

Reid Method: Developing Probable Lie Comparison Questions

Robert Peters

Numerous noteworthy developments in polygraph testing occurred during the preceding 90 years. It would not be unreasonable to assert that the most significant of those innovations is the development of the Probable Lie Comparison Question (PLC) by John Reid in 1947. A number of comparison question test (CQT) formats have been generated around the PLC. Although an exact determination is not possible, it appears that PLC examination formats are the most widely used polygraph testing technique around the world. PLCs provide the basis for a systematic diagnostic assessment (test data analysis) of polygraph physiological data. Systematic diagnosis provided the foundation for examination reliability. The PLC paved the way for another historic development, Cleve Backster's conception of numerical analysis of test data. PLC techniques established that the consistency and intensity of physiological response to individual test questions (stimuli) are an accurate measurement of an examinee's emotional and cognitive attention. (It was Reid's belief that the consistency of physiological response was of greater importance than the intensity of a response for diagnosing truth and deception.) For many years polygraph examiners referred to the subject's emotional and cognitive focus as "psychological set." Recently, it was suggested that "differential salience" (Senter, Weatherman, Krapohl, & Horvath, 2010) is a more appropriate term to explain the variations in physiological response resulting from emotions and cognitive activity. Regardless of terminology refinements, it is the comparison question that provides foundation for accurately distinguishing between liars and truth tellers. The PLC also provided the pathway for the development of Directed Lie Comparison Questions (DLC). Therefore comparison questions are indispensable to effectiveness of many if not most polygraph examinations.

The critical role of PLCs comes with considerable difficulties. The function of PLCs is counterintuitive. On the surface, many individuals do not find the explanation of the operative role of the PLC to be logical (Iacono, 2009). Critics of polygraph testing have ridiculed the assertion that a truthful subject would generate greater physiological response to stimuli that often appear to be of substantially less importance than the relevant questions (RQ). Polygraph critics also ridicule the claim that a subject who is lying to both RQs and PLCs will generate distinctively more consistent and intense physiological responses to RQs than to the PLCs. Critics also point out that PLCs can create the impression that the examiner is inappropriately expanding the scope of the examination beyond the designated relevant issue. Whatever the difficulty in explaining the PLC functionality, the task of developing appropriate PLCs is much more complex and challenging. In the process of administering an examination polygraph examiners perform multiple difficult tasks. None of the examiner's responsibilities are more demanding, complicated, or important than developing appropriate PLCs.

Proponents of the DLC cite two disadvantages of the PLC as reasons for utilizing DLCs in place of the PLCs (Blalock, Nelson, Handler, & Shaw, 2012). First, DLC proponents cite the difficulty of developing a valid PLC. Secondly, it is claimed that DLC development is more standardized and therefore less likely to disrupt the examination procedures. There is some substance to each of these objections. Developing appropriate PLCs does require exceptional analytical, interviewing, listening, and discernment skills. However, administering polygraph examinations is not an automated technical process. It is a technical diagnostic procedure that requires specialized skills and numerous decisions by the examiner that lead to the final assessment of truth or deception. The same is true of many activities. A doctor of

anesthesiology once commented that he enjoyed assisting a particular plastic surgeon more than other surgeons who practiced at his hospital. He described the plastic surgeon as an artist, who used a scalpel in place of a paintbrush. Administering a polygraph exam can be similar. An examiner lacking aptitude in the development of PLCs, has not achieved the full competency in the skills of the profession.

A large polygraph screening program provided a process for subjects to initiate formal complaints regarding the examination. PLC development generated a significant percentage of those complaints. Scrutiny revealed that almost always, it was the examiner's failure to utilize the appropriate question development methods that caused the subject to complain. The examiner's shortcomings generated resentment and angst that were unnecessary. Those emotions then developed into a formal complaint about the examiner and/or the exam process. Polygraph examiners proficient in the Reid Polygraph Examination Technique, seldom encounter such difficulties, or effectively resolve such PLC related issues when they initially occur.

Reid defines the PLC as a question regarding a past act of wrongdoing of the same general nature as the relevant incident under investigation, to which the subject will probably lie or be doubtful as to accuracy of the answer. The Reid Examination Technique does not use PLCs that address future actions or opinions. Just as such topics are not suitable relevant issues, the Reid Technique excludes such topics from use as PLCs. The PLC should address an issue that is as broad in scope as possible. The Reid Technique uses words such as "ever," "anything," and "anyone" to expand the range of the question. Qualifying statements (time bars, etc...) that exclude the relevant exam issue from the scope of the PLC are not employed by the Reid Examination Method. The Reid Technique of PLC development is based on the belief that PLC development is a complex process. The procedure requires thorough analysis, effective listening, and adept interviewing. The Reid Technique rejects the notion of routinely selecting PLCs from a prearranged menu or inventory of PLC questions. The Reid Technique does not utilize a homogenized list

or a set of standard PLC questions. The practice of selecting PLCs from homogenized lists increases the probability that PLC development will become mundane and that the PLC will fail to carry the appropriate emotional weight. The Reid Technique requires that each PLC be developed for the particular exam and subject.

Although the formation of the actual Reid PLC occurs near the end of the pretest interview, the Reid method of PLC development begins prior to the start of the examination session. PLC development begins with the examiner's assessment of the case facts. Based on analysis of the background information, the Reid examiner postulates the probable motivation for the incident under investigation. Often, the motivation of the offender is self-evident. Thefts, embezzlement, insurance fraud, robbery, counterfeiting, tax evasion, fraudulent expense claims, and similar acts of dishonesty are almost always motivated by greed and willingness to steal and cheat for financial gain. Therefore PLCs that address stealing, dishonesty and cheating are almost always appropriate in such cases.

In other instances, a perpetrator's motivation is not so easily discerned. Arson is an offense that results from a variety of motivations. The author tested a number of business owners regarding fires that occurred in buildings that their enterprise occupied. In a number of those cases, the business owner attempted to destroy inventory or equipment that could not be sold or generate income. The business owner's motivation for destroying the assets was to obtain fraudulent insurance payments to compensate for business failures. In those cases, the PLCs addressed topics of cheating, theft, and general dishonesty. The author also conducted a number of exams regarding arsons and bombings that appeared intended to maim or kill members of criminal motorcycle gangs. The suspect perpetrators, members of a rival motorcycle gang, did not stand to gain financially from destruction of buildings and vehicles destroyed by the arsons and bombings. The perpetrators carried out the arsons and bombings due to animosity, resentment, and a desire for revenge against the opposing gang. PLCs in those instances concentrated on acts of revenge and hatred that were intended to

injure, maim, or kill other persons, animals, and/or destroy property. In another case, a firefighter was tested regarding a series of arsons that destroyed large dairy barns and cattle housed therein. Analysis of the case facts, which included the firefighter's role in battling the fires, concluded that if the firefighter did set the arsons, his motivation was personal aggrandizement. Therefore PLCs that addressed issues of self-important or exaggeration of accomplishments were appropriate. Some arson is a simple act of vandalism caused by a disgruntled, often intoxicated, individual. PLCs in such cases should address issues of anger, animosity, and disregard for others. Anecdotal accounts indicate that some arson cause the arsonist to become sexually aroused. It is not unreasonable for examiners to consider the use of sexual topics for PLCs if there is some evidence that the arsonist was sexually motivated. When the analysis of case facts indicates the act in question was motivated by sexual impulses, PLCs should address unusual and bizarre sexual activities.

It should be noted that PLCs focused on sexual behaviors are not appropriate in all exams involving sexual activity. The author administered a number of examinations to individuals claiming to be the victim of sexual assaults. If the reports of sexual assault are false, the subjects' motivation have nothing to do with sexual stimuli. False reports of sexual assault are most likely motivated by revenge, animosity, efforts to extort money, or conceal embarrassing behavior. Therefore PLCs for the victims of sexual assault should address issues of revenge, lying, and false accusations. They do not address sexual topics.

There are several motivations for the improper revelation of privileged or restricted information. Most professional media organizations in the United States do not pay sources for information. So when restricted or privileged information is provided to the media, it often results from one of the following motivations; an attempt to disrupt or prevent implementation of management policies, self-aggrandizement by demonstrating access to important information, or acquiescence to persuasive efforts of the media representative. In exams addressing such activity, Reid examiners consider PLC topics such as; failure to accept the direction

of superiors, belief that one is more capable or smarter than others, failure to keep a promise, bragging, exaggerating personal accomplishments, belief that the rules do not apply, submitting to negative influence of others.

The revelation of proprietary information to a competitor or confidential information to foreign government is often motivated by greed. Media reports indicate that executives who revealed insider motivation received substantial payments for the sensitive information they provided to stock traders. In such cases, issues of greed, cheating, stealing, and fraudulent activities are appropriate topics for PLCs.

Some government spies are motivated by political ideology. The belief that the policies of their government are misguided serves as motivation/justification for their violation of the security procedures they agreed to uphold. According to media reports Anna Montes, a United States Government employee (Defense Intelligence Agency), who spied for the Cuban Intelligence Service, had an allegiance to the government of Cuba. Her loyalty to Cuba and dislike of the U.S. policies inspired her to provide classified information to the Cuban intelligence service. PLCs that address a disregard for security policies, failure to keep promises, and maintain oaths of loyalty to others should be consider as PLC issues for such exams.

Many compromises of proprietary or restricted information are not the result of any specific motivation. Rather, plain carelessness and/or disregard for security regulations that can be inconvenient, annoying, or appear to be uncalled-for can result in the improper revelation of information. In such cases PLCs addressing careless behavior, laziness, and unwillingness to accept personal responsibility are appropriate.

When a review of case facts is completed and the perpetrator's likely motivations determined, the Reid examiner will have identified several activities that may be suitable PLC topics. The Reid examiner will then review specific information regarding the subject(s) for leads on PLC issues. In some circumstances, extensive personal information on the subject will be available to the

examiner. The Reid examiner takes full advantage of the background information by carefully analyzing the information for appropriate PLC topics.

An investigator's report of a personal interview of the subject can often be very helpful in providing PLC topics. Transcripts of a subject's deposition or courtroom testimony should be thoroughly reviewed in preparation for the exam. In addition to preparing for discussion of the relevant issue, Reid examiners will attempt to identify PLC issues in a subject's sworn statements. Time and again, careful reviews will identify statements of questionable accuracy that were made under oath. Generally, subjects will be reluctant to acknowledge an inaccurate statement made under oath, regardless of the fact the topic may be rather insignificant in the context of the issue under investigation. Therefore, such items can be a productive starting point for development of a PLC.

Occasionally, investigators will surreptitiously monitor a subject's telephone conversations, emails, instant messaging, or documents on the subject's computer. The Reid examiner will scrutinize those materials, not just for information related to the relevant exam issue, but for potential PLC topics as well. The subject may have indicated in emails or instant messaging that he/she strongly believes a co-worker is responsible for the incident under investigation (e.g. theft, destruction of property, leak of restricted information to the media, etc...). The subject's communications may cite specific examples of the colleague's behavior and statements that generated the suspicion. Yet, when questioned by investigators, the subject did not provide any information regarding questionable behaviors or suspicion of others. PLCs focused on withholding knowledge of suspicious activities, being less than 100% thorough in responding to all the investigator's questions, or having any doubts regarding the honesty of coworkers can be very appropriate beginnings for PLC topics.

The author worked on a number cases in which investigators monitored subjects' telephone conversations. One subject was heard urging colleagues to be less than candid with investigators about matters unrelated to the relevant issue. The subject expressed

concern that some matters would reflect badly on the subject or their organization. A PLC addressing whether the subject had ever been uncooperative with authorities or ever suggested that others might lie might be very suitable PLC topics.

Some cases entail testing a number of individuals, such as co-workers or members of an organization. In such cases, it is not uncommon that one subject will provide personal information regarding another subject who is yet to be tested. Often that information can be a basis for excellent for PLC topics. In one such case, a number of police officers were tested regarding the disappearance of valuable jewelry from their department's evidence room. Two of the initial officers to undergo polygraph testing made comments to the examiner that proved valuable in a subsequent exam. The officers indicated that the examiner might have difficulty testing the police captain responsible for administering the department's evidence room. The officers stated that if the captain was responsible for the disappearance of the jewelry he would not admit to it. According to the officers, the captain had "never acknowledged doing anything inappropriate or ever making the slightest mistake." The examiner made note of these comments. For the captain's exam, he developed PLCs addressing whether, during his years of police work, the captain had ever been careless or inattentive to activities for which he was responsible. As the other officers predicted, the captain adamantly denied ever being mistaken, ever overlooking minor details, or that his management actions were anything but perfect. Due to the captain's adamant denials of even minor oversights, the examiner easily developed PLCs on these topics. Polygraph testing indicated the captain had no involvement in the theft of jewelry. Later a non-sworn employee of the city admitted to theft of the missing jewelry and items the department had yet to realize were missing from the evidence room.

In another case, a psychologist who had interviewed and examined the personality traits of the subject, informed the examiner that the subject was exceptionally vain and narcissistic. The psychologist advised the examiner, that being complimentary of the subject would ensure an amicable pretest

interview. Despite the fact that the subject had previously undergone a harsh interrogation by a colleague of the examiner, the psychologist's advice proved to be correct. The psychologist further indicated that the subject would be very unlikely to acknowledge any personal flaws or miscues. The subject was being tested regarding his claim of observing a meeting between several parties who should not have been in contact or even been acquainted. Utilizing the analysis of the psychologist, the examiner developed a PLC addressing whether the subject had ever exaggerated or embellished statements to enhance what others thought of him. Another PLC addressed whether the subject was ever mistaken in his observations or understanding of an event. Both PLCs proved to be very effective.

Unfortunately, the examiner often receives only limited background information regarding a subject. Even in the absence of specific contextual information on the subject, the Reid Polygraph Technique will assess generalities of the subject's background in an effort to identify issues that may be the basis of PLC development. Some stereotypical attributes often contain partial truths and elements for PLC development.

Individuals who work in a large office environment often form into cliques, engage in gossip, and circulate innuendos concerning other employees. For examinations regarding the improper compromise of proprietary information, revelation of personnel files, trading of insider financial information or similar issues, the work environment can a fruitful source of PLC topics. The occurrence of office gossip, the spreading of disparaging information, and failure to keep personal secrets provides excellent themes for PLC development. First line supervisors, individuals who work in a human resource department, administrative assistants, personal secretaries, and those who work in financial services often possess considerable personal/private information. Individuals in those positions have an ethical obligation to safeguard that privileged information. Yet human nature often results in failure to maintain personal information with complete secrecy. Excellent PLCs can often be developed around the issue of whether the subject ever failed in his/her ethical

responsibility to protect the privacy of fellow employees. Such PLCs can be suitable in exams addressing the compromise of restricted information, leaking legally protected information, or any exam in which personal ethics are at issue.

Police officers and some government officials are required to prepare numerous reports in which it would be unethical and/or unlawful to include any information that was not completely accurate. Due to the sheer volume of reports that some officials prepare and the nature of some information contained in reports achieving complete accuracy is challenging. It will often be impossible for an official to say with complete certainty that he/she has never generated a report that contained some false or inaccurate information. This point can often be developed into effective PLCs. Members of the professions such as medical doctors, lawyers, accountants, psychologists, and military officers work in an environment that presumes strict adherence to very demanding standards of professional ethics and behavior. As a result of the volume of activities in which such professionals engage, it is often possible to develop PLCs that focus on the missteps and cutting corners.

Because professional standards are an important aspect of their self-image, professionals are usually reluctant to admit such errors or carelessness. For example, due to the myriad rules and regulations of title/loan process it can be relatively simple to develop effective PLCs around the issue of whether all ethical/legal notices and warnings were made in every real-estate transaction. PLCs that address whether the subject always honored the privacy of clients can be useful for professional subjects such as accountants, lawyers, psychologists, and even polygraph examiners. Business and government personnel who regularly submit claims for reimbursement of work related expenses are natural targets for PLCs regarding false or inflated expense claims.

The Reid Examination Technique focuses the initial stages of the pretest interview solely on discussion of the examination relevant issue. No attempt is made to develop PLCs during the initial stages of the pretest interview. Once the initial

subject suitability information is gathered, the Reid pretest discussion is focused solely on discussion of the relevant examination issue. However, prior the start of the exam the examiner will prepare a list (written or mental) of potential PLC issues developed from the review of the case facts, the subject's background information. Which topics eventually are developed into PLCs will be dependent on the results of the pretest interview. Although, pre-exam preparation for selecting appropriate PLC topics is very important, the critical juncture in the development of PLCs occurs during the pretest interview.

From the moment the subject is first encountered, the Reid examiner is alert for potential PLC topics. The examiner is attentive for statements associated with items on the list of potential PLC issues that the examiner developed in preparation for the exam. It is very possible that the subject will reveal a suitable topic for a PLC, before he/she is even seated in the examination room. A subject may greet the examiner by demonstrating aggravation with being tested. A statement that indicates the subject is offended that his/her truthfulness or personal integrity would be questioned often provides the perfect basis for a PLC topic. If the relevant issue of the exam deals with the deliberate revelation of restricted information or violation of professional ethics, a subject might comment that it is very offensive for someone to even consider that the subject would violate his/her ethical obligation. Some subjects might comment that he/she is offended that anyone would think that he/she would have done something to harm or injure another person. A subject may greet the examiner with observations of skepticism or criticism of polygraph testing. Such statements can often be developed into PLCs regarding arrogance and feigning expertise or knowledge that one does not possess.

When conducting an examination in an industrial espionage case, the author encountered a subject that was extremely irate when greeted by the examiner. Once the examiner calmed the subject, it was established that the subject felt he was being singled out for testing because of his personal lifestyle, which was unrelated to the workplace. The examiner made note of that

comment for discussion at a latter point. When the time for development of PLCs arrived, the examiner referred to the subject's initial anger. A PLC addressing whether the subject had ever done anything in his life that might give others reason to believe he was dishonest or unethical was developed.

As previously mentioned, the Reid Technique does not initiate the actual development of the PLC with the subject until the relevant issue has been thoroughly reviewed with the subject. However, it is not at all uncommon that subjects will make statements during the discussion of the relevant issue that provide the basis for excellent PLCs. Reid examiners are alert to these openings and make either mental or written notes of those occurrences. The examiner may return to the subject's comments when it is appropriate to begin developing the PLCs.

Subjects may make comments such as *"You will probably never encounter a person as honest as I am,"* or *"I simply do not believe in lying or cheating, it is not the type of person I am,"* or *"I have never violated any security rules during my entire career,"* or *"I am a very religious person and would never violate the teachings of my church,"* or *"Ask anyone in the workplace, they will tell you I am the most honest person there,"* or *"These accusations are the result of jealousy and desire for revenge,"* or *"I have never lied about another person."* Whenever subjects make claims of absolute unfailing behavior they have opened the doorway for potential PLC issues. Some subjects will identify potential PLC issues by making statements that minimize past behaviors. Examples of such statements are *"I may not be perfect, but I would never lie about situation like this,"* or *"I have done some bad things, but I would never endanger someone's life,"* or *"I am not the best person around, but you are talking about an entirely different things than I would ever do,"* or *"I would tell you if I did this. I have screwed up in my life, but I always acknowledge my mistakes."* The Reid examiner will set aside such statements until review of the relevant exam issues is complete.

Only after the discussion of the relevant issue has made the subject's position regarding all aspects of the matter under

investigation perfectly clear, does the Reid Technique begin development of the PLCs. The Reid Examination Technique does not provide the subject any explanation for addressing the PLC topic. Nor is an explanation offered for making a PLC question part of the exam question list. It is exceedingly rare that a subject will raise any objection to or even question the introduction of a PLC topic into the exam. This is especially true if the examiner uses one of the subject's prior statements to initiate the PLC development. For example, the examiner may begin the discussion by saying "George you told me that I will probably never test a person as honest as you. That is a very interesting statement. I want to discuss that with you." On the rare occasions when an examinee does question the discussion of a PLC topic, the Reid examiner will say that he/she is checking to determine if there is an outside or related issue that might adversely interfere with the examination. In extremely rare cases, in which the subject is very resistant to the inclusion of the PLC questions in the exam, the examiner will simply explain the purpose of the PLC (Reid & Inbau, 1977). Such an occurrence is most likely to arise when the subject is involved in or knowledgeable of the legal profession. Those situations are exceedingly rare.

As the discussion of the PLC topics begins, the Reid examiner will initiate to use the information developed prior to this point in planning for the PLC development. If the examiner identified a pretest statement(s) for PLC development, that statement(s) will be introduced into the discussion at this point.

Examiner: "Arlene (subject), earlier you said that I will probably never test another person as honest as you. I did understand you correctly, right?"

Subject: "Yes, I said that. I think I am more honest than most people."

Examiner: "Arlene you are to be congratulated. I have no reason to doubt what you say. I am curious as to how you concluded that you are more honest than most. Is there some particular event or activity?"

Subject: "Well I just know how most people are."

Examiner: "How are they?"

Subject: "Well people you might think are honest, taken advantage of situations when they can to benefit themselves."

Examiner: "Give me an example."

Subject: "When people claim expenses, such as car mileage, for work related activities, many of them will exaggerate their claim."

Examiner: "I take it, that you have never done such a thing?"

Subject: "That's right?"

Examiner: "So Arlene, if I ask you on the polygraph test whether you ever took advantage of any situation to benefit yourself, you would answer, "no." Is that correct?"

Subject: "Well I guess I would."

Examiner: "That is very commendable Arlene. You can be very proud of that. That is important to demonstrate the type of person you are. So on the test I will ask, **"In your entire life did you get anything that was not coming to you?"** And you will answer **"No."** Is that correct?"

Subject: "Well yes, I guess I would say "no."

Examiner: "Good, I am going to ask you that on the test."

Occasionally, there will be examinations that address incidents in which the motive of the perpetrator appears to be virtuous or of principled intent. Such a situation requires an adjustment to developing appropriate PLCs. There was a case in which a confidential internal memorandum of professional medical association was surreptitiously provided to a U.S. Senator. The professional association opposed legislation that the senator was sponsoring. The association's plan for defeating the legislation was set forth in a memorandum for internal distribution only. Shortly after the memorandum was completed, it came into the possession of the senator who sponsored the legislation. It appeared that the person, who provided the memorandum to the senator, believed the proposed legislation to be a good public policy.

A number of employees of the professional organization were administered polygraph exams regarding whether they provided the internal memorandum to the senator. The personnel tested fell into two categories; (1) executives on the memorandum distribution list and (2) administrative personnel responsible for preparing, distributing, and archiving the memorandum. The examiner was provided minimal information regarding the examinees' backgrounds. In this case the examiner began PLC development with the probable motive of the perpetrator and then used the standards of the organization and the medical profession as the basis for PLCs.

Examiner: *"It appears that person who provided this memo to Senator _____ was acting with the best of intentions. The person probably believes the senator's legislation is good for the country and thinks the association's opposition is a bad thing."*

Subject: *"Yeah, that makes sense."*

Examiner: *"Whoever compromised the memorandum did a bad thing for a good reason. Has that ever happened to you? Did you ever do something wrong for what you believed was a good reason? Did you lie to protect someone, or steal to help someone, or help someone cheat because they were a good person?"*

Subject: *"I don't think so."*

Examiner: *"Now this is important, so I want you to be sure about your answer."*

Subject: *"I cannot remember ever doing something like that."*

Examiner: *"That is impressive. I am going to ask you that on the test. **'Did you ever do anything wrong because you believed it was the right thing to do?'** And you are going to answer, **'No'**, right?"*

Subject: *"Yes, I will say **'No'**."*

Examiner: *"Research shows that most people respect the medical professions because the ethics are very high. I am sure you would agree that the ethical standards of the medical profession and of this organization are very high. Even though you are not an actual*

member of the medical profession, as an employee of the association you agreed to abide by the organization's ethics and rules. You made it clear you were not involvement in the compromise of the memorandum we discussed. "Was there any time in the past when you failed to adhere by the associations standards and work rules."

Subject: *"Well don't recall doing anything."*

Examiner: *"That's commendable. I realize there are quite a few work rules and policies at the association. Apparently, you feel confident that you have never broken any of the workplace rules."*

Subject: *"Yes, I think that is true."*

Examiner: *"Which rule or policy do you find the most difficult?"*

Subject: *"I don't think any are real difficult."*

Examiner: *"That is remarkable and good to hear. In the time I spent around your office I noticed that the lunch period here is just ½ hour. That seems pretty tight, especially if you need to go out for lunch. But you don't have any issue with that if I understand you."*

Subject: *"Yes, I think that is true."*

Examiner: *"Great! As I said before this incident really boils down to an ethical matter. As you are aware, one thing that makes this memorandum incident so bad is that respecting privacy of patients and everyone may be the most significant ethical criteria of the medical profession."*

Subject: *"I guess that is right."*

Examiner: *"Since you came to work here, have you invaded anyone's privacy or shared personal information about one co-worker with others?"*

Subject: *"No."*

Examiner: *"I didn't think you would. Has there ever been a time that you betrayed a secret someone expected you to keep?"*

Subject: *"I am not sure what you mean."*

Examiner: "Well, did anyone ever ask you to keep a secret they shared with you, but you did not keep your promise? I am basically asking are you a reliable, dependable person."

Subject: "I believe I am."

Examiner: "That is good. So when I ask, **'Did you ever betray a promise that you made?'** you will answer, **'No'**, correct?"

Subject: "Well I guess I would."

When the Subject has provided an official statement regarding the issue prior to the polygraph exam, whether in the form of court testimony, a disposition, or a statement to investigators, the statement can be the starting point for PLC development.

Examiner: "You gave a lengthy statement in the deposition. How long did it take for the attorney to complete the questioning?"

Examinee: "I really don't remember."

Examiner: "It had to be several hours. Have you been able to review all your testimony?"

Subject: "No, not really."

Examiner: "Really, I am surprised your lawyer did not have you read the record, just to double-check the accuracy."

Subject: "Do you think there was something wrong?"

Examiner: "I really cannot judge that. It was a lengthy statement. The longer the statement is, the greater the chance for error. Was there any part where you lied?"

Subject: "No, I didn't lie."

Examiner: "Were you less than truthful in any answer?"

Subject: "No, I don't think so."

Examiner: "You sound somewhat unsure."

Subject: "Well as you said, it was a long statement."

Examiner: "But to the best of your memory, you were completely truthfully, right?"

Subject: "Yeah, I think that is right."

Examiner: "Is that the first time you ever gave a legal statement?"

Subject: "Well, I appeared in court several times on traffic tickets."

Examiner: "Were you always truthful in what you said in those court appearances?"

Subject: "Well I explained my perspective."

Examiner: "That is good. Have you ever been less than truthful in any legal statement? Were you always truthful on any legal documents you signed or similar statements?"

Subject: "I can't recall anytime I wasn't."

Examiner: "That is good. I am going to ask you that on the test. 'Did you ever lie on any legal verbal or written legal statement?' And you will answer, 'No'."

When developing a PLC, it is important to prevent the subject from making so many admissions that the subject believes he/she is answering the PLC truthfully. The Reid Technique uses several furtive methods to discourage the subject from making admissions to PLC issues. Three Reid interview methods for discouraging admissions to PLC issues are; (1) complimenting the examinee's denials of the PLC behavior as being impressive and important, (2) collecting extremely detailed information regarding any admitted behavior, (3) asking leading questions that assume the examinee has nothing to admit regarding the PLC issue.

Complimentary observations regarding the subject's behavior is a powerful method of deterring admissions. In the process, it can enhance rapport, while reducing likelihood of antagonizing the subject. If the subject states that he has lied to a superior on one occasion, the Reid examiner would praise the subject for lying only once. The compliment will provide the message that additional admissions might remove the subject from the laudable

category. The examiner might follow up the praise with a leading question.

Examiner: *"It is impressive that you have been so truthful with superiors. It will be important to demonstrate that you only lied that one time. So I will ask, 'Did you ever lie to a superior more than that one time?.' And your answer will be 'No', correct?"*

Collecting detailed information regarding a PLC admission is a very effective method of discouraging further admissions to the issue. The subject will assume that similar extensive explanations will be required of additional admissions. Therefore the subject will be disinclined to admit additional activities.

Examiner: *"So you stole a six pack beer in college?"*

"What was the date of that theft?"

"Where did you steal the beer from?"

"What is the address of that Seven-Eleven store?"

"What type of beer was it?"

"What would have been the cost of the six-pack if you had purchased it?"

"How did you get the beer of the store without being caught?"

"Where did you take the six-pack?"

"Did you drink all the beer yourself?"

"With whom did you share the beer?"

The subject will simply not want to answer similar detailed questions again regarding other thefts. Denying further thefts will be the easiest option.

Leading statements/questions are also used by Reid examiners to suppress admissions to PLC issues. Just as leading statements that assume the subject's prior misconduct by the subject are an effective interview method of eliciting admissions on relevant issues, the opposite is also true. Leading statements/questions that assume

the subject has not engaged in prior PLC activities are a valuable technique for preventing a subject from making admissions to the issue of the PLC.

Examiner: *"Other than that six-pack of beer when you were a college student, you never stole anything else, did you?"*

Examiner: *"You never cheated at anything other than high school algebra test, did you?"*

Examiner: *"If I ask you during the test, 'Other than that six-pack of beer, did you ever steal anything?', you would say 'No,' correct?"*

The Reid examiner does not disparage a subject who makes an admission to deter further disclosures. Criticism can offend a subject. Offended subjects are likely to become resentful, defensive, and alienated. Alienation can result in anger. Anger introduces an additional emotion into the exam. That additional emotion can detract from the subject's focus on truth or deception and adversely impact the examination. Antagonizing a subject also is likely to make a posttest interrogation more difficult and interrogation success less probable.

The development of appropriate and effective PLCs is critical to the success of the examinations utilizing PLC testing techniques. The Reid Polygraph Examination Technique employs a distinct process to ensure that the PLCs used for the collection of test data will support the validity of the examination results. The development process begins by analyzing the case facts to determine the probable motive for the behavior that will be the relevant issue of the exam. Once the apparent motive is established, the Reid examiner will develop a list of possible PLC topics. That list will consist of past acts of wrongdoing that resulted from the same or similar motivation as what instigated the relevant issue of the exam. The Reid examiner will then analyze the background information on the subject for indications of past behavior or statements by the subject that could be the basis for PLC topics. Once the examination session begins, the Reid examiner listens intently to the statements of the subject for topics that can be used for PLCs. Reid examiners begin pretest discussion of PLC topics only after the interviewing on the

examination relevant issue(s) is completed. When possible, statements of the subject made prior to or during the pretest interview are used to introduce the PLC issue. Reid examiners do not criticize the subject to suppress admissions to the PLC issue. Rather praise that assumes a very limited number of past PLC actions is employed to discourage admissions. The subject is questioned in great detailed question regarding any PLC

admission to discourage admissions. Similarly, leading questions/statements are used by the examiner to constrain admissions to the PLC topics and to establish an answer that is probably a lie or of dubious accuracy. The Reid method of PLC development is time consuming, tedious, and requires considerable analytic skill and proficient interviewing. But examination validity will diminish significantly absent those efforts.

References

- Blalock, B., Nelson, R., Handler, M. & Shaw, P. (2012). The empirical basis for the use of directed lie comparison questions in diagnostic & screening polygraph. *APA Magazine*, 45.
- Iacona, W. G. (2009). Forensic lie detection. *Journal of Forensic Psychology*, 1.
- Krapohl, D., & Sturm, S., (2002). Terminology reference for the science of psychophysiological detection of deception, *Polygraph*, 31.
- Reid, J. E., & Inbau, F. E. (1977). *Truth and Deception: The Polygraph Technique*. Baltimore/London: Williams and Wilkins.
- Senter, S., Weatherman, D., Krapohl, D., & Horvath, F. (2010). Psychological Set or Differential Salience: A proposal for reconciling theory and terminology in polygraph testing. *Polygraph*, 39.