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## Academic Schedule 2014

### Professional Course in Forensic Psychophysiology - Polygraph

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of the Course</th>
<th>Dates</th>
<th>Schedule</th>
<th>Duration (in Hours)</th>
<th>Modality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Daytime 1 - Bogota</td>
<td>February 10th to May 24th</td>
<td>Monday to Saturday 7:00 to 13:30</td>
<td>560</td>
<td>On-Site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daytime 2 - Bogota</td>
<td>May 26th to August 30th</td>
<td>Monday to Saturday 7:00 to 13:30</td>
<td>560</td>
<td>On-Site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daytime 3 - Bogota</td>
<td>September 15th to December 20th</td>
<td>Monday to Saturday 7:00 to 13:30</td>
<td>560</td>
<td>On-Site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nighttime 1 - Bogota</td>
<td>April 21st to August 18th</td>
<td>Monday to Friday 17:30 to 22:00 (Saturday 7:00 to 13:30)</td>
<td>560</td>
<td>On-Site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nighttime 2 - Bogota</td>
<td>August 11th to December 6th</td>
<td>Monday to Friday 17:30 to 12:00 (Saturday 7:00 to 13:30)</td>
<td>560</td>
<td>On-Site</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Graduate Courses

### Seminars

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of the Course</th>
<th>Dates</th>
<th>Schedule</th>
<th>Duration (in Hours)</th>
<th>Modality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Seminar of Lie Detection</td>
<td>March 14th</td>
<td>Friday 8:30 to 16:30</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>On Site/Virtual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Seminar for Polygraph Experts</td>
<td>May 23rd and 24th</td>
<td>Thursday and Friday 8:30 to 16:30</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>On Site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seminar of Security in Personnel Selection Processes</td>
<td>June 21st</td>
<td>Friday 8:30 to 16:30</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>On Site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seminar Regarding How to Prevent Delinquency Inside the Organizations</td>
<td>September 20th</td>
<td>Friday 8:30 to 16:30</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>On Site</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Other Courses

- **Training in Countermeasures Detection**
  - Dates: April 1st to 8th
  - Schedule: Monday to Friday, 8:30 to 21:30
  - Duration: 16:30
  - Modality: On Site/Virtual

- **PSOT Advanced Course (Certified by the APA)**
  - Dates: October 6th to 8th
  - Schedule: Monday to Friday, 8:30 to 16:00
  - Duration: 32
  - Modality: On Site

- **World Congress of Forensic Sciences and Polygraph**
  - Dates: November 26th to 29th
  - Schedule: 8:00 to 16:00
  - Duration: 32
  - Modality: On Site
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Quality data acquisition begins with your instrumentation
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The Paragon advantage
High resolution 24 bit data acquisition system.
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Lemo push-pull latching technology for a secure connection.
High-Retention USB requires 5 lbs force to disconnect.
Proven EDA technology that works when you need it.
Visit our video library to learn more
www.youtube.com/limestonetechinc

The Silver Solution is everything you need
protected in a Pelican instrument case.

- Data acquisition system: 8 channel DataPac_USB or 9 channel Paragon
- Polygraph Professional Suite software license
- 2 pneumatic respiration transducers
- 1 EDA lead, 1 set of 24k gold plated electrodes, 1 set of snap ends, 1 package of
  100 disposable Ag/AgCl wet-gel electrodes
- 1 adjustable blood pressure cuff, 1 FingerCuff, cardio tubing and Riester
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Contact us today
for a competitive quote.
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All-inclusive polygraph solutions
for the professional examiner

Polygraph Professional Suite Silver Solution
Best instrument, best results, best value!
Editor’s Corner

- Robbie Sue Bennett -

July 5, 1932
to
March 4, 2014

Robbie served as the APA National Office Manager for 29 years. There is hardly any member she has not helped personally. The APA has lost a true friend. May she rest in peace.

The next issue of the APA Magazine will feature a tribute to Robbie. Anyone wishing to share memories, stories, photos, etc. of Robbie is invited to submit them for publication (editor@polygraph.org). Closing date is May 9th.

- Don

APA
BOARD OF DIRECTORS
2013-2014

President
Charles (Chuck) Slupski
P.O. Box 2008
619 Hwy 138 West, Ste. C
Stockbridge, GA 30281
president@polygraph.org

President - Elect
Ray Nelson
presidentelect@polygraph.org

Chairman of the Board
Barry Cushman
c/o PPD
109 Middle Street
Portland, ME 04101
chair@polygraph.org

Vice President – Government
Donnie Dutton
vp-government@polygraph.org

Vice President – Private
J. Patrick O’Burke
vp-private@polygraph.org

Vice President – Law Enforcement
Walt Goodson
6100 Guadalupe Street
Austin, Texas 78752
vp-lawenforcement@polygraph.org

Director
George Baranowski
Mindsight Consultants
1912 E. US Hwy 20, Suite 202
Michigan City, IN 46360
directorbaranowski@polygraph.org

Director
Bill Fleisher
directorfleisher@polygraph.org

Director
Michael Gougler
P.O. Box 4022
Lago Vista, TX 78645
directorgougler@polygraph.org

Director
Jamie McCloughan
directormccloughan@polygraph.org

Director
Pam Shaw
1890 Starshoot Parkway
Suite 170-366
Lexington, KY 40509
directorshaw@polygraph.org

Ex Officio Members

Acting National Office Manager
Lisa Jacocks
P.O. Box 8037
Chattanooga, TN 37414-0037
manager@polygraph.org

Treasurer
Chad Russell
treasurer@polygraph.org

General Counsel
Gordon L. Vaughan, Esq.
Vaughan & DeMuro
111 S. Tejon St., Suite 545
Colorado Springs, CO 80903-2245
gvaughan@vaughandemuro.com

Editor-in-Chief
Donald J. Krapohl
P.O. Box 10411
Ft. Jackson, SC 29207
Editor@polygraph.org
In Memoriam

Robbie Sue Bennett

Robbie passed peacefully from this life on March 4, 2014 after a gradual decline in health. She was cared for by her sisters June and Faye during the last days of her life. Robbie was born in Decatur, TN but has been living in Chattanooga since 1978 after traveling the world with her husband Bill while serving in the Air Force. She was the secretary to the American Polygraph Association for 29 years, a position that she took very seriously and helped everyone she could. She is highly regarded by everyone who met her.

“No matter what instrument you use, we’ll train you. Be assured that our goal is to provide unmatched polygraph training.”

THE ACADEMY OF POLYGRAPH SCIENCE
Contact Us For More Information and Registration!

2014 Training Schedule

Basic Examiner's Course
• Fort Myers, Florida: Jan. 6 - Mar. 14, 2014
• Fort Myers, Florida: Jul. 14 - Sept. 19, 2014
• Fort Myers, Florida: Oct. 6 - Dec. 16, 2014

Post Conviction Sexual Offender Training Course
• Fort Myers, Florida: March 17-21, 2014
• Fort Myers, Florida: Sept. 22-26, 2014

Basic Examiner's Course
• Fort Myers, Florida: Apr. 7 - Jun. 13, 2014

“Simplifying Polygraph
For Law Enforcement, Government and Private Examiners

For registration, tuition and general questions, contact Instructor Ben Blalock
TEL: (630) 258-9030
E-mail: Ben@apsPolygraphSchool.com
FAX: (630) 860-9775

Academy of Polygraph Science
8695 College Parkway, Suite 2160
Fort Myers, Florida 33919

www.apsPolygraphSchool.com
In Memoriam

Cyrus D. Harden
The APA regrets the passing of Cyrus D. Harden of Atlanta on October 27, 2013. Mr. Harden was a Full Member of the American Polygraph Association since 1968, and a polygraph examiner for over 50 years.

Andrew B. Dollins
The APA regrets to announce the passing of Dr. Andrew “Andy” Belvin Dollins on February 13, 2014. Andy was well known in the polygraph community for his rigorous research, his support for best practices, and as a friend to all he knew. He worked for the National Center for Credibility Assessment and its predecessor organizations since 1993, and led and participated in some of the organization’s most important polygraph research studies. His obituary can be found at http://dunbar.tributes.com/our_obituaries/Andrew-Belvin-Dollins-99853010.

Dr. Dollins (center) with Cleve Backster (left) and Dr. Gordon Barland (right).

(photo courtesy of Bob Heard)
Announcement Regarding the 2014 APA Election Schedule

If you are interested in running for office, please take note of the positions being voted this year:

President Elect (1 year)
Vice President Government (1 yr)
Vice President Law Enforcement (1 yr)
Vice President Private (1 yr)
Director 2 (2 yrs)
Director 4 (2 yrs)

Applicants must specify which of the six offices he or she is a candidate. Candidates can only run for one office per year.

Below are important dates to remember

* May 1 – May 30: Period to submit nominations and self-nominations in writing to the National Office. Nominations must include a cover letter specifying for which office the candidate is vying.

* June 14: Last day to submit a candidate statement of up to 500 words for the APA Magazine and on the APA website.

* June 15 – 30: Validation of eligibility for holding APA office.

* July 5: Closing date for the APA Magazine. Candidacy letters published on APA website and the APA Magazine.

* July 12: Email notification of upcoming elections (Ensure your email address is correct with the National Office and APA website.

* July 14 – 20: Electronic elections.

* July 22: Posting of results of the APA elections.

* August 1: Email notification to members of a runoff, if necessary.

* August 4 – August 10: Runoff elections if necessary.

* August 11: Notification to winners. Posting of final election results

* September 11: Swearing in of officers at the Annual Banquet.

For additional information contact George Baranowski at directorbaranowski@polygraph.org
For sale
Almost new LX4000-B. Asking only $4000. Includes pneumo tubes, GSR plates, arm cuff, pump bulb, plethysmograph, seat activity sensor, and Lafayette Instruments carrying case. Deal also includes a Logitech HD 1080p webcam and software. Contact Savana Jones at savyjones@gmail.com, or by cell at (208) 431-4937.

Quotables

I’d rather attempt to do something great and fail than to attempt to do nothing and succeed.

~ Robert H. Schuller

Buy and Sell

MARSTON POLYGRAPH ACADEMY, LLC
390 Orange Show Lane - San Bernardino, California
Call toll free: (877) 627-2223
www.marstonpolygraphacademy.com / mail@marstonpolygraphacademy.com
The truth of the matter is, administering a polygraph exam without insurance is reckless.

Professional and Personal Injury Liability
Optional Coverages Available:
   Interviewing
   Written Testing
   Private Investigation
   Background Checks
   Law Enforcement Polygraphs
General Liability (available in most states)
Polygraph Examiner Training Schedule

Academy for Scientific Investigative Training

**Basic Examiner Course**
March 3 - April 25 (Philadelphia)
September 15 - November 7 (Philadelphia)

**Advanced Polygraph Course**
April 1 - 2 (Cape Town, South Africa)
July 28 - 29 (Philadelphia)

**Basic PCSOT**
April 28 - May 1 (Philadelphia)
November 10 - 14 (Philadelphia)

**Advanced PCSOT**
July 30 - 31 (Philadelphia)

**Forensic Assessment Interview and Interrogation Seminar**
March 10 - 14 (Philadelphia)
November 10 - 14 (Philadelphia)

**Morgan Interview Theme Technique**
April 24 - 25 (Singapore)

Academy of Polygraph Science

**Basic Examiner Course (Fort Myers)**
April 7 - June 13, 2014
July 14 - September 19, 2014
October 6 - December 16, 2014

American International Institute of Polygraph

**Basic Examiner Course**
March 31 - June 6 (South Africa)
May 12 - July 18 (Georgia)
August 25 - October 31 (Georgia)
September 22 - November 28 (South Africa)

**Backster School of Lie Detection**

**Basic Examiner Course**
January 6 - March 14, 2014

Gazit International Polygraph School

**Basic Examiner Course**
January 26 – April 3, 2014

Marston Polygraph Academy

*(all listed courses taught in San Bernardino, CA)*

**Basic Polygraph Instruction (400 hours)**
April 7, 2014 to June 13, 2014
July 7, 2014 to September 12, 2014
October 6, 2014 to December 12, 2014

**PCSOT Basic Course (40 hours)**
March 17, 2014 to March 21, 2014
June 16, 2014 to June 20, 2014
September 15, 2014 to September 19, 2014

Attention School Directors

If you would like to see your school’s course dates listed here, simply send your upcoming course schedule to editor@polygraph.org.
APA CANCELLATIONS REFUND POLICY:
Cancellations received in writing prior to 08/20/14 will receive a full refund. Persons canceling after 08/20/14 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)

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). 1014

DATE OF ARRIVAL_________________________________ DATE OF DEPARTURE__________________________________
Upcoming Seminars

The Indiana Polygraph Association (IPA) will hold their Spring Seminar on Friday, April 4, 2014 at the Indiana State Police Museum, located at 8660 E. 21st Street, Indianapolis, Indiana (near 1-70 and Post Road). Guest speaker will be Gordon Vaughan, APA General Counsel. The seminar is free to current IPA members; $100 for non-members. For more information, contact Delmer Gross at 812-246-5424 (dgross@isp.in.gov) or Sid Newton at 317-921-5336 (snewton@isp.in.gov).

The Annual Seminar of the American Association of Police Polygraphists (AAPP), co-sponsored by the California Association of Polygraph Examiners (CAPE), will be held on April 27 - May 2, 2014 at the Hilton Lake Las Vegas Resort & Spa in Henderson, Nevada. Please visit the AAPP website www.policepolygraph.org for more information.

New Jersey Polygraphists, Inc. will hold their next training seminar on May 5 - 7, 2014 in Atlantic City, New Jersey. Speakers will be Dr. David Raskin of the University of Utah, and Donald Krapohl, APA Editor. For further information is available by visiting their website at njpolygraph.net, via phone at 973-931-2028 or by email at Callmps@aol.com.

The APA Asia-Pacific Seminar will be held May 19-22, 2014 at the Conrad Centennial Singapore. For more information and a registration form, see pages 15-17 of this issue of the APA Magazine.
The CPSpro combines the unparalleled accuracy of Stoelting's polygraph hardware with our all-new state-of-the-art Fusion software. Designed from the ground up, CPSpro Fusion is loaded with innovative and powerful new features which will provide you with all the tools necessary to efficiently and reliably conduct, score, and report polygraph examinations.

When your reputation is on the line, and the truth is the only thing that matters, you can be confident that the CPSpro provides you with the tools to make the right call. Let CPSpro put science on your side…
Join us in Singapore for the APA Asia-Pacific Seminar!

APA Asia-Pacific Seminar
May 19 - 22, 2014
Conrad Centennial Singapore

Contact Information: APA National Office, P.O. Box 8037, Chattanooga, TN 37414-0037
Toll Free: 1-800-272-8037, Fax: 423-894-5435

Registration Deadline: April 18, 2014

PLEASE SEE REGISTRATION FORM FOR SEMINAR COST AND HOTEL INFORMATION
ASIA-PACIFIC SEMINAR AGENDA
May 19-22, 2014

SEMINAR TOPICS
Valid Principles (Update)
Extended Interviewing
Federal Formats
Test Data Analysis
Quality Assurance & Quality Control
Countermeasures
Empirical Scoring System
DLCs & DLST
Interviewing & Interrogations
The Utah Technique
Brain Fingerprinting
Legal Issues

SPEAKERS
Chuck Slupski
APA President
Raymond Nelson
APA President-Elect
Michael Gouger
APA Director
Skip Webb
APA Past-President
Don Kraphol
APA Editor
Pat O’Burke
APA VP Private
Larry Farwell
Government Works
Dominique Ngoo
Singapore Police Force
Pam Shaw
APA Director
Bill Fleisher
APA Director
Gordon Vaughan
APA Legal Counsel
MINDEF CCA Team
MINDEF CCA
Wenny
Brunei
Tim Lin Guh-Tyng
Taiwan

BANQUET GUEST SPEAKER:
William F. Norris
Director, National Center for Credibility Assessment
THE AMERICAN POLYGRAPH ASSOCIATION (APA)

ASIA-PACIFIC SEMINAR
MAY 19-22, 2014

ADVANCED REGISTRATION IS REQUIRED

APA FEDERAL ID #52-1035722

REGISTRATION
7:00 AM – 8:30 AM – MONDAY, MAY 19, 2014
**IN ORDER TO HAVE ADEQUATE SEATING, ADVANCED REGISTRATION IS REQUIRED**
1-800-272-8037 or 423-892-3992
FAX: 423-894-5435

SEMINAR HOURS
8:30 AM – 5:00 PM – MONDAY – THURSDAY
MAY 19-22, 2014

THURSDAY NIGHT BANQUET
6:30 – 7:30 PM – RECEPTION - BALL ROOM FOYER
7:30 – 10:00 PM – DINNER - BALL ROOM

LODGING
CONRAD CENTENNIAL SINGAPORE
TWO TEMASEK BOULEVARD

RESERVATIONS
CALL: 65-6432 7192/FAX: 65-6333 9166
Individual Reservations Cut-Off Date: 4/18/14

GROUP ROOM RATE
PRE-PAID BY MAY 18, 2014
SINGAPORE RATE SGD $320.00++ PER ROOM PER NIGHT
(Please be advised that all room rates quoted are indicative guideline rates and are subject to changes upon confirmation of the dates.)

SEMINAR FEE
FLAT RATE OF USD $1800.00

TO REGISTER FOR THE SEMINAR, PLEASE COMPLETE AND E-MAIL THIS FORM TO:
OFFICE@POLYGRAPH.ORG

Print Legibly or Type the Following

NAME: _______________________________ BUSINESS PHONE:____________________
ADDRESS:__________________________________________________________________
NAME ON NAME TAG:_______________________________________________________

Please remit payment to:
Credibility Solutions and Technologies PTE LTD
Bank Name: OCBC Bank
Bank Address: 65 Chulia Street, OCBC Centre, Singapore 049513
Bank Code: 7339
Branch Code: 629
SWIFT Code: OCBCSGSG

CES-ASIA-PACIFIC SEMINAR, MAY 19-22, 2014 (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). 2014
Greetings fellow APA members.

By this time most members will have heard of the sad news of the passing of our APA office manager Robbie Bennett. It is a testament to a personal integrity when there is universal sentiment about the importance of an individual in the work and lives of others. The outpouring of heartfelt sadness surrounding this news is well deserved. I knew Robbie only a short time compared to many others, but my experiences with her are probably no different than those of most APA members. Robbie was among the most pleasant, and hard-working, and conscientious supporters of the profession that we will ever know. Robbie Bennett gave the profession a human voice and human contact at the APA National Office, and made the effective operation of the APA her life work for these last years of her time on earth. We are fortunate to have benefited so greatly from her commitment to the APA and the profession. More importantly, we are fortunate to have benefited from Robbie’s humanness and genuine concern for people as individuals. There is a lot to be said for professionalism and attention to details, but the contribution of Robbie to the APA National Office and the profession at large goes well beyond her administrative capabilities. Robbie was a sincere friend to the APA as a whole and a sincere friend to APA members as individuals. Those of us who spend so much time assembling detailed accounts of the in-humanity and indecency that some persons inflict on others will have a deep understanding of the importance and value of human decency.

If we know in our hearts and believe that there is purpose and meaning in this world, that events and lives are not a simple mass of meaningless chaos without order, organization or direction, if we believe that the existence of meaning and direction prompts a choice about where and on what we place our highest value, if we believe that meaning and purpose are
central to the difference between right and wrong, and if we believe that the process of being human is a process of choices related to our beliefs about some purpose larger than the minutes before us, then we will recognize that Robbie lived her life with dedication to something she believed in. While it is not for me to define what her ultimate meaning and purpose was, it is easy to recognize her commitment and the value she held for the APA and its members. The APA and the other dedicated professionals at the national office will proceed into the future with an indelible memory of the example she set. If we believe that the process of being human and living a good life is more than a few chemical reactions and more than a series of choices, then we might also believe that passing from this lifetime is simply a transition - and that Robbie is now in a better place. Regardless, Robbie will be missed by many.

Robbie’s life work for the past 29 years was attending to the details of the APA. She would want that we not neglect those details at this time. As always there are a number of large and small things involving the profession and the future. Board members, committee members and others are continuing to provide education and training in the areas of validated techniques, normative data, suitability for polygraph testing, and the important role these have in the forensic and screening polygraph testing. Activities of the committees in recent months have included providing information to legal professionals regarding critical polygraph cases, and continuing to answer questions and inquiries about the art and science of polygraph testing. We anticipate continued increase in discussion and awareness of the importance of evidence-based-practices (EBP) and the use of validated polygraph techniques for which test results can be accounted for with published normative data and defended with published evidence.

As always the most important aspect of the polygraph profession, is the professional membership – those hardworking professionals who take the time and effort to hone their skills and abilities to seek the truth and obtain information from the myriad of persons who are motivated toward deceit and dangerousness. With that in mind, perhaps the best place to make contact with other professionals, and advance our knowledge and skills is the annual APA conference – this year in
the fine city of Seattle. The location, as usual is terrific for learning, but also to re-invigorate our professional energy and make the kind of personal and professional friendships that make the work, the workplace, and the world a better place to spend our lives.

J. Patrick O’Burke  
Vice President, Private

I am hoping that everyone is not suffering too badly from the snows and cold weather that seem to have hit the United States here lately. It seems that the weather has been so cold that global warming is no longer correct and what we experience is now just called “climate change.” There are also plenty of other issues impacting all over the world as well that remind us of our sometimes precarious existence. Please stay warm and safe until the conference in September.

In this issue, I wanted to talk about an issue that has been at the top of my priority list for a good while, the American Polygraph Association’s website. There was a time that I can remember when the “Yellow Pages” of the phone book were a mandatory business requirement. Those days are since long gone, having been replaced by the Internet and business or personal websites. The APA website should serve a variety of purposes for our organization, including supporting our members, allowing the transaction of business and being our ambassador to the general public. My impression is that the current APA website needs some considerable updating to fill the role that is required for an organization, such as ours that is both large and international.

For the private examiner, being visible in this electronic information age is everything. As with most things, visibility can cost money. The APA provides a Member Profile for examiners to post a short bio and contact information that could be used by the public in locating a polygraph examiner that is absolutely free. However, the features of the Member Profile are not adequate for the task and it lacks search engine criteria that would be beneficial for the public to use. It is surprising to me why so many members fail to use Member Profile. The one reason, which seems most likely, is that it does not work for our membership.
Another shortcoming has been in the ability to transact business with the APA via the website. The task of handling paperwork, such as conference registrations and applications for membership, is an onerous labor intensive chore. As such, we need to make it possible to have online submissions for the bulk of these paperwork submissions. This is one area where using computers to make our life easier is well suited. I am also aware from numerous conversations that we need the ability to process applications, and their required payments, in an on-line and more convenient method for our normal APA business.

I wanted to let you know that we have heard your concerns and have been examining these issues. One of our committee members was tasked and has made extensive effort to identify design ideas that allow us to see what is possible in turning the APA website into a professional Internet web portal. Certainly, we want to tackle the issues of processing on-line applications and accepting on-line payments that will make things easier for our members, as well as increasing information security. However, we also see how we can create better Member Profiles features that will better serve our membership and the public. Search criteria, such as language ability, PCSOT and other search features are possible. We can create the capability of having Member Profile where public and private side features could be utilized, resumes could be uploaded, or URLs created that would allow each member to set their own personal “mini-website” that could bring the public right to their electronic doorstep.

As a profession, we also need to make our website our own 24-hour-a-day, seven days a week advocate for the polygraph profession. The APA website is perhaps the most frequently utilized website that is an advocate for our profession. There are a number of opponents of polygraph and other technologies that expend a significant amount of effort to get out their message. As a profession, polygraph needs to have a full time professional “lobbyist” and that person should be our APA website. We are planning to discuss the issue of upgrading the APA website in the near future. I am asking, actually urging, our membership to provide ideas for improvement in business processes and public image for our profession. I
hope to hear from you soon, and if not, I am making plans to be able to show you an impressive, sophisticated and professional APA website in Seattle. Take care out there.

**Michael Gougler**

**Director**

Fellow Members,

It is less than six months until the seminar in Seattle, Washington. We are working with members of the Northwest Polygraph Association to ensure that this year’s event will be a memorable one. The APA is extending the APA membership rate to all members of the NWPA who are in good standing with the association. Don Clendennen is coordinating the effort with the Northwest Polygraph Association.

As most of you are aware Robbie Bennett passed away on March 4, 2014. Miss Robbie was the face of the APA for the past three decades. She was a hard worker that always put the APA first in her life. She is in a better place and will never be forgotten. Rest in peace my dear friend.

We are in the planning stages for the Tuesday night event, “A Night at the Ballpark.” The Seattle Mariners will host the Houston Astros in an evening contest. We hope you will plan on attending the game. The ballpark is only a mile from the hotel.

We will have an outstanding program that will emphasize “Act With Integrity’, the theme of this year’s conference.

Special thanks to Steve Duncan who is handling the technology issues for the classrooms.

Please get your nominations in for the annual APA awards. Skip Webb is leading the awards committee this year and he will coordinate the process with Donnie Dutton as the general chair.

Special thanks to Jamie Brown for once again donating a complete Limestone Polygraph system to the recipient of the Yankee Scholarship.

We will have interpreter services in classroom A and B throughout the seminar. Thanks to Chris Fausett for again providing the interpreters for the APA seminar. Lafayette Instruments has continued to be one of our most
generous supporters. Ray Nelson is again handling the coordination of translators.

Thanks to Complete Equity Markets and Melanie Javens for once again providing support to the association.

The Sheraton Seattle is the fabulous venue right in the heart of downtown near Pike Place Market! The room rate is government per diem until our allotment is sold out. Rooms are limited so please book early.

A schedule of classes and events will soon be posted on the website for your review. I look forward to seeing you in Seattle!

**Pamela Shaw**  
**Director**

Hello APA Board Members,

I’m sure many of you have heard by now that the APA’s National Office Manager, Robbie Bennett, passed away in early March. It is a deep loss for our association and the many, many members that Robbie influenced in her years of service. Robbie gave of herself day in and day out for almost 30 years at the National Office and tirelessly worked to better our association and our profession. Her dedication and commitment to the members of the APA was beyond compare. She was a pillar and mainstay for many examiners around the world that requested assistance from the APA throughout the year. In my seven years on the board I got to know Robbie well and I consider myself blessed to have known her. She was truly an example of service to others and working to the benefit of all. Beyond her work ethic and loyalty, Robbie was simply a joy to interact with. She had a giggle and innocence about her that was endearing. Robbie, we will all miss you greatly!

Though the details of routine life and business dull in comparison to the loss of someone like Robbie, I also know that the APA was one of her passions, and as such, she would want more than anything that we continue on with the good works already in progress. In that vein, I continue my report. In just a few short months the APA will be holding its 3rd APA Asia-Pacific Seminar in Singapore. This has been a seminar that has been held every 2 years in the Asia-Pacific region in an effort to reach out
to examiners in this part of the world, creating an opportunity to participate in the APA seminar experience while receiving continuing education. Given the expense and demands of intercontinental travel, many of our international members never get to experience the APA seminars held in the U.S. The previous Asia-Pacific seminars have been a success for the APA and so we are continuing to develop relationships and polygraph educational endeavors in the region (Please see the flyer and registration form in this issue of the magazine). The APA board realizes that there are many other areas of the world that might also benefit from this type of opportunity, and consequently, we welcome your feedback and suggestions as to how we might be able to expand this type of outreach in your country or region of the world.

Apart from the preparations of the APA Asia-Pacific seminar, there have also been on-going discussions about how we might be able to improve the APA website and whether or not we might be able to start accepting payments for memberships and seminars online. This is no small undertaking, but a project many of the board members would like to see realized. This will continue to be a part of board discussions and we hope to report that at some time in the near future that this has been accomplished.

Lastly, details regarding the upcoming national seminar in Seattle are almost finalized. Please keep an eye out for the schedule and the events that are planned. All of us on the Board look forward to seeing you there!

Gordon Vaughan
General Counsel

As General Counsel, I do not ordinarily provide written reports for the APA Magazine. Those are typically given orally to the Board of Directors at the various meetings. From time to time, there are occasions in which I feel there is information or something I have to say that I think is important – either just for me to say or which I think might be information for APA membership to hear. This is one of those occasions.

As you know from other submissions to this Magazine, the APA has lost two giants to the organization, to polygraph, and to those family and friends who knew them: T.V. O’Malley and Robbie Bennett.
As General Counsel for 17 years, serving with and for T.V. while he was a committee volunteer, Board Member, and APA President, I admired the energy and thoughtfulness that T.V. brought to every project and every office he undertook. He was more knowledgeable than any lawyer, including myself, of the Employee Polygraph Protection Act. I remember once in a lecture at an APA seminar I suggested T.V. was wrong about an interpretation he had of a provision of the Act – only to find that I was the one who was in error. After that, I often just referred inquiries on EPPA directly to T.V. as I knew on close calls I would be likely seeking his counsel.

At my first APA Board meeting, Robbie introduced herself to me and said that if there was anything I needed just to give her a call and she would take care of it (something I am sure all of you were told as well). While she might not have expected the hundreds of calls and e-mails calling in on that offer, she never once failed to come through or once expressed irritation at the request. I saw Robbie recently, after it was apparent that her health would overtake her ability to continue in her position with the APA. Even then, she wanted to know what she could do to help us in the transition of her absence.

I will miss T.V. and Robbie, but I am thankful that they were there for me and for the APA. We owe much to them both.

---

**THE POLYGRAPH QUESTION**

**Question:** Angelo Mosso used a device in the 1880s he called the “scientific cradle” in his studies on fear. In addition to the shifting of blood in the body, what physiological channels did he record, and what was the name of the recording instrument?

(Answer on page 34)
American International Institute of Polygraph

Address: PO Box 2008, Stockbridge, GA. 30281
619 Highway 138 W, Suite C, Stockbridge, GA 30281
Phone: 770-960-1377 Fax: 770.960.1355
Email: AIIP@Qpolygraph.com

BASIC - 2014 - United States

Professional Polygraph Examiner's Basic Training Program

Winter 2014
Schedule 1: January 6 - March 14, 2013 (Stockbridge, GA) 10 weeks

Spring & Summer 2014
Schedule 1: May 12 – July 18, 2014 (Stockbridge, GA) 10 weeks

Fall 2014
Schedule 1: August 25 - October 31, 2014 (Stockbridge, GA) 10 weeks

BASIC - 2014 – South Africa

Professional Polygraph Examiner's Basic Training Program
Schedule 1: March 31 – June 6, 2014 (Pretoria) 10 weeks

Schedule 1: September 22 – November 28, 2014 (Pretoria) 10 weeks

Advanced Training / Continuing Education

Basic PCSOT 40 hour Seminar / Stockbridge, GA
November 3 – 7, 2014
**LX5000 Advanced Computerized Polygraph**

The LX5000 provides superior physiological data and the most advanced electrodermal solutions that have ever been available to polygraph examiners. Backed by hardware and software engineers with decades of experience, the LX5000 system offers a robust platform that stands apart from other systems, performing under the most demanding conditions. *Our LX5000 is the most advanced and flexible polygraph system available today!*

**LX5000 Hardware Features**

- Designed as a robust system that is significantly smaller in size, our basic LX5000 System records nine channels at a time, and provides you with many additional benefits including:
  - Data transfer rate up to 360 samples per second across all channels
  - 24-bit analog to digital conversion
  - Small, compact design making transport and storage easy
  - Can add up to 9 additional channels (18 total)
  - Extended measurement ranges
  - Selectable GSR or GSC channel
  - Dedicated PPG channel included
  - Durable, yet lightweight design
  - Operation with our proven, state-of-the-art LXSoftware
  - 3 year warranty and lifetime technical support

**LXSoftware v11.1 Features**

Windows®-based since 1994, our software offers unparalleled ease-of-use and proven reliability, and is Windows® 7 compatible. LXSoftware comes with POLYSCORE® and Objective Scoring System Scoring Algorithms, as well as, the following features:

- Updated User List and Audit Trail
- Ability to “Snap” an Individual Trace to Baseline
- Integrated Multi-Language Support for English, Spanish, and Russian languages
- Six EDA choices (GSR or GSC - manual, detrended, and automatic)
- Multi-Camera Support: will support up to 16 cameras, providing multiple views of the subject
- Customizable Personal History and Exam/Series forms
- Scripting Capability
- Save Polygraph Files and all other documents as PDF formats

sales@lafayetteinstrument.com
www.lafayettepolygraph.com
Phone: (765) 423-1505
Conclusions

The legality of polygraph use varies from country to country and differs according to its various applications. On the basis of its assessed accuracy levels, the author considers that its merits in some areas may be greater than in others. Further, I note that the National Research Council’s (2003) findings suggested that its effectiveness in assessing deceitfulness is considerably better than that of the average individual or even trained professionals who do not employ this technology. As such, it is observed that the assessed 10 to 20% error rate noted in polygraph testing by the National Research Council (2003) would raise questions about the use of the polygraph in
areas where the likelihood of deception is low, for example in relation to security vetting. Further, I would judge that its application for investigative as opposed to evidentiary purposes, where more significant levels of deceitfulness are likely, e.g. in sexual offender assessment, ought to be viewed as sufficiently different as to be considered on its own merit and distinct from the polygraph’s other asserted uses. In addition, polygraph’s growth in sex offender work should, in my opinion, be a subject of some reflection in advance of criticism, since experienced practitioners in this field appear, in the great majority, to accept its utility and efficacy. However, issues of informed consent and possible self-incrimination should be considered on a case by case basis. Chaffin (2011) expressed clinical and ethical concerns with regard to polygraph testing juveniles and, relatedly, referenced that other vulnerable individuals, such as those who have mental ill health or intellectual disabilities may be inappropriate to assess in this way. Clearly, vulnerability and capacity are important considerations when using PCSOT and careful judgments, as well as advanced training for these polygraph examiners, would be appropriate to ensure best practice with careful consideration given to the ethical issues involved. In the UK the polygraph is not employed with individuals under the age of eighteen for PCSOT purposes. Perhaps relatedly, the author recognizes a need for specialized PCSOT training to take account of the possible effects of recollecting traumatic experiences, in particular among individuals being polygraphed who are psychologically more vulnerable. It is advised that working in an integrated way with the rest of the supervision and intervention staff will afford greater protection in this regard and also reflects responsible practice. It is also noted that in the USA, offenders are often obliged to pay for their own periodic polygraph examinations and, in circumstances where they fail, the frequency of retesting is greater, such that they may feel more impelled to pass their examinations in order to avoid increasing costs to them and their families. Such conditions may pressure offenders to be more open, though they may also introduce extraneous variables affecting the quality and accuracy of information conveyed. This practice is not employed in the UK, though comparison of disclosures does not suggest that paying personally for polygraph tests notably changes the range and type of information proffered by offenders. Finally, while it is legal to impel offenders to pay for their own
polygraphs in parts of the USA, the ethical aspect of this practice continues to be the subject of debate.

Offenders involved in treatment have a right to privacy in areas unconcerned with their offending behaviors, though by virtue of their convicted status, their rights are limited and they must face identified consequences for non-compliance with the conditions of their court orders. This applies to treatment involvement, psychometric assessment, supervision, restrictions imposed on their freedom of movement and their capacity for making various independent choices. In this sense, the polygraph is not different from other court mandated requirements and while considered invasive, if administered in accordance with strict professional standards, it could hardly be seen to be more intrusive than other accepted assessment and treatment strategies, including phallometric testing (Kalmus, Beech and Warberg 2009), the use of which is accepted by the European Court of Justice.

The USA National Research Council (2003) concluded that the polygraph was substantially better than chance, though short of perfection in its capacity for assessing deceitfulness. The British Psychological Society (2004) also expressed concerns about polygraph validity and accuracy, though the investigating committee did report that there was a developing body of evidence to suggest that the polygraph can encourage sex offenders to disclose their deviant thoughts and behaviors in ways that may assist those responsible for their supervision and treatment. The author would concur with these views and advise the reader to more carefully differentiate between the contexts within which polygraphy may be debated (Grubin 2010b). Within the field of sex offender work, the polygraph should, in my view, be regarded as one of a number of tools that may, in concert, be employed to improve assessment, treatment and offender monitoring. While it is certainly not infallible, this charge may equally be levelled in relation to professional judgment, psychometric evaluation and offender treatment, based on observations and assessed results in terms of our work in this field (Blacker, et al. 2011; Hanson, et al. 2002; Thornton, et al. 2003; Wilcox, et al. 2009). Though safeguards are in order, the capacity of polygraphy to contribute in an integrated way to better offense understanding, treatment engagement and
supervision are such that while being mindful of sound ethical practice, its rejection would, in my opinion, ultimately reduce public protection.

Taking full account of the rights of convicted individuals is an important consideration in any democratic society and notably, steps can and should be taken to minimize risk of self incrimination by asking questions that relate to offending behavior (prior to their current conviction) without seeking specific information that might directly lead to further criminal investigation. Importantly, offenders may nonetheless choose to give detailed disclosures about past offending behavior and such self-reports should be supported and respected by professionals involved.

Where disclosures occur, it is clear that they will need to be followed up if this is in the interest of protecting vulnerable individuals, though this same challenge occurs within group work or individual supervision. However, in my opinion, an important exception exists in relation to the administering of Monitoring Polygraph Examinations, where professionals involved perceive a need to investigate specific issues around possible new breaches or offences. Even so, where an offender acknowledges such additional criminal activity, their disclosure should be viewed as a positive alternative to continued denial.

As a society we must safeguard the rights of all of our citizens to the degree achievable, taking steps to enable offenders to hold themselves more accountable, as per the conditions of their court orders and gaining necessary information to assist them in developing more robust and tailored future plans for offense free lives. Ultimately, the polygraph is only one of a number of tools that professionals can employ in the work that they undertake and, as with other interventions, it can be subject to misuse. This however, reflects a need for vigilance and sound ethical standards. Nevertheless, the risk that polygraphy may be misused or the argument that it is not ‘one hundred percent’ accurate should not compel us to conclude that therefore polygraphy should be disused. Indeed, taking these two criteria into account, if this were the case, as a practicing forensic psychologist, I should in good faith consider finding other work.
Toward More Successful Interrogations

by Walter H. Greene

Introduction by Dale Austin

Introduction

In this edition of Hopefully Helpful, Walt Greene talks about “Successful Interrogations.” While there may be limited cross-over to specific issue testing, Walt is writing about screening exams. Walt—again—is spot on with his posttest advice that we must come across as confident and competent, and we must never quit. Len Harrelson, my first polygraph instructor, told us to keep pressing in our posttest. We could stop only when the subject provided relevant information, or stated he wanted to discontinue testing (or talk to a lawyer). Otherwise, “just give it five more minutes.”

About the author: Walter Greene is a retired federal polygraph examiner. The opinions and comments expressed in this article do not necessarily reflect those of the U.S. Government or the American Polygraph Association.
A couple of important points for us to think about:

1) The subject must know exactly where s/he stands when we start our interrogation.

2) Ordinarily, the more specific the interrogation, the more successful we will be. Once we decide that the subject is not NSR (not truthful), we must be as specific as possible in letting him/her know exactly where we plan to go. This is done by providing a logical, clear statement of fact. For instance, a good approach that is low-key, but straightforward, is to tell the subject, “Freddie, clearly there is more we need to discuss concerning (specific topic).” Initially, don’t say anything more or less. Wait for a response, or the lack of one. We are not calling the subject a liar. Yet, this approach leaves us a lot of room for maneuvering. Even if the subject responds with a strong denial, it doesn’t matter. The chances are extremely high that not everything about the selected topic has been discussed. At the same time, we are coming across as confident and competent, two ingredients that are absolutely necessary. A key here is to never back down. We must obtain some item of information that was not previously discussed. In many cases, the subject will provide information that will lead to areas that are more and more productive.

Once the “DPS” or “DPC”* is given, we should wait for the subject’s response, and then repeat our statement. At that point, it is generally a good idea to launch into our first theme. It may be something like, “Freddie, clearly there is more we have to discuss concerning the drugs issue.”

* “DPS” or “DPC”: Direct Positive Statement or Direct Positive Confrontation.

If there was no denial after the initial DPS or DPC, our second statement should be stronger, e.g., “Freddie, there is more we have to discuss about your use of drugs for non-medicinal purposes. Let me explain that when most people have problems with this issue, it’s not because they are hard core drug users or bad people. It’s because they are like most other people walking down the street everyday who have tried something out of curiosity or as a result of peer pressure. Sometimes we find ourselves
in situations where we do something that is totally out of character for us. This is not at all unusual; it’s human nature not to be perfect, etc.”

An error that is commonly made is presenting alternatives much too early, before the subject has “bought in” to our theme(s), and is ready to accept one of the choices. Speaking of alternatives, it’s best to try to make the lowest one a little worse than what we really believe the subject has done. The “higher” alternative should be as bad as we can make it, without sounding ridiculous.

Although there are always exceptions, we need to avoid general interrogations as much as possible. They are a last resort. Remember that the more general our questions are, the more vague and time-consuming the answers will be. The majority of our subjects is not ignorant, and can tell that we are simply taking a stab in the dark, if that, in fact, is what we’re doing. I’m convinced that in some cases, we might be better off making a calculated estimate based on charts, Personal History Statement, behavior, etc., about which topic to interrogate on if there is a problem we haven’t identified.

One final important point: Some phrases to avoid during interrogations are, “Can you think of anything else?”, “Is there anything else?”, and similar phrases. Instead, use with regularity, “What else?”

??? THE POLYGRAPH QUESTION ???

Answer: Mosso recorded respiration and changes in blood volume on a kymographeon. (from *La Peur: Étude Psycho-Physiologique*, 1886)
A cheating heart and an honest EDA

The case of contradicting responses

Tuvya T. Amsel

Every now and then examiners witness the phenomenon of contradicting responses in where in one or two channels the psychophysiological responses to the relevant question contradict the responses of another channel in the adjacent comparison question, such as seen in following figures:
The phenomenon is practically impossible since an examinee cannot be truthful as well as deceptive to the same question let alone at the same time, which in return creates a practical dilemma to the examiner of how to analyze those responses.

**What causes the phenomenon?**

Prof. Eitan Elaad, a well-known polygraph researcher has a few theories: “These responses are probably a mix of various causes, but first we have to keep in mind the following:

- “Personal differences between examinees’ responses that are being displayed in: a) different typical physiological responses and patterns, b) their unique dominant channel in where some has a dominant respiratory response or a dominant EDA response and so on and c) the immediateness of the responses i.e. how quickly they responded to the stimulus which of course also varies from examinee to examinee.
- “Latency period (time interval between the stimulus and the psychophysiological response to it) differ between each and every channel. The EDA is the fastest responding channel followed by the cardiovascular and then comes the slowest: the respiratory channel. These differences create a situation in were the EDA may shoot a short, minimal and quick response while the other channels are still in the process of developing the response.
- “Response duration (the time it takes the body to recover from its responding stage back to stability) which is different from channel to channel and needless to say from examinee to examinee. As mentioned before, the EDA reaches its peak pretty quickly while the other channels are still on their way to reach their peak.

“Considering all these factors we may witness a situation where the examinee is listening to a question and while answering or while s/he is close to answering it s/he suddenly realizes that

---

Prof. Eitan Elaad of The Department of Behavioral Sciences at Ariel University, formerly head of Polygraph Research at the Israeli National Police. Personal communication, October 2013.
s/he gave a wrong answer or a thought of doubt regarding the accuracy of the answer crossed his mind. This may be reflected instantly in the faster channel such as the EDA but not in the slower channel or channels resulting in a contradicting response.

“Another possible explanation to the phenomenon may be attributed to the difference sources of the psychophysiological response. While the EDA source is an orienting response (a reflex which brings about an immediate response to the slightest changes in the world around us i.e. stimulation, where the body prepares for both fight and flight until the source of the stimulation can be resolved) the cardiovascular and respiratory channels source is a suppression response (the conscious avoidance of an unpleasant thought which results in reduction of “firing” neurons). The different sources may affect and produce contradicting responses. It should be kept in mind than whenever an examinee hears a question, an orienting response will occur preparing the body either to fight or to flee, and upon identifying the stimulus the body will either continue to respond if the question poses a threat, or cease to response if the question is unthreatening.”

Dr. Ofer Lehaviii a physician and a graduate of basic polygraph training explains:

“Unlike a classical ‘fight or flight’ response to a genuine threat, the threat in a polygraph test is a result of the examinee’s cognition, which may confuse the examinee’s body resulting in contradicting responses. One should keep in mind that while the cardiovascular and respiratory responses reflect the transfer of the Autonomous Nervous System (ANS) control from the parasympathetic to sympathetic, the EDA channel is ONLY sympathetic. As a result in the process of homeostasis the body prioritizes which organ should be disconnected first and the EDA will be the first to cease responding.

“Another possible explanation might be the phenomenon called ‘The Parasympathetic Paradoxical Syndrome’ (PPS). PPS is a dynamic ANS imbalance

---

iiOfer Lehavi, M.D. Personal communication, March 2013.
that seems to accompany many diffuse and ill-defined symptoms mostly occurring together. The basic ANS problem is its inability to maintain bodily functions at a stable normal level. For example, if the blood pressure drops a little, e.g., on standing up, instead of increasing sympathetic activity a little to raise the blood pressure closer to normal, the body increases sympathetic activity too much so that the blood pressure becomes too high. Sensing that it is too high, the body tries to increase parasympathetic activity to bring the blood pressure down, but often overshoots, dropping blood pressure too much and triggering an increase in sympathetic activity. Such ‘over-responses’ to physical or emotional stresses, often followed by ‘over-corrections,’ are responsible for many of the ANS problems. Acute stresses can trigger sympathetic surges, making you jittery and ‘anxious’ (a physical, not psychological, phenomenon). Worse, sudden increases in sympathetic activity can trigger excessive parasympathetic ‘corrections’, causing nausea, sweating, lightheadedness and alike.”

**Suggested Recommendation**

None of these theories fully explain the phenomenon of contradicting responses and with all due respect to the interesting speculations, practitioners deal with the consequences, or in other words, our main concern is for operational guidance and practical advice of how to analyze such responses.

Though the phenomena are not very rare, experience shows that even with examinees that display such contradicting responses, it occurs maybe once but no more than twice during their test, thus enabling the examiner, in spite of it, to reach a conclusion. Hence, based on this assumption if the phenomenon occurred only once during three repetitions or more of a relevant question, just follow the rule “if in doubt zero it out” and assign zero or no response to that question. But if the phenomenon systematically appears in all relevant questions it is strongly advised you follow the rule “where in doubt there is no doubt” and call the examinee ‘unfit for testing’.

---

The author is a private examiner in Israel, and a regular contributor to the publications of the American Polygraph Association. The views expressed in this column are solely those of the author, and do not necessarily represent those of the American Polygraph Association. Publishable comments and replies regarding this column can be sent to editor@polygraph.org.
Does the polygraph measure lies? Why is it called a lie detector test? Does it measure fear? Is there some physiological response or activity that is uniquely associated with lying? Can lies be measured in a manner similar to the ways that physical things or events can be measured? Is there such a thing as a lie detector test, or a test that actually detects lies? Are there any other causes or activities besides lying that could cause reactions to polygraph questions? Are the results infallible? Have the test result ever been wrong? Can someone learn to fake the test results? What normative data exist to quantify our present knowledge regarding reactions from guilty or innocent persons? What is the confidence level or probability of error and associated confidence interval for test accuracy?

These and other questions have been heard repeatedly by examiners and scientists regarding the polygraph test. They are not merely rhetorical questions, and they are not asked for the simple purpose of being critical. Rather, these questions are often be asked in the spirit of administrative, scientific and legal, scrutiny. Neglecting to study and develop realistic evidence-based answers to these questions is simply unwise. Underlying these questions are
more fundamental questions about the underlying theory or construct on which the polygraph test functions. While the pursuit of answers to these questions may be the domain of researchers and scientists more than field practitioners, working professionals at all levels face the potential for damaging the outcome of individual cases or damaging the credibility and stature of the profession if they are completely unprepared to respond confidently to these questions.

Pioneers in polygraph testing faced the challenge of making order out of chaos for the first time, and did not enjoy the luxury of an existing knowledge-base in the way we do today. In that context test administration was largely a clinical process in which the intuition and experience of the examiner was centrally featured as the basis of test effectiveness and test accuracy – in the absence of procedural methods and normative data to support a structured quantitative solution. This can be seen historically in the methods devised by Keeler, in which quantitative analysis was not a large concern; by Reid, in which numerical analysis began to become important - though Reid, in the absence of an existing knowledge-base to guide decisions about cut-scores, wisely refrained from imposing the use of fixed cutscores and instead emphasized a more clinical approach to the decision concerning the final test result; by Backster who sought to overcome the myriad of emerging subjective clinical approaches through the development of a more structured procedural methods, using numerical cut-scores that seem to have been devised either intuitively or through some unpublished study; by the U.S. Government polygraph programs that sought to standardize the test by clarifying the structure of decision rules and fixed cutscores; by the group of researchers at the University of Utah, who published their empirical and statistical analysis regarding numerical and statistical scoring methods; and by the more recent Emperical Scoring System, based on decades of prior knowledge and evidence, in attempt to structure and simplify the application of norm-reference statistical procedures to polygraph scoring tasks. Clinical methods are excellent solutions in the learning context, and remain excellent solutions whenever validated structured objective methods do not yet exist.

One obvious upside of a clinical approach is the sense of professional satisfaction that ensues when
exercising a high level of expertise to an effective solution and resolution of an important matter. Another advantage of a clinical approach is the rich volume of information that can be developed for later scrutiny. As with most things there are advantages and disadvantages to every solution. The downside of a clinical approach is that the methods are inherently subjective, and also inherently difficult to teach and learn. As with other forms of testing, the emergence of methods for numerical scoring and statistical analysis have led to increases in both test accuracy and test reliability. That is where we stand today: it is difficult to find an ethical position from which to advocate for a less accurate and less reliable clinical approach when we have quantitative models that have been shown to provide better overall validity. The optimal solution will be to leverage the advantages of the two approaches: a clinical approach to develop rich sources of information, and a quantitative approach to ensure validity and reliability.

Returning to the question about ‘what does the polygraph measure,’ answering this questions is a process itself which can benefit from some explanation and definition. Scientific questions can be said to be enduring questions, in that we will never know everything: there is always more to learn. In that context it will be important to refrain from the temptation or impulse to express our present knowledge as if it is absolute knowledge that it not subject to change or modification when new information becomes available. Indeed resistance to change in the context of new knowledge – including observed phenomena that cannot be adequately accounted for with existing explanations – is a hallmark of dogma, pseudoscience, and the pursuit of goals that pertain more to individual egos, businesses or other organizations than to knowledge or the profession as a whole. The pursuit of knowledge is a never ending process, simply because it is humanly impossible to know everything. There is always more to learn. Our task is to continue learning, and to continue making good use of new emerging knowledge, including information and technology. Neglecting to make use of new knowledge is to risk becoming an anachronism.

What does the polygraph measure? The simplest and most general explanation is that the polygraph, like other tests, measures response to a stimulus. Stimulus-and-response, in some form,
is a construct that is central to virtually all forms of testing: present a stimulus and observe/measure the response. Although interesting, this explanation is a bit too generic to be very useful. At a more practical level the polygraph test can be said to measure physiological responses, involving the respiratory, cardiovascular and integumentary systems, in addition to somatic activity in skeletal muscle. Although more descriptive, this still does not satisfy the initial inquiry about what the polygraph actually measures. Indeed, it would be avoidant of the question to stop at this point. Advancing deeper into the detail, we note that those physiological reactions are associated with arousal in the autonomic nervous system, occurring in response to the test stimulus questions. This begs the next question: what is the relationship between autonomic arousal and lying? And the next question - what is the potential to observe the same autonomic arousal when someone is not lying? In the realm of science, there is always another layer of detail to investigate.

Questions about the correlation between autonomic arousal and lying are empirical questions, for which the answer exists in the form of a statistical correlation to describe the strength of association between observed autonomic responses and lying about a past behavior. These questions also involve the potential that observed autonomic arousal is caused by something other than lying. More precisely, what is the potential to observe autonomic response when a person is lying or not lying in response to a stimulus question that describes a past behavioral fact? In the polygraph testing context this question is further refined - what is the potential to observe certain differences in autonomic responses to target and control stimuli when a person is lying about a behavior described by the target stimuli? These questions underscore the importance of the study and development of normative data to quantify and describe our knowledge about responses that are expected to be typically observed among guilty or innocent persons who undergo polygraph testing.

Related empirical questions will involve the psychological basis of physiological responses. It was suggested many years ago that the psychological basis of reaction was emotion and fear, and this was a satisfactory explanation until the theoretical premise was evaluated with respect to physiological responses that are common to both
comparison question techniques and concealed information tests, and with regard to the similar effectiveness of comparison question tests formulated with probable-lie questions and directed-lie questions. As with other forms of science our working theories and hypotheses must be evaluated with consideration for both historical data and also for new information and new observed phenomena. When the data and evidence do not agree with the theory or hypothesis, then one of them must begin to change. Good scientific investigation, like good criminal investigation, does not allow for changing the data or evidence; it is the theory or hypothesis that must begin to change. In the polygraph testing context the emotion-fear hypothesis may not have been completely wrong, but is now viewed as largely incomplete. A more satisfactory working theory would recognize that research in psychophysiology tells us clearly that physiological differences between various emotions cannot be observed or measured by field polygraph instruments. A more complete working theory would therefore include a range of potential emotions as potentially underlying responses to test stimuli, and would also recognize that cognition or mental activity and behavioral conditioning appear to play a greater role than had been discussed in decades past.

While it is useful to develop a more satisfactory working theory about the psychological basis of response, there is always more to learn. Continued scientific inquiry may eventually help us to more effectively discriminate between various emotions, and may help us to better describe the mechanisms and relationship between behavioral experience and responses to test stimuli, and the relationship between the mental activities of deception and physiological responses to test stimuli. Continued scientific investigation may eventually help us to understand more precise details about the physiological mechanisms and actions that can be observed and recorded – and the correlation between these mechanisms and deception or other human phenomena.

Regardless of the depth of our knowledge, there will always remain more to learn – simply because it is humanly impossible to know everything. And regardless of the depth of our knowledge about the minute details of the psychological and physiological mechanisms underlying responses to test stimuli, the meaning
and interpretation of recorded and observed responses will remain an empirical and probabilistic question. This is because, as far as our present knowledge suggests, all physiological and all psychological activities have multiple causes and multiple purposes. Answers to empirical questions are unavoidably probabilistic concerns for which we must be careful that there is no false expectation of a deterministic or perfect solution for which randomness and error play absolutely no role. The alternative to learning to account for polygraph testing in a probabilistic manner would be for us to engage in pretense and dishonesty around the potential for absolute certainty.

Because there is no such thing as a perfect test that works every time without error for every person, our task – as a scientific community – is to continue to develop our knowledge-base and normative data to quantify and account for the probability that our test result is correct or incorrect. Our task – as a community of field practice professionals – is to learn to understand and make use of the best scientific knowledge available. The choice to neglect the best knowledge and information, or to emphasize procedures, practices and assumptions based on a less accurate or less complete knowledge-base, would betray our scientific obligation and betray the trust placed in us by our communities, agencies and countries to provide the most accurate possible assessment of an individual credibility.

What does the polygraph measure? The polygraph test, like other tests, measures response to the test stimulus. Responses to polygraph test stimuli are observed and measured in the form of differences in the strength of responses as the examinee is presented with comparison or control stimuli in sequence together with investigation target stimuli that describe the examinee’s possible involvement in or relationship to a factual or behavior issue of concern. While the basis of responses is psychological, the observed and recorded responses are physiological, allowing the polygraph instrument and polygraph examiner to observe and record the relative salience or differential salience of the different types of test stimulus questions. Salience can be thought of as a function of the basic principles and mechanisms of psychology, including emotion, cognition, and conditioning. Because the test stimuli refer to behavior, physiological responses are interpreted with the assumption that they are correlated with behavior – as long as
the observed responses are timely with the test stimuli and no interference or distracting stimuli is present during testing. Published evidence has repeatedly confirmed the operational construct that responses will tend to load onto relevant or comparison stimulus questions as a function of deception or truth-telling. Recorded data from multiple physiological sensors are aggregated together in the form of a numerical structural model that is compared with our knowledge, in the form of published normative data, about responses commonly observed among deceptive and truthful persons. If our knowledge is anchored in the form of quantitative information that is representative of the population and the examinee, recorded responses to test stimuli can be used to determine the empirical or statistical likelihood of a correct or incorrect result when the examiner has concluded that the responses from the examinee conform more closely to those of persons known to be deceptive or truthful.

One answer to the question concerning the question ‘why it is called a lie detector test,’ is this: the term lie detector test is a term of convenience, not a term of science. It is a term that conveys the goal and purpose of polygraph testing in a concise way that is easily understood by untrained persons and non-professionals. Despite the value of simplicity, it would be unwise for working professionals to actually limit or restrict understanding and intelligence to the simplistic hyperbole of ‘lie detector test.’ Instead, experts, professionals, and even technicians are all obligated to understand the details
and nuances of the test, so that they can better use the test capabilities and better account for their work when the need arises. In scientific terms the purpose of the test is not so much to detect lies but to discriminate between deception and truth-telling.

Tests can be said to be valid, in a scientific sense, if they increase the effectiveness of our discrimination, beyond what we might achieve by random chance alone, at statistically significant levels. This leads to another inevitable discussion about the need for statistical confidence intervals — and the potential hazards of neglecting these — but that is a topic for another time. Published studies at the present time indicate that some validated polygraph techniques are capable of average accuracy over 90% with a 95% confidence range from 86% to 96%. Scientific reviews tend to converge at an average accuracy rate that averages 89% for diagnostic exams with a confidence range of 83% to 95%.

Data at this time suggests that polygraph tests interpreted with the assumption that criterion state of the target questions vary independently may provide lower accuracy, with an average near 85% and a confidence range from 77% to 93%. The aggregated average accuracy of the range of validated techniques has been reported as 87% with a confidence range from 80% to 94%. While the reported averages tell us the trend or central tendency, the lower limit of the confidence range gives a more cautious or conservative view of the worst-case-scenario. Claims of accuracy in excess of the upper limits of these ranges are not consistent with the volume of available published evidence, and may simply be too good to be true.

Discussions about polygraph accuracy will inevitably prompt questions or discussions about the potential that someone can learn to fake the test result or defeat the polygraph test. Potential vulnerability to faking is a concern that is pertinent to all types of testing. This is again a complex topic for another time. Minimally, we must remember that there is no such thing as a perfect test. Polygraph accuracy depends, in part, on effective interviewing, effective test administration, and effective test data analysis. Test accuracy also depends on good instrumentation, good questions, and a suitable examinee who is represented by a knowledge-base and normative data. Effective faking strategies would have to increase testing errors beyond the confidence interval
surrounding known error rates. In the event that a testing error does occur it would be difficult to know whether the cause of error is related to intentional effort, or is simply within the known range of test accuracy and inaccuracy. The National Research Council (2003) wrote, “Claims that it is easy to train examinees to “beat” both the polygraph and trained examiners require scientific supporting evidence to be credible” p147.

Scientific proof of the effectiveness of faking strategies would have to show, with no potential for corrective action or remedy, a reproducible result in which the rate of error could be increased above the upper limit of the confidence range of the normally expected error rate. Of course, many tests, including the polygraph test, may include methods designed to identify, detect, and deter faking attempts.

Why is it not a truth-detector? Why not try to use the polygraph in a more optimistic paradigm? Questions about truth, and the compelling discussions they provoke, are also for another time. For now, it will have to suffice to say that truth is a philosophical question in the realm of epistemology and knowledge – with its own complex quandaries involving what kinds of things can be true, and what it means to say that something is true. The short answer is that opinions, beliefs, emotions and future events – or anything that cannot be factually verified – are not epistemological truths, unless we endorse a postmodern or deconstructionist view of truths as a form of subjective perspective or subjective experience.

A somewhat rationalist perspective would hold that truths are statements about facts that can potentially, though not always easily, be verified through empirical observation. From a statistical measurement perspective, positive test results inform us that the test result does not conform to our knowledge and evidence about how truthful persons respond. Polygraph test results that are statistically significant for deception signify that there is a high probability that external evidence will eventually be discovered to show that the person was involved in the behavioral issue of concern. In the practical work of polygraph and lie detection, we engage a form of pragmatic truth in which we accept persons as truthful when we are reasonably confident – based on a stated alpha level that describes our required confidence level or tolerance for error - that they are not lying.
Who Are We?

We are a profession but frequently fail to represent ourselves as such.

**JOB:** a small miscellaneous piece of work undertaken on order or at a stated rate; a specific duty, role or function; a regular remunerative position requiring little or limited formal education.

**OCCUPATION:** an activity in which one engages; the principle business of one’s life requiring some degree of formal training or academic education.

**PROFESSION:** a principle calling, vocation or employment requiring specialized knowledge and intensive academic preparation.¹

¹ Definitions from the *Miriam Webster Online Dictionary*. Edited for content.

About the author: Michael Lynch is a Primary Instructor with Marston Polygraph Academy. He can be reached at mlynch@lawyerspolygraph.com. The opinions and comments expressed in this article do not necessarily reflect those of Marston Polygraph Academy or the American Polygraph Association.
Who are we? How do we change the public perception polygraph is neither a job nor an occupation?

Semantics may be a partial solution. If we use “WE” rather than “I” in conversational dialogs, specialized knowledge and intensive academic preparation become the foundation examiner qualifications and not the usual debate over instrument accuracy. By offering people the opportunity to prove they are telling the truth, we become problem solvers in a world seeking answers to complex issues rather than polygraph technicians interested only in self-satisfying outcome. In conversational dialogs about polygraph, it might be best to focus on our ability to solve those complex issues rather than focus on descriptions of polygraph technicalities and detailed procedures.

Who are we? It all depends on what we say about our profession in the 21st Century.
In 1972 and 1978 two Wisconsin bicyclists were the victims of serious crimes. One rider was sexually assaulted and had her life dramatically changed by the subsequent investigation. The second victim almost lost his life, was hospitalized for several months, and never fully recovered from injuries he incurred. Both events resulted in criminal prosecutions in which the defendant was found guilty at trial. Appeals of both convictions brought about significant changes in Wisconsin criminal law regarding the admissibility of polygraph evidence in criminal trials.
The first offense occurred in Stevens Point. The victim was a sophomore at the University of Wisconsin-Stevens Point. She was an exceptional student from Milwaukee. Her father had been a high school teacher/coach and was presently the athletic director at a Milwaukee area high school. She intended to follow in her father’s career path. A serious boyfriend had recently become part of her life. She was enjoying college very much. April 26th had been a very pleasant sunny day in central Wisconsin, but it was a chilly night as the coed rode her bicycle through a quiet leafy residential neighborhood near campus. She was incredulous when a man suddenly grabbed her shoulders pulling her from the bicycle. After a significant struggle, the assailant was able to force the coed to the athletic field of a nearby high school. She was dragged into the dugout of the baseball field, where her clothing was forcibly removed and she was sexually assaulted. The attacker then disappeared into the night. After dressing, the young woman road her bike to her boyfriend’s dormitory. The police were called to the scene.

Six years later on May 31st a longtime resident of Elkhorn, was riding his bicycle along Highway 36 just west of the Burlington city limits. The weather had been beautiful that day, but why the bicycle rider decided to peddle his bicycle along Highway 36 in the dark has never been determined. Some members of the Elkhorn community might have described the cyclist as “odd.” He supported himself with a variety of manual labor jobs and lived in modest accommodations. Automobile traffic was light that night, but several cars were clustered behind a truck as they approached Burlington. One of those cars struck the bike rider launching him through the air before he landed alongside the road. His injuries were very severe. He laid unconscious in the hospital for three weeks. Several months passed before he recovered sufficiently to leave the hospital. The victim never fully recuperated from the injuries to his head. According to witnesses after skidding and striking the cyclist, the driver of the car never stopped but sped off into the night.

Aside from the fact that the victims in both cases were riding bicycles at the time of the crimes, they have another and more significant relationship. The prosecutions and subsequent legal actions that followed from each case marked the beginning and the end of polygraph evidence in Wisconsin criminal courts.

About one week after the sexual assault in Stevens Point, police developed a
suspect. The victim provided an eyewitness identification of that suspect in a police line-up. Physical evidence was recovered from the alleged crime scene and from the suspect’s residence which matched the description provided by the victim during her initial interview with investigators. DNA evidence was not available at the time of this offense, but the physical exam conducted immediately after the report of the offense confirmed the statements of victim that a sexual assault had occurred. Even though the suspect did not reside in Stevens Point, he acknowledged being there on the night of the assault and drinking heavily that same night. The complainant was cross-examined at great length during the preliminary hearing. The thrust of the questioning by defense counsel suggested the complainant was sexually promiscuous and made a fraudulent crime report to conceal that promiscuous behavior from her family. The judge found probable cause existed and directed that the case proceed to trial. Three days prior to the start of trial, defense counsel informed the district attorney that the defendant had submitted to polygraph testing and was found to truthful in denying the sexual assault. The test was administered by a police officer from another jurisdiction who administered the exam as a private agent of the defense counsel. The district attorney indicated that he would proceed with the prosecution. Early on the morning of the scheduled trial, the district attorney arranged polygraph testing of the complainant, by the same examiner who tested the defendant. That test found the complaint to be deceptive about some aspects of her claim to have been sexually assault. Nonetheless, the district attorney continued with the prosecution. Defense counsel attempted to introduce the polygraph test results into evidence during the trial. Consistent with existing evidentiary law, the judge refused to allow polygraph evidence to be presented. The defendant was found guilty by a jury and sentenced to prison. The conviction was appealed and was eventually considered by the Wisconsin Supreme Court. The polygraph test results were not the basis of the appeal, but were mentioned in a cursory manner in the defense submissions to the court. Nonetheless, in overturning the conviction the Supreme Court found that the defendant’s polygraph exam results should have been admitted, because polygraph testing had reached a point of sophistication and accuracy where admission into the trial proceedings was warranted (State v. Stanislawski, 62 Wis. 2d, 730). The court declared that subject to written stipulation agreement signed by defense
and prosecution polygraph exam results would henceforth be admissible evidence in Wisconsin courts. The decision was peculiar in several ways. First, as already mentioned, the polygraph results were not a significant aspect of the defense appeal argument. Secondly, no testimony or materials regarding the validity of polygraph exams was ever offered either at trial or in the appeals process. The overwhelming weight of evidence presented at trial was at odds with the polygraph findings. Finally, the court recommended that appropriate polygraph evidence come from exams administered in accordance with a systematic process of examination and data analysis such as that presented by John E. Reid and Fred E. Inbau in their text Truth and Deception (The Polygraph Technique). However, neither the exam of the defendant nor complainant was administered with the comparison question exam technique advocated by Reid and Inbau. Nevertheless, polygraph evidence became admissible in Wisconsin courts and was regularly utilized in criminal cases during subsequent years. For example, following the Supreme Court ruling, the Milwaukee District Attorney’s Office, the largest prosecuting agency in Wisconsin, entered into about 50 stipulation agreements annually.

Six years and 35 days after the incident in Stevens Point, a hit and run auto accident occurred in Walworth County just outside the City of Burlington. Burlington and Walworth County police never really initiated a search for the driver who fled the scene after striking the bicycle rider. Several hours after the incident on Highway...
36, Burlington Police received a series of anonymous telephone inquiries regarding whether a bicycle rider had been struck by a car on Highway 36 and the status of the bicycle rider. Seven hours after the incident, an individual presented himself at the Burlington Police Department and gave statement that he might have struck something along Highway 36 about 10 PM the previous night. The suspect insisted he never saw anything as he drove along Highway 36 but did hear a noise. He denied applying his brakes in a manner that caused his vehicle to leave long dark tire skid marks on the pavement at the point where the bicycle rider was struck. The suspect denied knowingly leaving the scene of accident. He did acknowledge spending considerable time at the Como Inn, a tavern several miles west of Burlington prior to driving home on Highway 36, but he adamantly denied driving while intoxicated. The suspect was a long time resident of Walworth County and had history of driving while intoxicated offenses. Several days later, Walworth County police presented the suspect at the office of the Walworth County District Attorney. He again denied knowingly striking the bicycle rider, deliberately fleeing the scene, and coming forward only after he was able to conceal his intoxication. The prosecutor expressed skepticism at the suspect’s account and indicated he would be more considerate in the prosecutorial decision if the suspect submitted to a stipulated polygraph examination. The suspect signed a standard the stipulation document, in which he agreed to submit to polygraph testing and that the results would be eligible for presentation at trial, should one occur.

The polygraph examination was administered by a Wisconsin Department of Justice polygraph examiner. The suspect was accompanied to the examination by a Walworth County police officer, who had been a longtime acquaintance of the suspect. The officer observed the exam on close circuit video. The examiner utilized a comparison question test procedure consistent with the guidelines set forth in the Supreme Court’s ruling authorizing polygraph admissibility. The test result indicated the suspect was deceptive when he denied seeing the bicycle rider on Highway 36 prior to the collision and knowingly fleeing the scene. After testing, the subject gave a statement in accordance with standard law enforcement practices to ensure that the subject is aware of his constitutional rights. The subject acknowledged that he had seen the bicycle rider prior to striking him and had strongly applied the
brakes of his car causing the car to skid on the pavement in a manner consistent with the tire markings investigators found at the scene. A subsequent statement by the suspect included the following comment; “I figured in my mind in having a lie-detector test that I would beat it.”

Despite these developments, the suspect entered a plea of not guilty and the case proceeded to trial. The polygraph examiner provided testimony during the trial to establish that the exam was administered in accord with the standards established for admissibility and as to the deceptive exam results. All exam materials, to include a video of the examination, were made available to the defense. The examiner was subject to cross examination by Dean’s attorney. The jury found the defendant guilty and a jail sentence was decreed by the court.

The conviction was appealed by the Wisconsin Public Defender’s office. The primary basis for appeal was the fact that the defendant had not been represented by counsel when he entered into the stipulation agreement that the results of his polygraph exam would be admissible at trial. The appeal did not submit that polygraph testing lacked appropriate validity or that all polygraph exams should be completely inadmissible. The Wisconsin Supreme Court eventually reviewed the case and ruled that henceforth polygraph examination results would no longer be admissible in Wisconsin courts (State v Dean 103 Wis. 2d, 228). The Court concluded that polygraph evidence had proved difficult to administer in the trial process. Since the defense did not make this argument in their written or oral arguments it is not clear as to the foundation of the court’s ruling.

The most perplexing aspect of this saga is that the polygraph exam that resulted in polygraph evidence becoming admissible evidence did not comply with the examination guidelines set forth in Supreme Court’s ruling, and based on the overwhelming weight of evidence the polygraph test result was almost certainly erroneous. While the exam that ended admissibility of polygraph evidenced adhered to all the court established benchmarks, and can realistically be considered as verified accurate based on the defendant’s posttest statement and preponderance of evidence. It can be reasonably contended that the Wisconsin Supreme Court’s rulings in these two cases unwittingly confirmed the Supreme Court’s second finding that the legal system was not able to properly evaluate and administer polygraph evidence.
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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.
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APA Accredited Polygraph Schools

Academy for Scientific Investigative Training
1704 Locust Street, 2nd Floor
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19103
Director: Nathan J. Gordon
Ph: 215.732.3349
Fax: 215.545.1773
E-mail: truthdoctor@polygraph-training.com
Webpage: www.polygraph-training.com

Academy of Polygraph Science
8695 College Parkway, Ste 2160
Fort Myers, FL 33919
Director: Benjamin Blalock
Ph: 239.424.9095
E-Mail: Ben@PolygraphToday.com
Webpage: www.apsPolygraphSchool.com

Academy of Polygraph Science Latinamerica
12945 Seminole Blvd. Ste 15
Largo, FL 33778
Director: Arno Horvath – 727.531.3782
E-Mail: polygraphacademy@hotmail.com
Website: abhpolygraphscience.com

American Institute of Polygraph (Singapore)
908 Barton Street
Otsego, Michigan 49078-1583
Director: Lynn P. Marcy
Ph: 269.692.2413
Fax: 269.694.4666
Webpage: www.polygraphis.com

American International Institute of Polygraph
P.O. Box 2008
Stockbridge, GA 30281
Director: Charles E. Slupski
Ph: 770.960.1377
Fax: 770.960.1355
E-mail: aiip@qpolygraph.com
Webpage: www.polygraphschool.com

Backster School of Lie Detection
861 Sixth Avenue, Suite 403
San Diego, California 92101-6379
Director: Cleve Backster
Ph: 619.233.6669
Fax: 619.233.3441
E-mail: clevebackster@cs.com
Webpage: www.backster.net

Canadian Police College Polygraph Training School
P.O. Box 8900
Ottawa, Ontario
Canada K1G 3J2
Director: Donald Macaulay
Ph: 613.998.0886
E-mail: donald.m.macaulay@rcmp-grc.gc.ca

Centro de Investigacion Forense Y Control de Confianza S.C.
Rodriguez Saro #523, Int. 501-A Col. Del Valle
Del. Benito Juarez
Mexico, D.F. C.P. 03100
Director: Jaime Raul Duran Valle
Ph: 011.52.55.2455.4624
Webpage: www.el-poligrafo.com

Centro Mexicano de Analisis Poligráfico y Psicologico, S.C.
Plateros 110, building 76, int 101
Col. San Jose Insurgentes
Del. Alvaro Obregon
Mexico D.F. (Mexico City) 03900
Phone: (52)(55) 56608728
(52)(55) 55936075
E-mail: fernanda@cemapp.com.mx

Gazit International Polygraph School
29 Hamered, Industry Building
P.O.Box 50474
Tel Aviv 61500 Israel
Director: Mordechai (Mordi) Gazit – 972.3.575.2488
E-mail: mordi@gazit-poly.co.il
Webpage: www.polygraph-school.com

Horowitz-Ginton Credibility Assessment Academy
11 Ben-Gurion, Vita Towers
Bnei-Brak 51260 Israel
Director: Dr. Avital Ginton
Ph: 972.3.616.1111
E-mail: ginton@zahav.net.il

Instituto Latinamericano de Poligrafia Mexico
Genova 33, Despacho 503
Col. Juarez Del Cuauhtemoc
C.P. 06600 Mexico D. F.
Director: Sandra Zambrano
E-mail: lpi2007@gmail.com

International Academy of Polygraph
1835 South Perimeter Road, Suite 125
Fort Lauderdale, Florida 33309-3066
Director: Scott A. Walters
Ph: 954.771.6900
Fax: 954.776.7687
E-mail: dci@deception.com

International Polygraph Studies Center
Insurgentes Sur No. 1877, Piso 2
Ofi. 204 Col. Guadalupe Inn
Deleg. Alvaro Obregon
C.P. 01020 Mexico D. F.
Director: Raymond Nelson – 303.587.0599
E-mail: international@poligrafia.com.mx

Israeli Government Polygraph School
P.O. Box 17193
Tel-Aviv 61171 Israel
Director: Eyal Peled
E-mail: igpolyschool@012.net.il
Latin American Polygraph Institute  
Carrera 46 #93-70  
Barrio La Castellana  
Bogotá, Colombia  
Director: Sidney Wise Arias  
Ph: 571.236.9630  
571.482.9421  
E-mail: swarias@bellsouth.net

Marston Polygraph Academy  
390 Orange Show Lane  
San Bernardino CA 92408  
Director: Cynthia Saenz  
Ph: 877.627.2223  
e-mail: mail@marstonpolygraphacademy.com  
Webpage: www.marstonpolygraphacademy.com

Maryland Institute of Criminal Justice  
8424 Veterans Highway, Suite 3  
Millersville, Maryland 21108-0458  
Director: Billy H. Thompson  
Ph: 410.987.6665 or 800.493.8181  
Fax: 410.987.4808  
E-mail: MDMICJ@aol.com  
Webpage: www.micj.com

Mexico Polygraph Studies Unit  
Calle Cuauhtemoc #168  
Colonia Tizapan de San Angel  
Mexico D.F. 01059  
Director: Luz Del Carmen Diaz  
Ph: 011.52.55.5616.6273  
E-mail: ldgalindo@entermas.net

MINDEF Centre for Credibility Assessment  
Block 13, Mandai Camp 2  
Singapore  
Director: V. Cholan – (65) 67684147  
E-mail: cholan@starinet.gov.sg

National Academy of Training and Investigations in Polygraph Analysis  
Reforma #364, Colonia Juarez  
Delegacion Cuauhtemoc  
Mexico, D.F. CP 0660  
Director: Jesus Sandoval Escalante  
Ph: 011.52.5.552.410313

National Center for Credibility Assessment  
7540 Pickens Avenue  
Fort Jackson, SC 29207  
Director: William F. Norris  
Ph: 803.751.9100  
Fax: 803.751.9125 or 37  
Registrar e-mail: registrar@ncca.mil  
Webpage: www.ncca.mil  
Federal, State, and Local Law Enforcement only

National Polygraph Academy  
1890 Star Shoot Parkway, Suite 170-366  
Lexington, KY 40509  
Director: Pam Shaw  
Phone: (859) 494-7429  
E-mail: shaw.national@gmail.com  
Website: http://www.nationalpolygraph.com

New England Polygraph Institute  
15 Glidden Road  
Moultonborough, NH 03254  
Director: David J. Crawford  
Ph: 603.253.8002  
E-mail: kacdc@worldpath.net

Northeast Counterdrug Training Center Polygraph Program  
c/o Dept. of Military & Veteran’s Affairs  
Building 8-64 Fort Indiantown Gap  
Annville, PA 17003-5002  
Director: Elmer Criswell  
Ph: 717.861.9432  
E-mail: lietestec@aol.com  
Municipal and State Agencies only

Texas Department of Public Safety Law Enforcement Polygraph School  
P.O. Box 4087  
Austin, Texas 78773-0001  
Director: Charles M. Hicks  
Ph: 512.997.4093  
Fax: 512.424.5717  
Local, State, and Federal agencies only

The Polygraph Institute  
19179 Blanco Road, Ste. 105, #812  
San Antonio, TX 78258  
Director: J. Patrick O’Burke  
Ph: 817.290.0033  
E-mail: JPOBurke@thepolygraphinstitute.com  
Webpage: www.thepolygraphinstitute.com

Tudor Academy  
Carrera 66, No. 42-103  
Barrio San Juaquin  
Medellin, Colombia  
Director: Charles Speagle  
Webpage: www.tudoracademy.com

Veridicus International Polygraph Academy  
Domingo Gonzales #35 Bis, Col. San Antonio Culhuacan  
Del. Iztapalapa  
Mexico DF, C.P. 09800  
Director: Yasmin Rios  
Ph: (01152) 1559103352  
Webpage: www.veridicusinc.com

Virginia School of Polygraph  
7885 Coppermine Drive  
Manassas, Virginia 20109  
Director: Darryl Debow  
Ph: 703.396.7657  
Fax: 703.396.7660  
E-mail: Polygraph11@comcast.net  
Webpage: www.virginiaschoolofpolygraph.com