group differences on several BQSS scores across all three conditions. On many scores, the Controls performed better than both the UM and CM groups, with no differences between the latter two. On other measures, both the CM and Control groups performed better than the UM group. In order to determine if the BQSS could discriminate between CM subjects and a group of 18 patients with documented traumatic brain injury but without any pending litigation, a logistic regression analysis was performed, resulting in an 81% correct overall classification rate. These results indicate that the BQSS may be useful in the detection of malingering.

Sweet, J. J., & Demakis, G. J.
Word-Face Discrepancies on the Warrington Recognition Memory Test: Absence of Laterality and Material Specific Findings.

Two studies were conducted to assess the purported ability of the Warrington Recognition Memory Test (RMT) to be sensitive to lateralized brain dysfunction and material specific (verbal vs. nonverbal) memory impairment. In Study 1, a heterogeneous sample of 227 patients with independent confirmation of brain disorder were classified into three groups based on RMT Faces and Words subtest scores. Group 1 patients (n = 37) scored significantly higher on words vs. faces, Group 2 patients scored significantly higher on faces vs. words (n = 35), and Group 3 (n = 154) patients scored equally on faces and words. Contrary to expectations, Group 1 patients scored better than Group 2 on both WMS-R subtests of Logical Memory and Visual Reproduction. In addition, neither group showed a material specific advantage that would be consistent with the word versus face discrepancy. In Study 2, different groups of patients with documented right or left hemisphere damage were assessed. Again, contrary to expectations, there were no significant differences between these groups on the Words and Faces subtests. Overall, these results question the apparent meaning of the RMT Words vs. Faces discrepancy score.

Russell, M. L., & Harvey, S. C.
Rebottled Wine: The Expanded Halstead Battery vs. The Halstead Russell Neuropsychological System-Evidence for Consistent Differences.

It has become increasingly clear that contemporary norms are needed for the Halstead Reitan Battery. Two of the most popular contemporary systems are the Expanded Halstead Reitan Battery by Heaton, Grant and Matthews (1991), and the Halstead Russell Neuropsychological Evaluation System (1994). Although both systems use large population normative samples, stratified by age and education, our subjective experience when using both systems in a large hospital practice was that the HRNES tended to systematically underestimate the degree of dysfunction. To assess the validity of that assumption, statistical comparisons were made between the t-scores for the index tests common to both systems. Fifty consecutive cases seen between January and June 1997 were analyzed and, consistent with our earlier impressions, significant differences between the two data bases were noted. Practical implications stemming from these findings are discussed as are recommendations for additional research.

Teichner, G., Golden, C.J., Crum, T., & Bradley, J.
Establishing the Reliability and Validity of the Luria Nebraska Neuropsychological Battery-III.

The present study presents the most recent data pertaining to the development of the Luria Nebraska Neuropsychological Battery-III. This new test battery is derived from a variety of sources including the previous Luria-Nebraska Batteries, and existing tests in psychology, speech, and education. The final version of this test battery comprises 33 scales as follows: General Orientation, Motor Coordination, Purposeful Movement, Drawing, Nonverbal Au-