

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

The Verifiability Approach to Detect Malingering of Physical Symptoms

I. Boskovic, Glynis Bogaard, Harald Merckelbach, Aldert Vrij & Lorraine Hope

Abstract

Inspired by recent research showing that liars are reluctant to include details they think are verifiable in their accounts, we explored in two studies ($N = 125$; $N = 105$) whether participants who report fabricated symptoms of ill-health ('malingers') present fewer verifiable details than participants who report genuine ill-health symptoms. In Study 1, participants were instructed to describe a typical day on which they had experienced a genuine or malingered symptom of ill-health. Truth tellers' statements included significantly higher proportions of verifiable details concerning the reported symptoms than malingers' statements. Compared with truth tellers, malingers generated longer statements with more unverifiable details. In Study 2, we informed participants that their statements may be assessed for verifiable or checkable details. Malingers referred interviewers to 'false' witnesses to provide checkable information and differences between malingers and truth tellers in statement length, and checkable and uncheckable details were no longer significant. The utility and implications of the verifiability approach to detection of malingering for physical symptoms are discussed.

Keywords: The Verifiability Approach, malingering, detection of deception, physical symptoms, symptoms report.

The Verifiability Approach to Detect Malingering of Physical Symptoms

Fabrication of physical symptoms in a medico-legal context burdens the health care system and ultimately may harm the care that genuine patients deserve (Bianchini, Greve, & Glynn, 2005). Thus, it is important to develop tools and strategies that can help in identifying people who fabricate ('malingering') symptoms of ill health. Malingering is defined as the intentional production of false or grossly exaggerated symptoms motivated by external incentives. The incentives may consist of financial rewards gained through personal injury litigation or workers's compensation procedures (McDermott & Feldman, 2007), or reduced legal responsibility (American Psychiatric Association, 2000, p. 739). It is difficult to determine on what scale malingering occurs, because 'successful' malingerers remain undetected (Resnick, West, & Payne, 2008). However, a conservative estimate is that, for example, 20% of chronic pain patients exaggerate their symptoms (Greve, Ord, Bianchini, & Curtis, 2009), while in cases of mild head injury and chronic fatigue prevalence rates of malingering are an estimated 35% (Mittenberg, Patton, Canyock, & Condit, 2002).

The most frequently used methods for the detection of malingering involve examining intentional underperformance on simple memory tasks (e.g., Iverson & Binder, 2000) or examining over-reporting of physical or psychological symptoms (Merten, Merckelbach, Giger, & Stevens, 2016). Such tests are called Symptom Validity Tests (SVTs) and have shown to be useful in a forensic setting (see Sleep, Petty, & Wygant, 2015; Bianchini, Mathias, & Greve, 2001), but less so in a medical setting (Schoenberg, Dorr, & Morgan, 2003; Roger, Sewell, & Salekin, 1994).

In general, somatic symptoms such as pain have been scarcely investigated in malingering research. Pain is a reliable concomitant of many physical symptoms, but research so far has failed to design specific methods to detect malingering of pain (Greve, Bianchini, & Brewer, 2013; Fishbain, Cutler, Rosomoff, & Rosomoff, 1999). One difficulty in detecting

THE VERIFIABILITY OF MALINGERED SYMPTOMS

4

1
2
3 fabrication of physical symptoms such as pain is that genuine symptoms do fluctuate over
4
5 time in intensity and durability (Fishbain et al., 1999). Malingers can therefore report about
6
7 their genuine 'bad' moments from the past, as if they are still ongoing. Another difficulty is
8
9 that it is impossible to quantify pain with methods that are independent of patients' self-
10
11 reports (McDermott & Feldman, 2007). Finally, almost everyone is familiar with pain as a
12
13 symptom and therefore most malingerers are likely to know what kind of sensations should be
14
15 reported to appear convincing, which impedes the detection of malingering in this domain
16
17
18 (Hamilton & Feldman, 2001).
19

20
21 Given these considerations, there is a need for novel malingering detection methods
22
23 that will not just focus on memory functioning and/or psychopathology, but on the verbal
24
25 details of patients' symptoms report. One recent study that addressed this issue in a systematic
26
27 fashion is that of Akehurst, Easton, Fuller, Drane, Kuzmin, and Litchfield, (2015). These
28
29 researchers employed a combination of criteria of different verbal lie detection methods, such
30
31 as Criteria Based Content Analysis (CBCA; see Blandon-Gitlin, Pezdek, Lindsay, & Hagen,
32
33 2009; Steller & Kohnken, 1989) and Reality Monitoring (RM; Johnson & Raye, 1981; see
34
35 Bogaard, Meijer, Vrij, Broers, & Merckelbach, 2013) to identify exaggerated symptoms after
36
37 exposure to an experimental stressor. Generally, evaluators who used these methods were
38
39 better in discriminating between truth tellers and malingerers than evaluators who did not use
40
41 these methods. However, the mere quantity of details in symptoms reports could not serve as
42
43 robust indicators of veracity (Akehurst et al., 2015). This suggests that the richness in details
44
45 in symptoms report, the main idea behind CBCA method, is not diagnostic of honesty.
46
47
48

49
50 One potentially promising avenue is a newly devised verbal lie detection method: The
51
52 Verifiability Approach (Nahari, Vrij, & Fisher, 2012). The Verifiability Approach is based on
53
54 two aspects of deceptive strategies. First, liars tend to provide statements that are rich in
55
56 details, because they want to make a convincing impression and believe that detailed stories
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 sound convincing. Second, liars tend to avoid mentioning details that could be checked by
4
5 investigators. As a solution to these conflicting strategies, liars, compared with truth tellers,
6
7 typically provide fewer details that can be verified and more details that cannot be verified
8
9 (Nahari, Vrij, & Fisher, 2014a, b; Nahari & Vrij, 2014).
10

11
12 Several Verifiability Approach studies (Harvey, Vrij, Nahari, & Ludwig, 2016; Nahari
13
14 et al., 2014b; Vrij et al., 2016) have examined the effect of informing participants, using an
15
16 ‘Information Protocol’, that the details of their statements could be subsequently checked by
17
18 the interviewer. Across studies, this warning has resulted in an increased number of verifiable
19
20 details being reported by truth tellers but not by liars, strengthening the efficiency of the
21
22 Verifiability Approach. This warning, as part of the Verifiability Approach, has also facilitated
23
24 discrimination between truths and lies in insurance claims settings (Harvey et al., 2016; Vrij
25
26 et al., 2016). Most likely these instructions motivated truth tellers to search their memory for
27
28 additional verifiable details - something that is not possible for liars to do.
29
30
31

32
33 The Verifiability Approach is a promising lie detection approach, but has not been
34
35 applied in the context of malingering physical symptoms to date. Actually, research to date
36
37 suggests that the efficacy of the Verifiability Approach depends on the context in which it is
38
39 used (Vrij, Nahari, Isitt, & Leal, 2016; Nahari et al., 2014). For example, in mock crimes
40
41 scenarios, where an interviewer knows all the details of the ‘crime’, liars have difficulty in
42
43 providing verifiable details. This is probably because liars are unable to demonstrate they
44
45 were at a different location than the crime scene during the time the crime occurred. In
46
47 contrast, in insurance claim cases, someone could falsely claim to have lost his phone while
48
49 running, but could then truthfully describe his run. Therefore, liars determine themselves
50
51 when an object is stolen or lost, which provides liars with more degrees of freedom to
52
53 generate false verifiable details (Vrij et al., 2016; Nahari et al., 2014). This might also explain
54
55 why the Verifiability Approach was not an effective strategy for discriminating between true
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 and false insurance claims (Nahari, Leal, Vrij, Warmelink, & Vernham, 2014). In case of
4
5 malingering, the same problems might apply, such as the absence of the ground truth and the
6
7 option to tell lies incorporated with previous truthfull experience of a specific symptom.
8

9
10 Therefore, our two studies are a first attempt to explore the usefulness of this approach
11
12 to the detection of malingering. We asked participants to write a statement reporting real or
13
14 fabricated common physical symptoms, such as a headache or stomach ache (Petrie, Faasse,
15
16 Crichton, & Grey, 2014). In the first study, participants were given the task to write a
17
18 symptom report, while in the second study, they were informed that their statements may be
19
20 checked by a medical professional. We predicted that in both studies, truth tellers would
21
22 provide significantly more verifiable details about their symptoms than malingerers, whereas
23
24 malingerers would include more non-verifiable details in their statements than truth tellers
25
26 (Hypothesis 1). We also predicted that the proportion of verifiable details (verifiable details /
27
28 total details) would be higher for truth tellers than for malingerers (Hypothesis 2).
29
30

31 32 **Study 1**

33 34 **Method**

35 36 **Participants**

37
38 We conducted an online study that included 125 undergraduate psychology students.
39
40 Participants were 17 - 38 years of age, with an average age of 20 years ($SD = 2.48$). The
41
42 majority were women (86%).
43
44

45
46 From the total number of participants, 41 reported having real physical symptoms of
47
48 different medical conditions (see Procedure), whereas 84 did not report any symptoms of
49
50 physical ill-health. On the basis of these initial symptom reports, participants were allocated
51
52 into two groups: truth tellers (with real symptoms) and malingerers (without symptoms).
53
54

55 56 **Procedure**

57
58
59
60

1
2
3 After participants signed up for the study, they were directed to an online link to start
4 the survey in Qualtrics. After answering demographic questions, participants were asked to
5 report any physical symptoms of ill-health they were experiencing ('Do you currently or did
6 you in the last week suffer from any physical symptoms, such as a headache, stomachache,
7 fatigue etc.?'). Participants who answered in the affirmative were considered as 'truth tellers',
8 whereas participants who responded negatively to the question were next instructed to
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

We presented the participants of both groups with 10 of the most frequent physical symptoms of ill-health reported in the general population (Petrie et al., 2014). Participants also could add additional symptoms if the illness they were experiencing was not on the list (no new symptoms were added). Malingerers were instructed to select one of the listed symptoms and to write a statement about the target symptom as though they suffered from it. They were presented with the following instructions: 'Imagine that you suffer from this specific symptom and try to imagine all the details of experiencing that symptom of ill-health. Consider that you did not attend your exam because of this symptom. Imagine we are the exam committee asking you to provide us with specific details of the day on which you experienced the symptom. Give us a description of your behavior during the day you 'had the symptom'. Your report should start with the morning in which you noticed the symptom and then proceed through the next hours until you went to bed.' Truth tellers received a similar instruction, except that they were asked to give a chronological account of the last day they suffered from their symptom of ill-health. Both groups wrote reports about their symptoms. No length nor time limitations were imposed. Table 1 shows the frequencies of selected symptoms for truth tellers and malingerers.

1
2
3 After truth tellers and malingerers had written their statements, we asked them to
4 evaluate the difficulty of this task on 7-point Likert scale (1 = very easy; 7= very difficult).
5
6
7 They were then thanked for participation and rewarded with one research credit.
8
9

10 -Insert table 1 about here-

11 **Coding**

12
13 All statements were coded by one coder, and the second coder scored a randomly
14 selected 20% of all statements. Both coders were blind to the veracity of the statements. We
15 coded for the presence of the following details, all derived from the Reality Monitoring
16 literature (Johnson & Raye, 1981): Perceptual (i.e., information about what a person has seen,
17 smelt, heard or felt); Spatial (i.e., information about spatial arrangement of objects or people);
18 Temporal (i.e., information about the time when a behavior/action happened, an event
19 happened or a sequence of events/behaviors happened), and descriptive (i.e., specific
20 description of action, objects or symptoms) details. Every word describing a symptom
21 ('headache', 'stomachache', 'pain', 'fatigue'), emotional feeling ('I feel', 'anxiety', 'scared'),
22 internal experience or state ('worried', 'decided', 'I wished/wanted', 'thirsty', 'tired'), or
23 information about what a person saw, heard or tasted ('I saw red dots', 'noise', 'bitter'), was
24 coded as a *perceptual* detail. *Spatial* codes included every detail about where an event
25 happened ('at home', 'in the streets', 'at car'), or about spatial arrangements of people or
26 objects ('upstairs/ downstairs', 'down', 'up', 'in front'). *Temporal* details included
27 information about the time in general ('at noon', 'midnight', 'day'), or about a specific time
28 ('at 13h'), or time sequences of the events ('before', 'after', 'during', 'the next day',
29 'previously').
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52

53 We also coded descriptions of actions and objects. Every description of an action
54 ('took an Aspirin 500mg', 'called a doctor', 'talked to my friend'), symptom ('strong',
55 'sharp', 'coming in waves'), or object ('shiny') was coded as *descriptive* detail.
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Following Nahari and Vrij (2014), all details were coded either as *verifiable* or *non-*
4 *verifiable*. For a detail to be coded as verifiable, it had to meet one of the following criteria.
5
6 The activities 1) were documented (appointment with a doctor, prescriptions, receipt etc.) and,
7 therefore, potentially checkable; 2) involved an action carried out together with (an) other
8 identified person(s) rather than alone or with a stranger who could not easily be traced; 3)
9 pertained to something that was witnessed by (an) other identified person(s); 4) were reported
10 as being recorded (e.g. on CCTV) by the interviewee; 5) used technology (use of cash
11 machine, bank cards, phone, tablet, computer); or 6) could potentially be checked by blood
12 analysis and medical tests (taking specific pills).
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

24 To examine the inter-rater reliabilities between coders intraclass correlation
25 coefficients (ICC) were calculated. They were excellent for verifiable (ICC = .98) and non-
26 verifiable details (ICC = .94), as well as for the total sum of details (ICC = .94). Regarding the
27 separate categories of detail, except for spatial details (ICC = .63), the majority of ICC's
28 indicated almost perfect agreement (all ICC's > .84; see supplemental Table 1). As we did not
29 formulate hypotheses about the different detail categories, we only report descriptives
30 pertaining to details in the Results section.
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39

40 Results

41 42 Difficulty of the task

43
44
45 To check whether truth tellers might have found the task less difficult than malingerers
46 an independent t-test was conducted. However, truth tellers and malingerers reported similar
47 difficulty levels, means being 4.10 ($SD = 1.39$) and 4.46 ($SD = 1.40$), respectively, $t(123) =$
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
1.36, $p = .18$).

56 Length of the statements

1
2
3 On average, participants produced 89.26 words per statement. Truth tellers provided
4 significantly shorter statements ($M = 66.71$, $SD = 48.76$) than malingerers ($M = 100.27$, $SD =$
5 83.52), $t(123) = 2.38$, $p = .02$, $d = .49$.
6
7
8
9

10 **Number of verifiable and non-verifiable details**

11
12
13 The difference between truth tellers ($M = .93$, $SD = 2.26$) and malingerers ($M = .45$,
14 $SD = 1.61$) in number of verifiable details reported was not significant, $t(123) = 1.34$, $p = .18$,
15 $d = .25$). However, truth tellers reported significantly less non-verifiable details ($M = 18.83$,
16 $SD = 10.43$) than malingerers ($M = 28.29$, $SD = 21.32$), $t(123) = 2.69$, $p = .01$; $d = .56$, which
17 partially supports Hypothesis 1.
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

25 **Proportions of verifiable details**

26
27 Verifiable details were reported by 16.8% of participants. Of the total number of
28 provided details, verifiable information comprised 2.4%. Calculating the proportion of
29 verifiable details (verifiable details / total of details), truth tellers had significantly higher
30 proportions ($M = .05$, $SD = .12$) than malingerers ($M = .01$, $SD = .03$), $t(123) = 2.43$, $p = .01$,
31 $d = .46$. This result supports Hypothesis 2.
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39

40 **Number of (verifiable and non-verifiable) perceptual, spatial, temporal, and descriptive** 41 **details**

42
43
44 Exploring the potential differences between groups in different categories of details,
45 we found that truth tellers ($M = .83$, $SD = 1.96$) provided a significantly higher number of
46 descriptive verifiable details than malingerers ($M = .32$, $SD = 1.01$), $t(123) = 1.91$, $p = .03$, d
47 $= .33$. However, truth tellers reported significantly less ($M = 4.22$, $SD = 3.63$) perceptual non-
48 verifiable details, $t(123) = 4.30$, $p = .001$, $d = .86$, than malingerers ($M = 8.09$, $SD = 5.18$).
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56 The same was found for descriptive non-verifiable details, truth tellers $M = 10.66$ ($SD = 6.14$),
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 malingerers $M = 14.85$ ($SD = 13.01$), $t(123) = 1.95$, $p = .02$, $d = .41$, (see supplemental Table
4
5 2 and 3).
6
7

8 **Study 2**

9
10 The results of Study 1 revealed that malingerers used longer statements richer in non-
11 verifiable details. Truth tellers produced higher proportions of verifiable details than
12 malingerers – although the proportion of verifiable details produced was low in both
13 conditions . Thus, our results are in line with previous studies on the Verifiability Approach
14 (Nahari & Vrij, 2014; Nahari et al., 2014a, b) and also suggest that low verifiability reports
15 might be a feature of people who malingering suffering from physical symptoms. Therefore, in
16 Study 2 we tested whether differences in verifiability between truth tellers and liars would
17 become more pronounced when participants are given additional instructions about verifiable
18 details, as was found in previous studies (see Nahari et al., 2014b; Vrij et al., 2016; Harvey et
19 al., 2016).
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31

32 **Method**

33 **Participants**

34
35
36
37 105 undergraduate psychology students were recruited. Participants' age ranged from
38 18 to 26 years, with an average of 20 years ($SD = 1.48$). The majority were women (74%).
39
40

41
42 From the total number of participants, 38 reported to having physical symptoms, while
43 67 denied suffering from any physical condition. Therefore, as in the previous study,
44 participants were allocated to two groups: truth tellers (with real symptoms) and malingerers
45 (fabricating an account of symptoms).
46
47
48
49

50 **Procedure**

51
52
53 Study 2 followed a similar procedure as Study 1. Participants had an option to choose
54 one of ten symptoms from the list or to add a new one (see Table 1). However, unlike our first
55 study, before starting with writing the statements about their symptoms, the participants were
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 given an 'Information Protocol', which informed them that the details they provide may be
4
5 checked (as in Harvey et al., 2016). The Information Protocol explicitly outlined what kind of
6
7 information is considered a verifiable detail: 'We know from research that liars prefer to
8
9 avoid providing details that can be verified whereas truth tellers prefer to provide verifiable
10
11 details. Therefore, we are going to give your statement to medical professionals and ask them
12
13 to decide if your statement is truthful, based on the extent to which the details you provide can
14
15 be verified. Verifiable details are activities that can be documented and therefore verifiable
16
17 (phone calls, doctor appointment, prescriptions etc., or activities that could be checked
18
19 through blood analysis and medical documentation), carried out with another person (that can
20
21 be identified), witnessed by another person (identifiable person), or recorded by CCTV
22
23 cameras. Details that do not meet any of these criteria are considered to be unverifiable.'
24
25
26
27

28
29 After writing the statement, using 5-point Likert scales (1 = completely unmotivated; 5
30
31 = strongly motivated), we asked participants how motivated they had been to write down a
32
33 convincing statement and to what extent they thought to have succeeded in this. Participants
34
35 were also asked to report how strongly they believed that the details they provided would be
36
37 checked by researchers on 5-point Likert scale (1= definitely no; 5 = definitely yes).
38
39

40
41 We asked malingerers whether they had been using bluffing as a strategy in writing
42
43 their statements. Bluffing was defined as providing false verifiable details. The possible
44
45 answers were 'Yes', 'Maybe', and 'No'. Perhaps the easiest way of bluffing is to confabulate
46
47 about a person who can confirm the story (Culhane, Hosch, & Kehn, 2008). In this context,
48
49 this might be a person who the individual claims has witnessed them experiencing the
50
51 symptoms or who they have confided in about their symptoms. Therefore, to investigate
52
53 whether malingerers refer to false witnesses, we coded every statement in which a close
54
55 person (parents, girlfriend/boyfriend, flatmate) was mentioned. After finishing the task, all
56
57 participants were thanked for participating and rewarded with one research credit.
58
59
60

Coding

As in Study 1, all statements were coded by one coder, while the second coder scored a randomly selected 20% of all statements. Both coders were blind to the veracity of statements. The ICC's between coders was excellent for verifiable details (ICC = .94), non-verifiable details (ICC = .97), and for the total sum of details (ICC = .98). The ICC's for other categories of details also indicated good agreement (all ICC's > .80; see supplemental Table 1).

Results

Motivation, estimation of success, difficulty of the task, and belief that statements will be checked

Truth tellers reported ($M = 3.53$, $SD = .79$) a comparable level of motivation as malingerers ($M = 3.43$, $SD = .80$), $t(103) = .57$, $p = .57$. Also, the truth tellers ($M = 3.53$, $SD = .76$) did not differ from malingerers ($M = 3.31$, $SD = .96$) in how they rated their success, $t(103) = 1.17$, $p = .24$. As in Study 1, difficulty of the task was rated on a 7-point Likert scale. Truth tellers ($M = 3.76$, $SD = 1.28$) and malingerers ($M = 3.42$, $SD = 1.29$) did not differ with respect to their difficulty ratings, $t(103) = 1.32$, $p = .19$.

Both truth tellers ($M = 3.50$, $SD = .89$) and malingerers ($M = 3.15$, $SD = .96$) were moderately convinced in the possibility that the veracity of their statements will be checked, and the difference between groups was not significant, $t(103) = 1.85$, $p = .07$.

Length of the statements

On average, participants produced 142.47 words per statement. The length of the statements was not significantly different for truth tellers ($M = 152.63$, $SD = 111.16$) and malingerers ($M = 136.70$, $SD = 85.29$), $t(103) = .82$, $p = .41$.

Number of verifiable and non-verifiable details

Truth tellers ($M = 8.26, SD = 15.31$) and malingerers ($M = 6.66, SD = 9.02$) did not differ in number of generated verifiable details, $t(103) = .68, p = .50$. The group difference in number of non-verifiable details was not significant either, $t(103) = .63, p = .53$, with truth tellers ($M = 48.92, SD = 32.76$) and malingerers ($M = 45.03, SD = 29.44$) producing a comparable number of such details.

Proportions of verifiable details

The number of participants providing verifiable details was much higher than in study 1 (57.1% vs. 16.8%). Verifiable details formed 13.1% (2.4% in study 1) of the overall number of details in all statements. The average proportion of verifiable details (verifiable details / total of details) was .12 ($SD = .15$) for truth tellers, and .13 ($SD = .12$) for malingerers; this difference was not significant, $t(103) = .30, p = .77$.

- Insert Table 2 about here -

Bluffing as a strategy

From the total number of malingerers, 17 participants (25.4%) reported that they 'maybe' had used bluffing, while 19 malingerers (28.4%) admitted providing false verifiable details. From a total of 41 malingerers who provided (false) verifiable details, 63.4% mentioned a close person who could confirm their story. On the other hand, 57.9% of truth tellers also provided information about family members or close people who could confirm their story. The association between veracity and frequency of mentioning close people was not significant, $X^2(1) = 1.03, p = .31$.

Number of (verifiable and non-verifiable) perceptual, spatial, temporal, and descriptive details

Truth tellers produced significantly more spatial verifiable details ($M = .87, SD = 2.07$) than malingerers ($M = .15, SD = .44$), $t(103) = 2.75, p = .01, d = .48^1$. A similar pattern was observed for the number of spatial non-verifiable details, $t(103) = 2.67, p = .001, d = .51$, with truth tellers generating more information about locations or spatial arrangement of people and objects ($M = 2.79, SD = 3.04$) than malingerers ($M = 1.52, SD = 1.82$). Group differences with regard to the other details categories did not reach significance (see supplemental Table 2 and 3).

Discussion

We examined whether the Verifiability Approach (Nahari & Vrij, 2014) could differentiate between people who are suffering from common physical symptoms and those who are malingering such symptoms. The main findings of our studies can be summarized as follows: Truth tellers included a higher proportion of verifiable details despite generating shorter statements than malingerers, which supports the Verifiability Approach. However, this effect only emerged in Study 1 where participants were not provided with an instruction to include verifiable detail. When the instruction was provided (Study 2), no difference between truth tellers and malingerers in non/verifiable details emerged. These results appear to indicate that the instruction weakened the effect of the Verifiability Approach - unlike in previous studies where the use of such an instruction enhanced the differences between truthful and deceptive accounts. This discrepancy suggests that detecting malingerers using the Verifiability Approach may be more effective if the patients are required to provide their

¹ Because of the low number of participants in both groups, we also calculated a Mann-Whitney U test (U test = 1052.00, $z = 2.04, p = .02$), which also yielded a significant result.

1
2
3 reports spontaneously – rather than warning them that their reports will be examined for
4
5 verifiable details.
6
7

8 We believe this discrepancy in findings is related to different levels of difficulty to
9
10 incorporate false verifiable details into an account in this specific setting. Note that bluffers
11
12 always run the risk that the investigator will actually check their account. When they are not
13
14 fully convinced that their statements will be reviewed - which we checked and found in study
15
16 2 – they might be more prone to bluffing because the risk of being caught seems low. The
17
18 most popular way of bluffing reported in the current research was claiming that another
19
20 person could confirm the account, most frequently a person closely related to malingerer (e.g.,
21
22 parents, boyfriend, flatmate) (see also Culhane et al., 2008). Actually, mentioning close
23
24 people as witnesses is a clever strategy because the majority of people are willing to
25
26 corroborate a statement of a close friend or relative in order to help that person (Hosch et al.,
27
28 2011).
29
30
31
32

33 However, providing false witnesses might be much more convenient in one context
34
35 than in the other settings. For example, in a criminal setting, asking a friend to provide a false
36
37 alibi is a risky approach. The criminal needs to inform the friend beforehand to pretend that
38
39 s/he was with or spoke with the criminal, which means that the friend will be aware of the
40
41 falsehood of criminal's statement. Criminals may be reluctant to do this, and if they are, they
42
43 are unlikely to mention the friend during the interview. The same applies to insurance
44
45 settings, because if a fraudulent claimant is using a false witness, that person would also have
46
47 to be informed about the false scenario they have to report and confirm in the statement.
48
49 Consistent with this, Vrij et al. (2016) found that only 17% of liars reported discussing the
50
51 incident with the person they mentioned in their statements, compared with 77% of truth
52
53 tellers. In a malingering situation, it is easier to actually fool friends because common
54
55 physical symptoms are often not clearly visible to others. Therefore, even if a friend denied
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 noticing a malingerer's headache, the malingering would not necessarily be exposed as
4
5 headaches are often not visible from someone's actions, and people often do not mention to
6
7 others that they have a headache. In sum, bluffers may think it is easier to get away with false
8
9 witnesses in malingering situations than in criminal and insurance settings. Further, when
10
11 asked to rate the difficulty of writing the (false/true) statements, malingerers did not differ
12
13 from truth tellers. This may indicate that providing false potentially checkable information did
14
15 not pose a big challenge for malingerers.
16
17
18

19 Another point to be addressed concerns the length of the statements between groups in
20
21 both studies. While truth tellers spontaneously wrote significantly shorter statements than
22
23 malingerers, when we provided the Information Protocol, the difference was lost. Similar to
24
25 these findings are the results of previous insurance claims studies in which researchers
26
27 suggested that providing a detailed model statement about an unrelated topic would elicit
28
29 more verbal clues of deception, such as longer and more detailed reports among truth tellers
30
31 than among liars. However, the results showed that, even with the model statement, liars
32
33 provided the same length of statements as truth tellers (Leal, Vrij, Warmelink, Verham, &
34
35 Fisher, 2013).
36
37
38

39 The main disadvantage of the Verifiability Approach in a medico-legal context seems
40
41 to be the low spontaneous production rate for verifiable details in genuine patients' report.
42
43 The percentage of truth tellers who reported verifiable details in Study 1 was around 17%,
44
45 while it was 57.1% in Study 2 following instructions to provide such details. This suggests
46
47 that the majority of genuine patients experiencing physical symptoms of ill-health do not
48
49 spontaneously provide checkable details. It is also possible that they simply might not have
50
51 any checkable to report about. In the context of symptoms, the majority of information
52
53 provided by patients is subjective, and mostly concentrated on their internal state, rather than
54
55 on external or visible condition. Thus, the situations in which professionals have the option to
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 verify persons' symptoms complaints via cameras or witnesses may be extremely rare
4
5 (Resnick et al., 2008). Additionally, people differ in the way they perceive their symptoms
6
7 and behave when experiencing them (see Kolk, Hanewald, Schagen, & van Wijk, 2003; see
8
9 also van Wijk, Huisman, & Kolk, 1999). While one person may immediately calls a doctor or
10
11 goes to the pharmacy, another person may just stay in their office, without complaining to
12
13 anybody. Both persons are truth tellers, but the second one would not have any verifiable
14
15 details to report concerning their physical symptoms of ill-health.
16
17

18
19 One important limitation of the current study is that we relied on self-reports for the
20
21 selection of truth tellers and malingerers, without any independent check as to whether they
22
23 actually suffered from the reported symptoms or not. However, the incidence of selected
24
25 symptoms amongst truth tellers was consistent with previous research about symptoms most
26
27 frequently experienced by non-malingers (see Petry et al, 2014; Dandachi-FitzGerald &
28
29 Merckelbach, 2013).
30
31

32 33 **Future Research**

34
35
36 We do not exclude the possibility that, with certain adjustments, it may be possible to
37
38 extend the Verifiability Approach into an efficient tool for the detection of malingering of
39
40 physical symptoms. The adjustments should focus on making both malingerers and truth
41
42 tellers more convinced that their statements will be checked, such as presenting the 'warning'
43
44 that their statements will be checked multiple times during the reporting phase. It is
45
46 reasonable to assume that if malingerers are sure that their reports will be questioned, they
47
48 will be less willing to provide false verifiable details. Additionally, the warning could include
49
50 'consequences' for such an act, because in reality people are confronted with losses if it is
51
52 established that they malingered. However, such a warning could also influence truth tellers,
53
54 who then will realize that they could be seen as malingerers, and they therefore may feel the
55
56 need to write plausible statements.
57
58
59
60

Acknowledgement

These initial studies were conducted within the research line project about the Verifiability Approach in malingering physical symptoms, approved by the standing ethical committee of the Faculty of Psychology and Neuroscience, Maastricht University (ECP-157 O1 10 2015). The studies were funded by the The House of Legal Psychology under the Erasmus Mundus Joint Doctorate program.

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

References

- Akehurst, L., Easton, S., Fuller, E., Drane, G., Kuzmin, K., & Litchfield, S. (2015). An evaluation of a new tool to aid judgments of credibility in the medico-legal setting. *Legal and Criminological Psychology*. Retrieved May 20, 2016, from <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/lcrp.12079>.
- American Psychiatric Association. (2000). *Diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders*, 4th Ed., text revision. Washington, D.C.: Author.
- Culhane, S. E., Hosch, H. M., & Kehn, A. (2008). Alibi generation: Data from US Hispanics and US non-Hispanic whites. *Journal of Ethnicity in Criminal Justice*, 6, 177-199.
- Bianchini, K. J., Greve, K. W., & Glynn, G. (2005). On the diagnosis of malingered pain-related disability: Lessons from cognitive malingering research. *The Spine Journal*, 5, 404-417. doi:10.1016/j.spinee.2004.11.016
- Bianchini, K. J., Mathias, C. W., & Greve, K. W. (2001). Symptom validity testing: A critical review. *The Clinical Neuropsychologist*, 15, 19-45. doi:10.1076/clin.15.1.19.1907
- Blandon-Gitlin, I., Pezdek, K., Lindsay, D. S., & Hagen, L. (2009). Criteria-based content analysis of true and suggested accounts of events. *Applied Cognitive Psychology*, 23, 901-917. doi: 10.1002/acp.1504
- Bogaard, G., Meijer, E. H., Vrij, A., Broers, N. J., & Merckelbach, H. (2014). Contextual bias in verbal credibility assessment: Criteria-Based Content Analysis, Reality Monitoring, and Scientific Content Analysis. *Applied Cognitive Psychology*, 28, 79-90. doi: 10.1002/acp.2959
- Dandachi-FitzGerald, B., & Merckelbach, H. (2013). Feigning≠ feigning a memory deficit: The Medical Symptom Validity Test as an example. *Journal of Experimental Psychopathology*, 4, 46-63. doi: 10.5127/jep.025511

- 1
2
3 Fishbain, D. A., Cutler, R., Rosomoff, H. L., & Rosomoff, R. S. (1999). Chronic pain
4
5 disability exaggeration/malingering and submaximal effort research. *The Clinical*
6
7 *Journal of Pain, 15*, 244-274. ISSN: 0749-8047
8
9
- 10 Greve, K. W., Bianchini, K. J., & Brewer, S. T. (2013). The assessment of performance and
11
12 self-report validity in persons claiming pain-related disability. *The Clinical*
13
14 *Neuropsychologist, 27*, 108-137. doi: 10.1080/13854046.2012.739646
15
16
- 17 Greve, K. W., Ord, J. S., Bianchini, K. J., & Curtis, K. L. (2009). Prevalence of malingering
18
19 in patients with chronic pain referred for psychologic evaluation in a medico-legal
20
21 context. *Archives of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation, 90*, 1117-1126.
22
23 [doi:10.1016/j.apmr.2009.01.018](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apmr.2009.01.018)
24
25
- 26 Hamilton, J. C., & Feldman, M. D. (2001). Chest pain in patients who are malingering. Hurst,
27
28 J. W., Morris, D. C. (Eds.). *Chest pain* (pp. 443-456). Armonk, NY: Futura Publishing.
29
30
31
- 32 Harvey, A. C., Vrij, A., Nahari, G., & Ludwig, K. (2016). Applying the Verifiability
33
34 Approach to insurance claims settings: Exploring the effect of the information protocol.
35
36 *Legal and Criminological Psychology*. doi:10.1111/lcrp.12092
37
38
- 39 Iverson, G. L., & Binder, L. M. (2000). Detecting exaggeration and malingering in
40
41 neuropsychological assessment. *The Journal of Head Trauma Rehabilitation, 15*, 829-
42
43 858.
44
45
- 46 Johnson, M. K. (2006). Memory and reality. *American Psychologist, 61*, 760-771. doi:
47
48 10.1037/0003-066X.61.8.760
49
50
- 51 Johnson, M. K., & Raye, C. L. (1981). Reality monitoring. *Psychological Review, 88*, 67-85.
52
53 doi: 10.1037/0033-295X.88.1.67
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Kolk, A. M., Hanewald, G. J., Schagen, S., & van Wijk, C. M. G. (2003). A symptom
4
5 perception approach to common physical symptoms. *Social Science & Medicine*, 57,
6
7 2343-2354. doi:10.1016/S0277-9536(02)00451-3
8
9
- 10 Leal, S., Vrij, A., Warmelink, L., Vernham, Z., & Fisher, R. P. (2013). You cannot hide your
11
12 telephone lies: Providing a model statement as an aid to detect deception in insurance
13
14 telephone calls. *Legal and Criminological Psychology*, 20, 129-146. doi:
15
16 10.1111/lcrp.12017
17
18
- 19 Leins, D., Fisher, R. P., Vrij, A., Leal, S. and Mann, S. (2011), Using sketch drawing to
20
21 induce inconsistency in liars. *Legal and Criminological Psychology*, 16, 253–265.
22
23 doi:10.1348/135532510X501775
24
25
- 26 Merten, T., Merckelbach, H., Giger, P., Stevens, A. (2016). The Self-Report Symptom
27
28 Inventory (SRSI): A new instrument for the assessment of distorted symptom
29
30 endorsement. *Psychological Injury and Law*, 9, 102- 111. doi: 10.1007/s12207-016-
31
32 9257-3
33
34
- 35 McDermott, B. E., & Feldman, M. D. (2007). Malingering in the medical setting. *Psychiatric*
36
37 *Clinics of North America*, 30, 645-662. doi:10.1016/j.psc.2007.07.007
38
39
- 40 Mittenberg, W., Patton, C., Canyock, E. M., & Condit, D. C. (2002). Base rates of
41
42 malingering and symptom exaggeration. *Journal of Clinical and Experimental*
43
44 *Neuropsychology*, 24, 1094-1102. doi: 10.1076/jcen.24.8.1094.8379
45
46
47
- 48 Nahari, G., Leal, S., Vrij, A., Warmelink, L., & Vernham, Z. (2014). Did somebody see it?
49
50 Applying the verifiability approach to insurance claims interviews. *Journal of*
51
52 *Investigate Psychology and Offender Profiling*, 11, 237-243. doi:10.1002/jip.1417
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Nahari, G., & Vrij, A. (2014). Can I barrow your alibi? The applicability of the verifiability
4 approach to the case of an alibi witness. *Journal of Applied Research in Memory and*
5 *Cognition*, 3, 89-94. [doi:10.1016/j.jarmac.2014.04.005](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jarmac.2014.04.005)
6
7
8
9
10 Nahari, G., Vrij, A., & Fisher, R. P. (2014a). Exploiting liar's verbal strategies by examining
11 the verifiability of details. *Legal and Criminological Psychology*, 19, 227-239.
12 [doi:10.1111/j.2044-8333.2012.02069.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2044-8333.2012.02069.x)
13
14
15
16
17 Nahari, G., Vrij, A., & Fisher, R. P. (2014b). The verifiability approach: Countermeasures
18 facilitate its ability to discriminate between truths and lies. *Applied Cognitive*
19 *Psychology*, 28, 122-128. [doi:10.1002/acp.2974](https://doi.org/10.1002/acp.2974)
20
21
22
23
24 Nahari, G., Vrij, A., & Fisher, R. P. (2012). Does the truth come out in the writing? Scan as a
25 lie detection tool. *Law and Human Behavior*, 36, 68-76. [doi: 10.1037/h0093965](https://doi.org/10.1037/h0093965)
26
27
28
29
30 Petrie, K. J., Faasse, K., Crichton, F., & Grey, A. (2014). How common are symptoms?
31 Evidence from a New Zealand national telephone survey. *BMJ open*, 4, e005374.
32 [doi: 10.1136/bmjopen-2014-005374](https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjopen-2014-005374)
33
34
35
36
37 Resnick, P. J., West, S., & Payne, J. W. (2008). "Malingering of posttraumatic disorders". In
38 R. Rogers (Ed.), *Clinical Assessment of Malingering and Deception* (pp. 109-127) (3rd
39 ed.). New York, NY: Guilford Press.
40
41
42
43
44 Sleep, C. E., Petty, J. A., Wygant, D. B. (2015). Framing the results: Assessment of response
45 bias through select self-report measures in psychological injury evaluations.
46 *Psychological Injury and Law*, 8, 27-39. [doi: 10.1007/s12207-015-9219-1](https://doi.org/10.1007/s12207-015-9219-1)
47
48
49
50
51 Steller, M., & Kohnken, G. (1989). Criteria-based content analysis. In D. C. Raskin (Ed.),
52 *Psychological Methods in Criminal Investigation and Evidence* (pp. 217-245). New
53 York, NY: Springer-Verlag.
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Schoenberg, M. R., Dorr, D., & Morgan, C. D. (2003). The ability of the Millon Clinical
4
5 Multiaxial Inventory--to detect malingering. *Psychological Assessment, 15*, 198 - 204.
6
7 doi: 10.1037/1040-3590.15.2.198
8

9
10 van Wijk, C. M. G., Huisman, H., & Kolk, A. M. (1999). Gender differences in physical
11
12 symptoms and illness behavior: A health diary study. *Social Science & Medicine, 49*,
13
14 1061-1074. doi:10.1016/S0277-9536(99)00196-3
15
16

17 Vrij, A., Nahari, G., Isitt, R., & Leal, S. (2016). Using the verifiability lie detection approach
18
19 in an insurance claim setting. *Journal of Investigative Psychology and Offender*
20
21 *Profiling*. doi: 10.1002/jip.1458
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

Table 1. *Frequencies and percentage of selected symptoms in truth tellers and instructed malingerers in both studies.*

Symptoms	Study 1		Study 2	
	Truth tellers	Malingeringers	Truth tellers	Malingeringers
	<i>n</i> (%)	<i>n</i> (%)	<i>n</i> (%)	<i>n</i> (%)
Back or neck pain	13 (31.7)	10 (11.9)	12 (31.6)	8 (11.9)
Headache	10 (24.4)	35 (41.7)	9 (23.7)	23 (34.3)
Fatigue or loss of energy	8 (19.5)	19 (22.6)	6 (15.8)	15 (22.6)
Upset stomach or indigestion	5 (12.2)	5 (5.9)	5 (13.2)	7 (10.4)
Insomnia or sleeping problems	2 (4.9)	10 (11.9)	1 (2.6)	5 (7.5)
Congested or runny nose	1 (2.4)	2 (2.4)	0	1 (1.5)
Joint pain or stiffness	1 (2.4)	0	1 (2.6)	0
Cough	1 (2.4)	0	1 (2.6)	4 (6.0)
Muscle pain	0	3 (3.6)	0	1 (1.5)
Low blood pressure or circulation problems	0	0	0	2 (3.0)
Added symptoms:				
- Vertigo	0	0	0	1 (1.5)
- Intestine pain	0	0	1 (2.6)	0
- Knee pain	0	0	1 (2.6)	0
- Sore throat	0	0	1 (2.6)	0
Total	41 (100)	84 (100)	38(100)	67(100)

Table 2. Length of the statements, difficulty of the task, non-verifiable and verifiable details, in study 1 and study 2.

Group	<i>N</i>	Length of the statements <i>M (SD)</i>	Difficulty of the task <i>M (SD)</i>	Number of non-verifiable details <i>M (SD)</i>	Proportion of verifiable details <i>M (SD)</i>
Study 1					
Truth tellers	41	66.71 (48.76)	4.10 (1.39)	10.43 (1.62)	.05 (.12)
Malingers	84	100.27 (83.52)*	4.46 (1.40)	21.32 (2.33)	.01 (.03)
<i>Sign.</i>		*	/	**	*
Study 2					
Truth tellers	37	152.63 (111.16)	3.76 (1.28)	48.92 (32.76)	.12 (.15)
Malingers	68	136.7 (85.29)	3.42 (1.29)	45.03 (29.44)	.13 (.12)
<i>Sign.</i>		/	/	/	/

Notes: * $p < 0.05$; ** $p < 0.01$; Length of the statements is calculated as sum of words; Difficulty of the task was graded using 7-point Likert scale; Proportion of verifiable details was calculated as verifiable details/ total details. Bonferroni post hoc correction was applied.

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