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.

NORTH AMERICA: 856.765.9770 (toll free)
INTERNATIONAL: 011.613.634.2594
E-mail: sales@limestonetech.com
Website: www.limestonetech.com
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Deadlines

This issue closed on January 7, 2011.

Deadline for March/April, 2011 issue is March 7, 2011.

Submission of Articles

The APA Magazine is published by the American Polygraph Association. The mere publication of an article, new item, or notice in this Magazine does not constitute an endorsement by the American Polygraph Association. Advertising and Editorial address is APA Editor, P.O. Box 10411, Fort Jackson, SC 29207, USA. Subscription address is: APA, P.O. Box 8037, Chattanooga, TN 37414-0037. Subscription rate is US $125.00, mailed first class. Outside US $150.00, mailed first class. Changes of address should be sent to: APA, P.O. Box 8037, Chattanooga, TN 37414-0037. The Publisher is not responsible for issues not received because of improper address information. Submission of polygraph-related newspaper articles should be sent to: Don Krapohl, P.O. Box 10411, Fort Jackson, SC 29207 or Editor@polygraph.org.
This is in response to Bill Teigen’s comments published in the Nov/Dec 2010 APA Magazine.

Mr. Tieigen indicated that “marital (fidelity) testing” was not on his list of “preferred professionalism” and that this type of testing is not necessary in our profession.

To many examiners, fidelity testing represents a significant portion of their income. While some examiners find this work distasteful, many others have learned how to handle these exams in a professional manner. Tens of thousands of couples have had relationship issues resolved satisfactorily through PDD testing.

Exams for relationship issues are very similar to PCSOT exams. Instead of asking “Did you have sexual contact with someone under 18 years of age” we ask “Did you have sexual contact with anyone other than your spouse?” The test format is essentially the same. The concern that most examiners seem to have is the volatility of the situation in general and the intense emotions that must be dealt with when interacting with the client.

These can easily be mitigated by following a few simple guidelines, such as not offering relationship advice, and not providing test results at the time of the exam.

A 24-hour cooling down period is reasonable.

Mr. Teigen also indicated that fidelity testing generates more than its share of APA ethics complaints. This is understandable given the emotionality of the parties involved. However, these complaints can be minimized if the exam is done to APA standards and the appropriate releases are signed. I personally don’t care if a complaint is filed against me because I will have all the appropriate and necessary documentation to support my findings.

The only problems I see with fidelity testing are the examiners who take shortcuts by running abbreviated tests, asking inappropriate (subjective or inflammatory) test questions, attempting to provide counseling or relationship advise, and rendering decisions that are not supported by the data collected. If we just do our job the way we were taught, the problems tend not to materialize.

Fidelity exams can be done as accurately and professionally as any other type of exam. Just like when EPPA was being debated, most examiners believed we should improve the quality of the exam rather than outlaw its existence. We see how well that went. Of course, if we eliminate fidelity testing, these clients can always turn to VSA.

- R. Michael Martin

Q. According to published research studies with large samples of field cases, Father Summers (1936, 1938) reported what level of accuracy using his Pathometer (early electrodermal device) Method in the detection of deception?

A. 80%  
B. 90%  
C. 95%  
D. 98%  
E. 100%  

(answer on page 29)
Welcome to a new year, and what a year it will be for the APA. As detailed in the reports of the Board of Directors, the next 12 month will mark an exciting transition period for the organization. Election of APA officers will take place electronically for the first time this summer, opening wider opportunities for APA members to choose their leadership regardless of where they live. Also, members may self nominate for office for the first time, thereby removing any barriers to service on the Board for those who choose to run. Also, the APA Magazine will go all-electronic soon. Members will get their APA Magazine weeks earlier (or more for some members) than can be done in the paper format. This says nothing for the significant cost savings with electronic publications, a portion of which will be reallocated to a targeted public relations effort.

This year will also be a year of preparation. On January 1, 2012 all APA members must use testing methods that are supported by published research, a longstanding standard in forensic science, psychology, medicine, and other fields that use tests. While most APA members are already in compliance, the APA is doing what it can to help others who may not be familiar with these testing methods. Seminar Chair Mike Gougler has developed a seminar schedule in which the scientifically supported methods will be taught. Every effort will be put into place to help examiners who wish to adopt evidence-based practices. It is good for the profession, good for those whom we serve, and good to our public image.

And finally, we are still seeking articles for publication on courtroom testimony for a special edition of Polygraph. Please send them electronically to me at editor@polygraph.org.
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If your association has election of officers or other important announcements, please notify the APA Magazine. Send them to: Editor@polygraph.org
In Memoriam

William R. Warner

The APA regrets to announce the passing of William R. Warner on December 4, 2010, Salinas, California, at the age of 62.

He received his polygraph examiner’s license in 1985 and soon after started Bill Warner Polygraph which he owned and operated for over 20 years.

He was an APA member since January 9, 1986.
IMPORTANT NOTICE

2011 Elections and Electronic Voting

The 2011 elections will be conducted via electronic voting, as determined by membership at the 2010 American Polygraph Association (APA) Seminar. According to the APA By-Laws (updated through September 18, 2010), “Any member qualified under Division V of the By Laws to hold APA elected office may have his or her name appear on the ballot if nominated by at least one voting member of the Association. A voting member may self-nominate.” Nominations and self-nominations must be sent to the APA National Office or via email to the National Office Manager Robbie Bennett at: manager@polygraph.org. Any form of written communication (e.g., electronic, facsimile, etc.) is acceptable, provided the communication can be authenticated, if necessary, as that of a voting member. The offices open for election include:

President Elect
Vice President Government
Vice President Law Enforcement
Vice President Private
Director 4

All nominations must be received no later than May 1, 2011.

Nominations received after May 1, 2011 will not be included in the electronic ballot. Nominees should submit a packet which includes a cover letter and a statement of up to 500 words regarding their goals for the office in which they seek election. The statement will be attached to the electronic ballot. The dates for the electronic elections are as follow:

June 1, 2011 The electronic ballot will open. The ballot will remain open for seven calendar days. Please note that your login will be your last name and your password will be your membership ID number.

June 7, 2011 The electronic ballot will close.

Your membership number is provided on the mailing label of this magazine.

Instructions regarding accessing the ballot will be sent to you via email the week prior to the ballot opening. This email will also include the website link you will need to visit in order to access the electronic ballot. Do not delete this email. If you do not have an email address on file with the APA National Office you will not receive this message. Please contact Robbie Bennett at manager@polygraph.org or by phone at (800) 272-8037 if your email address is not on file. Though you do not need an email address to vote, your email address will be used for correspondence and instructions regarding the voting process. Similar instruction will also be published in the March/April APA Magazine.

The candidates will be notified within 48 hours of the close of the election. The results will then be published on both the public and private portion of the website. The vote count will only be published on the private portion of the website. If no candidate for a given office wins 50% of the vote for the office, a runoff election will be conducted two weeks after the close of the first ballot. The dates for the runoff election, if necessary, will be:

June 21, 2011 The electronic ballot will open. The ballot will remain open for seven calendar days.

June 27, 2011 The electronic ballot will close. The same procedures for notification will be followed as describes above for the initial ballot.

If you have any questions regarding the electoral process or the electronic elections, please contact the Electronic Elections Committee Chair, Marty Oelrich, at: website@polygraph.org or (480) 577-5355.
Announcement from APA Member Tuvia Shurany

Dear Colleagues

At the last APA seminar there were two proposals by an international member: One to create a position of International Vice President to the APA and the other to change the Association’s name to APA International. Neither proposal was approved by the attending members.

The APA President, Mr. Nate Gordon, understands the importance of the representation of the international members and their needs, and he established an international committee. I have been asked to Chair this committee.

In order to serve and raise the needs of the international members I hereby ask you to send me all requests and thoughts regarding the needs or improvements of the APA for the international committee or for all.

I can be reached with the following e-mail addresses: tuvia@liecatcher.com, and Shurany@gmail.com.

With best wishes for the coming year.

- Tuvia Shurany

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. Please send electronic copies to Editor@polygraph.org, or to PO Box 10411, Ft. Jackson, SC 29207.

Upgrading Membership Classifications from 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, 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

If you have any problems or questions regarding your membership, please call the National Office Manager at 800/272-8037 or 423/892-3992.
Lafayette Instrument Company is proud to present the new

**LX5000-SW All in One Computerized Polygraph System**

The LX5000 System combines Lafayette's newest hardware innovations with its renowned LXSoftware features. Its powerful new adjustments will improve the usability of data beyond what has been presented in the past, providing the field examiner with superior results! The LX5000 provides you with the following benefits:

- A total of nine channels can be recorded at one time
- Data transfer rate up to 360 samples per second across all channels
- 24-bit analog to digital conversion
- Wired USB connectivity
- Small, compact design making transport and storage easy
- Expandable: can add up to 3 additional modules
- Extended measurement ranges
- PPG and Activity Seat Sensor included
- Durable, yet lightweight design
- EDA Redesign: 6 EDA Choices (GSR or GSC - manual/tilt table, detrended, and automatic modes)

**LXSoftware v 11.0 New Features**

- Compatible with Windows XP, Vista, or Windows 7
- Multi-Camera Support: supports as many cameras as your computer will support
  - Timestamp with date included on video
  - Bookmark/Event Recording Capability on audio/video
  - Take subject's photo while video is recording
- Polygraph Reference: contains a collection of articles on various polygraph-related subjects
- Customizable Personal History and Exam/Series forms
- Simplified Customizable Final Reports
- Attach external documents to polygraph files
- New Scripting Capabilities
- Data Export Feature
- Save Polygraph Files and all other documents as PDF format
- Email Polygraph Files
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
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

Students can earn up to 12 hours of undergraduate credit while completing training.
Polygraph Examiner
Training Schedule

Academy for Scientific Investigative Training
March 14 - May 6, 2011
May 16 - July 8, 2011
September 12 - November 4, 2011

Advanced Polygraph
November 15 - 16, 2011

PCSOT
March 7 - 22, 2011
May 9 - 13, 2011
July 11 - 15, 2011
November 7 - 11, 2011

Advanced PCSOT
July 18 - 19, 2011

Backster School of Lie Detection
June 6 - July 29, 2011
September 12 - November 4, 2011

PCSOT
March 21 - 25, 2011 (tentative)
November 7 - 11, 2011 (tentative)

Advanced PCSOT
March 25 - 28, 2011 (tentative)
November 12 - 14, 2011 (tentative)

American International Institute of Polygraph
March 14 - May 20, 2011 (South Africa)
April 11 - June 3, 2011 (Kentucky)
May 23 - July 29, 2011 (10 weeks)
May 23 - July 15, 2010 (8 weeks)
August 29 - November 4, 2010 (10 weeks)
August 29 - October 21, 2011 (8 weeks)
September 26 - December 2, 2011 (South Africa)

Marston Polygraph Academy
May 9 – July 1, 2011
September 12 – November 4, 2011

Maryland Institute of Criminal Justice
April 4 - May 27, 2011
September 12 - November 4, 2011

PCSOT
March 7 - 11, 2011
November 7 - 11, 2011

Arizona School of Polygraph Science
March 7 - April 29, 2011
September 26 - November 18, 2011
January 23 - March 16, 2012

National Center for Credibility Assessment
April 26 - July 27, 2011
August 16 - November 17, 2011

ASTM Standards on Campus lets instructors bring ASTM Standards to the classroom easily and affordably. Professors can register their course online and select up to 10 ASTM standards for using in their course or curriculum. Students download the standards package for just $10. Ten ASTM Standards for $10 – the best deal on campus! Log on to http://www.astm.org/studentmember/Access_by_Course.html for details!
**ADVANCED RESERVATION REQUIRED**

**AMERICAN POLYGRAPH ASSOCIATION**

**HILTON AUSTIN**

500 EAST 4TH STREET, AUSTIN TX 78701

(All room reservations must be made individually through the Hotel's reservation department by calling 1-800-236-1592. **(Ask for the group rate for APA)**

---

**APA FED ID # 52-1035722**

Plan now to attend the APA 46th Annual Seminar/Workshop, **SEPTEMBER 11 – 16, 2011**

**Room rate:** $104.00 Single/Double occupancy, plus taxes (currently 15% tax) **SELF PARKING - $8.00 PER/DAY**

**CUTOFF DATE for hotel reservations is 08/15/11 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: Michael C. Gougler-512-466-0471

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, 2011.

**Registration Hours** – Sunday, 9/11/11 (10:00 am-6:00 pm)

**On-Site** – Monday, 9/12/11 (8:00 am -12:00 Noon)

**Seminar Sessions** – Monday-Friday, 9/12/11 – 9/16/11

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 08/25/11** for applicable discount. Payment information and registration received after 08/25/11 will be charged the on-site fee.

---

**NAME**

**ADDRESS**

**CITY/STATE**

**ZIP**

**NAME OF GUEST(S)**

**CHILDREN/AGES**

**NAME BADGE (CALLED BY)**

**GUEST (CALLED BY)**

---

**PRE PAID BY AUGUST 25, 2011**

$350 – Member/Applicant

$350 – TALEPI Member

$475 – Member/Applic W/Guest

$125 – Additional Guest

$500 – Non-Member

$625 – Non-Member W/Guest

**FEE RECEIVED AFTER AUGUST 25, 2011**

$400 – Member/Applicant

$400 – TALEPI Member

$525 – Member/Applic W/Guest

$175 – Additional Guest

$550 – Non-Member

$675 – Non-Member W/Guest

**ADDITIONAL $50.00 FOR WALK-INS**

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

---

**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_________________________________________________________2011**

---

**APA Cancellations Refund Policy:**

Cancellations received in writing prior to **08/25/11** will receive a full refund. Persons canceling after **08/25/11** will not receive a refund but will be provided with the handout material.

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

**Tax Deductions:**

All expenses of continuing education (including registration fees, travel, meals and lodging) taken to maintain and improve professional skills are tax deductible subject to the limitations set forth in the Internal Revenue Code.

(The registration fee includes professional instruction, seminar materials, AM and PM Refreshment Breaks)

All reservations must be guaranteed by a major credit card or advance deposit in the amount of one night’s lodging. Reservations not guaranteed will be automatically cancelled at the cut-off date.

---

**THE SALT LICK BBQ**

**TUESDAY SEPTEMBER 13**

**BUSES LEAVE HOTEL AT 4:00 PM**

Must ride bus

All You Can Eat BBQ served buffet style, includes beef brisket, pork ribs, sausage, and chicken, coleslaw, potato salad, beans, bread, butter, pickles, onions, self-serve iced tea, water, and coffee, peach and/or blackberry cobbler with ice cream

---

**NAME BADGE**

**BUSINESS PHONE**

---

# TICKETS @$15.00 = ___________
Upcoming Seminars

The New Mexico Society of Forensic Polygraphers and The American Polygraph Association will co-host a continuing education seminar on **16-18 February, 2011**, in Albuquerque, NM. Accommodations will be at the Hyatt Regency Albuquerque, 330 Tijeras, NW, Albuquerque, NM. For further details and registration see pages 18-19 of this magazine.

The California Association of Polygraph Examiners (CAPE) will be holding a training seminar on **February 25-26, 2011**, at the Portola Hotel and Spa, Two Portola Plaza, Monterey, CA 93940. A special room rate of $129 single/double is available for seminar attendees, and reservations can be made by calling the hotel at 888-222-5851. Seminar fee is: CAPE members - $100/one day or $175/both days; Non-members - $150/one day or $250/both days. For complete conference details and registrations forms, visit the CAPE website at: www.californiapolygraph.com, or contact CAPE secretary, Bob Heard, at capesecretary@aol.com.

The 2011 Annual Seminar of the American Association of Police Polygraphists is scheduled for **March 28 - April 1 in Cambridge, MA, at the Hyatt Regency Cambridge, 575 Memorial Drive, Cambridge, MA 02139-4896, Phone: (617) 492-1234**. The AAPP hotel group rate is $105.00 plus tax. If paid before February 28th, the seminar fees are $285.00 (AAPP members) and $410.00 (non-members). Registration inquiries can be made through the AAPP National Office (888) 743-5479. For more details visit the AAPP website, or contact Region III Director / Seminar Chair Jim Wardwell at (860) 826-3065 or e-mail Director3@policepolygraph.org.

Polygraph Advanced Countermeasure Course April 4 - April 8, 2011. This 40-hour course is presented by the National Center for Credibility Assessment (NCCA). It is open only to law enforcement polygraph examiners. The tuition for this course is $250.00. Meals may be obtained at the Texas Department of Public Safety (DPS) Training Academy for $10.00 per day. There is no lodging available at the DPS Training Academy; however, rooms are available at a local Extended Stay Hotel - Austin Metro located at 6300 US Highway 290 East, Austin, Texas, 78723, for $39.00 per night. For more information, contact Felicia Ruiz at (512) 424-5024.

The Tennessee Polygraph Association presents its 2011 Polygraph Seminar on **April 19 - April 22, 2011** at the Mainstay Suites in Pigeon Forge, TN. Room rate is $69/night and can be reserved by calling the hotel at 865-428-8350. Seminar fee is $175 before April 1st; $200 at the door. Topics will include child sex abuse testing, child physical abuse testing, countermeasures, post test interrogation, testifying in court, ethics and PCSOT. For more information, contact Jeff White at 615-384-8422 or by email at jawhite86@yahoo.com.

On **June 3rd and 4th** the Florida Polygraph Association (FPA) will hold its Summer Seminar at the beautiful **Melbourne Beach Hilton Oceanfront Hotel in Indialantic, FL**. Room rates are $99.00 when reservations are made before May 15th. Ben Blalock will present on Test Data Analysis on June 3rd and Steve Duncan will discuss Polygraph Ethics on June 4th. For cost and other information please visit the FPA website at floridapolygraphassociation.com.
WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 16, 2011

11:00 AM  LATE REGISTRATION

1:00 PM  OPENING CEREMONIES:
          KATHY FULLER, PRESIDENT
          NEW MEXICO SOCIETY OF FORENSIC POLYGRAPHERS

1:15 – 5:00 PM  COUNTERMEASURES
                STEVEN D. DUNCAN
                GEORGIA DEPT OF PUBLIC SAFETY (SID)

3:00 -3:15 PM  BREAK

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 17, 2011

ATTORNEY F. LEE BAILEY AND GORDON L. VAUGHAN

8:00 AM – 10:00 AM  LEGAL ISSUES AFFECTING POLYGRAPH ADMISSIBILITY
9:30 AM – 9:45 AM  BREAK
10:00 AM - 12:00 NOON  LAYING PROPER FOUNDATION
12:00 NOON – 1:15 PM  LUNCH ON YOUR OWN
1:15 PM – 3:15 PM  MOOT COURT
3:15 PM -  3:30 PM  BREAK
3:30 PM -  5:00 PM  SMALL GROUP TESTIMONY WORKSHOP

FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 18, 2011

8:00 AM – 12:00 NOON  SETTING CONTROLS
                      CHAD RUSSELL, APA TREASURER

9:45 AM – 10:00 AM  BREAK

12:00 PM –  1:15 PM  LUNCH ON YOUR OWN

1:15 PM -  5:00 PM  POST-TEST INTERVIEWING
                    STEVEN D. DUNCAN
                    GEORGIA DEPT OF PUBLIC SAFETY (SID)

3:00 PM -  3:15 PM  BREAK

NOTE:

“...The presentations of the speakers and the materials at this seminar are designed to provide general information on the seminar topics presented in an effort to help polygraph professionals maintain their professional competence. The views of the speakers and contents of the materials presented have not been approved by the Board of Directors of the American Polygraph Association (APA) and, accordingly, should not be construed as representing the policy of the American Polygraph Association. The presentations and materials provided at this seminar are provided with the understanding that the APA is not engaged in rendering professional or legal services.”
THE AMERICAN POLYGRAPH ASSOCIATION (APA)
CONTINUING EDUCATION SEMINAR
CO-SPONSOR NEW MEXICO SOCIETY OF FORENSIC POLYGRAPHERS
FEBRUARY 16, 17 & 18, 2011
ADVANCED REGISTRATION IS REQUIRED

APA FED ID # 52-1035722

FEBRUARY 16, 17 & 18, 2011
1:00 PM - 5:00 PM, WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 16
8:00 AM – 5:00 PM, THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 17
8:00 AM – 5:00 PM FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 18

CONTINUING EDUCATION SEMINAR:
COUNTERMEASURES (Steve Duncan)
LEGAL ISSUES, LAYING PROPER
FOUNDATION, MOOT COURT (Attorneys F. Lee Bailey/Gordon Vaughan)
SETTING CONTROLS (Chad Russell) and
POST TEST INTERVIEWING (Steve Duncan)

LODGING
HYATT REGENCY ALBUQUERQUE
330 TIJERAS NW
ALBUQUERQUE, NEW MEXICO 87102
$79.00 S/D, PLUS TAX 13%
To make Hotel Reservations:
CALL: 1-505-842-1234 or 1-800-272-8037
Individual Reservations - Cut-off date: 02/01/11

REGISTRATION FEE
PRE-PAID BY 02/10/11
$200.00 APA Member/Applicant and
$225.00 Non-Member
FEE RECEIVED AFTER 02/10/11
$225.00 APA Member/Applicant and
$250.00 Non-Member

**IN ORDER TO HAVE ADEQUATE
SEATING, ADVANCED REGISTRATION
IS REQUIRED**
1-800-272-8037 or 423-892-3992
FAX 423-894-5435

CONTINUING EDUCATION CREDITS
When you attend this seminar, you receive up to 20 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 2/10/11, will receive a full refund. Persons canceling after 2/10/11, will not receive a refund but will be provided with the handout material.

TAX DEDUCTIONS
All expenses of continuing education (including registration fees, travel, meals and lodging) taken to maintain and improve professional skills are tax deductible subject to the limitations set forth in the Internal Revenue Code.
(The registration fee includes professional instruction, seminar materials, AM and PM Refreshment Breaks)

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 number is on front of card)

SIGNATURE
CES-Albuquerque, New Mexico (2/16-18, 2011) (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).
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APA 2011, 2012 and 2013 Seminar Dates and Sites Set

The APA has entered into a multi-year contract with Hilton Hotels to host its Annual Seminar and General Membership Meetings for 2011, 2012 and 2013. Locations are: 2011 in Austin, Texas; 2012 in San Diego, California; and 2013 in Orlando, Florida. The Seminar dates and hotels are:

Hilton Austin
September 11 - 16, 2011

Hilton San Diego Bayfront
September 16 - 21, 2012

Orlando Hilton Bonnet Creek
September 8 -13, 2013

By negotiating a multi-year contract the APA was able to obtain very favorable concessions for APA members at some of Hilton’s newest and most prominent properties. All seminar attendees, whether government or private, will pay lodging rates based on the U.S. Government Accounting Services prevailing lodging per-diem for that area. These rates are currently, before tax: Austin ($104); San Diego ($147); and Orlando ($108). These rates are also available to attendees who wish to arrive or leave a minimum of two days before and/or after the seminar based on availability. All attendees will receive free in-room internet, free fitness center admission and discounts for parking. Resort fees, if any, will be waived for attendees. Other attendee benefits will also be offered based on the individual hotel location.

Some highlights regarding these properties are:

**Hilton Austin:** (512)482-8000.
The Hilton Austin hotel is located in down-town Austin. The hotel is only one block from Austin’s famous Sixth Street nightlife and a short stroll to the entertainment, shopping and dining in the Warehouse Entertainment District and 2nd Street District. The location is also convenient to many attractions such as the Capitol Building, Bob Bullock Texas Historical Museum, the University of Texas and the LBJ Presidential Library. The hotel is also only seven miles from Austin Bergstrom International Airport.

**Hilton San Diego Bayfront:** (619) 564-3333.
The Hilton San Diego Bayfront is a new premier hotel located in downtown San Diego along the San Diego Bay. The hotel is minutes from the San Diego International Airport and within walking distance of the vibrant Gaslamp Quarter boasting world-class shopping and dining. It is also within walking distance of the San Diego Padres’ PETCO Park and the financial district.

**Hilton Orlando Bonnet Creek:** (407) 597-3600.
The Hilton Orlando Bonnet Creek is a new world class Florida hotel which opened in the Fall of 2009. It is one of the largest hotel developments by Hilton and is adjacent to the first-ever newly built Waldorf Astoria outside of New York. It is located in a private natural setting on 482 acres and surrounded on three sides by the Walt Disney World® Resort. Complimentary shuttle service to the Walt Disney World attractions is provided by the hotel. Located on site is a championship golf course designed by Rees Jones for which attendees will receive discounted
greens fee. Also on site are unique nature preserves. There is a free form lagoon-style pool with zero entry pool and waterslide. For families there is Kids Club with supervised indoor and outdoor activities. The Hilton and the Waldorf Astoria offer a combined 12 restaurants and bars.

The APA is already planning programs and additional events for these seminars. While the APA has contracted for over 350 rooms during peek seminar dates it is anticipated that these will be will be popular seminars and that we will fill these room allotments. Early reservations are encouraged. You may make reservations for any of these seminars now by contacting the hotels at the telephone numbers provided and informing them that you are making reservations with the APA group. The hotel will require a deposit for one night to hold your reservation and will provide to you information about cancellation policies. Generally, these policies provide for a refund of the deposit for cancellations received prior to 72 hours before the scheduled arrival.

**Quotables**

*We learn more by looking for the answer to a question and not finding it than we do from learning the answer itself.*

- Lloyd Alexander

---

**Accredited Basic and Advanced Training**

By Internationally Known Polygraph Experts

---

**Nathan J. Gordon and William L. Fleisher**

- They Wrote the Book - 3rd Edition Bigger & Better!
- ASIT PolySuite Algorithm Creators
- Software Inventors
- Peer-Reviewed Scientific Research
- Teaching Around The World

---

**Academy for Scientific Investigative Training**

**Cutting-Edge Forensic Innovators**

---

**ADVANCE YOUR AGENCY, & CAREER**

- Basic Polygraph
- Advanced Polygraph
- Continuing Education
- Post Conviction Sexual Offender Training
- Proprietary Algorithms for Chart Analysis
- Forensic Assessment Interview Technique
- Integrated Zone Comparison Technique
- Horizontal Scoring System
- Manual Algorithm for Data Analysis
- Integrated Interrogation Technique
- Three DVD’s on Interview & Interrogation
- NEW SCORING SOFTWARE: ASIT Polysuite™

Now Offered by Lafayette

---

**2011 A.S.I.T. Courses**

**Polygraph 101 Basic ($4,750. US/$5,500 Abroad)**

(Academics: 8 weeks, Post-Grad: Two Weeks)

Jan. 10 – Mar. 4; Mar. 14 – May 6; May 16 – Jul. 8; Sept. 12 – Nov. 4

**Advanced Polygraph ($450.00)**

Nov. 14 and 15

**Post Conviction (PCSOT) ($600.)**

Mar. 7 – 11; May 9 – 13; Jul. 11 – 15; Nov. 7 – 11

**Advanced PCSOT ($450.)**

July 18 – 19

**Forensic Assessment Interviewing and Integrated Interrogation Techniques ($600.)**

Jan. 24 – 28; Mar. 28 – Apr. 1; May 30 – June 3; Sept. 25 – 30

---

© Copyright 2010 A.S.I.T. All rights reserved.
The American Polygraph Association presents
The 46th Annual Seminar/Workshop

Austin, Texas
September 11 - 16, 2011

Michael C. Gougler, Chair

“Validated Polygraph Principles and Techniques: Attaining the Goal.”
### Monday, September 12, 2011

**Classroom A**

**8:00 – 10:00**

**Opening Ceremonies**

- Call to Order – Nathan Gordon, APA President
- Master of Ceremonies – Michael Gougler, Director
- Presentation of Colors – DPS Texas Honor Guard
- The National Anthem – Brian Vaughan, President of TALEPI
- Pledge of Allegiance – Pam Shaw, President-Elect APA
- Bag Pipes and Drums – Barry Cushman
- Invocation – Pam Shaw
- Welcome to Austin, Texas – Steve McCraw, Director of Texas DPS

**10:00 am – Noon**

General Session – Valid Polygraph Principles – Don Krapohl & Donnie Dutton

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classroom A</th>
<th>Classroom B</th>
<th>Classroom C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1:00 – 3:00 pm</td>
<td>1:00 – 5:00 pm</td>
<td>1:00 – 3:00 pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Federal ZCT</strong></td>
<td><strong>Comparison Questions</strong></td>
<td><strong>New Technologies to Detect</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Donnie Dutton</strong></td>
<td><strong>Chad Russell</strong></td>
<td><strong>Non-Verbal Patterns in Deceivers</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Utah PLT</strong></td>
<td><strong>Utah PLT</strong></td>
<td><strong>Utah PLT</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pam Shaw</strong></td>
<td><strong>Pam Shaw</strong></td>
<td><strong>Pam Shaw</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 10:00 – 10:15 Break

Sponsored by:

### 11:00 – 1:00

Lunch (On Your Own)

### 1:00 – 3:00 pm

**Classroom A**

- Federal ZCT
- Donnie Dutton

**Classroom B**

- Comparison Questions
- Chad Russell

**Classroom C**

- New Technologies to Detect
- Non-Verbal Patterns in Deceivers
- Elkins, Burgoon & Dunbar

### 3:00 – 5:00 pm

**Classroom A**

- Utah PLT
- Pam Shaw

**Classroom B**

- Linguistic & Vocal Patterns
- Differentiating Truthful & Deceptive Responses
- Burgoon, Dunbar & Elkins

### 2:00 – 2:15 Break

Sponsored by:

### 3:30 – 4:00 Break

Sponsored by:

### APA Issues in the Different Fields of Polygraph

**5:00 – 6:00**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classroom A</th>
<th>Classroom B</th>
<th>Classroom C</th>
<th>Classroom D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>PRIVATE</strong></td>
<td><strong>GOVERNMENT</strong></td>
<td><strong>LAW ENFORCEMENT</strong></td>
<td><strong>INTERNATIONAL</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nathan J. Gordon</td>
<td>Jimmy Padgett</td>
<td>Pamela K. Shaw, Chad Russell, Barry Cushman</td>
<td>Frank Horvath, Ph.D</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* APA School Requirements for Spanish Speaking School Directors: Roy Ortiz
### Classroom A

8:00 – 12 noon
- Cognitive Interviewing
  - Mike Bryant, ATF
  - Special Agent/Polygraph Examiner

9:15 – 9:30 Break – Sponsored by:

10:00 – 12:00 noon
- Concealed Information Test
  - Matt Hick, Texas DPS
  - & Jamie McCloughan, Michigan State Police

### Classroom B

8:00 – 10:00 am
- Directed Lie Screening Test
  - Walt Goodson, Texas DPS

10:00 – 12:00 noon
- Interviewer Biases & Questioning Strategies
  - Dunbar, Elkins & Burgoon

### Classroom C

8:00 – 10:00 am
- 8:00 – 10:00 am
- Interviewer Biases & Questioning Strategies
  - Dunbar, Elkins & Burgoon

10:00 – 12:00 noon
- TES Validation Study
  - Andrew Dollins

---

**APA Annual Business Meeting**

1:00 – 4:00 pm
- Classroom A

4:15 PM - ???

**The Salt Lick Bar-B-Que**

Dinner and Entertainment

All you can eat barbeque meal is served buffet style in the Pavilion, and includes beef brisket, pork ribs, sausage and chicken; BBQ sauce, coleslaw, potato salad and beans; bread, butter, pickles and onions, iced tea, water and coffee. Dessert will be peach and/or blackberry cobbler with ice cream.

**$15.00 per person**

WEDNESDAY, September 14, 2011

8:00 – 12:00

APA MEMBERSHIP EXAMINATION (Room #??)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CLASSROOM A</th>
<th>CLASSROOM B</th>
<th>CLASSROOM C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8:00 – 12:00 noon Countermeasures Gordon Moore, Las Vegas Metro Police Department</td>
<td>8:00 – 12:00 noon PCSOT Examiners Perspective Ray Nelson, APA Director</td>
<td>PLEA MENTORSHIP PROGRAM 8:00 – 10:00 am Polygraph Information Network Introduction Bill Gary 10:00 – 12:00 noon Conduct of an Examination Leonard Salcedo</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9:15 – 9:30 Break – Sponsored by:

10:45 – 11:00 Break – Sponsored by:

12:00 – 1:00 Lunch (On Your Own)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CLASSROOM A</th>
<th>CLASSROOM B</th>
<th>CLASSROOM C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1:00 – 3:00 pm Ethics Bill Teigen, VP Private APA</td>
<td>1:00 – 3:00 pm Integrated ZCT Nate Gordon, APA President</td>
<td>PLEA MENTORSHIP PROGRAM 1:00 – 3:00 pm Test Question Construction Bill Gary</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3:00 – 3:15 Break – Sponsored by

3:15 – 5:45 POLYGRAPH INSTRUMENTS WORKSHOP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CLASSROOM A</th>
<th>CLASSROOM B</th>
<th>CLASSROOM C</th>
<th>CLASSROOM D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AXCITON SYSTEMS Bruce White</td>
<td>LAFAYETTE INSTRUMENTS Chris Fausett</td>
<td>LIMESTONE TECHNOLOGY Jamie Brown</td>
<td>STOELTING INSTRUMENTS Shawn Edwards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Classroom A</td>
<td>Classroom B</td>
<td>Classroom C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:00 – 12:00</td>
<td>PCSOT Therapist Perspective</td>
<td>8:00 – 10:00 am Quadri-Track</td>
<td>PLEA MENTORSHIP PROGRAM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00 – 12:00</td>
<td>Reid Tech</td>
<td>10:00 – 12:00 noon Reid Tech</td>
<td>PLEA MENTORSHIP PROGRAM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:15 – 9:30</td>
<td>Break – Sponsored by:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:00 – 1:00</td>
<td>Lunch (On Your Own)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:00 – 3:00</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td></td>
<td>PLEA MENTORSHIP PROGRAM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:00 – 5:00</td>
<td>PCSOT Supervision Perspective</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mike Wolfe, Director Taylor County CSCD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:00 – 2:15</td>
<td>Break – Sponsored by:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:00 – 3:15</td>
<td>Break – Sponsored by:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:30</td>
<td>BANQUET</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Classroom A</td>
<td>Classroom B</td>
<td>Classroom C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:00 – 10:00 am</td>
<td>Empirical Scoring System (ESS)</td>
<td>PCSOT Legal Implications</td>
<td>Mentorship Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ray Nelson, APA Director</td>
<td>Gordon Vaughan, APA General Counsel</td>
<td>Brian Fuller</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:00 – 9:15</td>
<td>Break – Sponsored by</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00 – 12:00 noon</td>
<td>(continued)</td>
<td>Relevant/Irrelevant Screening</td>
<td>PCSOT Civil Commitment Process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Empirical Scoring System (ESS)</td>
<td>Barry Cushman</td>
<td>Allison Taylor, Executive Director CSOT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ray Nelson, APA Director</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:30 – 10:45</td>
<td>Break – Sponsored by</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:00 – 1:00</td>
<td>Lunch (On Your Own)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:00 – 3:00 pm</td>
<td>Research Topic</td>
<td>Polygraph in the Islamic Culture</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Marty Oelrich, APA Director</td>
<td>J. Patrick O’Burke, Director MVM Polygraph School</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:00 – 2:15</td>
<td>Break – Sponsored by</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:15 ??</td>
<td>CLOSING REMARKS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>APA President, Pamela Shaw</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SUPERIOR DATA QUALITY
FREE SOFTWARE AT
WWW.AXCITON.COM
Interested in advertising your business or product in the APA Magazine?

For pricing and payment information, contact Robbie Bennett at the APA National Office, P.O. Box 8037, Chattanooga, TN 37414, (800) APA-8037, or email - manager@polygraph.org.

Then, all you need to do is send your electronic ad in .jpeg or .pdf file format, to the editor at editor@polygraph.org.

Don't worry, short line items in the Buy and Sell and Upcoming Seminar sections are still free.

As always, we publish (at no charge) in each Magazine a listing of upcoming polygraph training sessions for APA accredited schools.

Submissions and/or technical questions regarding your ad should be sent to editor@polygraph.org. Please note that submission deadlines are posted on page 3 of each issue.

“Training Today’s Examiners for Tomorrow’s Challenges”

Accredited by the American Polygraph Association
Recognized by the American Association of Police Polygraphists
Recognized by the National Polygraph Association
Approved by the Texas Board of Polygraph Examiners
Approved by the California Bureau of Private Postsecondary and Vocational Education

Thomas M. Kelly, MA
Bachelor of Arts – Social Science, 1973
Master of Arts – Forensic Psychophysiology, 2002

Mr. Kelly has more than thirty years experience in law enforcement. At the time of his retirement, he was the lead polygraph examiner for the Los Angeles field division of the United States Drug Enforcement Administration. He has conducted polygraph examinations worldwide.

Robert Parkinson, BS, D.C.
Bachelor of Science - Psychology, 1987
Bachelor of Science - Biology, 1990
Doctor of Chiropractic - 1991

Dr. Parkinson has taught physical sciences on college campuses in the United States and in South America for the US State Department. He has authored a course in DNA.

Michael B. Lynch, MPA
Bachelor of Science – Criminal Justice, 1974
Master of Public Administration, 1989

Mr. Lynch has been a polygraph examiner since 1974. He has taught in under graduate and graduate programs at state universities. He is a Past-President of the California Association of Polygraph Examiners and has published in polygraph journals and publications.

Candace D. Elder, AA, LPT
Associate of Arts Degree - Psychology, 1992

Ms. Elder has been a polygraph examiner since 1999. She is APA certified as a Post-Conviction Sex Offender examiner and is a Licensed Psychiatric Technician. She has presented PCSOT protocol before professional associations and groups.

CLASES EN ESPAÑOL

La Academia de Poligrafía Marston ha capacitado a examinadores especializados en poligrafía para los gobiernos de muchos países hispano parlantes. Contamos con la capacidad y con la disposición para impartir nuestras clases en grupos de veinte o más estudiantes locales en cualquier lugar designado dentro de toda América Latina. Para mayor información, por favor póngase en contacto con nosotros.

MARSTON POLYGRAPH ACADEMY
390 Orange Show Lane - San Bernardino, California
Mail to: Post Office Box 5842 - San Bernardino, CA 92412

Call toll free: (877) 627-2223
or visit: www.marstonpolygraphacademy.com

?? THE POLYGRAPH QUESTION ??

Answer: E. 100%. In a curious trend, the lie detection literature since the early 1900s shows that when field practitioners report accuracy when testing their own field cases or techniques, accuracy is substantially higher than that reported in independent research, and usually approaches perfection.
Pursuant to the Constitution and By-laws of the APA, the following letter of public censure was issued on November 4, 2010, after this public censure was approved by the APA Board of Directors on November 1, 2010.

AMERICAN POLYGRAPH ASSOCIATION

NATIONAL OFFICE — ROBBIE BENNETT, Manager
SUITE 800, 5700 BUILDING, CHATTANOOGA, TN 37411-4015 — 423/892-3992 — 1-800-APA-8037
MAILING ADDRESS: P.O. BOX 8037, CHATTANOOGA, TN 37414-0037
FAX # 423/894-5435

[DATE], 2010

Ronald P. Bae, Ph.D.
17150 Cottonwood Road
Cottonwood, AL 36302

Re: APA Grievance No. 123-10

Dear Dr. Bae:

The American Polygraph Association Board of Directors has adopted the recommendation of the APA Ethics and Grievance Committee to accept an agreed disposition of Ethics Complaint No. 123-10 which was filed with the APA on or about February 2, 2010. That agreed disposition is for the issuance of a public letter of censure to be published in an upcoming issue of the APA Magazine.

The Complaint alleges that you conducted a polygraph examination on February 2, 2008, in the State of Nevada without having obtained a license to administer such an examination in that jurisdiction as required by N.R.S. §648.110. The examination you conducted was a private examination and not conducted in the performance of an official duty for a law enforcement or investigative agency and, as such, not subject to the exemption under N.R.S. §648.061. You have admitted to this conduct and have, as mitigation, stated that you were requested to perform the examination by an attorney in connection with a Federal administrative matter and understood from the attorney that you would not require a Nevada license to conduct the examination.

The Committee has determined that no such exception appears to be permitted under N.R.S. §648.110 and that your having conducted the examination was in violation of APA By-Law and Standard of Practice 3.1 which requires "all examinations [to] be conducted in compliance with governing local, state, and federal regulations and laws."

By agreement, the APA issues this letter of censure and directs its publication in the APA Magazine at the earliest available opportunity.

Sincerely,

Nathan J. Gordon
President, American Polygraph Association

DEDICATED TO TRUTH
An Ethical Issue in the APA

By William K. Teigen
Vice President-Private
and General Chairman of the Ethics and Grievance Committee

The APA Ethics and Grievance Committee (Grievance Committee) has completed work on an issue in calendar year 2010 that sets out a lesson that bears consideration by APA Members. The issue is ensuring that you are properly licensed, if appropriate, to conduct a polygraph examination within the United States. You, as an APA Member, are responsible for that determination, not someone engaging your services.

I have often lectured to polygraph students and examiners on the topic of “Ethics.” I have attended as many lectures by others on “Ethics” as I have given but my lectures are unique in one perspective. I think “Ethics” start by simply following the rules. In training examiners, students or current, practicing examiners, I make a presentation on what rules apply to them doing polygraph testing. I point out that 28 of our United States have licensing laws that regulate polygraph testing within the borders of those states. In each of those 28 states, to perform polygraph testing as a law enforcement examiner (excluding Federal examiners and examiners contracted to do Federal testing) and/or a private polygraph examiner, you must have a license from that state, and it must be current. A good starting point for checking on which states have licensing laws is the “Polygraph: Quick Reference Guide to the Law,” available through the APA National Office.

State licenses for polygraph testing are reasonably easy to obtain. They normally require that you have graduated from a recognized polygraph training school, you have conducted a number of actual polygraph examinations yourself that are reviewed by a mentor following your graduation, you have passed an oral/written examination that determines the level of knowledge you have in professionally appropriate matters, you have presented some of your polygraph examinations for review by the regulating authority providing the state polygraph license, and you pay a licensing fee.

To further develop my point of simply following the rules, if you are a polygraph examiner and want to closely associate with like-minded folks, you will probably join a professional association, like the APA. Before joining, I would always encourage you to become familiar with that organization’s Constitution, By-laws, Standards of Practice, etc. and make sure you can and will comply with those regulations. That is a relatively easy research job that you can do by visiting our web site, www.polygraph.org and clicking on the APA Constitution and By-laws.

Division III of the APA By-laws is the division that sets forth Standards of Practice (effective 1/20/2007). Under item 3.1, labeled Statement of Purpose, our By-laws say in part: “Moreover, all examinations are required to be conducted in compliance with governing local, state, and Federal regulations and laws.” As a practical matter that would mean, among other things, to all APA members that are doing state or local law enforcement polygraph testing or private testing, you must have a polygraph examiner’s license in the states that require same before doing any polygraph testing in those jurisdictions. This committee will investigate every complaint that comes before our committee wherein it is alleged that one of our APA members conducted a test without a license in a state that requires a license for that test. Please do the right thing and not add to the Grievance Committee’s workload by violating APA By-law 3.1.

I hope my article causes you to leisurely read our Constitution and By-laws, which is not a great labor, and then you will know the simple rules we are asked to follow to be Ethical, APA Members.
President’s Message

Nathan Gordon

I hope everyone had a wonderful time during the holidays, and that 2011 will be healthy and prosperous for you and your families. I am looking forward to a productive year serving as President with our Board.

I have appointed William Fleisher to Chair the Public Relations Committee. Bill began his career as a Philadelphia Police Officer, then served with the F.B.I., retired as the ASAC of the U.S. Customs Philadelphia Office, and has been in private practice for over 15 years. He was chosen by Philadelphia Magazine as one of the 76 smartest Philadelphians, and is one of the founders of the Vidocq Society. He has a great deal of experience dealing with the media, and I believe he will do an outstanding job for our association in this role.

I have appointed Tuvia Shurany to Chair the International Liaison Committee. Tuvia is the former Director of the Israeli Government Polygraph School. He is currently in private practice in Costa Rica, and has lectured in the United States, Latin America, Asia, Africa and Europe. Tuvia speaks five languages fluently and seems very excited about the task I assigned him.

The APA has set a much more aggressive course of action to deal with the problems of pseudo-lie detection technologies. I will be testifying in court in January about the inaccuracies of CVSA technology. We have begun a campaign to send out information concerning the differences between polygraph and voice stress to law enforcement agencies around the country.

I have just returned from lecturing in South Africa and was disappointed that unification of the associations there has not taken place. Hopefully they will learn that their future lies in their ability to become one, and the only influence they should be experiencing from America is what can happen if they don’t!

The Board has been busy and I highly suggest you read each Director’s message to stay abreast of our direction. Director Padgett, with the assistance of T.V. O’Malley, is actively reviewing the Accredited School Policy Manual which has been “in the works” for over two years now. Director Oelrich continues to update our web site and is actively working to ensure we have an electronic voting ballot for the 2011 election. Director Gougler has our 2011 Annual Seminar in Austin, Texas well organized. I think it will be a great seminar, and I think you will find Austin a very exciting place to visit. Director Cushman is staying on top of our concerns about the professionalization of the Forensic Sciences, with a great deal of input by Dr. Horvath. Director Teigen is actively involved in the Ethics Committee and working on making our process of handling these matters more efficient. President Elect Shaw has done an amazing job organizing communication with our Divisional Associations and staying on top of upcoming legislation.

I cannot say enough about the work that is done by Robbie and Lisa in our National Office, and I continue to be amazed at the importance and impact both our attorney, Gordon Vaughn, and our Editor and former President, Don Krapohl, have on our association and our profession.

I have received no input from you concerning whether the term of office for the President and President-Elect should be extended to two years. I would appreciate it.

I will see you in Austin!
Your leadership has recently put together a small package of materials to send to select chiefs and sheriffs in the U.S. who are supporting training on the use of voice stress analysis devices. The compiled information is intended to educate those agency executives about the lack of validity and reliability of voice stress and encourages them to consider polygraph, an instrument that is supported with research, and consequently offers all-around greater benefits. If you would like to access this information and potentially share the same materials with agency executives in your area, please contact the National Office and/or the Public Relations & Information Committee Chair.

Lastly, I’d like to mention the changes that become effective in 2012. For the past four years, the changes have been documented in our By-Laws along with the posted effective date, so nothing should come as a surprise to anyone, but as the time is drawing near, it’s important to ensure not only awareness, but preparedness. One significant change is the requirement to use a movement sensor during test data collections. The other significant change involves the requirement to use validated principles and techniques. Your board, along with other involved members of the Association are reviewing each area carefully and critically to ensure that we, as a body, are prepared (i.e., aware, educated, trained, and equipped) to move forward. I applaud the Association and the leaders that have come before me for having the vision to look ahead and establish a standard designed to build credibility with other grounded professions, and one that ultimately ensures our continued existence in the fields of forensic science and psychophysiology. Please keep a lookout for more information to come.

State Association leaders, as we embark upon a new year, there will be many preparations for state association seminars and other training opportunities. Please help get the word out about your seminar by sharing your information via email with other association leaders. They in turn, can disseminate the information to the members of their associations. The polygraph community at-large has many great opportunities to share and learn with each other, let’s get the

Hello everyone! I hope you are off to a wonderful start in the New Year! It’s always great to feel the freshness of new beginnings. As of the time of this writing, I do not have anything new to report as far as the State Advisory, Past President’s or Legislative committees, so I would like to take the opportunity to highlight some important items that are before us, or at least, on the horizon.

First, I would like to encourage and remind members we will officially utilize electronic voting in our next election cycle, which will not be too far off from the time you receive this magazine. If you have an interest to serve the profession and this Association as a member of the Board, please feel free to contact any current Board member or the National Office for more information. Nominations must be received by the National Office by May 1, 2011. If you are a conscientious individual, dedicated to serving your peers and clients, and are committed to strengthening the polygraph profession, then I encourage you to seek a leadership position on the Board. Don’t sit back and assume someone else will do the job. Get involved and be a part of ensuring our success!

As decided at the September 2010 General Business Meeting, the APA Magazine is available electronically. As of now, the magazine is being made available in paper and electronic formats, but in time, it will only be available electronically. In this transition time, if you aren’t a registered user on the APA website, please get with Marty Oelrich, our website manager, to ensure your username and password are set so you’ll be able to access the publications and other important information (i.e., announcements, notifications, and elections processes).

We have good news to share about the hotel rate for our upcoming seminar in Austin, Texas. The contracted rate was initially set for $121/night, but it will now be lowered to $104 in accordance with the federal lodging rate. Please be sure to reserve your rooms early at the hotel to ensure your opportunity to stay onsite. Though this is a large hotel, there are other large groups that also contend for space.
word out! If you need assistance with this, please let me know and I’ll be glad to help.

I’m looking forward to the year ahead, and as we journey together, I wish each and every one of you a peaceful and successful 2011!

Barry Cushman  
Vice President, Law Enforcement

As you should be aware by now, much is happening in the world of forensic science, and we in the polygraph profession need to be sure we keep up with the changes that are coming. (Actually, we’re ahead of the game in many areas, but it appears many do not know that is the case.) While I won’t review the entire history here (refer to my comments in the last issue for some additional details), I do want to give you a summary from Senator Patrick Leahy’s perspective. You may not be aware that a draft piece of legislation has been made public regarding forensic science, and it is the culmination of a few years of research on the state and needs of forensic science in the United States. The following are excerpts from Senator Leahy’s public letter introducing the forensic reform legislation to congress (which can be found in its entirety here: http://leahy.senate.gov/press/press_releases/release/?id=1b2c4b75-c0b1-4aeb-97fe-97b531f71550):

For nearly two years, the Senate Judiciary Committee has been examining serious issues in forensic science that go to the heart of our criminal justice system. …It is my intention to introduce legislation early next year that represents the culmination of this process. That legislation will strengthen our confidence in the criminal justice system and the evidence it relies upon by ensuring that forensic evidence and testimony is accurate, credible, and scientifically grounded.

In February of 2009, the National Academy of Science (NAS) published a report asserting that the field of forensic science has significant problems that must be urgently addressed. The report suggested that basic research establishing the scientific validity of many forensic science disciplines has never been done in a comprehensive way. It also suggested that the forensic sciences lack uniform and unassailable standards governing the accreditation of laboratories, the certification of forensic practitioners, and the testing and analysis of evidence. Indeed, I was disturbed to learn about still more cases in which innocent people may have been convicted, perhaps even executed, in part due to faulty forensic evidence.

Since then, the Judiciary Committee has held a pair of hearing [sic] on the issue. Committee members, as well as staff, have spent countless hours talking to prosecutors, defense attorneys, law enforcement officers, judges, forensic practitioners, scientists, academic experts, and many, many others to learn as much as we can about what is happening now and what needs to be done....Accordingly, as a former prosecutor, I am committed to strengthening the field of forensics, and the justice system’s confidence in it, so that their hard work can be consistently relied upon, as it should be.

While there were varying responses to the findings of the NAS report, one thing was clear: there needed to be a searching review of the state of forensic science work in this country. And it also became clear through this process that there is widespread consensus about the need for change and the kind of change that is needed. Almost everyone I heard from recognized the need for strong and unassailable research to test and establish the validity of the forensic disciplines, as well as the need for consistent and rigorous accreditation and certification standards in the field.

Among other things, it will require that all forensic science laboratories that receive federal funding or federal business be accredited according to rigorous and uniform standards. It will require that all relevant personnel who perform forensic work for any laboratory or agency that gets federal money become certified in their fields, which will mean meeting standards in proficiency, education, and training.

I expect that the proposal will set up a rigorous process to determine the most serious needs for peer-reviewed research in the forensic science disciplines and will set up grant programs to fund that
research. The bill will also provide for this research to lead to appropriate standards and best practices in each discipline.

A draft of the legislation is available here from the American Academy of Forensic Sciences. Begin here for details: http://www.aafs.org/draft-justice-and-forensic-science-reform-act-12-22-10. The AAFS will post the final draft when it is available.

In a nutshell, the (draft) bill, which will likely be changed before it is officially introduced, creates the “Office of Forensic Science” within the Deputy Attorney General along with an advisory board, the “Forensic Science Board.” Its job is “… promoting best practices and ensuring consistency, scientific validity, and accuracy with respect to forensic testing, analysis, identification, and comparisons, the results of which may be interpreted, presented, or otherwise used during the course of a criminal investigation or prosecution.” I presume the Board would find that screening for spies, for example, would create the circumstances in which forensic testing (polygraph screening) “may be… used during the course of a criminal investigation…” given that it’s in our government’s interest to prosecute spies. Why that’s important will be mentioned momentarily.

One of the duties of the Board will be to “develop a recommended definition of the term ‘forensic science discipline’ …which shall encompass disciplines with a sufficient basis that involve forensic testing, analysis..., the results of which may be interpreted, presented, or otherwise used during the course of a criminal investigation...” They also must develop a list of forensic science disciplines for the purpose of the law.

One potentially troubling part of the law, though necessary, is in regard to those disciplines that don’t make the list: “If the Board recommends that a field should not be included on the list submitted under paragraph (1) because the field has insufficient scientific basis, the Board shall publish an explanation of the recommendation, including publication of the explanation on the website of the Board.”

While the now infamous (in the pro and anti polygraph communities, anyhow) 2003 NAS report on polygraph screening was favorable to specific-incident polygraph testing, it wasn’t so kind to screening examinations. I don’t think it’s a stretch to imagine the possibility of the Board citing the 2003 report as its justification for adding polygraph screening to the “didn’t make the cut” pile, and that could be devastating. We have certainly addressed some of the issues, and as I mentioned last time, we’re ahead of others in the forensic science community, but we need to get the word out and stay ahead of the issues that could arise in the coming months and years.

The draft contains other relevant information, and I encourage you all to read it for yourselves. Please know that we are doing all we can to stay on top of the issue and represent the needs of our membership. We are going to have to get in line with the recommendations from which this piece of legislation to-be was formed. They are coming whether any among us want them or not. In the end, making sure all of the so-called forensic sciences are actually based on sound science is a good thing. Making sure individual practitioners are competent (through individual certification) is also coming, as I mentioned in my last update. Determining what a competent examiner is, however, requires us to examine our best practices, code of ethics, basic school requirements, etc, as there must be a standard(s) against which the individual is gauged.

It’s a great time to be in polygraph. We owe so much to the pioneers who have persevered and handed down to us the wisdom they have gained and cataloged over the years. It will be interesting to see how the profession continues to mature over the coming years. We have a very real opportunity to show the rest of the forensic science community that we are serious about what we do and that we have the empirical evidence necessary to establish ourselves not only as equals, but as a more developed sub-discipline than some others at the current time.

As always, if there is anything I can do for you, please don’t hesitate to get in touch with me.

Mike Gougler
Director

Fellow Professionals,

I hope everyone had a safe and enjoyable holiday season.

Since the last magazine, I have been assigned an additional committee. I will serve as chairman of the Past President’s Advisory Committee. Any past president may address concerns or make recommendations directly to me. I will bring the
information to the Board of Directors.

Update from the Seminar Committee: I have included in this issue a first draft of the 2011 seminar schedule (subject to change) for Austin. The theme for this year’s conference will be “Validated Polygraph Principles and Techniques: Attaining the Goal.”

As you are aware, beginning January 1, 2012, the APA Standards of Practice will require that examiners use validated techniques. This seminar will provide training on polygraph techniques that currently meet or are in the process of meeting the required research standards. Your board believes that it is our responsibility to provide you the information to be in compliance with the standards. As you can see by reviewing the schedule, the training will have something for everyone.

NOTE: Please make your travel plans to ensure that you can attend Friday’s classes. Many interesting and highly requested sessions will be scheduled.

In regard to the Awards committee, please send any nominations for the APA annual awards to Robbie Bennett or myself. The awards are more meaningful if we have a large list of nominees to select from.

Please attend the Tuesday night event at the Salt Lick. Transportation will be provided courtesy of our vendors. A live band will perform for your enjoyment. The cost is only $15.

Airport transportation to the Austin Hilton is available by taxi (approximately $20), super shuttle (approximately $14 - $17), and city metro bus for $1. The Austin Hilton is located in the heart of Austin’s renowned 6th street entertainment district.

I would again like to thank TX DPS and our co-sponsor TALEPI for their assistance in organizing this seminar. Kudos to Walt Goodson, Brian Vaughan, Kelly Hendricks, and Matt Hicks for their quick action in finalizing some critical details.

We are striving to make the 2011 Austin APA seminar the finest in the history of this great organization. It is a joy and honor for me to serve the membership as the program chair.

Marty Oelrich
Director

APA Membership,

There have been a number of projects that have been completed or are currently underway since the 2010 conference. This has included the successful completion of a Request for Proposals process that has been established for the APA assisting in providing funding for research by thesis and doctoral students. This also includes substantial projects which are currently underway by the Website Committee and the new Ad Hoc Subcommittee on Electronic Voting. These two committees will be working together throughout the foreseeable future. Accordingly, for those members who do not have an email address on file with the APA National Office, please forward an email message to manager@polygraph.org including your first and last name and current email address. The National Office will likely be providing a confirmation email to you that will include your membership ID number. It is essential that the APA National Office have a current active email address and for you to have your membership ID in order to engage in the 2011 elections. Please ensure you complete this task as soon as possible as these items will be needed to authenticate your membership for the 2011 electronic vote.

The Electronic Voting subcommittee has reviewed several proposals from outside companies to assist in conducting the 2011 election. However, the committee has not made a commitment to any of the companies as of date. Regardless, electronic voting will decrease the time and costs involved in the election process and will assist in diminishing the concern of members regarding bias. This process will be completely anonymous and the only information that will be accessible to the APA is that an individual voted, which is tabulated through the authentication process, which will indicate you logged into the applicable website and voted.

Please note that due to the challenges associated with changing the voting process from mailed paper ballots to electronic ballots, there will be several attempts to test run this system. This will include the APA National Office sending a bulk email to all APA members with instructions to access the APA website at www.polygraph.org and access the most recent APA Magazine, which will be available via a downloadable PDF file. If you do not receive this email, you will need to contact
the APA National Office and update your email address on file. This process will serve as a means of ensuring the email addresses on file are accurate and will assist us in identifying those members who do not have an email address on file. If you do not have an email address and do not intend to create one in the coming months, please contact the APA National Office and request a paper ballot for the 2011 elections. To all other members, prior to the beginning of the voting process, you will receive an email from the company we contract with providing instructions on voting, which will include the date and time voting will open and close, a link to the website where you will need to login, and the information you will need to login, which was discussed above. Following the closing of the 2011 elections, the results will be available immediately. The opening and closing dates for voting are found on page 10.

The Website Committee is currently preparing to release a reformatted website with a significant number of upgrades that will remediate a number of long standing problems. This will include upgrading the appearance of the website, which will be representative of professional associations. As a result of the upgrade process, there may be times when certain links of the members only content are inaccessible. However, please feel free to contact me if you have any questions, comments or concerns.

The APA also had an exhibitor’s booth at the Association for the Treatment of Sexual Abusers Conference on October 20-23, 2010, in Phoenix, Arizona. I was the official representative of the APA and had an opportunity to engage in a significant number of conversations with consumers of polygraph examinations, as well as some detractors. The conference was a success and we provided approximately 100 copies of the APA Model Policy for Post-Conviction Sex Offender Testing.

If you have any questions, comments, or concerns regarding the APA Website, the 2011 elections, or any other topic, please feel free to contact me via email at website@polygraph.org.

Chuck Slupski  
Director

Welcome to the new year. I hope the past has treated you well and the future will be even greater. Please note that the Standards of Practice Committee has been diligently working on updating the APA Standards of Practice. I anticipate that clarification of standards information relating to criterion validity of various polygraph testing procedures will be accepted at a future Board meeting and that the membership should be reading about these updates in future issues of this magazine.

Standards of Practice Committee  
Rick Kurtz (Chairman) - Kentucky  
Mark D. Handler – Kentucky  
Walt G. Jones – Kentucky

I am pleased to announce on behalf of the Post-Conviction Sex Offender Testing Committee that Candace Elder of Yucaipa, CA and Ben L. Blalock of Cape Coral, FL have both been recognized by the APA as PCSOT Polygraph Examiner Instructors.

Post-Conviction Sex Offender Testing Committee  
Ray Ham, Jr. (Chairman) – Iowa  
Kenneth A. Hosier – Georgia  
Raymond Nelson – Indiana  
Daniel E. Sosnowski – Georgia

The APA Quality Control Committee eagerly awaits the opportunity to assist the membership on a voluntary basis by reviewing one or more recorded polygraph examination sessions. In addition to reviewing the examination from a “comparison with professional standards” perspective, this committee has the expertise to offer suggestions for future exams.

Quality Control Committee  
Elmer N. Criswell, Jr. (Chairman) – Pennsylvania  
Jack Consigli – Massachusetts  
Robert “Bob” C. Heard – California

A new ad-hoc committee for Community Safety Polygraph Testing has been established and is developing a combined model policy for guidance when conducting examinations related to PCSOT and offenders under court supervision or in treatment programs related to alcohol / drug offenses and / or domestic violence. It appears that this model policy may expand into other testing areas as we move into the future.

NEW Testing for Community Safety Committee  
Rob G. Lundell (Chairman) – Oregon  
Donald J. Krapohl – South Carolina  
Raymond Nelson – Indiana  
Mark D. Handler – Kentucky

Please advise if I may assist you. Chuck Slupski – polygraphchuck@gmail.com.
This paper concerns the importance of single word differentiation between Comparison Questions and Relevant Questions in Multi-Faceted and Multi-Issue Examinations to allow for immediate question recognition by an examinee and subsequent enhanced discriminatory psychophysiological reactions to those questions within a test format of greatest salience.

In a screening study by Dr. Gordon Barland, in May, 1981, he reported that testing was less accurate in determining the precise question to which deceptive subjects were lying than was expected. He went on to say that this was inconsistent with the Backster theory of “psychological set” which posited that the questions in the format holding the greatest salience should produce the greatest psychophysiological reactions. Dr. Barland’s overall conclusion from his research was that strong inconsistent reactions to different relevant questions during an examination were better predictors of deception than consistent significant “spot” reactions to the same relevant question.

This seems not only inconsistent to what Backster had theorized, but also with what most examiners believe. As a result, we began to question how Dr. Barland’s research had reached this conclusion. Why should reactions in a screening test be different than the reactions we would expect from a deceptive examinee in a specific examination?

Our view is that in a specific examination we generally have single word differentiation between our Comparison and Relevant questions. The examinee usually does not know what categories (Comparison vs. Relevant) questions fall under. The examinee only knows which questions hold the greatest threat or salience to him or herself. How many words does the examinee have to hear before the threat is realized? For example, if you are an innocent examinee, your greatest threat should be to one or more of the Comparison Questions. If you are deceptive, the threat is to the Relevant Questions. Look at the following ten words and see if you can determine whether the question they introduce is a Comparison or Relevant Question:

1. During….. 2. Regarding….. 3. Between…..

With just single word recognition you should have been able to determine that 1, 3, 6, and 10 were Comparison Questions and the others were relevant Questions. This recognition would have triggered immediate psychophysiological reactions to those questions of greatest threat or salience.

Research has shown that “As sensory information enters the brain, it splits into two paths. One feeds into consciousness, where we can observe and remember it. The other flows through the subconscious” where the amygdala “filters it for signs of danger.” The amygdala is the most primitive part of the emotional brain. If the amygdala determines that this stimulus poses a threat to the person’s well being, it triggers the “flight/flight/hold” response even before we are consciously aware of the threat.

According to New York University neuroscientist Joseph LaDoux, the amygdala “can receive signals from the ears and eyes in just twelve-thousands of a second.” It takes the consciousness around one-half a second to be aware of outside stimuli. Therefore, it is clear how a subject’s sympathetic reactions may occur before he or she recognizes it’s the most threatening question in the test.

Now let us examine a screening test. In this test there are four (4) different Relevant and four (4) Comparison Questions. The relevant target issues are illegal drug involvement, undetected serious crimes, honesty and job terminations. Here are the questions:

As an adult, have you had any involvement with illegal drugs?

As an adult, have you committed a serious undetected crime?

As an adult, in any one day, have you stolen more than $25.00 in cash or property from an employer?

As an adult, have you ever been fired from a job?

You are the examinee, and you are going to lie to the question concerning theft. Psychologically you are focused on that question. The examiner asks, “As an adult…..” and expecting to hear the theft question you begin to react, as the examiner continues, “have you committed a serious undetected crime?” One cannot “unfire the gun” and stop the reaction which just took place because you expected a different ending to the question. As a result you show strong inconsistent reactions to the Relevant Questions during the examination, depending on your anticipatory expectations of the threatening relevant question, and when it is actually asked.

This phenomenon led to our use of “pre-fixes” in all our examinations which are multifaceted, such as a PCSOT Monitor exam, or a multi-issue examination, such as a screening or PCSOT Sexual History Exam. All questions are reviewed with the examinee and asked during the examination with single word pre-fixes, thus allowing for immediate threat or non-threat recognition by the examinee.

An example of the questions reviewed and asked in a screening test might be:

**Sunday** – Is today Sunday?

**Understand** – Do you understand I will only ask the questions I reviewed?

**Lie** – Do you intend to deliberately lie to any test question?

**Responsibility** – As a juvenile have you ever lied to avoid responsibility for something you did?

**Crime** - As an adult have you ever committed a serious undetected crime?

**Cheat** – In school, did you ever cheat?

**Drugs** – As an adult, have you had any involvement with illegal drugs?

**Parents** – As a juvenile, did you ever do anything you wouldn’t want your parents to know about?

**Theft** – As an adult, in any one day have you stolen more than $25.00 in cash or property from a job?

**Friend** – As a juvenile did you ever say anything untrue about a friend?

**Fired** – As an adult, have you ever been fired from a job?

**Cooperate** – Have you deliberately done anything to try and beat this test?

**EXTRA IRRELEVANTS** (reviewed but not necessarily asked):

**Tuesday** – Is today Tuesday? (actual day of examination)

**Philadelphia** – Right now are you in Philadelphia?

**Paris** – Right now are you in Paris?

An example of the questions reviewed and asked in a PCSOT Monitor test might be:

**Sunday** – Is today Sunday?

**Understand** – Do you understand I will only ask the questions I reviewed?

**Lie** – Do you intend to deliberately lie to any test question?

**Parole** – In the past 6 months, other than what we discussed, have you lied to your P.O. about anything?

*supra.*
The next ASTM International Committee E52 on Forensic Psychophysiological Detection of Deception will be held in conjunction with the American Association of Police Polygraphist’s 34th Annual Seminar, located at the Hyatt Regency in Cambridge, Massachusetts, on Saturday, March 26, 2011 and Sunday, March 27, 2011. 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 at meetings.

The primary discussion during the March 2011 meeting will relate to the committees most recently balloted items. The December 2010/January 2011 ballot contained four items, which included:

1. Reapproval of E1954-04, which is the Standard Practice for Conduct of Research in Psychophysiological Detection of Deception (Polygraph). According to ASTM International (2004), the standard “establishes essential and recommended elements in the design, conduct and reporting of research on psychophysiological detection of deception (polygraph). Analog and field research are addressed separately (p.600).” The ballot did not include any recommended changes to the standard. For questions regarding this standard, please contact Don Krapohl at krapohld@gmail.com.

2. Reapproval of E2063-05, which is the Standard Practice for Calibration and Functionality Checks Used in Forensic Psychophysiological Detection of Deception Polygraph Examinations. According to ASTM International (2005), “This practice provides guidelines for calibration and instrumentation (both analog and computerized systems) actively used in the psychophysiological detection of deception (p.747).” The ballot did not include any recommended charges to the standard. For questions regarding this standard, please contact Chris Fausett at cfausett@lafayetteinstrument.com.

3. Two revisions to E2062-10, which is the Standard Guide for PDD Examination Standards of Practice. According to ASTM International (2010), “This guide established essential and recommended elements in the procedures for the conduct of a psychophysiological detection of deception (PDD) examination (p.745).” The revisions included the following:

3.1 The balloted item included additional language to be included under Section 5, Pretest Practices. The language specifically addressed “intense accusatory questioning immediately prior to a polygraph.”
3.2 The balloted item included additional language under Section 6, Intest Practices. The language specifically addressed the use of testing protocols which are supported by replicated scientific evidence or professional best practices.

For questions regarding the two balloted items under E2062-10, please contact Mark Handler at polygraphmark@gmail.com or Don Krapohl at krapohld@gmail.com.

References


The author of this article 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. If you have any questions regarding the upcoming meeting or have any other questions regarding Committee E52, please feel free to contact Marty Oelrich at martyoelrich@hotmail.com.

**Tech Talk, continued**

**Communication** – Since being on parole, have you had any unreported communication with a minor?

**Group** – In the past 6 months, other than what we discussed, have you misled your group about anything?

**Sex** – Since being on parole, have you performed a sexual act with a minor?

**Therapist** – In the past 6 months, other than what we discussed, have you lied to your therapist about anything?

**Viewed** – Since being on parole, have you viewed a minor in the nude?

**Cooperate** – Have you deliberately done anything to try and beat this test?

**EXTRA IRRELEVANTS** (reviewed but not necessarily asked):

**Tuesday** – Is today Tuesday? (actual day of examination)

**Philadelphia** – Right now are you in Philadelphia?

**Paris** – Right now are you in Paris?

By reviewing and asking the examination questions with these pre-fixes we are immediately allowing the examinee to accurately determine whether the question which is about to be asked is one that he or she is threatened by and one in which they will attempt deception. We have found that using pre-fixes in these types of examinations, results in more discriminating and accurate psychophysiological reactions.
The Likelihood Ratio (LR) provides a convenient and easily understandable index of how much a test result will change the probability or odds of having a condition after a known or assumed prior incidence rate (base rate). In the case of polygraph testing, the condition of interest is involvement in the issue under investigation. The LR+ tells us how much more likely it is that a person is lying than not, after failing a polygraph test, compared with the likelihood before he or she sat in the chair and completed the test. If a person produces a truthful test result, the LR- tells us how much more likely a person is to be telling the truth than before the test.

Test “accuracy” is a constellation of concerns, each of which elucidate different advantages and disadvantages. The search for a single numerical description of the constellation of test accuracy dimensions is unlikely to ever be satisfied. Simplistic descriptors of polygraph test accuracy involve frequency and proportion descriptions of the number of correct and incorrect decisions, both with and without inconclusive test results included in those calculations. Exclusion of inconclusive results produces more flattering numbers, but fails to provide all the information necessary to adequately evaluate or compare the effectiveness of different scoring and decision models. Conversely, inclusion of inconclusives into the calculation produces a less flattering but more realistic description of test accuracy as these calculations represent test sensitivity (percent correct for deceptive cases including inconclusives) and test specificity (percent correct for truthful cases including inconclusives), which can be used to calculate an LR.

LRs can be a useful aid to polygraph field examiners and their consumers (adjudicators, investigators, treatment providers) because there is a difference between the utility of the test and the utility of the test result. The first of these, utility of the test, includes such things as disclosure and deterrence, and are a function of the testing process not the test itself. The latter of these, utility of the test result, speaks to the diagnostic accuracy of the test, and the ability of the test result itself to assist professional decision makers to make more accurate judgments about an individual’s involvement or non-involvement in a behavioral issue of concern. The LR provides an expedient and usable scientific way to calculate a statistical description of the utility of the test result.

LRs may also be used to compare the efficacy of two or more scoring and decision models, for a given or assumed base rate. Different testing situations may benefit from the different strengths in a particular model. But in order to capitalize on that benefit, you must have some way to measure and assess its value. For example, screening numerous employees for security purposes is certainly different from conducting an event specific test in a police department. An informed examiner will be able to select one scoring and decision model over another for these two scenarios. LRs may be used to capitalize on a strength or appreciate limitations of a model and select a model that best fits the needs of that situation.

Results from a test with no diagnostic value add no incremental validity to the accuracy of professional decisions, beyond that which they could have made before or without the test using the prior incidence rate alone (simply guessing the base rate). Incremental validity results from diagnostic accuracy, and will be useful to all systemic processes that attempt to make use of the polygraph test result, whether pre-employment screening, PCSOT, information security, event-specific diagnostic testing, etc. While no actions should be taken solely on the results of any polygraph test, scientifically substantiated test results, with known error estimates, can add incremental validity to decisions made by professionals involved in investigations, risk management and community safety.

Interpretation and calculation of a LR is a simple matter, as it is a statement about the odds that a person or test result belongs in one category versus another category. The LR for a positive result (LR+) tells us the factor by which the probability or odds of the condition increase, beyond the prior incidence rate, when a test is positive (SR). The likelihood ratio for a negative result (LR-) tells us the factor by which the probability or odds of the condition decrease, below the prior incidence rate,
when a test is negative (NSR). The advantage of the LR, compared with traditional Bayesian metrics such as positive predictive value (PPV) and negative predictive value (NPV) is that the LR is inclusive of inconclusive results, and will provide information that more accurately generalizes to field settings. PPV and NPV, on the other hand, are exclusive of inconclusive results and provide information that is both non-resistant to (e.g., affected by) base rate differences and non-resistant to inconclusive results.

How to calculate LRs

The likelihood ratio of a positive test result (LR+) is sensitivity divided by 1 - specificity.

\[
LR^+ = \frac{\text{sensitivity}}{1 - \text{specificity}}
\]

The likelihood ratio of a negative test result (LR-) is 1 - sensitivity divided by specificity.

\[
LR^- = \frac{1 - \text{sensitivity}}{\text{specificity}}
\]

To make use of LRs with individual test results it is necessary to either know or make assumptions about the base rate or prior probability, before conducting the examination, that the examinee would be deceptive or involved in the behavioral concern. We can then make mathematical adjustments to our assumptions or knowledge about the probability of involvement in the issue of concern by multiplying the prior probability by the LR+, or the LR-. The prior probability, when multiplied by the LR, can be expressed as a simple proportion, or an odds ratio. Conversion of a proportion to an odds ratio is a simple matter, using the following formula.

\[
\text{odds} = \frac{\text{probability}}{1 - \text{probability}}
\]

Conversely, if we know the odds in favor of an event, the probability is just the odds divided by one plus the odds. Here's a formula.

\[
\text{probability} = \frac{\text{odds}}{1 + \text{odds}}
\]

When the LR is multiplied by the prior probability, expressed as a proportion or an odds ratio, the result tells us how much a positive or negative result changes the likelihood that an examinee was truthful or deceptive. Honts and Schweinle (2009) used the sensitivity and specificity levels of the Test for Espionage and Sabotage (TES), to plot the LR+ and LR- across all base rates to describe the information gained index (IGI) for deceptive, truthful and inconclusive results.

\[
\text{odds}_{\text{post}} = \text{odds}_{\text{pre}} \times \text{likelihood ratio}
\]

The post-test probability or odds represent the new odds or probability that a subject is truthful or deceptive, following an “SR” or “NSR” test result. It incorporates information about the base rate and information about the diagnostic test itself (the likelihood ratio).

For the below example we calculated the LR+ and LR- for both the 7-position and Empirical Scoring System (ESS) results using the same data from the Blackwell (1998) study.

In this example we are simply using the LR+ and LR- with the base rates published in the Blackwell data (65% deceptive and 35% truthful) to demonstrate the difference between the Blackwell 7-position performance and the decremented ESS performance.

For the 7-position we used the sensitivity of .97 and specificity of .44 obtained from the data from the original study results. The LR+ is 1.7 and the LR- is .07. See Table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test results</th>
<th>Actually Deceptive</th>
<th>Actually Truthful</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“SR”</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“NSR”</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For ESS we used a sensitivity of 0.79 and a specificity of 0.78 which came from the Nelson et al. (2008) analysis of this data set using ESS. The LR+ is 3.5 and the LR- is .27. See Table 2.

You can see the different tradeoffs for each test model in Table 3 which were calculated using
Table 2. Numbers of subjects testing deceptive and truthful using ESS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test results</th>
<th>Actually Deceptive</th>
<th>Actually Truthful</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SR</strong></td>
<td>51</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NSR</strong></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>65</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

the diagnostic test calculator version 2006032401 (Schwartz, 2007). This calculator is free software, available under the Clarified Artistic License and allows the user to calculate and appreciate the tradeoffs of LRss and other accuracy aspects. The prior odds of deception are the same for both groups 1.8 to 1 for deception and about 0.5 to 1 for truthful. After the polygraph test, however one can appreciate the difference in post-test odds. For the ESS model, a positive test result (SR) suggests the subject is almost 7 times more likely to be deceptive than truthful. For the 7-position model a positive test result suggests the subject is about 3 times more likely to be deceptive than truthful. Conversely one can appreciate the trade-offs in the truthful decisions between the models. For the ESS model, a negative test result (NSR) suggests the subject is about 1/10th times more likely to be truthful than deceptive. For the 7-position model a negative test result suggests the subject is about 4/100th times more likely to be truthful than deceptive.

Simply pointing to a single aspect of an accuracy profile like sensitivity or false negative rates is not likely to well-inform an end user of the overall usefulness of a particular model. As we have shown here, different models performed differently on the same data set. It is incumbent upon polygraph examiners to learn the potential strengths and weaknesses of their testing models so they can best advise their consumer on the confidence of the results they provide. This will empower the consumer to make the best use of the utility of the test result. Having an understanding of how tests work will allow us to make adjustments to fit the testing needs. We can adjust sensitivities, specificities or inconclusives for truthful and deceptive cases by adjusting the decision alpha (cut scores). We can use these estimates to make predictions of how our actions will affect the test performance. For example, a positive result from a test with high sensitivity and poor specificity may not be as informative as a negative result, under the same circumstances.

Many situations would seem to call for balanced sensitivity and specificity that can accurately differentiate truthful from deceptive subjects well above chance. Some situations, however, may desire a model that is risk-aversive and misses few deceptive subjects, at the cost of many false-positive results. In either circumstance, in order to be able to evaluate testing models, we need a tool by which to compare them. Additionally, to provide end-users with useful information about the test result, we need a metric by which they may make estimates of the odds of deception or truthfulness. The LR is a convenient, simple and well researched index that fulfills both requirements.

Table 3. ESS and 7-position prior and posterior probabilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sensitivity</th>
<th>Specificity</th>
<th>LR+</th>
<th>LR-</th>
<th>Base rate Truthful -prior probability of deception (odds)</th>
<th>Base rate Deceptive -prior probability of deception (odds)</th>
<th>Positive test Posterior probability of deception (odds)</th>
<th>Neg. test Posterior probability of deception (odds)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ESS</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>35% (0.54)</td>
<td>65% (1.8)</td>
<td>87% (6.7)</td>
<td>13% (0.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-pos.</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>35% (0.54)</td>
<td>65% (1.8)</td>
<td>76% (3.2)</td>
<td>4% (0.04)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Plato sat quietly by a stream fishing. He was in deep conversation with Socrates, his “life instructor” on the nature of truth. Fishing always helped Plato unravel the day’s thoughts.

The fishing line tugs. He pulls. Our intrepid fisherman is now the proud owner of a box with a small hole. Something rattles when he shakes it. What could be inside? The rusty latch crumbles.

Inside he finds a brass tube. He feels a rough etching. Maybe something written?

He washes off the mud and wipes it on the lawn. In the sun’s morning’s rays he barely makes out the four words that would change the world forever, “****** truth***** inside *******place *******speak.” The rest was all garbled.

What could this puzzle mean? Was this a present from the gods? Truth? Inside?

The open box was empty. So he closed it. But still the promised truth did not appear.

Place? Place what?

The ray of sun glanced off the tube.

Oh! The tube in the box! It was a perfect fit.

Speak?

At this point Plato felt a little foolish. But then he learned that sometimes doing foolish things in life can lead to great wisdom; not unlike that week-long drinking / hunting / and when in Greece do as the Greek men do party. Now that was hard won wisdom. Never hunt with men who don’t know how to shoot straight.

So speaking something into what appeared to be a brass tube was nothing to worry about. He figured he would start with the truth.


“I said that I am a man.” He wondered why he yelled at the thing.

“I heard you the first time. Yes, that is true.”

Stunned, Plato dropped the box as though a snake.

“Ouch!”

He approached and carefully opened the lid. No one was inside.

“Close the lid. You’re letting in a draft.”
“Slam!”

“Who or what are you?”

“Speak into my tube and I will tell you whether you speak true or false.”

Plato was amazed at what was now obviously a gift from the gods. But he needed proof.

“I have a girlfriend,” he said into the tube.

He heard a small snicker from inside. “You speak only a half-truth for I know that you have many friends.”

Plato was amazed.

“That will be one silver coin please.”

“What? A coin?”

“I lost my magic coin at the bottom of the river many years ago. I need it for my discernments.”

“How then did you rightly divine the truth with me?”

“I guessed. A fifty-fifty chance is all I can provide without my magic coin so place the coin inside me. Ask your question, shake and I will speak the truth.”

Plato fished a coin from his pocket and slid it down the tube.

“I am dressed in silk,” he said hoping no one within earshot could hear.

He shook the box and listened to the coin inside rattle to a stop.

“The magic coin says that you tell true about your loins but not about the rest of you.”

Plato was astounded.

Plato and his “Truth Box” made millions. It is to be noted though that he would have been twice as rich if the box would have been more than half-right.

Patrick Lynch is a teacher and the son of Michael Lynch, APA Member and Primary Instructor with the Marston Polygraph Academy. Michael Lynch can be reached at mlynch@lawyerspolygraph.com. The opinions and comments expressed in this article do not necessarily reflect those of the Marston Polygraph Academy or the American Polygraph Association.

**Quotables**

_The reasonable man adapts himself to the world; the unreasonable one persists in trying to adapt the world to himself. Therefore all progress depends on the unreasonable man._

~G.B. Shaw, *Man and Superman*, 1903
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