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Academy for Scientific Investigative Training
Accredited Basic and Advanced Training
By Internationally Known Polygraph Experts

2010 A.S.I.T. COURSES

Polygraph 101 Basic:
Jan. 11 – Mar. 5;   Mar. 15 – May 7;
May 17 – Jul 9;     Sept. 13 – Nov. 5

Advanced Polygraph:
Nov. 15 & 16

PCSOT - Post-Conviction
Mar. 8 – 12;  Jul. 12 – 16;  Nov. 8 - 12

Advanced PCSOT
May 12 – 14

Forensic Assessment Interviewing &
Interrogation Techniques (FAINT)
Jan. 25 – 29;  Mar. 29 – April 2;
June 7 - 11;    Sept. 27 – Oct. 1

United States: Nathan J. Gordon, Director
1704 Locust Street, Philadelphia, PA  19103
Voice: 215-732-3349 Fax: 215-545-1773
E-mail: Truthdoctor@Polygraph-Training.com

Middle East: Essam Ali Gamal El-Din
Voice: 2027607178 Cell: 2010-164-0503
Fax: 202-760-7178 E-mail: Info@truth-seeker.net

Singapore: Dr. Anthony Chin
Cell: 65 9069 4769
E-mail: asiatruthseeker@yahoo.com

Latin/South America: Tuvia Shurany
Cell: 972-54-884-4000
E-mail: tuvia@liecatcher.com

Nathan J. Gordon and William L. Fleisher
■ They Wrote the Book
■ Proprietary Algorithm Creators
■ Software Inventors
■ Peer-Reviewed Scientific Research
■ Teaching Around The World

ADVANCE YOUR AGENCY, YOUR CAREER

■ Basic Polygraph
■ Advanced Polygraph
■ Post-Conviction Sexual Offender Training
■ Forensic Assessment Interview Technique
■ Integrated Zone Comparison Technique
■ Horizontal Scoring
■ Manual Chart Interpretation Algorithm
■ Integrated Interrogation Technique
■ Multi-Media Interview Interrogation Series
■ NEW SCORING SOFTWARE: A.S.I.T. PolysuiteTM, Now Offered by Lafayette Instruments
Editor’s Corner

Donald J. Krapohl

First: A happy holiday season to everyone, and best wishes in the New Year.

I hope you will find this APA Magazine especially informative. Several prominent writers from among the APA membership have crafted thoughtful and thought-provoking articles for this issue of the Magazine on a range of topics, including EPPA, electrodermal recording, voice stress, professionalism, and a future perspective. As always you’ll also find seminar notices, reports from the APA Board, announcements and items of special interest that you’ve come to expect. Collectively they speak to a vibrant health of the Association and the profession. While both challenges and opportunities await us in 2010, our field continues to grow thanks to the hard work of so many.

As a final comment, the 5-year APA Strategic Plan is currently being updated by President Elect Nate Gordon. If you want an opportunity to weigh in on the strategic vision of the profession, you should send your comments to Nate.
Applicants for APA Membership
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APA Upgrades to Full Member

Michael H. Branks
Bryant H. Crosby
Jennifer Kass
Matthew Martin
Ondina Melo
Carlos Odria
Guillermo Witte

Certificate of Advanced & Specialized Training

Danny Bragg
Aubry J. Spencer

Upgrading Membership Classification
Associate to Full Member

If you have a college degree and you have completed a minimum of 200 polygraph examinations, request that your membership classification be upgraded from ASSOCIATE to FULL MEMBER.

In order for the Board of Directors to act upon your request, it will be necessary for you to:

Provide a notarized statement from your supervisor or knowledgeable colleague, who must be a full member of the American Polygraph Association (APA), attesting that you have completed a minimum of 200 polygraph examinations.

Please forward the certification directly to:

APA National Office
P.O. Box 8037
Chattanooga, TN 37414-0037

If you have any problems or questions regarding your membership, please call the National Office Manager at 800/272-8037 or 423/892-3992.
New School Accreditation Applications

Veridicus International Polygraph Academy
Domingo Gonzales # 35
Bis Col. San Antonio
Culhuacan Del. Iztapalapa
Mexico DF CP 09800

Letter to the Editor
from John R. Schwartz
2009 William L. and Robbie Bennett Memorial Award Winner

Bill Bennett became my mentor when I first came onto the APA Board of Directors in 1982 as the new Vice President (Government). My youthful enthusiasm, tempered by his wisdom and guidance, helped me immeasurably to accomplish my APA responsibilities. Of more long-term importance, Bill Bennett personified personal integrity and moral courage and set the example for me in those attributes I value most. He lived those attributes every day and became a close and trusted friend. The best way for newer APA members to really understand what a great man Bill Bennett was, is to recognize that he was the only man capable of earning the love, loyalty, and undying admiration of Ms. Robbie.

Get the latest polygraph news and information as it happens. Log on regularly to the APA website at www.polygraph.org.

The Arizona School of Polygraph Science

Approved by:
  • American Polygraph Association,
  • American Association of Police Polygraphists,
  • Various State Licensing Boards and meets ASTM Standards for Polygraph Schools

Licensed and approved by:
  • Arizona State Board for Post-secondary Education

Founded 1985 Arizona Incorporated 1986
Laura W. Perry Director
Joe Perry Operations Manager

This polygraph examiner-training course is a comprehensive ten week program in the latest computerized polygraph techniques. Classroom is equipped with state-of-the-art equipment to view live examinations both physically, and electronically, as it is seen and done on the computer screen. Small classes (no more than 10 students) offer one-on-one attention to student needs. It consists of intensive classroom study, hands-on practice and a post-test field project.

Information regarding this course, including, but not limited to pre requisites, curriculum, tuition, refund policy, academic progress, etc., can be found on our website: http://www.azpolygraphschool.com/

TEN-WEEK POLYGRAPH TRAINING COURSES

April 13 to June 19, 2009
September 7 to November 13, 2009
January 11, to March 19, 2010

3106 West Thomas Rd. Suite 1114
Phoenix, Arizona 85017
Tel: 602-272-8123
Fax: 602-272-9735
Internet: http://www.azpolygraphschool.com/
E-mail: laurawellsperry@cox.net
In Memoriam

Michael Buben

It is with great sadness we report the passing of APA member Michael Buben, Yardley, Pennsylvania, age 53. He was employed by the Lower Makefield Township Police Department. He graduated from the Academy for Scientific and Investigative Training and became a member of APA on January 8, 1987.

Edward (Ed) F. Clarke

The APA regrets to announce the passing of Edward F. Clarke, on October 6, 2009 at the age of 65. Mr. Clarke was trained at the USAMPS during March, 1982. Became a member of APA during May, 1982. He was self employed as a Polygraph Examiner from October, 1991 to October, 2009. He retired from the U. S. Marine Corps during 1991. He served on many Committees during his tenure with APA.

Ronald Reuss

Dr. Ronald Merl Reuss, Ed.D., Honorary Member of the American Polygraph Association and long-time research colleague of James Allan Matte, died of heart failure on 4 November 2009 at the age of 76, at Millard Fillmore Gates Circle Hospital, Buffalo, New York. Funeral services for the celebration and eulogy of Dr. Reuss were held on 7 November 2009 at the Lane Funeral Home in Niagara Falls, New York. Dr. Reuss is survived by his wife Carol, three sons, Alan, Bill and Dave, and his daughter Karen.

Dr. Reuss received his Bachelor’s degree in science and mathematics, magna cum laude, from the State University of New York at Albany, his Master’s degree in biology from the State University of New York at Albany, and his Doctorate in science education from the State University of New York at Buffalo. As part of his studies for his doctorate, he conducted research on muscle physiology at Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute, Troy, New York, and at the State University of New York at Buffalo Medical School. Dr. Reuss also studied radiation physics and radiation biology at the University of New Mexico, co-sponsored by the Atomic Energy Commission. He further conducted research on lung tumor antigens at Roswell Park, Memorial Institute, Buffalo, New York, and completed a Chautauqua course in modern aspects of cardiopulmonary physiology.

Dr. Reuss authored several research studies published in various peer-reviewed journals and of particular importance was an Anatomy and Physiology Lab Manual published in 1973 with a Second Edition in 1979. In 1985 he co-authored a Lab Manual and Study Guide in Anatomy and Physiology. His active participation in field research on forensic psychophysiology in which he co-authored five studies published in Polygraph, the Journal of the American Polygraph Association resulted in his being awarded Honorary Membership in the American Polygraph Association. He will be remembered by all who knew him as a kind and selfless person who positively touched the lives of countless people who owe him so much. He will be deeply missed.

Floyd D. Williams

The APA regrets to announce the passing of Floyd D. Williams, on June 30, 2009 at the age of 70. Mr. Williams was trained at the Southwest School of Polygraph on May 30, 1980. Became a member of APA on January 8, 1981. He was self employed as a Polygraph Examiner from January, 1981 until his death. He retired from the U. S. Air Force during 1980.
IMPORTANT NOTICE

Ballots for the 2010 election of officers will take place next February. Offices open to election of candidates will be:

President Elect
Vice President Government
Vice President Law Enforcement
Vice President Private
  Director 1
  Director 2
  Director 3

To appear on the ballot candidates need to be formally nominated by one or more APA members (By-Law 6, as amended on Aug 4, 2009). Nominations and self-nominations must be mailed to the APA National Office, or via e-mail to the Fair Elections Committee (FEC) Chair, Michael Gougler, at:

  gouglerm222@yahoo.com

Nominees should submit a packet which includes a cover letter and a statement of up to 500 words regarding their goals for office. The statement will be published in the APA Magazine and included in the ballot packet sent to members.

Nominations must be received by February 5, 2010. Ballots will be mailed on February 15th, 2010.

If you have any questions about the electoral process, please contact the Fair Elections Committee Chair, Michael Gougler, at gouglerm222@yahoo.com, or by telephone at (512) 466-0471.
Latin American Polygraph Association - New Board of Directors

At the September meeting of the Latin American Polygraph Association (Asociación Latinoamericana de Poligrafistas, or ALP) held in Lima, Peru, the following Board of Directors were elected for 2009-2010. All are APA and ALP members:

President: Ms. Eleonora Quintero, Colombia
Vice-President: Ms. Vanessa Mena, Guatemala
Treasurer: Mr. Sidney Wise Arias, Panama and USA
Secretary: Ms. Gladys Alzate, Colombia

New PCSOT Text Available

Now available, a new text on PCSOT titled The Use of the Polygraph in Assessing, Treating and Supervising Sex Offenders, edited by Dr. Daniel T. Wilcox. It contains 14 chapters from recognized experts in the study of sex offenders, offender management, polygraph and advanced technologies. To order the book or to read a chapter excerpt, visit the publisher’s website at www.wiley.com. Also available at Amazon.com and many bookstores.

Call for Papers

In 2010 the APA will publish a special edition on courtroom testimony. We are actively seeking original works that will assist APA members in the preparation, conduct, reporting, and testimony of polygraph examinations for court purposes. Areas may include, but are not restricted to PCSOT exams, evidentiary exams, Paired (Marin Protocol) Testing, stipulated exams, and court-ordered exams. Manuscripts will be accepted until September 1, 2010. Please send electronic copies to Editor@polygraph.org, or to PO Box 10411, Ft. Jackson, SC 29207.

William J. Yankee Scholarship Award

The William J. Yankee Scholarship is now open for the 2010 calendar year. Candidates must have a 4-year college degree, and submit a packet to the National Office by June 1st. The packet must include a cover letter as well as an essay on the polygraph or related areas. Candidates must also have their college transcripts sent directly from the institution to the National Office. A committee, chaired by the APA Editor, will review the packets and recommend a choice to the APA Board of Directors. The selectee must use the award monies toward an APA accredited polygraph school, but may not use them for training already started. For more information send an e-mail to Editor@polygraph.org, or call (803) 463-1096.
Polygraph Examiner Training Schedule

**Academy for Scientific Investigative Training**

January 11 - March 5, 2010  
March 15 - May 7, 2010  
May 17 - July 9, 2010  
September 13 - November 5, 2010

**PCSOT**

March 8 - 12, 2010  
July 12 - 16, 2010  
November 8 -12, 2010

**Advanced PCSOT**

May 12 - 14, 2010

**Forensic Assessment Interviewing & Interrogation Techniques (FAINT)**

January 25 - 29, 2010  
March 29 - April 2, 2010  
June 7 - 11, 2010  
September 27 - October 1, 2010

**American International Institute of Polygraph**

January 4, 2010 (Georgia)  
March 22, 2010 (South Africa)  
April 12, 2010 (Georgia)  
June 7, 2010 (Ohio)  
August 30, 2010 (Georgia)  
September 27, 2010 (South Africa)

**Arizona School of Polygraph Science**

January 11 - March 19, 2010

**Backster School of Lie Detection**

January 18 - March 12, 2010  
June 7 - August 6, 2010  
September 13 - November 5, 2010

**PCSOT**

March 15 - 19, 2010 (tentative)  
November 8 - 12, 2010 (tentative)

**Annual Polygraph Examiner Work Conference**

December 6 - 10, 2010

**Defense Academy for Credibility Assessment**

January 5 - April 7, 2010  
April 27 - July 28, 2010  
August 17 - November 18, 2010

**Horowitz-Ginton Credibility Assessment Academy**

November 2 - December 31, 2009

**Maryland Institute of Criminal Justice**

January 11 - March 5, 2010  
March 29 - May 21, 2010  
April 5 - May 28, 2010 (Lafayette, IN)  
September 20 - November 12, 2010

**PCSOT**

March 8 -12, 2010

**Troy University Polygraph Center**

**Advanced Training**

Applicant Testing  
November 30 - December 4, 2009  
Interview & Interrogation  
December 7 - 11, 2009

**Quotables**

“In theory, there is no difference between theory and practice. But in practice, there is.”  
- Yogi Berra
**ADVANCED RESERVATION REQUIRED**

**HILTON MYRTLE BEACH**

10000 BEACH CLUB DRIVE, MYRTLE BEACH SC 29572

All room reservations must be made individually through the Hotel’s reservation department by calling 1-800-876-0010  (Ask for the APA group rate)

---

**APA FED ID # 52-1035722**

Plan now to attend the APA 45th Annual Seminar/Workshop, **SEPTEMBER 12 – 17, 2010**

**Room rate:** *$120.00 Single/Double occupancy, plus taxes (currently 12% tax) FREE PARKING*

**CUTOFF DATE for hotel reservations is 08/10/10 or until APA's room allotment is fulfilled. Number of rooms are limited.** Individual departure dates will be reconfirmed upon check-in. (72 HOUR CANCELLATION)

Seminar Chair: Robbie S. Bennett – 800/272-8037, 423/892-3992  FAX: 423/894-5435

Seminar Program Chair: Vickie Murphy-Carr-410/987-6665

Each registered person will be provided handout material; ID badge and tickets to all APA sponsored events.

**IMPORTANT:** The pre-registration discount is good only if payment is received on or before August 25, 2010.

**Registration Hours** – Sunday, 9/12/10 (10:00 am-6:00 pm)  
**On-Site**–Monday, 9/13/10 (8:00 am -12:00 Noon)  
**Seminar Sessions**–Monday-Friday, 9/13/10 – 9/17/10

Complete the form below, attach check, VISA, MC or AE information payable to the APA and mail to:  
APA National Office, PO Box 8037,  
Chattanooga, TN 37414-0037

Or FAX to: **423/894-5435**

to arrive **no later than 08/25/10** for applicable discount. Payment information and registration received after 08/25/10 will be charged the on-site fee.

---

**NAME_________________________**  
**BUSINESS PHONE_________________________**

**ADDRESS_________________________**  
**ZIP_________________________**

**CITY/STATE_________________________**  
**NAME OF GUEST(S)_________________________**

**NAME BADGE (CALLED BY)_________________________**  
**CHILDREN/AGES_________________________**  
**GUEST (CALLED BY)_________________________**

**PRE PAID BY AUGUST 25, 2010**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fee Description</th>
<th>Fee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$350 – Member/Applicant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$475 – Member/Applicant W/Guest</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$125 – Additional Guest</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$500 – Non-Member</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$625 – Non-Member W/Guest</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FEES RECEIVED AFTER AUGUST 25, 2010**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fee Description</th>
<th>Fee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$400 – Member/Applicant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$525 – Member/Applicant W/Guest</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$175 – Additional Guest</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$550 – Non-Member</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$675 – Non-Member W/Guest</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ADDITIONAL $50.00 FOR WALK-INS**

*GUEST FEE includes APA SPONSORED EVENTS: Reception, Guest Breakfast, and Banquet.

**YOUR NAMETAG IS YOUR ADMISSION TICKET TO ALL EVENTS AND ACTIVITIES. PLEASE WEAR IT AT ALL TIMES DURING THE CONFERENCE.**

**DATE OF ARRIVAL_________________________**  
**DATE OF DEPARTURE_________________________**

VISA ( ) MC ( ) AE ( ) _______________________________ (CVV2)__________ EXP:__________

(CVV2 is a 3 digit number found on the back of your VISA or MC card or a 4 digit number on the front of the AE).

SIGNATURE_________________________________________2010
Upcoming Seminars

The National Polygraph Association is holding their annual seminar and business meeting on January 25 - 27, 2010 at the Golden Nugget Hotel and Casino in Las Vegas, Nevada. A special room rate of $49 per night is available for seminar attendees. Reservations can be made by calling 1-800-634-3454 (must be made by December 23, 2009 and must mention National Polygraph Association to get rate). Seminar fee is $125 in advance and $175 at the door for members; and $175 in advance and $250 at the door for non-members.

For more information contact Gary Davis at 785-828-3248 or e-mail at nationalpolygraph@yahoo.com.

The American Polygraph Association and the New Mexico Society of Forensic Polygraphers will conduct a training seminar on February 10-12, 2010 in Albuquerque, NM. Topics include Computerized Scoring; Chart Interpretation; Directed Lie Control Testing Technique and Physiology. For further information, contact the APA National Office at 800-APA-8037.

The California Association of Polygraph Examiners (CAPE) will be conducted a Training Seminar on March 5-6, 2010 (Fr-Sat) at the Disneyland® Resort in Anaheim, CA. A contracted room rate has been arranged at the Disney’s Paradise Pier® Hotel, 1717 South Disneyland Dr. Anaheim, CA 92802.

A hotel weblink, registration and course outline information is available at the CAPE website (www.californiapolygraph.com).

The American Polygraph Association is sponsoring an Asia-Pacific Seminar on April 12-16, 2010 at the Conrad Centenniel Hotel in Singapore. See pages 14-15 for agenda and registration form.

The American Polygraph Association will hold it’s 45th Annual Seminar/Workshop on September 12-17, 2010 in Myrtle Beach, South Carolina. Registration form and information is located on page 12.
ASIA-PACIFIC SEMINAR AGENDA
April 12-16, 2010

SEMINAR TOPICS
Diagnostic Dialogue
Test Question Construction
IZCT Format
Test Data Analysis
Ethics & Standards
Setting Comparisons
MGQT & Zone Test Formats
Semi-Structured & Structured Interviewing
Instrument Manufacturer Updates & Training

SPEAKERS
Dan Sosnowski
APA President

Nate Gordon
APA President-Elect

Michael Gougler
APA Chairman of the Board

Bill Teigen
APA Vice President Private

Marty Oelrich
APA Director

Chad Russell
APA Treasurer

Pam Shaw
APA Vice President Law Enforcement

*Topics and speakers are tentative and subject to change.*
THE AMERICAN POLYGRAPH ASSOCIATION (APA)
CONTINUING EDUCATION SEMINAR
ASIA-PACIFIC SEMINAR APRIL 12 – 16, 2010
ADVANCED REGISTRATION IS REQUIRED

APA FED ID # 52-1035722

REGISTRATION
1:00 PM - 5:00 PM – MONDAY, APRIL 12, 2010

SEMINAR HOURS
9:00 AM – 5:00 PM – TUESDAY-FRIDAY
APRIL 13-16, 2010

LODGING
CONRAD CENTENNIAL SINGAPORE
TWO TEMASEK BOULEVARD
SINGAPORE 038982

To make Hotel Reservations:
CALL : 65-6432 7192 / FAX 65 6432 7198
Individual Reservations - Cut-off date: March 25, 2010

GROUP ROOM RATE
SINGAPORE $250.00 PER ROOM PER NIGHT
(Exchange rates equate to approximately US$178.57)

SEMINAR FEE
PRE-PAID BY FEBRUARY 12, 2010
$1500.00 (US FUNDS) APA Member/Applicant

PRESIDENT’S RECEPTION
MONDAY, APRIL 12, 2010
6:00 PM – 10:00 PM

BANQUET
THURSDAY, APRIL 15, 2010
6:00 PM – 10:00 PM

CONTINUING EDUCATION CREDITS
When you attend this seminar, you receive up to 28 CEUs
(Continuing Education Units) of continuing education credit approved
by the American Polygraph Association and the Federal Certification
Program for Continuing Education and Training.

CANCELLATION AND REFUND POLICY:
Cancellations received, in writing, before 02/12/10, will receive
a full refund. Persons canceling after 02/12/10, will not receive a
refund but will be provided with the handout material.
(The registration fee includes professional instruction,
seminar materials, AM and PM Refreshment Breaks)

CONTINUING EDUCATION IS VITAL TO YOUR SUCCESS
AND SHOULD BE A LIFELONG PURSUIT

**IN ORDER TO HAVE ADEQUATE
SEATING, ADVANCED REGISTRATION
IS REQUIRED**

1-800-272-8037 or 423-892-3992
FAX 423-894-5435

TO REGISTER FOR THE SEMINAR, PLEASE COMPLETE AND MAIL THIS FORM TO:
APA NATIONAL OFFICE, P.O. BOX 8037, CHATTANOOGA, TN 37414-0037
OR FAX IT TO 423-894-5435

Print Legibly or Type the Following

NAME: __________________________________________    BUSINESS PHONE:_________________________
ADDRESS: ____________________________________________________________________________________
NAMETAG-CALLED BY:_______________________________________________________________________

(   ) CHECK MADE PAYABLE TO: AMERICAN POLYGRAPH ASSOCIATION IS ENCLOSED

(   ) CHARGE $____________ TO MY: (   )VISA    (   )MASTERCARD    (   )AE
NUMBER ______________________________________     CVV2______________    EXP.__________
(CVV2 is a 3 or 4 digit number found on the back of your credit card. AE cards on front of card)

SIGNATURE _____________________________________________________________

CES-ASIA-PACIFIC SEMINAR, April 12-16, 2010 (We can’t possibly reach everyone who would be interested in taking part in this seminar. Please help us
by making photocopies of this page for your co-workers and business associates. Thanks for your assistance). 2010
Celebrating over 60 years, Lafayette Instrument proudly introduces the new **LX5000**, the world’s first modular polygraph!

**Hardware Innovations:**
- Simultaneously records an unlimited number of channels*
- Data transfer rate up to 360 samples per second across all channels
- 23-bit analog to digital conversion
- Wired USB connectivity, or cutting edge wireless Bluetooth® technology
- Small, compact design making transport and storage easy
- The modular design is completely expandable, allowing for easy and inexpensive hardware upgrades
- Extended measurement ranges
- Wireless module includes rechargeable Lithium Ion battery
- GSR and PLE channels on one module
- Choice of electronic or pneumatic Pneumograph module
- Rugged design, yet lightweight
- Operates with same trusted and state-of-the-art LX Software
- 3 year warranty and lifetime technical support
* depending upon your computer's configuration

**New LX Software 10.0 Innovations:**
- LX5000 and LX4000 Support
- Objective Scoring System v. 3 (OSS-3)
- Redesigned E-mail PF Cepability
- Translator Mode
- Configurable LXSSoftware File Directories
- Signature Pad Support for Personal History
- Enhanced Technical Support Features
- Prompt for Archiving Audit Trail File
- Preferences Changes No Longer Require a Restart

**Special Offers**
- Trade-in your Axciton, Stoelting or Limestone Computerized Instrument, and receive a $1500.00 discount off the list price of an LX5000 or 4000 System
- UPGRADE to a Lafayette Instrument LX5000 from the LX4000 for ONLY $3750.00
- UPGRADE to a Lafayette Instrument LX4000 from the LX2000 or LX3000 for ONLY $2500.00

**LX4000 - PLATINUM SERIES**
THE BACKSTER SCHOOL OF LIE DETECTION

The generally recognized leader and premier school throughout the world in establishing and teaching polygraph technique standards.

All schools are not the same!
(Become a part of history ...learn directly from the creator of Modern Polygraph Technique!)

Polygraph Examiner Training Courses

Accredited by the American Polygraph Association since 1966
Recognized by the American Association of Police Polygraphists

Clevé Backster: Director and Chief Instructor
Charter/Life member: American Polygraph Association
American Association of Police Polygraphists
California Association of Polygraph Examiners

Originator of the Backster Zone Comparison Technique, and the first system for numerical evaluation of polygraph charts, both now generally adopted as the standard throughout the polygraph field.

8-WEEK BASIC POLYGRAPH EXAMINER TRAINING COURSES
June 8 – July 31, 2009
September 14 – November 6, 2009
January 18 – March 12, 2010
June 7 – August 6, 2010
September 13 – November 5, 2010

POST CONVICTION SEX OFFENDER TESTING TRAINING COURSE
(Firm) November 9 - 13, 2009
(Tentative) March 15 – 19, 2010
(Tentative) November 8 – 12, 2010

5-DAY POLYGRAPH EXAMINER WORK CONFERENCE
(52nd Annual) December 7 - 11, 2009
(53rd Annual) December 6 – 10, 2010

The Backster School of Lie Detection
ATTN: JT Adams, Registrar
861 Sixth Avenue, Suite 403
San Diego, CA 92101
Tel: (619) 233-6669 Fax: (619) 233-3441
E-mail: clevebackster@cs.com
Website: www.backster.net
President’s Message

Dan Sosnowski

It has come to my attention that the APA did not acknowledge or thank Jamie Brown & Limestone Technologies for once again donating a Limestone Polygraph System to the individual who was awarded the William Yankee Scholarship. For the past several years, Jamie has been kind enough to give the winner of the Yankee Scholarship a polygraph system. He informed me that it was his wish to continue this fine tradition. So on behalf of the APA, I would like to thank Jamie for his ongoing contributions made to the APA.

By now, many members who have accessed the APA website have noticed some changes. These modifications of the home page have been in the works for a period of time. The APA owes a great deal of thanks to Marty Oelrich who has taken over the site. He has spent many hours of his own time getting these changes to work properly. We should also thank Marty’s wife and family for allowing him to spend time away from his family.

Pam Shaw, General Chair of the Continuing Education Committee just returned from Virginia Beach where the APA conducted a co-sponsored training seminar with the Virginia Polygraph Association. Approximately 100 examiners attended the seminar which has always been a success. Thanks to all to helped to put this training seminar together. Once again, Miss Robbie made sure that everything ran smooth. Miss Robbie has a knack for making the entire Board of Directors look good.

Pam is also working very hard at assembling the 1st ever International APA Conference. The APA realizes that many of our International members cannot afford to travel to the US in order to attend training. The APA will provide quality training from top notch instructors worldwide as long as it reasonable and economically feasible. The conference is scheduled to take place in Singapore, April 13-16, 2010. We are also hoping that examiners from the Southeast Asia region will attend the conference and partake in an excellent opportunity to gather and exchange ideas.

Vickie Murphy-Carr continues to work diligently on arranging speakers for next year’s conference. The conference is scheduled for September 12-17, 2010 and will be held in Myrtle Beach, SC. The facility at the Hilton Hotel is a very nice venue especially since the hotel is located on the beach.

Other Board members have been working with their respective committees which you can read about their progress described under their Board reports.

Thanks again for the opportunity to represent this fine organization and its members.

Board of Directors’ Reports

Nate Gordon
President Elect

I have lectured in South Carolina, Mississippi, Boston, Connecticut, Pennsylvania, South Africa and Colombia, South America over the past several months.

I have begun circulating a survey to the international community to try and access how we can better serve them, as well as get an understanding into how polygraph is being used around the world and what types of research are being pursued. Our Board has approved our organization’s first foreign seminar, which will be held in 2010 in Singapore.

The advertisement which compares the accuracy of polygraph with voice stress appeared in the September issue of Police Chief Magazine; perhaps the largest circulated law enforcement
journal in our country. This was paid for in total by donations made for lectures I have given.

I was extremely pleased to be able to be present at the South African Professional Polygraph Association (SAPPA) meeting when a vote was taken which will unite the two polygraph associations in South Africa into a single organization, and a much stronger voice.

In South America, I was amazed at the number of examiners there were, and was very impressed with their thirst for knowledge.

I will be drafting our organization’s future strategic plan before year’s end. I would like to hear from you concerning what areas and directions you think are most important for our profession to take. I personally believe that our view of “best practices” should be applied to all examinations, not just those we have classified as “most important.” For the individual examinee, whether they are taking a screening test, or an evidentiary test, it is a test of utmost importance to them. If we have established, through research, what makes a test “most” accurate, I believe it should be required for all examinations. Again, I want to hear your views.

I recently taught a PCSOT course following the new model. It was like learning the material all over again, especially the number of different exam types it has now been broken down to: SHE I, SHE II, IO, IOI, PAE, SOME, and ME. I would like to hear from PCSOT examiners concerning the model and how you view it.

The year is coming to an end. I am looking forward to 2010. It is time for us to take a look back at what we have done over the past year, and set our goals for the coming one. Next year’s crops will depend on the seeds we plant now!

**Pam Shaw**

**Vice President, Law Enforcement**

Hello fellow members! Since the last writing, I’ve had the honor of presenting at several polygraph seminars; one hosted by the Oklahoma Bureau of Investigations, another with the Colorado Association of Polygraph Examiners and most recently, the Virginia Polygraph Association seminar that was co-hosted with the APA. It has been great to get out and visit with so many members on their “home” turf. We all face different challenges according to the laws of our region or other exigent circumstances, so it is exciting to have the opportunity to focus specifically on several select regions and see how we, the polygraph profession, are doing there. I am always refreshed to interact with examiners that are eager to learn; ensuring they are up to date in polygraph practices and involved in their local polygraph community. I am also regularly encouraged by the stories I hear of how individuals are getting involved in educating those around them about polygraph and how they tackle the problems they face. On behalf of the APA, and as your continuing education chair, “Thank you!” to each of the above associations!

In the vein of continuing education, the Board has recently been asked to attempt something new and unique regarding educational opportunities on an international level. We regularly discuss the APA co-hosting seminars in relation to state associations or combined regions of the U.S., but historically have not been requested to use this APA service internationally. A request was initiated by international APA members desiring to more boldly introduce the APA to the Asia-Pacific region in an effort to increase international participation/membership, provide APA quality training to many who would rarely, if ever, have the opportunity to attend a seminar in America, and provide a forum in which examiners from numerous surrounding countries could get to know each other and network. The request was to recreate, as near as possible, the APA’s annual seminar so that examiners across the world could more readily experience the value of APA seminars and membership, and as a result (hopefully), become inspired to get involved.

When the request was brought before the Board, I was tasked by your leadership to investigate many areas of such an undertaking before a decision could be made. To highlight a few, projected cost analyses were developed, seminar venues were contacted and surveys for anticipated participation and attendance had to be conducted. It was necessary to ensure that the request was feasible, reasonable, and responsible. At our October teleconference, I reported back to the Board the requested details and it was approved to host a regional APA seminar in the Asia-Pacific region of the world with Singapore volunteering as the host location. Dates for the seminar have been set for April 12-16, 2010.

Your Board is energized and has prepared as best as possible to attempt something of this magnitude, but realizes all the while that it comes with certain risks. This will be a landmark experience for our association and could potentially define the likelihood of similar, future endeavors for our association and its members. If you have questions or would like additional information, please feel free to contact me or touch base with Robbie at the National Office. You’ll also find additional seminar
information in this edition of the *Magazine*.

Regarding State Advisory Committee business, the last and first months of the years often mean the election of new leadership in our various state associations. If your association has recently undergone a change of leadership, or if they are about to, please remind one or more of your officers to notify the APA Office. The state advisory committee members will soon be updating records and developing an email network for announcements and facilitates communication among state leaders. Make sure your state is involved by ensuring that your leadership is informed.

I hope each of you have a blessed Christmas season and I look forward to sharing great things with you in 2010!

**William K. “Bill” Teigen**  
**Vice President, Private**

I have had the September/October APA Magazine in my hands now for about a week and it is already past time for me to send my contribution for the next issue. For the first time in my membership of the APA I realize that we do not have a section in this magazine for “letters to the editor” where members might respond to the comments of contributors to the magazine and/or discuss polygraph related matters. In my first published article as one of your elected officials, I made some comments that should have elicited comments pro or con to my published thoughts. My email address is in the front of the magazine like those addresses of all elected officers and ex-officio board members of the APA. To date, “nary” a comment has been offered by an APA member. (Let me note for the record that I am not conceited enough to think many read my comments, but some did).

I have proposed that the board of directors give serious thoughts about the structure of the APA Ethics and Grievance Committee. As the General Chairman of the Ethics/Grievance Committee, I suggested in my comments in the last magazine that effectively the Grievance Committee, upon the receipt of a complaint from the public, can investigate the actions of public and International members but probably could not conduct a thorough investigation of a law enforcement or a government examiner. Their respective agencies could and probably would limit the answers of their examiners to questioning of an “outside agency” like the APA. By category of membership, that means the Grievance process does apply to 50% of the APA membership, private and International members. By head count of member examiners according to categories of membership, that means 1/3 to 1/2 of the membership could be excluded from the effectiveness of an APA Grievance inquiry. I asked the board to consider whether they thought that situation was fair and effective. We will discuss this at future Board of Directors’ meetings and propose action if the board feels action is warranted.

Vice President-Law Enforcement Pam Shaw has been tasked and has done an outstanding job of taking a proposal of the APA to conduct a training seminar in Singapore this coming spring and see if it could be done. What a huge task! She is well on the way to making it happen with the active participation of APA International members in Singapore and elsewhere in the Far East. The board was asked to consider this training endeavor and decided to support the proposal, which included a guarantee to the APA that this seminar be a no expense and/or a profitable effort on our part. Nice job Pam!

The APA membership has already submitted a nomination for one of our annual awards and, on its surface, it is a very meaningful nomination. I encourage all of you to communicate with the National Office, attention Awards Committee, or myself, and nominate someone you know is deserving of APA recognition. The annual recognition of accomplishments by members of the APA starts from the general membership and should not be, but can be, left to the members of the Awards Committee. Take a minute for the APA and look around you professionally. Let us know who is and has done an outstanding job in the field of polygraphy and start to make the awards process happen. Note to all: we all seem to love awards going to “new” folks, don’t we?

An ironic thing is about to happen in the APA. New officers were installed on the board in August of this year. In January we will be voting on officers for CY 2010-2011. Some of the newly elected officers have been in place 3 months, me included, and the new officers will have to decide, based on then, at most 5 months’ experience, whether or not they want to run in the next election of the new administration of the APA. I never have been a fan of our Fair Elections Program and I still am not. Last issue I commented on the fact that, on average, less than 25% of the APA membership voted in the APA elections for each of the elected positions in CY 2009. At our annual seminar, 120 members, about 5% of our membership, voted on a very important issue during our general membership meeting and it affected all of the APA. I am and will be an
advocate of changing the Fair Election Process or returning to elections during the annual seminar. Both have positive values as well as negative values but the concept of “one member, one vote” does not, effectively, bear out in our “democracy.” The statistics I have presented to you say that from 5% to 25% of our membership get involved in important decisions for our organization.

Texas polygraph laws changed in CY 2009. Texas examiners lost their indicatory board of governance, the Texas Polygraph Examiners Board, but retained the requirement to be licensed to conduct polygraph tests in the State of Texas. We are now licensed and regulated by the Texas Department of Licensing and Regulations (TDLR) along with 28 other professions. Many things are changing in Texas polygraph, most all of them for the better, I believe. If any of you in State Associations want to dialog about our Texas transformation, send me a message or give me a call.

Thank you for letting me serve you and the APA in this elected position.

Barry Cushman
Director

Hello APA members. I hope this finds you well and that you are seriously considering getting out to our next seminar. Given the current financial state in this country and throughout the world, the sooner you budget, the better it may be. Please know that your board is working hard for you. I don’t want to rehash what you’ll find elsewhere, so please take the time to read what’s going on and who’s doing what within your organization. If you can assist in any way – even through words of encouragement or constructive criticism – then take the time to call or send an email to the relevant person(s).

I’d like to take the opportunity to address a situation I had hoped had extinguished itself; however, it appears that is not the case. We are a relatively small community, and there is little benefit to be a house divided. Sure, we can have heated debates, and they can very healthy. I’m not talking about healthy, spirited debate here though. There seems to be an “us versus them” mentality within our ranks, which is concerning. As to who is who in that debate, bear with me for a moment. As you read, keep in mind that I am only writing about my personal observations and perceptions. This is not an indictment of any one person or any group. Given this is an editorial commentary of sorts, I’m not going to heavily cite – or even appropriately cite – sources. Instead, I’d just like to start a conversation.

I know it goes back farther, but the “surge,” if you will, seems to have come following Don Krapohl’s article on “validated” techniques published in our journal in 2006 (Volume 35, Number 3). As one in the growing “we must be data driven” crowd, I appreciated the effort Don put into that article. This is not meant to be a defense of Don; he can do that well enough without me. My concerns are the growing systemic effects of what I perceive to be misunderstood motives of those supporting many of outspoken science-minded crowd’s motives (or perhaps more properly, the scientific community-minded crowd).

The responses that were published in the following journal appear to have been the beginning of the current state of affairs. To summarize (from my viewpoint), Cleve Backster’s techniques, and their derivatives didn’t make Don’s list, and that was seen as some type of attack on Cleve and his progeny. Since that time, we’ve heard, among other things, that barring phrases on CQs don’t really matter and that the term “psychological set” has been abandoned in exchange for “differential salience.” Again, the groaning I’ve heard seems to add changes such as these to the pile of “evidence” demonstrating that Cleve and his closest followers have been thrown overboard. Those labeled as doing the throwing appear to be those in the US Federal Government (and their perceived progeny) pushing the strict scientific agenda.

As one in the latter crowd – based on comments I’ve heard from some – I think the point has been missed. Let me say right off the bat that Cleve was a man ahead of his time. Were it not for his efforts (and this is not to discount the contributions of others), we would not be where we are today. To make my point, consider the “Backster Exploratory” test: it is a test designed to be used when the real issue is somewhat elusive. Significant reactions to any of the issues presented in that test are “broken out” for further probing in a (Backster) single-issue test. Viola! Successive hurdles! It’s not something new. The term was simply language scientists in other fields could more easily understand because it’s a term used in other scientific circles. Cleve has been preaching it for years! Naming the process wasn’t demonstrating that Cleve and his closest followers of the current state of affairs. To summarize (from their derivatives didn’t make Don’s list, and that was seen as some type of attack on Cleve and his progeny. Since that time, we’ve heard, among other things, that barring phrases on CQs don’t really matter and that the term “psychological set” has been abandoned in exchange for “differential salience.” Again, the groaning I’ve heard seems to add changes such as these to the pile of “evidence” demonstrating that Cleve and his closest followers have been thrown overboard. Those labeled as doing the throwing appear to be those in the US Federal Government (and their perceived progeny) pushing the strict scientific agenda.

As one in the latter crowd – based on comments I’ve heard from some – I think the point has been missed. Let me say right off the bat that Cleve was a man ahead of his time. Were it not for his efforts (and this is not to discount the contributions of others), we would not be where we are today. To make my point, consider the “Backster Exploratory” test: it is a test designed to be used when the real issue is somewhat elusive. Significant reactions to any of the issues presented in that test are “broken out” for further probing in a (Backster) single-issue test. Viola! Successive hurdles! It’s not something new. The term was simply language scientists in other fields could more easily understand because it’s a term used in other scientific circles. Cleve has been preaching it for years! Naming the process wasn’t demonstrated that Cleve and his closest followers have been thrown overboard. Those labeled as doing the throwing appear to be those in the US Federal Government (and their perceived progeny) pushing the strict scientific agenda.

As one in the latter crowd – based on comments I’ve heard from some – I think the point has been missed. Let me say right off the bat that Cleve was a man ahead of his time. Were it not for his efforts (and this is not to discount the contributions of others), we would not be where we are today. To make my point, consider the “Backster Exploratory” test: it is a test designed to be used when the real issue is somewhat elusive. Significant reactions to any of the issues presented in that test are “broken out” for further probing in a (Backster) single-issue test. Viola! Successive hurdles! It’s not something new. The term was simply language scientists in other fields could more easily understand because it’s a term used in other scientific circles. Cleve has been preaching it for years! Naming the process wasn’t demonstrated that Cleve and his closest followers have been thrown overboard. Those labeled as doing the throwing appear to be those in the US Federal Government (and their perceived progeny) pushing the strict scientific agenda.

Let’s look at “psychological set.” We all know
what it means. It means a person generally reacts more strongly to one type of question: relevant or comparison. A truthful person’s “psychological set” is (most of the time) on the CQs; the liars, on the RQs. The principle hasn’t changed from when Cleve first described it. However, the scientific community doesn’t know what “psychological set” means. We’ve created our own jargon over the years, and it is making it difficult to find acceptance in the scientific community, which is not good for the future of polygraph. In response, and rather than asking thousands and thousands of scientists to change their well-established terminology, many of us in the polygraph community – especially those trained as scientists – have adopted the language of the long-established scientific community. (As an aside – in case it comes up during a game of Trivial Pursuit – our good friend, scientist and polygraph examiner, Dr. Avital Ginton, told me “psychological set” did exist in the psychological literature many years ago, but it didn’t mean what we say it means.) Please humor me and permit me to editorialize some more for just a moment. There is absolutely no reason to believe or hold the position – none, zero, nada – that any Backster CQT (or its derivatives) is not as valid as any other similar CQT. (Do you recall how the NAS grouped them all together in its review of polygraph?) As long as the test uses a proper pre-test [the essentials of which we could catalog], a couple well-developed CQs and a couple well-developed RQs, it’s a valid CQT. (Granted, if you present too many issues, you can run a “valid” test with chance accuracy.) In his 2006 article, Don suggested something that I think was shamefully overlooked by so many. He suggested the following: “Polygraph techniques in many shapes and sizes could be assembled from valid principles…. The use of valid principles brings with it significant benefits. They could be used as benchmarks to help avert professional disagreements that involve non-critical differences between techniques, and to help identify deficient techniques. If the profession were to adopt this approach to technique development and abandon the “science-lite” methods of the past, we could find the field moving toward higher accuracy, fewer disagreements, and more credibility.”

Interestingly, that’s what the Utah researchers have been telling us for years, and yet we’ve chosen to bicker instead of moving forward at the pace we likely could have. Think about it for a moment: is there any real difference in how any of us were taught to run a test? It’s relatively simple: conduct an unbiased pre-test, develop and introduce the RQs and CQs, run the test, and score it properly. While we can debate some of the nuances of each step, we generally agree on the main substance. The issues we debate seem to be irrelevant.

I started to create a list of validated principles (and Don has presented on many) to plug into a matrix that includes the single-issue techniques we all use. I have been overloaded with “things” and that project has taken a backseat for the time being. Though not complete, there is no reason for me to believe that any single-issue CQT techniques in use today would not meet the threshold of “valid” when approached from that perspective. I don’t think you’ll find anyone in either camp who would seriously disagree. (With some help, I could probably pull off a paper and presentation in little time.)

We are at a crossroads. We need to decide whether we are going to fight with ourselves over things that are really just a waste of energy, or whether we are going to move ahead – together – for our mutual benefit. I’m sorry if this sounds like a lecture, but I’m concerned about where we are and where we are going. We’re a conglomeration of egos, I know, but if we fight amongst ourselves (over non-issues), our enemies need only sit back and wait for us to self-destruct. We don’t need camps or sects. We’re too small. Moreover, we don’t need to have hurt feelings over issues that only perceived (i.e., not real). We do need to pause and evaluate what we do. From a scientific perspective, we must do it piece by piece. We’ll likely find – as we have already – some of what we do doesn’t work like we thought it did. So what? Does it really matter if we didn’t get it all 100% correct right out of the gate? That doesn’t mean we shouldn’t be willing to espouse new ideas either. Many of them may not turn out to do what we had hoped, but again, so what? Some surely will. I can honestly say that polygraph examiners are some of the best people I know. They care about their work, and they take seriously their at times awesome responsibility to discern fact from fiction. I am proud to say I am a member of this profession. It just bothers me that there are at least some who are taking personally the necessary discussions we need to have to grow and move polygraph to the place it deserves to be. Considering the great contributions so many have selflessly handed down to us isn’t it wiser to honor them by bettering the profession through empirical research? Thanks for listening. Call or email me if I can do anything for you. Godspeed.

Marty Olerich
Director

The website committee has committed significant time and effort since the last publication and has completed the upgrade of the Content Management System (CMS), which was initiated by the last Board of Directors. Though there have been
significant changes with the website during the past month, there are significant improvements which still need to be made. The most noticeable changes are the theme and layout. However, there have been numerous other changes which are not as visible, as they relate to the data and content contained in the CMS. The upgrade resulted in some significant problems; some of which were preexisting and some of which resulted from the upgrade. Although most of these issues have been resolved, there are still several problems that are still being addressed.

There has been some feedback from my members regarding website functionality, including several issues related to the online membership directory. These problems are due in part due to lack of standards. This includes information input into your account. For example, the search of your name is dependent upon standard input of your city and state. Specifying “Phoenix” and “Arizona” versus “PHX” and “AZ.” This will assist in ensuring the information is available when someone is searching for examiners in your location, as the search query “Arizona” will only identify those individuals who used the full spelling of Arizona and not those who listed themselves under “AZ” and vice-versa. Please ensure your information is consistent and follows this standard to ensure your information is retrieved during search queries. Please note that

the membership directory available on the website is done on a voluntary basis and does not consist of all APA members. For more information regarding the inclusion of your information on the online membership directory, please visit the APA Forums. The website currently includes access to most publications of the APA Magazine from the past two years. The remaining volumes will be included upon their receipt. There has also been some discussion regarding the addition of another module to the website which would allow the congregation and organization of all APA publications, including the Journal. This could potentially lead to easier accessibility of these publications to members, reduce costs and materials, and allow for International members to access this material more expediently. Again, the website will be an ongoing process of development and there is considerable room for improvement.

The Research and Development Committee has identified several projects which it will be further assessing during the next several weeks. Additional information will be forthcoming. If you have any questions or comments regarding the Website Committee or the Research and Development Committee, please contact me at website@polygraph.org.
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Polygraphists Professional Liability Coverage

Coverage Includes (but is not limited to):

Professional and Personal Injury Liability

Optional Coverages Available:

Interviewing
Written Testing
Private Investigation
Background Checks
Law Enforcement Polygraphs

General Liability (available in most states)

For specific information write, fax or call Melanie Javens at:

Complete Equity Markets, Inc.
1190 Flex Court
Lake Zurich, Illinois 60047-1578
www.cemins.com
Toll Free In U.S. & Canada (800) 323-6234
In Illinois (847) 541-0900 • Fax (847) 541-0444

A tradition of innovation and service.
You’re Not Just Buying a Polygraph
Look Closer

Cutting edge technology at your finger tips!

**FingerCuff™**
Limestone Technologies' all inclusive Polygraph Professional Suite™ includes our revolutionary FingerCuff™. Finally an alternative to the Blood Pressure Cuff. Incorporate cutting edge technology with our new FingerCuff™.

**Pulse Oximetry Sensor**
Limestone Technologies has integrated the industries' best medical pulse oximetry design for our latest Finger PLE sensor. NONIN PureSAT® signal processing technology provides exactly what examiners need! Consistently reliable physiological measurements, even in a challenging monitoring environment.

Untouchable quality with unbeatable pricing!

**Polygraph Professional Suite™**
Silver Solution $5,995USD
1 DataPac_USB™ a true 8-channel instrument
1 StingRay SE™ piezo electronic film countermeasure cushion
2 pneumatic respiration transducers
1 complete set of EDA electrodes (traditional metal and silver/silver wet gel electrodes)
100 disposable silver/silver wet gel EDA electrodes
1 deluxe pneumatic blood pressure cuff with large sphygmomanometer (one size fits all)
1 FingerCuff™ pneumatic blood pressure cuff
1 deluxe Pelican instrument case with custom padded divider set
1 OSS 1 & 2 scoring algorithms, courtesy of Donald Krapohl and Barry McManus
1 OSS 3 scoring algorithm, courtesy of Raymond Nelson, Donald Krapohl and Mark Handler
1 comprehensive full color printed and bound user’s manual, and Integrated video tutorials
3 year maintenance agreement (Phone support & software updates)
3 year DataPac_USB replacement warranty through overnight courier service

Superior technical support when you need it!

**Customer service 24/7**
Online technical support is available 24/7 through our secure knowledge base. Quarterly program updates are available to customers on our dedicated, secure online server. Software when you want it, at your convenience.

**Replacement Warranty**
Be assured that all instruments include a three year replacement warranty. Our guarantee that any defective equipment will be replaced within 48 hours maximizes your profits and productivity.

See for yourself. Contact us today.

Limestone Technologies
Charting the future...

NORTH AMERICA: 886.765.9770 (toll free)
INTERNATIONAL: 011.613.634.2594
E-mail: sales@limestonetech.com
Website: www.limestonetech.com
THE TRUTH WILL SET YOU FREE TO EXPLORE CAREER OPPORTUNITIES.

The Troy University Polygraph Center is a program within Troy University established with the purpose of preparing students for careers as polygraph examiners.

The Troy University Polygraph Center is accredited by the American Polygraph Association.

Enroll today!

Samuel L. Braddock
Director
sbraddock@troy.edu

Jessica Blakemore
Recruiter/Registrar
jbault@troy.edu

TROY UNIVERSITY
A future of opportunities
troy.edu

Students can earn up to 12 hours of undergraduate credit while completing training.

Troy University Polygraph Center
1117 Perimeter Center West, Suite N101, Atlanta, GA 30338
770-730-0033/1-866-426-1068
atlanta@troy.edu
The next meeting of ASTM International Committee E52 on Forensic Psychophysiology will be held in conjunction with the National Polygraph Association on Saturday, January 24, 2010, at the Golden Nugget Hotel in Las Vegas, Nevada. The meeting will be held from 8:00am to 5:00pm. The agenda will include a review of the following four items that were balloted in November 2009:

- **Addition to Standard Guide for PDD Examination Standards of Practice (E2062):** Additional language proposed regarding use of interpreters to be included as a new section;

- **Addition to Standard Guide for PDD Examination Standards of Practice (E2062):** Additional language proposed in section four regarding cultural sensitivity;

- **Addition to Standard Guide for PDD Examination Standards of Practice (E2062):** Additional language proposed in section five PDD examinations following adversarial interrogations and additional language proposed in section six regarding differentiating between evidentiary examinations and investigative examinations.

- **Addition to Standard Terminology Relating to Forensic Psychophysiology (E20335):** Additional terminology proposed, including Quality Control, Significant Responses, No Significant Responses, Inconclusive, No Opinion, Screening Examination, and Successive Hurdles.

Please note that if you are interested in attending Committee E52 meetings, they are open to non-members. Both your attendance and comments are welcome. If you have any questions regarding the aforementioned meeting or other related questions regarding Committee E52, including the proposed additions listed above, please feel free to contact Marty Oelrich at martyoelrich@hotmail.com.

Please note that Marty Oelrich, the author of this column, is the Secretary for Committee E52 on Forensic Psychophysiology. However, the views and comments expressed within this article do not necessarily reflect those of ASTM International or those of Committee E52 on Forensic Psychophysiology.
Results You Can Count On From A Name You Can Trust.

Stoelting is the most trusted name in polygraphy, with a tradition of polygraph innovation spanning nearly 80 years. The CPS II is engineered to be the most powerful and easy to use polygraph system on the market.

INNOVATIVE FEATURES OF THE CPS II:

Eight Signal Channels
Collect up to 8 channels of data using the most technologically advanced hardware and sensors available.

Video and Audio Recording
Record audio and video of an entire exam with a web camera. The CPS II video program is easy to use, providing trouble-free operation and quality video compression.

New Scoring Windows Screen
Customize your scoring windows for each channel when numerically scoring your charts. The University of Utah’s optimized scoring windows are set as default.

Exclusive Numerical Scoring Screen
Numerically score your charts on your computer screen using our display of easy to understand computer measurements which are designed to facilitate the efficiency, reliability, and accuracy of diagnoses of truth and deception.

Exclusive Voice Response Channel
Mark the exact time when you ask your questions (onset and offset) and when your subject answers via lapel microphones.

Scientifically Validated Algorithms
Evaluate your data using scientifically-validated algorithms created at the University of Utah. All algorithms are included free of charge with the CPS II program.
EMPLOYEE POLYGRAPH PROTECTION ACT OF 1988

EPPA COMES OF AGE

A Twenty-One Year Review of The History, Law, and Application of EPPA

Gordon L. Vaughan, Esq.¹

Introduction

As I write this introduction, it is just a few days until the twenty-first anniversary of President Ronald Regan’s signing into law the Employee Polygraph Protection Act of 1988 (“EPPA”) or (the “Act”). At the time EPPA was passed by the 100th Congress, the polygraph industry was under attack on a number of fronts. Those that questioned the scientific underpinnings of polygraph were, in November 1983, given the blunt instrument of the critical report of the U.S. Congressional Office of Technology Assessment, Scientific Validity of Polygraph Testing: A Research Review and Evaluation. Labor and civil liberties groups opposed to employee polygraphs found strong allies in prominent political figures from both sides of the isle in Senators Ted Kennedy and Orrin Hatch who expressed deep reservations about the “explosive growth” of the use of lie detectors. The industry itself, unable to secure national regulation, consistent state regulation, or even internal industry agreement on standardization in the use of polygraph, was rife with insufficiently trained examiners. These factors, along with a growing recognition in the law of an individual’s right to privacy, made the passage of EPPA almost inevitable. In fact, given the political climate of the time, it is a wonder that EPPA spared the public sector and a few specific industries from the general sweep of prohibition of employee polygraphs.

EPPA’s sponsors, probably accurately, predicted that the Act would eliminate up to eighty-five percent of the polygraph examinations that had been administered prior to EPPA by private employers. It is without doubt that hundreds of thousands of employees who would have been eliminated from employment consideration, in part, by the use of polygraph, went on to be hired by employers.

Not unexpectedly, there was a sudden decrease in job opportunities for polygraph examiners. In 1987, the year before EPPA was passed, The American Polygraph Association had 2,886 members - 1,599 of which were private examiners. By 1989, the year following EPPA, the number had dropped to a total of 2,260 members - 1084 of which were private examiners. By 1993, total APA membership was 1,581 with only 569 private examiners (a loss of over 1000 private examiners since 1987). While the APA’s total membership now approaches its pre-EPPA levels, the effect of EPPA persists. In 2008, total membership was 2,764 with 1,101

¹This article is the first of a four-article series. It is a modified and abbreviated version of an article and materials presented by the author at the American Polygraph Association’s 44th Annual Seminar in Nashville, Tennessee, in August 2009. The author gratefully acknowledges Richard C. Anguiano, Esq., Andrew S. Vaughan, Esq., and T.V. O’Malley for their assistance in the preparation of this article. Additionally, the author acknowledges the liberal use of the interpretive materials regarding EPPA provided by the United States Department of Labor and set out in Application of the Employee Polygraph Protection Act, 29 CFR Part 801, et. Seq.
private examiners. Even these numbers are skewed by the large increase in international members over those in the organization before EPPA. In 2008, international membership was as high as 492 members.

Also not surprisingly, since EPPA, employee fraud and theft have skyrocketed with estimates of national costs of between 40 and 400 billion dollars annually. See http://www.bitingthehandthatfeeds.com/preface.htm.

EPPA has undergone almost no legislative tinkering in its twenty-one year history. Some observe, with surprise, that there has been very little judicial consideration of the Act, particularly as the last twenty-one years have seen an explosion of employee-related litigation. A partial explanation for the minimal litigation of claimed EPPA violations is that navigating the exemptions provided by the Act can be tricky and few employers are willing to travel the heavily mined landscape of seeking polygraph examinations under the ongoing-investigation exemption. Even those industries provided exemptions under EPPA sometimes appear reluctant to risk violation of the Act by instituting a comprehensive pre-employment polygraph program.

EMPLOYEE POLYGRAPH PROTECTION ACT OF 1988

I. HISTORICAL CONTEXT OF EPPA

A. PRE-EPPA POLYGRAPH USE AND ABUSE


It was estimated that in 1984 that between 200,000 and one million polygraph examinations were administered to job applicants and employees. See David E. Neely, The Employee Polygraph Protection Act: Good News for Employees and Job Applicants, 77 Ill. B.J. 598 (1989). In 1985, the estimated number had increased to approximately two million polygraph tests administered. Id. An estimated three-fourths of those polygraph tests conducted by private employers in 1985 were for purposes of screening job applicants. Id.

Despite the growing and wide-spread use of polygraph testing, a majority of jurisdictions did not license polygraph examiners, and there was little uniformity among those jurisdictions that did provide licensing. As a result, the number of polygraph examiners grew with little legislative oversight or control. Consequently, many of these examiners had inadequate training and were not compelled to follow any standards of practice. Some examiners were alleged to conduct ten or more examinations a day with the entire examination lasting thirty minutes or less. There were complaints of unnecessary personally-intrusive questions. See Ryan K. Brown, Specific Incident Polygraph Testing Under the Employee Polygraph Protection Act of 1988, 64 Wash. L. Rev. 661 (1988). See also Charles P. Cullen, The Specific Incident Exemption of the Employee Polygraph Protection Act: Deceptively Straightforward, 65 Notre Dame L. Rev. 262 (1990). Also, in November 1983, the Office of Technology Assessment issued a report finding that there was little scientific evidence of polygraph accuracy.2 Office of Technology Assessment, U.S. Cong., Scientific Validity of Polygraph Testing: A Research Review and Evaluation, OTA-TM-H-15, November 1983 (“OTA Report”).

2The OTA Report had many weaknesses, not the least of which was that it considered inconclusives as errors, thus significantly decreasing the reported accuracy of polygraph. See OTA Report at 98. A Department of Defense report followed the OTA Report and came to different conclusions. See U.S. Dept. of Defense, The Accuracy and Utility of Polygraph Testing 2 (1984).
B. LEGISLATIVE HOSTILITY AND THE ENACTMENT OF EPPA

Objections to employer use of the polygraph were raised on the grounds described above and on other grounds, as well. For example, many considered the use of lie detectors as an unreasonable intrusion on the privacy of workers. Others contended that the use of polygraph disproportionately disqualified minority applicants. 133 Cong. Rec. H9538 (daily ed. Nov. 4, 1987). Opponents to the use of polygraph by employers included labor organizations such as the American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations (AFL - CIO), the American Civil Liberties Union, the American Medical Association, and the American Psychological Association.

In response to these objections, at least eighteen states enacted regulations governing polygraph use. These state laws lacked uniformity and consistency in enforcement. Complaints were lodged that these laws were sometimes circumvented by employers who might require employees to submit to polygraph tests in neighboring states with less stringent regulations.

The private sector's use and abuse of polygraphs had received Congressional attention since the mid-1960's. In the 99th Congress, the House of Representatives passed House Bill 1524 which proposed banning all uses for the polygraph in the private sector but exempted five industries from the ban (these industries were in the areas of national security, the manufacture and distribution of drugs, and private security agencies). At the same time, in the Senate, Senate Bill 1815 was introduced by Senators Edward Kennedy and Orrin Hatch and proposed a total ban on private-sector polygraph testing and contained no exemptions. The 99th Congress expired before the Senate could act on the legislation.

In the 100th Congress, the House again passed a private-sector ban in House Bill 1212 with two industries (private securities and drug manufacturers) exempted from the proposed ban. Senators Kennedy, Hatch, and ten other Senate members introduced a somewhat different approach in Senate Bill 1904. Senate Bill 1904 included a provision for all industries to be able to use polygraph for certain ongoing investigations. The Senate Bill’s aim was to prohibit what was believed to be the scientifically unsupported screening examinations but permitting, under strict conditions, polygraph examinations for investigation of certain economic losses. The Senate version was perceived by many industries as a more moderate approach and converted many to support the Senate version. As noted by Ching Wah Chin, Protecting Employees and Neglecting Technology Assessment: The Employee Polygraph Protection Act of 1988, 55 Brook. L. Rev. 1315, 1321, n. 21 (1990):

Organizations such as the National Association of Convenience Stores, National Grocer’s Association, National Mass Retailer Institute, National Restaurant Association and National Retail Merchant’s Association opposed H.R. 1212 but supported the more flexible S. 1904. Senate Report, supra note 2, at 45, reprinted in 1988 U.S. Code Cong. & Admin. News at 732. American Association of Railroads, American Bankers Association, and Securities Industry Association were also converted by S. 1904. Id. These latter associations had the additional incentive to support the Act because they represent industries that were given an additional exemption. Security services that protect public transportation, currency, negotiable securities, precious commodities or instruments, or proprietary information are exempt from the Act.

Other industries continued to oppose the proposed legislation, arguing that the loss of polygraph would essentially eliminate an important weapon against employee theft. Id. at 1320-21. In addition, the American Polygraph Association (“APA”) lobbied and testified against both versions of the proposed legislation. Considerable compromises were made between the bills passed by the House and the Senate during the House and Senate Conference and, from this, EPPA was the result. H.R. CONF. REP. 100-659, P.L. 100-347, Employee Polygraph Protection Act of 1988, House Conference Report No. 100-659 (May 26, 1988).

On June 27, 1988, President Ronald Reagan signed into law the Employee Polygraph Protection Act of 1988. The law took effect on December 27, 1988. EPPA has remained essentially unchanged since it was passed.
Overview

Polygraph chart quality invariably affects the ability to arrive at decisive test results. In my experience I have found that chart quality can be considerably improved by tweaking probe output. Although my research includes the output of all polygraph probes, in this paper I specifically address the electrodermal probes, and ways to improve their output.

Actual polygraph charts are usually not as smooth and clear as the examples that appear in the reference books. The skin of some of the test subjects generates electric resistance that does not allow a clear reading, and the causes are quite obvious: the fingers fitted with the electrodermal probes swell (especially when fitted on the same hand as the cardio sleeve) and perspire during the test, and the conductivity is unstable. These factors, along with others, contribute to unclear graphs. In addition, some examinees apply pressure to the probes, purposely or not, which also affects the recording.

Electrodermal Probe Enhancement: Solution

In order to avoid the electrodermal factors which deteriorate chart quality, I’ve designed and assembled an improved probe array, which enhances the probe output by:

- allowing the skin to breathe.
- providing good and stable conductivity.
- preventing the test subject from applying pressure to the probes.

First of all, in order to achieve correct and stable conductivity, I wrapped the stainless steel plates with a gold coil (Figure 1). The coil wrapped over the plates allows the skin to breathe. This improved the conductivity by solving the perspiration and swelling issues.

The second part of the solution related to the probe's location on the hand. Traditionally, electrodermal probes are fitted on fingertips. This affects readings because examinees can easily apply pressure on the probes, deliberately or not. In addition, fingertip skin can be rugged and tough, and even intentionally manipulated to hamper polygraph readings. From a different point of view I might also add that quite a few examinees told me they felt uncomfortable being fitted with probes on their fingertips; “feels like I’m sitting on an electric chair” is a phrase I heard often.

To overcome the probe location issue, I prepared a circular band from a wide rubber strip, attached two Velcro strips to the band’s inside, and attached the electrodermal probes (along with the gold coil) to the Velcro strips (Figure 3). Later, I decided to improve this prototype and assembled larger stainless steel probes, over which I wrapped gold coils. Then, I attached the probes by permanent pasting to the inside of the rubber band (Figure 4). The rubber band ensures that the pressure on the probes remains consistent and stable.

Now, during polygraph tests I have two ways to attach the electrodermal probes to the examinee’s hand: either on the fingertips (traditionally) or by sliding the rubber band over the palm, just below the fingers.
To further improve conductivity, I prepared a disposable cleaning cloth, soaked in brine, in a small, sealed container. Before mounting the electrodermal probes on the examinee’s palm I use the soaked cloth to apply a thin and moist layer of brine to the electrodermal probes’ contact areas. This method, by the way, improves and stabilizes conductivity also when probes are attached to the fingertips.

Right after mounting the probes on the examinee’s palm, I take a skin resistance reading from the polygraph computer display. By adjusting the probes’ location, and the amount of applied brine, I achieve what I consider the recommended resistance range of 60-200 KΩ. Before each chart, I usually check the resistance between the electrodermal probes, and adjust accordingly.

**Conclusion**

From my experience, using the gold coiling and rubber band solution:

- doesn’t offend the examinee
- is easy to assemble
- maintains constant pressure and conductivity
- prevents countermeasure of the readings by the examinee
- produces an optimal electrodermal graph

The electrodermal graph quality can be immediately verified using the Stim Test as a first chart.

**Figure Appendix**

**Figure 1: Electrodermal Probes wrapped with gold coil**

**Figure 2: Electrodermal Probes fitted inside rubber band, with gold coil**

**Figure 3: Rubber band with probes attached by Velcro, allowing two mounting methods**

**Figure 4: Rubber band with probes permanently pasted inside**

---

For further information on this article, please contact Mr. Rom directly at israel@ginegar.net
There are long standing arguments in society as to what constitutes a profession and the characteristics of its practitioners, the professionals. More specifically, is a polygraph examiner qualified to be so classified? To explore this question, it might be helpful to describe the characteristics of other work groups which are usually not considered a profession before the profession’s profile is described.

**Labor:** General labor is oriented to performing a task assigned by others. The laborer asks no questions, has virtually no decision making input, does the work assigned and receives remuneration for the task. The greatest reward for that work is the paycheck. A person does this type of work solely out of economic necessity. There is little psychic or emotional reward beyond the paycheck. Work hours are usually well defined, eg. 9 to 5. When the work day or week is completed, the laborer goes back to private life to enjoy family and friends. Little thought is given to the next day’s work until the dreaded moment arrives when the task driven day begins anew. The laborer is almost entirely free of economic liability for any work related failures.

**Skilled Labor:** Skilled labor, as the term implies, is characterized by specialized abilities or skills not possessed by most of society. Typically, these individuals are sort after by developers of industry. Typical examples of this group would be technicians, carpenters, electricians, plumbers, secretaries, masons, auto mechanics, etc. These titles reflect rather well, their skills. Although remuneration is still the most important reason for their work effort, job satisfaction and societal respect has increased significantly over the unskilled labor group. Nevertheless, the skilled laborer’s task is still assigned by others. However, some field decision-making by the skilled worker may feed back to the decision-maker who assigned the task.

For example, a carpenter may not be able to execute a certain construction plan in the field exactly as described on the blue prints but can offer an alternative method. However, the carpenter is still expected to wait for approval by the architect before proceeding.

Skilled workers often enjoy respect from family and friends. The skills acquired often originate from older family members. Perhaps the son learned the skill from the father. There is often strong identity with others in the same skill area. It would be common for members of the skilled labor group to have a feeling of one for all and all for one. They may be unionized, often wearing baseball caps, jackets or tee shirts with emblems displayed showing unity, and pride among the group members. The fraternal identity of firefighters and policemen often result in elaborate funerals with many comrades in attendance.

Their work assignments, however, are still defined by others. Economic liability is still the responsibility of the decision-makers except for the most egregious cases.

**The Professions:** The professions may be the most difficult to define. Widespread consensus on core characteristics can be elusive. Nevertheless, at lease some of the common criteria, typical of the profession can be described.

The Noble Professions: Religion (Clergy), Medicine (Physician), Law (lawyer, Judge), Education (Teacher, Professor) are often the most respected. Society’s highest moral and ethical standards are expected from this group. The noble professions’ purpose and focal point are rooted in service to society and humankind with little regard for their own welfare, hence, the nobility title. Their responsibility to society is 24/7 not just 9 to 5. Don’t confuse the nobility of the profession with the possible moral failings of the practitioner.

Other examples of professional titles may include: Architect, CEO, CPA, Engineer, etc. There are many characteristics which can define and describe the professions, some of which could lead to much debate and opinion, making standard definitions difficult to establish. Nevertheless, a few broadly viewed characteristics of the professional practioners can be considered here.
Often, the professional practitioners are viewed as the final decision-makers in their body of knowledge. Typically, a physician, the practitioner of medicine, would be the final decision maker about medical matters. In other words, the physician has no boss, the buck stops here, mind set. When necessary, the physician will seek advice, expert opinion, or counsel from peers. The professional is guided by lateral advice rather than a hierarchical advice. After assessing the best medical information available, the physician becomes the final decision-maker of a medical course of treatment. So it goes throughout the professions. The architect may seek the advice of an engineer before finalizing architectural plans.

Remember, the professionals are the final decision-makers in their body of knowledge. With that authority, comes great responsibility, and liability. The reward is societal respect, high remuneration and a title for life.

To achieve the skills to make good decisions, which will affect others, the professional practitioner must go through an exhaustive filtering process of understanding cause and effect relationships. This filtering process is traditionally done at an institution of higher learning called a University. The successful development in this skill area of decision-making is certified by a Degree.

When good decisions are made they are based on evidence gathering methods when pursuing the truth. The highest level of truth gathering information has been shown, over time, to be achieved by the principles established by the scientific method. Information gathered by this method provides a power of prediction. Keep in mind when a solution to a problem is declared to be scientifically based, it does not mean that it is free of error but rather the outcome was determined by following certain protocols which provide the greatest likelihood of being correct with the lowest chance of error. All scientific outcomes have error rates, both false positives and false negatives. It becomes the burden of the receiver of scientific data to either accept or reject the outcome based on the statistical probability of correctness. Let’s explore this scientific methodology.

All humans can make observations of phenomena but only scientists (all people seeking the truth) do it with curiosity. It is this quality of curiosity which leads to the recognition of problems and resolutions.

If the problem is to be addressed scientifically, it must be accessible to data collection methods which can be quantified. If the problem can be studied scientifically, a hypothesis must be formulated which offers a tentative answer to the problem before any experimentation begins. However, it must be noted that a hypothesis is based upon certain assumptions which are believed to be true but have not withstood the rigors of scientific inquiry. Thus the hypothesis, by its construct, is fundamentally a weak basis for making decisions or predictions.

To elevate confidence in one’s decision-making skills and predicative value, the scientist must design an experiment which can test the hypothesis by quantifying and comparing the data collected from the unknown (the variable) to a known set of values (the control).

If the data collected is statistically significant and can support the hypothesis, the hypothesis is said to be accepted; sometimes described as a confirmed hypothesis. If the data does not support the hypothesis, it must be rejected or at least modified and perhaps retested.

When the hypothesis is supported and accepted after data analysis, the study is often published in a peer reviewed journal where it can be scrutinized by other interested scientists. If other scientists are able to replicate the original findings, the prefix “hypo” can be dropped allowing hypothesis to be elevated to a theory. The more replications obtained, confidence in the theory increases thus providing greater predictive value. For example, after many trial studies researching the effects of the active ingredient in aspirin, (acetylsalicylic acid) on headaches and other body pain, it can be concluded that consuming aspirin is a good predictor for relieving pain and headaches.

Keep in mind, theories are developed in controlled laboratory settings and are designed to test a variable compared to a control in a certain known population sample. Usually, the laboratory sample is believed to represent a larger real world population group. When the laboratory experimental outcome is used to generalize to the
larger population it represents, the confidence in the decision-making process and predictive value may be reduced. The laboratory population being tested is likely to be more homogeneous than the larger general population to which the generalization is being applied. The greater heterogeneity of the larger world population will likely introduce more variables than were controlled for in the laboratory which can potentially reduce the efficacy of the laboratory findings. Therefore, science will always be an ongoing venture, observing and testing new information detected or discovered in the larger environment.

In the polygraph milieu, decision making is based on well established and widely accepted psychophysiological principles established by that scientific discipline. Specifically, cognitive and emotional assessment of novel stimuli will generate selective vegetative responses (cardiovascular, respiratory and skin conductance) which can be recorded easily with non-invasive transducers.

Over recent years, based on these psychophysiological principles, many polygraph hypotheses have been proposed, tested and replicated to become theories in polygraph science. In the view of many polygraph researchers, when a subject is presented with question stimuli perceived with differential jeopardy, measurable vegetative responses can be recorded and evaluated leading to truthful or deceptive decision making. From this theoretical base, the Zone Comparison Test (ZCT) and the Concealed Information Test (CIT) were birthed and withstood a high degree of critical scientific scrutiny.

In summary and conclusion, if polygraph is to be considered a profession, its practitioners must subscribe to scientific methodologies in pursuit of the truth which begin with statistical evidence in support of a polygraph hypothesis. If the methodology can be replicated by others, a theory is formed which becomes the basis for scientific polygraph decision making.
Post Conviction Sex Offender Testing

Raymond Nelson

answers to Sep/Oct 2009 puzzle
“Sex offenders can be required to submit to computerized voice stress analysis as part of their post-release supervision to determine if they are telling the truth, a federal court has ruled.”

*New York Law Journal* - 10/08/09

The issue is not voice stress analysis v. polygraph. The issue is single channel v. multi-channel instrumentation. There are four significant cases which address the reliability of single channel instruments used to detect deception.

In the mid 18th century, Luigi Galvani was experimenting with ‘animal electricity’ in frogs. Today, Galvanic Skin Reaction/Response (GSR) can be observed and recorded. Today, science can demonstrate a reliable relationship between a controlled stimulus and variable GSR conductivity.

In the late 19th century, Cesare Lombroso was recording the changes in blood pressure of suspects during questioning using a “hydrosphygmograph.” Today, science can demonstrate a reliable relationship between a controlled stimulus and cardiovascular reaction.

In the early 20th century, Vittorio Benussi designed an apparatus that recorded the tidal volume of human lungs. Today, science can demonstrate a reliable relationship between a controlled stimulus and pulmonary tidal volume.

Voice Stress Analysis (CVSA) is a single channel instrument with origins in the early 1970’s. “The presence or absence of stress in voice modulation may be a valid and reliable indicator or deception if used in conjunction with a multi-channel instrument . . . The PSE as a lie detector performed at random chance . . .”¹ Then, as today, there is no science that can demonstrate a reliable relationship between a controlled stimulus and voice stress.

There are no independent studies that support the validity and reliability of any single channel instrument used alone for the purpose of detection of deception.

The past thirty years have produced independent studies that support the validity and reliability of multi-channel instruments; which, when used for the purpose of detection of deception by individuals whose training, education and experience, qualifies them to express an opinion.

A General Acceptance Rule for the 21st Century “We think the computerized voice stress test when used alone has not yet gained such standing and scientific recognition among physiological and psychological authorities as would justify the courts in admitting expert testimony deduced from the discovery, development and experiments thus far made.”

Court of Common Sense, 2009

They walk among us. If the courts wish to jeopardize the public safety by releasing sex offenders based upon opinion derived from an unproven single channel instrument, so be it. However, the efficacy of ‘single channel lie detection’ should never be proven by the rape of a child.

Michael Lynch, the author of this article, is a Primary Instructor with Marston Polygraph Academy. He can be reached at mlynch@lawyerspolygraph.com. The opinions and comments expressed in this article do not necessarily reflect those of Marston Polygraph Academy or the American Polygraph Association.
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BASIC POLYGRAPH COURSE

Session I – January 11 – March 5, 2010
Session II - March 29 – May 21, 2010
Special Session – April 5 – May 28, 2010 Lafayette, Indiana
Session III – September 20 – November 12, 2010

The MICJ polygraph program has been fully accredited by the APA since 1976. The course focus is on testing techniques most widely used by the US Army CID including numerical chart scoring, MZCT [Zone], Army MGQT, AFMGQT, POT and R/I for Applicant Screening by Instructors with over 150 years of experience.

The course meets ASTM Standards and is Approved by the AAPP and for Veterans Benefits

Call, Fax or email for booklet and enrollment information
SEE THE MICJ WEB SITE FOR ADDITIONAL DETAILS

APA APPROVED ADVANCED TRAINING

Post Convicted Sex Offender Testing Course
40-hour Course Dates:

November 16 - 20, 2009
March 8 – 12, & November 15 - 19, 2010

The basic 40-hour course for all polygraph examiners.
APA members may take the APA Examination to obtain APA PCSOT Certification.

FOR SALE: “Polygraph Test Question Source Book” by Billy H. Thompson
$22.00 [includes priority postage & handling]

“Nonverbal Communications…An Investigator’s Guide,” 2d Ed.
by Vickie T. Murphy-Carr, $31.00 [includes postage & handling]
MasterCard/Visa accepted – 1-800 493-8181

MARYLAND INSTITUTE OF CRIMINAL JUSTICE
P. O. Box 458, Millersville, MD 21108-0458
Email: mdmicj@aol.com - Web Site: www.micj.com
AMERICAN International INSTITUTE OF POLYGRAPH

Accredited by the American Polygraph Association
Recognized by the American Association of Police Polygraphists

WHEN QUALITY COUNTS!

Professional Polygraph Examiner Training. Curriculum and training methods based on Federal training and experience with the Army Criminal Investigations Command and the Department of Defense Polygraph Institute. Training programs have an overall objective of providing the knowledge, skills and ability to professionally administer polygraph exams.

Schedule 1: TRADITIONAL TEN (10) WEEKS IN RESIDENCE
Schedule 2 & 3: EIGHT WEEKS IN RESIDENCE & TWO WEEKS EARNED

- We provide polygraph equipment for training. Try it before you buy it.
  * Lafayette   * Axciton   * Limestone   * Stoelting

- Experienced faculty using effective training methods. Less talk, more action.

- Video recorded laboratory exercises. Learn by doing.

2010 Class Start Dates

<table>
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<tr>
<th>January 4</th>
<th>March 22</th>
<th>April 12</th>
<th>June 7</th>
<th>August 30</th>
<th>September 27</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>Ohio / 8 week</td>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>South Africa</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Director & Primary Instructor—Charles (Chuck) E. Slupski

Primary Instructor – Allan E. Stein
Army CID Examiner & Polygraph Instructor at US Army Polygraph School

Primary Instructor – Robbie Frederick
Police Examiner & Polygraph Instructor

Primary Instructor – Rick W. Kurtz
Polygraph Program Manager, Police Examiner and Polygraph Instructor

Primary Instructor – Mark D. Handler
Former Police Examiner, Author / Researcher and Polygraph Instructor

Professional facility with large classroom and nine (9) audio-video recorded laboratory rooms.

Mail to: P.O. Box 686, Morrow, GA 30260-0686
Location: 1115 Mt. Zion Road, Suite F, Morrow (Atlanta), Georgia
Email: AIIP@Qpolygraph.com  Phone: (866) 477-5180  Fax: (770) 960-1355
www.polygraphschool.com
Validity and Reliability in Polygraph Testing - What if?

Mark Handler, Raymond Nelson & Marty Oelrich

Professionals in the field of psychophysiological detection of deception (PDD; polygraph), struggle at times to affirm themselves as members of the social or forensic sciences. PDD practitioners have been described as people who believe in their testing procedures leaving room to infer that PDD testing lacks scientific support. There is little doubt that most in our profession would prefer to be considered professionals by those with whom we interact. This would include: scientists from other disciplines, judges, attorneys, police investigators, psychologists, agency administrators and our examinees.

An interesting paradox is that too many discussions of the validity of PDD testing commonly center on the credentials of the practitioner, including education, training, and experience, but shy away from difficult discussion about scientific details pertaining to dimensional characteristics of test accuracy, normative data and decision theoretic complexities. Respect and acceptance from professionals in related fields of science and adjacent professions will be inevitable when PDD professionals more consistently respond to questions and information requests with factual knowledge based on the empirical study of normative data, including descriptions of distribution shapes and confidence intervals. What will remain unimpressive to professionals outside of PDD is a disinterest, apathy, or antipathy toward matters of science and test theory, as well as attitudes indicative of ignorance and insecurity towards matters of scientific competence among polygraph professionals.

Professional maturation requires more than assertive talk, hyperbole and reliance on anecdotal cases. Mature professional discourse is factual and descriptive. Metaphoric discussion, while useful to teaching and dissemination tasks, is never allowed to replace the need for factual descriptions. Gaining the respect of others outside of polygraph will require a continued commitment to professional development. Fortunately a successful evolutionary model need not be constructed from the ground up. We can, and should, rely on the collective work of other related disciplines in developing things like expanded professional and technical vocabularies, ethics declarations, standards of practice and operating rules of practice in an effort to further account for ourselves and our work.

Our goals in this paper are not so grandiose as to suggest we can tackle all of our perceived problems at once. Nor do we emphatically assert that our offerings here are the final solution to any particular concern we address. Instead, we suggest as a starting point for discussion one area, that of validity and reliability of PDD testing within the context of evaluation, testing and reporting results using normative data that represent the population in known and describable ways.

Much has been made through the years of which techniques are “valid” or “validated” and how “accurate” a particular examination or technique may be. We have no argument, whatsoever, with the need to understand just how well our examination protocols and scoring conventions perform. After all, accountability in data and measurement are the things that will continue to separate us from vulnerability to the same concerns which we level at the proponents of voice stress technologies. Little regard has been paid, however, to the idea that a single numerical index that purports to describe performance is inherently inadequate. Barring extreme values, using one number to describe “accuracy” is unlikely to well inform an end user of the test’s potential. Instead, accuracy, in many discussions, refers to a composite of overall decision accuracy along with other dimensions such as
inconclusive rates for truthful and deceptive persons, sensitivity to deception, specificity to truthfulness, false-positive and false-negative error rates and predictive indices calculated as conditional probability statements.

A seemingly obvious statement is that end users, or consumers, of PDD testing should employ the examination and results responsibly. Perhaps less apparent is the concept that PDD examiners may have a responsibility to more effectively educate our consumers to understand and explain the strengths and weaknesses of the examination protocols we employ. It goes without saying that one test cannot fit all circumstances. There is converging evidence that suggests effective guidelines for the selection of examination techniques that will optimally pursue the objectives of different examination contexts. Field examiners and program managers should all become familiar with those bodies of PDD research that inform us of which PDD approach works best, and when. PDD practitioners will ultimately be expected to account for and anticipate the complications presented by exceptional individuals. We stand to gain the respect of professionals and professional ethicists when we more clearly define the populations represented by our normative data, and acknowledge and account for outliers and marginally suitable test subjects.

In order to be able to fulfill our ethical and scientific responsibilities, examiners may have to work to increase their vocabulary and understanding about test related phenomena. Learning terms and concepts like; sensitivity, specificity, true and false positive index, positive and negative predictive values, alpha and p-values will improve examiners understandings of the tradeoffs involved in PDD testing. Mastery of these conceptual topics will begin to melt the biased perceptions that scientific minded PDD opponents have attempted to endorse. Similarly, having a clearer understanding of decision theoretic principles, including signal detection theory, information gained index and base rates, will allow examiners to better advise the consumers of PDD testing about the results of a test and recommended actions to be taken.

Polygraph associations should seek out individuals capable of presenting these concepts in a clear and accessible manner so practitioners are comfortable discussing them among themselves and with others outside of the profession. Polygraph schools teaching basic PDD courses should seek to incorporate these notions into the core curriculum to imbue the new examiner with a fundamental understanding of potential strengths and limitations of their newly chosen profession. Adopting a greater commitment and appreciation for scientific accountability will serve to raise the professional bar and should promote increased respect from outside of the polygraph community.

So, what if we attempt to ground our standards of practice in a language of accountability? What if we could do so without telling one another what test format one must use? What if instead we inspected each exam and scoring convention for the correct use of the concepts and principles inherent to scientific testing? What if we agree to continue to improve our dialogue and understanding of our choice in technique? What if we choose to treat one another as professionals by setting standards that are responsible and reasonable still allowing the examiner the flexibility to choose a technique based on what they can defend by a neutral and unwavering presentation of the scientific evidence?

Maybe our standards might include language like this;

(b) Reliability and Validity.

(1) PDD examiners should ensure they assess each examinee’s suitability (e.g. psychologically, developmentally, medically, etc.), the appropriateness of examination techniques used, as well as the generalizability and potential limitations of test results. PDD examiners should understand factors that may reduce the reliability of PDD examinations. This would include; examinee characteristics (e.g. psychological or developmental), characteristics of test administration (e.g. non-standardized procedures), characteristics of the environment in which the examination is conducted, and characteristics or behavior of the PDD examiner.

(2) PDD examiners should administer, score, interpret or utilize PDD techniques, test data evaluation protocols, components and instruments in a manner and for purposes for which there are professional or scientific bases.

(3) PDD examiners should administer, score, interpret or use PDD techniques and test data evaluation protocols only if they are familiar with their sensitivity, specificity, inconclusive rates, reliability of scoring, validation and related standardization or outcome studies of, and proper applications and use thereof. PDD examiners who use examination techniques which have no empirical support should advise potential examinees and denote so in written reports. Additionally PDD examiners
should identify potential limitations, such as unknown sensitivity, specificity, reliability, validity, or error rates to consumers of the particular examination.

What if, just as a step towards growth, we agreed to abide by these three simple principles? What effect could that have on the polygraph profession? We argue that our profession as a whole would grow intellectually and as a result be a more informed service provider. We believe we would be in a stronger position to serve the consumers of PDD testing. The inevitable effect of these advances is that scientists and professionals outside of the PDD testing will find little to criticize and they will begin to acknowledge polygraph professionals as responsible members of the behavioral sciences. Most importantly we would hold the profession accountable to our examinees for the tools and techniques we employ.

What if?

The opinions expressed in this paper represent only those of the authors, and do not necessarily represent the views of the APA or the authors’ employers.

---

**Tech Bit**

by Gregg Marshall

Recycling Your Electronics

My daughter works for Whole Foods. As a college aged person, she has enthusiastically embraced the save the world ethos many young people have. We’re now using reusable shopping bags and recycling our plastic, glass and metal.

Technology moves fast. I have been recommending people look at computer purchases like office supplies instead of capital expenditures required by the IRS for 20 years. If you look at your computer as a capital asset you tend to live with outdated technology too long. Given the cost of powerful systems, both desktop and portable, it is easy to justify replacing your system every year or two based solely on productivity improvements.

That leaves you with a dilemma. What do you do with the outdated equipment?

The obvious first solution is trickle down. Use your old system to upgrade another employee. Use that employee’s system to upgrade another employee, etc.

If it is still working, donate it to a school or non-profit. Just because you’ve moved on to an upgraded system doesn’t mean it isn’t more than powerful enough to support word processing and/or Internet surfing. Or give it to an employee to take home. We did that a lot in my old company. I figured that time spent on a home computer increased the employee’s working knowledge of computers and made them more productive at work.

If you do give your old system to someone else, remember to securely erase the hard drive first. You don’t want sensitive information leaking out. Don’t just delete the files, do a full DOD erase with a program like Eraser (http://heidi.ie/eraser/).

If your electronic “junk” isn’t working, or is so old that it can’t be donated, don’t just throw it away. Most electronics contains toxic materials and valuable metals that need to be reclaimed. Two resources for recycling electronics are:

http://www.myboneyard.com
http://www.gcycle.org

Remember, don’t just dispose of electronics--find a way to recycle them instead. Planet Earth will thank you.

Gregg Marshall, CPMR, CSP, is a speaker, author and consultant. He can be reached by e-mail at gmarshall@repconnection.com, or visit his website at http://www.repconnection.com.
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