VSVT

Victoria Symptom Validity Test

Score Report

GENERATED BY
PARiConnect™

by Daniel Slick, PhD, Grace Hopp, MA & Esther Strauss, PhD, and PAR Staff

Client Name:	Sample Client	Complaints of Memory Dysfunction:	Yes
ID Number:	PAR Sample	Possible Litigation:	Yes
Date of Testing:	10/10/2023	Date of Injury:	4/22/2023
Date of Birth:	10/31/2002	Loss of Consciousness (LOC):	Yes
Age:	20	Duration of LOC:	5 mins
Gender:	Female	Length of Post Traumatic Amnesia:	6 Months
Years of Education:	14	Results of Neuroimaging:	N/A
Reported Ethnicity:	Native American	Setting:	Office
Marital Status:	Single	Previous Head Injury:	
		Previous Testing:	
		Sensory/Motor Impairments:	
		Other Neurological/Medical Disorders:	

Introduction

This report is designed to assist in the interpretation of performance on the Victoria Symptom Validity Test (VSVT). The VSVT provides one measure of the level of effort expended on test-taking by clients referred for psychological or neuropsychological evaluations.

The VSVT and other forced-choice tests are often referred to as symptom validity tests, rather than malingering tests, because unusually poor performance may reflect poor effort, deliberate feigning, exaggeration of real cognitive deficits, factors independent of conscious dissimulation and external rewards, or any combination of the above. Therefore, it's important for users to recognize that VSVT scores are, at best, capable of indicating that factors other than cognitive impairment may be influencing a client's performance. Even when performance on the VSVT is in the questionable range and financial or other incentives exist, the client may be legitimately impaired, acting without conscious intent, or both.

Users should be knowledgeable about the research and ethical issues related to assessing symptom validity. They should exercise considerable caution and good judgment when interpreting results of symptom validity tests such as the VSVT because of the potentially serious implications when those results suggest less-than-optimal effort. Users are strongly encouraged to employ additional measures to assess effort and motivation when the client's VSVT performance raises concerns about the level of effort expended during an evaluation. More reliable and accurate conclusions about a client's motivation and effort can best be made by using multiple assessment instruments and considering additional sources of information.

VSVT Summary Scores

Items Correct score	Raw score	Binomial p value	Suggested interpretation
Easy Items Correct	24/24	>.9999	Valid
Difficult Items Correct	23/24	>.9999	Valid
Total Items Correct	47/48	>.9999	Valid

Note. Raw scores indicate the number of items correct/maximum number of items in the category.

Between-Group Comparisons: Items Correct Scores

Items Correct score	Client		Control	Feigning	Comp	Non-comp
			Comparison group			
Easy Items Correct	24	M	23.97	20.30	23.33	23.53
		SD	0.18	4.35	1.97	1.19
Difficult Items Correct	23	M	23.44	10.95	20.17	22.63
		SD	0.92	6.06	4.80	1.79
Total Items Correct	47	M	47.41	31.26	43.50	46.16
		SD	0.92	9.05	6.08	2.59

Note. Comp = Compensation-seeking; Non-comp = Non-compensation seeking. Control n = 95; Feigning n = 43; Comp n = 205; Non-comp n = 32.

Descriptive Statistics for Response Latency Variables

Response Latency (seconds)	Valid (above chance)	Questionable (at chance)	Invalid (below chance)
	Classification		
Easy Items			
M	1.67	2.84	3.40
SD	0.73	1.45	1.02
95% CI	1.58-1.77	2.26-3.42	2.81-3.99
Difficult Items			
M	2.68	5.50	4.70
SD	1.28	3.44	1.67
95% CI	2.52-2.85	4.11-6.89	3.73-5.67

Note. Valid n = 135; Questionable n = 20; Invalid n = 15.

Between-Group Comparisons: Response Latency

Response Latency (seconds)		Client	Control	Feigning	Comp	Non-comp
			Comparison group			
Easy Items Correct						
	M	1.25	1.29	2.48	2.06	1.61
	SD	0.32	0.37	1.05	1.04	0.53
Difficult Items Correct						
	M	1.94	1.93	4.08	3.45	2.61
	SD	0.32	0.51	2.12	2.02	1.11
Total Items Correct						
	M	1.62	1.61	3.28	2.76	2.11
	SD	0.82	0.41	1.43	1.45	0.80

Note. Comp = Compensation-seeking; Non-comp = Non-compensation seeking. Control n = 95; Feigning n = 43; Comp n = 205; Non-comp n = 32.

Item Scores for Block 1

Item #	Response accuracy		Item type	Response Latency (seconds)
	Correct	Incorrect		
Item 1	X		Easy	0.92
Item 2	X		Easy	1.03
Item 3	X		Difficult	2.34
Item 4	X		Easy	1.07
Item 5	X		Easy	1.98
Item 6		X	Difficult	1.17
Item 7	X		Difficult	2.71
Item 8	X		Easy	1.01
Item 9	X		Difficult	1.72
Item 10	X		Easy	1.32
Item 11	X		Difficult	2.52
Item 12	X		Difficult	1.62
Item 13	X		Easy	1.30
Item 14	X		Easy	1.17
Item 15	X		Difficult	1.92
Item 16	X		Difficult	2.93

Score Totals for Block 1 (16 Items)

Item Type	Items Correct	Response Latency
Easy	8	1.23
Difficult	7	2.12
Total	15	1.67

Note. Retention interval for Block 1 was 5 seconds.

Item Scores for Block 2

Item #	Response accuracy		Item type	Response Latency (seconds)
	Correct	Incorrect		
Item 1	X		Easy	1.93
Item 2	X		Difficult	2.19
Item 3	X		Easy	1.25
Item 4	X		Difficult	1.91
Item 5	X		Easy	1.16
Item 6	X		Difficult	1.69
Item 7	X		Easy	1.09
Item 8	X		Difficult	2.64
Item 9	X		Easy	1.52
Item 10	X		Easy	1.11
Item 11	X		Difficult	1.67
Item 12	X		Difficult	1.16
Item 13	X		Easy	1.04
Item 14	X		Easy	0.97
Item 15	X		Difficult	1.18
Item 16	X		Difficult	2.74

Score Totals for Block 2 (16 Items)

Item Type	Items Correct	Response Latency
Easy	8	1.26
Difficult	8	1.90
Total	16	1.58

Note. Retention interval for Block 2 was 5 seconds.

Item Scores for Block 3

Item #	Response accuracy		Item type	Response Latency (seconds)
	Correct	**Incorrect**		
Item 1	X		Difficult	1.51
Item 2	X		Difficult	2.59
Item 3	X		Easy	1.04
Item 4	X		Easy	1.84
Item 5	X		Difficult	1.85
Item 6	X		Difficult	2.00
Item 7	X		Easy	1.69
Item 8	X		Difficult	1.56
Item 9	X		Difficult	1.69
Item 10	X		Easy	1.35
Item 11	X		Easy	0.94
Item 12	X		Difficult	1.50
Item 13	X		Easy	1.30
Item 14	X		Difficult	2.83
Item 15	X		Easy	0.90
Item 16	X		Easy	0.96

Score Totals for Block 3 (16 Items)

Item Type	Items Correct	Response Latency
Easy	8	1.25
Difficult	8	1.94
Total	16	1.60

Note. Retention interval for Block 3 was 5 seconds.

Score Totals for Blocks 1-3 (48 items)

Item Type	Items Correct	Response Latency
Easy	24	1.25
Difficult	23	1.99
Total	47	1.62

Right-Left Preference score

-0.04

Note. Scores < -0.6 indicate an extreme left-side preference; scores > 0.6 indicate an extreme right-side preference.

— END OF REPORT —