Patterns of malingering and compliance in measures of interrogative suggestibility

Rhiannon Woolston b, Stella A. Bain a, James S. Baxter b

a Department of Psychology, Glasgow Caledonian University, Cowcaddens Road, Glasgow G4 0BA, United Kingdom
b Department of Psychology, University of Strathclyde, 40 George St., Glasgow G1 1QE, United Kingdom

Received 13 June 2005; received in revised form 23 September 2005; accepted 12 October 2005

Abstract

This study aimed to compare indicators of malingering with those of compliance on the Gudjonsson Suggestibility Scales (GSS 1). It was hypothesised that participants issued with instructions either to appear susceptible to leading questions or to comply with an interviewer's perceived requirements would show unique patterns of GSS scores, allowing them to be differentiated from each other, and from a control group. The study had a single-factor between participants design. Participants were tested in one of three conditions: Misled, Compliant, or Standard instructions. Sixty-six participants took part in the study. Results indicated unique patterns of scoring in all three conditions; all three groups were distinguishable from each other. Results support previous studies which indicate that some patterns of malingering may be identifiable on the GSS. However, compliant responding may not be readily distinguishable from genuine vulnerability. Results are discussed in terms of the theoretical distinction between suggestibility and compliance.
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1. Introduction

Malingering is defined in DSM-IV as the intentional production of false or exaggerated physical or psychological symptoms, motivated by incentives such as avoiding criminal prosecution. One area where such faking may present a problem is in the evaluation of defendants in criminal cases who claim that they have been subject to undue pressures in police interrogations. Gudjonsson and Clark (1986) term susceptibility to suggestion and pressure during police and similar interviews ‘interrogative suggestibility’ (IS) and define it as:

The extent to which, within a closed social interaction, people come to accept messages communicated during formal questioning as a result of which their subsequent behavioural response is affected (p. 84).

The Gudjonsson Suggestibility Scales (GSS) are two instruments designed to measure IS which can be used to evaluate the susceptibility of interviewees to interrogative pressure. Two parallel forms of the GSS exist (GSS 1 and GSS 2) which produce closely comparable scores in the general population. Scoring on each scale is based on recall of a spoken narrative and 20 questions about the narrative. Participants initially provide free recall of the narrative before being questioned. Five questions are straightforward and fifteen are leading in that they suggest that certain details were part of the narrative although, actually, they were not. The number of these leading items accepted by an interviewee when the questions are first asked provides a score termed ‘Yield 1’. Negative feedback, designed to apply ‘interrogative pressure’ is then administered to the interviewee in the form of the statement that ‘You have made a number of errors. It is therefore necessary to go through the questions once more, and this time try to be more accurate’. This should be stated ‘clearly and firmly’ according to Gudjonsson (1997). The questions are then asked again and three further measures obtained; ‘Yield 2’, ‘Shift’, and ‘Total Suggestibility’. (Further details on scoring the GSS are provided in Section 2.)

The Gudjonsson scales can be used to identify individuals who may require extra care during a forensic interview or in cases where a statement or confession has been retracted (Gudjonsson, 1997, 2003). However, deceitful witnesses or suspects who regret statements to police may benefit from gaining high IS scores on the GSS. Part of their case may then be that their GSS performance is evidence of a general susceptibility to interrogative pressure, signifying that the evidence in their own statements is unreliable.

Reviewing a number of studies, Gudjonsson (2003) noted that memory recall correlates negatively with suggestibility; the poorer an individual’s memory is for events, the more suggestible they are generally regarding those events. Therefore, an inconsistent, and hence suspect, performance on the scales may appear as a combination of low memory recall scores and low suggestibility scores, or high memory recall and high suggestibility scores. Smith and Gudjonsson (1986) demonstrated such a pattern in a study of faking on the GSS 1. One group of participants of average or above average IQ was instructed to ‘fake to a level substantially below your usual standard’ but was given no details of the rationale or the purpose of the test except that it was a test of memory. A second group of participants of slightly below average IQ acted as controls and was told only that they were taking a memory test. The main findings were that faking participants showed substantially poorer recall than non-fakers, but that there were no consistent or marked differences between the groups on the interrogative suggestibility measures. Smith and Gudjonsson
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