-pencil format. In other words, in all cases patients and simulators were administered a  
15  
16 large number of items that included but were not limited to the final 29 IOP-29 items.  
17  
18 Although other instruments have been developed in a similar manner (for example, see  
19  
20 Peters, Sunderland, Andrews, Rapee, & Mattick, 2012), this may have affected our results, to  
21  
22 some extent. To address this limitation, new data are currently being collected, in various  
23  
24 countries and cultural contexts.  
25  
26

27  
28 Another limitation of these studies, which is actually shared by all simulation studies,  
29  
30 is that it is impossible to know whether the behavior of the simulators reflect that of true  
31  
32 malingerers in actual real-life situations. To maximize generalizability we took several  
33  
34 methodological cautions, such as providing contexts to facilitate malingering, offering extra  
35  
36 incentives for the best feigners, cautioning to not exaggerate so as to produce a believable  
37  
38 profile, etc. (Rogers, 1997, 2008; Rogers & Bender, 2013; Rogers & Gillard, 2011; Viglione  
39  
40 et al., 2001). Nonetheless, it is still unknown whether true malingerers in real-life situations  
41  
42 would have obtained the same scores as those produced by our simulator samples. Finally,  
43  
44 future research might consider investigating samples with base rates different from .50, such  
45  
46 that different cut-off scores could be investigated.  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## DEVELOPMENT OF THE IOP-29

## References

- Abramsky, A. B. (2005). *Assessment of test behaviors as a unique construct in the evaluation of malingered depression on the inventory of problems: Do test behaviors add significant variance beyond problem endorsement strategies?*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, California School of Professional Psychology, San Diego.
- Arbisi, P. A., & Ben-Porath, Y. S. (1995). An MMPI-2 infrequent response scale for use with psychopathological populations: The Infrequency-Psychopathology scale, F(p). *Psychological Assessment, 7*, 424-431.
- Archer, R. P., Buffington-Vollum, J. K., Stredny, R.V., & Handel, R. W. (2006). A survey of psychological test use patterns among forensic psychologists. *Journal of Personality Assessment, 87*, 84-94.
- Beaber, R. J., Marston, A., Michelli, J., & Mills, M. J. (1985). A brief test for measuring malingering in schizophrenic individuals. *American Journal of Psychiatry, 142*, 1478-81.
- Ben-Porath, Y. S., & Tellegen, A. (2008). *MMPI-2-RF (Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory-2 Restructured Form): Manual for administration, scoring, and interpretation*. Minneapolis. University of Minnesota Press.
- Blanchard, D.D., McGrath, R.E., Pogge, D. L., & Khadivi, A. (2003). A comparison of the PAI and MMPI-2 as predictors of faking bad in college students. *Journal of Personality Assessment, 80*, 197-205.
- Chafetz, M., & Underhill, J. (2013). Estimated costs of malingered disability. *Archives of Clinical Neuropsychology, 28(7)*, 633-639.
- Connell, K. (2004). *Detecting simulated versus genuine posttraumatic stress disorder*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, California School of Professional Psychology, San Diego.

## DEVELOPMENT OF THE IOP-29

- 1  
2  
3 Edens, J. F., Poythress, N. G., & Watkins-Clay, M. M. (2007). Detection of malingering in  
4  
5 psychiatric unit and general population prison inmates: A comparison of the PAI,  
6  
7 SIMS, and SIRS. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 88(1), 33-42.  
8  
9  
10 Elhai, J. D., Gold, P. B., Frueh, B. C., & Gold, S. N. (2000). Cross-validation of the MMPI-2  
11  
12 in detecting malingered posttraumatic stress disorder. *Journal of Personality*  
13  
14 *Assessment*, 75, 449-463.  
15  
16 First, M. B., Spitzer, R. L., Gibbon, M., & Williams, J. B. W. (1995). Structured Clinical  
17  
18 Interview for Axis I DSM-IV. Disorders - Patient Edition (SCID-I/P). New York:  
19  
20 Biometrics Research Department, NY State Psychiatric Institute.  
21  
22  
23 Green, L. (1999). *Computerized versus standard administration of the Inventory of Problems:*  
24  
25 *An examination of reliability and validity.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation,  
26  
27 California School of Professional Psychology, San Diego.  
28  
29  
30 Green, P., Allen, L. M., & Astner, K. (1996). *The Word Memory Test: A user's guide to the*  
31  
32 *oral and computer administered forms.* Durham, NC: CogniSyst Inc.  
33  
34  
35 Green, R.L. (1991). *The MMPI-2/MMPI: An interpretative manual.* Boston, MA: Allyn &  
36  
37 Bacon.  
38  
39 Hawes, S., & Bocaccini, M. (2009). Detection of overreporting of psychopathology on the  
40  
41 Personality Assessment Inventory: A meta-analytic review. *Psychological*  
42  
43 *Assessment*, 21(1), 112-124.  
44  
45  
46 Jansak, D. (1996). *The Rorschach comprehensive system depression index, depression*  
47  
48 *heterogeneity, and the role of self-schema.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation,  
49  
50 California School of Professional Psychology, San Diego.  
51  
52  
53 Lally, S. J. (2003). What tests are acceptable for use in forensic evaluations? A study of  
54  
55 experts. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice*, 34, 491-498.  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## DEVELOPMENT OF THE IOP-29

- 1  
2  
3 Landis, P. E. (1996). *Detection of simulated posttraumatic stress disorder: A validation study*  
4  
5 *of the Inventory of Problems*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, California School of  
6  
7 Professional Psychology, San Diego.  
8  
9  
10 Larrabee, G.J. (2003). Detection of malingering using atypical performance patterns on  
11  
12 standard neuropsychological tests. *The Clinical Neuropsychologist*, 17, 54–68.  
13  
14 McCullough, J. M. (2011). *The convergent and ecological validity of the Inventory of*  
15  
16 *Problems with a community-supervised, forensic sample*. Unpublished doctoral  
17  
18 dissertation, California School of Professional Psychology, San Diego.  
19  
20  
21 McDougall, A. (1996). *Rorschach indicators of simulated schizophrenia*. Unpublished  
22  
23 doctoral dissertation, California School of Professional Psychology, San Diego.  
24  
25 Meehl, P. E., & Rosen, A. (1955). Antecedent probability and the efficiency of psychometric  
26  
27 signs, patterns, or cutting scores. *Psychological Bulletin*, 52, 194-216.  
28  
29  
30 Mellin, D. (1996). *Test-dependent malingering: can the testing situation induce and measure*  
31  
32 *behaviors suggestive of malingering?*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, California  
33  
34 School of Professional Psychology, San Diego.  
35  
36  
37 Meng, X. L., Rosenthal, R., & Rubin, D. B. (1992). Comparing correlated correlation  
38  
39 coefficients. *Psychological Bulletin*, 111, 172-175.  
40  
41  
42 Miller, H. A. (2001). *M-FAST: Miller-forensic assessment of symptoms test professional*  
43  
44 *manual*. Odessa, FL: Psychological Assessment Resources.  
45  
46  
47 Morey, L. (1991). *Personality Assessment Inventory: Professional manual*. Tampa, FL:  
48  
49 Morey, L. (1996). *An interpretive guide to the Personality Assessment Inventory (PAI)*.  
50  
51 Odessa, FL: Psychological Assessment Resources.  
52  
53  
54 Morey, L. C. (2007). *Personality Assessment Inventory (PAI). Professional Manual (2nd ed.)*.  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## DEVELOPMENT OF THE IOP-29

- 1  
2  
3 O'Brien, S. M. (2004). *An investigation into the incremental value of test-dependent*  
4  
5 *malingering of schizophrenia*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, California School of  
6  
7 Professional Psychology, San Diego.  
8  
9  
10 Peters, L., Sunderland, M., Andrews, G., Rapee, R. M., & Mattick, R. P. (2012).  
11  
12 Development of a short form Social Interaction Anxiety (SIAS) and Social Phobia  
13  
14 Scale (SPS) using nonparametric item response theory: the SIAS-6 and the SPS-6.  
15  
16 *Psychological Assessment, 24(1)*, 66-76.  
17  
18 Pizitz, T. D. (2001). *Detection of malingered mild head injury using the tripartite conceptual*  
19  
20 *model of malingering and the inventory of problems*. Unpublished doctoral  
21  
22 dissertation, California School of Professional Psychology, San Diego.  
23  
24 Psychological Assessment Resources.  
25  
26  
27 Rees, L.M., Tombaugh, T.N., Gansler, D.A., & Moczynski, N.P. (1998). Five validation  
28  
29 experiments of the Test of Memory Malingering (TOMM). *Psychological Assessment,*  
30  
31 *10*, 10-20.  
32  
33  
34 Rogers, R. & Bender, S.,D. (2013). Evaluation of malingering and related response styles. In  
35  
36 I. B. Weiner (Ed.-in-Chief), J. R. Graham & J. A. Naglieri (Vol. Eds.),  
37  
38 *Comprehensive Handbook of Psychology: Assessment Psychology* (2nd Edition Vol.  
39  
40 10, pp. 517-540). Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons.  
41  
42  
43 Rogers, R. & Salekin, R. (1998). Research report beguiled by Bayes: A re-analysis of  
44  
45 Mossman and Hart's estimates of malingering. *Behavioral Sciences and the Law, 16,*  
46  
47 147-153.  
48  
49  
50 Rogers, R. (1997). *Clinical Assessment of malingering and deception*. New York: The  
51  
52 Guilford Press.  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## DEVELOPMENT OF THE IOP-29

- 1  
2  
3 Rogers, R. (2008). Detection strategies for malingering and defensiveness. In R. Rogers  
4  
5 (Ed.), *Clinical assessment of malingering and deception* (pp. 14–35). New York, NY:  
6  
7 Guilford Press.  
8  
9  
10 Rogers, R. (Ed.). (1988). *Clinical assessment of malingering and deception (1st ed.)*. New  
11  
12 York: Guilford Press.  
13  
14 Rogers, R., & Gillard, N. D. (2011). Research methods for the assessment of malingering. In  
15  
16 B. Rosenfeld & S. Penrod (Eds.), *Research methods in forensic psychology* (pp. 174-  
17  
18 188). Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.  
19  
20  
21 Rogers, R., Gillis, J. R., Dickens, S. E., & Bagby, R. M. (1991). Standardised assessment of  
22  
23 malingering: Validation of the structured interview of reported symptoms.  
24  
25 *Psychological Assessment, 4*, 89–96.  
26  
27  
28 Rogers, R., Gillis, J., Bagby, R., & Monteiro, E. (1991). Detection of malingering on the  
29  
30 Structured Interview of Reported Symptoms (SIRS): A study of coached and  
31  
32 uncoached simulators. *Psychological Assessment, 3*, 673-677.  
33  
34  
35 Rogers, R., Harrell, E. H., & Liff, C. D. (1993). Feigning neuropsychological impairment: A  
36  
37 critical review of methodological and clinical considerations. *Clinical Psychology*  
38  
39 *Review, 13*, 255-274.  
40  
41  
42 Rogers, R., Salekin, R. T., Sewell, K. W., Goldstein, A. M., & Leonard, K. (1998). A  
43  
44 comparison of forensic and nonforensic malingerers: A prototypical analysis of  
45  
46 explanatory models. *Law and Human Behavior, 22*, 353-367.  
47  
48 Rogers, R., Sewell, K. W., & Gillard, N. D. (2010). *Structured Interview of Reported*  
49  
50 *Symptoms (SIRS) and professional manual*. Lutz, FL: Psychological Assessment  
51  
52 Resources, Inc.  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



## DEVELOPMENT OF THE IOP-29

- 1  
2  
3 Rogers, R., Sewell, K. W., Morey, L. C., & Ustad, K. L. (1996). Detection of feigned mental  
4  
5 disorders on the Personality Assessment Inventory: A discriminant analysis. *Journal*  
6  
7 *of Personality Assessment*, 67, 629–640.  
8  
9  
10 Rogers, R., Sewell, K. W., & Ustad, K. L. (1995). Feigning among chronic outpatients on the  
11  
12 MMPI-2: An analogue study. *Assessment*, 2, 81–89.  
13  
14 Schaich, D. (2000). *A synthesis of the conceptual and inferential procedures involved with*  
15  
16 *the assessment of malingering: An applied study*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation,  
17  
18 California School of Professional Psychology, San Diego.  
19  
20  
21 Sellbom, M., Bagby, R. M., & Rogers, R. (2008). *Response styles on multiscale inventories.*  
22  
23 *Clinical assessment of malingering and deception (3rd ed.)*. (pp. 182-206). New  
24  
25 York, NY US: Guilford Press.  
26  
27  
28 Slick, D., Hopp, G., Strauss, E., & Thompson, G. B. (2005). *VSVT Victoria Symptom Validity*  
29  
30 *Test*. Odessa, FL: Psychological Assessment Resources.  
31  
32  
33 Smith, G. P., & Burger, G. K. (1997). Detection of malingering: Validation of the Structured  
34  
35 Inventory of Malingered Symptomatology (SIMS). *Journal of American Academic*  
36  
37 *Psychiatry and the Law*, 25, 183–189.  
38  
39  
40 Streiner, D. L. (2003). Being inconsistent about consistency: When coefficient alpha does and  
41  
42 doesn't matter. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 80, 217-222  
43  
44 Systems.  
45  
46 Tombaugh, T.N. (1996). *Test of Memory Malingering*. Toronto, Canada: Multi-Health.  
47  
48  
49 Viglione, D. J. & Landis, P. (1994). *The Development of an Objective Test for Malingering.*  
50  
51 Paper presented at the biennial meeting American Psychology-Law Society, Santa Fe,  
52  
53 New Mexico.  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## DEVELOPMENT OF THE IOP-29

1  
2  
3 Viglione, D. J., Wright, D., Dizon, N. T., Moynihan, J. E., DuPuis, S., & Pizitz, T. D. (2001).

4  
5 Evading detection on the MMPI-2: Does caution produce more realistic patterns of  
6  
7 responding?. *Assessment*, 8(3), 237-250.

8  
9  
10 Watson, C. G., Juba, M. P., Manifold, V., Kucala, T., & Anderson, P. E. D. (1991). The  
11  
12 PTSD interview: Rationale, description, reliability, and concurrent validity of a DSM-

13  
14 III-based technique. *Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 47, 179-188.

15  
16 Widows, M. R., &  
17  
18 Smith, G. P. (2004). *SIMS: Structured Inventory of Malingered. Symptomatology*  
19  
20 *professional manual*. Odessa, FL: Psychological Assessment.

21  
22 Weber, K. A. (2008). *Improving External Validity with Simulators in Malingering Research*.

23  
24 Unpublished doctoral dissertation, California School of Professional Psychology, San  
25  
26 Diego.

27  
28 Wood, S. (2008). *Unique contributions of performance and self-report methods in the*

29  
30 *detection of malingered psychotic symptoms*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation,

31  
32 California School of Professional Psychology, San Diego.  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## DEVELOPMENT OF THE IOP-29

Table 1. Composition of the Combined Sample used for Study 2.

	Patients ( $n = 166$ )	Simulators ( $n = 167$ )	Total ( $n = 333$ )
<b>Diagnosis/Target (<math>Chi^2_{(3)} &lt; .01, n.s.</math>)</b>			
Head Injury	38	38	76
Psychosis	44	45	89
PTSD	40	40	80
Depression	44	44	88
<b>Gender (<math>Phi = .01, n.s.</math>)</b>			
Male	74	72	146
Female	92	95	187
<b>Age (<math>Chi^2_{(4)} = 6.85, n.s.</math>)</b>			
Range	18 to 67	18 to 69	18 to 69
Less than 25	27	37	64
25 to 34	33	47	80
35 to 44	52	40	92
45 to 54	36	28	64
More than 54	18	15	33
<b>Education (<math>Phi = .05, n.s.</math>)</b>			
Less than College	59	51	110
Some College or Higher	107	116	223
<b>Marital Status (<math>Phi = -.10, n.s.</math>)</b>			
Married	56	72	128
Other	110	95	205

DEVELOPMENT OF THE IOP-29

Table 2. Diagnostic Efficiency Statistics of the IOP-29 False Disorder Probability Score (Validation Sample, Study 2; n = 165).

Cut-off	Sensitivity	Specificity	<i>Base Rate = .50</i>			<i>Base Rate = .25</i>			<i>Base Rate = .10</i>			<i>Base Rate = .05</i>		
			PPP	NPP	OCC	PPP	NPP	OCC	PPP	NPP	OCC	PPP	NPP	OCC
0.05	1.00	0.06	0.52	1.00	0.53	0.26	1.00	0.30	0.11	1.00	0.15	0.05	1.00	0.11
0.10	0.95	0.22	0.55	0.82	0.59	0.29	0.93	0.40	0.12	0.98	0.29	0.06	0.99	0.26
0.20	0.94	0.40	0.61	0.87	0.67	0.34	0.95	0.54	0.15	0.98	0.46	0.08	0.99	0.43
0.50	0.81	0.79	0.80	0.80	0.80	0.56	0.93	0.80	0.30	0.97	0.79	0.17	0.99	0.79
0.80	0.47	0.95	0.91	0.64	0.71	0.76	0.84	0.83	0.52	0.94	0.90	0.34	0.97	0.93
0.90	0.34	0.99	0.97	0.60	0.66	0.90	0.82	0.83	0.75	0.93	0.92	0.59	0.97	0.96
0.95	0.13	1.00	1.00	0.53	0.56	1.00	0.78	0.78	1.00	0.91	0.91	1.00	0.96	0.96

PPD = Positive Predictive Power; NPP = Negative Predictive Power; OCC = Overall Correct Classification.

## DEVELOPMENT OF THE IOP-29

Table 3. Point Bi-serial Correlations with Group and Area Under the Receiver Operator Characteristic Curves for the IOP-29, MMPI-2, and TOMM.

	Point Bi-serial	
	Correlations with	AUC ( <i>SE</i> )
	Group <sup>a</sup>	
<i>O'Brien's (2004) Schizophrenic/Psychotic</i>		
<i>Sub-Sample (n = 88)</i>		
IOP-29 Multiple Weight Score	.61**	.845 (.042)
IOP-29 False Disorder Probability Score	.61**	.845 (.042)
MMPI-2 Scale F	.44**	.789 (.051)
MMPI-2 Scale Fp	.51**	.809 (.049)
MMPI-2 Scale Ds-r2	.65**	.880 (.037)
<i>Abramsky's (2005) Depression</i>		
<i>Sub-Sample (n = 85)</i>		
IOP-29 Multiple Weight Score	.67**	.898 (.037)
IOP-29 False Disorder Probability Score	.71**	.898 (.037)
TOMM-1	-.51**	.760 (.053)
TOMM-2	-.58**	.821 (.048)
TOMM-tot	-.57**	.814 (.047)

<sup>a</sup>Dummy Code: 1 = Simulator; 0 = Bona Fide Patient. \* $p < .05$ ; \*\* $p < .01$ .

## DEVELOPMENT OF THE IOP-29

Table 4. Point bi-serial correlations and AUCs of the IOP-29 and PAI within the Forensic ( $n = 128$ ) and Psychotic ( $n = 90$ ) Samples.

	Point bi-serial	
	Correlation with Group <sup>a</sup>	AUC ( <i>SE</i> )
<i>Forensic Sample (n = 128)</i>		
IOP-29 – False Disorder Probability Score	.80**	.943 (.023)
PAI – Negative Impression Management (T score)	.82**	.966 (.016)
PAI – Malingering Index (raw score)	.57**	.837 (.038)
PAI – Rogers Discriminant Function (raw score)	.68**	.892 (.030)
<i>Psychotic Sample (n = 90)</i>		
IOP-29 – False Disorder Probability Score	.70**	.915 (.028)
PAI – Negative Impression Management (T score)	.65**	.887 (.034)
PAI – Malingering Index (raw score)	.67**	.909 (.031)
PAI – Rogers Discriminant Function (raw score)	.66**	.886 (.037)

<sup>a</sup> Dummy Code: 1 = Simulator; 0 = Bona Fide Patient. \* $p < .05$ ; \*\* $p < .01$ .

## DEVELOPMENT OF THE IOP-29

Table 5. Hit Rates of the IOP-29 and PAI within the Forensic ( $n = 128$ ) and Psychotic ( $n = 90$ ) Samples.

	Group		Diagnostic Efficiency Statistics				
	Patients	Simulators	Sensitivity	Specificity	PPP	NPP	OCC
<i>Forensic Sample (n = 128)</i>							
IOP-29 – False Disorder Probability Score			.72	1.00	1.00	.78	.86
$p < .50$	64	18					
$p \geq .50$	0	46					
PAI – Negative Impression Management			.75	.98	.98	.80	.87
$T < 81$	63	16					
$T \geq 81$	1	48					
PAI – Malingering Index			.08	.98	.83	.52	.53
Raw $< 3$	63	59					
Raw $\geq 3$	1	5					
PAI – Rogers Discriminant Function			.72	.92	.90	.77	.82
Raw $< 0$	59	18					
Raw $\geq 0$	5	46					
<i>Psychotic Sample (n = 90)</i>							
IOP-29 – False Disorder Probability Score			.82	.80	.80	.82	.81
$p < .50$	36	8					
$p \geq .50$	9	37					
PAI – Negative Impression Management			.82	.73	.76	.81	.78
$T < 81$	33	8					
$T \geq 81$	12	37					
PAI – Malingering Index			.89	.76	.78	.87	.82
Raw $< 3$	34	5					
Raw $\geq 3$	11	40					
PAI – Rogers Discriminant Function			.96	.67	.74	.94	.81
Raw $< 0$	30	2					
Raw $\geq 0$	15	43					

PPP = Positive Predictive Power; NPP = Negative Predictive Power; OCC = Overall Correct Classification. Cut scores for the PAI scales were defined based on Hawes and Bocaccini's (2009) meta-analytic review (NIM and MAL) and on Morey's (2007) PAI manual (RDF). PPP, NPP, and OCC are calculated using the base rate of our sample, which is equal to .50.