

## Accepted Manuscript

Title: Self-initiated versus instructed cheating in the physiological Concealed Information Test

Authors: Linda Marjoleine Geven, Nathalie klein Selle, Gershon Ben-Shakhar, Merel Kindt, Bruno Verschuere



PII: S0301-0511(18)30223-0  
DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biopsycho.2018.09.005>  
Reference: BIOPSY 7589

To appear in:

Received date: 4-4-2018  
Revised date: 10-9-2018  
Accepted date: 12-9-2018

Please cite this article as: Geven LM, klein Selle N, Ben-Shakhar G, Kindt M, Verschuere B, Self-initiated versus instructed cheating in the physiological Concealed Information Test, *Biological Psychology* (2018), <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biopsycho.2018.09.005>

This is a PDF file of an unedited manuscript that has been accepted for publication. As a service to our customers we are providing this early version of the manuscript. The manuscript will undergo copyediting, typesetting, and review of the resulting proof before it is published in its final form. Please note that during the production process errors may be discovered which could affect the content, and all legal disclaimers that apply to the journal pertain.

**Self-initiated versus instructed cheating in the physiological Concealed Information Test**

Linda Marjoleine Geven<sup>1,2,\*</sup>, Nathalie klein Selle<sup>2</sup>, Gershon Ben-Shakhar<sup>2</sup>, Merel Kindt<sup>1</sup> & Bruno Verschuere<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Department of Clinical Psychology, University of Amsterdam, the Netherlands

Nieuwe Achtergracht 129B, 1018WS Amsterdam

<sup>2</sup> Department of Psychology, Hebrew University of Jerusalem, Israel

Mount Scopus, 91905, Jerusalem

\* Corresponding author at: Faculty of Social and Behavioural Sciences, Department of Clinical Psychology, University of Amsterdam, Amsterdam, The Netherlands.

Email address: L.M.Geven@uva.nl

**Highlights:**

- The current experiment examined the impact of self-initiated versus instructed cheating on the validity of the Concealed Information Test (CIT).
- Provided with the opportunity to cheat for a financial gain, 37.4% of participants cheated.
- The detection efficiency using SCR, RLL and HR measures did not differ between participants who cheated on their own initiative compared and instructed cheaters.
- The data demonstrate that the validity of the CIT is not restricted to instructed cheating, which is encouraging from an ecological validity perspective.

Download English Version:

<https://daneshyari.com/en/article/11004516>

Download Persian Version:

<https://daneshyari.com/article/11004516>

[Daneshyari.com](https://daneshyari.com)