

# Preface

## Introduction

This book is a lengthy one consisting of 34 chapters arranged into two major sections. The first section of the book gives the basics in the area of psychiatric/psychological injury, malingering, and its detection and assessment, focussing on posttraumatic stress disorder (PTSD). The second section adds material, in particular, on pain, on traumatic brain injury (TBI), on therapy, and on ethics, as well as supplements for study and education.

## Content

Specifically, this work is about the detection of malingering, feigning, and related response biases expressed by evaluatees in forensic and related disability evaluations, in general, and in psychological and psychiatric injury cases, in particular. Psychological injury involves PTSD, chronic pain, TBI (especially mild, MTBI). This book is the first authored (as opposed to edited) broad-coverage book in the field on malingering. Also, it covers other areas of psychological injury, such as the injuries themselves (PTSD, pain, TBI) and their assessment and treatment. Another major focus of the book is on ethics. The work looks dispassionately at the science in the field, and points out inconsistencies, while proposing solutions to facilitate both practice and testimony for court. This book adopts a middle-of-the-road and state-of-the-art perspective that makes it ideal for use in both the latter contexts.

The first part of the book analyzes and discusses the inconsistencies in definitions that mark the field of study of malingering and related terms, as well as indicating the difficulties in establishing the prevalence or base rate in psychological/psychiatric injury populations in forensic disability and related contexts. It analyzes extant models related to malingering/feigning, (a) especially that of Slick et al. (1999), which is on Malingered Neurocognitive Dysfunction (MND), and (b) its

modifications suggested by Rogers et al. (2011a, b) and Boone (2011), as well as (c) another malingering-related model on pain, MPRD, Malingered Pain-Related Dysfunction (Bianchini et al. 2005). Based on these two models of malingering in neurocognition and in pain (MND and MPRD, respectively, as well as the proposed revisions by Rogers et al. and Boone), and (d) on a fourth major source, the work of Rubenzer (2009) on testing for malingered PTSD, the author of the monograph developed a new diagnostic system applicable to PTSD cases. Then, based on this PTSD model, he revised the MND and MPRD models to develop his own. Therefore the three proposed malingering-detection systems are quite uniform, except for some critical examples (the revised MND and MPRD models are presented in depth in the supplementary/appendix section later in ends the book).

The present work also describes a model of the distribution of malingering and other response biases, as well as a questionnaire based on it. They that can be used in surveys of professionals undertaking evaluations related to malingering and other response biases. The types of response biases in the questionnaire are compatible with the three malingering diagnostic systems created. The distributions obtained in surveys with the questionnaire could help clarify the prevalence or base rate of the various types of credible and noncredible response styles in the questionnaire. If used in surveys this way, the results could help practice in the area both for mental health and legal professionals, as well as court. In addition, the first part of the book includes a review of an important test in the area, the MMPI-2-RF (Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory, Second Edition, Restructured Form; Ben-Porath and Tellegen 2008/2011).

The second part of the book includes monograph literature review, focusing on the work of (a) Larrabee (2012) and (b) Reynolds and Horton (2012) on the topic of malingering in neuropsychology. Also, it focuses on recent work on malingered PTSD. This part of the book concentrates on controversies/contrasts, the adversarial divide and law, stringent research (the work of Rogers), as well as the question of gold standards in malingering diagnostic systems and assessment. It gives the practitioner much material to work with, such as differences in more plaintiff-related and defense-related approaches to malingering, chapters that help in detecting malingered PTSD, and discussion of law and causality.

The third part of the book looks at assessment and the most recent journal literature. First, it examines even-handedly evaluator and evaluatee factors that influence disability evaluations, including biases such as confirmatory bias. It focuses on expert report writing/testimony. As for the journal literature review, it examines recent articles published in the field (in 2012).

The fourth part of the book examines the psychological injuries of MTBI and chronic pain, as well as conversion disorder. There is a chapter on pain feigning, which includes a proposed instrument to assess it.

The fourth part of the book then continues discussing psychological injury, malingering, ethics, and law, examining the most recent book on the topic. It analyzes in much depth the book on TBI by Carone and Bush (2013), and the most recent articles published in the field (in 2012). The book by Carone and Bush and the most recent literature review both include sources consistent with the present approach, as well as others that are examined critically when they are not.

The last substantive chapters of the book are in this fourth part. They shift gears into areas that are more general than psychological injury and law. They consider therapy and ethics within the psychological injury context, but also deal with general issues in psychology. In these chapters, after reviewing relevant, recent literature, the book presents broad models that allow for expert practice and reflection. The second therapy chapter of this part presents a transdiagnostic therapeutic module based on belief in free will and change processes. The second ethics chapter of this part presents a model of ethical thought and ethical decision-making.

The fifth part of the book is comprised of supplementary material and appendices. There are two chapters on tests and testing and three on tables presenting the specific malingering diagnostic systems created in the present work.

The sixth part of the book includes three chapters on education and study, including one on a glossary of terms. The first chapter outlines a course proposal for the area of psychological injury and law, for which the present book could serve as its textbook (e.g., graduate; upgrading; continuing education). The next chapter provides study questions to help review its contents.

The concluding two chapters to the book first present guidelines to cut scores for PTSD tests when working in the area of psychological injury and law. Then the last chapter considers the most recent articles relevant to the book that were published in the journal *Psychological Injury and Law*. A brief overview of the book. It ends with recommendations.

## Conclusion

Overall, the present book has much to offer to the reader. (a) It gives a comprehensive overview of the field of psychological injury and law. (b) Also, it indicates that progress is being made in meeting court admissibility criteria of good or acceptable science compared to poor or “junk” science. This progress includes movement toward the development of “gold standard” models and criteria related to malingering and related response biases, but much research remains to be done. It emphasizes that the proposed system developed by the author can be used by psychiatrists and other mental health professionals, not just psychologists. It should be noted that the systems should be used with caution until shown to be sufficiently valid for assessment and court purposes. (c) Further, the book expands into the useful areas of appropriate therapy and ethics in the field. It includes ethics material related to assessment and malingering, in particular, and to working in the area of psychiatric/psychological injury and law, in general. To conclude, the present book argues for a comprehensive, impartial, and scientifically-informed approach to assessment in the area of forensic disability and related contexts involving psychological injuries, including of malingering and related negative response bias detection. Moreover, by having such an approach to all areas of practice in the area, including in therapy and ethical decision-making, the professional will facilitate functioning effectively in the field and also avoid some of the pitfalls in the area.

## References

- Ben-Porath, Y.S., and A. Tellegen. 2008/2011. *MMPI-2-RF: Manual for administration, scoring, and interpretation*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Bianchini, K.J., K.W. Greve, and G. Glynn. 2005. On the diagnosis of malingered pain-related disability: Lessons from cognitive malingering research. *The Spine Journal* 5: 404–417.
- Boone, K.B. 2011. Clarification or confusion? A review of Rogers, Bender, and Johnson's a critical analysis of the MND criteria for feigned cognitive impairment: Implications for forensic practice and research. *Psychological Injury and Law* 4: 157–162.
- Carone, D.A., and S.S. Bush, 2013. *Mild traumatic brain injury: System validity assessment and malingering*. New York: Springer.
- Larrabee, G.J. 2012. *Forensic neuropsychology: A scientific approach*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Reynolds, C.R., and A.M. Horton Jr. 2012. *Detection of malingering during head injury litigation*. New York: Springer.
- Rogers, R., S.D. Bender, and S.F. Johnson. 2011a. A critical analysis of the MND criteria for feigned cognitive impairment: Implications for forensic practice and research. *Psychological Injury and Law* 4: 147–156.
- Rogers, R., S.D. Bender, and S.F. Johnson. 2011b. A commentary on the MND model and the Boone critique: "Saying it doesn't make it so." *Psychological Injury and Law* 4: 162–167.
- Rubenzler, S. 2009. Posttraumatic stress disorder: Assessing response style and malingering. *Psychological Injury and Law* 2: 114–142.
- Slick, D.J., E.M.S. Sherman, and G.L. Iverson. 1999. Diagnostic criteria for malingered neurocognitive dysfunction: Proposed standards for clinical practice and research. *The Clinical Neuropsychologist* 13: 545–561.

Toronto, ON, Canada

Gerald Young

Malingering, Feigning, and Response Bias in  
Psychiatric/ Psychological Injury  
Implications for Practice and Court

Young, G.

2014, XXV, 925 p. 38 illus., Hardcover

ISBN: 978-94-007-7898-6