

## FBS False Positive Rates

At 7:00 AM -0600 11/9/05, Steve Rubenzer wrote: Kim,

The FBS has been crossed many times. The only negative info I've seen was the Butcher articles, which found higher false positive rates than usually desired,

Five separate studies have found hi fprs for the FBS:

	fpr
Bagby found	50%,
Butcher found	64%,
Larrabee found	20%,
Blanchard found	31%,
Dearth found	24%

The primary use of the FBS is in **forensic settings**. However, the rebuttal is simple: the fpr is too hi for use. Why use a scale that is so easily rebutted?

rkm

Bagby, R. M., Nicholson, R. A., Buis, T., & Bacchiochi, J. R. (2000). Can the MMPI-2 validity scales detect depression feigned by experts? *Assessment*, 7(1), 55-62.

Butcher, J., Arbisi, P., Atlis, M., & McNulty, J. (2003). The construct validity of the Lees-Haley Fake Bad Scale: Does this scale measure somatic malingering and feigned emotional distress? *Archives of Clinical Neuropsychology*, 18, 473-485.

Larrabee, G. J. (2003). Detection of symptom exaggeration with the MMPI-2 in litigants with malingered neurocognitive dysfunction. *Clinical Neuropsychologist*, 17(1), 54-68.

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(2), 197-205.

Dearth, C., Berry, D., Vickery, C., Vagnini, V., Baser, R., Orey, S., et al. (2005). Detection of feigned head injury symptoms on the MMPI-2 in head injured patients and community controls. *Archives of Clinical Neuropsychology*.

## FBS Crosses NAN 2005

But then there are the three poster presentations at NAN 2005 (2 by Woltersdorf, one by Mittenberg, et al) which all found positive results.

In their response to the Butcher article, Less- Haley and Fox cite 15 positive studies - most of which found FBS to be the best discriminator among legitimate and malingering claimants. Most of those that didn't (Elhai, Bury and Bagby) used highly questionable designs that contrasted student simulators with purported legitimate patients - ALL of whom were compensation seeking and for which NO determination of malingering was made. Is there a worse possible design? Butcher also made no determination of malingering, even in the one sample of six that was in litigation.

Why use the **FBS**? Because in **PI settings**, it **has the best discrimination and highest sensitivity of all response bias scales** in studies with reasonable designs. Problems include highly variable cut scores across studies (19-27) and substantial FP rates if lower scores are used. However, **a score of 29 or greater** have high specificity and decent sensitivity.

Steve Rubenzer, PhD, ABPP Diplomate in Forensic Psychology American Board of Professional Psychology

-----Original Message----- From: law and psychology discussion list [mailto:PSYLAW-L@LISTSERV.UNL.EDU] On Behalf Of Faulder Colby PhD Sent: Friday, November 11, 2005 11:46 PM To: PSYLAW-L@LISTSERV.UNL.EDU Subject: Re: FBS

Then of course there was the poster that Rhiannon Ellis and I presented at APS prior to the Butcher articles titled, "Assessing effort: Failures of the MMPI-2 Fake Bad Scale" (October 2001). But who's counting?

-----Original Message-----

From: law and psychology discussion list [mailto:PSYLAW-L@LISTSERV.UNL.EDU] On Behalf Of Kim McKinzey  
Sent: Tuesday, November 08, 2005 8:35 PM To: PSYLAW-L@LISTSERV.UNL.EDU  
Subject: Re: M-FAST help, please

At 6:51 AM -0500 11/8/05, H. Anthony Semone, PhD wrote:  
Kim McKinzey wrote:

At 12:23 AM -0500 11/8/05, H. Anthony Semone, PhD wrote:

Give him Gervais' RBS, 41 items off MMPI-2  
Nope. fpr is sky hi. Yet another faking test that failed cross.

rkm