



EUROPEAN

POLYGRAPH

PUBLISHED QUARTERLY

Volume 13

2019

Number 1 (47)



Andrzej Frycz Modrzewski Krakow University



EUROPEAN

POLYGRAPH

Journal of Andrzej Frycz Modrzewski
Krakow University

European Polygraph is an international journal devoted to the publication of original investigations, observations, scholarly inquiries, and book reviews on the subject of polygraph examinations. These include jurisprudence, forensic sciences, psychology, forensic psychology, psychophysiology, psychopathology, and other aspects of polygraph examinations.

Opinions expressed in articles and book reviews published in *European Polygraph* solely reflect the experience and expertise of their respective Authors and Reviewers. Their publication does not imply any form of endorsement on behalf the Editors and Publishers who provide space for the presentation of, often contradictory, views and discussion of positions.

Editorial Board

Sergei Aleskovskiy (Almaty, Kazakhstan)
Tuvya T. Amsel (Tel Aviv, Israel)
Avital Ginton (Tel Aviv, Israel)
Don Grubin (Newcastle, United Kingdom)
Charles R. Honts (Boise, United States)
Frank S. Horvath (East Lansing, United States)
Donald Krapohl (Fort Jackson, United States)
James Matte (Williamsville, USA)
Alexandr B. Pielenicyn (Moscow, Russia)
Jerzy Pobocho (Szczecin, Poland)
David C. Raskin (Homer AK, USA)
Tuvia Shurany (Jerusalem, Israel)
Gintaras Švedas (Vilnius, Lithuania)
Igor Usikov (Kiev, Ukraine)
Jennifer M.C. Vendemia (Columbia, United States)
Jan Widacki (Krakow, Poland)
Daniel T. Wilcox (Birmingham, United Kingdom)

Editor-in-Chief Jan Widacki

Associate Editor Anna Szuba-Boroń

Managing Editor Margerita Krasnowolska

Office

ul. Herlinga-Grudzińskiego 1C;
30-705 Kraków (Poland)
e-mail: aszuba@afm.edu.pl
www.polygraph.pl

Language Editor Martin Cahn

Statistics Editor Tadeusz Stanisław

Cover design Joanna Sroka, Oleg Aleksejczuk



Publisher Council
of the Andrzej Frycz Modrzewski
Krakow University
Klemens Budzowski
Maria Kapiszewska
Zbigniew Maciąg
Jacek M. Majchrowski

Copyright© by Andrzej Frycz Modrzewski
Krakow University
Krakow 2018
ksiegarnia@kte.pl

e-ISSN 2380-0550
ISSN 1898-5238

European Polygraph offers open access to all
its issues:

<http://www.polygraph.pl>

<https://www.degruyter.com/view/j/ep>

The original of *European Polygraph*
is its electronic version.



Contents

Articles

- **Stanley M. Slowik, Frank S. Horvath:** *Chicago: Where Polygraph Becomes a Science*7
- **Jan Widacki, Natalia Mirska, Małgorzata Wrońska:** *Verbal and Non-verbal Symptoms of Deception in the Eyes of Policemen and Psychologists*25

Book review

- **JW:** *Избранные публикации из журнала «Европейский полиграф» (Izbrannyye publikatsii iz zhurnala “Yevropeyskiy Poligraf”; Selected publications from European Polygraph journal), Moscow 2019*43
- **Vitalii Shapovalov:** *Довідник поліграфолога. Валідні формати тестів та системи бального оцінювання (The Polygraph Examiner Resource Guide. Validated Polygraph Techniques and Scoring Systems; has been established by the team of practical polygraph examiners of Ukraine: Vitalii Shapovalov, Dmytro Zubovskyi, Diana Aliksieieva-Protsiuk, Olesia Goncharova)*45

■ Certificate Impact Factor	47
-----------------------------------	----

■ The Basic Information for Authors	49
---	----

■ Rules and regulations concerning publishing papers in European Polygraph	51
---	----

■ Ordering Information.....	53
-----------------------------	----

Articles



Stanley M. Slowik*

Stanley M. Slowik, Inc.,
Evergreen, Colorado, United States

Frank S. Horvath**

Michigan State University, Emeritus
United States

Chicago: Where Polygraph Becomes a Science

Чикаго: где полиграф становится наукой

Key words: History of polygraph, polygraph in Chicago, John E. Reid

Abstract

In the 1920's, earlier work on polygraph instrumentation and procedure in Europe and the United States came together in Chicago where John Reid and Fred Inbau at the Scientific Crime Laboratory applied extensive field observations in real life criminal cases to create the Comparison Question and semi-objective scoring technique, the factors that allowed polygraph to achieve scientific status.

While Chicago was not the first place the instrumental detection of deception was attempted, it was the place where the contemporary, comparison question technique was first developed and polygraph became a science. This fortuitous development was

* slowik@att.net

** horvathf@twc.com

the result of the unlikely assemblage of a remarkable group of polygraph pioneers and a ready supply of criminal suspects.

It is impossible to pinpoint when people first began noticing the relationship between lying and observable changes in the body. The early Greeks founded the science of physiognomy in which they correlated facial expressions and physical gestures to impute various personality characteristics. The ancient Asians noted the connection between lying and saliva concluding that liars have a difficult time chewing and swallowing rice when being deceptive. Clearly, behavioral detection of deception pre-dates instrumental detection of deception which, it is equally clear, is European in origin. By 1858 Etienne-Jules Marey, the grandfather of cinematography recently feted in Martin Scorsese's film *Hugo*, and Claude Bernard, a French physiologist, described how emotions trigger involuntary physiological changes and created a "cardiograph" that recorded blood pressure and pulse changes to stimuli such as nausea and stress (Bunn, 2012). Cesare Lombroso, often credited as the founder of criminology, published the first of five editions of *L'uomo delinquente* in 1876 in which he postulated that criminals were degenerates or throwbacks to earlier forms of human development. Lombroso later modified his theory of "born criminals" by creating three heretical classes of criminals: habitual, insane and emotional or passionate (Lombroso, 1876).

By 1898, Hans Gross, the Austrian jurist credited with starting the field of criminalistics, rejected the notion of "born criminals" and postulated that each crime was a scientific problem that should be resolved by the best of scientific and technical investigative aides (Gross, 2014). In 1906, Carl Jung used a galvanometer and glove blood pressure apparatus with a word association test and concluded that the responses of suspected criminals and mental perverts were the same (Jung, 1907).

In order to appreciate the important polygraph contributions that occurred in Chicago, one needs to first consider what was happening at Harvard University and in Berkeley, California at the beginning of the 20th Century.

The Harvard School

At Harvard University's Departments of Psychology and Physiology, William James, Walter Cannon, Hugo Münsterberg and his student, William Moulton Marston, all conducted significant work in psychological theory relevant to present day polygraph. William James was the first to define emotions as bodily changes, specifically, that such changes were responses to recognizing an exciting stimuli. This notion was later captured in the somewhat simplistic "Fear does not make us run from the bear – running

from the bear makes us experience the emotion of fear” (James, 1894). James was successful in recruiting Hugo Münsterberg from Germany to Harvard though subsequently they often disagreed with each other’s work. Münsterberg extended Jung’s work with delayed answers and the word association test using Matthaos Hipp’s chronoscope, an electromagnetic timer capable of measuring very brief time intervals. Münsterberg concluded that delayed answers were an indication of deception. Unfortunately, since numerous physical, visual and mental pre-conditions can also significantly affect response time and can easily be manipulated, time response techniques were rejected by Marston and others, at least with regard to investigative applications. Münsterberg is credited with being the Father of Industrial Psychology and promoted the use of psychology to shape consumer desire. He subscribed to James’ theory of the human automaton, that people acted according to a predetermined set of coded instructions. Münsterberg also wrote that perception was heavily affected by individual memory and sensory differences in which in turn effect responses to stimuli (Münsterberg, 1907). This basic notion was to resurface in present day discussions of polygraph standardization. While many procedural aspects of polygraph technique most certainly can and have been standardized, attempts to carry this into all aspects of polygraph can lead to serious decision errors. While comparison questions, for example, should generally match the topic of the relevant questions it is even more important that they be individually developed with the subject and not merely pulled by rote from a rigid, limited pre-determined list (Reid & Inbau, 1977).

Münsterberg also maintained that the “3rd Degree”, i.e. using physical force to coerce confessions, was an ineffective technique, not because of any moral or legal sensibilities, but because it was ineffective at obtaining the truth. The term “3rd Degree” has been credited to a 19th century NYPD Detective, Thomas Byrne, alleged to have beaten confessions from suspects and the term a play on his name (Alder, 2007). Münsterberg appeared to be far more interested in curing, not detecting lies and proposed replacing judges and juries with scientific Instrumentation to resolve criminal cases (Münsterberg, 1922). This idea continues to haunt the polygraph profession with numerous decisions against polygraph admissibility on the grounds that it “usurps the provenance of the jury”.

Münsterberg’s most illustrious student, William Moulton Marston, developed the Systolic Blood Pressure test as a Senior at Harvard, claiming 94% - 96% accuracy in detecting deception (Marston, 1917). About the same time, Marston demonstrated that “good liars”, i.e. subjects who seemed to enjoy lying, could disprove Münsterberg’s theory that late answers on the word association test indicated deception and could, in fact, obtain faster chronoscope times than truth tellers. Marston was known as the originator of audience testing wherein he would test subjects to determine their response

to various movies and products. In 1930 he had published *The Art of Sound Pictures* explaining what was needed to create a gripping story, how various gestures were associated with different passions and how to make movies emotionally safe from censorship (Marston & Pitkin, 1930). In 1931 Universal Pictures employed Leonarde Keeler in Chicago to test DePaul University undergraduates watching Boris Karloff in the movie *Frankenstein* and, based upon the test results removed scenes in which the Monster drowns a small girl and Dr. Frankenstein compares himself to God (Mechan, 1931).

In 1928 Marston wrote *Emotions of Normal People* espousing his theory that the primary drive of all people was to submit to a higher power. This later became the premise of his comic book series, *Suprema – The Wonder Woman* for which Marston wrote all the scripts (Bunn, 1997).

Marston is best known in legal circles for his attempt, in 1922, to introduce his Systolic Blood Pressure test in *U.S. v. Frye* in which Frye was found guilty of 2nd degree murder (U.S. v. Frye, 1922). In declining to admit Marston's test, Judge McCoy opined that lie detection was not yet a matter of common knowledge and if the test was adopted, the jury system would have to be abandoned. Upon appeal, in 1923, the District of Columbia Court of Appeals ignored Judge McCoy's concerns and focused on when a scientific principle is no longer experimental but demonstrable, therein establishing, until *Daubert* in 1993, the Frye Rule in which a scientific test has to be "sufficiently established to have gained general acceptance in the particular field in which it belongs" (Frye v. U.S., 1923).

Walter Cannon, long term Chair of the Department of Physiology at Harvard Medical School, extended Claude Bernard's early work on homeostasis concluding that physiological centering does not happen by chance but is the result of organized, physiological self-government. With fellow physiologist Philip Bard he developed the Cannon-Bard theory explaining why people feel emotions first and then act upon them, contrary to William James' assertion that "running from the bear makes us experience the emotion of fear". In 1915 he coined the term "fight or flight" in his book *Bodily Changes in Pain, Hunger, Fear and Rage: An Account of Recent Researches into the Functions of Emotional Excitement* (Cannon, 1915). Cannon proposed that diverse stimuli can produce the same physical response and, by inference, that the same stimuli can produce diverse physical responses. Applying this to modern polygraph examinations, some polygraph subjects respond consistently in all three of the standard parameters (BP/pulse, respiration and EDA), others in two of the three, some in only one of the three with inconsistent responses in each parameter being fairly typical. The reverse - that different stimuli can evoke similar responses - is easily seen by comparing Known or Probable Lie responses to Comparison Questions with Countermeasure exercises such as solving math problems, visualizing exciting thoughts,

using memory, being asked confusing or ambiguous questions, the use of shocking or provocative words, unreviewed or surprise questions or the use of Directed Answer procedures. While all of these can produce similarly appearing responses, clearly they do not qualify as appropriate Comparisons due to their vast differences in triggering mechanisms. In short, Differential Salience should start with a level playing field – apples-to-apples – and not similarly appearing response patterns caused by salience to very different stimuli (Reid, 1977). Someone whose personal value set perceives lying as negative conduct with negative consequences will react (if they react at all) for salience very different than someone being told to provide a Directed Answer or mentally solve a math problem. Comparison Questions are not created just to see if a subject is capable of responding but to see if they respond for the same reasons as lying to the Relevant Questions. Cannon's research on homeostasis is therefore, just as important to polygraph response theory today as his more familiar *fight or flight* (or *freeze*) theory was to polygraph pioneers.

The Californians

While scientists at Harvard were developing some of the early explanations for the psychophysiological mechanisms of the instrumental detection of deception, August Vollmer, John Larson and Leonarde Keeler were busy with the more practical applications of the emerging science.

August Vollmer, credited with the evolution of police work from an Honorable Occupation to a true Profession, was himself a veteran of the Spanish - American War with a 6th grade education. Nevertheless, he insisted that law enforcement be completely independent from politics, that candidates have the highest standards, preferably a college education, and was a vocal proponent of the scientific investigation of crime, including the instrumental detection of deception (Deakin, 1988). Vollmer was Chief of Police in Berkeley, California and hired newly minted PhD, John Larson, as a police officer, assigning Larson to look into William Moulton Marston's Systolic Blood Pressure test. In 1923, Vollmer was persuaded to become Chief of the Los Angeles Police Department at a time when then Chief Louis Oaks and 10% of the Departments patrol officers were active members of the Ku Klux Klan. Despite Vollmer's attempts to separate law enforcement from politics, his tenure lasted less than a year but was significant because of its influence on the career of Leonarde Keeler. August Vollmer originally was Charles Keeler's, Leonarde's father, mailman. After becoming Police Chief at Berkeley and assigning John Larson to research Marston's work, Chief Vollmer assigned high school student, later University of California at Berkeley college student, Leonarde Keeler, to assist. When Vollmer went to Los Angeles, Leonarde followed and came in contact

with a number of people who actually made refinements to the polygraph instrumentation being used by Larson for which Keeler was later credited.

Vollmer was later to reunite with Larson and Keeler in Chicago, albeit by very different paths. Vollmer was influential to a significant number of other former Berkeley police officers including O. W. Wilson who eventually became Chief of the Chicago Police Department and who retained the polygraph services of John Reid in Chicago to resolve numerous, infamous allegations of police misconduct.

Paradoxically, Vollmer wasn't always the pinnacle of professionalism for which he is best known. He was known to complain about "by the book" requirements and "the foolish worship of technicalities" which undid arrests. Vollmer sometimes expressed a desire to see his officers "shoot a few criminals to set an example", the antithesis of modern law enforcement philosophy (Los Angeles Times, 1924). There is no evidence that Vollmer ever did any of the foregoing other than saying things for dramatic effect. In fact, Vollmer is often cited for his expressed desire to use police for prevention, not punishment.

John Larson of Nova Scotia received his Masters from Boston University with a thesis describing a method for fingerprint identification, though his methodology was never adopted. He received his Doctorate in Physiology from the University of California and was hired by Chief August Vollmer at the Berkeley Police Department becoming the very first "Police PhD", but only one of Vollmer's many "College Cops". It was somewhat unsettling to hear that as recently as 2015 the American Polygraph Association was actually considering making exceptions to the original 1966 college degree membership requirement that Vollmer felt necessary for basic police work in 1918. Vollmer assigned Larson to expand upon Marston's earlier work at Harvard and shortly thereafter Larson developed a method to continuously record blood pressure/pulse, a significant advancement over Marston's periodic recordings. Notably, nearly all of Larson's work involved actual criminal suspects. Some of his earliest reported cases involved Sorority members suspected of dorm room thefts, polygraph subjects who were actual suspects, not college students participating in simulated laboratory studies. When times were slow at the Police Department, Larson would sometimes have his fellow officers round-up hobos and give them Searching Peaks polygraph examinations using maps to find out where, in the United States, they were from and whether they were, in fact, WWI Army deserters. Larson corroborated his polygraph charts with confessions but then did something extraordinary. He conducted "clearing charts" and noted that post-confession charts were very similar to innocent subject charts, a practice, with the notable exception of some intelligence cases, seldom practiced today. Larson was also the first to describe the problem of false positives in polygraph examinations theorizing that innocent subjects give deceptive responses to the Relevant Questions over the Ir-

relevant Questions due to guilt and shame rather than deception (Detroit News, 1948; Redstone, 1947).

It is difficult to identify the person responsible for creating the original Relevant/Irrelevant polygraph technique. Clearly Marston used a version of the technique prior to Frye's 1922 Systolic Blood Pressure test. Larson, who was aware of Marston's work, appears to be using a similar technique, as well as a searching Peak of Tension test. However, it is not clear, when one considers Jung's and Munsterberg's early research, if these early practitioners and researchers are basically using the word association test for the detection of deception or each of these pioneers simply applied another previously existing interviewing procedure from Clinical Psychology. In the same light, though Leonarde Keeler is credited with creating the Searching Peak format, John Larson was practicing it in the field when Keeler was still a high school student. It appears far more likely Keeler merely adopted Larson's "Peak" procedure rather than create anything new. Likewise, what some today are calling separate and distinct Comparison Question techniques are in fact simple variations of the Comparison Question technique originated by John Reid in the late 1930's or early 1940's. Merely changing the number and test location of Relevant and Comparison Questions and calling it a different "technique" does not appear to have any significant effect on examination accuracy since they all seem to keep coming up with Reid's same validity and reliability rates of around 85% (Nelson, 2011). For example, early versions of the "Utah Technique", for which peer review, published validity studies exist, originally included Backster's Symptomatic Question. These were, structurally, very different tests from the latest "Utah Technique", which now uses four Relevant Questions and three Comparison Questions and for which no validity studies exist. Yet, they are all called the "Utah Technique" (Horvath and Peters, 2013).

Although Reid originally referred to this new, third type of question as a Comparison Question, he and Inbau later adopted the term Control Question in deference to conventions of the time. This third type of question, today, is more correctly called a Comparison Question, not in deference to Reid's original term but due to changes in the psychological lexicon. Larson left Berkeley in 1923 to attend Rush Medical School in Chicago. While there, he worked part-time at the Illinois Institute for Juvenile Research conducting polygraph examinations at Joliet State Penitentiary. Larson appears to have consulted with Marston in the Frye case as Marston appears to have desired to parade Larson's field experience before the Court, along with their combined academic achievements. Larson, however, never officially participated in the testimony and indicated that this experience led him to conclude the polygraph was not ready for Court but would be acceptable for police work, essentially parroting the written Frye Appellate decision. Despite fundamental improvements in polygraph technique since 1922,

notably the development of Reid's Comparison Question technique, instrumentation and accuracy research, this same mantra is still espoused by some law enforcement agencies in present times (ibid, Alder).

Leonarde Keeler, as noted previously, was first exposed to polygraph when Chief August Vollmer assigned him to assist John Larson in expanding upon Marston's Systolic Blood Pressure test. Though Keeler was only a high school student at the time, it appears he had a very charismatic personality and was somewhat of a polygraph kleptomaniac, obtaining credit for both instrumental and procedural innovations that were actually developed by others. During their long, strained association under Vollmer's formal and informal consul, Keeler was supposed to focus on improving the polygraph instrument while Larson was to devote his efforts to improving the procedures or technique and conducting research regarding examination validity and reliability (ibid, Bunn). To a certain extent, both performed in their assigned roles but, at least in the case of Leonarde Keeler, not in the manner Vollmer envisioned.

Although there is evidence that Keeler enrolled at the University of California at Berkeley, there doesn't appear to be any record that he actually attended classes. When Vollmer became Chief in Los Angeles, Keeler transferred to UCLA and, again, doesn't appear to have been much of a student in the year he was there. However, he did have occasion to work with Hiram Edwards, a physicist at the college and Charles Sloan, a reporter with the Los Angeles Times who also happened to be an accomplished machinist. The three were able to develop a new form of metal tambour that greatly improved the sensitivity of polygraph recordings. When Vollmer resumed his position as Chief of the Berkeley Police Department, Keeler, with the help of his father, also returned to the Bay Area and was accepted as a student in the Psychology Department at Stanford University in Palo Alto, California. He was mentored by Professor Walter Miles who had agreed to give Keeler some laboratory space and allowed Keeler to work on further refining the polygraph instrument. Again, now for the third school in a row, it appears unlikely that Keeler actually attended classes at Stanford. In 1927, while Miles and Keeler were on a sales trip to show Tyco Instruments Keeler's prototype polygraph, they stopped in Chicago where Keeler met Herman Adler, Director of the Illinois Institute of Juvenile Research, who offered Keeler a job on the spot as a polygraph examiner. Adler had previously traveled to Berkeley to see Larson's work, having been interested in Marston's early reports. In 1929, Keeler accepted Adler's offer and moved to Chicago (24, Alder). That same year, August Vollmer authored *The Illinois Crime Survey*, a rather scathing report about police corruption, particularly in Chicago (Wigmore, 1929). Vollmer moved to Chicago in 1930 to teach Police Science at the University of Chicago with the expectation that he might soon become Chief of the Chicago Police Department. As discussed previously, John Larson was already in

Chicago attending Rush Medical School and conducting polygraph examinations for Adler at the Institute of Juvenile Research. The stage was therefore set with the three Californians, Vollmer, Larson and Keeler together again, this time in Chicago at the time of an event that forever changed the future of polygraph: the St. Valentine's Day Massacre. Before discussing the significance of this seminal event on polygraph, it is first useful to consider how social evolution, the media and presumably, the public in Chicago framed the issue of crime and criminal investigation.

The Media and the "Lie Detector"

As early as 1907, the New York Times reported Hugo Munsterberg's ability to *Invent a Machine to Cure Liars*" (New York Times, 1907) but it wasn't until 1909 that Charles Walk in *The Yellow Circle* used the term "lie detector" to describe Munsterberg's use of the chronoscope and work association test as "a machine that's a lie detector" (Walk, 1909). That same year, two Chicago newsmen, Edwin Balmer and William Harge created the fictional character Luther Trant who was described as a Scientific Detective using a three channel polygraph (pneumograph, galvanometer and glove plethysmograph) to unmask criminals (Balmer & MacHarg, 1910). In 1910 Arthur Reeves created *Craig Kennedy – The Truth Detector* who used a two channel polygraph and Munsterberg's word association test to investigate crime (Reeve, 1912). Finally, in 1930 Chester Gould created the comic strip *Dick Tracy* and described the fictional detective using a Keeler Polygraph to catch criminals. It is interesting to note the Gould attend the month long Northwestern University Law School Scientific Crime Lab course on evidence collection and polygraph and, therefore, was very much aware of polygraph's "state of the art" at the time.

Chicago in the 1920's

In 1910 Henry Wigmore, Dean of the Northwestern University Law School established the first criminological research center, the **American Institute for Criminal Law and Criminology**. Dean Wigmore was later to be frequently referenced by fellow Law School Dean, Fred Inbau, for Wigmore's response to the 1922 *Frye* decision, "If there is ever devised a psychological test for the valuation of witnesses, the law will run to meet it" (Wigmore, 1940). At about the same time, Illinois established the first Juvenile Court based on the philosophy of Jane Adams' Chicago Hull House that crime was a disease that should be treated, i.e. correct, forgive and forget (Davis, 1973). This philosophy continues to periodically resurface and today can be seen in various Presi-

dential Executive Orders (2015) restricting the FBI, DEA, ATFE and other federal law enforcement agencies' use of criminal records in conducting employment background checks, the EEOC's Revised Guidelines (2012) limiting the periods of accountability regarding credit and criminal records and the Ban-the-Box movement where various states and local governments prohibit public employers from soliciting information about criminal convictions until after job applicants have been given Conditional Offers of Employment (Slowik, 2015).

As a further outgrowth of the Juvenile Court, in 1909 the **Institute for Juvenile Research** was created in Chicago with William Healy as its first Director. Healy was a disciple of James and Munsterberg and repeated their notion that lying was a gateway to vice and polygraph should be used to cure lying (Healy, 1915). In 1916 Herman Adler became the second Director of the Institute. Adler had always been interested in lie detection and in fact had previously traveled to Berkeley to see John Larson's work with polygraph. Not surprisingly, in 1924 when Larson came to Chicago to attend Rush Medical School, Adler hired Larson at the Institute of conduct polygraph examinations. Although how this came to be is somewhat unclear, for some reason the Institute for Juvenile Research was also responsible for evaluating adult prisoners at Joliet State Penitentiary. Because of this responsibility, Larson began conducting between 100 and 150 polygraph examinations of inmates per month and advising the Parole Board regarding their suitability for parole. Ironically, present day Post - conviction Sex Offender Testing appears to have been long preceded by Larson's efforts in this area though no one has apparently reviewed his procedures or results.

By 1925 there had begun a protracted struggle between the American Institute for Criminal Law and Criminology at the Northwestern Law School and the Institute for Juvenile Research's work at the Joliet Penitentiary where the Nurture Progressives (Northwestern) believed crime would be reduced by improving environments and the Nature Progressives (Joliet) believed in segregation and sterilization, maintaining that criminal tendencies were the result of racial degeneracy and heredity (ibid, Alder).

On St. Valentine's Day, February 14, 1929, five individuals dressed in Chicago Police uniforms and believed to be working for the Capone gang, lined up five members of a rival Northside gang and two innocent bystanders in a garage and using tommy guns, killed all seven. While gang related murder was not unusual for Chicago in the 1920's, this event so outraged the Chicago Crime Commission that two members, Burt Massee, a Vice President with Colgate Palmolive, and Walter Olson, President of Olson Rug Company, agreed to fund the very first crime laboratory in the United States at Northwestern Law School with former Army Lt. Colonel Calvin Goddard as the Director. Goddard is credited with formalizing procedures for the emerging forensic science of ballistics and was instrumental in the New York Sacco and Vanzetti case. God-

dard proceeded to examine all the tommy guns used by the Chicago Police as well as the surrounding suburban police departments and concluded that none were used in the St. Valentine's Day murders. Goddard's opinion was later verified when a weapon found in the possession of Fred "Killer" Burke, a member of the Detroit Purple gang known to affiliate with the Capone gang in Chicago, matched bullets recovered from the scene of the Chicago murders (myalcaponemuseum, 2015).

If ballistics was, therefore, the first forensic science, polygraph could well have been the second because in 1930, Leonarde Keeler was hired by this newly minted Northwestern University Scientific Criminal Detection Laboratory for the sole purpose of conducting polygraph examinations – free for law enforcement, flat fee per examination for the private sector. In addition to ballistics and polygraph, the Crime Lab soon added serology, hair and fiber analysis, plaster foot and tire mark identification, photography, Questioned Document analysis and an extensive library on the scientific investigation of crime. The Crime Lab also started with first school of forensics in 1931, a month long session where Keeler taught the first open polygraph course. Keeler's wife, Kay, was hired as an Assistant and was trained at the University of Chicago by Albert Osborn, becoming the first female Questioned Document examiner. Beginning in February of 1930, the Crime Lab, under the umbrella of the Northwestern Law School, began publishing the very first peer review professional journal devoted to law enforcement, the *American Journal of Police Science* with a polygraph article by Keeler in the first publication (Keeler L., 1930). Because of the Depression, it was largely revenues paid by private sector banks and retailers for Keeler's polygraph services that supported all the other forensic services and administration of the Crime Lab between 1930 and 1938. In 1938 the City of Chicago purchased the Crime Lab from the University for \$ 25,000 and it became, and is today, the Chicago Police Department Scientific Crime Laboratory (Inbau, 1985). Fred Inbau was appointed Director, Goddard returned to New York and Inbau assigned a young lawyer, John Reid, to look into the high error rate of specific issue polygraph examinations using the Relevant/Irrelevant questioning technique. Ironically, one of City's purchase stipulations was the Keeler would no longer be allowed to work at the Crime Lab, the basis for which has never been disclosed.

Chicago After 1930

While the use of forensics, including polygraph, to assist in criminal investigations was becoming established in Chicago, J. Edgar Hoover was admonishing Agent Melvin Purvis for using the services of the Northwestern Crime Lab to assist in the investigation of federal crimes. Hoover, however, was not above sending Agent Charles Appel in the 1930's to the month long training course at the Northwestern

Crime Lab and subsequently copying the Lab's material to eventually start the FBI's own Crime Lab. Hoover, later sent at least one Agent to Leonarde Keeler, Inc. for several weeks of polygraph, specific training in the late 1930's. Unfortunately, polygraph did not seem to make the transition to the FBI's crime lab with the same level of professionalism as some of the other emerging forensic sciences. Early FBI polygraph examiners were either "preceptor" trained (read about polygraph procedures and/or watched other examiners conduct examinations) or were formerly trained somewhere else before joining the FBI. It was therefore fairly common in Chicago, particularly during the 1960's and 1970's for private polygraph examiners to be hired by banks to conduct internal theft investigations but receive the case facts (and give the test results) to the FBI Agent in charge of the case since both the number and quality of federal examiners at the time was insufficient for the need. This situation was rectified much later by upgrading the old Army polygraph school and including other, non-military federal agencies to eventually form the federal polygraph school presently operating as the National Academy of Credibility Assessment. While it was not widely known during the time of the Congressional Hearing leading to the 1981 Employee Polygraph Protection Act, most of the federal law enforcement agencies using polygraph were close to losing polygraph as an investigative tool until Congress essentially forced them to adopt many of the basic training protocols already in practice in the private sector (NSDD 84, 1983). Sadly, even today, the federal school still does not require the level of training John Reid was able to require in Illinois back in 1963 (ILCS 4301, 1963), particularly with regard to mandatory captive internships using licensed intern instructors and a minimum number of real, not simulated, case subjects. While Quality Assurance procedures sometimes catch mistakes that show up in question formulation and charts, numerous additional errors can only be identified by someone present at the time the intern conducts the examination, a reality recognized in medicine and other behavioral sciences.

In 1930, John Larson returned to Chicago and reprised his role polygraph testing inmates at Joliet State Penitentiary. As a very young, newly minted examiner, I had the experience of not only attending Joliet Warden Regan's retirement at this facility (1968) but, over the years, actually conducting polygraph examinations within the confines of the institution. I suspect Larson's experience dealing with actual criminals forever influenced his resolve to unequivocally reject polygraph findings based on laboratory studies using college students in artificial scenarios.

At the time, the Nature/Nurture argument, as interpreted in Chicago, had Larson (Southside/Institute of Juvenile Research) promoting a psycho - physiological source for crime and the Northwestern Crime Lab (Northside/Keeler/FBI) seeking a more proactive approach to criminal investigation. So, apparently at Vollmer's insistence,

Larson and Keeler agreed to work together to resolve some basic issues: scientific accuracy at determining truth and deception vs. commercial effectiveness. This, of course, is exactly the same situation polygraph faces when confronted with the relative merits of specific issue accuracy vs. PCSOT and other unverifiable screening tests. In any case, Larson appears to be the first to attempt to standardize polygraph procedures and wrote, for Keeler, specific procedures on how to introduce the test (preamble), including the option to opt out of the test (voluntariness), to use a fixed RQ/IQ sequence, to use a fixed Blood Pressure settings (consistency), and an admonition to not use Keeler's "card trick" Acquaintance Test. Keeler was an amateur magician. With the intentions of stimulating untruthful subjects who thought they could "beat" the polygraph and calming the false positive fears of the truthful subjects, Keeler would have subjects pick from a marked deck of cards then test as to the identity of the card chosen. Since Keeler already knew which card was selected, he was always able identify the correct card and demonstrate the accuracy of the examination. While Keeler never stopped using his Card Test, it appears that he did in fact adopt a more standardized approach to polygraph procedures as indicated by his polygraph lectures both at the Northwestern Crime Lab and later at Leonarde Keeler, Inc.

Upon obtaining his medical degree, John Larson became responsible for conducting the psychiatric evaluations of all parolees in the Illinois State system. About this time Larson became convinced that his supervisor at the Institute of Juvenile Research, Herman Adler, was blocking Larson's attempts to expose corruption regarding the parole decisions. Larson left the Institute and proceeded to work at numerous mental health institutions from Detroit to Seattle, at one time teamed with the Indiana State Police to teach "clinical polygraph" and renamed the polygraph the "Reactograph", using the instrument to test lobotomy patients as part of mental disease diagnoses. Larson eventually became disillusioned with polygraph as a procedure for the detection of deception and became an outspoken critic of its use for anything other than mental health treatments. While John Larson most certainly did more than anyone since William Moulton Marston with regard to the scientific evaluation of polygraph accuracy and the standardization of polygraph procedures, Larson was very much opposed to artificial laboratory studies of polygraph which he called **"using statistical analysis of artificial tests using undergraduates telling lies about meaningless games"** (Alder, p. 121).

Although virtually unheard of today, in the early 1930's, Chicago medical doctor and psychologist, Orlando Scott, tried to get Keeler and the Northwestern Crime Lab to introduce polygraph in criminal proceedings. When this effort proved unsuccessful, he created his own **National Detection of Deception Laboratory** claiming to have

a “100% effective Thought Wave Detector” which he maintained that not even psychopaths could defeat since he could always “turn up the juice”. Scott’s device was actually a very large GSR instrument with a giant arrow - like needle bearing no resemblance to polygraph instruments of the time. Scott, however, was somewhat successful at getting his testimony based on this “lie detector” admitted in federal and state civil proceedings (Look, 1938).

While Leonarde Keeler may have taken credit for technical improvements in the polygraph instruments that others actually created and, apparently, did not develop either the Relevant/Irrelevant or Peak of Tension questioning techniques that he is sometimes associated with, he most certainly deserves to be credited for the commercialization of polygraph and its acceptance as an investigative tool by the police and federal government. Keeler promoted the idea of periodic screening tests by retailers and banks, a procedure nearly identical to PCSOT testing but focusing on integrity rather than sexual issues. Keeler was successful in getting such major employers as Marshall Fields, Walgreens and Zenith Radio to polygraph their employees and persuaded Lloyds of London to give Chicago banks a 10% reduction on their insurance premiums when they had Keeler polygraph their employees every six months. While the police and government agencies did not have to pay the Northwestern Crime Lab for Keeler’s polygraph services, commercial employers did and Keeler, in fact, is credited with supporting all the other forensic services at the Lab with the revenues obtained from private sector polygraph examinations after the Lab lost its private sector funding due to the Recession. Initial participants in the Northwestern month long forensics school who received polygraph instruction from Keeler included the Indianapolis, Kansas City, St. Louis, Cincinnati, Buffalo and Honolulu Police Departments as well as the State Police in Michigan, Indiana and North Dakota. After the Chicago Police acquired the Crime Lab from the University, Leonarde started Leonarde Keeler, Inc. and hired an old Berkeley associate, Charlie Wilson as a fellow examiner. Keeler then trained Charlie’s wife, Jane, to become the first female polygraph examiner. In 1942, Keeler joined with T.P. Sullivan of the Illinois State Police to create the first Mobile Crime Lab with Keeler conducting field polygraph examinations. In 1944, Army CID used Keeler to polygraph German POW’s incarcerated in the United States to determine which were sufficiently free of Nazi ideology to be repatriated as police officers in post-war Germany. In 1946, the Atomic Energy Commission used Keeler to create a periodic screening program at the Oak Ridge facility that Keeler’s student, Russell Chatham later expanded into a program resulting in the testing of all 5,000 employees by teams of polygraph examiners (Keller, E., 1984). While this program was later disbanded, it was reinstated by the U.S. Department of Energy in 1999 to require periodic polygraph examinations of employee in the nuclear facilities under their jurisdiction (Alder, p.258).

While Keeler, most certainly deserves credit for the commercialization of polygraph, the acquisition of the Scientific Crime Laboratory from Northwestern University with Prof. Fred Inbau as Director by the City of Chicago set the stage for the single person most responsible for the dedication, insight and originality that allowed polygraph to become by all measures a true science: John E. Reid.

References

- Alder, K. (2007), *The Lie Detectors: The History of an American Obsession*, Free Press, New York, pp. 19–20.
- Balmer, E. and MacHarg, W. (1910), *The Achievements of Luther Trant*, Small, Maynard & Company, Boston.
- Barta, M. (1992), *Picturing Time: The Work of Etienne-Jules Marey*, University of Chicago Press, Chicago.
- Bunn, G. (2012), *The Truth Machine – A Social History of the Lie Detector*, Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore, p. 67.
- Bunn, G. (1997), ‘The Lie Detector, Wonder Woman and Liberty: The Life and Work of William Moulton Marston’, *History of the Human Sciences*, vol. 10, no. 1, pp. 91–119.
- Cannon, W. (1915), *Bodily Changes in Pain, Hunger, Fear and Rage: An Account of Recent Researches into the Function of Emotional Excitement*, Appleton, New York.
- Davis, A. (1973), *American Heroine: The Life and Legend of Jane Adams*, Ivan R. Dee Publisher, Chicago.
- Deakin, T. (1988), *Police Professionalism: The Renaissance of American Law Enforcement*, Charles Thomas, Springfield.
- Detroit News*, 1/23/48.
- Frye v. U.S.*, 54 App. D.C. 46, 293 Fed. 1013, 12/3/1923.
- Gross, H. (2014), *Criminal Psychology: A Manual for Judges, Practitioners and Students*, Gutenberg Ebook #1320.
- Healy, W. (1915), *Honesty: A Study of the Causes and Treatment of Dishonesty Among Children*, Bobbs-Merrill, Boston.
- Horvath, F. and Peters, R. (2013), *The Reid Polygraph Technique*, American Polygraph Association Annual Seminar, Orlando, 9/12.

Illinois Law Regarding the Licensing of Polygraph Examinations and Regulating the Practice of the Polygraph Technique, 224(ILCS 4301)8/23/63.

Inbau, F. (1985), *Scientific Crime Detection: Early Efforts in Chicago*, in *August Vollmer: Pioneer in Police Professionalism*, V2, Regional Oral History Office, Bancroft Library, University of California-Berkeley.

James, W. (1894), 'The Physical Basis of Emotion', *Psychological Review*, vol. 1, pp. 516–529.

Jung, C. (1907), 'On Psychophysical Relations of the Associative Experiment', *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, vol. 1, p. 247.

Keeler, E. (1984), *The Lie Detector Man: The Career and Cases of Leonarde Keeler*, Telshare Publishing, Boston.

Keeler, L. (1930), 'A Method For Detecting Deception', *American Journal of Police Science*, vol. 1, p. 48.

Los Angeles Times, 2/12/24.

Lombroso, C. (1876), *L'uomo delinquente: alla medicima legale ed alle discipline carcerarie*, Hoepli, Milan (Getty Research Institute Archives).

Look, 1/4/1938, p. 29.

Marston, W. (1917), 'Systolic Blood Pressure Symptoms of Deception', *Journal of Experimental Psychology*, vol. 2, pp. 117–163.

Marston, W. and Pitkin, W. (1930), *The Art of Sound Pictures*, Appleton, New York.

Mechan, L. (1931), 'Frankenstein', *Motion Picture Herald*, 11/14.

Munsterberg, H. (1907), 'Nothing but the Truth', *McClures Magazine*, vol. 29, pp. 532–536.

Munsterberg, M. (1922), *Hugo Munsterberg: His Life and Work*, Appleton, New York, p. 149.

Myalcaponemuseum, www.myalcaponemuseum.com/id186.html.

National Security Decision Directive 84 (1983); DoD Directives 5210.48, 5210.48R and 5210.78 (1986).

New York Times, 'Invents Machine for Cure of Liars', 9, 9/11/07.

- Nelson, R. (2011), 'Meta-analytical Survey of Criterion Accuracy of Validated Polygraph Techniques,' *Polygraph*, vol. 40, no. 4.
- Redstone, D. (1947), 'The Case of the Dormitory Thefts,' *Readers Digest*, vol. 51, pp. 18–21, December.
- Reeve, A. (1912), *The Truth Detector*, in *The Treasure Train*, Harper and Brothers, New York, 29.
- Reid, J. and Inbau, F. (1977), *Truth and Deception: The Polygraph ("Lie Detector") Technique*, Williams and Wilkins Company, Baltimore.
- Slowik, S. (2015), 'Compliance Update: Employment Practices and Procedures,' *APA Magazine*, vol. 48, no. 1, pp. 51–56.
- U.S. v. Frye*, 130 S.Ct. 307, July, 1922.
- Walk, C. (1909), *The Yellow Circle*, A.C.McClury, New York.
- Wigmore, H. (ed.) (1929), *Chapter Five: The Police (in Chicago)*, Illinois Crime Survey, Illinois Association for Criminal Justice, Chicago Crime Commission.
- Wigmore, H. (1940), *Treatise on Anglo-American System of Evidence*, Little, Brown & Company, Boston, 2, pp. 237–238.



Jan Widacki*

Andrzej Frycz Modrzewski Kraków University,
Kraków, Poland

Natalia Mirska

Andrzej Frycz Modrzewski Kraków University,
Kraków, Poland

Małgorzata Wrońska

Andrzej Frycz Modrzewski Kraków University,
Kraków, Poland

Verbal and Non-verbal Symptoms of Deception in the Eyes of Policemen and Psychologists¹

Вербальные и невербальные симптомы лжи – точка зрения полицейских и психологов

Key words: detection of deception, verbal symptoms of deception, behavioural symptoms of deception, verbal cues of deception, behavioural cues of deception, interview, interrogation

Abstract

The objective of the study was to test how selected respondents (psychologists and police officers) evaluate the diagnostic value of symptoms (cues) of deception listed in literature on the subject. To achieve that, 16 verbal and non-verbal (behavioural) symp-

* jan.widacki@gmail.com

¹ The Polish version of the article was published in the journal „Przegląd Bezpieczeństwa Wewnętrznego” 2012, 7 (4).

toms listed in literature as most typical and most frequently accompanying deceit were ever located by 100 police officers and 101 psychologists ($n=201$).

Their task was to group the symptoms according to the following categories: “often present”, “rarely present”, and “never present”. Both the groups of respondents claimed that in their work they have to frequently decide whether their interlocutors tell the truth or lie, and are convinced that they are capable of accurate detection of deception through their assessment of verbal and non-verbal (behavioural) symptoms accompanying lie. The latter belief is clearly refuted by the results of all known experimental studies.

In fact, police officers and psychologists agreed that the most diagnostic symptom is “avoidance of eye contact” (143 respondents categorised it as often present). “High frequency of eye blinking” was considered least diagnostic of the symptoms, with only 47 respondents claiming that it is frequent, together with “head scratching” with 51 considering it as occurring “often”). Convergence of the respondents’ opinions was high. No significant differences between the occupational and age groups, and genders were discovered. The results of the study remain coherent with the results of studies by other authors maintaining that the skill of detecting deception in the interlocutor is determined neither by education, nor occupation, nor gender, nor the age of the person performing the detection.

Introduction

Literature has gathered sufficiently large body of proofs to support the claim that, against general convictions, police officers (as well as officers of special and customs services) do not recognise lies better than representatives of other professions and social groups (Kraut, Poe 1980; Kohnken 1987; Vrij 1993; Vrij 1994; Akehurst, Kohnken, Vrij 1996; Vrij, Van Dalen, Van Wijngaarden, Foppes 1996; Vrij, Semin 1996; Strömwall, Granhag 2003; Lakhani, Taylor 2003; Vrij, Taylor 2003; Strömwall, Granhag 2003; Granhag, Andersson, Stromwall 2004; Granhag, Stromwall, Harwig 2005; Vrij, Man 2005; Ulatowska 2005, Mann, Vrij 2006; Colwell, Miller, Miller 2006; Vrij, Semin 2006; and Ulatowska 2009).

Moreover, a conclusion was reached in experimental studies, that prisoners detect deception slightly better than special forces officers. Other experimental studies demonstrated that women are better than men in reading non-verbal behaviours of other people, especially in reading facial expression, and followed a larger number of behavioural symptoms (cues) in their judgements of veracity. It was noted that women from the countries where their social position is lower are relatively most accurate in the detection of deception (Hurd, Noller 1988; De Paulo, Epstein, Wyer 1993).

Representatives of the profession in which the skill of assessing the interlocutor's truthfulness seems important, i.e. lawyers, police officers, teachers, and psychologists, believe, usually ungroundedly, that they can use their assessment of verbal and behavioural symptoms to detect a lie (Colwell, Miller, Miller, Lyons 2006; Mann, Vrij 2006; Vrij 2009; Okrasa 2010).

As the Polish forensic practice demonstrates, expert psychologists participating in interrogations, are sometimes requested by the court or prosecutor to assess witness veracity, a service they do not as a rule refuse.

Such a procedure remains at odds with the results of experimental research investigating the accuracy of such judgements. The listing of results of 39 experimental studies conducted by different authors in different countries in 1980–99 demonstrates that accurate recognition of lie based on the assessment of verbal and non-verbal symptoms accompanying it occurred in 31–63% of cases. The average value of correct recognition of deception based on these factors was 58%. Moreover, as Vrij (Vrij 2008) found and demonstrated, it was easier to confirm truthfulness (on average 67% of correct reports) than lie with only 44% of correct answers. Similar results were obtained in Polish experimental studies by Ulatowska (Ulatowska 2009).

The results obtained remain permanently above statistical chance and bear out that lie can be detected on the grounds of the assessment of verbal and non-verbal symptoms, yet the number of correct judgements is decidedly lower than in polygraph examinations and other methods accepted as capable of providing proofs in criminal cases (Widacki 1977; Widacki, Horvath 1978; Vrij 2008; Widacki 2008; Vrij 2009).

However, obtaining results that are generally constantly above the statistical chance by non-instrumental methods proves that they are not chance or random. This supports the rationality for further research, aimed especially at improving the diagnostic value of the method, and identifying the limits of its efficiency and reasons of deficiencies.

Perhaps an infallible standard of verbal and non-verbal symptoms accompanying lie should be defined individually for every human being. This would require an assumption that an "individual language of lie" exists, not unlike the language of an individual (idiolect) distinguished by linguists (Feluś 1976). That "individual language" consists of body language and other symptoms that the process of communication consists of. It needs testing whether such a pattern can also be determined at supra-individual level, for example, for people with a specific type of personality; such an assumption can be theoretically justified.

An assumption that there may be no universal complex of verbal and non-verbal symptoms accompanying lie, and therefore that such complexes must be sought for individ-

ual personality types, has already been presented in literature (Riggio, Fridman 1983; Sigman, Reynolds 1983; Vrij 2008; Vrij 2009).

Purpose of research

The main purpose of research was to test how the respondents we have selected assess the diagnostic value of symptoms of deception mentioned in literature on the subject.

First, we selected for our study experts performing such activities in their everyday work. They were a group of police officers from investigation divisions and psychologists. Secondly, we agreed a list of symptoms accompanying lie (deception) based on the most frequently repeated descriptions recurring in expert literature, and eliminated the least popular ones.

At the same time we wanted to test whether there are differences in the assessment of diagnostic quality of the symptoms of deception between the groups of police officers and psychologists included in the study, or whether both follow a single pattern. The answer to this question indirectly answers the question whether the skill of recognising lie depends on education and theoretical background of the person conducting the recognition, or does it rather depend on other factors, for example, life experience, including professional experience. We also considered the above important due to the fact that there is a proven connection between the knowledge of lie indicators and efficiency of its detection (Ulatowska 2011).

Moreover, we wanted to find out whether police officers and psychologists, as we could expect on the grounds of previous knowledge, are convinced that they can accurately recognise lie based on the judgement of verbal and non-verbal symptoms. This is important, as in practical cases, the future of the defendant (accused) and witnesses may depend on their judgements of individual's truthfulness, and so does the later course of an investigation, and the whole criminal case.

In our notional model for the detection of lie by a person trained for the purpose, we also accounted for additional traits that influence efficiency of action. We wanted to test whether the sex and professional experience have any bearing on the selection of specific symptoms of lie. In other words, we wanted to test whether women and men working for the police base their judgements of truthfulness on the same symptoms, and whether police officers with different duration of professional service pay attention to the same symptoms of lie, and judge them in the same manner.

Composition of the sample

The sample was of quota type, as two homogenous professional groups (50-50) performing identical actions and using identical skills in their professional work have been selected. We construe the group of all respondents as homogenous in using the same skill: recognition of symptoms of lie (deception). The group can be divided into two types, accounting for two professions, which, however, remain internally uniform. We focus on the similarities in the work performed by all the subjects, and not on the internal differentiation within the groups and statistical verification of causal relations. The method of sample selection reminds of qualitative expert studies using a standardised interview questionnaire.

There were 201 people, 100 police officers and 101 psychologists, participating in the experiment. The two professional groups were selected with respect to their contact with various people, while the nature of their professional work often makes them assess whether the interlocutor (interrogated or questioned) tells the truth or lies.

The police officers examined in the experiment came from three regional police HQs. All (available) officers from the policeman and investigation/officers of intelligence divisions in the first two HQs were examined, while only the number necessary to bring the number of respondents to 100 were examined in the third. The group consisted of 40 women and 60 man. The average age was 37.4, with age span from 23 to 56.

The duration of professional service of the psychologists was fairly differentiated, as their number included both experienced court experts (it is hard to collect a group of 100 consisting solely of such experts) as well as individuals only starting their professional life. The group consisted of 72 women and 29 men. The average age was 28, with the extremes at 21 and 58.

The method

The respondents were given a questionnaire composed of two sections to fill. In the first section, there were asked to answer whether they must assess interlocutor's truthfulness at work, whether they believe they can do it dependably, and how they perform such activity.

The main task of the respondents was to determine the frequency at which they believe the selected behaviours that most frequently accompany lie according to literature are present on a three-degree scale ("always accompany", "sometimes accompany", and

“never accompany”) (Akehurst, Kohnkonen, Vrij, Bull 1996; Taylor, Vrij 2001; Vrij, Semin 1996; Westcott, Davis, Clifford 1991). The list contained both verbal and non-verbal symptoms (cues) and included:

- an unnatural tone of the voice;
- hesitation while talking;
- raised pitch of the voice;
- language errors (including repetition and breaking off of words and sentences);
- pauses and periods of silence while producing sentences;
- avoidance of eye contact;
- hand and foot fidgeting;
- gestures correcting the clothing;
- high frequency of eye blinking;
- touching nose, eyes, lips, and/or ears;
- frequent posture shifts;
- manipulating nearby objects;
- nervous movements of hands and/or fingers;
- head scratching;
- artificial smiles;
- nervous swallowing of saliva.

Wherever the respondents admitted that rather than a single universal standard of lie/deception there are different ones, proper for various personality types of the deceptive individual, in the second sequence of the questionnaire, they were given the task to select the symptoms of insincerity listed in the first part that they believed characteristic of individual personality types (according to the generally accepted classification introduced by Eysenck).

Analysis of the collected material

Our aim is a comprehensive approach to the phenomenon of assessment of symptoms of deception by people performing specific professional duties. Those people are a uniform, homogenous cohort, at least as far as the nature and manner of performing their professional duties are concerned. We wanted to test how the people who make use, also practical, of their knowledge of symptoms of deception treat these symptoms. We shall consider their opinion as an indicator of the condition of the phenomenon. Should they believe that symptoms that allow judgements of deception exist, they will consider them possible to detect (“sometimes” or “often”). However, if they have doubts concerning specific symptoms, they should avoid them (“never”). First comes the analysis of the group composed indiscriminately of police officers and psychologists who are

simply representatives of “detectors of deception”. Using table and graphic presentation procedures, we assigned the answers to categories, and compared them for different groups (properties). For the purpose of this article we use simple albeit clear graphic presentation. It includes both the numbers of specific answers (absolute numbers in categories selected by the respondents) and the percent breakdown of all categories of answers for each of the 16 symptoms. The percentage values refer to the total N=201.




Fig. No. 1: Assessment of the diagnostic quality of 16 symptoms of deception by police officers and psychologists jointly.

This graph brings together the answers of 201 respondents to 16 successive questions, offering three alternative answers each. Its analysis aims at determining differences (the breakdowns of variables serve comparisons between the values for individual properties) and determining where a category of the answers “wins” or “loses” (i.e. is represented by the longest or shortest section) with others.

There are no pronounced differences, and the most popular categories generally lie in the centre (in the “sometimes” category). This means that respondents are cautious in their judgements, and they neither firmly trust the symptoms (the “often” category on the right) nor do they rule them out (the “never” category on the left). Their answers

are cautious. The category “often” only dominates for a single symptom: “avoidance of eye contact”.

Let us, however, consider how to understand the low share of the “never” category in the answers presented above. As our investigation shows, the whole set of symptoms was believed to characterise deception, and avoidance was only assigned in quite a low percentage (with the highest proportion of answers around one fourth, 27% out of $N=201$). All respondents made use of the whole set of symptoms, and did not consider any as useless. We do not know whether in this way the respondents declare that they happen to use all the symptoms at work or that they have their different favourite sets. We asked them whether they see a connection between symptoms and the fact that somebody lies. The symptoms we use are popular as far that they are mentioned in expert literature and at training events. Therefore, we perhaps gathered insight whether respondents know such elements and have heard of them, and therefore recognise them. To sum up: the cohort construed as a whole links the given symptoms to the potential of detection of deception.

To complement our knowledge, we checked whether individual respondents often displayed a tendency to choose the answer “never” (maximum value for a single respondent was 16, while no one (0 people) reported that the whole set was useful. If somebody used the answer “never” for more than 10 symptoms, he or she would be sceptical about the possibility of detecting deception with non-instrumental methods. As such people few were, the results do not show lack of acceptance for the presented symptoms of deception. Summing up, no symptom was considered unfit for recognising deception and rejected. However, doubts (over 20%) are relatively frequently encountered in the case of two symptoms: high frequency of eye blinking (25.4%) and head scratching (27.4%).

As the presented set holds no elements to be rejected by people judging deception, we want to determine whether our respondents consider some of the 16 symptoms offered as working especially well in the detection of deception. The answers show that there is no such set. Only one symptom – avoidance of eye contact – was singled out by the respondents. All the remaining ones are treated as “sometimes” (most numerous answers) or “often” suitable, however, the variability of the respondents’ answers is very high. A conclusion can be drawn that each respondent proposes a different conglomerate of symptoms that allow detection of deception: there is no popular and averaged set (universal for everyone performing such professional duties). We find no clear markers that would mean that this or that symptom can be used for the detection of deception certainly and in every case. Most answers fall in the cautious category, meaning that the respondents believe the given symptom to work, albeit only under certain conditions. The investigated cohort shows no tendencies or, for our broad picture, tendencies in

their actions. The wide extent of the central category ("sometimes") means that the subjects neither declare rejection (strong mistrust) nor full acceptance (trust) of individual symptoms. A large majority are undecided about no fewer than 15 symptoms. Nothing suggests radicalisation of views. Generally, it can be stated that the respondents believe that all the symptoms are rather fit for the detection of deception.

A search for changes in the categories of independent variables in cross tables brought no results. The opinions concerning 16 symptoms are nearly identical for women and men, insignificantly different for different age groups and for people with different duration of professional experience or service. The only slight differences can be noticed when professional groups are compared. Psychologists and police officers approach the assessment of diagnostic quality of the symptoms differently. It is not a difference that would result in a structure of different actions. This is how we understand the expectation that representatives of individual subgroups would apply different sets of activities or standards. No such divisions can be found in this case and yet everyone proposes similar opinions (declaring lack of strong conviction that a symptom be applied), however, either professional group makes a different use of this hesitation. Scopes for police officers in categories "never" and "often" far more narrow. In their case, the central category expands towards both extremities, as they are far more cautious and sceptical in their opinions than the other group. In turn, psychologists represent a more narrow central category, its space being taken over by more radical judgements. To generalise, police officers are cautious in their opinions, yet they may treat symptoms as something ancillary in the professional duties they perform: in their activity, they are more like craftsmen internalising abstract principles. In turn, psychologists treat knowledge as something that can be brought into agreement through arguments, and try to ascertain a relationship between their practical endeavours and elements of the theory, which leads to a disheartening conclusion that they are the ones who more strongly trust the reliability of their knowledge and own infallibility.

Significant tendencies in opposing behaviours of the two groups concern two symptoms: "an unnatural tone of the voice" and "raised pitch of the voice." The tables should be read as follows: the total percentage on the right-hand side of the table (in a single row) is compared with the cells in the same row. The interesting values are those that lie above or below the total percentage (construed as average opinion of the uniform cohort of police officers and psychologists) that show how many more or fewer opinions of a given type are expressed by the police officers as compared to psychologists. If one belongs to a given professional group, we examine whether and how differently he or she believes, in comparison with the collective opinion of all the respondents (both professional groups together). This is to show whether there are professional groups that are especially eager (or reluctant) about the diagnosed symptoms. Full flow of ten-

dency exists in the case when we find a greater deviation from the average percentage on the one hand, and smaller on the other: if the answers of police officers are below the average percentage, psychologists should do the same in a number greater than the average percentage.

Table No 1: Opinion about the symptom “an unnatural tone of the voice” broken by the professional group

	Group		Total
	Police officers (count % in the group)	Psychologists (count % in the group)	
Never	11 (11%)	16 (15,8%)	27 (13,5%)
Sometimes	70 (70%)	44 (43,6%)	114 (56,7%)
Often	19 (19%)	41 (40,6%)	60 (29,8%)

Table No 2: Opinion about the symptom “raised pitch of the voice” broken by the professional group

	Group		Total
	Police officers (count % in the group)	Psychologists (count % in the group)	
Never	12 (6%)	30 (14,9%)	42 (20,9%)
Sometimes	63 (31,4%)	36 (17,9%)	99 (49,3%)
Often	25 (12,5%)	35 (17,3%)	60 (29,8%)

In the following sequence, we asked whether respondents believe that the set of symptoms characteristic of deception is universal, or different, connected to the personality type of the deceiver.

According to 82% of police officers who answered the question, symptoms of deception are connected to the type of personality, 7% of the respondents believe that the symptoms of lie manifested in behaviour are not connected to personality type, and

11% do not have fixed opinion. According to 87% of psychologists symptoms of deception are connected to personality type, 8% believe that there is no such correlation, and 5% are of no fixed opinion.

We later asked the respondents to separately assign symptoms that best fit each type of personality. Contrary to the anticipations, this provided no precise structure, nonetheless, a handful of symptoms most frequently associated with type of personality can be listed.

Symptoms "artificial smiles" and "raised pitch of the voice" are the ones that respondents believed to be characteristic of extroverts. "Avoidance of eye contact", "pauses and periods of silence while producing sentences" and "hesitation while talking, using such expressions as *hmm* and *err*" are symptoms of deception characteristic for introverts. According to the respondents, the symptoms of deception typical of neurotics are "fidgeting with legs and feet", "gestures correcting the clothing", "high frequency of eye blinking", "frequent posture shifts", "nervous movements of hands and/or fingers" (e.g. tapping the fingers on the table), "language errors (including repetition and breaking off of words and sentences)", "nervous swallowing of saliva", and "manipulating nearby objects".

Closing, we discuss answers to one of the questions we found most important, controlling the respondent's conviction about his or her ability to detect deception accurately. 75% of police officers in the study believe themselves capable of accurate assessment of truthfulness of their interlocutor, 23% do not know how to detect symptoms of lie efficiently, and only 2% of the police officers in the study assume they cannot accurately judge the veracity of their interlocutor. In turn, 69% of psychologists in the study believe they can accurately verify the truthfulness of their interlocutor, only 4% declare that they cannot assess the veracity of the interlocutor, and 27% have no fixed opinion on the subject.

Conclusions

The study confirmed that a great majority of both police officers and psychologists are convinced that they possess the skill of accurate detection of deception. They presented such a conviction, although according to our knowledge, it remains inconsistent with previous experimental studies.

The study failed to define a catalogue of symptoms (both verbal and non-verbal) used by police officers and psychologists to assess the credibility of the interlocutor. Representatives of both professional groups judge lie on the grounds of the same

symptoms, however only applying each of them “to a small degree”. We only determined a single symptom that enjoys the trust of all the respondents (higher only with respect to the others) as well as two symptoms with relatively low level of trust. Generally, respondents display reservation towards all the symptoms and are not certain about their diagnostic quality, altogether avoiding radical judgements. There is therefore no single set of features that would help in the detection of deception; there is no popular system of operation, all we deal with is cautious application of “everything, just in case”. Every symptom may come in handy, and none are best, infallible, or redundant.

The claim that neither education, nor profession, nor sex influence the choice of symptoms used for detection of deception can be considered justified. The decisions are rather based on life experiences of the persons performing the detection. With one reservation, however, namely that the two professional groups approach the individual symptoms slightly differently. This, however, is not a nuanced catalogue of symptoms to be used but only a difference in the caution in approaching symptoms; a somewhat different degree of trust: lower in police officers and higher (more radical) in psychologists.

As much as the two groups in the study are similar in the cautious assessment of usefulness of symptoms for the detection of deception, they differ significantly in their choice of sets of these elements. Every respondent has own, slightly different, catalogue of lie detection symptoms.

According to our study, the respondents can accurately detect lie while performing their work. They do not trust a selected set of symptoms, are cautious in the judgement of diagnostic suitability (“rather” useful, i.e. “sometimes” symptomatic), and use them all in different configurations, not abandoning any altogether. They recognise that the individual symptoms may be aligned with the type of personality of the interlocutor (potential liar). This is why we have come to the conclusion that it is worthwhile to embark on a study aimed at determining an individually developed set of lie detection symptoms adjusted to individually construed types of personality. The conclusions presented here may be applied along two lines. First, we believe that every individual behaves slightly different, in a manner proper for them, and consequently also has his or her individual set of lie syndromes. Secondly, knowing about the differentiation among the people whose behaviour they are to investigate, each person detecting deception applies an own “key”, depending on the assessment of the person and situation.

As far as recommendations concerning further preparation of staff for investigative procedures are concerned, the results of our studies show that:

1. Training of police, special force, customs and similar offices in the detection of deception using verbal and behavioural symptoms should emphasise the limitations of the method and they need to formulate non-categorical conclusions derived from this routine.
2. Expert psychologists should refrain from issuing judgements on veracity of persons interrogated in their presence on the grounds of observation of verbal and non-verbal symptoms.

References

- Akehurst, L., Kohnken, G., Vrij, A., Bull, R. (1996), 'Lay Persons' and Police Officers' Beliefs Regarding Deceptive Behavior', *Applied Cognitive Psychology*, vol. 10, pp. 461–471.
- Bond, C. F. jr, De Paulo, B. M. (2006), 'Accuracy of Deception Judgements', *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, vol. 10, no. 3, pp. 214–234.
- Bond, C. F., Omar, A., Mahmoud, A., Bonser, R.N. (1990), 'Lie Detection Across Cultures' *Journal of Nonverbal Behavior*, vol. 14, pp. 189–205.
- Colwell, L.H., Miller, H.A., Miller, R.S., Lyons jr P.M. (2006), 'US Police Officers' Knowledge Regarding Behaviors Indicative of Deception: Implications for Eradicating Erroneous Beliefs Through Training', *Psychology, Crime & Law*, vol. 12, no. 5, pp. 489–503.
- De Paulo, P. J., De Paulo, B.M. (1989), 'Can Deception by Salespersons and Customers Be Detected Through Nonverbal Behavioral Cues?', *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, vol. 19, pp. 1552–1577.
- De Paulo, B.M., Epstein, J.A., Wyer, M.M. (1993), *Sex Differences in Lying: How Women and Men Deal with Dilemma of Deceit*, in Lewis, M., Saarni C. (eds.), *Lying and Deception Everyday Life*, The Guilford Press, New York, pp. 126–147.
- De Paulo, B.M., Pfeifer, R.L. (1986), 'On the Job Experience and Skill at Detecting Deception', *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, vol. 16, pp. 249–267.
- Ekman, P. (1997, 2003), *Kłamstwo i jego wykrywanie w biznesie, polityce i małżeństwie*, Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN, Warszawa.
- Ekman, P., Friesen, W.V. (1974), 'Detecting Deception from Body or Face', *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, vol. 29, pp. 288–298.

Feluś, A. (1976), 'Aspekt językowy i grupowy języka', *Problemy Kryminalistyki*, vol. 124, pp. 769–773.

Granhag, P.A., Andersson, L.O., Stromwall, L.A. et al. (2004), 'Imprisoned Knowledge: Criminals' Beliefs About Deception', *Legal and Criminological Psychology*, vol. 9, pp. 1–17.

Granhag, P.A., Stromwall, L.A., Hartwig, M. (2005), 'Granting Asylum or Not? Migration Board Personnel's Beliefs About Deception', *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, vol. 31, pp. 29–50.

Hartwig, M., Granhag, P.A., Stromwall, et al. (2004), 'Suspicious Minds: Criminals' Ability to Detect Deception', *Psychology, Crime & Law*, vol. 10, pp. 83–95.

Hurd K., Noller P. (1988), 'Decoding Deception: A Look at the Process', *Journal of Nonverbal Behavior*, vol. 12, pp. 217–233.

Kohnken, G. (1987), 'Training Police Officers to Detect Deceptive Eyewitness: Does it Work?', *Social Behavior*, vol. 2, pp. 1–17.

Kraut, R.E., Poe, D. (1980), 'On the Line: The Deception Judgements of Customs Inspectors and Laymen', *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, vol. 36, pp. 380–391.

Lakhani, M., Taylor, R. (2003), 'Beliefs About the Cues to Deception in High- and Low-situations', *Psychology, Crime & Law*, vol. 9, pp. 357–368.

Mann, S., Vrij, A. (2006), 'Police Officers' Judgements of Veracity, Tenseness, Cognitive Load and Attempted Behavioral Control in Real-life Police Interviews', *Psychology, Crime & Law*, vol. 12, no. 6, pp. 307–319.

Okrasa, A. (2010), 'Psychologiczne metody wykrywania kłamstwa a przesłuchanie policyjne', cz. II, *Przegląd Policyjny*, no. 1 (97), pp. 132–155.

Porter, S., McCabe, S., Woodworth, M., et al. (2007), 'An Investigation of the Impact of Motivation and Feedback on Deception Detection – Genius is 1% Inspiration and 99% Perspiration... or is it?', *Legal and Criminological Psychology*, vol. 12, pp. 297–309.

Riggio, R.E., Friedman, H.S. (1983), 'Individual Differences and Cues to Deception', *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, vol. 45, pp. 899–914.

Siegmán, A.W., Reynolds, M.S. (1983), 'Self-monitoring and Speech in Feigned and Unfeigned Lying', *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, vol. 45, pp. 1325–1333.

Stromwall, L., Granhag P.A. (2003), 'How to Detect Deception? Arresting the Beliefs of Police Officers, Prosecutors and Judges', *Psychology, Crime & Law*, vol. 9, pp. 19–36.

- Taylor, R., Vrij, A. (2001), 'The Effects of Varying Stake and Cognitive Complexity on Beliefs About the Cues to Deception', *International Journal of Police Science and Management*, vol. 3, pp. 111–123.
- Ulatowska, J. (2005), 'Deklarowana wiedza „ekspertów” i „laików: na temat przejawów kłamstwa', *Psychologia Jakości Życia*, vol. 4, pp. 165–180.
- Ulatowska, J. (2009), 'Knowledge of Cues to Deception – Looking for its Determinants', *Problems of Forensic Sciences*, vol. 80, pp. 411–428.
- Ulatowska, J. (2011), 'Związek wiedzy o wskaźnikach kłamstwa z umiejętnością jego wykrywania', *Z Zagadnień Nauk Sądowych*, vol. LXXXV, pp. 50–63.
- Vrij, A. (1993), 'Credibility Judgement of Detectives: The Impact of Nonverbal Behavior, Social Skills and Physical Characteristics on Impression Formation', *Journal of Social Psychology*, vol. 123, pp. 601–611.
- Vrij, A. (2008), *Detecting Lies and Deceit. Pitfalls and Opportunities*, 2nd ed., Erlbaum, J. Wiley&Sons, Ltd, London.
- Vrij, A. (1994), 'The Impact of Information and Setting on Detection of Deception by Police Detectives', *Journal of Nonverbal Behavior*, vol. 18, pp. 117–137.
- Vrij, A. (2009), *Wykrywanie kłamstw i oszukiwania. Psychologia kłamania i konsekwencje dla praktyki zawodowej*, Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego, Kraków.
- Vrij, A., Akehurst, L., Brown, L., et al. (2006), 'Detecting Lies in Young Children, Adolescents and Adults', *Applied Cognitive Psychology*, vol. 20, pp. 1225–1237.
- Vrij, A., Akehurst, L., Knight, S. (2006), 'Police Officers', Social Workers', Teachers' and General Public's Beliefs About Deception in Children, Adolescents and Adults', *Legal and Criminological Psychology*, vol. 11, pp. 297–312.
- Vrij, A., Akehurst, L., Van Dalen, D., Van Wijngaarden, J.J., Foppers, J.H. (1996), 'Non-verbal Gedrag en Misleading', *Tijdschrift voor de Police*, vol. 58, pp. 11–14.
- Vrij, A., Mann, S. (2005), *Police Use of Nonverbal Behavior as Indicators of Deception*, [in:] Reggio, R.E., Feldman, R.S. (eds.), *Applications of Nonverbal Communication*, Erlbaum, Mahawah, New Jersey, pp. 63–94.
- Vrij, A., Semin, G.R. (1996), 'Lie Experts' Belief About Nonverbal Indicators of Deception', *Journal of Nonverbal Behavior*, vol. 20, pp. 65–80.
- Vrij, A., Taylor, R. (2003), 'Police Officers' and Students Beliefs About Telling and Detecting Trivial and Serious Lies', *International Journal of Police Science and Management*, vol. 5, pp. 41–49.

Westcott, H.L., Davis, G.M., Clifford, B.R. (1991), 'Adults' Perceptions of Children's Videotaped Truthful and Deceptive Statements', *Children and Society*, vol. 5, pp. 123–135.

Widacki, J. (1977), *Wartość diagnostyczna badania poligraficznego i jej znaczenie kryminalistyczne*, Wydawnictwo UJ, Kraków.


Widacki, J. (red.) (2018), *Kryminalistyka*, C.H. Beck, Warszawa.

Widacki, J., Horvath, F. (1978), 'An Experimental Investigation of the Relative Validity and Utility of the Polygraph Examination and Tyree Rother Common Methods of Criminal Identification', *Journal of Forensic Sciences*, vol. 23, no. 3, pp. 596–601.

Zuckerman, M., De Paolo, M.B., Rosenthal, R. (1981), *Verbal and Nonverbal Communication of Deception*, in: Berkowitz L. (ed.), *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, Academic Press, New York, pp. 1–57.

Zuckerman, M., Koestner, R., Alton, A.O. (1984), 'Learning to Detect Deception', *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, vol. 46, pp. 519–528.

Book review



*Избранные публикации
из журнала
«Европейский полиграф»
(Izbrannyye publikatsii
iz zhurnala
“Yevropeyskiy Poligraf”;
Selected publications from
European Polygraph journal),
Moscow 2019*

Центр Прикладной Психофизиологии (Tsentr prikladnoy psikhofiziologii, Centre for Applied Psychophysiology) published Russian translations of 13 articles by 11 authors that had been published earlier in European Polygraph in 2011–15. The Editors inform that their project is the first issue and plan publishing two issues annually.

The articles included are by Jan Widacki – *Logical Identity of Conclusions from Polygraph Testing Performed in Control Questions Test (CQT) and Guilty Knowledge Test (GKT) Techniques* (EP 2011, 5, 1 (15)), Jerzy Konieczny – *Meta-*

Analytic Survey of Criterion Accuracy of Validated Polygraph Techniques. Report Prepared for the American Polygraph Association Board of Directors, „Polygraph” Special Edition, 2011, vol. 40, no. 4 (EP 2012, 6, 1 (19)), Marcin Gołaszewski – *Validated Techniques and Scoring Models for PDD Test Data Analysis – Conclusions from the 2011 APA Report* (EP 2012, 6, 4 (22)), James A. Matte – *Limited response to Marcin Gołaszewski’s Conclusions From the Meta-Analytic Survey of Criterion Accuracy of Validated Polygraph Techniques* (EP 2013, 7, 2 (24)) and *Critique of Article by Nelson and Handler Entitled “Statistical Reference Distributions for Comparison Question Polygraphs”* (EP 2015, 9, 2 (32)), Tuvya T. Amstel – *Comparative Review of Polygraph and Other Diagnostic Tools and Methods* (EP 2013, 7, 1 (23)), Donald J. Krapohl – *Decision Accuracy for the Relevant-Irrelevant Screening Test: Influence of an Algorithm on Human Decision-Making* (EP 2015, 9, 4 (34)) and *Letter to the Editor: Calculating Polygraph Decision Accuracy* (EP 2014, 8, 2 (28)), Raymond Nelson – *Letter to the Editor of European Polygraph* (EP 2015, 9, 2 (32)), Natan J. Gordon and W.L. Fleisher – *Effectiveness of the Integrated Zone Comparison Technique (IZCT) with Various Scoring Systems in a Mock Crime Experiment by Students* (EP 2012, 6, 1 (19)), and Ch.A. Patton – *The Integrated Zone Comparison Technique; a Field Utility Study in a Deceptive Population* (EP 2013, 7, 3 (25)).

Each article received a short gloss from the editors of the volume.

Russia is generally known to employ more than 10,000 polygraphers. There are many more in Ukraine and other former Soviet Republics (incl. Kazakhstan, Azerbaijan), where the Russian language is well known and commonly used. For this reason, translation of articles published in English into Russian is a good idea, as it extends the numbers of European Polygraph readers.

J.W.



The Polygraph Examiner Resource Guide (Validated Polygraph Techniques and Scoring Systems) has been established by the team of practical polygraph examiners of Ukraine: Vitalii Shapovalov, Dmytro Zubovskyi, Diana Alieksieieva-Protsiuk, Olesia Goncharova
Довідник поліграфолога (валідні формати тестів та системи бального оцінювання)
 [уклад.: В. Шаповалов, Д. Зубовський, Д. Алексєєва-Процюк, О. Гончарова]. — Київ: Освіта України, 2018. — 20 с.

The key concept of the edition is to provide the practical polygraph examiners with credible reference information that may be required in the field while preparing to testing, choosing the suitable test format, and analyzing the obtained results.

This is the first publication in Ukraine offering concise and organized information on the scoring systems and valid formats of tests recommended to use by the American Polygraph Association (APA) after the conducted meta-analysis of accuracy of the polygraph techniques. In course of designing the Resource Guide, the compilers utilized the information of the articles and publications by

Bell B., Raskin D., Honts Ch., Kircher J., Nelson R., Handler M., Blalock B., as well as the ASTM standards.

The edition includes the following sections:

- Recommended scoring systems: 7-position scoring system (Utah), 7-position scoring system (Federal), Empirical Scoring System – Multinomial (ESS-M).
- Standard terminology for the results of polygraph examination.
- Valid formats of tests: Utah Zone Comparison Test (Utah ZCT), Federal You Phase (Bi-Zone), Federal ZCT, Air Force Modified General Question Test (AFMGQT), Directed Lie Screening Test (DLST), Concealed Information Test (CIT).
- Generally recognized abbreviations.

For convenience of use, the information is completed in the tables in the certain logical sequence. For example, the following items have been described for each of the scoring systems:

- “Application” specifies the formats of tests that go with a certain scoring system;
- “Method of Analysis” It describes what types of the questions are compared and in which combination;
- “Features for Analysis” identifies the physiological variables recommended for analysis in the applicable scoring system;
- “Scoring Rules” deals with the specifics of score award for each physiological channel.

A similar principle is used for description of the test formats:

- “Sphere of Application” specifies in which cases a certain test format is advisable to use;
- “Types of Questions” lists the types of questions completing the test formula;
- “Sequence of Questions” suggests a schematic diagram of the test formula;
- “Analysis” It describes what types of the questions are compared and in which combination
- “Decision-making Rules” determine the decision-making thresholds (scores) of the applicable scoring system.

The publication has received a positive review of Mark Handler and has been recommended for press by the Scientific-Methodological Board of the National Academy of Internal Affairs (record №2 of October 22, 2018).

Vitalii Shapovalov

ISSN/EISSN 1898-5238/ 2380-0550



European Polygraph

CERTIFICATE

Of **IMPACT FACTOR**

0.63

SCORE | 0.63

ISSUED BY | Citefactor.org

CALCULATED FOR YEAR
2017



Electronic Object Identifier (EOI)
www.citefactor.org/check/

Directory Indexing of International Research Journals



Date Of Issue
August 16, 2018

The Basic Information for Authors

To publication will be accepted unpublished research papers as well as review article, case reports, book reviews and reports connected with polygraph examinations.

Submitted manuscripts must be written in English.

All papers are assessed by referees (usually from Editorial Board), and after a positive opinion are published.

Texts for publication should be submitted in the form of normalized printout (1800 characters per page) and in electronic form (diskette, CD), or sent by e-mail to Editorial Office.

The total length of research papers and review article should not exceed 12 pages, case reports – 6 pages, and other texts (book review, report) – 5 pages.

The first page of paper should contain: the title, the full name of the author (authors), the name of institution where the paper was written, the town and country.

Figures should be submitted both in printed form (laser print, the best) and electronic form.

Tables should be numbered in Roman numerals and figures in Arabic ones.

Figures, tables, titles of figures and titles of tables should be included on a separate page. The places in the text where they are to be included should be indicated.

THE BASIC INFORMATION FOR AUTHORS

The references should be arranged in the alphabetical order according to the surnames of the authors.

The references should be after the text.

Each reference should include: the surname (surnames) of the author (authors), the first letter of author's first name, the title of the book, year and place of the publication, the name of publisher, or the title of the paper, the full title of the journal, the year, the volume, the number and the first page of the paper.

For example (in references):

Reid J., Inbau F. (1966), *Truth and Deception: the Polygraph ("Lie-detector") Techniques*, Williams & Wilkins, Baltimore.

Abrams S. (1973), *Polygraph Validity and Reliability – a Review*, Journal of Forensic Sciences, 18, 4, 313.

and (Reid, Inbau, 1966), (Abrams, 1973) inside text.

Texts for publication in "European Polygraph" should be mail to:

"European Polygraph"
Andrzej Frycz Modrzewski Krakow University
ul. Gustawa Herlinga-Grudzińskiego 1
30-705 Kraków (Poland)

or e-mail: m.krasnowolska@gmail.com
oleg1998@gmail.com

Rules and Regulations Concerning Publishing Papers in European Polygraph

1. All papers sent to European Polygraph by their respective authors undergo preliminary assessment by the Editor-in-Chief.
2. The initial assessment results in the decision whether to send the work for an independent review or return it to the author with the information that it will be not published.
3. Two independent reviewers for “internal reviews” are appointed by the Editor-in-Chief or by the Deputy Editor following consultation with the Editor-in-Chief.
4. The following cannot be independent reviewers: Editor-in-Chief, Deputy Editor-in-Chief, employees of Andrzej Frycz Modrzewski Krakow University, and people with papers published in the issue containing the reviewed paper.
5. The internal review should answer the question whether the reviewed paper is fit for printing and whether it requires any amendments, and if it does, state what they are, and must be in written form, and conclude in an unequivocal verdict concerning publication or rejection of an article.
6. If one of the reviewers provides comments and amendments, but does not disqualify the paper, the Editor pass the comments on to the author, asking for the author’s opinion and any amendments.
7. Should the opinions of the author and reviewer diverge, the decision to print the paper or otherwise is made by the Editor.
8. In the case mentioned in 7 above, before making their decision, Editor-in-Chief can appoint another independent reviewer.

9. In exceptional cases, when there are significant circumstances justifying such a decision, and the Editors do not agree with the opinion of the reviewer, Editors may decide to publish a paper against the opinion of the reviewer.
10. The names of reviewers is not disclosed to the author, and the names of authors are not disclosed to reviewers.
11. Book reviews and reports are not reviewed, the decision to publish them is the responsibility of the Editors.

Ordering Information

Please, send your orders by e-mail to ksiegarnia@kte.pl, including:

- full name (first and last in case of natural persons; registered business name in case of legal persons)
- address (permanent address or registered seat),
- address for delivery of your copies of European Polygraph,
- number of successive issues ordered (minimum 4), and number of copies of each issue.
- One year subscription (4 issue): USD 50, € 40.
- Shipment costs is added of the subscription price.
- All subscriptions must be pre-paid to our account:
Krakowskie Towarzystwo Edukacyjne Sp. z o.o. ul. G. Herlinga-Grudzińskiego 1C,
lok. C224, 30-705 Kraków

Payment by USD: 24 1020 2892 0000 5102 0222 8161

IBAN PL 24 1020 2892 0000 5102 0222 8161

KOD BIC (SWIFT): BPKOPLPW

Name of the bank: Powszechna Kasa Oszczędności Bank Polski Spółka Akcyjna

Payment by €: 19 1020 2892 0000 5002 0222 8203

IBAN PL 19 1020 2892 0000 5002 0222 8203

KOD BIC (SWIFT): BPKOPLPW

Name of the bank: Powszechna Kasa Oszczędności Bank Polski Spółka Akcyjna

All publication dates are subject to change without notice.

Условия подписки

Заказы содержащие имя и фамилию или название компании, учреждения, адрес доставки и номер журнала, от которого должна происходить подписка (минимум 4 номера) необходимо переслать на адрес: ksiegarnia@kte.pl.

Стоимость годовой подписки, охватывающей 4 номера составляет \$ 50 или € 40.

Цена включает в себя стоимость доставки.

Предоплата должна быть произведена на наш банковский счет:

Krakowskie Towarzystwo Edukacyjne Sp. z o.o. ul. G. Herlinga-Grudzińskiego 1C/lokC224,
30-705 Kraków

Payment by USD: 24 1020 2892 0000 5102 0222 8161

IBAN PL 24 1020 2892 0000 5102 0222 8161

KOD BIC (SWIFT): BPKOPLPW

Name of the bank: Powszechna Kasa Oszczędności Bank Polski Spółka Akcyjna.

Payment by €: 19 1020 2892 0000 5002 0222 8203

IBAN PL 19 1020 2892 0000 5002 0222 8203

KOD BIC (SWIFT): BPKOPLPW

Name of the bank: Powszechna Kasa Oszczędności Bank Polski Spółka Akcyjna.

Сроки публикации могут изменяться без предварительного уведомления.