

8% of the credible group,  $X^2=31.61$ ,  $p=.000$ . We also found that 15% of the non-credible group failed the SDMT-W part compared to 1% of the credible group,  $X^2=19.18$ ,  $p=.000$ . Meanwhile, on the SDMT-O part 19% of the non-credible group failed compared to 1% of the credible group,  $X^2=25.52$ ,  $p=.000$ . On the COWAT letter fluency task 74% of the non-credible group failed compared to 19% of the credible group,  $X^2=36.90$ ,  $p=.000$ . Finally, results revealed on the Finger Tapping Test 19% of the non-credible group failed compared to 3% of the credible group,  $X^2=10.01$ ,  $p=.002$ .

**Conclusions:** As expected, the non-credible participants demonstrated significantly higher PVT failure rates compared to credible participants. A possible explanation driving higher failure rates in our sample can be due to cultural variables (e.g., bilingualism). It was suggested by researchers that linguistic factors may be impacting higher PVT failure rates and developing a false-positive error. Future research using undergraduate samples need to identify which PVT's are being impacted by linguist factors.

**Categories:** Forensic

Neuropsychology/Malingering/Noncredible Presentations

**Keyword 1:** assessment

**Keyword 2:** effort testing

**Keyword 3:** malingering

**Correspondence:** Krissy E. Smith, California State University Dominguez Hills, krissye.smith@gmail.com

### 87 Examining the use of the Embedded Performance Validity Test in the Brief Visuospatial Memory Test-Revised Among Spanish-Speaking Patients

Liliam R Castillo<sup>1,2</sup>, Christine M Bushell<sup>3</sup>, Sofia Coll<sup>3</sup>, Lilian Salinas<sup>4,5</sup>, William B Barr<sup>4,5</sup>

<sup>1</sup>John Jay College of Criminal Justice, New York, New York, USA. <sup>2</sup>The Graduate Center, City University of New York, New York, New York, USA. <sup>3</sup>Yeshiva University, New York, New York, USA. <sup>4</sup>NYU School of Medicine, New York, New York, USA. <sup>5</sup>NYU Comprehensive Epilepsy Center, New York, New York, USA

**Objective:** The Brief Visuospatial Memory Test-Revised (BVMT-R) Recognition Discrimination (RD) index has emerged as an embedded performance validity test (PVT). However, there do not appear to be any studies that have examined its utility in Spanish-speaking samples. This pilot study examined the classification accuracy of the BVMT-R RD for detecting performance invalidity in a Spanish-speaking forensic sample.

**Participants and Methods:** This cross-sectional study utilized a sample of 89 Spanish speakers that were administered the BVMT-R during an outpatient neuropsychological evaluation. Out of the 89 Spanish speakers, 43 were subjects in litigation, 32 were neurological patients evaluated for clinical purposes, and 14 were healthy controls. The sample was 67% male/33% female, 53% South American, 33% Caribbean (Dominican, Puerto Rican, Cuban), 10% Central American, 3% North American (Mexican), and 1% Spanish, with a mean age of 44.2 years ( $SD = 14.2$ ; range = 20-78) and mean education of 11 years ( $SD = 3.7$ ; range = 0-20). Test administration for each patient was completed in Spanish by a fluent, Spanish-speaking examiner. In total, 64/89 (72%) were classified as valid and 25/89 (28%) as invalid based on performance across the Test of Memory Malingering (TOMM), at least one additional PVT (Rey-15 item memory test; Rey Dot Counting Test; Reliable Digit Span; WHO-AVLT recognition trial) and objective diagnostic criteria identifying invalid performance. Analyses included three univariate analyses of variance (ANOVA), with the groups (healthy vs neurological vs litigation) as independent variables and performance on BVMT-RD as the dependent variable.

**Results:** Statistically significant differences among the groups were found  $F(2,86)=8.32$ ,  $p < .001$ . Post-hoc analysis (Scheffe test) showed the mean of the litigation group to be significantly lower than the means of the other two groups (healthy and neurological), which showed no difference between them. An ANOVA with validity groups as the fixed factor and BVMT-R RD index as the dependent variable was significant  $F(1,85)= 21.02$ ,  $p < .001$ . Results of a ROC curve analysis yielded statistically significant AUC (.794). The optimal cut-score was BVMT-R RD  $\leq 5$  (48% sensitivity/88% specificity).

**Conclusions:** Results of the BVMT-R RD index in this Spanish-speaking population differed by subgroup, with worse performance seen in

individuals involved in litigation, compared to those who were not (healthy and neurological). Notably, the BVM-T-R RD index significantly differentiated validity groups, maintaining adequate sensitivity and good specificity. Overall, results demonstrate promise for BVM-T-RD as a PVT for Spanish-speaking populations.

**Categories:** Forensic Neuropsychology/Malingering/Noncredible Presentations

**Keyword 1:** performance validity

**Keyword 2:** malingering

**Correspondence:** Liliam R. Castillo, John Jay College of Criminal Justice, City University of New York, lcastillo@gradcenter.cuny.edu

### 88 Determining the Eye-Tracking Strategies Used in the Game "Spot the Missing Object (SMO)" by Simulator Malingers, ADHD, and Non-ADHD

Luis E Aguerrevere, Maximilian Gerhold  
Stephen F. Austin State University,  
Nacogdoches, TX, USA

**Objective:** Typical evaluations of adult ADHD consist of behavior self-report rating scales, cognitive or intellectual functioning measures, and specific measures designed to measure attention. Boone (2009) suggested monitoring continuous effort is essential throughout psychological assessments. However, very few research studies have contributed to malingering literature on the ADHD population. Many studies have reported the adequate use of symptom validity tests, which assess effortful performance in ADHD evaluations (Jasinski et al., 2011; Sollman et al., 2010; Schneider et al., 2014). Because of the length of ADHD assessments, individuals are likely to become weary and tired, thus impacting their performance. This study investigates the eye movement strategies used by a clinical ADHD population, non-ADHD subjects, and malingering simulators when playing a common simple visual search task.

**Participants and Methods:** A total of 153 college students participated in this study. To be placed in the ADHD group, a participant must endorse four or more symptoms on the ASRS (N = 37). To be placed in the non-ADHD, participants should have endorsed no ADHD

symptoms (N = 43). Participants that did not meet the above criteria for ADHD and not-ADHD were placed in an Indeterminate group and were not included in the analysis. A total of 20 participants were instructed to fake symptoms related to ADHD during the session. A total of twelve Spot the Difference images were used as the visual picture stimuli. Sticky by Tobii Pro (2020) was used for the collection of eye-movement data was utilized. Sticky by Tobii Pro is an online self-service platform that combines online survey questions with an eye-tracking webcam, allowing participants to see images from their home computers.

**Results:** Results indicated on the participants classified as Malingering had a significantly Visit Count (M = 17.16; SD= 4.99) compared to the ADHD (M = 12.53; SD= 43.92) and not-ADHD groups (M = 11.51; SD=3.23). Results also indicated a statistically significant Area Under the Curve (AUC) = .784; SE = .067; p = .003; 95% CI = .652-.916. Optimal cutoffs suggest a Sensitivity of 50% with a False Positive Rate of 10%.

**Conclusions:** Results indicated that eye-tracking technology could help differentiate simulator malingers from non-malingers with ADHD. Eye-tracking research relates to a patchwork of fields more diverse than the study of perceptual systems. Due to their close relation to attentional mechanisms, the study's results can provide an insight into cognitive processes related to malingering performance.

**Categories:** Forensic Neuropsychology/Malingering/Noncredible Presentations

**Keyword 1:** noncredible presentations

**Keyword 2:** inhibitory control

**Keyword 3:** attention deficit hyperactivity disorder

**Correspondence:** Luis E. Aguerrevere, Stephen F. Austin State University; aguerrevle@sfasu.edu

### 89 Detecting Feigned Cognitive Impairment Using Pupillometry on the Warrington Recognition Memory Test for Words

Sarah D Patrick<sup>1</sup>, Lisa J Rapport<sup>1</sup>, Robin A Hanks<sup>1</sup>, Robert J Kansner<sup>1,2</sup>